

Fire & Life Safety Section International Association of Fire Chiefs



Fire Service Voting Guide Part 2 ICC Online Consensus Ballot

**This guide includes suggested fire service positions and comments
for the ICC Online Consensus Ballot
Voting Period – May 11-22, 2015**

**These positions may be updated prior to, during, and after Public
Comments are submitted, as additional information is received.**

Table of Contents

Online Ballot for Floor Motions.....	1
IEBC ó International Existing Building Code	2
IBC-FS ó International Building Code/Fire Safety.....	3
IBC-G ó International Building Code/General	4
IBC-E ó International Building Code/Egress	7

Online Ballot for Floor Motions

Starting with the 2015 code development cycle, ICC has implemented a new procedure for voting on Floor Motions made at the Committee Action Hearing. This process is part of cdpACCESS and provides those who were not able to attend the Committee Action Hearing the opportunity to vote on Floor Motions.


Who can vote: anyone who is an ICC Member.


Where do you vote: a link will be provided on the ICC homepage, www.iccsafe.org or you can access cdpACCESS directly at <https://cdpaccess.com/>

When can you vote: the voting period will run from Monday, May 11, 2015 to Friday, May 22, 2015.

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent

 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee


 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service


IEBC – International Existing Building Code

IEBC – International Existing Building Code					
#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
EB18	Richard Wood, Univ of Mass	O	D	AS	<p>Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal.</p> <p>This proposal would allow pyrophoric materials to be used and stored in buildings that are partially sprinklered or have other types of extinguishing systems. Table 307.1(1) specifically states that pyrophoric materials cannot be located within a building unless the building is sprinklered throughout.</p> <p>This is a valid need, but this is not the right way to fix it. It creates a hazardous materials increase for existing buildings that is not allowed in new buildings. Additionally, it creates a new undefined term “special hazards point suppression system” which also does not correlate with any national standards. Most importantly, the FCAC has a College Laboratory Workgroup with significant stakeholder involvement that will be presenting a comprehensive IFC solution in the current Group B Cycle. Passage of this proposal will significantly complicate the work of the FCAC committee.</p>
EB25	Jonathan Wilson, Natl Center for Healthy Housing	O	D	AS	<p>Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as submitted.</p> <p>This proposal relates to EB21.</p> <p>The revision to 403.11 already occurs in EB21, but prefer the wording in EB21.</p> <p>EB21 was not approved by the committee. Although it is the preferred proposal, at this point this item should be supported.</p>

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent

 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee

 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service


IBC-FS – International Building Code/Fire Safety


Page 49 in the monograph

IBC-FS – International Building Code/Fire Safety					
#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
FS2	Dan Nichols, State of NY	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. This would remove the limitation on providing sprinklers in lieu of fire-resistance ratings required in the code. Definitely, this section needs to be reworded. A better solution was proposed in Item FS1, but FS1 is not up for a Floor Motion vote. This item should be disapproved, and a Public Comment be prepared for Item FS1 since it provides a more comprehensive solution.
FS16	Ali Fattah, San Diego Development Services	--	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. While the intent of the proponent is good, the wording in this proposal makes it confusing and therefore difficult to apply.
FS27	FCAC	S	AM	D	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as modified. This proposal allows lot lines to be established for ownership purposes within buildings without requiring a fire wall to be constructed on the lot line. This is a common occurrence in covered mall construction, and even the mall requirements do not require a fire wall.

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent

 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee



 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service

IBC-G – International Building Code/General

IBC-G – International Building Code/General					
#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
G1	Victor Cuevas, Los Angeles	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. This proposal is unclear. Understand what the proponent is trying to do, but this language does not make it better.
G2	Steve Thomas, Colorado Code Consulting LLC	M	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Better than G1, but still does not solve problem. This item needs to be revised with a Public Comment.
G33	CTC	S	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal as submitted. This proposal is deleting the provision which allows construction of certain occupancies under the IRC provided they are sprinklered. If this is approved, then the code will allow these occupancies to be constructed as an R-3. R-3s are allowed to be constructed under the IRC. If the sprinkler requirement is deleted in the IRC adoption, then these occupancies would not be sprinklered. NOTE: FLSS position changed to opposition of this item after floor testimony was heard.
G42	CTC	S	AS	D	Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as submitted. This will allow Group R-4 Condition 1 to be constructed under the IRC. This would negate any requirements in the IBC for Group R-4 Condition 1 occupancies. If the local jurisdiction has removed the sprinkler requirement from the IRC, then these occupancies would not be sprinklered. NOTE: FLSS position changed to opposition of this item after floor testimony was heard.
G51	David Collins, AIA	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Relocating all of the requirements for atriums from Chapter 4 Special Use and Occupancies to Chapter 5 Height and Area does not improve the code. If a user was going to look for requirements on smoke control or fire alarms in atriums, why would he look in Chapter 5 Height and Area?
G68	David Collins, AIA	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Relocating all of the requirements for live/work units from Chapter 4 Special Use and Occupancies to Chapter 5 Height and Area does not improve the code. If a user was going to look for egress and fire protection requirements on live/work units, why would he look in Chapter 5 Height and Area?
G69	David Collins, AIA	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Relocating all of the requirements for Groups I-1, R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 from Chapter 4 Special Use and Occupancies to Chapter 3 Use and Occupancy Classification does not improve the code. If a user was going to look for smoke barriers and fire alarm requirements on Groups I-1, R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4, why would

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent


 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee
 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service


IBC-G – International Building Code/General

#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
					he look in Chapter 3 Use and Occupancy Classification?
G79	Steve DiGiovanni, So NV Chapter	SWA	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. The revision to Exception 3 is based on a swimming pool on the rooftop of a high-rise building would be classified as Group A-5 occupancy. It seems more likely that the swimming pool will be on top a hotel and A-5 classification would not be appropriate.
G89	Bob Davidson, Davidson Code Concepts	SWA	D	AM	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Agree with the concept of this change. However, there is an issue with 404.2 ó the IFC does not contain any requirements on low fire hazard contents, or limitations of combustible materials or decorations in atriums. That code provision was deleted several cycles ago.
G93	Steve DiGiovanni, So NV Chapter	S	D	AS	Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as submitted. This will allow new technologies to be accepted in the code without a request for alternate method.
G114	Steve DiGiovanni, So NV Chapter	S	D	AM	Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as modified. This allows the proscenium wall to terminate at a 2-HR horizontal assembly. Most likely, when these provisions went into the code it was not anticipated that the proscenium wall would be located in a multi-story building, or that it would be located on other than the ground floor.
G157	Jay Wallace, Boeing Company		D	AM	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. While this proposal adds new situations into the Incidental Use table (which is good) it also changes the method of protecting the Incidental Use Areas (which is bad). This would allow for systems other than sprinklers, and refer the user off to NFPA 70 to determine protection and construction requirements.
G165	Dennis Richardson, American Wood Council	O	D	AM	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. This will allow CLT to be used for buildings up to 9 stories in height. The CLT must meet the fire testing requirements and meet the hour rating in and of itself. Then, all of the CLT will be covered with 5/8ö Type X sheetrock which will add additional protection. This would allow combustible construction up to 100ø in height.
G200	CTC	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. This proposal will change the height threshold where protection of openings in elevator shafts is required from 75øto 420ø One of the methods for protecting the elevator door opening is with a lobby. Therefore, the lobby would not even need to be considered until 420ø
G213	FLSS	S	D	AS	Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to approve this code change proposal as submitted. Provides requirements for multi-level temporary tents and membrane structures to meet structural design requirements.
G226	William Hall, Portland	M	D	AM	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion This proposal would require that a 3 rd party agency be hired to

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent

 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee


 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service


IBC-G – International Building Code/General

#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
	Cement Assoc; Jonathan Humble, Iron & Steel Institute				<p>provide the function of the fire prevention program superintendent, and that employees of the 3rd party agency be on-site 24 hours a day when the building is of Type V construction with a height of 40 or more, or in some cases when the building is more than one story in height, based on Table 504.4. While supervision is necessary, many companies can provide their own superintendent to accomplish this task.</p> <p>While this may be a great item, it seems quite appropriate for all types of construction. Each type of construction brings its own specific hazards and problems.</p>
G234	Barry Grieve, Target Corp	O	D	AS	<p>Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal.</p> <p>This proposal adds language that would allow for a replicable building program. This new appendix would make reference to "Guideline for Replicable Buildings".</p> <p>If the jurisdiction is not adopting the guideline already, this reference in the appendix will not encourage it to happen.</p>

FLSS Positions	
S = Support	O = Oppose
SWA = Support with Amendment	M = Monitor

Committee Action	
AS = Approve as Submitted	AM = Approve with Modification
D = Disapprove	WP = Withdrawn by Proponent

 Indicates items submitted by IAFC Fire & Life Safety Section or the Fire Code Action Committee

 Indicates items of high priority for the Fire Service

IBC-E - International Building Code/Egress

IBC-E – International Building Code/Egress					
#	Proponent	Initial Position	Committee Action	Floor Motion	Comments
E11	Steve Thomas, CO Code Consulting	O	D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. While the occupant load factor for industrial uses may need revision, the occupant load is typically more than would be found in a warehouse or storage facility. Take a potato chip processing and packaging facility, for example. There are areas covered with ovens, fryers, conveyors and machinery. But there are other packaging areas where the workers can hold hands they are in such close proximity. The average over the entire floor area is what needs to be looked at.
E26	Rick Lupton, Seattle Planning and Development		D	AS	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. This proposal disregards the fact that there can be small rooms within a story where the occupant load is below the threshold requiring two or more exits. These rooms would now be required to provide two exits. This would apply to every room on a storyí bathrooms for example.
E57 Pt II	John Woestman, Kellen Company	SWA	AS	D	Vote FOR the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to Disapprove this code change proposal. This proposal provides locking criteria for existing school classrooms that would be equivalent to new construction. Item EB23 was Approved as Modified and provides criteria to allow for safe lock down operations.
E99	Steve DiGiovanni, Clark County	M	D	AM	Vote AGAINST the Floor Motion ó this will be a vote to disapprove this code change proposal. Based on the proposed language, the proponent is suggesting that the travel distance can be increased where the last portion is within a 1-HR corridor. But there is no correlation with the situation where a 1-HR corridor is required. The code currently allows an exit passageway to be constructed as the final portion of the means of egress to allow the exit travel distance to be increased. The measurement of travel distance stops at an exit passageway. For example, a H-3 is required to have a 1-HR corridor, and Table 1017.2 allows a travel distance of 150ø But this section would allow an additional 100ø(67% increase) just for extending the 1-HR corridor. In other words, the travel distance is increased with no commensurate increase in safety.