2007/2008 INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE COMMITTEE

Rolland M. Crawford—Chair
Division Chief/Fire Marshal
City of Loma Linda
Loma Linda, CA

John F. Mueller—Vice Chair
Chief/New York State Office of Fire Prevention and Control
Albany, NY
Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals (NASFM)

David L. Adams, RA
Fire Protection Engineer
Sandy Springs Fire Rescue
Sandy Springs, GA
Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals (NASFM)

Frank G. Castelvecchi, III, PE
Senior Plans Review Engineer
County of Henrico, Building Inspections
Richmond, VA

Sean DeCrane
Battalion Chief
Cleveland Fire Department
Cleveland, OH

Robert J. Geislinger
Fire Marshal
Parker Fire Protection District
Parker, CO

Al Godwin, CBO
Building Official
City of Fort Worth, Texas
Fort Worth, TX

Tonya L. Hoover
Assistant State Fire Marshal
CAL FIRE/Office of the State Fire Marshal
Sacramento, CA
Rep: California Fire Chiefs/Fire Prevention Officers Section

Thomas Izbicki
Associate Manager
Rolf Jensen & Associates
Addison, TX

Robert J. James
Regulatory Services
Underwriters Laboratories
Tampa, FL

Joe McElvaney, Jr., PE
Fire Protection Engineer
City of Phoenix
Phoenix, AZ

Peter Merrill
President & CEO
Construction Dispute Resolution Services, LLC
Santa Fe, NM
Rep: National Association of Home Builders (NAHB)

Gary L. Powell
Project Manager
NANA/Colt Engineering, LLC
Anchorage, AK

Dennis S. Smith, CFI, CBO
Senior Building & Fire Inspector
Charter Township of Grand Blanc
Grand Blanc, MI

Jerry R. Tepe, FAIA
Architect
JRT-AIA Architect
Hopkinton, NH
Rep: American Institute of Architects

Staff Secretary:
Bill Rehr
Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

F1-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee preferred the wording in code change F2-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F2-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that considering the safety of firefighters and other emergency responders is appropriate for the scope of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F3-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the intent needs to be more clearly expressed. The definition of Building Area does not include the exterior walls, which could cloud the issue. The committee observed that one- and two-family dwellings are not always used for residential purposes. The storage of hazardous materials in these buildings could be a problem if they are excluded from the applicability of the code. The committee expressed its opinion that the interpretation cited in the proponent's reason statement may be wrong and that the current text is preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

F4-07/08

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 914-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text is adequate and that the topic of historical buildings is also better addressed in the IBC and IEBC. It was unclear how the application of the proposed standard would affect the application of IBC Chapter 34. It was also indicated that the proposed standard could create conflict with the IBC since the standard specifically requires compliance with NFPA 5000.

Assembly Action: **None**

F5-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed section would be redundant with current Section 106 which the committee preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

F6-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is outside the scope and intent of the IFC and could set up conflicts between the fire code official and the fire chief. It was also a concern as to exactly what "fire records" are since the term is not defined. The requirement could cause problems for volunteer fire departments and states that do not report. It was also unclear as to how the section would be enforced and that it could lead to inconsistent data collection.

Assembly Action: **None**

F7-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide needed correlation between the IFC and the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F8-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that an annual permit program is inconsistent with the types of permits required by the IFC. Section 105.7.3 was one among many sections that would be in conflict with this proposal. This same proposal appeared last cycle as code change F9-06/07 and was also disapproved because: "The proposed sections would conflict with current Section 901.7. There is no inspection component included in the proposal. Rather than a lengthy list of entities to whom an annual permit might be issued, use of the defined term “owner” would be more appropriate."

Assembly Action: **None**

F9-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is over-broad and that the proposed sections would conflict with the detailed requirements of current Section 901.7

Assembly Action: **None**

F10-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was unclear how the provisions would be applied to the two types of permits required by the IFC. In particular, item #3 is not needed since IFC permits are not occupancy group based and item #5 is also not germane to the IFC permit process. The other items are already covered by other sections of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F11-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide clarity and correlation between the IFC and the IBC on the subject of permit applications and extensions.

Assembly Action: **None**

F12-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide internal consistency based on the action on code change F11-07/08 and correlation between the IFC and the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F13-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F14-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide needed correlation between the IFC and the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F15-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

105.4.1 Submittals. Construction documents and ~~other~~ supporting data shall be submitted in two or more sets with each application for a permit and in such form and detail as required by the fire code official. The construction documents shall be prepared by a registered design professional where required by the statutes of the jurisdiction in which the project is to be constructed.

> **Exception:** The fire code official is authorized to waive the submission of construction documents and ~~other~~ supporting data not required to be prepared by a registered design professional if it is found that the nature of the work applied for is such that review of construction documents is not necessary to obtain compliance with this code.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide improved correlation of the IFC with the IBC, IEBC, IRC, IWUIC, IFGC, IMC and IPC. Internal correlation with the number of document sets required by Section 105.4.6 will also be achieved. The modification removes the ambiguous phrase "other data" and focuses on the specific type of data required.

Assembly Action: **None**

F16-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the added text in Section 105.4.1 of the proposal could allow the fire code official to require construction documents in violation of state professional registration laws and felt that current Section 104.7.2 deals with that issue. The committee also preferred approved code change F15-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F17-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

105.4.1.1 Examination of documents. The fire code official shall examine or cause to be examined the accompanying construction documents and shall ascertain by such examinations whether the work indicated and described is in accordance with the requirements of this code ~~and other pertinent laws or ordinances~~.

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it will provide improved correlation of the IFC with the IBC, IEBC, IRC, IWUIC and IECC. The modification removes language that is more appropriate for the IBC because the fire code official could not know all "…other pertinent laws or ordinances." that might apply.

Assembly Action: **None**

F18-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the IFC does not need yet another "laundry list" which could lead to errors in the review process.

Assembly Action: **None**

F19-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that, while the subject matter is already covered in Sections 901.2 and 907.1.1, the proposal will be useful in specifically targeting "shop drawings", which is a generally understood term in the plan review profession.

Assembly Action: **None**

F20-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide correlation with the IBC, IEBC, IRC, IWUIC and IECC and facilitate "fast-track" projects.

Assembly Action: **None**

F21-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text is preferable because it gives the fire code official authority to require revised plans rather than mandating re-submittals for every change. Under the current text, the fire code official could also waive revised plans for minor changes if appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F22-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change F18-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F23-07/08

Errata: Revise new item 10 to read as follows:

~~9.~~10.To engage in the dispensing of liquid fuels into the fuel tanks of motor vehicles from tank vehicles at commercial, industrial, governmental or manufacturing establishments.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides improved regulation of Class IIIB liquids used as motor fuels.

Assembly Action: **None**

F24-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the added term "vessels" is in conflict with the use of the term in other sections of the code. Also, the term "special equipment" is subjective and could lead to inconsistent enforcement. It is also possible that the added text could be interpreted to require a farmer with a small diesel tank in the bed of his pickup truck to get a permit to fill the tank.

Assembly Action: **None**

F25-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the format of the current section is preferable and that there is no reason to change it.

Assembly Action: **None**

F26-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it deletes text on closed storage, use and handling facilities that was brought forward in error from the legacy Uniform Fire Code during the IFC drafting process.

Assembly Action: **None**

F27-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

105.7.4 Cryogenic fluids. A construction permit is required for installation of or ~~modification~~ alteration to outdoor stationary cryogenic fluid storage systems where the system capacity exceeds the amounts listed in Table 105.6.10. Maintenance performed in accordance with this code is not considered an alteration ~~modification~~ and does not require a construction permit.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it corrects an accidental omission of construction permit requirements during the IFC drafting process and provides a needed clarification of the code. The modification improves internal correlation by using language that is consistent with other sections of the IFC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F28-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that, due to their hazardous contents, flammable liquid transportation pipelines are as much in need of scrutiny during installation as during repair or modification.

Assembly Action: **None**

F29-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that a blanket exception in Section 105.7 would be inappropriate and in conflict with other sections of the IFC, most notably Section 901.7.

Assembly Action: **None**

F30-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action on code change F25-07/08. The committee felt that the format of the current section is preferable and that there is no reason to change it.

Assembly Action: **None**

F31-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed section would create conflicting lines of authority between the building official and the fire code official because the issuance of certificates of occupancy are within the purview of the building code official. The proposed section would also be redundant with the current language in Section 105.3.3, which accomplishes the intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

F32-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is redundant and that testing requirements are better kept in current code sections on specific types of systems. The proposal is also overbroad and does not specify what types of "installations" it would be applied to.

Assembly Action: **None**

F33-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 112
SERVICE UTILITIES

112.1 Authority to disconnect service utilities. The fire code official shall have the authority to authorize disconnection of utility service to the building, structure or system in order to safely execute emergency operations or ~~regulated by this code and the referenced codes and standards set forth in Section 102.6 in case of emergency where necessary~~ to eliminate an immediate hazard ~~to life or property~~. The fire code official shall notify the serving utility and, whenever possible, the owner and occupant of the building, structure or service system of the decision to disconnect prior to taking such action if not notified prior to disconnection. The owner or occupant of the building, structure or service system shall be notified in writing as soon as practical thereafter.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which authorizes the code official to take definitive action to abate hazards caused by or contributed to by building utilities by means of disconnection of one or more of a building's utility services where all other lesser remedies have proven ineffective. The modification clarifies that disconnection of utilities is primarily a fire operational issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F34-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the uses of the term "Fire Hazard" in various sections of the IFC do not lend themselves to a consistent definition. The definition was also judged to be too limiting as to what a fire hazard is, that it does not include provisions for imminent hazards and that it would be in conflict with several sections of the code, notably Section 906.3, where the term is used.

Assembly Action: **None**

F35-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it is the responsibility of the fire chief to decide what is an important building, not what buildings are or are not expendable. Also, the definition is proposed for the wrong location.

Assembly Action: **None**

F36-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will clarify the code by providing a reasonable definition of the term "inert gas" that is used in many sections of the IFC. It was also felt that using the dictionary definition could incorrectly lead to the unanticipated and unintended regulation of certain gases, such as radon.

Assembly Action: **None**

F37-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, in the proposed definitions, the highest or lowest finished surface could be anywhere along a fire apparatus access road as opposed to in front of the building and could thus create more confusion than not having the definitions.

Assembly Action: **None**

F38-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the phrase "…upon the highways…" in the definition would be too limiting and excludes boats and aircraft, which it felt could be considered motor vehicles for code purposes. If they are not included in a definition, no permit would be required for them under Section 105.6.16, Items 9 and 10. Also, the definition should include gas, liquid or solid fueled vehicles operating under their own power. It was felt that the commonly accepted definition of the term is adequate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F39-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the definition of permit is clearly implied in the term itself and its use within the code and that it need not be specifically defined in the IFC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F40-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change which provides a needed reorganization of the common fire hazards and firefighter safety issues.

Assembly Action: **None**

F41-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides needed technical specifications for waste containers consistent with other provisions of the IFC. Large containers that do not meet these requirements can pose a significant fuel load hazard.

Assembly Action: **None**

F42-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because it contains a dumpster size criterion in the section title but not in the body of the text. Since titles are editorial, the section has no framework of applicability. In addition, Section 304.3 scopes its subsections to waste containers inside of buildings, making this proposal out of place as a regulation of dumpsters outside of buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

F43-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text provides guidance for the fire code official by indicating the basis for responding to open burning complaints and should be retained without change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F44-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

307.4.3 Portable outdoor fireplaces. Portable outdoor fireplaces shall be used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and shall not be operated within 15 feet (3048 mm) of a structure or combustible material.

~~**Exception:** Portable outdoor fireplaces used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions at one- and two-family dwellings.~~

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides needed clarification of the open burning regulations with respect to portable outdoor fireplaces. The modifications recognize that manufacturer's often provide additional safety suggestions in their instructions and that the new provisions should be applicable to all buildings without exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

F45-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would eliminate the permitting requirement for Group A and E occupancies, which the committee felt was inappropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F46-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text better reflects the original intent of the IFC Prescriptive Drafting Committee to allow grilling on fully sprinklered balconies. The action taken in the 2006-2007 cycle on code change F28-07/07 provided the clarification of the code that was needed and here is no reason to further change the text, which would confuse the issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F47-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee did not feel that the materials in the proposed exception revision were equivalent to automatic sprinklers because the materials are still combustible. Additionally, even a 1-hour rated wall will have openings that are unprotected through which a fire on the balcony can readily spread to the interior of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

F48-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a desirable relocation of the open flame cooking provisions to a more appropriate section.

Assembly Action: **None**

F49-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text is clearer. Current Section 308.3.2 #5 requires enclosed flame but that does not appear in the proposed solid fuel provisions. The revisions do not appear to regulate gas-fueled devices. It is unclear how a candle could be made to be self-extinguishing.

Assembly Action: **None**

F50-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there was no justification for deleting exception 1.3 without providing an equivalent noncombustible base capability in the proposed referenced sections.

Assembly Action: **None**

F51-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proponent's efforts should be continued to correct the issues cited in his failed modification and several items that were noted by the committee, including the all-inclusive Group A applicability of some provisions that would exempt Group B religious or assembly uses of less than 50 persons and the confusing language "drinking and dining establishments" in Section 308.3.1 that could exempt bars that do not serve food and restaurants that do not serve liquor. Also, Section 308.1.4.1 could be interpreted as allowing LP-gas fired cooking devices with tanks greater than 2.5 pounds to be used within 10 feet of combustible construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

F52-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that a re-write of the smoking regulations has merit but the proposal needs additional work to resolve several issues, including, but not limited to, the restrictiveness of allowing only metal trash containers in Section 310.6, not prohibiting smoking in oxygen storage areas in Section 310.2.1 and a need for further guidance in the formulation of smoking policy.

Assembly Action: **None**

F53-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

311.2.2 Fire protection. Fire alarm, sprinkler and standpipe systems shall be maintained in an operable condition at all times.

Exceptions:

1. When the premises have been cleared of all combustible materials and debris and, in the opinion of the fire code official, the type of construction, fire separation distance and security of the premises do not create a fire hazard.
2. Where approved by the fire chief, buildings that will not be heated and where fire protection systems will be exposed to freezing temperatures, fire alarm and sprinkler systems are permitted to be placed out of service and standpipes are permitted to be maintained as dry systems (without an automatic water supply) provided the building has no contents or storage, and windows, doors and other openings are secured to prohibit entry by unauthorized persons.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to require the jurisdiction to determine the appropriateness of taking an unheated building fire protection system out of service. The modification recognizes that this is primarily an operational issue and places the approval with the fire chief.

Assembly Action: **None**

F54-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

311.5.4 Placard symbols. The design of the placards shall use the following symbols:

1. [ ] This symbol shall mean that the structure had normal structural conditions at the time of marking.
2. [\] This symbol shall mean that structural or interior hazards exist and interior fire-fighting or rescue operations should be conducted with extreme caution.
3. [X] This symbol shall mean that structural or interior hazards exist to a degree that consideration should be given to limit fire fighting to exterior operations only, with entry only occurring for known life hazards.
4. Vacant Marker Hazard Identification Symbols: The following symbols shall used to designate known hazards on the Vacant Building Marker. They shall be ~~painted~~ placed directly above the symbol.
   4.1. R/O - Roof Open
   4.2. S/M - Stairs, Steps and Landing Missing
   4.3. F/E – Avoid Fire Escapes
   4.4. H/F – Holes in Floor

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to provide the fire department incident commander with enhanced tactical information about the hazards to firefighters present in vacant buildings. The modification provides flexibility in how the placards are to be displayed rather than only allowing them to be painted on the building which could present long-term maintenance issues.

Assembly Action: **None**

F55-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which clarifies the intent of the code in its prohibition of the storage, use or repair of fueled equipment inside of buildings by including portable generator sets.

Assembly Action: **None**

F56-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

315.3.1 Storage beneath overhead projections from buildings. Where buildings are ~~required to be~~ protected by automatic sprinklers, the outdoor storage, display, and handling of combustible materials under eaves, canopies or other projections or overhangs is prohibited except where automatic sprinklers are installed under such eaves, canopies or other projections or overhangs.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will reinforce the requirements of NFPA 13 and provide clearer guidance to the fire code official in regulating outdoor combustible storage under eaves and canopies. The modification reflects the committee's opinion that any building protected by sprinklers should comply with the requirements as a matter of good fire protection, not just those required by the code to be sprinklered.

Assembly Action: **None**

F57-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal could subtly force the adoption of and mandate compliance with the IWUIC and cause IFC adoption problems in areas that do not wish to be involved with the IWUIC. The committee also felt that the proposal would create conflict with the actions taken on code changes WUIC7-, WUIC8- and WUIC9-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F58-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal lacked clarity as to whether carts in coin-operated laundries would be included in the regulations and that the use of the undefined term "commercial laundry" could result in inconsistent enforcement. Also, the applicability of the regulations to existing carts has not been portrayed. The committee felt that a size/capacity of the carts to be regulated should be included.

Assembly Action: **None**

F59-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to provide enhanced life safety in large Group A venues by providing patron assistance in emergencies. The committee did observe, however, that there should be more guidance on the training required and clarification that existing staff can be used and the fact that new staff need not be hired for this purpose.

Assembly Action: **None**

F60-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to enhance the level of safety in industrial occupancies by requiring a fire safety and evacuation plan and drills for employees. The committee did observe, however, that further definition of the applicability triggers is needed, e.g. in how big a Group F, how many occupants, should Group F-2, which deals with essentially noncombustible materials, be included?

Assembly Action: **None**

F61-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

404.3.3.1 Lockdown plan contents. Lockdown plans shall be approved by the fire code official and shall include the following:

1. Initiation. The plan shall include instructions for reporting an emergency that requires a lockdown.
2. Accountability. The plan shall include accountability procedures for staff to report the presence or absence of occupants.
3. Recall. The plan shall include pre-arranged signal for returning to normal activity.
4. Communication and coordination. The plan shall include an approved means of two-way communication between a central location and each secured area.
5. ~~The plan shall be in accordance with the National Incident Management System and applicable state and federal laws or regulations.~~

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to provide a means for involving the fire code official in lockdown procedure planning that is currently being done but without fire service input. The modification recognizes that the NIMS is primarily a tool for emergency forces and deletes unclear language regarding other applicable laws. The committee also observed that the regulations could be improved by including the police and other interested and affected agencies and officials in the lockdown planning process. In addition, guidance should be provided on the "accountability procedures" and the "central location" in Sections 404.3.3.1(2) and 404.3.3.1(4), respectively, and providing applicable exceptions to compliance with other parts of the code in lieu of the new last sentence in Section 404.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

F62-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which is a response to the committee's request for alternative storage means in its disapproval of code change F37-06/07 in the last code development cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F63-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproval**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that college level dormitories do not need the level of regulation that would be required by this proposal and that it would create substantial enforcement difficulties.

Assembly Action: **None**

F64-07/08

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 DOL 29 CFR 1910.120(g)(6)iii-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that this change is not needed. Section 2703.9.1 already provides for trained on-site FD liaisons. The proposal does not provide guidance on how these personnel are to be equipped. If they can be available on a call-in basis, there is no guidance as to the expected response time to the scene which could lead to delays in handling the incident. Attempting to have the fire department train with the number of liaisons that could be required in a community by this change would be impractical. FD hazardous material response teams are better equipped and well trained to handle incidents without liaisons who may or may not be available when needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

F65-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to give the fire code official important plan review information on the site security arrangements which could affect FD access. The committee observed that, since this section is applicable to proposed fire apparatus access, gates installed after the fire apparatus access is completed would not be subject to plan review.

Assembly Action: **None**

F66-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F67-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change which will provide for full-width, properly surfaced fire apparatus access roads.

Assembly Action: **None**

F68-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is appropriate to provide the fire code official with a means of preventing road grades that might cause fire apparatus to get "hung up" along the entry grades and changing grades of fire apparatus roads. The proposal brings to light an important issue that is often overlooked in fire apparatus access road design.

Assembly Action: **None**

F69-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.3 Marking. Where required by the fire code official, approved signs or other approved notices and/or markings that include the words NO PARKING - FIRE LANE shall be provided for fire apparatus access roads to identify such roads or prohibit the obstruction thereof. The means by which fire lanes are designated shall be maintained in a clean and legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it strengthens the section by clarifying the marking requirements and adds standard marking legend wording. The modification recognizes that there are times when notice with or without the markings may be appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F70-07/08

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM F2200-05 and UL 325-02 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.5 Required gates or barricades. The fire code official is authorized to require the installation and maintenance of gates or other approved barricades across fire apparatus access roads, trails or other accessways, not including public streets, alleys or highways. Electric gate ~~openers~~ operators, where provided, shall be listed in accordance with UL 325. Gates intended for automatic operation shall be designed, constructed and installed to comply with the requirements of ASTM F 2200.

503.6 Security gates. The installation of security gates across a fire apparatus access road shall be approved by the fire chief. Where security gates are installed, they shall have an approved means of emergency operation. The security gates and the emergency operation shall be maintained operational at all times. Electric gate ~~openers~~ operators, where provided, shall be listed in accordance with UL 325. Gates intended for automatic operation shall be designed, constructed and installed to comply with the requirements of ASTM F 2200.

Appendix D103.5 Fire apparatus access road gates. Gates securing the fire apparatus access roads shall comply with all of the following criteria:

1. The minimum gate width shall be 20 feet (6096 mm).
2. Gates shall be of the swinging or the sliding type.
3. Construction of gates shall be of materials that allow manual operation by one person.
4. Gate components shall be maintained in an operative condition at all times and replaced or repaired when defective.
5. Electric gates shall be equipped with a means of opening the gate by fire department personnel for emergency access. Emergency opening devices shall be approved by the fire code official.
6. Manual opening gates shall not be locked with a padlock or chain and padlock unless they are capable of being opened by means of forcible entry tools or when a key box containing the key(s) to the lock is installed at the gate location.
7. Locking device specifications shall be submitted for approval by the code official.
8. Electric gate ~~openers~~ operators, where provided, shall be listed in accordance with UL 325.
9. Gates intended for automatic operation shall be designed, constructed and installed to comply with the requirements of ASTM F 2200.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides quality assurance and operational integrity requirements for gates in fire apparatus roads. The modification revises the term to be consistent with the terminology used in the referenced standard UL325.

Assembly Action: **None**

F71-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it is not needed based on the action taken on code change F65-07/08, which requires that gates appear on construction documents for fire apparatus access roads.

Assembly Action: **None**

F72-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

F73-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide better correlation of the IFC with the IBC in measuring the height of buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

F74-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed requirements are unclear and would be difficult to enforce, especially in high-rise office or apartment buildings as well as in covered malls. The committee also observed that it is unclear how tenant changes would be regulated, and expressed concern that there are no sign illumination criteria, the rear and side sign visibility requirements are unclear and the proposal could be construed as crossing the line into privacy issues and zoning issues

Assembly Action: **None**

F75-07/08

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 1620-03 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal has merit and would provide important building information to fire incident commanders, however, it had questions and concerns regarding a number of issues, including: how multiple occupancies and multiple construction types in the same structure would be handled, how changing occupancies would be handled, whether it would apply to carports, lean-to sheds, etc., that it would require handicapped persons to put up signs in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, that the on-going accuracy of the information provided could not be assured, that the responsibility for sign maintenance is not clearly defined, that the requirements for existing buildings are onerous, that construction types in existing buildings can be impossible to identify, that the use of electronic media as an alternative should be explored, that proposed Sections 505.3.6 and 505.3.7 contain commentary language. Additionally, the proposed standard does not comply with the ICC standards policy.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee liked the concept but had several areas of concern including which two walls the signs should be located on, how buildings with fire resistance rating reductions are labeled and the practicality of labeling a building with multiple occupancies. The charging language requiring such signs needs revising to be effective. A suggestion of placing such language in Chapter 9 was also offered.

Assembly Action: **None**

F76-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, while the proposal has merit, it should require that hazardous materials information be retained at an approved location rather than in a box on the outside of the building. The purpose of the HMIS and HMMP reports required by Chapter 27 was intended to be for pre-planning purposes, not for use during an incident. It is unclear as to who is responsible

for maintenance of the box contents. While the current text focuses on having keys to gain access to and within buildings, the proposal would trade off that access for the cited hazmat reports, which seems to be a disconnect.

Assembly Action: **None**

F77-07/08

PART I – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II – IBC GENERAL **Withdrawn by Proponent**

F78-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

315.4 Storage underneath high-voltage transmission lines. Storage located underneath high-voltage transmission lines shall be in accordance with Section 507.4.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide enhanced firefighter safety when working on incidents underneath high-voltage transmission lines. The modification provides a needed cross-reference to the provisions from a new section in the combustible storage section in Chapter 3.

Assembly Action: **None**

F79-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it could prompt a building owner to claim the fire department mobile water supply as an acceptable water supply for a building project. The section is referring to fixed water supply sources, not mobile sources. Mobile water supplies should not be relied on as a primary water supply due to their limited capacity and the time required to set up the operation.

Assembly Action: **None**

F80-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

F81-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text works well and is preferable because it allows local jurisdictions that might have a different water supply requirement to easily bring it into the code and it is easy to reference the water supply appendices.

Assembly Action: **None**

F82-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there is no justification for increasing the fire resistance rating requirement for fire command center enclosure from one to 2-hours.

Assembly Action: **None**

F83-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F84-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

509.1 (IBC [F] 911.1) (Supp) Features. Where required by other sections of this code and in all buildings classified as high-rise buildings by the *International Building Code*, a fire command center for fire department operations shall be provided. The location and accessibility of the fire command center shall be approved by the fire department. The fire command center shall be separated from the remainder of the building by not less than a 1-hour fire barrier constructed in accordance with Section 706 of the *International Building Code* or horizontal assembly constructed in accordance with Section 711 of the *International Building Code*, or both. The room shall be a minimum of ~~250~~ 200 square feet (~~23~~ 19 m^2) with a minimum dimension of 10 feet (3048 mm). A layout of the fire command center and all features required by this section to be contained therein shall be submitted for approval prior to installation. The fire command center shall comply with NFPA 72 and shall contain the following features:

(Features 1 through 17 are unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide additional working room for the fire command staff who will occupy the fire command center. The modification provides a more reasonable working size for the fire command center.

Assembly Action: **None**

F85-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide the emergency operations commander with needed information in a convenient location at little or no cost.

Assembly Action: **None**

F86-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved and the committee expressed a number of concerns with the proposal, including that it saw no justification for creating a 2-hour fire resistance rating requirement for fire command center enclosure; that placement of the fire command center a distance away from the building lobby would place the incident commander out of touch with what is typically the primary staging area for fire operations; that changing the name of the room to emergency command center would conflict with NFPA 72 terminology (fire command center) and could cause confusion as to who is in charge of the operations that are directed from that room; that the provisions of proposed Section 509.2 are already covered in Section 509.1, and that the information required in Section 509.1(12) would not be useful and would overburden the incident commanders.

Assembly Action: **None**

F87-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it has merit and would resolve a serious and long-standing issue in fire department operational efficiency and safety. The committee indicated, however, that there are substantial issues which need to be resolved, including: applicability to "all" buildings would be unreasonable; the application to existing buildings would be onerous; there is no exception for single family residences; deleting the fire department communications system would eliminate a useful backup system; the title phrase "emergency responder" could lead to demands for other municipal departments that use radios to be provided with such a system; and technical requirements should not be relegated to an appendix. The committee expressed its hope that the continuing work on this topic by the ICC Code Technology Committee and the JFSRC would resolve the concerns.

Assembly Action: **None**

F88-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there was inadequate justification for the proposal and that the current (supp) text provides adequate safeguards for tanks larger than 660 gallons.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-M
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change adds needed guidance for fuel oil tanks larger than 660 gallons which was missing previously. It references an approved standard that has proven to be reliable.

Assembly Action: **None**

F89-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide correlation with the referenced standard, NFPA 20.

Assembly Action: **None**

F90-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved it apparently duplicates the previous proposal F89-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F91-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide improved safeguards in the use of portable electric space heaters in certain Group I occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis: The reference in this proposal to new occupancy “Group I-5” is dependent on the final action on Code Change G33-07/08 (D). If that code change is not approved, the reference to “Group I-5” would be deleted from these sections.

F92-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, by adding the IMC reference in Section 606.9, a "circular reference" is created, sending the user to the IMC which, in turn, sends the user back to these same provisions in the IFC. The current text is adequate and avoids the confusion that could be created by this code change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F93-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide an increased level of safety in refrigeration systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

F94-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide appropriate correlation with the ASHRAE 15 refrigeration standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

F95-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

607.3 Fire service access elevator lobbies. Where fire service access elevators are required by Section 3007 of the *International Building Code,* fire service access elevator lobbies shall be maintained free of storage ~~and furnishings~~.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that it is desirable to have a specific prohibition on storage in fire service access elevator lobbies in the code to increase the likelihood that the lobby will be fully available for fire department operations. The modification removes language that the committee felt could result in unreasonable and inconsistent interpretation and enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

F96-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproval**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it could increase the hazard of a runaway elevator and that sprinklers should be retained in the elevator machine room since it is an attractive place for combustible storage.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved at the request of the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

F97-07/08

Errata: Replace the proposal by adding Item 2 as follows:

F97–07/08
608, IMC [F] 502.4, [F] 502.4.1; 602.1 (New)

Proponent: Ronald Marts, Telcordia Technologies, representing AT&T, BellSouth, SBC, PacBell, Ameritech, SNET, Qwest, Cincinnati Bell

1. Revise IFC as follows:

608.1 (Supp) Scope. Stationary storage battery systems having an electrolyte capacity of more than 50 gallons (189L) for flooded lead acid, Nickel Cadmium, and VRLA, or a total battery weight (excluding racks or cabinets) of 1000 pounds for Lithium-Ion, ~~and~~ Lithium Metal Polymer and Nickel Metal Hydride, used for facility standby power, emergency power, or uninterrupted power supplies shall comply with this section and with Table 608.1.

TABLE 608.1 (Supp)
BATTERY REQUIREMENTS

	Non-Recombinant Batteries		**Recombinant Batteries**			**Other**
Requirement	**Flooded Lead Acid Batteries**	**Flooded Nickel Cadmium (Ni-Cd) Batteries**	**Valve Regulated Lead Acid (VRLA) Batteries**	**Lithium-Ion**	**Nickel Metal Hydride**	**Lithium Metal Polymer**
Safety Caps (608.2)	Venting caps (608.2.1)	Venting caps (608.2.1)	Self-resealing flame-arresting caps (608.2.2)	No caps	Self-resealing flame-arresting caps (608.2.2)	No caps
Thermal Runaway Management	Not required	Not required	Required (608.3)	Not required	Required (608.3)	Required (608.3)
Spill Control	Required (608.5)	Required (608.5)	Not required	Not required	Not Required	Not Required
Neutralization	Required (608.5.1)	Required (608.5.1)	Required (608.5.2)	Not required	Required (608.5.2)	Not Required
Ventilation	Required (608.6.1; 608.6.2)	Required (608.6.1; 608.6.2)	Required (608.6.1; 608.6.2)	Not Required	Required (608.6.1; 608.6.2)	Not Required
Signage	Required (608.7)	Required (608.7)	Required (608.7)	Required (608.7)	Required (608.7)	Required (608.7)
Seismic Control	Required (608.8)	Required (608.8)	Required (608.8)	Required 608.8	Required (608.8)	Required 608.8
Fire Detection	Required (608.9)	Required (608.9)	Required (608.9)	Required 608.9	Required (608.9)	Required 608.9

608.2.2 Recombinant batteries. Valve-regulated lead-acid (VRLA), nickel metal hydride, or other types of sealed, recombinant batteries shall be equipped with self-resealing flame-arresting safety vents.

608.3 (Supp) Thermal runaway. VRLA and lithium metal polymer, and nickel metal hydride battery systems shall be provided with a listed device or other approved method to preclude, detect, and control thermal runaway.

608.5 (Supp) Spill control and neutralization. An approved method and materials for the control and neutralization of a spill of electrolyte shall be provided in areas containing lead-acid, nickel-cadmium, or other types of batteries with freeflowing liquid electrolyte. For purposes of this paragraph, a "spill" is defined as any unintentional release of electrolyte.

Exception: VRLA, Lithium-Ion, Lithium Metal Polymer, nickel metal hydride, or other types of sealed batteries with immobilized electrolyte shall not require spill control.

608.5.1 Non-recombinant battery neutralization. For battery systems containing lead-acid, nickel-cadmium, or other types of batteries with free-flowing electrolyte, the method and materials shall be capable of neutralizing a spill from the largest ~~lead-acid battery~~ cell or block to a pH between 7.0 and 9.0.

608.5.2 (Supp) Recombinant battery neutralization. For VRLA, nickel metal hydride, or other types of sealed batteries with immobilized electrolyte, the method and material shall be capable of neutralizing a spill of 3.0 percent of the capacity of the largest VRLA cell or block in the room to a pH between 7.0 and 9.0.

Exception: Lithium-Ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries shall not require neutralization.

608.6 Ventilation. Ventilation of stationary storage battery systems shall comply with Sections 608.6.1 and 608.6.2.

608.6.1 (Supp) Room ventilation. Ventilation shall be provided in accordance with the *International Mechanical Code* and one of the following:

1. For flooded lead acid, flooded Ni-Cad, ~~and~~ VRLA, and nickel metal hydride batteries, the ventilation system shall be designed to limit the maximum concentration of hydrogen to 1.0 percent of the total volume of the room; or
2. Continuous ventilation shall be provided at a rate of not less than 1 cubic foot per minute per square foot (1 ft3/min/ft2) [0.0051m3/s m2] of floor area of the room.

Exception: Lithium-Ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries shall not require ventilation beyond what is normally required in accordance with the *International Mechanical Code*..

2. Revise IMC as follows:

[F] 502.4 (Supp) Stationary storage battery systems. Stationary storage battery systems, as regulated by Section 608 of the *International Fire Code*, shall be provided with ventilation in accordance with this chapter and Section 502.4.1 or 502.4.2.

Exception: Lithium-ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries shall not require ventilation beyond what is normally required by this code.

[F] 502.4.1 Hydrogen limit in rooms. For flooded lead acid, flooded nickel cadmium, ~~and~~ VRLA and nickel metal hydride batteries, the ventilation system shall be designed to limit the maximum concentration of hydrogen to 1.0 percent of the total volume of the room.

[F] 502.4.2 Ventilation rate in rooms. Continuous ventilation shall be provided at a rate of not less than 1 cubic foot per minute per square foot (cfm/ft2) [0.00508 m3/(s • m2)] of floor area of the room.

3. Add new definition as follows:

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

BATTERY TYPES

Nickel metal hydride battery. An electrochemical secondary (rechargeable) alkaline battery where the charge carriers (positive Hydrogen ions) are stored in non-gaseous form in a metal alloy hydride material.

Reason: This proposed change adds Nickel Metal Hydride (NMH) batteries to Section 608. NMH batteries are currently undergoing tests by several end users for use as stationary battery back-up systems where lead acid and VRLA batteries are currently used. Section 608 has become the "battery" section of the code, where several requirements can be addressed for each technology battery. The new definition is required for clarity.

This proposed change also includes an enhancement to rooms where Lithium-Ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries are located by requiring general ventilation in accordance with the IMC.

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because there was no detailed information provided on nickel-metal hydride batteries for the committee to evaluate in determining if the proposed tabular requirements are appropriate or not. The battery name implies that it involves hydrogen but that information could not be determined from testimony.

Assembly Action: None

F98-07/08

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it captures when neutralization is needed and corrects a previous error regarding pH.

Assembly Action: None

F99-07/08

Errata: Replace the proposal by adding Item 2 as follows:

F99–07/08
608.6.1; IMC [F] 502.4, [F] 502.4.1

Proponent: Stephen McCluer, APC-MGE

1. Revise IFC as follows:

608.6.1 (Supp) Room ventilation. Ventilation shall be provided in accordance with the *International Mechanical Code* and the following:

1. For flooded lead acid, flooded Ni-Cad, nickel metal hydride and VRLA batteries, the ventilation system shall be designed to limit the maximum concentration of hydrogen to 1.0 percent of the total volume of the room within an eight hour period and under the worst case condition of recharge following a discharge, or equalize charging, if the capability exists, whichever is higher; or
2. Continuous ventilation shall be provided at a rate of not less than 1 cubic foot per minute per square foot ($1ft^3/min/ft^2$) [$0.0051m3/s\ m^2$] of floor area of the room.

   Exception: Lithium-Ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries shall not require ventilation in excess of that required by the *International Mechanical Code*.

2. Revise IMC as follows:

[F] 502.4 (Supp) Stationary storage battery systems. Stationary storage battery systems, as regulated by Section 608 of the *International Fire Code*, shall be provided with ventilation in accordance with this chapter and Section 502.4.1 or 502.4.2.

Exception: Lithium-ion and Lithium Metal Polymer batteries shall not require ventilation in excess of that required by this code.

[F] 502.4.1 Hydrogen limit in rooms. For flooded lead acid, flooded nickel cadmium, nickel metal hydride and VRLA batteries, the ventilation system shall be designed to limit the maximum concentration of hydrogen to 1.0 percent of the total volume of the room within an eight hour period and under the worst case condition of recharge following a discharge, or equalize charging, if the capability exists, whichever is higher.

[F] 502.4.2 Ventilation rate in rooms. Continuous ventilation shall be provided at a rate of not less than 1 cubic foot per minute per square foot (cfm/ft2) [0.00508 m3/(s • m2)] of floor area of the room.

Reason: The IMC is a big document. It would be helpful to guide the reader to the relevant section of the IMC, which would logically be the VENTILATION section (presently Chapter 4). [see proposal M29-07/08 on IMC Ch 5]

Add nickel-metal-hydride batteries to the list of regulated battery types. Stationary NiMH battery systems have only recently been introduced to the market and are expected to become more widely used in the near future.

Add a time limit to the requirement for gassing. Theoretically, given enough time in a sealed space and given an infinite amount of gas generation, enough hydrogen could be generated to reach a one percent concentration… sometimes in days, weeks or even months. Assuming that other monitoring protections required by this code are functioning, such a design requirement is unrealistic and needlessly expensive. A requirement to design a ventilation system to prevent the accumulation of 1% hydrogen gas within an eight hour period is reasonable. Realistically, most battery systems must be in a sustained failure mode to generate that much gas. Vented batteries could do so, and would require a ventilation system designed for such conditions under this proposal.

Add the requirements under which such hydrogen gassing could occur. It should not be the theoretical laboratory maximum failure mode. Hydrogen release is created under conditions of excessive heat and/or voltage through the cells. Assuming compliance with the thermal runaway protection required by 608.3, the requirement should be based upon the worst case event likely to be seen in actual applications. Worst case would be during the high voltage event of equalize charging for a vented (flooded) battery. Some battery systems, such as UPS with VRLA batteries, do not permit or have provisions for equalize charging, in which case the worst case high voltage condition is recharge following a discharge.

Add the caveat that no “additional” ventilation is required beyond what is required by the IMC. Even Li-Ion and LMP batteries need at least some ventilation.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction beyond what is already required by the *International Fire Code* and the *International Mechanical Code*.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action on code change F97-07/08 and the fact that including a time frame in Section [F] 502.4.1 is of questionable value.

Assembly Action: None

F100-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will limit the monitoring requirement to only those cabinets that depend on mechanical ventilation.

Assembly Action: **None**

F101-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee expressed a number of concerns with the proposal, including that it does not define if or when such systems are needed; the storage could be in a 55 gallon drum; it would be difficult to keep the vessels away from public access areas, especially since they would likely be stored in a loading dock area that is typically accessible to the public and the proposal does not contain cleaning and maintenance provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

F102-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is vague as to where the eyewash station would be required and that it does not indicate for whom it would be installed. OSHA regulation 1910.51 has better detailed requirements on the subject. Also disapproved for consistency with the action of the IPC committee on Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IPC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal for 2 reasons: 1) The creation of a Group I-5 occupancy by G33-07/08 Part I was disapproved by the IBC general committee and 2) placing a contingent requirement for emergency showers and eyewash (based upon another code's requirement) is inconsistent with how Table 403.1 is used. Where requirements are placed in the table, they are mandatory and not dependent on outside decision processes.

Assembly Action: **None**

F103-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text "New construction…" would include new floor openings in existing buildings, making the proposal redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

F104-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it resolves the concerns over unsafe buildings expressed in the committee's disapproval of similar code change F57-06/07 in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F105-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

703.1 Maintenance. The required fire-resistance rating of fire-resistance-rated construction (including walls, firestops, shaft enclosures, partitions, smoke barriers, floors, fire-resistive coatings and sprayed fire-resistant materials applied to structural members and fire-resistant joint systems) shall be maintained. Such elements shall be visually inspected by the owner annually~~,~~ and properly repaired, restored or replaced when damaged, altered, breached or penetrated. Where concealed, such elements shall not be required to be visually inspected by the owner unless the concealed space is accessible by the removal or movement of a panel, access door, ceiling tile or similar movable entry to the space. Openings made therein for the passage of pipes, electrical conduit, wires, ducts, air transfer openings and holes made for any reason shall be protected with approved methods capable of resisting the passage of smoke and fire. Openings through fire-resistance-rated assemblies shall be protected by self- or automatic-closing doors of approved construction meeting the fire protection requirements for the assembly.

107.2 ~~Inspection, t~~ Testing and operation. ~~Passive fire systems and e~~ Equipment requiring periodic testing or operation to ensure maintenance shall be ~~inspected,~~ tested or operated as specified in this code.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides for the periodic inspection of fire-resistance-rated construction. The modification clarifies who is to conduct the annual inspection and that permanently concealed elements are not expected to be inspected; Section 107.2 is also returned to the current text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F106-07/08

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 105-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria (already referenced in the IBC).

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide a needed maintenance companion section to the IBC smoke barrier and smoke partition provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

F107-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for consistency with the action on code change F106-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F108-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal would create conflict with the IBC treatment of non-separated mixed uses. It was also judged to be more restrictive than the IBC, which would create a scoping conflict between the two codes. It was also unclear as to the meaning of the term "incidental accessory occupancies".

Assembly Action: **None**

F109-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would result in text more restrictive than the IBC or IRC because the IBC only requires separation of sleeping units from one another, not from other parts of the building, and because Group R-4 can be built non-sprinklered to the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F110-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on F108- and F109-07/08 and also because the introduction of federal terminology will create conflicts with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F111-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it is too broad in scope and that the current text works better. Also, the proposal is more restrictive than the IBC---the IBC permits unenclosed openings but the proposal does not take that into account, creating conflict between the codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

F112-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed exception would prevent the retroactive enclosure of many openings, which is the fundamental purpose of Section 704.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

F113-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would be more restrictive than the IBC or IRC because they allow unprotected openings in new construction which this proposal would not allow. The committee's opinion is that the proper approach would be to change the new building requirements in the IBC and IRC before making this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

F114-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text adequately portrays the applicability of Chapter 8 to new and existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

F115-07/08

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 CPSC 16 CFR Part 1630-2000 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that application of the DOC "pill test" to interior floor finishes other than carpet is outside the scope of the standard (which is applicable to carpets only). No referenced standard is offered for floor materials other than carpet. Retroactive application would be onerous and it is unclear as to how the critical radiant flux of existing carpeting would be determined. Adding the scoping limitation to "newly installed" would be more reasonable.

Assembly Action: **None**

F116-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee had several concerns with the proposal, including that federal licensing requirements should remain a choice, not an IFC mandate because the code cannot accommodate widely varying licensure requirements. Also, changing the class of interior finish for non-sprinklered Group R-4 in the proposal would be in conflict with the IBC interior finish requirements for new buildings. Applying the provisions to existing buildings would create an undue burden in requiring changes to existing interior finishes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it was appropriate for the allowable flame spread index in Group R-4, interior wall and ceiling finishes, to be reduced in some instances. Occupants with Group R-4 in many cases need assistance to evacuate. The increased level of safety afforded by requiring a lower maximum flame spread index (Class B rating) provides additional time for evacuation of the structure.

Assembly Action: **None**

F117-07/08

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 E 2404-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would be inappropriate to apply the proposed requirements to existing wall coverings that predate the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F118-07/08

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 E 2404-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide an appropriate standard reference for material test sample preparation.

Assembly Action: **None**

F119-07/08

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 E 2573-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would be unreasonable to apply a test for new materials retroactively. Previously approved curtain and drape material may have passed the E 84 test but might not pass the E 2573 test. If the intent is to apply to new materials, Section 803 is the wrong place to include it.

Assembly Action: **None**

F120-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

804.1 (Supp) Interior trim. Material, other than foam plastic, used as interior trim shall have a minimum Class C flame spread index and smoke-developed index, when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723, as described in Section 803.1.1. Combustible trim, excluding handrails and guardrails, shall not exceed 10 percent of the specific wall or ceiling areas to which it is attached.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide better control of the fire load of interior finishes. The committee did express a concern that the retroactive provisions of the IFC should recognize that there may be previously approved applications based on the IBC's "aggregate" wall or ceiling area. The modification provides correlation with IBC Section [F] 806.5 and other sections that reference both ASTM E 84 and UL 723 as a result of the approval of code change FS11-06/07 in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F121-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as Submitted for consistency with the action taken on code change F120-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F122-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would delete needed regulations that provide a framework for regulating foam plastic without any apparent justification. If removed, there would be no way to regulate previously approved materials retroactively.

Assembly Action: **None**

F123-07/08

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 BS 5852:2006 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard CPSC 16 CFR 1633-2006 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change F124-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F124-07/08

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 BS 5852:2006 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard CPSC 16 CFR 1633-2006 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the proposed regulations would be unenforceable for all occupancies and that they should be applicable to newly introduced items only. Accordingly, the committee felt that removal of the sprinkler exceptions would be unreasonable. The committee also felt that the retroactive application of the proposed regulations would prohibit furniture transfers (such as occur between parents and their children going off to college or setting up housekeeping, etc.) and that the financial impact would be onerous and disproportionate to the benefits to be derived. Additionally, there were no fire statistics presented that would support the change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F125-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is inappropriate to maintain an exception for smoke detectors in occupancies where the occupants cannot escape without assistance.

Assembly Action: **None**

F126-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides for testing to NFPA 260 or NFPA 261, which is consistent with previous actions of the committee in allowing either standard to be used.

Assembly Action: **None**

F127-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee expressed concerns over the lack of any apparent rationale for allowing the 50% coverage in Exception #1 and also whether such regulations might not be bordering on becoming a civil rights/freedom of speech issue. Additionally, it was felt that Exception #2 is too subjective and provides no guidance as to what "limited quantities" are, who is to make the determination that a fire spread hazard is not present or how the hazard might be analyzed and determined.

Assembly Action: **None**

F128-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as Submitted for consistency with the actions taken on code changes F120- and F121-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F129-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

808.1 Wastebaskets and ~~soiled~~ linen containers in Group I-2, I-3 and I-5 occupancies. Wastebaskets, ~~soiled~~ linen containers and other waste containers, including their lids, located in Group I-2, I-3 and I-5 occupancies shall be constructed of noncombustible materials or of materials that meet a peak rate of heat release not exceeding 300 kW/m^2 when tested in accordance with ASTM E 1354 at an incident heat flux of 50 kW/m^2 in the horizontal orientation. Metal wastebaskets and other metal waste containers with a capacity of 20 gallons (75.7 L) or more shall be listed in accordance with UL 1315 and shall be provided with a noncombustible lid. Portable containers exceeding 32 gallons shall be stored in an area classified as a waste and linen collection room and constructed in accordance with Table 508.2 of the *International Building Code*.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for consistency with the action on code changes F41-, F42- and F58-07/08. The modification re-focuses the change to the linen containers, which are the real issue, rather than whether their contents are clean or soiled.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis: The reference in this proposal to new occupancy “Group I-5” is dependent on the final action on Code Change G33-07/08 (D). If that code change is not approved, the reference to “Group I-5” would be deleted from this section.

F130-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the term "manual fire alarm system" is an easily understood, common term for which no definition is needed in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F131-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there was no technical justification presented for increasing the sprinkler thresholds. It was also noted that the thresholds are excessive in comparison to IBC Table 503 height and area limitations, which would likely require sprinklers anyway.

Assembly Action: **None**

F132-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current exception that is aimed at limited-use facilities is needed and that the "exclusive" use of the area for participant sports is the key to successful application and must be strictly enforced by the fire code official at the outset of a project. Changes to the use of the area after occupancy should be reviewed as an illegal change in use that must be regulated.

Assembly Action: **None**

F133-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide increased life safety and property protection in buildings that are an essential part of a community. Whereas several previous proposals sought to sprinkler all schools without exception, this proposal includes a reduced but reasonable threshold that is similar to other sprinkler thresholds in Section 903.

Assembly Action: **None**

F134-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F135-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

903.2.6 (IBC [F] 903.2.6) Group M. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings containing a Group M occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:

1. Where a Group M fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m^2);
2. Where a Group M fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane;
3. Where the combined area of all Group M fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m^2) ; or
4. Where a Group M occupancy is used ~~primarily~~ for the display and sale of upholstered furniture.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is a good first step supported by the furniture industry in attempting to deal with the hazards presented by upholstered furniture. The committee indicated its sense that future efforts on the topic need to address Group F and S upholstered furniture occupancies as well and that a reasonable sprinkler threshold needs to be added to provide some relief to the small businesses that will now be affected. The modification removes a subjective term that the committee felt could create serious enforcement inconsistencies.

Assembly Action: **None**

F136-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

903.2.9 (IBC [F] 903.2.9) (Supp) Group S-2. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings classified as enclosed parking garages in accordance with Section 406.4 of the *International Building Code* as follows.

1. Where the fire area of the enclosed parking garage exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m^2); or
2. Where the enclosed parking garage is located beneath other groups.

Exception: Enclosed parking garages located beneath Group R-3 occupancies.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it will provide fire protection for the more hazardous area of garages. The modification retains the exception because Group R-3 occupancies can be sprinklered with an NFPA 13D system which would not include the garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

F137-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that approval would be equivalent to creating a 1 story open parking structure for commercial trucks without any safeguards against the trucks being used for long-term storage akin to a mini-warehouse situation, thus increasing the hazard. Also, the phrase "completely constructed of noncombustible materials" is problematic in that some combustible elements are always allowed in Types I and II construction. These facilities would present a very large fuel load and there has been no technical justification provided for doubling the area of these buildings when they are 75% open-sided.

Assembly Action: **None**

F138-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a logical reorganization of the sections.

Assembly Action: **None**

F139-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it is a height instead of risk change that would disproportionately affect Group B buildings and there has not been statistical data submitted showing that a problem exists to support the change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F140-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee disagreed that the proposal is a simple clarification and clean-up of the section and felt that there is also sufficient ambiguity in Section 903.3.1and all of its subsections to create a need for a complete re-work of that section and all of its subsections. It was felt that this section could be viewed as a specific requirement that would override Section 903.3.1 which could be viewed as only the general requirement and that mixed uses could claim on that basis that non-residential parts of the building do not need to comply with NFPA 13. Based on the proposed wording, it was also felt that this revised section could mandate the use of NFPA 13R for all Group R occupancies

Assembly Action: **None**

F141-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

F142-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was not substantiated and would exchange sprinkler protection for a type of material, which would make no sense if the fire started in an electrical fixture or from grilling on the balcony. The material would not provide any floor-to-floor protection due to the slat construction and the door to the interior of the dwelling unit would still be unprotected and could allow fire spread to the inside of the building. The proposal would also be in conflict with Section 308.3.

Assembly Action: **None**

F143-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there was no technical justification provided to substantiate the proposed change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F144-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it is consistent with the scope of NFPA 13D. It was pointed out, however, that the definition of "townhouse" in the IBC includes 3 or more attached dwelling units which differs from the term defined in the IRC. Some separation requirement could be added to this section to resolve that issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F145-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F146-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it implies that water supplies for buildings not in seismic zones need not be reliable and also that the text would be redundant inasmuch as NFPA 13 already requires a reliable water supply.

Assembly Action: **None**

F147-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it removes unnecessary text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F148-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the alarms required by this section and NFPA 13 are not considered a fire alarm system and are not intended to be an evacuation alarm. Accordingly, the ADAAG requirements would not apply, making this change unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

F149-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because, while the committee felt that it had merit, the committee expressed concern over several issues. The proposal contains subjective language regarding a passageway large enough to move the largest piece of equipment but does not indicate where the passageway is located (i.e., inside the room or outside the room) or how far the minimum size must extend beyond the room.

It was unclear as to whether manufacturers of all components that could be installed in the room would have recommended service clearances for their products. The committee felt that these proposed requirements should be handled separately in the code in the applicable section (e.g., for sprinklers in Section 903, for fire pumps in Section 913, etc.)

Assembly Action: **None**

F150-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the hazard level of pyroxylin plastic warrants the current threshold of any amount. It was also acknowledged that the IBC and IFC are not correlated on this topic but it was suggested that the IBC threshold should be reduced to any amount to achieve the correlation.

Assembly Action: **None**

F151-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed retroactive requirements would be too costly and that the decision to create such a requirement and establish a compliance schedule should remain as a local issue. The IEBC, it was felt, handles the issue better and retrofitting should be tied to renovations or other work in the building. Collateral effects, such as the need for asbestos remediation resulting from the retrofit, should also be considered.

Assembly Action: **None**

F152-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is overbroad in that it would be applicable to all Group A-2 occupancies (e.g., fast food restaurants, small family restaurants, etc.) where the life hazard does not warrant retroactive sprinklering, not just to night clubs. The proposal also disregards reasonable alternative solutions for improving safety in existing night clubs as contained in the other NIST night club report recommendations. The proposal should provide limiting language to make the requirement applicable only to night clubs that serve alcohol, have live music, etc.

Assembly Action: **None**

F153-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproval**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal was not warranted since the occupants in Group I-1 occupancies are capable of self-preservation. The committee also observed that even the federal government is taking a more measured approach. The committee preferred code change F154-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F154-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which recognizes the life loss history of Group I-2 occupancies resulting from the occupants not being capable of self-preservation and the need to defend them in place.

Assembly Action: **None**

F155-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposal is not needed since Group R-4 occupants are capable of self-preservation and that Group R-4 buildings can be built without sprinklers under the IRC. The proposal would create conflict with the IRC in that if that is the code the Group R-4 is built to without sprinklers, it would immediately be in violation of the proposed requirement in this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

F156-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide needed direction for the re-evaluation of cooking equipment and its protection. It also recognizes that modern extinguishing system design is very precise with reduced toleration for errors and that the older generation dry chemical systems may no longer provide adequate protection.

Assembly Action: **None**

F157-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

905.3.3 (IBC [F] 905.3.3) (Supp) Covered mall buildings. A covered mall building shall be equipped throughout with a standpipe system where required by Section 905.3.1. Covered mall buildings not required to be equipped with a standpipe system by Section 905.3.1 shall be equipped with Class I hose connections connected to the automatic sprinkler system sized to deliver water at 250 gallons per minute (946.4 L/min) at the most hydraulically remote hose connection while concurrently supplying the automatic sprinkler system demand. The standpipe system shall be designed to not exceed a ~~friction loss of~~ 50 pounds per square inch (345 kPa) residual pressure loss with a flow of 250 gallons per minute (946.4 L/min) from the fire department connection to the hydraulically most remote hose connection. Hose connections shall be provided at each of the following locations:

1. Within the mall at the entrance to each exit passageway or corridor.
2. At each floor-level landing within enclosed stairways opening directly on the mall.
3. At exterior public entrances to the mall.
4. At other locations as necessary so that the distance to reach all portions of a tenant space ~~anchor store~~ does not exceed 200 (60 960 mm) feet from a hose connection.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides good guidance to the code official regarding design of standpipe systems in covered malls. The modifications reflect what the committee felt the correct pressure loss terminology should be and also the fact that a covered mall, by definition, does not include anchor stores.

Assembly Action: **None**

F158-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

905.3.7 (IBC [F] 905.3.7) Marinas and boatyards. Standpipes in marinas and boatyards shall comply with Chapter 45.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that that the proponent's reason statement substantiates the need for the change, however the committee also felt that leaving a "pointer" section in Section 905, as indicated in the modification, would be useful to the fire code official.

Assembly Action: **None**

F159-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a useful clarification and refinement of required standpipe hose connection locations.

Assembly Action: **None**

F160-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a reasonable exception to the fire extinguisher location requirements for Group I-3 occupancies, where tampering is a concern.

Assembly Action: **None**

F161-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the change provides a needed refinement of the construction document requirements which were part of the reorganization of Section 907 in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F162-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.2 (IBC [F] 907.2) (Supp) Where required - new buildings and structures. An approved manual, automatic or manual and automatic fire alarm system installed in accordance with the provisions of this code and NFPA 72 shall be provided in new buildings and structures in accordance with Sections 907.2.1 through 907.2.22 and provide occupant notification in accordance with Section 907.6, unless other requirements are provided by another section of this code.

A minimum of one manual fire alarm box shall be provided in an approved location to initiate a fire alarm signal for fire alarm systems employing automatic fire detectors or waterflow detection devices. Where other sections of this code allow elimination of fire alarm boxes due to sprinklers, a single fire alarm box shall be installed.

Exception<u>s</u>:

1. The manual fire alarm box is not required for fire alarm systems dedicated to elevator recall control and supervisory service.
2. The manual fire alarm box is not required for Group R-2 occupancies <u>unless required by the fire code official to provide a means for fire watch personnel to initiate an alarm during a sprinkler system impairment event. Where provided, the manual fire alarm box shall not be located in an area that is accessible to the public</u>.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that the manual fire alarm box should not be provided in Group R-2 where false alarms are a problem. The modification avoids putting the manual fire alarm box in all Group R-2 occupancies where there could be a false alarm problem while leaving open the option for the fire code official to require one in a restricted location for use by fire watch personnel, if needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

F163-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.2.13 (IBC [F] 907.2.13) (Supp) Atriums connecting more than two stories. A fire alarm ~~smoke detection~~ system shall be installed in occupancies with an atrium that connects more than two stories, with smoke detection installed throughout the atrium. The system shall be activated in accordance with Section 907.6. Such occupancies in Group A, E or M shall be provided with an emergency voice/alarm communication system complying with the requirements of Section 907.6.2.2.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide correlated usage of the newly defined term “automatic smoke detection system” and the term “manual fire alarm system”, thus eliminating the current confusion caused by some sections requiring “automatic fire detection systems” (which could be interpreted as being a sprinkler system) and others requiring “automatic smoke detection systems”. The modification provides clarification that only the atrium portion of the building is required to be provided with smoke detection, not the entire building.

Assembly Action: **None**

F164-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that the change provides a logical, needed refinement and correlation of the language used in all occupancy group fire alarm requirements which were part of the reorganization of Section 907 in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F165-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that there is no need to notify of a fire alarm the occupants who are incapable of taking meaningful evacuation action in response to it and that the fire code official should have specific approval authority in that decision.

Assembly Action: **None**

F166-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the change returning the exceptions to the 2006 edition Section 907.2.9.1 is appropriate because the reorganization of Section 907 in the last cycle did not intend to make any technical changes but did in this case, without any justification.

Assembly Action: **None**

F167-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the change provides a needed refinement and correlation of the fire protection requirements for new Group R-4 occupancies, which are currently in conflict with the alarm requirements for existing Group R-4 occupancies. Currently, existing Group R-4 occupancies are required to be provided with an automatic or manual fire alarm whereas new Group R-4 occupancies are not required to be so equipped.

Assembly Action: **None**

F168-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it corrects the type of voice system suitable for high-rise buildings to a more reliable, supervised voice alarm communications system.

Assembly Action: **None**

F169-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides needed clarification of the automatic fire detection and duct smoke detection systems for high-rise buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

F170-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the IMC committee action on Part II. The committee felt that there is no justification for the change, especially since it was just changed to the current text in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no compelling reason presented to move the smoke detector from the return air side to the supply air side of the fan. Fires in filters and fan motors are not as life threatening as fires in the occupied spaces which the return air detector would detect first. Some of the language does not coincide with NFPA 90A as claimed by the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

F171-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on F87-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F172-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which deletes an unneeded and unenforceable section.

Assembly Action: **None**

F173-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.2.21 (IBC [F] 907.2.21) (Supp) Airport traffic control towers. An automatic ~~fire~~ smoke detection system that activates the occupant notification system in accordance with Section 907.6 shall be provided in airport control towers in all occupiable and equipment spaces.

Exception: Audible appliances shall not be installed within the control tower cab.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it recognizes the critical need for quiet in air traffic control tower cabs. The modification provides correlation of the terminology in this section with the terminology established by code change F163-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F174-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it deletes text that is in conflict with the alarm monitoring requirements of Section 907.

Assembly Action: **None**

F175-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides a needed revision to clarify the reorganized Section 907 from code change F122-06/07 by clearly indicating the type of fire alarm system required in Group I.

Assembly Action: **None**

F176-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.3.3.1.1 Group R-1 hotel and motel automatic ~~fire alarm~~ smoke detection system. An automatic ~~fire alarm~~ smoke detection system that activates the occupant notification system in accordance with Section 907.6 shall be installed in existing Group R-1 hotels and motels throughout all interior corridors serving sleeping rooms not equipped with an approved, supervised sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.

Exception: An automatic ~~fire~~ smoke detection system is not required in buildings that do not have interior corridors serving sleeping units and where each sleeping unit has a means of egress door opening directly to an exit or to an exterior exit access that leads directly to an exit.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a needed improvement to the re-write effort begun in Section 907 in the last cycle by clearly indicating where an automatic smoke detection system is required in Group R-1 hotels and motels. The modification provides correlation of the terminology in this section with the terminology established by code change F163-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F177-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.3.3.2.1 Automatic ~~fire alarm~~ smoke detection system. An automatic ~~fire alarm~~ smoke detection system that activates the occupant notification system in accordance with Section 907.6 shall be installed in existing Group R-1 boarding and rooming houses throughout all interior corridors serving sleeping units not equipped with an approved, supervised sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.

Exception: Buildings equipped with single-station smoke alarms meeting or exceeding the requirements of Section 907.2.10.1 and where the fire alarm system includes at least one manual fire alarm box per floor arranged to initiate the alarm.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a needed improvement to the re-write effort begun in Section 907 in the last cycle by clearly indicating where an automatic smoke detection system is required in Group R-1 boarding and rooming houses. The modification provides correlation of the terminology in this section with the terminology established by code change F163-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F178-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.3.4 (Supp) Single- and multiple-station smoke alarms. Single- and multiple-station smoke alarms shall be installed in existing Group R occupancies and in dwellings ~~not classified as Group R occupancies~~ constructed in accordance with the *International Residential Code* in accordance with Sections 907.3.4.1 through 907.3.4.3.

907.3.4.1 (Supp) Where required. Existing Group R occupancies and dwellings ~~not classified as Group R occupancies~~ constructed in accordance with the *International Residential Code* not already provided with single-station smoke alarms shall be provided with single-station smoke alarms. Installation shall be in accordance with Section 907.2.10, except as provided in Sections 907.3.4.2 and 907.3.4.3.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides correlation with the IPMC in requiring single- and multiple-station smoke alarms in all dwelling units, whether considered in Group R or not. The committee felt that the modification clarifies that the dwellings intended to be regulated are those constructed in accordance with the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis: The original proposal included the language "…and in dwellings not classified as Group R occupancies", which was proposed based upon the *International Property Maintenance Code*. The modification recommended refers to the dwelling units constructed in accordance with the IRC for retroactive requirements for installation of smoke alarms, which has no application given that the IRC requires smoke alarms for all new dwelling units constructed in accordance with the IRC. Further, this modification imposes a retroactive requirement for the IRC that is outside the scope of the IFC. A public comment is recommended to resolve this issue.

F179-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a clear statement that duct smoke detectors must be suitable and listed for the environment within the duct system.

Assembly Action: **None**

F180-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it does not provide the clarity desired by the proponent and would cause confusion in the application of the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

F181-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would change the intent from currently requiring all units to be capable of retrofit with visual alarms to only those units for the "hard of hearing". The current text expresses the code's true intent and there is no justification to change it. "Hard of hearing" is also an inappropriate term in accessibility discussions today. It was noted that hearing loss is often incremental over time and that the revised section could be used to require someone who experiences a gradual hearing loss to move to a different, dedicated dwelling unit equipped with visible alarms. It was also observed that the revisions would not support future technology in how visible alarms are activated.

Assembly Action: **None**

F182-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the proposed exception is deficient in providing guidance on performance levels associated with the term "limited".

Assembly Action: **None**

F183-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that installing detection wire in all the locations listed in the proposal was excessive.

Assembly Action: **None**

F184-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the life safety evaluation in NFPA 101 is overly complicated for a prescriptive design and that there are too many variables in it, such as civil disturbances or chemical spills outside the building, for proper application in this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

F185-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that inserting the exception would cause confusion in code application and that the current text choices are adequate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F186-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it is over-broad in its scope, that the current preferred method is preferable and that the proposal could lead to inconsistent enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

F187-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee noted that the method being proposed is one of three methods recognized in the current NFPA 92B and that committee is discussing deleting it. The committee felt that since it is already in the referenced standard NFPA 92 B, it need not be duplicated in the code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F188-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the alternative design method proposed in this proposal could simply be handled through the provisions of Section 104.9 and that it need not be enumerated in the code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F189-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it deletes problematic, unenforceable code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F190-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would reduce the protection of system wiring afforded by the current text by not including control wiring. This could then become a weak link in the reliability of the system. The current text works well and must be retained.

Assembly Action: **None**

F191-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current text is preferred and that the proposal would create confusion in the application of the section. The relocation of the exceptions to Section 910.2 would create confusion by raising the question as to whether everything that follows in the section is exempted whereas the current text location makes it very clear that everything that follows in Section 910 is exempted. In addition, the IBC Means of Egress Committee approved code change E114-07/08 which deletes the increased exit access travel distance allowance for smoke and heat vents and if the membership approves in at the Final Action Hearing, Section 910.2.3 will be deleted.

Assembly Action: **None**

F192-07/08

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 204-07 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 change is not needed since the use of an alternative design method could be accomplished under the provisions of Section 104.9 and that the proposed change would be too limiting in the available alternative design methods to only those in NFPA 204.

Assembly Action: **None**

F193-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal could create confusion in that it appears to require draft curtain in all cases whereas Chapter 23 allows certain exceptions. It was also felt that that the subject matter should be located in Section 910.3.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

F194-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that Note a serves valuable function in directing the code user to Chapter 23, notable Section 2308.5, and should be retained

Assembly Action: **None**

F195-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which clarifies the intent of the code with regard to vent spacing.

Assembly Action: **None**

F196-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

F197-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is unsubstantiated and unneeded and that it could be treated as an alternative method under the provisions of Section 104.9. Concern was expressed about the unwanted operation of the vents due to pressure surge-generated water flow switch activations, and especially about the potential for building and contents damage from the unwanted opening of the vents in inclement weather. It was also felt that the fire service should have the ability to keep the vents closed as needed to let the sprinklers do their job in fire control or extinguishment and to easily re-close the vents once they have been opened. It was unclear as to why the wiring enclosure is limited to steel conduit only when there are many reliable wiring methods available. It was also noted that, from an editorial standpoint, there is simply too much information contained in the one large proposed paragraph, which is inconsistent with code style.

Assembly Action: **None**

F198-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal could lead to vents being required throughout all roof areas, even where they would serve no useful purpose.

Assembly Action: **None**

F199-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides clarification by using correct sprinkler terminology in the correct manner.

Assembly Action: **None**

F200-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee expressed a number of concerns with the proposal, among them that smoke and heat vents help to increase firefighter safety by providing an alternative to allow firefighters to ventilate the building without having to go to the roof. In Section 910.3.1, Items 4 and 5 will decrease in value and effectiveness as the building size increases and the openings can be obstructed by storage inside the building. Section 910.4 removes separation from lot lines and fire walls which could lead to venting onto adjacent property. Finally, it was felt that, since the subject is being studied by the ICC Code Technology Committee, any form of approval would be premature.

Assembly Action: **None**

F201-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which properly changes the approval authority from the fire code official to the fire chief since fire department connection location is a fire department operational issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F202-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

912.4 (IBC [F] 912.4) Signs. A~~n~~ metal ~~approved permanent~~ sign with raised letters at least 1 inch (25 mm) in size shall be mounted on all ~~new and existing~~ fire department connections serving automatic sprinklers, standpipes or fire pump connections. Such signs shall read: AUTOMATIC SPRINKLERS or STANDPIPES or TEST CONNECTION or a combination thereof as applicable. Where the fire department connection does not serve the entire building, a sign shall be provided indicating the portions of the building served.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide important information to the fire department as to which of multiple fire department connections should be used. The modification retains the current text of the first sentence of the section for correlation with the requirements of NFPA 13.

Assembly Action: **None**

F203-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide an increased level of fire pump reliability by enclosing them in a fire-resistance rated pump room using requirements correlated with NFPA 20.

Assembly Action: **None**

F204-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on F87-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F205-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1027.1 General. Means of egress in existing buildings shall comply with the requirements of Section 1027 and the building code that applied at the time of construction. Where these provisions conflict, the most restrictive provision shall apply.

~~For existing buildings that were not required to comply with a building code at the time of construction, such buildings shall comply with the requirements of Section 1027 and, in addition, shall have a life safety evaluation prepared, consistent with the requirements of Section 104.7.2. The life safety evaluation shall identify any changes to the means of egress that are necessary to provide safe egress to occupants and shall be subject to review and approval by the fire code official. The building shall be modified to comply with the recommendations set forth in the approved evaluation.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides needed clarification of the true intent of the code with respect to means of egress requirements for existing buildings. The modification removes what was viewed as an unneeded paragraph that references Section 104.7.2 for requirements when that section has no requirements. Also, a life safety evaluation can be currently required by Section 104 in cases where no original construction code information is available.

Assembly Action: **None**

F206-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide an expanded duration of emergency lighting from 60 to 90 minutes which will correlate with Section 1011.5.3, the National Electrical Code and federal regulations. This will provide more evacuation time in occupancies where the occupants cannot self-evacuate.

Assembly Action: **None**

F207-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that its retroactive requirements would be an onerous burden on existing buildings, and that they would be more restrictive that the requirements for new construction. It was also noted that the action taken approving code change F154-07/08, if sustained in the final action, would require retroactive sprinklering of Group I-2 which should be taken into account.

Assembly Action: **None**

F208-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that its provisions would conflict with new building design requirements and that the term "effective corridor width" is ambiguous. Also, the term "approved equipment" in the definition could cause inconsistent enforcement because it contains no guidance as to what type of equipment is intended and could be interpreted as anything. Established code style is that definitions should not contain technical requirements, which is what the last sentence of the definition is. If wider corridor widths are needed, then it should be part of the new building design.

Assembly Action: **None**

F209-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide correlation with Section 1017.3 for new buildings which was revised by code change E130-06/07 by increasing the dead-end limits to 50 feet in sprinklered Groups E, I-1 and U.

Assembly Action: **None**

F210-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will facilitate emergency evacuation of bed-ridden patients in existing Group I-2 by providing an additional exit access door in larger patient rooms or suites, consistent with Section 1014.2.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

F211-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was overbroad and would require immediate compliance in all high-rises of the listed occupancies. Historic buildings, which are very difficult to retrofit, would be included. It was noted that there is no documentation on the cost-effectiveness of these markings in existing buildings and that the NIST report did not discuss requiring egress path markings in existing buildings. The section, in order to be effective, would require retrofitting of exit enclosure illumination in accordance with Section 1027.1.7 of the 2007 Supplement. It was suggested that the IEBC might be a better place to deal with this issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F212-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current term "occupied" is well understood as meaning when anyone in the building and that the proposal could create ambiguity and possible dangerous situations of locking exits through its vague terminology.

Assembly Action: **None**

F213-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it creates an undesirable "laundry list" that could result in "unequal violations" by creating the perception of elevating the listed items higher than others. It was also observed that the charging text could be construed as an unsafe building declaration and that the proposal would make good commentary.

Assembly Action: **None**

F214-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the OSHA directive that the proponent identified also addresses some other fire protection systems that are not included in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F215-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, besides the dry cleaning process, the fire load typically found in dry cleaning establishments is excessive and that the sprinkler protection afforded by the current text should remain. Concern was also expressed about the reliability and long-term maintenance of the dry cleaning systems in smaller plants.

Assembly Action: **None**

F216-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would be unreasonable to require that a building not be occupied under any circumstances until the sprinkler system is completed. It is commonplace in low- and mid-rise buildings, for example, to allow occupancy of lower floors while work continues on the upper floors.

Assembly Action: **None**

F217-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides a useful clarification of the non-applicability of the chapter to a category of flammable and combustible liquids which will not sustain combustion.

Assembly Action: **None**

F218-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would require that existing buildings be required to be retrofitted with service corridors for hazardous materials, which it was felt is not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

F219-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which would provide a useful clarification of the terminology and correlation with NFPA 704.

Assembly Action: **None**

F220-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was being asked to referee an industry disagreement on a subject about which the committee has very little information. SAGS appears to be a technology on which the industry cannot even agree and has not been able to develop an adequate referenced standard. A concern was also expressed that the pressure reduction devices are not listed or labeled by a nationally recognized testing laboratory. In dealing with highly corrosive, highly toxic materials, there is no information as to system reliability. SAGS cylinders are currently allowed by the code as any other gas cylinder, so there is no prohibition involved in the current text. The testimony presented consisted of opposing industry view points with no significant testimony from the fire service and it was suggested that a broad consensus be sought on this topic before bringing the proposal back again.

Assembly Action: **None**

F221-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for the same reasons as F220-07/08. It was also observed that NFPA 318 does not address the types of systems in this proposal and to approve F221-07/08 could set up a competing standard for the systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

F222-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that without a specific upper quantity limit, the fuel load could be increased significantly. It was observed that the problem appears to be one of confusion between the flammable and combustible liquids classification terminology and that of NFPA 704. It was also observed that the proper resolution of the stated problem would be better handled in the HPM definitions, not in a footnote.

Assembly Action: **None**

F223-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which deletes outdated, arbitrary text that is covered in other sections and standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

F224-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, due to the large occupant load in these occupancies, without clear guidance or requirements as to allowable quantities allowed in the corridor, limitations on "parking time", and specifying open or closed containers, exit access corridors in HPM facilities should be strictly regulated as in the current text.

Assembly Action: **None**

F225-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2202.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

AIRCRAFT MOTOR-VEHICLE FUEL-DISPENSING FACILITY. That portion of property where flammable or combustible liquids or gases used as motor fuels are stored and dispensed from fixed automotive-type equipment into the fuel tanks of aircraft.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which fills the need for defining this type of motor fuel dispensing facility. The modification further clarifies that these facilities, found mainly at small, local airports, use the same type of dispensing equipment as automotive facilities rather than the more sophisticated fuelers and systems found at larger airports.

Assembly Action: **None**

F226-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2204.4.1 Approved containers required. Class I, II and IIIA liquids shall not be dispensed into a portable container unless such container does not exceed ~~5~~ 6 gallons (~~18.9~~ 22.7 L) capacity, is listed or of approved material and construction, and has a tight closure with screwed or spring-loaded cover so designed that the contents can be dispensed without spilling. Liquids shall not be dispensed into portable tanks or cargo tanks.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which limits the size of portable containers which can be filled. The modification provides correlation with industry size standards for approved portable containers.

Assembly Action: **None**

F227-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, while it has merit and the biodiesel issue needs to be addressed, the revision to Section 2206.2.3, Item 2 would result in a lesser standard of safety for Class I, II and III than that in item 5 and there needs to be clarification of the differences between the classes of liquids versus liquid fuels.

Assembly Action: **None**

F228-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will provide the fire code official with needed authority to require maintenance inspections and to order the repair of containment and dispensing equipment as needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

F229-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the requirement that protected aboveground tanks be listed and labeled is being removed and that there is no technical basis for the proposal. In addition, Exception 3 does not refer to protected aboveground tank as do Exceptions 1 and 2. The proposal would also treat protected aboveground tanks differently than special enclosures when the development of protected aboveground tanks was specifically directed at making them equivalent to special enclosures.

Assembly Action: **None**

F230-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

ALCOHOL BLENDED FUELS. Alcohol blended fuels, including those containing 85% ethanol and 15% unleaded gasoline (E85), are flammable liquids consisting of ethanol or other alcohols blended greater than 15% by volume. ~~Alcohols are polar compounds that exhibit increased moisture absorption, water solubility, polar solvency and solution conductivity relative to gasoline. Alcohol-gasoline blended fuels have unique properties that may affect material compatibility and fire response.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will provide needed regulations for a type of alternative motor fuel and its dispensing equipment that has grown in popularity. The modification removes text that is useful for commentary but not needed in the definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

F231-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would not improve the code and that the current text is adequate. The current text only references equipment and only needs to reference other sections that deal with equipment.

Assembly Action: **None**

F232-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the term is easily understood and that the current text of the table is needed to regulate clearances.

Assembly Action: **None**

F233-07/08

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 EN 1981:1998 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the proponent had responded to the committees concerns regarding the way the standard is referenced. That concern was expressed in the committee action on code change F156-07/07 in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not receive enough data to determine the applicability of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

F234-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, while it has merit and is an improvement over code change F155-06/07 (D), there is still need for clarification beyond what the committee is able to undertake with modifications. Concern was expressed over subjective or inconsistent terminology which could cause confusion, such as "qualified operator" in Section 2209.5 versus "trained personnel" in Section 2209.5.4.4, the inconsistent use of the terms "refueling" and "fueling" for the same operation in a number of locations throughout, and "to the extent practical" in Section 2209.5.3.1. It was also noted that in Section 2209.5.1, the proper reference should be to Section 2209.3.1, which is where now-referenced Section 2209.3.2.1 sends the user anyway.

Assembly Action: **None**

F235-07/08

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 UL 2075-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides an appropriate referenced standard for flammable gas detectors.

Assembly Action: **None**

F236-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the format of code change F237-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F237-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2301.1 Scope. High-piled combustible storage shall be in accordance with this chapter. In addition to the requirements of this chapter, the following material-specific requirements shall apply:

1. Aerosols shall be in accordance with Chapter 28.
2. Flammable and combustible liquids shall be in accordance with Chapter 34.
3. Hazardous materials shall be in accordance with Chapter 27.
4. Storage of combustible paper records shall be in accordance with NFPA 13 ~~and NFPA 232~~.
5. Storage of combustible fibers shall be in accordance with Chapter 29.
6. Storage of miscellaneous combustible material shall be in accordance with Chapter 3.

2310.1 General. Records storage facilities used for the rack or shelf storage of combustible paper records greater than 12 feet (3658 mm) in height shall be in accordance with Sections 2306 and 2308 and NFPA 13 ~~and NFPA 232~~. Palletized storage of records shall be in accordance with Section 2307.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately substantiates the need for the change and removes references to a standard that has been withdrawn from service by its promulgator. The proposed standard NFPA 232 was submitted for review after the standards reviews were posted on the ICC website and, although it was the announced opinion of staff that it complies with the ICC standards policy, the committee did not feel that it would be a useful standard for reference. The committee observed that the proposed standard is more of a business continuity standard rather than focusing on fire protection and therefore removed it from the proposal through the modification.

Assembly Action: **None**

F238-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a useful tool for the fire code official as well as premises operating staff in regulating the height for storage.

Assembly Action: **None**

F239-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change F200-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F240-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2309.4 Automated rack storage. High-piled storage areas with automated rack storage shall be provided with a manually activated emergency shut down switch for use by emergency personnel. The switch shall be clearly identified and shall be in a location approved by the fire <u>chief</u> ~~code official~~.

2302.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

AUTOMATED RACK STORAGE. Automated rack storage is a stocking method whereby the movement of pallets, products, apparatus, or systems are automatically controlled by mechanical or electronic devices ~~that take the place of human labor~~.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change which will provide enhanced firefighter safety when working in and around high-piled storage areas. The modification to Section 2309.4 appropriately changes the approving authority to the fire chief since this is a fire department operational issue. The modification to the definition deletes unnecessary text that is commentary

Assembly Action: **None**

F241-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because it provides needed guidance to the fire code official on how membrane structures erected on buildings are to be viewed and regulated. Without this change, they are essentially a building addition without regulation. The action is also consistent with the action taken by the IBC-General Committee on Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: If a membrane is constructed on a building it needs to be regulated. This proposal would clarify between the temporary requirements in the IFC and the permanent membrane requirements in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

F242-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides needed correlation between Chapters 10 and 24 on the subject of exit sign illumination.

Assembly Action: **None**

F243-07/08

PART I – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a needed clarification and improved correlation between the tent and canopy provisions of the IBC and those of the IFC. It was observed, however, that the lack of a definition for canopy in the IFC may become problematic later on. The action is also consistent with the action of the IBC-General Committee on Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Clarifies within the IBC the difference between a tent-like structure and permanent canopy structure such as those used in locations such as fuel service stations.

Assembly Action: **None**

F244-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2505.2 Separation of piles. Individual tire storage piles shall be separated from other piles by a clear space of at least 40 feet (12 192 mm).

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will remove the limiting language from the section. The modification is consistent with the proponent's reason statement and restores and further clarifies the original intent of the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

F245-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved at the request of the proponent who wishes to revise the proposal to reflect a consensus that has been reached on how to better deal with physical and health hazards since the proposal was first submitted.

Assembly Action: **None**

F246-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

Add a new section to Appendix H as follows:

1.4 HMMP short form. Facilities with the maximum allowable quantities or less per control area in Tables 2703.3.3(10) through 2703.1.1(4) and where the threshold planning quantities at 40 CFR Part 355, Sections 302 and 304 are not exceeded, shall be allowed to file a short-form HMMP which shall include the following components.

1.4.1. General facility information:
1.4.2. A simple line drawing of the facility showing the location of storage facilities and indicating the hazard class or classes and physical state of the hazardous materials being stored;
1.4.3. Information that the hazardous materials will be stored and handled in a safe manner and will be appropriately contained, separated and monitored, and
1.4.4. Assurance that security precautions have been take, employees have been appropriately trained to handle the hazardous materials and react to emergency situations, adequate labeling and warning signs are posted, adequate emergency equipment is maintained and the disposal of hazardous materials will be in an appropriate manner.

Add an introduction to Section H102, as follows:

Facilities which have prepared, filed and submitted a Tier II Inventory Report required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or required by a state which has secured USEPA approval for a similar form shall be deemed to have complied with this section.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the proponents had reached agreement on Appendix H format and contents and had appropriately responded to the committee's suggestions in the last cycle. It was suggested that the appendix could be improved by creating a separate section on emergency preparedness/emergency response and to move the items related to those topics out of their current locations in the HMMP section. The modification provides a useful "short form" HMMP that has been accepted by the proponents for facilities not classified in Group H (i.e., having no more than the MAQ per control area).

Assembly Action: **None**

F247-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the additional table entries will provide needed guidance to the fire code official in determining occupancy Group H.

Assembly Action: **None**

F248-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F249-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will provide technical specifications for pressure vessels.

Assembly Action: **None**

F250-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that piping design is a complex discipline that design engineers in the field are familiar with and, therefore, they do not need a list of standards in the code. In addition, the committee felt that, since the proponent did not submit the proposed standards for staff and committee review due to the very high cost of doing so, then no jurisdiction could be expected to purchase the standards either. The committee also indicated that the IMC or IFGC would be a more appropriate venue for these discussions.

Assembly Action: **None**

F251-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the choice of piping category is an engineering judgment item and should be documented and justified in the plan review process. The standard is very complex and can be confusing and would likely not be in the fire code official's library due to the documents high cost. The committee also observed that these issues should be handled by the IMC and IPC committees and then the IFC could simply reference those codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

F252-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2703.2.9 Testing. The equipment, devices and systems listed in Section 2703.2.9.1 shall be tested at the time of installation and at one of the intervals listed in Section 2703.2.9.2. Written records of the tests conducted or maintenance performed shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of Section 107.2.1.

Exceptions:

1. Periodic ~~T~~ testing shall not be required where approved written documentation is provided stating that testing will damage the equipment, device or system and the equipment, device or system is maintained as specified by the manufacturer.

2. Periodic ~~T~~ testing shall not be required for equipment, devices and systems that fail in a fail-safe manner.
3. Periodic ~~T~~ testing shall not be required for equipment, devices and systems that self-diagnose and report trouble. Records of the self-diagnosis and trouble reporting shall be made available to the fire code official.
4. Periodic ~~T~~ testing shall not be required if system activation occurs during the required test cycle for the components activated during the test cycle.
5. Approved maintenance in accordance with Section 2703.2.6 that is performed not less than annually or in accordance with an approved schedule shall be allowed to meet the testing requirements set forth in Sections 2703.2.9.1 and 2703.2.9.2.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it would provide improved safety by requiring acceptance testing rather than periodic tests only. The modification clarifies the proponent's intent that exceptions 1 through 4 should not apply to the acceptance tests.

Assembly Action: **None**

F253-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with action on code change F252-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F254-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2704.7 (Supp) Standby or emergency power. Where mechanical ventilation, treatment systems, temperature control, alarm, detection or other electrically operated systems are required, such systems shall be provided with an emergency or standby power system in accordance with NFPA 70 and Section 604.

Exceptions:

1. ~~Standby or emergency power for m~~ Mechanical ventilation for storage of Class IB and Class IC flammable and combustible liquids in closed containers not exceeding 6.5 gallons (25 L) capacity ~~single story occupancies~~.
2. Storage areas for Class 1 and 2 oxidizers.
3. Storage areas for Class II, III, IV and V organic peroxides.
4. Storage areas for asphyxiant, irritant and radioactive gases.
5. For storage areas for highly toxic or toxic materials, see Sections 3704.2.2.8 and 3704.3.2.6.
6. Standby power for mechanical ventilation, treatment systems and temperature control systems shall not be required where an approved fail-safe engineered system is installed.

[F] 414.5.4 (Supp) Standby or emergency power. Where mechanical ventilation, treatment systems, temperature control, alarm, detection or other electrically operated systems are required, such systems shall be provided with an emergency or standby power system in accordance with Section 2702.

Exceptions:

1. ~~Standby or emergency power for m~~ Mechanical ventilation for storage of Class IB and Class IC flammable and combustible liquids in closed containers not exceeding 6.5 gallons (25 L) capacity ~~single story occupancies~~.
2. Storage areas for Class 1 and 2 oxidizers.
3. Storage areas for Class II, III, IV and V organic peroxides.
4. Storage areas for asphyxiant, irritant and radioactive gases.
5. For storage, use and handling areas for highly toxic or toxic materials, see Sections 3704.2.2.8 and 3704.3.2.6 of the *International Fire Code*.
6. Standby power for mechanical ventilation, treatment systems and temperature control systems shall not be required where an approved fail-safe engineered system is installed.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change. The modification correlates with industry treatment of portable container storage. Notably, FM Global recognizes that storage of small, closed containers does not pose a risk that warrants ventilation for these materials. FM Data Sheet 7-29, *Flammable and Combustible Liquid Storage in Portable Containers*, does not require mechanical ventilation for flammable liquids in closed containers of not

greater than 6.5 gallons individual capacity, with a flash point of not greater than 100 ºF and a boiling point equal to or greater than 100ºF. NFPA 30, *Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code*, also recognizes that closed container storage does not pose a risk that warrants ventilation (ventilation is required if there is open dispensing). These materials are in sealed containers in storage. Any loss of power would require an immediate cessation of operations, which would eliminate spill risk. By limiting the container size, the potential for accidental spills is significantly reduced.

Assembly Action: **None**

F255-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, while it has merit, the committee had numerous concerns, including: it focuses on hazardous material storage when the incidents anticipated here typically happen in transportation scenarios; the system would use "old technology" such as tornado sirens when there are a number of newer, more cost-effective technologies that are available, including, among others, the internet or "reverse 911" systems; it is questionable as to making community vulnerabilities so readily available which could be used in criminal activities or terrorism; it puts the fire code official in the position of having to test the system or relying on certified personnel without providing any guidance on what certification would entail and who the certifying agency would be; it would allow the fire code official to arbitrarily expand the safety zone without providing any guidance on the criteria that should be met for that to happen; there have been no statistical data provided as to the injuries or deaths that have been averted because of such systems; the proposed text does not say that the system is required; it contains redundant definitions, i.e., buffer zone and vulnerability zone mean the same thing; it contains definitions of terms that are not used in the text, i.e., hypersensitivity list and hazmat even zone; more concise triggers should be provided since this would not be an appropriate requirement for all Group H occupancies; and it was suggested that these requirements be placed in an appendix to the code so that if a community needs the provisions, it will be readily available for adoption.

Assembly Action: **None**

F256-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved at the proponents request based on the action taken on code change F254-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F257-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it clarifies the intent of the section regarding the operation of automatic controls.

Assembly Action: **None**

F258-07/08

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 DOL 29 CFR 1910.119-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did **not** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the proponent requested it and the committee felt that the text could be used to require businesses to prepare a PHA when they might not otherwise have to. The proposal needs further refinement as to applicability only to facilities subject to PHA under the 29 CFR standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

F259-07/08

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 DOL 29 CFR 1910.119-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did **not** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action on code change F258-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F260-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide appropriate regulation of tube trailers.

Assembly Action: **None**

F261-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that non-bulk cryogenic fluids and oxidizing gases need to be included along with a broader reference to Chapter 40.

Assembly Action: **None**

F262-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a needed reorganization and clarification of Chapter 32 .

Assembly Action: **None**

F263-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the current text reflects the code's intent on fireworks better and that the new text would be too permissive. The proposed text would not reflect the strong voice that the IFC needs to be on the subject of fireworks. It was also noted that the proposed text would be in conflict with the charging paragraph.

Assembly Action: **None**

F264-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there needs to be more definitive proof of the hazard reduction of the explosive material and that it should be better documented as being permanent. There needs to be specific specifications on the dilution and desensitization to provide guidance in decision making.

Assembly Action: **None**

F265-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 3301.8.1(3)
APPLICATION OF SEPARATION DISTANCE (Q-D) TABLES—DIVISION 1.4 EXPLOSIVES[a,b,c,d]

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.
a. The minimum separation distance (Do) shall be a minimum of 50 feet.
b. Linear interpolation between tabular values in the referenced Q-D table shall not be allowed.
c. For definitions of Quantity-Distance abbreviations IBD, ILD, IMD, IPD and PTR, see Section 3302.1.
d. This table shall not apply to ~~articles, including articles packaged for shipment, that are not regulated as an explosive under Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms regulations or unpacked articles used in process operations that do not propagate a detonation or deflagration between articles, or to~~ consumer fireworks, 1.4G.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement substantiates the need for the change. The new table note is simply a reiteration of the fact that, by definition, consumer fireworks, 1.4G, are not regulated by the table. The definition is often overlooked in applying the provisions of the table and this will provide clarity for the code user. The modification corrects an error in the preparation of the original code change.

Assembly Action: **None**

F266-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the new table note is simply a reiteration of the fact that, by definition, consumer fireworks, 1.4G, are not regulated by the table. The definition is often overlooked in applying the provisions of the table and this will provide clarity for the code user. This is also consistent with the action taken on code change F265-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F267-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for consistency with the action taken on code changes F265-07/08 and F266-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F268-07/08

Errata: Replace the reason statement as follows:

Reason: Since the temporary storage of consumer fireworks, 1.4G occurs in almost every state in the US, it makes good sense to specify fire safety regulations for those situations. NFPA 1124-2006 contains fairly comprehensive requirements for such storage that have been developed through the NFPA consensus process.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide good guidance on the short-term pre-holiday storage of consumer fireworks.

Assembly Action: **None**

F269-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F270-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there are other standards that are available from other promulgators that may be applicable and because the proponent requested disapproval to revise the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

F271-07/08

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

3404.2.7.3.3 Vent pipe outlets. Vent pipe outlets for tanks storing Class I, II or IIIA liquids shall be located such that the vapors are released at a safe point outside of buildings and not less than 12 feet (3658 mm) above the ~~adjacent~~ finished ground level. Vapors shall be discharged upward or horizontally away from adjacent walls to assist in vapor dispersion. Vent outlets shall be located such that flammable vapors will not be trapped by eaves or other obstructions and shall be at least 5 feet (1524 mm) from building openings or lot lines of properties that can be built upon. Vent outlets on atmospheric tanks storing Class IIIB liquids are allowed to discharge inside a building if the vent is a normally closed vent.

> **Exception:** Vent pipe outlets on tanks storing Class IIIB liquid inside buildings and connected to fuel-burning equipment shall be located such that the vapors are released to a safe location outside of buildings.

3404.2.7.5.2 Filling, emptying and vapor recovery connections. Filling, emptying and vapor recovery connections to tanks containing Class I, II or IIIA liquids shall be located outside of buildings at a location free from sources of ignition and not less than 5 feet (1524 mm) away from building openings or lot lines of property that can be built on. Such openings shall be provided with a liquid-tight cap which shall be closed when not in use and properly identified.

Filling and emptying connections to indoor tanks containing Class III B liquids and connected to fuel-burning equipment shall be located at a ~~grade~~ finished ground level location outside of buildings. Such openings shall be provided with a liquid-tight cap which shall be closed when not in use. A sign in accordance with Section 2703.6 that displays the following warning shall be permanently attached at the filling location:

TRANSFERRING FUEL OTHER THAN CLASS III B COMBUSTIBLE LIQUID TO THIS LOCATION TANK CONNECTION IS A VIOLATION OF THE FIRE CODE AND IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED

3404.2.7.5.8 Overfill prevention. An approved means or method in accordance with Section 3404.2.9.6.6 shall be provided to prevent the overfill of all Class I, II and IIIA liquid storage tanks. Storage tanks in refineries, bulk plants or terminals regulated by Sections 3406.4 or 3406.7 shall have overfill protection in accordance with API 2350.

An approved means or method in accordance with Section 3404.2.9.6.6 shall be provided to prevent the overfilling of Class IIIB liquid storage tanks inside buildings connected to fuel-burning equipment.

> **Exception:** Outside above-ground tanks with a capacity of 1320 gallons (5000 L) or less.

~~An approved means or method in accordance with Section 3404.2.9.6.6 shall be provided to prevent the overfilling of Class IIIB liquid storage tanks inside buildings connected to fuel-burning equipment.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal provides reasonable controls to prevent the overfilling of tanks containing Class IIIB liquids supplying fuel burning equipment and as a safeguard against the impact of potential switch-loading to a more hazardous class of liquid fuel. The modification provides correlation with the terminology used in Chapter 5 of the IBC and clarifies the intent of the proposal that the exception should apply to the entire section, including the added text on Class IIIB liquids.

Assembly Action: None

F272-07/08

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 API RP 2210-(2000) indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal included no technical justification for the deletion of Section 3404.2.9.6.3 which contains an important and necessary tank vent safeguard in favor of a reference to a document, API RP 2210, that contains no technical requirements on end-of-line flame arrestors. The proposed referenced document contains only anecdotal historical information on flame arrestors.

Assembly Action: **None**

F273-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the connection location should be related to where the delivering vehicle is parked. It was also suggested that the provision might be better located in Section 3404.2.7.5.6.

Assembly Action: **None**

F274-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the tanks, as they deteriorate, can leave dangerous holes in the ground that can lead to injury or property damage.

Assembly Action: **None**

F275-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it will provide needed tank and equipment maintenance requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

F276-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 3404.3.6.3(1)
MAXIMUM STORAGE HEIGHT IN CONTROL AREA

TYPE OF LIQUID	NONSPRINKLERED AREA (feet)	SPRINKLERED AREA[a] (feet)	SPRINKLERED WITH IN-RACK PROTECTION[a, b] (feet)

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

a. In buildings ~~required to be~~ protected by an automatic sprinkler system, the storage height for containers and portable tanks shall not exceed the maximum storage height permitted for the fire protection scheme set forth in NFPA 30 or the maximum storage height demonstrated in a full-scale fire test, whichever is greater. NFPA 30 criteria and fire test results for metallic containers and portable tanks shall not be applied to non-metallic containers and portable tanks.
b. In-rack protection shall be in accordance with Table 3404.3.6.3(5), 3404.3.6.3(6) or 3404.3.6.3(7).

TABLE 3404.3.6.3(2)
STORAGE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PALLETIZED OR SOLID-PILE STORAGE IN LIQUID STORAGE ROOMS AND WAREHOUSES

CLASS	STORAGE LEVEL	MAXIMUM STORAGE HEIGHT			MAXIMUM QUANTITY PER PILE (gallons)		MAXIMUM QUANTITY PER ROOM[a] (gallons)	
		Drums	Containers[b] (feet)	Portable tanks[b] (feet)	Containers	Portable tanks	Containers	Portable tanks

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm, 1 gallon = 3.785 L.
a. See Section 3404.3.8.1 for unlimited quantities in liquid storage warehouses.
b. In buildings ~~required to be~~ protected by an automatic sprinkler system, the storage height for containers and portable tanks shall not exceed the maximum storage height permitted for the fire protection scheme set forth in NFPA 30 or the maximum storage height demonstrated in a full-scale fire test, whichever is greater. NFPA 30 criteria and fire test results for metallic containers and portable tanks shall not be applied to non-metallic containers and portable tanks.
c. These height limitations are allowed to be increased to 10 feet for containers having a capacity of 5 gallons or less.
d. For palletized storage of unsaturated polyester resins (UPR) in relieving-style metal containers with 50 percent or less by weight Class IC or II liquid and no Class IA or IB liquid, height and pile quantity limits shall be permitted to be 10 feet and 15,000 gallons, respectively, provided that such storage is protected by sprinklers in accordance with NFPA 30 and that the UPR storage area is not located in the same containment area or drainage path for other Class I or II liquids

TABLE 3404.3.6.3(3)
STORAGE ARRANGEMENTS FOR RACK STORAGE IN LIQUID STORAGE ROOMS AND WAREHOUSES

CLASS	TYPE RACK	STORAGE LEVEL	MAXIMUM STORAGE HEIGHT (feet)[b]	MAXIMUM QUANTITY PER ROOM[a] (gallons)
			Containers	Containers

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm, 1 gallon = 3.785 L.
a. See Section 3404.3.8.1 for unlimited quantities in liquid storage warehouses.
b. In buildings ~~required to be~~ protected by an automatic sprinkler system, the storage height for containers and portable tanks shall not exceed the maximum storage height permitted for the fire protection scheme set forth in NFPA 30 or the maximum storage height demonstrated in a full-scale fire test, whichever is greater. NFPA 30 criteria and fire test results for metallic containers and portable tanks shall not be applied to non-metallic containers and portable tanks.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will clarify the proper application of the tables to the types of containers that were the subject of the referenced full-scale tests. The modification reflects the committee's opinion that there is no reason to allow the jeopardizing of the protection afforded by non-required sprinkler systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

F277-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a useful clarification of the text on the subject of liquid transfer.

Assembly Action: **None**

F278-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a useful clarification of the text and also for consistency with the action taken on code change F277-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F279-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a useful clarification of the text and is being offered in response to committee discussion on this topic in the last cycle.

Assembly Action: **None**

F280-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F281-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3406.5.4.5 Commercial, industrial, governmental or manufacturing. Dispensing of Class II and III motor vehicle fuel from tank vehicles into the fuel tanks of motor vehicles located at commercial, industrial, governmental or manufacturing establishments is allowed where permitted, provided such dispensing operations are conducted in accordance with the following:

1. Dispensing shall occur only at sites that have been issued a permit to conduct mobile fueling.
2. The owner of a mobile fueling operation shall provide to the jurisdiction a written response plan which demonstrates readiness to respond to a fuel spill and carry out appropriate mitigation measures, and describes the process to dispose properly of contaminated materials.
3. A detailed site plan shall be submitted with each application for a permit. The site plan shall indicate: all buildings, structures and appurtenances on site and their use or function; all uses adjacent to the property lines of the site; the locations of all storm drain openings, adjacent waterways or wetlands; information regarding slope, natural drainage, curbing, impounding and how a spill will be retained upon the site property; and the scale of the site plan.

   Provisions shall be made to prevent liquids spilled during dispensing operations from flowing into buildings or off-site. Acceptable methods include, but shall not be limited to, grading driveways, raising doorsills or other approved means.
4. The fire code official is allowed to impose limits on the times and days during which mobile fueling operations may take place, and specific locations on a site where fueling is permitted.
5. Mobile fueling operations shall be conducted in areas not accessible to the public or shall be limited to times when the public is not present.
6. Mobile fueling shall not take place within 15 feet (4572 mm) of ~~streets, alleys, public ways,~~ buildings, property lines, combustible storage or storm drains.

   Exceptions:

   1. The distance to storm drains shall not apply where an approved storm drain cover or an approved equivalent that will prevent any fuel from reaching the drain is in place prior to fueling or a fueling hose being placed within 15 feet of the drain. Where placement of a storm drain cover will cause the accumulation of excessive water or difficulty in conducting the fueling, such cover shall not be used and the fueling shall not take place within 15 feet of a drain.
   2. The distance to storm drains shall not apply for drains that direct influent to approved oil interceptors.

7. The tank vehicle shall comply with the requirements of NFPA 385 and local, state and federal requirements. The tank vehicle's specific functions shall include that of supplying fuel to motor vehicle fuel tanks. The vehicle and all its equipment shall be maintained in good repair.

8. Signs prohibiting smoking or open flames within 25 feet (7620 mm) of the tank vehicle or the point of fueling shall be prominently posted on three sides of the vehicle including the back and both sides.
9. A portable fire extinguisher with a minimum rating of 40:BC shall be provided on the vehicle with signage clearly indicating its location.
10. The dispensing nozzles and hoses shall be of an approved and listed type.
11. The dispensing hose shall not be extended from the reel more than 100 feet (30 480 mm) in length.
12. Absorbent materials, nonwater-absorbent pads, a 10-foot-long (3048 mm) containment boom, an approved container with lid and a nonmetallic shovel shall be provided to mitigate a minimum 5-gallon (19 L) fuel spill.
13. Tank vehicles shall be equipped with a "fuel limit" switch such as a count-back switch, to limit the amount of a single fueling operation to a maximum of 500 gallons (1893 L) before resetting the limit switch.

    Exception: Tank vehicles where the operator carries and can utilize a remote emergency shutoff device which, when activated, immediately causes flow of fuel from the tank vehicle to cease.

14. Persons responsible for dispensing operations shall be trained in the appropriate mitigating actions in the event of a fire, leak or spill. Training records shall be maintained by the dispensing company and shall be made available to the fire code official upon request.
15. Operators of tank vehicles used for mobile fueling operations shall have in their possession at all times an emergency communications device to notify the proper authorities in the event of an emergency.
16. The tank vehicle dispensing equipment shall be constantly attended and operated only by designated personnel who are trained to handle and dispense motor fuels.
17. Fuel dispensing shall be prohibited within 25 feet of any source of ignition.
18. The engines of vehicles being fueled shall be shut off during dispensing operations.
19. Nighttime fueling operations shall only take place in adequately lighted areas.
20. The tank vehicle shall be positioned with respect to vehicles being fueled to prevent traffic from driving over the delivery hose.
21. During fueling operations, tank vehicle brakes shall be set, chock blocks shall be in place and warning lights shall be in operation.
22. Motor vehicle fuel tanks shall not be topped off.
23. The dispensing hose shall be properly placed on an approved reel or in an approved compartment prior to moving the tank vehicle.
24. The fire code official and other appropriate authorities shall be notified when a reportable spill or unauthorized discharge occurs.
25. Operators shall place a drip pan or an absorbent pillow~~, in good condition,~~ under each fuel fill opening prior to and during dispensing operations. Drip pans shall be liquid-tight. The pan or absorbent pillow shall have a capacity of not less than 3 gallons. Spills retained in the drip pan or absorbent pillow need not be reported. Operators, when fueling, shall have on their person an absorbent pad capable of capturing diesel foam overfills. Except during fueling, the nozzle shall face upward and an absorbent pad shall be kept under the nozzle to catch drips. Contaminated absorbent pads or pillows shall be disposed of regularly in accordance with local, state and federal requirements.
~~26. All persons and parties with an interest in the property such as property owners, lessors, real estate companies, property managers and operators of the property shall give written consent to allow the mobile fueling to be conducted on the property. Managers, lessees, renters and other persons shall not solely give permission. Each person or party shall indicate that they understand the risk of spills.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change to provide reasonable safeguards for spill control in mobile dispensing situations. The modifications delete what the committee felt was redundant verbiage in Item #6, subjective language in Item #25 and a cumbersome and unenforceable provision, Item #26.

Assembly Action: **None**

F282-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides a needed resolution of conflict within the scoping text of Chapter 35.

Assembly Action: **None**

F283-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides needed clarification of the applicability of the section to only offices in Group B.

Assembly Action: **None**

F284-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which provides correlation with the action taken on code change F169-06/07 in the last cycle using a weight basis for liquefied gases and a volume basis for non-liquefied gases using the same indexing system used in F169-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

F285-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F286-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

F287-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will clarify that the weather protection requirements do not include Note a to Table 3504.2.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

F288-07/08

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 CPSC 16 CFR 1633-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was beyond the scope and intent of the definition of flammable solid and an inappropriate attempt to get polyurethane foam designated as a flammable solid based on an inappropriate test standard that is intended for chemicals, not ordinary consumer products containing foam material. Such a designation could have a negative impact on a variety of consumer issues including requiring otherwise ordinary occupancies to be classified as Group H due to the presence of polyurethane foam or products containing it, such as mattresses and upholstered furnishings. This is also consistent with the action taken on code change G29-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F289-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that the relocation of these provisions is appropriate and will clarify the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

F290-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it reflects a consensus of concerned parties that responded to committee input in the last cycle and provides improved regulation of home oxygen use. Concern was expressed, however, that Sections 4006.6.2 and 4006.7 could be viewed as breach of privacy issues and could be in violation of HIPPA rules for patient medical confidentiality.

Assembly Action: **None**

F291-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides an appropriate update to the definition oxidizer consistent with OSHA regulations and NFPA 40.

Assembly Action: **None**

F292-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it would provide the fire department with improved operational features. Concern was expressed that a lower marina size limit is needed to avoid applying the provisions to small marinas, that there is no requirement that slip identification be visible from the land side and the proposal did not provide signage size criteria.

Assembly Action: **None**

F293-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that there was no technical justification provided for the need for smoke and heat vents and design criteria for the size of the smoke and heat vents were unclear. It was also noted that Section 4504.6, Exception 2 should be written in a positive performance manner rather than being prohibitive.

Assembly Action: **None**

F294-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

4601.2 Intent. The intent of this chapter is to provide a ~~reasonable~~ minimum degree of fire and life safety to persons occupying existing buildings by providing for alterations to such existing buildings which do not comply with the minimum requirements of the *International Building Code*.

4601.3 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section 105.7 and the *International Building Code* and this code.

4601.4.1 ~~Plans and specifications~~ Construction documents. ~~Plans and specifications~~ Construction documents for the necessary alterations shall be completed within a time schedule approved by the fire code official.

4603.1 Required modifications. ~~Means of egress in existing buildings shall comply with the requirements of Section 1027 and the building code that applied at the time of construction. Where these provisions conflict, the most restrictive provision shall apply.~~

~~For existing buildings that were not required to comply with a building code at the time of construction, such buildings shall comply with the requirements of Section 1027 and, in addition, shall have a life safety evaluation prepared, consistent with the requirements of Section 104.7.2. The life safety evaluation shall identify any changes to the means of egress that are necessary to provide safe egress to occupants and shall be subject to review and approval by the fire code official. The building shall be modified to comply with the recommendations set forth in the approved evaluation.~~ Existing buildings shall comply with not less than the minimum provisions specified in Table 4603.1 and as further enumerated in Sections 4603.2 through 4603.7.3.

The provisions of Chapter 46 shall not be construed to allow the elimination of fire-protection systems or a reduction in the level of fire safety provided in buildings constructed in conformance with previously adopted codes.

Exception: Group U Occupancies do not need to comply.

4603.3.6 Escalators connecting ~~less than~~ four or less stories. In other than Group B and M occupancies, escalators creating vertical openings connecting ~~less than~~ four stories or less shall be protected by either 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction or an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Sections 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 shall be installed throughout the building, and a draft curtain with closely spaced sprinklers shall be installed around the escalator opening.

4604.5 Illumination emergency power. The power supply for means of egress illumination shall normally be provided by the premises' electrical supply. In the event of power supply failure, illumination shall be automatically provided from an emergency system for the following occupancies where such occupancies require two or more means of egress:

1. Group A having 50 or more occupants.

   Exception: Assembly occupancies used exclusively as a place of worship and having an occupant load of less than 300.

2. Group B buildings three or more stories in height, buildings with 100 or more occupants above or below the level of exit discharge, or buildings with 1,000 or more total occupants.
3. Group E in interior stairs, corridors, windowless areas with student occupancy, shops and laboratories.
4. Group F having more than 100 occupants.

   Exception: Buildings used only during daylight hours which are provided with windows for natural light in accordance with the *International Building Code*.

5. Group I.
6. Group M.

   Exception: Buildings less than 3,000 square feet (279 m^2) in gross sales area on one story only, excluding mezzanines.

7. Group R-1.

   Exception: Where each sleeping unit has direct access to the outside of the building at grade.

8. Group R-2.

   Exception: Where each dwelling unit or sleeping unit has direct access to the outside of the building at grade.

9. Group R-4.

   Exception: Where each sleeping unit has direct access to the outside of the building at ground level. ~~The emergency power system shall provide power for not less than 60 minutes and consist of storage batteries, unit equipment or an on-site generator. The installation of the emergency power system shall be in accordance with Section 604.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement substantiates the need for the change which represents a significant effort to consolidate all retroactive construction requirements into a single chapter for a more user-friendly enforcement tool. The committee acknowledged that additional work may be needed on the new chapter but felt that the scope of the work done on this proposal warrants its inclusion in the code at this time. The modifications reflect the fact that the IFC is a minimum code (Section 4601.2), "construction documents" rather than "plans and specifications" is the term used in the IFC (Section 4601.4.1) and the proposal is presented as containing no new changes, only a reorganization, and the struck-out text in Section 4604.5, Item 9 could not be accounted for as being existing. The modification to Section 4603.1 corrects an editorial error in the preparation of the original code change which inadvertently duplicated Section 4604.1. The modification to Section 4603.3.6 corrects the inadvertent omission of 4 story buildings in the preparation of the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

Analysis: The purpose of this proposal is to draw together in one chapter all of the current retroactive existing building construction requirements and affects not only the sections shown in this proposal but also any additional existing building construction requirements that may be approved in the current code development cycle. Those proposals, if approved, will be correlated with and placed into the new chapter.

F295-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because it provides for a needed administrative update to the IFC referenced standards list.

Assembly Action: **None**

F296-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the approval of an increase or reduction in required fire flow is a fire department operational issue which directly affects the fire departments ability to suppress fires and therefore should remain with the fire chief.

Assembly Action: **None**

F297-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee preferred the current text, which has been in the legacy codes since 1988.

Assembly Action: **None**

F298-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, while it has merit and should be pursued, it is not useful in its current form. It is unclear as to what an "effective fire and life safety inspection program" is or how it could be quantified; documentation by the local government is of questionable value; there is currently no recognized certification body for such programs; there is no clear link between fire flow and fire prevention activities; and there is no assurance that the program will continue in an effective form in the face of budget cuts.

Assembly Action: **None**

F299-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the gate does not need to be the full width of the access road.

Assembly Action: **None**

F300-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that using ½ the diagonal dimension would not be practical for open land area with odd shapes and that a fixed dimension would be more workable. It was also noted that Section D106.1 already addresses the issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

F301-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the approval of the fire code official is a critical element and should be retained. There was also concern over those cases where an approval is given based on a future event which may, or may not, happen.

Assembly Action: **None**

F302-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change F300-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

F303-07/08

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards CGA P-20-2003 and CGA P-23-2003 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change, which will delete appendix text in favor of referenced standards for the classification of hazardous materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

F304-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

APPENDIX I
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS – ~~UNSAFE~~ NONCOMPLIANT CONDITIONS

The provisions contained in this appendix are not mandatory unless specifically referenced in the adopting ordinance.

I101 ~~UNSAFE~~ NONCOMPLIANT CONDITIONS

I101.2 ~~Unsafe~~ Noncompliant conditions requiring component replacement. The following ~~conditions~~ shall be deemed ~~unsafe~~ noncompliant conditions and shall cause the related component(s) to be replaced to comply with the provisions of this code:

~~I101.2 Unsafe~~ I101.3 Noncompliant conditions requiring component repair or replacement. The following ~~conditions~~ shall be deemed ~~unsafe~~ noncompliant conditions and shall cause the related component(s) to be repaired or replaced to comply with the provisions of this code:

8. Fire pumps having any of the following conditions:

   8.1. Pump room temperature is less than 40 degrees F;

   ~~**Exception:** Pump room housing a diesel pump equipped with an engine heater.~~

   8.2. Ventilating louvers are not freely operable;
   8.3. Corroded or leaking system piping;

8.4. Diesel fuel tank is less than two-thirds full; or
8.5. Battery readings, lubrication oil or cooling water levels are abnormal.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the HAEB Committee's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change and that it addresses the concern expressed in the 2006-2007 cycle by the IFC committee that the provisions should be in an appendix and in public testimony that references to appropriate NFPA standards should be included. The modifications revise the term "unsafe" to "noncompliant" wherever it occurred based on the committee's feeling that "noncompliant" with the code better reflects the nature of the enumerated items; correct a section numbering error; revise the charging text syntax to flow better and delete an inappropriate exception which could expose diesel pump rooms to freezing.

Assembly Action: **None**

F305-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that including the IBC tables in an IFC appendix could lead to attempts at inappropriate applications of the tables. In addition, adding the tables could lead to confusion in how they are intended to be used and present on-going correlation problems as the IBC text changes over time.

Assembly Action: **None**
