

2007/2008 INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE

Terrance L. Carolan—Chair
Mechanical Inspector
Harbor Springs, MI

Tony Longino, CBO—Vice Chair
Chief Mechanical Inspector
County of Greenville
Greenville, SC

Edward J. Angelone
Consultant
Keyspan Energy Delivery
Brooklyn, NY
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

James Anjam
Manager, Inspection Section
Arlington County
Arlington, VA

Keith O. Bienvenu
Secretary/Treasurer
Bienvenu Brothers Enterprises, Inc.
Metairie, LA
Rep: Plumbing Heating Cooling
Contractors Association (PHCC)

Paul W. Cabot
Administrator, National Fuel
Gas Code
Washington, DC
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

Michael Deegan
Gas Program Coordinator/Service
Manager
Clearwater Gas System
Clearwater, FL
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

Ronnie Ray Frazier
Codes and Standards Manager
Atmos Energy Mid-Tex Division
Dallas, TX
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

David F. Hall, CFM
Director of Inspection Services Building
Official-Floodplain Administrator
City of Georgetown
Georgetown, TX

Dennis Holden
Director, Customer Relations
Southwest Gas Corporation
Tucson, AZ
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

Windell F. Peters
Manager, Codes and Standards
AGL Resources Inc.
Atlanta, GA
Rep: American Gas Association (AGA)

Michael D. Redifer
Building Official
City of Newport News
Newport News, VA

AGA Liaison

Jim Ranfone
Managing Director
American Gas Association
400 N. Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC

Staff Secretary:
Gregg Gress
Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

FG1-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions achieve consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The committee agreed with the proponent's reasons and felt that it is necessary to define the code official's liability.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG2-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The authorization given in the proposed text is already common practice and is the privilege of the authority having jurisdiction. Section 106.4 is a more appropriate location for such new text.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.2 Preliminary inspection. Before a permit is issued, the code official is authorized to inspect and ~~approve~~ evaluate the systems, equipment, buildings, devices, premises and spaces or areas to be used.

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. This provision can be a valuable tool for the code official, especially for existing buildings, by allowing him/her to inspect conditions that might affect safety before issuing the permit. The modification replaced the term "approve" with the term "evaluate" to avoid the impression that the code official can only approve the items rather than evaluating and possibly disapproving them.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.2 Preliminary inspection. Before a permit is issued, the code official is authorized to inspect and ~~approve~~ evaluate the systems, equipment, buildings, devices, premises, and spaces or areas to be used.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, and IRC and legally allows the code official to make 'evaluation' inspections of a site or building prior to a permit being issued. The modification was to change the word "approve" to "evaluate" so as to further clarify the purpose of the code official's visit in a pre-permit inspection.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IPSDC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.2.2 Preliminary inspection. Before a permit is issued, the code official is authorized to inspect and ~~approve~~ evaluate the systems, equipment, buildings, devices, premises, and spaces or areas to be used.

Committee Reason: : The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, and IRC and legally allows the code official to make 'evaluation' inspections of a site or building prior to a permit being issued. The modification was to change the word "approve" to "evaluate" so as to further clarify the purpose of the code official's visit in a pre-permit inspection.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V – IWUIC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will correlate the IWUIC with the IBC, IRC, IFC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, and IPSPDC and will provide the code official with a useful tool in managing the permit process, especially in cases of permits being issued for an existing building.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG3-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.2 Time limitation of application. An application for a permit for any proposed work shall be deemed to have been abandoned 180 days after the date of filing, unless such application has been pursued in good faith or a permit has been issued; except that the code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding 180 days each. The extension shall be requested in writing and justifiable cause demonstrated.

Committee Reason: The proposed revision achieves consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The new text will relieve the code official's burden of having to file and store abandoned applications for permits and will allow for extensions to be granted for cause. The committee agreed with the proponent's reasons. The modification simply substitutes common code language for atypical code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.2 Time limitation of application. An application for a permit for any proposed work shall be deemed to have been abandoned 180 days after the date of filing, unless such application has been pursued in good faith or a permit has been issued; except that the code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding 180 days each. The extension shall be requested in writing and justifiable cause demonstrated.

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. It adds a definite time limit on permits where the work has not begun. The modification replaces "is authorized" with the more mandatory "shall have the authority".

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.2 Time limitation of application. An application for a permit for any proposed work shall be deemed to have been abandoned 180 days after the date of filing, unless such application has been pursued in good faith or a permit has been issued; except that the code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding 180 days each. The extension shall be requested in writing and justifiable cause demonstrated.

Committee Reason: : The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, IFC and IRC. Applications for permits are sometimes abandoned by the requester for a variety of reasons resulting in a burden to the jurisdiction for storing these abandoned documents for an indefinite time period. The new text

establishes a maximum retention time so that the jurisdiction can free up valuable file storage space. It also allows for extensions of time for applications. The modification restates the code official's authority in mandatory code language

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART IV – IPSDC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

106.2.2 Time limitation of application. An application for a permit for any proposed work shall be deemed to have been abandoned 180 days after the date of filing, unless such application has been pursued in good faith or a permit has been issued; except that the code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to grant one or more extensions of time for additional periods not exceeding 180 days each. The extension shall be requested in writing and justifiable cause demonstrated.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, IFC and IRC. Applications for permits are sometimes abandoned by the requester for a variety of reasons resulting in a burden to the jurisdiction for storing these abandoned documents for an indefinite time period. The new text establishes a maximum retention time so that the jurisdiction can free up valuable file storage space. It also allows for extensions of time for applications. The modification restates the code official's authority in mandatory code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART V – IWUIC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will correlate the IWUIC with the IBC, IEBC, IRC, IFC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, and IPSDC and will provide the code official with a useful tool in managing the permit process by limiting the time between the review process and the issuance of a permit and reducing the burden of storing abandoned applications. It will also provide the code official with the authority to grant extensions of time when such extensions are justified.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG4-07/08

**PART I – IFGC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

106.4.5 Suspension or revocation of permit. The code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to suspend or revoke a permit issued under the provisions of this code wherever the permit is issued in error or on the basis of incorrect, inaccurate or incomplete information, or in violation of any ordinance or regulation or any of the provisions of this code.

Committee Reason: The proposed revision achieves consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The committee agreed with the proponent's reasons. The revised text provides for code official discretion in determining whether to revoke a permit. The modification simply substitutes common code language for atypical language.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART II – IMC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.4.5 Suspension or revocation of permit. The code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to suspend or revoke a permit issued under the provisions of this code wherever the permit is issued in error or on the basis of incorrect, inaccurate or incomplete information, or in violation of any ordinance or regulation or any of the provisions of this code.

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. The change deletes the mandatory "shall revoke a permit" with the more appropriate "is authorized to revoke" which

provided the code official the leeway to review the circumstances and make the appropriate decision. The modification replaces "is authorized" with the more mandatory "shall have the authority".

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.5.5 Suspension or revocation of permit. The code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to suspend or revoke a permit issued under the provisions of this code wherever the permit is issued in error or on the basis of incorrect, inaccurate or incomplete information, or in violation of any ordinance or regulation or any of the provisions of this code.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the revised text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, IFC, IWUIC and IRC. The revised text allows the code official more discretion in determining whether a permit should be revoked or suspended if incorrect information is discovered after permit issuance. The modification restates the code official's authority in mandatory code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IPSDC

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

106.3.5 Suspension or revocation of permit. The code official ~~is authorized~~ shall have the authority to suspend or revoke a permit issued under the provisions of this code wherever the permit is issued in error or on the basis of incorrect, inaccurate or incomplete information, or in violation of any ordinance or regulation or any of the provisions of this code.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the revised text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC, IEBC, IFC, IWUIC and IRC. The revised text allows the code official more discretion in determining whether a permit should be revoked or suspended if incorrect information is discovered after permit issuance. The modification restates the code official's authority in mandatory code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG5-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision achieves consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The committee agreed with the proponent's reasons. The revised text will provide a reasonable minimum post-construction plan retention period because the period immediately following construction completion is typically when most disputes arise that depend on the construction documents for resolution.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. This proposed change establishes a minimum construction document retention period by the code official to insure that such documents are available if a dispute arises shortly after completion of construction. The change also recognizes that state or local laws may establish retention periods that would override the IMC requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the revised text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC and IRC. As many

state laws already require a post-construction document retention period, this revision aligns the IPC with such practices so that construction documents are available to help solve any disputes that might develop in the months after project completion.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART IV – IPSDC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the revised text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IBC and IRC. As many state laws already require a post-construction document retention period, this revision aligns the IPC with such practices so that construction documents are available to help solve any disputes that might develop in the months after project completion.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART V – IWUIC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will correlate the IWUIC with the IBC, IRC, IFC, IFGC, IMC, and IPC and will provide a reasonable minimum post-construction plan retention period because the period immediately following construction completion is typically when most disputes arise that depend on the construction documents for resolution.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART VI – IFC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal will correlate the IFC with the IBC, IRC, IFGC, IMC, and IPC and will provide a reasonable minimum post-construction plan retention period because the period immediately following construction completion is typically when most disputes arise that depend on the construction documents for resolution. Approval is also consistent with the committee action on Part V.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG6-07/08

**PART I – IFGC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision achieves consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The committee agreed with the proponent's reasons. The revised text will provide the code official with the ability to protect the continuity of permits issued under previous codes or code editions, provided that such permits are being actively executed after the effective date of the currently adopted code.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART II – IMC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. It provides the code official with a tool to allow construction to continue under a previous edition of the code if the permit is actively executed within the designated time frame.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART III – IPC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IEBC, IBC, IWUIC and IRC. As some projects are permitted just prior to the adoption of a new code edition, this new text protects the continuity of the permit so that construction can proceed in accordance with the code edition under which the permit was issued.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART IV – IPSDC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IEBC, IBC, IWUIC and IRC. As some projects are permitted just prior to the adoption of a new code edition, this new text protects the continuity of the permit so that construction can proceed in accordance with the code edition under which the permit was issued.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V – IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed new section would be in conflict with current Section 105.3.6 of the IFC and that it would be problematic with respect to the retroactive provisions of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG7-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision achieves consistency with and coordination among the codes in the ICC family. The permit should be available on the jobsite as evidence of work authorization and to serve the inspectors needs.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This section needs to be consistent with similar sections in other I-codes. This code change provides enforceable language to insure that the permit is posted and available on the jobsite at all times.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IEBC, IBC, IWUIC and IFC. Requiring that a permit copy be kept on site provides proof to anyone needing it that the work in question has been authorized.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IPSDC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement indicating that the new text is necessary for consistency with coordinating sections already established in the IEBC, IBC, IWUIC and IFC. Requiring that a permit copy be kept on site provides proof to anyone needing it that the work in question has been authorized.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG8-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed definition will provide consistency with Z223.1 (NFGC) and will be a needed definition because the term is used in the new CSST bonding text that will appear in Section 310 of the 2009 IFGC.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG9-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed definition will provide consistency with Z223.1 (NFGC) and will be a needed definition because the term is used in the new CSST bonding text that will appear in Section 310 of the 2009 IFGC.

Assembly Action:

None

FG10-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202 (IFGC) GENERAL DEFINITIONS

~~**COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL.** A material or assembly constructed of one or more components or materials that are not defined as noncombustible.~~

NONCOMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL. A material that, in the form in which it is used and under the conditions anticipated, will not ignite, burn, support combustion, or release flammable vapors when subjected to fire or heat. Materials that are reported as passing ASTM E 136, are considered to be noncombustible materials.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposed definition of noncombustible is needed because the term is used but not currently defined. The modification deletes the unnecessary converse definition and deletes subjective text that would cause interpretation problems.

Assembly Action:

None

FG11-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is cumbersome and difficult to interpret and enforce. Disapproval is consistent with the action taken to approve the alternate definition in FG10. Items 1, 2 and 3 of the definition are not appropriate for code text because they might be changed within the actual standard.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

FG12-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed definition is consistent with that in the NFGC, Z223.1. The code refers to exterior chimneys but fails to define them.

Assembly Action:

None

FG13-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code refers to leak checks, but, provides no definition for such. The proposed definition is consistent with that in the NFGC, Z223.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG14-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The current definition excludes some types of outlets because not all gas outlets are threaded or bolted. The proposed definition is generic and not exclusive.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG15-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision is consistent with the appliance manufacturer's installation instructions. The definition serves to define a closet. The concern for a water heater should be no different than for a furnace, boiler or air-conditioning appliance.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG16-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision would allow gas appliances to be installed in storage closets, which is exactly what this section is intended to prohibit. Gas appliances are not "stored" in storage closets, rather, they are permanently installed in mechanical rooms/closets or appliance closets. A closet with a furnace and water heater, for example, should not be designated as or referred to as a storage closet. Closets designated for storage will contain highly combustible materials that could pose a fire hazard if gas-fired appliances were also installed in the same space. Clothes closets, pantries and linen closets are all types of storage closets and this section intends to keep gas appliances out of such spaces to avoid a possible fire hazard.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG17-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Attic access openings and passageways need to be large enough to allow appliances to pass through without the need to disassemble them. This would apply to taking an appliance out of an attic as well as putting a new one in an attic. It is unclear what the "largest component" of an appliance would be. The last sentence is revised to clarify that the stated opening size is the minimum in all cases.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change clarifies that the opening must be large enough to remove the largest appliance without having to dismantle the appliance. This will make the IMC consistent with the language in the IFGC and IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IRC-M

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of the word "and" in both sections makes it clear that the opening must meet the minimum dimension and large enough to remove the largest appliance without having to dismantle the appliance. This will make the IRC consistent with the language in the IFGC and IMC.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG18-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Gas piping run through someone else's property is subject to tampering and an easement agreement may be necessary to obtain access to such piping. Townhouses are separated by property lines and gas piping should not cross property lines. If a townhouse unit burns down, any gas piping that extended through it to serve adjacent units will be destroyed resulting in gas leakage and loss of service to the adjacent units. If a significant increase in gas demand occurs in a townhouse unit, it may be necessary to increase the size of piping that passes through other units and other people's property.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG19-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no evidence provided that the proposed text will reduce the risk of gas leakage entering a building. Gas leakage can migrate into a building by many paths such as under footings, around water and sewer pipes, through cracks in the foundation, etc. The exact cause of documented gas explosions in buildings is not known.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

FG20-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The current code requires the gas pipe to be sealed to the sleeve, but fails to require the sleeve to be sealed to the wall. Lack of such sealing could allow gas or water to enter the building through the annular space around the sleeve.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG21-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text will allow mechanical sealing devices to be used to seal around a pipe that passes through a core-drilled hole in a concrete foundation wall.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG22-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

FG23-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

~~404.8.1 Isolation. Above ground LP-gas metallic piping and metallic tubing that conveys fuel gas from an LP-gas storage container shall be provided with an approved dielectric fitting to electrically isolate from the underground portion of the pipe metallic piping or tube from the above ground portion that enters a building. Such Dielectric fittings shall be installed above ground, outdoors.~~

Committee Reason: Electrical isolation is currently required for natural gas service piping, but, LP-gas piping is not required to be treated in the same way. The proposed isolation requirement will eliminate any perception that underground gas piping is being used as a grounding electrode. All CSST piping systems will be required to be bonded to a grounding electrode system in the 2009 code and this proposal will make sure that the underground LP-gas piping is electrically isolated. The modification simply intends to make the wording more concise.

Assembly Action:

None

FG24-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard was not provided to the committee for their review.

Assembly Action:

None

FG25-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and clarifies that the intent is to require all pipe supports to be constructed of metal, not just straps. Support devices made of plastic should not be used to support gas piping. It is common practice and acceptable to support piping by resting it on structural components of a building such as joists.

Assembly Action:

None

FG26-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision makes certain that a sediment trap will serve its intended purpose by requiring the trap to be oriented vertically.

Assembly Action:

None

FG27-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Valves located in accordance with this section have to be located on the manifold assembly, have to be identified as to their purpose and have to be readily accessible. These requirements relieve the concerns raised by the proponent. There is no apparent problem with what is allowed by current text.

Assembly Action:

None

FG28-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Current text of this section already requires what is being proposed.

Assembly Action: None

FG29-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is currently no standard to which these devices can be listed.

Assembly Action: None

FG30-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is currently no standard to which these devices can be listed.

Assembly Action: None

FG31-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on FG29-07/08 and FG30-07/08

Assembly Action: None

FG32-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is redundant with the manufacturer's installation instructions for the appliance connector.

Assembly Action: None

FG33-07/08

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and Sections 409.5 and 411.1 of the IFGC. The connector standards allow 6 foot lengths and such lengths have a good safety record.

Assembly Action: None

FG34-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Restructuring of text that occurred in the previous code development cycle necessitates the proposed revision to the section references so as to secure the intent. Sections 409.5.2 and 409.5.3 both address remotely located shutoff valves and the intent of exception # 1 is to allow piping downstream from such valves to pass through walls, floors, partitions and ceilings as it runs between the shutoff valve and the appliance served. Piping downstream of a shut off valve is technically a connector and if the shutoff valve is in a different room or story, it will be necessary for the connector to pass through construction assemblies to reach the appliance.

Assembly Action:

None

FG35-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

411.3 Suspended low-intensity infrared tube heaters. Suspended low-intensity infrared tube heaters shall be connected to the building piping system ~~by means of an appliance connector listed as~~ with a connector listed for the application complying with ANSI Z21.24/CGA 6.10. The connector shall be installed as specified by the tube heater manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and the appliance manufacturer's installation instructions. The connector must be the specified type installed in a specific configuration to avoid failures resulting from repeated movement of the connector caused by expansion and contraction of the heater. The modification is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and revisions to Z21.24 that introduce additional criteria for connectors used in the application.

Assembly Action:

None

FG36-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and is necessary to make sure that plastic appliance vents are properly installed.

Assembly Action:

None

FG37-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.6.13 (IFGS) Fastener penetrations. Screws, rivets and other fasteners shall not penetrate the inner wall of double-wall gas vents, except at the transition from an appliance draft hood outlet, a flue collar or a single-wall metal connector to a double-wall vent.

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent with the NFGC, Z223.1 and the vent manufacturer's installation instructions and is necessary to make sure that double-wall vents are installed without damage resulting from fastener penetration of the inner wall. The modification recognizes that penetration of the inner wall at the point where double-wall vent connects to single wall pipe, a flue collar or a draft hood outlet is common practice and harmless.

Assembly Action:

None

FG38-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

FG39-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

FG40-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent the NFGC, Z223.1 and provides a necessary requirement to prevent flow turbulence/interference in a venting system where multiple appliances connect to a single flue or vent.

Assembly Action:

None

FG41-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent the NFGC, Z223.1 and provides a necessary safety requirement for sealing outside wall penetrations to prevent the entry of combustion products into the building.

Assembly Action:

None

FG42-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

505.1.1 Commercial cooking appliances vented by exhaust hoods. Where commercial cooking appliances are vented by means of the Type I or II kitchen exhaust hood system that serves such appliances, the exhaust system shall be fan powered and the appliances shall be interlocked with the exhaust hood system to prevent appliance operation when the exhaust hood system is not operating. The method of interlock between the exhaust hood system and the appliances equipped with standing pilot burner ignition systems shall not cause such pilots to be extinguished. Where a solenoid valve is installed in the gas piping as part of an interlock system, gas piping shall not be installed to bypass such valve. Dampers shall not be installed in the exhaust system.

Exceptions:

- 1- An interlock between the cooking appliance(s) and the exhaust hood system shall not be required where heat sensors or other approved methods automatically activate the exhaust hood system when cooking operations occur.
- 2- ~~An interlock between the cooking appliance(s) and the exhaust hood system shall not be required for appliances that are of the manually operated type and are factory equipped with standing pilot burner ignition systems.~~

Committee Reason: The proposed revision will help ensure that no field alterations are made to cooking appliances that are equipped with standing pilot ignition systems. The proposed revision will alleviate the safety concern for personnel having to relight pilots after each time the hood system is shut down. The modification is consistent with the intent of the proposed new exception. Instead of relieving standing pilot appliances from the requirement for an interlock, the modified text limits the method of interlock to a method that will not extinguish the pilot. The modification cures the pilot outage problem and prevents any conflicts with the IMC coverage for appliance/hood interlocks.

Assembly Action:

None

FG43-07/08

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text could exclude powered equipment tested to other UL standards.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

FG44-07/08

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text will prohibit rigid gas connections to engine powered equipment because vibration caused by the equipment could damage the gas piping.

Assembly Action: None

FG45-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent asked that the proposal be disapproved in anticipation of submitting a public comment to reword the text to capture his intent.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested that the committee disapprove this code change to allow him to possibly rework it and submit a public comment.

Assembly Action: None

FG46-07/08

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent asked that the proposal be disapproved in anticipation of submitting a public comment to reword the text to capture his intent.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IMC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested that the committee disapprove this code change to allow him to possibly rework it and submit a public comment.

Assembly Action: None

PART III – IRC-M

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested that the committee disapprove this code change to allow him to possibly rework it and submit a public comment.

Assembly Action: None

FG47-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Unvented room heaters are safe if installed and used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. No evidence was given to support the banning of such appliances. Some of the health concerns expressed by the proponents could not be substantiated and could be attributed to other causes.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG48-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No application guidance is provided. The Code Technical Committee does not stand behind the mandate for CO alarms at this time. There is no link provided to permanently installed appliances. There is no reason to single out unvented heaters because they are proven to be safe.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG49-07/08

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

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**

FG50-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no product standard for such appliances at this time. Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on FG29-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

FG51-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It is appropriate to update the standards as requested by the promulgators.

Assembly Action: **None**
