

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
ADM32	IEBC 101.5.4.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	The proposed additional text in item 2 clarifies that the Appendix A chapters are acceptable options only when the building in question is explicitly within the scope of the relevant appendix chapter.	Proponent - The proposed revisions to Items 2.3 and 2.4 are editorial.		AS 14-0
ADM33	IEBC 101.5.4.2, Chapter A5	Peter Somers, Structural Engineers Association of Washington	Delete chapter A5	Proponent - unnecessary redundancy and duplication of requirement		D 14-0
E8 PT2	R202	David W. Cooper, Stair Manuf. Assoc.	Provide a definition to clarify the intent of the code on riser			AS 10-1
E58 PT2	R311.3.1	Julie Ruth, JRuth Code Consulting	clarifies that threshold height is to be measured to the finished floor or landing			AS 11-0
E60 PT3	R311.2, R311.2.1 (N)	John Morgan, MO Assoc of B.O.	coordinate the requirements for deadbolts between the IPMC, IBC and IRC			D 10-0
E70 PT2	R311.7.4	Tim Pate, Colorado Chapter ICC	code change will delete the word "carpets"			D 11-0
E71 PT2	R311.7.4	Dave Frable, U.S. Gen. Svs. Admin.	intent of this code change is to ensure the method for measuring riser height and tread depth includes all floor coverings	Committee – agree this does not add or clarify code language		D 11-0
E72 PT2	R311.7.4	Jake Pauls	Revise language to make clear where stair tread measurement is done, with or without carpet	Opponent – concern with how to enforce especially when carpet typically aren't code regulated Committee – concern that it would be tough to enforce		D 11-0 ASF failed
E74 PT2	R311.7.4.1, R311.7.4.2	Jake Pauls	technical change affecting maximum and minimum rise and tread depth dimensions	Opponent – disagree with the concern to change dimension, refute the studies to show an increase in stair accidents Proponent – argues that more injuries have occurred, the data he has is appropriate based upon what is available Committee – not sure if the solution proposed will reduce injuries, one member believe it make sense	Looks like proponent is attempting to get the riser and tread back to 7" and 11" like it was before. Committee voted down, assembly tried to overturn but barely failed 63% (66% is required).	D 9-2 ASF failed
E75 PT2	R311.7.4.3, R311.7.4.3.1 (N), R311.7.4.3.2 (N), R311.7.4.3.3 (N)	Jake Pauls	Editorial revision to separate out nosing, tread and riser requirement	Committee – believe it is an educational issue if there is a lack of clarity on the req'mt.		D 9-2
E97 PT2	R311.7.7.3	Jake Pauls	Delete the Type II handrail graspability	Opponent – argues that no data given to prove that Type II does not work or is a cause to injuries		D ASF failed
E100 PT2	R202, R312.2	Paul K. Heilstedt, ICC Code Technology Committee	Provide new definition for "fixed-seating" and requirements for it	Opponent – unnecessary language Committee – think there is some merit, but still grey on wording, would like to see diagram		D 11-0
E122 PT2	R311.4	Stuart Tom, CA Fire Chiefs Assoc.	establishes standards that will also apply to very large dwellings and dwellings constructed on steep lots	Opponent – don't think the 1000 sf is right, it's arbitrary, other thinks it is confusing, don't believe it will add to safety Committee – does not think there is any technical data to justify the extra exit.	There aren't enough people from CA to support this. 4 of the 11 committee members are affiliated with home building associations that are oppose to this concept.	D 11-0
E150 PT2	R310.1	Steven Orlowski, NAHB	Allow use of sprinkler to omit emergency rescue window	Opponents – unintended consequences as other types of uses from IBC may be allowed to use IRC, and to remove egress windows would be a concern, use of sprinkler is not a guarantee	This is a bad idea. Another area where sprinkler is used to waive a passive safety requirement. In this case, committee approved. Assembly challenged motion but failed to get the required vote.	AS 7-4 DF failed
E194 PT2	R202	Jeff Lowinski, Window & Door Manuf. Assoc.	proposal adds a definition to the IRC for "Landing"			D 10-1
EB3 PT1 EB3 PT2	Chapter 2; IBC Chapter 2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	editorial change intended to correct awkward grammar and sentence structure for "dangerous building"			AS 14-0 AS 14-0
EB4 PT1 EB4 PT2	Chapter 2; IBC Chapter 2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Increase % of damage before upgrade of existing building is required, from 20% to 33%			AS 14-0 AS 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING: COMMITTEE: AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED
 ASSEMBLY: ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
EB5	501.1, 1102.1, 1102.4, 1102.5	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	It proposes a general exemption for historic buildings in Chapter 5 along with an explicit list of requirements in Chapter 11		Although CA does not use the IEBC, reference to exempt certain types of accessibility is a concern.	AS 14-0
EB6 PT1 EB6 PT2	506.2.2, 506.2.2.1; IBC 3405.2 (IEBC [B] 304.2), 3405.2.1(IEBC [B] 304.2.1)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	The purpose of this proposal is to exempt certain combinations of buildings, seismic risk, and damage from triggered seismic upgrades.		Elimination of seismic load effect on SFD may be a concern. Chapter should look at this language.	AS 13-0 AS 13-0
EB7	506.2.2.3	Gary R. Searer	This change is intended to make seismic upgrades of the lateral force resisting system after a large earthquake logical.			D13-0
EB8 PT1 EB8 PT2	506.2.3.1; IBC 3405.3.1 (IEBC [B] 304.3.1)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	The purpose of this proposal is to exempt certain buildings from triggered seismic upgrades.		Elimination of seismic load effect on SFD may be a concern. Chapter should look at this language.	AS 13-0 AS 13-0
EB9 PT1 EB9 PT2	506.2.3.1; IBC 3405.3.1 (IEBC [B] 304.3.1)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	The purpose of this proposal is to exempt certain buildings from triggered seismic upgrades.		Exempt SFD in Seismic Category A, B, and C. Not a concern for those of us in D and higher. However, EB8 is more critical as it doesn't even use design category.	AS AS
EB15	606.2.1, 807.4.4 (New)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal relocates a triggered structural improvement from Chapter 6 to Chapter 8 where it is more appropriate.			AS 14-0
EB16	606.3.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal is an editorial clarification.			AS 14-0
EB17	606.3.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal makes a reasonable allowance for "reduced" wind loads for certain triggered upgrades by introducing 75% criteria.			AS 12-2
EB21	707.5, 807.4, 807.4.3	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Multiple revision to existing structural element resisting lateral loads			AS 14-0
EB22	707.5	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	this proposal adds a provision that prohibits the creation of structural irregularities already prohibited for new buildings per ASCE 7			AS 14-0
EB24	807.4.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	requires alterations within a 5-yr period to be counted together for purposes of determining whether the project is big enough to trigger a seismic upgrade			AS 14-0
EB25	807.4.4 (N)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Add new bracing for unreinforced masonry parapets			AS 14-0
EB36	1101.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal clarifies that the provision's intent is to require some description of the designed or de facto lateral system and to identify its salient features			AS 14-0
EB37	1102.2, 1106.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Editorial change to definition of "unsafe condition" and "dangerous building"			AS 14-0
EB38	1202.3, 1202.4	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal makes the wind and seismic upgrade triggers in Chapter 12 consistent with those already in Sections 302.4, 303.4, 707.5, 807.4.3, and 1003.3.			AS 14-0
EB40	A102.2	Peter Somers, NCSEA	This code change which groups of essential or hazardous buildings are subject to strengthening			AS 14-0
EB41	A103	Peter Somers, NCSEA	The proposed revision to the definition rigid diaphragm			AS 14-0
EB42	A110.2	Peter Somers, NCSEA	The proposed change provides appropriate wall anchorage forces for buildings with rigid diaphragms.			AM 13-0
EB43	A301.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Eliminate the word "assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D or E"			AS
EB44	A301.2	David Bonowitz, NCSEA	Eliminate wording conflict with more general			AS 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
		EBS	provisions for historic buildings in IEBC chapter 11			
EB45	A301.2, A301.3, A304.1.1	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	relocates three sentences from current section A301.2 to section A301.3 and makes coordinating revisions			AS 14-0
EB46	A303	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal makes the provision more consistent and enforceable.			AS 14-0
EB47	A304.1.3, A304.1.4, Fig. A3-8, Fig. A3-8A(N), Fig. A3-8B (N), Fig. A3-8C (N), Fig. A3-9,	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal updates and replaces Figures A3-8 and A3-9, and makes corresponding revisions to the text.			AS 14-0
EB49	A304.2.3 thru A304.2.6, A304.2.6 (N), Appendix A	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal addresses a series of provisions all related to new foundation elements. It proposes a number of editorial revisions for clarity and consistency of terminology, as well as a few substantive improvements			AM 13-1
EB50	A304.3.1, A304.3.2, A304.3.3, A304.5, A302	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal is primarily editorial. It renames and revises the definitions of the two anchor types for consistency with definitions now used in ACI 318 Appendix D and other ICC-ES resources.			AS
EB52	A304.5.1 (N)	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Add requirement and specification for use of common wire nails			AM 11-3
EB53	A304.6	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Remove phasing of the strengthening work			AS 14-0
EB54	Fig. A31- through A3-7	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal updates Figures A3-1 through A3-7 to improve their clarity, consistency, usability, and enforceability, and to better coordinate them with the text.			AS 14-0
EB55	A401.2	Gary Searer, NCSEA EBS	This proposal clarifies the scope by removing inapplicable and unnecessary language.			AS 13-0
EB71	Appendix C (New)	T. Eric Stafford, Institute for Business and Home Safety	New guideline for wind retrofit of existing buildings			AM 14-0
EB72	Appendix C (New)	T. Eric Stafford, Institute for Business and Home Safety	New guideline for wind retrofit of existing buildings			AS 8-5
FS118PT2	R302.11.1	Rick Thornberry, Cellulose Insulation Manufacturers	adds a new Item 8 to the list of fire blocking materials to recognize cellulose insulation		Not sure what this will do with a new item that can be used as a fireblocking material.	AM 9-2
FS124PT3	IRC 202 (N)	Marcelo M. Hirschler, for American Fire Safety Council	Add new definition for insulation	Opponent – definition does not add any clarity and make it confusion Committee – not good code language		D 11-0
FS144PT2	R202, 703.13, 703.13.1, Chapter 44	Matthew Dobson, Vinyl Siding Institute	Introduce polypropylene (PP) siding into the code	Committee – safety concern with the product		D 6-5
FS147PT2	Table R601.3.1	Edward L. Keith, PE, APA	the generic term “wood structural panel” is used			AS 11-0
FS150PT2	R703.12.1 (N)	John Woestman, Masonry Veneer Manuf. Assoc.	The proposed language for flashing at the foundation is similar to the weep screed requirements for stucco and compliments the flashing performance requirements of section R703.8 Flashing			AS 11-0
FS151PT2	R703.12.1 (N)	John Woestman, Masonry Veneer Manuf. Assoc.	The proposed requirement that both the wall and the walking surface be supported by the same foundation			D
FS155PT2	R302.1.2 (N)	Michael Love, Washington DC Fire Marshal Committee	Add a new section to IRC Chapter 3 as R302.1.2 to increase fire resistance of combustible exterior walls when directly exposed to combustible decks	Opponents – too restrictive, will drive people to not get permits in jurisdictions where they require it, should take material into consideration otherwise if unduly affect material that tend to be		D 11-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				non-combustible with having to be rated Proponents – fire treated wood for deck less than 5 ft would reduce fire concerns Committee – overall appears to agree with opponents, particularly people not getting permits		
FS156PT1		Jay H. Crandell, Foam Sheathing Coalition	Propose new foam plastic sheathing for exterior	Proponent request to deny based on comments made by other and will look to revise. Will work with stakeholder. APA – suggest there need to be a structural standard first before this can be used.		D 13-0
FS180	2606.5, 2609.1, 2610.1.1	J. Nigel Ellis, Ellis Fall Safety Solutions, LLC	Add safety screen around skylight to prevent potential human contact from falling through it	Opponents – why have this if in many cases people cannot access or be around it NCSEA – oppose, unnecessary		D 13-0
G2 PT1 GS PT2	202, Appendix I; IRC R202, Appendix H	Daniel J. Walker, National Sunroom Association	Move definition of patio cover into the code		Both structural and irc committee disapprove.	D 12-1 D 11-0
G5 PT2	R202	Theresa Weston, DuPont Building Innovations	correct an apparent contradiction between definitions within the code on vapor permeable			AM 10-1
G28 PT2	R101.2, R202	Maureen Traxler, Seattle Dept of Planning & Dev.	proposal allows lodging house, with intent on small bed and breakfasts, to be constructed according to the IRC	Opponents – concern this new use, which is commercial in nature, now uses the IRC for construction Committee – should be in zoning code, does not address change of use	Several motion made, all failed. Committee eventually disapproved. Assembly motion to overruled Committee.	D 7-4 AMF passed
G56 PT2	IRC R302.6	Dennis Richardson	To provide a complete separation between garage areas and any habitable areas of the dwelling unit including its attic	Committee – all appear to think it's not necessary		D11-0
G190	3401.4, 3401.4.3 (N), 3403.4.1, 3404.4.1, 3405.2.1, 3408.4	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal would simply replace those four occurrences with a single identical provision in an appropriate location at the top of the chapter.			AS 14-0
G191	3401.4.1	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	Change the reference to dangerous to unsafe			AS 14-0
G193	3402.1, 3405.2, 3405.2.1, 3405.2.2, 3405.2.3, 3405.3, 3405.4	Gary R. Searer	This proposal is intended to reduce the dramatic and significant upgrade triggers that were introduced into Chapter 34	Proponent – This proposal requires structural upgrades of existing structures only when the costs of repair-only are substantial; i.e. at least half the market value of the building.		AS
G194	3405.2, 3405.4	Gary J. Ehrlich, NAHB	The purpose of this proposal is to clarify new language added to Chapter 34 for the evaluation of existing buildings.			AM 14-0
G195	3405.2.3	Gary R. Searer	This change is intended to make seismic upgrades of the lateral force resisting system after a large earthquake logical.			D 13-1
G196						W
G197	3408.4	David Bonowitz, NCSEA EBS	This proposal is editorial, for consistency.			AS 14-0
RB1	R202	Maureen Traxler, Seattle Dept of Planning & Dev.	definition of "Basement" has been modified to be consistent with the 2009 IBC definition of "Basement."			AS 7-4
RB2	R202	Diana M. Hanson, North American Deck and Railing Assoc	To distinguish a patio from a deck			D 10-1
RB3	R202	Daniel J. Walker, PE, Thomas Associates	Add definition of patio from Appendix into main body of code		An attempt to get patio cover in the main body of the code.	D 11-0
RB4	R202	Maureen Traxler, Seattle Dept of Planning & Dev.	changes are intended to have the IRC definition for story above grade plane match that of the IBC	Committee – agree that this clear the definition and reduce confusion		AS 8-3

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
RB5	R202	James Ranfone, American Gas Assoc	Add word "separately owned" into definition of townhouse	Committee – concern that this is a zoning type issue	Don't think this will add clarity to the requirement	W
RB6	R202	Julie Ruth, PE, JRuth Code Consult	revision clarifies that the "primary" material in the composite is wood or other cellulose-based material with plastic(s)			
RB7	R301.1.1, Ch. 44 (N)	Julie Ruth, PE, JRuth Code Consult	Allow new standard for sunroom specification			D 11-0
RB8	R301.1.4 (N), R301.1.4.1 (N), R301.1.4.2 (N), R301.1.4.3 (N), Fig. R301.1.4 (N)	Larry Wainright, SBCI	New labeling or signage requirement to denote structural members	Proponent – code change is to provide first responders with the information necessary to help facilitate fighting fire		D
RB9 PT1	R301.1.4 (N), R301.1.4.1 (N), R301.1.4.2 (N), R301.1.4.3 (N), Fig. R301.1.4 (N)	Sean DeCrane, Cleveland Fire Dept	New labeling or signage requirement to denote structural members	Proponent – code change is to provide first responders with the information necessary to help facilitate fighting fire		D
RB10	R301.1.4 (N)	Daniel J. Walker, PE, Thomas Assoc	Add patio design requirement from Appendix into main body of code		An attempt to get patio cover in the main body of the code.	D 11-0
RB11	R202 (N), R301.1.5 thru R301.1.5.4 (N), Table R301.1.5(1) (N), Table R301.1.5(2) (N)	Daniel J. Walker, PE, Thomas Assoc	Add screen enclosure definition into the code	Opponent – this proposal is again a piecemeal of appendix into the main body of code Committee – definition need more work	An attempt to get patio cover in the main body of the code.	D 11-0
RB12	R301.2.1, R301.2.1.1, R301.2.2.2.5, R301.2.2.4, R301.3	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	proposal is to clarify the IRC limitations for wind and seismic design		Seems like a reasonable change, it does read easier.	AS 8-3
RB13	R301.2.1.1	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	Delete the "hurricane prone area" from this section			AS
RB14	R202, R301.2.1, Fig. R301.2(4), Fig. R301.2(4)A (N), R301.2.1.1, Fig. R301.2(4)B (N), R301.2.1.2, Fig. R301.2(4)C, R301.2.1.4	James Rossberg, Structural Engineering Institute of ASCE	purpose of this proposal is to update and coordinate the provisions of the 2012 IRC with those of the 2010 edition of ASCE 7 for the determination of wind loads			AM 11-0
RB15	R301.2.2	John England, MCO, England Enterprises	Revise the rule and exception for seismic provision	CRSC – support this proposal	Reasonable change.	AS 11-0
RB16	R301.2.2.2.6 (N), R1001.3, R1001.4, R1003.3, R1003.4, Table R1001.1	Homer Maiel, CBO, City of San Jose	reinforcing and anchorage of masonry and concrete chimneys were extended to Seismic Design Category C	CRSC – support this proposal to reduce chimney damage even in low earthquake area Opponent – feel this is not justified, maybe the damage is more due to poor workmanship	While this is a good proposal, it will not have any impact on those of us in Seismic Design Category D and higher region. A lot of debate on this item.	D 8-3 ASF failed
RB17	R301.2.4.1, R322.1.1	Rebecca C. Quinn, for FEMA	recognizes the Coastal A Zone as "flood hazard areas"			AS 10-1
RB18	Table R301.7	Stephen Kerr, Josephson Werdowatz & Assoc.	Alter allowable deflection for plastered ceiling			AS 11-0
RB19	Table R302.1	Steven Orlovski, NAHB	Change the fire separation distance for exterior wall from 5 ft to 3 ft	Opponents – no technical reason to reduce separation, do not change what matches the IBC, why reduce because of outdated legacy codes that allowed 3 ft Committee – see no compelling reason to change this requirement	There is strong opposition from many Fire Dept and even BO from the mid and east coast against reducing the distance to 3 ft	D 8-3
RB20	R302.1	Don Davies, Utah Chapter of ICC	limit the roof projection for carports and patio covers within 5 ft of the lot line	Opponent – if garage can be closer, why would not allow the same for these structures Committee – concern that it does not say carport or patio cover but structure	Seems overly restrictive	D 11-0
RB21	R302.1	Maureen Traxler, Seattle Dept of Planning & Dev	No protection is required between dwelling and accessory structure, other than garage			D 10-1
RB22	R302.2, R302.2.4	Michael Gardner, Gypsum	Change from 1-hr to 2-hr for fire wall between	Proponent – this req'mt was based on assumption that there	This was debated for quite some time among	D 7-4

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
		Association	townhouse	would be fire sprinkler, and if there is none, this should be 2-hr Opponent -	proponents and opponents. I think this is a good proposal, but committee disapproved and motion by assembly failed.	ASF failed
RB23	R302.2.1, Fig. R302.2.1(1)-R302.2.1(2)-R302.2.1(3) (N)	Larry Wainright, SBCI	Add detail to clarify that is the fire-resistance rating of the wall assembly that needs to be continuous from the foundation to the underside of the roof sheathing	Committee – concern that if detail added what other area of code would need detail		D 11-0
RB24	R302.2.2	Jeffrey Anderson, Chesterfield County Dept. of Bldg. Insp.	Add language to the exception provision to make parapet req't match IBC			D 11-0
RB25	R302.3	Steven Orłowski, NAHB	to reference the applicable residential fire sprinkler to NFPA 13-D or Section P2904 instead of just NFPA-13	Opponent – the ½ hr wall rating was based on the use of NFPA-13, to now use NFPA-13D would impact the reduced rating in the wall in the first place, limited sprinkler in attic where fire occur would happen with NFPA-13D Proponent – no one uses this exception because it's too restrictive, need to change to encourage use		D 8-3
RB26	R302.5.1	Sean DeCrane, Cleveland, OH Fire Department	Add language to garage door between residence to be equipped with a self-closing device	Proponent – need to have door close so fire does not spread to residence, very low cost to install Opponent – don't think this is an actual issue, don't think the majority of country has this type of issue to require door closure Committee – inconvenient to homeowner, people will disable if installed	Stuart spoke to this item as well as other FD and BO members. This is a low cost measure to ensure fire-life safety. Committee disapproved, but assembly overruled to pass motion overwhelmingly. Good ruling by assembly.	D 7-4 ASF passed
RB27	R309.4	Bob Eugene, UL	Add language to include label for garage door opening			AS 11-0
RB28	R302.4 (N)	Daniel J. Kress, for Finger Lakes B.O. Assoc	New section to permit decks to be constructed without meeting certain rating requirement	Committee – does not add clarity for deck		D 11-0
RB29	R302.4 (N)	Daniel J. Kress, for Finger Lakes B.O.	Decks shall be constructed in accordance with Sections R302.1, R302.2 and R302.3	Committee – does not add clarity for deck		D 10-0
RB30	Table R302.6	Joe Holland, Hoover Treated Wood Products	Add 5/8" fire treated plywood as a material for protection between garage and dwelling	Proponent – want to add another equivalent material so it's not just gypsum, and argue it is better than the gypsum Opponent – concern that we will now have hundred of different products to have to consider, further complicating BO's decision Committee – the equivalent word is already there, not necessary	It seems like this is a product battle for inclusion in code.	D 8-2
RB31	R302.7 (N), R502.14 (New), Table R502.14 (N)	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	Add minimum fire resistance of floor/ceiling systems equivalent to 2x lumber floor construction	Opponent – this will change the way residential construction is done if this type of rating is required Committee – expresses concern this may be a product related issue for fire rating	Seems like an unnecessary requirement.	D 11-0
RB32	R302.9, R302.9.1	Joe Holland, Hoover Treated Wood Products	Allow fire-retardant coating to be used for flame spread in existing construction	Opponent – owner may not know it's there, may paint over this, may do other work that alter this, may inadvertently exclude other products to satisfy this Proponent – rarely is this called out in plan review for residence, so need option in case flame spread is not met during field inspection Committee – existing code is self explanatory, no need to consider this as there are other option		D 10-0
RB33	R302.9.4	Marcelo M. Hirschler, American Fire Safety Council	Editorial changes to interior finish under alternate test method			AS
RB34	R302.10.1	Jesse J. Beitel, for Extruded Polystyrene Foam Assoc.	provides a pointer to section and clarifies the requirements for foam plastic insulation			AS 9-2
RB35	R302.11, M1501.2 (N)	Julius Ballanco, for In-O-Vate Technologies	proposed change to remove penetration of rated walls	Proponent – dryers are more prone to fire than other appliances, this provision helps prevent it Opponent – don't think it will help much and believe this is an attempt to give unfair advantage by listing materials in proposal,	Doesn't seem relevant since the penetration is typically into a non-rated wall, so protection wouldn't make sense.	D 11-0 ASF failed

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				disagree that non-combustible be used in a combustible wall, no data to support that this is a problem		
RB36	R302.12	Fire Chief Kevin A. Gallagher, Fire Chief's Assoc. of MA	Require draft stopping in void spaces exceeding 500 in lieu of the existing 1,000 sqft			D
RB37	R302.12	Fire Chief Kevin A. Gallagher, Fire Chief's Assoc. of MA	Require draft stopping in void spaces exceeding 500 in lieu of the existing 1,000 sqft			D
RB38	R305.1	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Revise minimum ceiling height for bathrooms and toilet rooms		This proposal is confusion.	D 10-1
RB39	R308.4	William E. Koffel, Glazing Industry Code Committee	Add language regarding exception #5			D 10-1
RB40	R308.4	Tim Pate, Colorado Chapter ICC	minor change to change the word guardrail to guard, eliminate exception 1 under item 7			AS 9-2
RB41	R310.1	Mike Rice, Assoc. of MN Building Officials	Clarify where the sill height is measure from			AS 10-1
RB42	R310.1.5 (N)	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Require egress window to have labeling affix to them	Proponent decides to withdraw to work out the wording		D 11-0
RB43	R310.2.2 (N)	Scott Dornfeld, Assoc. of MN Building Official	Require drainage at window well that serve as egress window	Proponent – will reduce damage caused by poor drainage	Seems like a good proposal	AS 10-1
RB44	R311.3	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Modify exception at floor and landing at exterior door	Proponent request to disapprove		D 11-0
RB45	R311.3.2	Homer Maiel, PE, CBO, City of San Jose	Revise direction of door swing over landing and floor	Proponent request to disapprove, poorly worded		D 11-0
RB46	R311.7.4.1, R311.7.4.2, R311.7.4.2.1 (N), R311.7.4.3	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Language related to risers is relocated from the section on "Profile" to the section on "Risers", which is more appropriate.	Proponent – this is purely an editorial to make language on stair tread and riser clearer, others believe it makes this easier to find, no technical change	Seems like a reasonable change and clarify language	AM 10-1
RB47	R311.7.4.2, R311.7.4.2.1 (N), R311.7.4.2.2 (N)	Jake Pauls	separating out and labeling the separate issues of tread depth and the uniformity of tread depths for rectangular and winder treads	Committee – disapprove based upon previous action on RB46		D 11-0
RB48	R311.7.3 (N), R311.7.5	David W. Cooper, Stairway Manuf.	Add language to clarify distance between landing to be consistent with IBC			D 10-1
RB49	R311.7.7.1	David W. Cooper, Stairway Manuf.	Add language to exception to discontinue handrail at winder transition		Assembly challenge to ruling failed, did not get the 66% (only 60%) required.	D 9-2 ASF failed
RB50	R311.9 (N)	Katherine Bang, City of Portland	Provide requirement for exit discharge and protection of that path to public way			D 11-0
RB51	R312.1, R312.2	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Revise when guard is required and the height	Opponent – changing the wording will make it less clear, original requirement took a long time to develop and should not just change it without data to support		D 9-2
RB52	R312.3	Tiffani Kerlik	Change spacing and opening in guard from 4" to 2.5"			D
RB53	R313.1, R302.2, R302.2.4	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Change common wall between unit from 1-hr to 2-hr			W
RB54	R313.1, R313.2, R313.2.1	Steven Orlowski, NAHB	delete the reference of the mandatory requirement of residential sprinkler systems	Opponent – argue that it is wrong for mandatory req't on sprinkler Proponent – fire officials who spoke cited statistics that people's live are saved in those homes with sprinklers NFPA – cite the majority of death are in homes, so it makes sense to have sprinkler to prevent fire, needed to be there to protect young, old and incapacitated person who live in homes NAHB - strongly disagrees with the fire services perception of America's fire problem, further state that smoke detector is the primary reason in 99.5%, the mandatory sprinkler is an overkill. Committee – agree with opponent, it is safer and is a nominal cost	Very controversial and contentious issue. Many of committee believes it should stay in and let the debate continue to shed more light on the subject while other feel the pain from elected official, homeowner, and builders. Committee disapproved. Assembly challenge disapproval. Overwhelming majority disapprove as well. It seems that the majority of people in the room are FD and fire sprinkler coalition members.	D 7-4 ASF failed

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				in the long run		
RB55	R313.1.1	Phillip A. Brown, American Fire Sprinkler Association	Add NFPA-13D as an option			D
RB56	R313, R313.1, R313.1.1, R313.2, R313.2.1, Appendix P (N)	Steven Orlowski, NAHB	Delete sprinkler requirement and move it into an appendix		Same result as RB54	D 7-4
RB57	R313, R313.1, R313.1.1, R313.3.2, R313.2.1	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Delete sprinkler requirement		Proponent withdrawn given what happen with RB54 and RB56.	W
RB58	R314.1	Bob Eugene, UL	Only listed products that are labeled for smoke detection			AS
RB59	R314.4	Lou Malattia, WABO	The UL Listed wireless interconnected smoke alarm system with AC ionization sensor hardwired would allow all of the smoke detectors to be interconnected without requiring hard wiring all of them.			AS
RB60	R315, R315.1.1, R315.1.2, R315.1.3, Ch. 44	Scott Dornfeld	Delete provision for carbon monoxide alarm			D
RB61	R316.4, R316.4.1 (N), R316.4.2 (N), Ch. 44 (N)	Marcelo M. Hirschler, American Fire Safety Council	Revision to thermal barrier requirement			D
RB62	R316.5.3	Rick Thornberry, Cellulose Insulation Manufacturers Association	proposing the use of 1-1/2 inch thick cellulose loose-fill insulation as another acceptable material			AM
RB63	R317.4	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	To clarify the intended requirement to have performance ratings established and monitored in accordance with ASTM D7032.			D
RB64	R202 (N), R317.5 (N), R317.5.1 (N), Ch. 44 (N)	Marcelo M. Hirschler, American Fire Safety Council	Reference plastic lumber deck into the code			D
RB65	R318.4	Greg Baumann, Insulating Concrete Form Association	proposal updates the code language to illustrate that areas of "moderate to heavy" are also susceptible to termite attack of below grade			W
RB66	R321.4 (N)	John England, MCO, England Enterprises	Require 3 rd party certification of elevator and lift	Opponent – creates a certification requirement and would place an undue burden on bldg dept		D 11-0
RB67	R322.3.2, R322.3.3	Rebecca C. Quinn, for FEMA	to clarify that an observed practice of using mat or raft foundations that are above eroded grade is not consistent with the regulations of the NFIP	Opponent – concern that removing mat, raft or other foundation from current language may imply to BO that it is not permitted in certain flood area Proponent – ASCE 24 already provide provisions on how to address this		D 8-3
RB68	R322.3.3	Rebecca C. Quinn, for FEMA	Add language to make space below elevated building shall be free of obstruction for flood to flow through	Proponent – this is consistent with ASCE 24 language		AS 11-0
RB69	R401.3	Jim Olk, B.O. Assoc. of Texas	Adding the term "the building" and deleting the term "walls" make the provision applicable to all types of foundations	Opponent – concern that BO may misinterpret this and start applying it to all type, believe it is more of a local issue that is driving this proposal Proponent – this is intended to clear up the wording, this change should make it easier to understand, focus is to improve drainage away from building Committee – think the existing language already is clear and this doesn't necessarily make it better		D 11-0 ASF failed
RB70	R403.1, Fig. R403.1(1) (N)	Jason Thompson, National Concrete Masonry Association	to introduce an alternative design and construction option to allow discontinuous footers	Opponent – continuous footing should be required, and if discontinuous an engineer should analyze, not to use a table that does not consider load above, detail is inappropriate		D 11-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
RB71	R403.1, R404.6 (N)	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	makes a clear statement about the acceptability of pier and beam foundations	Opponent – definition of pier and beam foundation is unclear and creates confusion		D 11-0
RB72	R403.1.3	Homer Maiel, City of San Jose	make the use of plain concrete footings unacceptable without horizontal reinforcement	Committee – questioned whether or not there was data to support the need for this FEMA – support this proposal	Will need to consider local amendment for this regardless of model code, no reinforcement in building 3 stories for SFD is problematic in high seismic region. Challenge by assembly to this failed.	D 11-0 ASF failed
RB73	R202 (N), R403.1.6	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	Add definition to clarify "sole plate" and "sill plate", and allow 1/2" anchor bolt for anchorage on foundation	Opponent – definition need work		D 11-0
RB74	R403.1.6	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	Require wood sill plates or wood bottom plates shall have full bearing on the foundation system	Proponent - full bearing is required to prevent cross-grain bending stresses		D 11-0 ASF failed
RB75	R403.1.6	Mark Ferm, Boise, ID	Add 2 additional exception to foundation anchorage	FEMA – oppose since it has no merit		D 11-0
RB76	R403.1.9 (N)	Daniel J. Walker, PE, Thomas Assoc	Add slab and footing criteria for patio into the main body of code	Opponent – this should be designed Committee – feel this along with other provision is being piecemeal into the main body		D 11-0
RB77	R404.1.1, R404.1.2	Robert Rice, Southern ORE Chapter of ICC	Add language to require detailing and drawing	Opponent – this type of language is already in administrative section of code for construction documents		D 11-0 ASF failed
RB78	R404.1.2.3.6.1, R611.4.4 (N), Chapter 44 (N)	Stephen V. Heller, Insulating Concrete Form Association	Allow flat IFC into the code and make reference to a standard ASTM			AS 11-0
RB79	R404.1.5.3	Bruce D. Spicher, Orangeburg County	Delete item #7 from pier and curtain wall foundations			D 11-0
RB80	R404.1.9 (N), R404.1.9.1 (N) thru R404.1.9.5 (N), R602.10.7	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	introduce provisions for isolated masonry piers used as foundations for raised wood floor systems	Committee – mixed, but concern with no pier cap and ability to distribute load	Need to analyze this provision further as it allows masonry pier to support braced wall panels. Not sure if it is a concern or problem yet if approved.	D 7-4
RB81	R404.4	Robert Rice, Southern ORE Chapter of ICC	lateral support required at top and bottom of concrete or masonry wall	Committee – language is confusing, not clear guidance, has merit, but need additional work		D 11-0
RB82	R405.1, R405.1.1 (N), R405.2 thru R405.3	James Jorgensen, Metropolitan Kansas Chapter of ICC	Provide provision for drainage, including the use of perforated pipes, in foundation construction	Opponent – no technical reason was submitted to substantiate change		D 11-0
RB83	R408.3	Jesse J. Beitel, for Extruded Polystyrene Foam Association	proposal gives the user and /or installer the option to tape or seal to the insulation rather than the stem wall			AS 11-0
RB84	R501.3 (N), Ch. 44 (N)	Jeff Hugo, CBO, National Fire Sprinkler Association	construction consisting of prefabricated I joists, trusses, and cold formed steel shall be provided with sprinkler	AF&PA – opposes this proposal Proponent – widespread fire experience shows that floors framed out of these materials do not have the same durability	This proposal may be overly conservative in an effort to prevent floor collapse during fire.	D
RB85	R501.3 (N), Ch. 44 (N)	Larry Wainright, Structural Building Components Assoc.	require the underside of floors to be protected	AISI – opposes this proposal Committee – wants the proponent and opponent to work together to put something that make sense		D 11-0
RB86	R501.3 (N)	Sal DiCristina, Code Solutions	to protect the underside of a floor	Proponent request disapproval since the previous proposal was disapproved.		D 11-0
RB87	R501.3 (N)	Sean DeCrane, Int. Assoc. of Fire Fighters	to protect the underside of a floor	Proponent request disapproval since the previous proposal was disapproved.		D 11-0
RB88	R501.3 (N)	Joseph Fleming, Boston Fire Dept	to protect the underside of a floor	Proponent request disapproval since the previous proposal was disapproved.		D 11-0
RB89	R502.1.3, R602.1.1, R802.1.2	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	added elevated-temperature performance requirements for end-jointed lumber adhesives intended for use in fire resistance-rated assemblies			AS 11-0
RB90		Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	to create a deck-related section to provide a single location for the existing provisions.			AS
RB91	R202 (N), R502.1.8 (N), R602.1.4 (N), R802.1.6	Edward L. Keith, APA	New definition for structural composite lumber and make reference to an ASTM	Proponent – this is already in the IBC and make it consistent		AS 11-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
	(N), Ch. 44 (N)					
RB92	R502.2.2, R502.2.2.3	Steven Winkel, FEMA/BSSC	Removing the words "as applicable" clarifies that it is always applicable for vertical and lateral loads on deck			AS 9-2
RB93	R502.2.2.1.1	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	proposed changes bring the placement requirements of lag screws or bolts in deck ledger into agreement with the minimum requirements in the 2005 NDS			D 11-0
RB94	R502.2.2.3, Fig. R502.2.2.3	Diana M. Hanson, North American Deck and Railing Assoc.	Delete deck lateral load connection in R502	Opponent – why remove something that gives a method of attaching deck, if other option is important, have that added, not remove this whole section		D 9-2
RB95	R502.8, Fig. R502.8	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	Editorial revision, add the word "cutting"			AS 11-0
RB96	R502.11.2, R505.1.3, R802.10.3, R804.3.7	Larry Wainright, SBCI	update the references			AM
RB97	R505.2, R603.2, R804.2	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Revise size of radius bend for structural framing	Proponent – prefer RB98 better, request disapproval		D 11-0
RB98	R505.2, R603.2, R804.2	Michael C. Kerner, for Dietrich Industries	Remove the max. inside radius bend for structural framing	AISI – support proposal		AS 11-0
RB99	R506.1	James R. Baty, ACI	incorporated the design guidance for slabs-on-ground including post-tensioned slabs			AS 10-1
RB100	R506.2.3	Rick Davidson, City of Maple Grove	Remove the word "detached" from garage in the exception language	Proponent – vapor barrier should not be omit for attached garage		AS 7-4 DF failed
RB101	R601.3, R601.3.1, Table R601.3.1, R601.3.2, R601.3.3, R703.1.3 (N), R703.1.3.1 (N), Table R703.1.3.1 (N), R703.1.3.2 (N), R703.1.3.3 (N)	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	editorially relocate the provisions on vapor retarders			AM
RB102	R202 (N), R602.3	Jay H. Crandell, Foam Sheathing Coalition	Add definition for "exterior wall covering"	APA and AF& PA – oppose, this is not a simple editorial change or definition		AM 11-0
RB103	Table R602.3(2)	Randall Shackelford, Simpson Strong-Tie	Clarify that Table R602.3(2) is only to be used as alternate fastening and add a footnote g to clarify that these alternate attachments are not to be used when the basic windspeed is 100 mph or greater			AS 6-5
RB104	R602.7, R602.7.1 (N), Table R602.7.1 (N), Fig. R602.7.1(1)-(2) (N)	Joseph Lstiburek, Building Science Corporation	Add new text, table and figures for single member headers in exterior bearing walls			AM
RB105	Table R602.3(1), R602.3.5 (new), Section R602.10 (including figures and tables), Table R802.11	Chuck Bajnai, Chesterfield County, VA, Chairman, ICC Ad-Hoc Committee	Substantial revisions to wall bracing requirements	Proponent – many stakeholders, BO, engineers, builders involved with this for 3 yrs to revamp these requirements, compromises and equal ground was made to get these revisions	Need to fully review in order to better understand if the changes are approved by the Committee.	AM 11-0
RB106	R602.9, Table R602.10.1.2(2), R602.10.9 thru 602.10.9.3, R602.11.2	Chuck Bajnai, Chesterfield County, VA, Chairman, ICC Ad-Hoc Committee	Require cripple wall to be continuously sheathed and provide a Table for cripple wall			AS 11-0
RB107	R602.10.1.2, R602.10.1.4.1, Table R602.10.1.2(3), Table R602.10.2, R602.10.2.1, R602.10.3, Table R602.10.3.1, R602.10.3.5 (N), Table R602.10.3.5	Chuck Bajnai, Chesterfield County, VA, Chairman, ICC Ad-Hoc Committee	Revise special wall bracing requirements for wood-framed buildings with stone or masonry veneer		The Structural Code Committee should take a look at this and determine if there are any concerns for high seismic region.	AM 11-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
	(N), Fig. R602.10.3.5 (N), R602.12, R703.7					
RB108	R602.10.5.4	Louis Wagner, for American Fiberboard Association	Delete the requirement for continuously sheathed brace wall line	Proponent request denial since RB105 addressed this issue		D 11-0
RB109	R602.10.6.2, Fig. R602.10.6.2(2), Fig. R602.10.6.2(3)	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	amend and simplify the language for blocking between roof rafters and trusses over braced wall panels			AM 11-0
RB110	R602.10.8	Larry Wainright, Structural Building Components Assoc.	Add an exception to allow panel sheathing to occur over an adjoining stud			AM 11-0
RB111	R602.10, R602.12 (N)	Chuck Bajnai, Chesterfield County, VA, Chairman, ICC Ad-Hoc Committee	Add a new simplified approach to determine required wall bracing		The Structural Code Committee should take a look at this and determine if there are any concerns for high seismic region.	AS 11-0
RB112	R602.12, R603.12.1, R602.12.1.3, Table R602.12(1), Table R602.12(2), Fig. R602.12, R703.7, Table R703.7(1), Table R703.7(2)	Charles Clark, Brick Industry Association	This code change effectively reduces the special wall bracing requirements for wood-stud framing behind masonry veneer in recognition that the veneer carries a significant portion of its own load in-plane.	Proponent – arguing that there are test to support that masonry carries it's own load and is not necessary to require all these bracing requirement, remove this from Do zone Opponent – the testing done does not fully account for all seismic consideration, it is premature to remove this requirement at this time Committee – mixed on this proposal	The Structural Code Committee should take a look at this and determine if there are any concerns for high seismic region. Although disapproved, the committee disapproved based upon the fact that the technical data referenced by proponent was not submitted.	D 6-5
RB113	R602.12, Table R602.12(1), Table R602.12(2)	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	Revision to the wall bracing and stone and masonry veneer			D 11-0
RB114	R606.1, Table R606.1 (N)	John England, MCO, England Enterprises	New table for mortar types			D
RB115	R606.6	John England, MCO, England Enterprises	Provide provision for isolated pier			D
RB116	R606.6.1	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	provide additional options for providing bearing at the top of masonry piers			D
RB117	Table R607.1	John England, MCO, England Enterprises	Delete existing Table R607.1 and replace with a new Table to better clarify			D
RB118	R607.3	Charles Clark, Brick Industry Association	code change to ensure that anchored masonry veneer does not exceeding 5" in thickness has wall ties			AS
RB119	R612.1, R703.8	Jeff Lowinski, Window & Door Manu. Assoc.	Revise flashing requirement, removes the inappropriate flashing text in this chapter			D 10-1
RB120PT1	R313 (N)	Sarah A. Rice, CBO	Editorial revision to move window fall requirement into another section of the code			W
RB121	R313 (N)	Daniel E. Nichols, NY Code Enforcement	Editorial revision to move window fall requirement into another section of the code			AS
RB122PT1	R612.2	Paul K. Heilstedt, ICC Code Technology Committee	Change min. window sill height from 24" to 36"			D
RB123PT1	R612.2, R612.3, R612.4, R612.4.1, R612.4.2	Paul K. Heilstedt, ICC Code Technology Committee	Remove exception item #2 from complying with window sill height requirement			AM
RB124	R612.2, R612.3, R612.4, R612.4.1, R612.4.2, Chapter 44 (N)	Julie Ruth, AAMA Window Opening Control Device Task Group	Remove exception item #2 from complying with window sill height requirement			W
RB125	R310.2 (N), 612.3, R612.4, R612.4.1, R612.4.2	Jeff Lowinski, Window & Door Manu. Assoc.	Add new text for window fall prevention device			D
RB126	R601.4 (New), R612.2, R612.3, R612.4, R612.4.1, R612.4.2	Jeff Lowinski, Window & Door Manu. Assoc.	New window rough opening requirement			D
RB127	R612.8, Chapter 44 (New)	Jeff Burton, Association of Millwork Distributors	The code change proposal adds an additional requirement (option) to the code in that it includes			AS

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			a structural component interchangeability methodology			
RB128	Tables R613.3.2, R613.5(1), R613.5(2)	Edward L. Keith, APA	Revise value in the table			AS
RB129	R613.7	Edward L. Keith, APA	proposed language is added to clarify the limitation in drilling and notching in wood			D
RB130	R614 (N), R614.1 (N)	Daniel J. Walker, PE, Thomas Assoc	defines the allowable configuration of patio cover walls	Opponent – this should be designed Committee – feel this along with other provision is being piecemeal into the main body		D 11-0
RB131						W
RB132						AS
RB133						D
RB134						D
RB135						AM
RB136						D
RB137						D
RB138						AS
RB139						AS
RB140	R703.7.4, R703.7.4.2, R703.7.4.3, Table R703.7.4 (New)	Charles Clark, Brick Industry Association	This code change adds a table to the anchored masonry veneer provisions			AS
RB141	R703.7.4.1	Charles Clark, Brick Industry Association	Revise tie requirement			AS 11-0
RB142	R703.7.4.1	Jay H. Crandell, Foam Sheathing Coalition	The proposed 10d common nail should provide a minimum 2-1/2" penetration into framing when applied over a typical 1/2" thick sheathing	Proponent request disapproval based upon action of RB140		D 11-0
RB143	R703.7.7 (N)	Tim A. Fleming, Code Solutions	New text to add requirement for corner movement flashing	Committee – attempt to address water infiltration misses the mark		D 11-0
RB144	R202 (N), R703.8, Ch. 44 (N)	Jeff Lowinski, Window and Door Manuf. Association	proposed revisions to the window and door flashing requirements	Proponent request disapproval		D 11-0
RB145	R202 (New), R703.8	Jeff Lowinski, Window and Door Manuf. Association	This proposal identifies alternate flashing methods for windows and doors			D 10-1
RB146	R703.8	Mike Rice, Association of MN Building Officials	addressing wall and roof intersections and further prevent water from entering the wall			D 11-0
RB147	Table R703.4, R703.11.2, R703.11.2.1, R703.11.2.2, R703.11.2.3, Table R703.11 (N)	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	New table to address vinyl siding for wind load			D
RB148	R202 (N), R703.13 (N), Ch. 44 (N)	Marcelo M. Hirschler, American Fire Safety	regulate the use of polypropylene siding			D 10-1
RB149	R801.3	Jim Olk, B.O. Assoc. of Texas	Revision to roof drainage			D 11-0 ASF failed
RB150	R802.3.2	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	corrects a conflict between R802.3.2 and R802.3.1			AS
RB151	Fig. R802.5.1	Robert Rice, Southern Oregon Chapter of ICC	Existing figure is lacking in some information and references to pertinent sections of code. This proposal updates the figure.			AS
RB152	R802.7, R802.7.1, R802.7.1.1 (N), Fig. R802.7.1.1 (N), R802.7.1.2 (N), Fig. R802.7.1.2	Dennis Pitts, AF&PA	The revision simplifies text on notching of rafter members by referencing material elsewhere in the code.			AS
RB153	R802.10.2.1	Larry Wainright, SBCI	Allow wood truss to be in a 3 story bldg as oppose to the current 2 story limit			AS
RB154	R301.2.1, Table	T. Eric Stafford, Institute for	Revise and update wood uplift connector			AS

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
	R602.3(1), R802.10.5, R802.11.1, R802.11.1.2 (N), R802.11.1.3 (N), Table R802.11	Business and Home Safety	requirement for wind, new tables added to address this			
RB155	R802.10.5, R802.11.1, R802.11.1.2 (N), R802.11.1.3 (N)	Larry Wainright, SBCI	provides the requirements for connecting wall top plates to roof framing			D
RB156	Table R602.3(1), R602.10.1.2.1, R802.10.5, R802.11.1, Table R802.11	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	The purpose of this proposal is to provide sensible and simplified requirements for roof uplift connections.			AS
RB157	R806.1, R806.2, R806.3 (New)	Michael Fischer, Roof Attic Ventilation Coalition	The proposal clarifies that ventilators open to outside air, as opposed to adjacent attic or rafter spaces or some other interior space.			D
RB158	R806.2	Joseph Lstiburek, Building Science Corporation	allows one attic ventilation ratio			D
RB159						D
RB160						D
RB161						AM
RB162						D
RB163						
RB164						D
RB165						D
RB166						D
RB167						D
RB168						D
RB169PT1						D
RB170						AS
RB171						D
RB172						AS
RB173						D
RB174						D
RB175						D
RB176						W
RB177						D
RB178	R202 (N), Appendix G, R324 (N), R325 (N), R326 (N), Chapter 44	Tom Neltner, National Center for Healthy Housing	this code change proposal brings the requirements for swimming pools, spas and hot tubs out of Appendix G and into the body of the code text.			W
RB179						D
RB180						D
RB181						D
RB182						D
RB183						D
RB184	R302.1, Table R302.1(1), Table R302.1(2) (New), R309.5 (New)	Tom Lariviere, Joint Fire Service Review Committee	the proposal permits homes to have larger footprints without triggering fire-rated exterior walls and permits more flexible use of windows on walls facing property lines	Opponents – did not feel this proposal justify the reduction in separation distance for wall protection Proponents – with sprinkler now required, this requirement should be changed Committee – mixed in support and opposition of this proposal	Assembly floor action overwhelmingly (79%) overrule Committee. Chapter will need to evaluate how this may affect our enforcement of it.	D 10-1 ASF passed
RB185	R302.2	Tom Lariviere, Joint Fire Service Review Committee		Opponents – too restrictive for soffit protection		D 11-0
RB186	R310.1	Tom Lariviere, Joint Fire Service Review Committee	Allow use of sprinkler to omit means of rescue window	Opponents – unintended consequences as other types of uses from IBC may be allowed to use IRC, and to remove egress windows would be a concern, use of sprinkler is not a guarantee	This is a bad idea. Another area where sprinkler is used to waive a passive safety requirement. The fire sprinkler coalition challenged the ruling, but motion	D 6-5 ASF failed

PUBLIC HEARING: COMMITTEE: AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED
 ASSEMBLY: ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
					failed.	
RB187	R314.3	Tom Lariviere, Joint Fire Service Review Committee	Provide an exception to remove smoke alarm in sprinkler building		This is a bad idea. Another area where sprinkler is used to waive a passive safety requirement.	D
S1 PT1 S1 PT2	1502.1	Bob Eugene, UL	Roof assemblies are also designed to provide wind resistance and fire resistance		Structural committee disapproved. IRC committee disapproved to be consistent with ruling.	D D 10-0
S2	1504.3	Don Surrena, CBO, NAHB	Clarify the requirements for roof drains and the requirements for secondary emergency overflow drains, their sizing, location and quantity			
S3 PT1	1503.6	John Woestman, The Kellen Company	Skylight to be omitted from providing crickets and saddles			D
S4	1504.3	Mike Ennis, Single Ply Roofing Industry	Provide a prescriptive method to enhance the perimeter and corner attachment of nonballasted roofs			D
S5	1502.1, 1504.4, 1504.6, 1504.7	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	Add clarity to the code by providing a specific definition in Section 1502 for the term "low slope"			W
S6	1504.4, 1504.4.1 (N), 1504.4.2 (N), T1504.4 (N), 1504.8, T1504.8	Thomas L Smith, AIA, RRC, TlSmith Consulting Inc.	code change proposal addresses two types of roof coverings to prevent roof aggregate blow-off			D 9-5 ASF failed
S7	1504.5	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	add clarity to the code by providing the specific roof membrane types			AS
S8	1504.5	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	intended to add a specific reference and clarity to which part of ANSI/SPRI ES-1 applies in Section 1504.5			AS
S9	1504.9 (N), Ch. 35	Mike Ennis, Single Ply Roofing Industry	guidance is provided for designing roof gardens and landscaped roofs to withstand wind loads		Not sure if this is a good or bad provision. It now provides criteria for landscaped or garden roof. None provided before.	D
S10	T1505.1, 1507.16, 1507.16.1 (N)	Robert J Davidson, Code Consultant	proposed that Table 1505.1 be modified that would require the roof coverings on roofs that contain roof gardens or landscaped roofs have the required classification of the roof covering increased one level			
S11	T1505.1	Brian Tollisen, PE, NY Div of Code Enforcement	proposal requires the fire separation distance to be at a minimum of 30' on all sides, allows buildings of Type VA construction to have a Class C roof			
S12	1505.8 (N), Ch. 35	Mike Ennis, Single Ply Roofing Industry	provides a design method to assure an acceptable level of performance of roof gardens and landscaped roofs when exposed to exterior fire sources			
S13	1505.8 (New)	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	clarify that rooftop photovoltaic systems that are adhered or attached to the roof need to comply with building code requirements for fire classification		Labeling is required to show it meet fire classification when installed on roof. This would be new and would help inspector.	
S14 PT1	T1507.2.7.1(2)	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	to make the classification requirements in IBC Table 1507.2.7.1(2) consistent with the classifications described in the test method			D
S15 PT1	1507.2.8.1, 1507.3.3.3 (N), 1507.4.5 (N), 1507.5.3.1 (N), 1507.6.3.1 (N), 1507.7.3.1 (N), 1507.8.3.1 (N),	T. Eric Stafford, PE, Institute for Business and Home Safety	use of metal caps is recommended for areas with the highest basic design wind speeds			D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED
ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
	1507.9.3.1 (N)					
S16 PT1	1507.2.9.3	T. Eric Stafford, PE, Institute for Business and Home Safety	this proposal is to address two issues related to the wind performance of roofs			D
S17 PT1	1507.5.5.1 (N)	Bob Eugene, UL	new section covering wind resistance for metal roof shingles used in residential applications			D
S18 PT1	1507.10.2, Ch. 35	Bob Eugene, UL	UL55A should be referenced as an alternate standard in this code section			AS
S19	T1507.10.2, Ch. 35	Michael D. Fischer, The Kellen Company	adds ASTM D2824 to the list of material standards used in BUR systems			AS
S20 PT1	1507.14.3, T1507.14.3 (N)	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	clarify the code by adding a table within Section 1507.14.3 that identifies the specific protective coating materials			AS
S21 PT1	1507.15, 1507.15.1, 1507.15.2	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Assoc	clarify the code by adding terminology that is appropriate for this section			AS
S22 PT1 S22 PT2	1502.1, 1507.17 (N), 1509.6 (N), Ch. 35	Bob Eugene, UL	provides guidance for installers and code officials regarding the installation of photovoltaic modules/shingles		New solar PV shaped like a shingle. New installation requirement. Allowed to be used as a new roofing material.	AM AS
S23 PT1	1507.17 (New)	Bob Eugene, Underwriters Laboratories Inc	provides guidance for installers and code officials regarding the installation of formed plastic shingles		Not sure what fire classification this new formed plastic shingle will have if used as roof covering.	D
S24	1508.1	Mike Ennis, Single Ply Roofing Industry	clarifies requirements for the use of above deck insulation by providing testing options			
S25	T1508.2, Ch. 35	Tony Crimi, AC Consulting Solutions Inc	add current ASTM C 726 specification			
S26	1509.1, 1509.2.4	Homer Maiel, PE, CBO, City of San Jose	statement in Section 1509.1 is revised to specifically add rooftop mounted enclosures			
S27	1509.2-1509.5.2, 1509.6-1509.7.5 (N)	Rick Thornberry, PE, The Code Consortium, Inc	majority of the revisions proposed in this code change are editorial in nature but there are also a few technical changes			
S28	1509.6 (N)	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Association	clarify that rooftop-mounted photovoltaic systems need to comply with building code requirements		Concern about requiring the panels to be designed for wind and having to meet fire classification	
S29	1510.3	Mike Ennis, Single Ply Roofing Industry	allow new single-ply membrane directly over an existing roofing system without tear-off of the existing roof coverings			D
S30 PT1	1510.3	Mark S. Graham, National Roofing Contractors Association	allow existing adhered ice barrier membrane to remain in place and be covered with a new ice barrier membrane			AS
S31	1602.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7-10 MC 2 nd ballot item 5 related to vehicle barrier system	Editorial (may not match ASCE 7) NCSEA – negative; load environmental trigger		AS 14-0
S32	1602.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Redefines roof and floor LL such that for roof > 20 psf would be treated as floor LL Proposal revises IBC for consistency with an ASCE 7 proposal being considered by Live Load Subcommittee.	NCSEA – negative; Q where does 20 psf come from; trigger in definition not a good way to handle code requirements		AM 12-2
S33	1603.1.3, 1603.1.4, 1603.1.5, 1705.3.4	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Updates required documentation of snow, wind and seismic with respect to corresponding provision in ASCE7 (WSC-WL8-14, MC 1 st ballot item #20)	CRSC – object to item 11 NCSEA – negative; go with CRSC		AM 14-0
S34	1603.1.5	Kevin Moore, Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Adds to EQ design documentation horizontal and vertical structural irregularity, as applicable	JSL – Dynamic characteristics of a building structure do not normally adhere to the provisions prescribed in the irregularity table. Attempt to document the type of structural irregularity appear unnecessary CRSC – AM		D
S35	T1604.3	Stephen Kerr, P.E.	Adds new line item for deflection limit on plaster	BCC (SEAoC) – OK, Concur with deflection limit of L/360 for		AS

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			and stucco	plaster/stucco; Stucco is referenced under R301 and 2510; support for consistency NCSEA – AS; serviceability issue		
S36	T1604.3	Robert McCluer, MCA	Provides deflection limitation for metal composite material panels	JSL – The words “permanent set deflection” alerts to possible yielding or brittle failure mode. The proposed L/180 may not be stringent enough. Suggest adhere to L/240 NCSEA – oppose; against plastic deformation, should be elastic		D
S37	1604.3.6	Stephen Kerr, P.E.	Address possible increased deflection requirements that may be necessary for certain finishes not specifically addressed in Table 1604.3	JSL – While the intent of this proposal may be fundamentally desirable, the requirement carries a legal implication for designers who otherwise follows the standard of care of the profession BCC (SEAOc) – DK and RH felt this increased engineers exposure; too stringent and inappropriate NCSEA – oppose; 1604.3.1 is adequate; suggest SK to withdraw		AM
S38	1604.4	Randy Lee Dube, TET design solution	Recognizes certain type of structural body frame in the Code	JSL – This is probably a proprietary system covered under a ICC-ESR; current code provision is adequate NCSEA – oppose; open code to being abuse; does not add to code positive direction		D
S39	T1604.5	David Badger, Virginia Tech	Clarifies buildings used for “adult education facilities” to avoid misinterpretation	JSL – Disagree with proponent reasoning. In fact, most building structures are built with public funds and is expected to have better performance than privately owned structures. Another concern is for safe exiting requirements of occupant. CRSC – mild support NCSEA – negative; questionable occupant load		D
S40	T1604.5, 1705.3.3, 1707.7	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Clarifies the determination of occupancy category and the requirements for special inspection where hazardous materials are present. It was prepared in conjunction with ASCE 7 Proposal GPSC-5R2 (MC 2 nd ballot)	JSL – It would appear that ductwork and piping should be grouped if both carry “hazardous” material. NCSEA – oppose; language not code enforceable; “pose threat to public” is too vague		AS
S41 OT1 S41 PT2	202, 403.2.3, 1602.1, 1603.1.4, 1603.1.5, 1604.5, plus Tables	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates IBC and IEBC with the ASCE 7-10. The need for correlation is due to ASCE 7 Proposal GPSC-3AR2 (MC 2 nd ballot item 10) This proposal changes “occupancy category” to “risk category”	JSL – Change to “risk” is an unnecessary distinction, and does not lend itself to similar occupancy distinction for wind design. NCSEA – AM; modify 1604.5	Unnecessary change. Will only add confusion as we would have to learn a new term.	AM AS
S42	T1604.5	Michael Mahoney, FEMA	Moves K-12 from category II to category III in view of the need for emergency community shelter	JSL – Currently category IV includes buildings and other structures classified as “emergency preparedness”. Since only certain assembly type building are used for emergency shelter, this proposal eliminates all K-12 “classroom” buildings from category III Sbcc - strongly opposes as it is not justified in CA because of our strict enforcement of school facility design already. SoSC – CA Field Act governs risk category for public schools. (-ve) SSC – Retain school in category III BCC(SEAOc) - strongly opposes as this provision is not needed in California. NCSEA – AM or oppose; concern about security and egress, cost more to build		D 11-3
S43	1604.7, 1702.1, 1703.4, T1704.5.1, T1704.5.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates references to referenced standards with their charging text in Section 102.4 and to eliminate superfluous text	Editorial OK		AS
S44	1604.8.2, 1613.7	Philip Brazil, Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Change to structural wall provision for consistency with related revisions to ASCE 7 Proposal GPSC-2R2 MC 2 nd ballot item #2 and SSC TC-4-CH14-07-R1	JSL – TC-4-CH14-07-R1 has been modified on 2009-08-21 SSC meeting. Comment by jsl related to anchorage force ballot item needs to be incorporated prior to removal of 1613.7. JSL – The 2 nd line should be revised to read: “of the structure shall be anchored to the roof and to all floor, and members and other structural elements that” – since attachment		AM

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				of lightly loaded walls to slabs may be acceptable for lateral resistance. SoSC – this affects only SDC A – no position CRSC – AM; need to correct numbering with ASCE7		
S45	1604.9	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Added text aligns IBC Section 1604.9 with Section 1.3.5 of ASCE 7.	JSL – Commentary language need not be entered in the body of the code. CRSC – AM NCSEA – 20 psf commentary language already in wind chapter		D
S46	1604.11 (N)	Daniel Walker, National Sunroom	Adds provision for patio cover design loads (See Appendix I of code)	JSL – Inappropriate to include in the code certain manufactured product for patio roof cover with reduced design criteria. Proposal conflict with T1607.1 item 29. NCSEA – oppose; roof should be designed for 20 psf; wind and seismic not covered in appendix Other ICC chapters – oppose	This shouldn't be added because it could by default make an item that use to be Appendix I and now into the main body of the code and not allow BO to decide whether to adopt or not.	D 13-0
S47	1605.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlation is due to ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LC-12-R1, approved by the Load Combinations Subcom., and is being balloted by the MC 2 nd ballot Item #22. Change permits the mixing of strength/LRFD and ASD load combinations for the design of a structure	JSL – Load combination for concrete should preferably remain in under ACI 318. CRSC - oppose NCSEA – oppose; why do we need to check all load combinations if we can tell which one controls design		W
S48	1605.1, 1810.3.6.1, 1810.3.9.4, 1810.3.11.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlation with MC 4 th ballot item #23 TC-2-CH12-63-R1, relative to load combination with overstrength factor	JSL – TC-2-CH12-63-R1 has been approved by MC pending public comment. If approved for ASCE 7-10, some of verbiage in IBC will be redundant NCSEA - negative; full vs nominal		AM
S49	1605.2.1, 1605.3.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correction with LCSC LC-9a, which is being balloted by the MC 2 nd ballot Item #2 relative to load combinations of loads due to fluids, lateral earth pressures, ground water pressures or the pressure of bulk materials	NCSEA – negative; Does not match; ASCE 7 exception 2 awkward as written; not all exception		AM
S50	1605.2.1, 1605.3.1, 1605.3.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correction with ASCE 7-10. Provisions being deleted were the product of a legacy code for roof configurations for snow and seismic loads	BCC (SEAoC) –appears editorial CRSC – negative NCSEA – negative; no technical justification; disconnect on snow load (ASCE 7 sec. 2.3.2);		D
S51	1605.2.1, 1605.3.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LC-10-R1, which has been approved by the LCSC and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #17. Load factor for wind load is reduced in combination equations. The wind speed in ASCE 7-10 is mapped at longer return periods (700-1700 years depending on occupancy category)			W
S52	1602.1, 1605.2.1, 1605.2.2, 1605.3.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LC-1-R1, which has been approved by the LCSC and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #4. Change relates to self-straining loads in load combination	JSL – Appear editorial, but need to coordinate with ACI 318 and TMS 402 have picked up the terminology for T NCSEA – will support if modified to match ASCE7		AS
S53	1605.3.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 proposal on load combination affecting ASD. LCSC LC-4, which has been approved by the LCSC and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #3	NCSEA – AM; does not match ASCE 7		AM
S54	1605.1, 1605.3.1, 1605.3.2, 1605.3.2.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Change attempts to correlates with ASCE 7. Provisions being deleted were the product of a legacy code. The ASCE 7 Committee develops and maintains the provisions of Chapter 2 and has chosen not to add provisions for alternative load combinations using allowable stress design into	JSL – Committee needs to decide if there is any merit to retain alternate basic load combination (WSD) eq. 16-16 through 16-21 to be consistent with ASCE 7 SBCC - neutral, although it makes sense to be consistent, there are still issues about the extent of conservatism in overturning forces.		D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			the standard.	BCC (SEAoC) mildly opposes- soils issues not addressed CRSC – negative NCSEA- oppose; maintain alternate load combination		
S55	106.2, 1607.1.1	Larry Brown, NAHB	Relocate 106.1 to 1607.1.1 relative to live load posting	JSL – Requirement of LL posting is administrative provision and should stay under 106.1 NCSEA – oppose		D
S56	1603.1.3, T1607.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-4, which has been approved by LL subcom. Change relates to piled snow load removal	JSL – Just as for wind and EQ force, snow load pile up should be based on recurrence and probable return period to ensure assumed density is on the conservative to preclude local collapse or long term maintenance NCSEA – voted 4-3 for support		W
S57	T1607.1 IRC T R301.5	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-9, which has been approved by LL subcom., and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #5. Change relates to attic loading	NCSEA – positive		AM 13-0
S58	T1607.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Aligns with ASCE 7 Table 4-1for live load on stages and platforms	JSL – Projection and control room is normally built as a localized mezzanine. Occupant load in such room usage is normally low. Imposing a 100 psf LL is unwarranted. NCSEA – oppose; keep current code language BCC (SEAoC) – did not discuss		AS
S59	1605.2.1, T1607.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Clarifies live load for stairs, ramps and means of egress (including landing)	JSL – Landing and ramp can become more congested in an emergency, and as such should be designed for 100 psf. Change the second line to read: "Landings, ramps and all other" NCSEA – no position; exit is part of egress		W
S60	1605.2.1, T1607.1, 1607.9.1, 1607.9.1.4	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposals LLSC-LL9 and LLSC-LL11, which were approved by the Live Load Subcommittee and are being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot items #5 and #6. Change pertains to reduction of live load, changes in various live load listings and load combinations	NCSEA – AM ; skating rink missing	Need to pay attention as LL is rearranged and reorganized, some deleted like skating rink. Not sure how often we deal with skating rink to worry about it being deleted.	AM 9-5
S61 PT1 S61 PT2	T1607.1, IRC T 301.5	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB	Proposal relaxes attic storage live load requirements to roof rafter/ ceiling joist assemblies and trusses	JSL – Reduction of ceiling joist design load below that required by ASCE 7 is non-conservative; oppose NCSEA – no position; beyond ASCE 7 and current IBC		D 14-0 W
S62	T1607.1, IRC T R301.5	John England, England Enterprise	Changes balcony live load to 60 psf	The current wording is a result of 07/08 code cycle change proposal. Balcony deck loading under T1607.1 should remain. ASCE 7 change balcony to 1.5 x occupancy LL NCSEA – no position; failures cause by poor connection; need to correlate with ASCE 7	This would have been a good change, but did not pass.	D 14-0
S63	202	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Current definitions for awning, canopy and marquee are not adequate. Clarifies what live load to apply to each category.	JSL – This proposal has been debated each of the last two code cycles. Cornice and marquee should be grouped under the category of canopy, and if position over public right-of-way, a live load of 75 psf is mandated; and if such element is within a private property, it should be treated as any normal roof. Question should be raised on design requirement of balcony over the public right-of-way NCSEA – does not mind to drop this one; 10 feet above ground is arbitrary		D 8-5
S64	202, T 1607.1	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	See item S63	NCSEA – prefer S63; will withdraw		W
S65	T1607.1	Larry Wainright, SBCA	Updates IBC in harmony with IRC on attic live load	JSL – To control design load based on insulation thickness is inappropriate; oppose NCSEA – need more discussion; prefer 10 psf not accessible and 20 psf if accessible		D 13-0
S66 PT1 S66 PT2	T 1607.1, IRC T R301.5	Larry Wainright, SBCA	Deletes minimum 10 psf ceiling loading which conflicts with 1606.2, design for (actual) dead	JSL – Requirement under T1607.1 for ceiling distributed load of 10 psf does not conflict with 1606.2 which only required design be		D 13-0 W

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			load.	based on the more stringent of the two design requirements BCC(SEAoC) - oppose		
S67	1602.1, 1607.4, 1607.7.1-1607.7.1.2, 1607.7.2, 1607.7.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposals LLSC-LL6, LLSC-LL9 and LLSC-LL11, which were approved by the Live Load Subcommittee and are being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot items #1, #3, #5 and #6. Changes are essentially editorial	NCSEA – AM or oppose; need to match ASCE 7		AM 11-3
S68	1607.5, 1607.13, 1607.13.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 proposal TC-2-CH4, 5, 11, 12-01 approved by SSC and under MC 4 th ballot item #1. Change specifies partition loads as live load instead of dead load.	JSL – Proposal TC-2-CH4, 5, 11, 12-01 redefines partition as a 15 psf LL for gravity loading condition, but did not include any change on the 5 psf horizontal loading as “horizontal” live load. The horizontal 5 psf should be clarified as horizontal (interior) wind load. mwj - as proposed wording not clear and confusing and could lead to reduction permitted for LL. SoSC – negative Sbcc - appear to be potential loopholes in allowing live load reductions or in calculating the effective weight for seismic load determination. SSC – should limit LL reduction to partition load BCC(SEAoC) - opposes as this proposal makes unnecessary wording changes, for example, since the requirements are already in the live load section of the code, there is no need to define the loads as live loads. NCSEA – oppose; partition load is not in the table and therefore not reducible		D 13-1
S69	1602.1, 1605.4, 1607.6 (N), T1607.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-7, which has been approved by LL subcom., and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #4. Change pertains to helipad	JSL – Agree that provision for helipad under 1605.4 should be relocated and appropriately renumbered as 1607.14 for special loading. NCSEA – no position; impact factor should be accounted	New term helipad used. Changes loading requirement. Helipad load added to LL table.	AM 14-0
S70	1607.6, 1607.6.1, 1607.6.2-1607.6.5 (N)	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Clarifies that for conditions where heavy highway type vehicles have access onto a structure, then that structure will need to be designed using the same code and requirements that roadways in that jurisdiction are designed under	Heavier distributed loads and/ or concentrated loads should always be addressed for specialty occupancy. Such loading can appropriately be higher than the code minimum. Fire trucks may occasionally access exterior ramps or parts of garage occupancy, but is not normally housed in elevated garage. Regardless whether the source of loading was Removal of minimum loading criteria regardless whether criteria originated or not from ASSHTO for trucks and deferring to jurisdiction will lead to non-uniformity of enforcement. Sbcc – lean toward support BCC(SEAoC) - this proposal is a significant expansion of the heavy vehicle requirements NCSEA – request denial by proponent so they can clean it up		D 13-0
S71	1012.1, 1013.1, 1013.1.1, 1602.1, T1607.1, 1607.7	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-9, which has been approved by LL subcom., and is being balloted under MC 2 nd ballot item #5. Change pertains to handrails, guardrails and grab bars	JSL – Appear editorial clarification of handrails and guardrail system loading criteria		D 11-3
S72	1607.7.1.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Clarifies applicable design loads for handrails and guardrails	JSL – While we concur with this seemingly editorial clarification, we question why ASCE 7 LLC would not change the ASCE 7 provision NCSEA – oppose; unless Phil show better reasoning		W
S73	1607.7.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-14, which has been approved by LL subcom. awaiting ballot by MC. Change relates to	Concur with editorial clarification NCSEA – support; need to be consistent with load factor BCC – agree		AM

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			vehicle barrier system			
S74	1607.7.3	Gary Searer, WJE	Clarifies loading requirements for vehicle barrier systems based on 07/08 item S70	JSL – The basis behind whether the 6000 lb should be service load or impact load has not been identified. Certainly, if the spacing of the barrier is reasonably close, more than one single barrier will have to yield before ultimate failure. This proposal may be more restrictive than needed		D 13-0
S75	1607.8, 1607.8.1, 1607.8.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Correlates with ASCE 7 Proposal LCSC LL-10, which has been approved by LL subcom. awaiting ballot by MC. Change relates to impact load for elevator machinery	JSL – In 1607.8 – what is inadequate? and what is unordinary impact condition? Proposed verbiage is unnecessary. In 1607.8.2 – the increase is a simpler way to account for impact load than having to get hold of ASME A17.1		AS 12-2
S76	1607.9 – 1607.9.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Unifies live load reduction for both floor and roof by deleting eq. 16-23 and 16-24 for better alignment with ASCE 7-10	JSL – Concur with re-numbering of 1607.9.1.1 through 1607.9.1.5 NCSEA – this is not ASCE 7		D
S77	1607.9, 1607.9.1.5, 1607.11.2, 1607.11.2.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Aligns IBC with ASCE 7 chapter 4 on live load and live load reduction			AM 12-2
S78	1607.9.2	Matt Rescorla, Cubic Designs, Inc	Modifies alternate floor live load reduction for LL > 100 psf	JSL – Disagree with proponents rational on removal of the 20 percent maximum LL reduction for columns; also the light storage noted in T1607.1 is for manufacturing occupancy. NCSEA – oppose		D 14-0
S79	1602.1, T1607.1, 1607.11.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	Defines design loads for landscaped roof	JSL – Revising the definition of dead load to include “landscape materials” can be misleading for enforcement of any incidental or decorative planting NCSEA – verify ASCE 7 on this subject		D 13-1
S80	T1607.1, 1607.11.2, 1607.11.2.2, 1607.11.3	Trxler, Seattle Dept. of Planning and Development	Makes a distinction of unoccupied landscape roof	All landscape roof needs to be maintain with both foot-traffic as well as equipment weight. This proposal does not appear to solve all issues associated with “green roof” NCSEA – neutral; may be OK		AS 14-0
S81	1607.13	Stephan Kerr, P.E.	Clarifies the 5 psf for interior walls and partitions as wind load for the purpose of calculating deflection	JSL – Concur with defining the 5 psf as wind load for interior walls and partitions BCC(SEAoC) – neutral; SteveK may revise language NCSEA – neutral or AM; need to bump up the 5 psf if ultimate wind sustain		D
S82	1607.14 (N)	Dennis Richardson, dbr group Inc	Adds provision for fire-resistance rated exterior walls with 10 psf minimum design horiz load	JSL – Current wind provision already requires 10 psf on exterior walls and cladding. This proposal relates to stability for wall during a fire appear to require all fire-rated walls to be designed as cantilever. This can lead to legal implication for any wall collapse during a structural fire NCSEA – oppose; NPFA criteria; structural stability		D
S83	1602.1, 1608.3(N), 1611.2	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton	Adds provision for ponding instability to align with ASCE-7 sec. 8.4	Need to review update in ASCE 7-10 JSL – Concur with addition of definition for susceptible bay BCC(SEAoC) - did not discuss 1608.3 – snow may “pile up” but should not be classified as “ponding”. Mitigation need to consider appropriate use of radiant heating adjoining roof drain location for flat or near flat roofs to preclude ponding NCSEA – Accept; match ASCE 7		AM
S84	1602, 1609.1.2.2 -1710.3	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Proposal updates and coordinates the provisions of the 2012 IBC with those of the 2010 edition of ASCE 7 for the determination of wind loads. The underlying reason for this change is to adopt into the 2012 IBC the new wind speed maps that have been adopted into ASCE 7.	JSL – This is a major revision of wind design in going to ultimate wind velocity. Ken Luttrell has agreed to re-activate SEAOC Wind Ad Hoc to review this proposal. It would appear that removal of the alternate all height method is unnecessary unless it is proofed to be non-conservative. The proposed T1609.1.1 provides for the appropriate ultimate wind velocity to the normal design wind velocity. The proposal changes the wind maps to “Ultimate Wind” speeds,	Change from basic wind speed to ultimate wind speed, new definition, new wind map, conversion table, another change that will require plan checker to learn new criteria (i.e., additional training will be required)	AM 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				which would change California to wind speeds varying from 100 mph to 115 mph, but eliminate the load factor. This may cause confusion. BCC(SEAoC) – strongly opposes removal of all-heights method in 1609.6; will support amendment to retain All-height procedure since this was just introduced last code cycle; Krug to contact Tyree; NCSEA – may entertain amendment by SEAOC; discuss with Tyree; maps represent difference in risk		
S85	1609.1.1, 3108.1	Scott Beard, City of Tacoma	Proposal corrects an underestimation in TIA 222-G standard related to Topographic Wind Speedup Effect.	NCSEA – support; simplification		AS 14-0
S86	1609.1.1, 1609.1.1.2, ch. 35	Paul K. Heilstedt, ICC CTC	Proposal is a follow-up to S81-07/08 which was a result of the CTC's investigation of the area of study by NIST of WTC	JSL – Concur with update of reference standard ASCE 49-09 on Wind Tunnel Testing		D 14-0
S87 PT1 S87 PT2	1609.1.1, 1609.1.1.1, ch. 35 IRC R301.1.1, ch. 44	Phil Samblanet, TMS	Modification introduces standard of design and construction of masonry residential structures in high wind areas based on TMS 404-09, Standard for Masonry High Wind Residential Construction	JSL – TMS 404 is applicable to Masonry High Wind for Residential construction, which is beyond IBC jurisdiction; negative NCSEA – TMS 404 not complete; will support only if update is complete		D 8-4 D 11-0
S88	1609.1.2	Kurt Roeper, Ingersoll Rand	Refers to ICC 500 for impact requirement for protection of openings	NCSEA – impact requirement ICC-500; noted that wind committee oppose		D
S89	1609.1.2	John Woetman, Door Safety Council	Clarifies that opening, not glazing, are to be impact-resistant covering in wind-born debris regions	NCSEA – oppose		D 13-0
S90	1609.1.2.2, ch. 35	John Woetman, Door Safety Council	Makes reference to ANSI A250.13 for impact resistance of side hinged doors	NCSEA – language vague on impact resistance; need ASTM standard	Was heavily debated and passed by a close margin. Not sure if this will have an impact on us in Ca except area of high wind or hurricane.	AS 7-6
S91 PT1 S91 PT2	1612.2, IRC 202	Gary Searer, WJE	Proposal intends to simplify method of substantial damage and substantial improvement are determined by linking definition to replacement value using RS Means or NCE	JSL – This proposal may be more appropriate for chapter 34 for existing building or structure instead of chapter 16		D 8-3 D 9-2
S92 PT1 S92 PT2 S92 PT3 S92 PT4	801.5, 1403.5	Rebecca Quinn, DHS, FEMA	Clarifies flood elevation below which ASCE 24, Flood Resistance Design and Construction is applicable.		Provide design requirement for utilities and equipment below base elevation.	AM 13-1 AM 13-1 AM 13-1 AM 13-1
S93	1612.5	Rebecca Quinn, DHS, FEMA	Amends flood resistance design (ASCE 24) to 10 psf minimum to correspond to ASCE 7			AM 14-0
S94	1612.6 (N), Ch.35	Michael Mahoney, FEMA	Adds provisions on tsunami for coastal communities, and reference to FEMA P646-08, Guidelines for Design of Structures for Vertical Evacuation from Tsunamis	JSL – There has been some warnings of tsunami in San Diego coastal region but otherwise not a major issue in California historically	Add tsunami design requirement. Not likely to affect most of us in CA unless you're along coast.	AM 12-2
S95	1613.1 – 1613.7	Steven Winkler, Kelly Cobeen BSSC CRSC	This code change proposes deletion of the earthquake ground motion maps and the associated SDC provisions, citing instead ASCE 7 for maps and SDC assignments. The 2008 USGS seismic hazard maps incorporate new information on earthquake sources and ground motion prediction equations including the new Next Generation Attenuation (NGA) relations. The ground motion maps proposed for the IBC further incorporate technical changes adopted for the 2009 NEHRP Provisions that include use of: (1) risk-targeted ground motions, (2) maximum	JSL – Proposal appropriate only if ASCE 7-10 is updated with new maps. mbh –briefed committee on the NGA, fragility curve, and the 84 percentile based on deterministic approach under the maximum direction jk – question basis of uniform risk; much discussion at EBC on possible problems with the 1% probability of collapse SoSC – mbh will write a statement to oppose SSC (SEAoC) – white paper for California but would not oppose; new maps will be available	All the seismic maps deleted from the IBC and referred back to ASCE 7. Seems like everything is moving out of the code and into standards.	D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			direction ground motions, and (3) near-source 84 th percentile ground motions.			
S96	1613.5.1, Fig. 1613.5(1) – 1613.5(14)	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	2010 edition of ASCE 7 will adopt new spectral response seismic design maps and maps of the transition period for the long-period portion of a design response spectrum. Change reflects adoption of a uniform risk, as opposed to uniform hazard basis, eliminating inequities in treatment of different regions of the U.S.	JSL – Proposal appropriate only if ASCE 7-10 is updated with maps using NGA mbh – same discussion as S95 SoSC – mbh will write a statement to oppose SSC (SEAOc) – white paper for California but would not oppose; new maps will be available		D
S97 PT1 S97 PT2	1613.5.1, Fig. 1613.5 (1) – 1613.5 (14) IRC Fig. R301.2	Steven Winkler, Kelly Cobeen BSSC CRSC	Companion change to S95 for IRC	JSL – Proposal appropriate only if ASCE 7-10 is updated with new maps mbh – same discussion as S95 SoSC – mbh will write a statement to oppose SSC (SEAOc)– white paper for California but would not oppose; new maps will be available USGS – these are latest maps CRSC – supports proposal		AM AS 11-0
S98	1613.5.2, 1613.5.5, 1613.5.5.1, T1613.5.2	Phil Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Deletes text from the IBC related to site class definitions and site classifications in favor of referencing the applicable text in ASCE 7. In IBC 1613.5.2, editorial changes are made for consistency with 11.4.2 of ASCE 7-10, which is the source of the provisions in the section	JSL – Review ASCE 7-10 chapter 20 for consistency with the table format of T1613.5.2 for soil class F. Agree in principle with removing duplication from IBC SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc) - OK		AS
S99	1613.5.5, Ch. 35	Ronald J. Ebelhar, HC Nutting I A Terracon Company	There is currently no guidance in the IBC for example methods or standards to measure the shear wave velocity in the field. Proposal added references to ASTM D4428/D 4428M-07 and D7400-08	mbh- more restrictive than what is being used SoSC – negative SSC (SEAOc) – other method should be allowed		D
S100	1613.6.1, 1602.1	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Flexible diaphragm provision has been considered and approved by the Seismic Subcommittee of ASCE 7 for inclusion into the 2010 edition of ASCE 7; hence with the adoption of ASCE 7-10 by reference this provision becomes duplicative	SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S101	1613.6.3	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Provision for automatic sprinkler system has been considered and approved by SSC for ASCE 7-10	SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S102	1613.6.4	Phil Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	AAC design limitations has been considered under ballot TC-5-CH14-12 and approved by SSC for ASCE 7-10	IBC may not adopt chapter 14 of ASCE-10 as there are still items ASCE 7 takes exception to material standards SoSC – does not affect SDC D, E and F SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S103	1613.6.5	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Provision for elevator seismic control has been considered and approved by SSC for ASCE 7-10	SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S104	1613.6.6	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Steel plate shear wall - Correction has been made to Section 12.2.5.4 of the 2010 edition of ASCE 7, so this modification is no longer necessary.	SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc)– OK BCC (SEAOc)– OK if in ASCE 7-10		AS
S105	1613.6.7	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Provision for minimum separation distance has been considered and approved by the SSC of ASCE 7 for inclusion into the 2010 edition of ASCE 7	JSL – Discuss whether I-factor should be removed from denominator of equation (SEAOc) SoSC – support SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S106	1613.6.8	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	Provision for ductwork has been considered and approved by the SSC of ASCE 7 for inclusion into the 2010 edition of ASCE 7	SoSC – support if same wording as in ASCE 7-10 SSC (SEAOc) – OK		AS
S107	1613.6.9 (N), Ch. 35	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Adds cold formed special bolted moment frame to ASCE 7 T12.2-1	See also item S189 JSL – This proposal is an attempt to respond to comments to		D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				BSSC 4 th M.O. ballot from SEAOC (SEAOC being the lead commenter.) While the proposed codified system using cold-formed steel, based on tests at UCSD, may generally thought as simple system for industrial platforms or localized mezzanine floors, such limitations were not included in either AISI 110 or the proposal. At this time ASCE 7-10 has included similar provisions although there were still negative comments not fully addressed other than ruled non-persuasive in SSC meeting. The provisions as proposed can apply to rack-type buildings. We would have preferred to limit the system for SDC C or lower. SoSC – based on test we need to limit to double channel members; agree system should be limited to SDC C or lower SSC (SEAoC) – Not restricted to short period due to flexibility of system; need to be limited to 2% drift; test did not fully support full restraint vs partial restraint; Tom Hale to write an opposition statement		
S108	1613.8 (N), Appendix L (N)	Bob Bachman, COSMOS	Adds new appendix L on strong ground motion instrumentation.	JSL – COSMOS as well as SEAOC attempted to introduce mandatory language into the Code during the 07/08 code cycle. Floor discussions at the hearing felt that since no consensus standard is available on the calibration and maintenance of instruments, building official would have difficulties to enforce code. By placing the requirements in an appendix as it was in appendix to chapter 16 in 1997 UBC, it will at least give something for major jurisdictions such as LA city and SF city to enforce. BCC (SEAoC) and ScSC – Support SSC (SEAoC) – OK		AM
S109	1602.1, 1605.2.2, 1605.3.1.2, 1614 (N)	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Adds provision on ice-sensitive structure and atmospheric ice load	JSL – Do we need language in the code if it is already in ASCE 7?		AS
S110	1614.3.1, 1614.4.1	Matthew Senecal, ACI	The list of sections is the majority of the structural integrity requirements but not all that are related to these topics. A singular reference to ACI 318 is a more accurate statement.	JSL – The two sections modified include charging language for relatively new lateral force resisting systems using prestress/postension. Reference to specific sections in reference standard helps enforcement agencies to ensure specific design conditions are met. Furthermore, the re-organization of ACI 318-14 will most certainly create further impositions for users to locate where in the reference standards the provisions are listed and may easily overlook significant requirements. This proposal may have merit for adoption in future code cycle after 2014; suggest negative		D 8-6
S111	1702.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Adjust definitions for cont. insp. and periodic special inspection	QAC (SEAoC) – “at the completion of the work” should stay for periodic inspection		D 8-5
S112	1702	John England, England Enterprises	Defines “statement of special inspection”	QAC (SEAoC) – 1705 describes in detail what must be in the statement BCC(SEAoC) - lean negative		D
S113	1702.1	Kirk Harman, NCSEA QA comm.	Defines “special inspector	QAC (SEAoC) – consistent with 1704.1		D
S114	1702.1	Kirk Harman, NCSEA QA comm.	Adjust definitions for cont. insp. and periodic special inspection	QAC (SEAoC) – need to coordinate with S111		D 8-5
S115	202, 1702, 1703, 1704.17 (N), 1708.1, 1708.4	James Carlson, Seismic Source Co.	Revises various terms to correlate with current philosophy to implement code	QAC (SEAoC) – poorly written CRSC - oppose		D 14-0
S116	1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1710	Kirk Harman, NCSEA QA comm.	Re-organization of chapter 17	QAC (SEAoC) – Re-organize; No material change BCC (SEAoC) - Proposal was discussed, and needs further review, but if no qualitative changes, will support; suggest separate “Structural Observation”	How will this re-organization affect building dept's practice	AM 12-2
S117	1704.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton		QAC (SEAoC) – allows prescriptive design to go without special inspection; question “building component” vs “work or		AS 13-1

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				construction" BCC (SEAOc) – Exception 2 is poorly written as is,		
S118	1704.1	Gary Ehrlich, NAHB		QAC (SEAOc) – previous exception for R-3 was tossed out; BCC (SEAOc) – oppose, can default to IRC		D
S119	1704.1.1 (N)	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton	Provide access for special inspection	QAC (SEAOc) - unnecessary change since S.I. is in advance of building inspection 110.1 BCC (SEAOc) – contractual action; mild support	Good idea. Will not have any direct impact on building inspection as this is intended to address issue faced by special inspector.	AS 12-2
S120	1704.1.1, 1705.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton		BCC (SEAOc) - Exception is unnecessary		AS 14-0
S121	1704.3 – 1704.3.3.3, T1704.3	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Redirect the requirement for certain special inspection back to the material standards.	QAC (SEAOc) – too industry friendly; Chapter N is based on QAP of Appendix Q in AISC 341; no “continuous” or “periodic” inspection, and simply “observe and Perform”; inspection level is effectively reduced and the role of the engineer in reviewing material and welding submittal is reduced; BCC (SEAOc) – How does this relate to statement of special inspection; should leave requirement in Chapter 17 for one code cycle.	Another area of the code where the requirements are referenced somewhere else and not in the building code.	AS 13-1
S122	T1704.5	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton	Revise table 1704.4	JSL – Inappropriate to refer to ICC-ES. QAC (SEAOc) – adds complexity BCC (SEAOc) – lean to negative; delete “such as”		AM 13-1
S123	1704.5	Kirk Harman, NCSEA QAC		QAC (SEAOc) – rely on TMS 402 and 602 for all inspection, but 2011 version is not yet available BCC (SEAOc) – lean negative		AS 8-6
S124	1704.6, T1704.6(N), 1706.2, 1707.3, 1704.3.5 (N)	Kirk Harman, NCSEA QAC	New table for wood and cold form steel inspection	QAC (SEAOc) – Modify to eliminate exception 2 (or add language to effect inspection for seismic; add language to include inspection for wood panels used in cold formed framing BCC (SEAOc) – code change is a relaxation of current requirements		D 13-1
S125	T1704.7	Lori Simpson, Treadwell & Rollo		QAC (SEAOc) – qualified testing lab should be allowed to inspect and not necessary at the discretion of geotech engineer BCC (SEAOc) – we need record of inspection particularly within building pad		D
S126	1704.15(N), 1704.15.1 (N), 1704.15.2	Tony Crimi, International Firestop Council		QAC (SEAOc) – add more verbiage in code of fire stop		
S127	1704.15(N), ch.35	William Koffel, Glazing Industry		QAC (SEAOc) - add more verbiage in code of fire stop		
S128	1704.15(N), ch.35	William Koffel, Glazing Industry		QAC (SEAOc) - add more verbiage in code of fire stop		
S129	1613.4, 1705.1, 1705.2, 1705.3-1705.3.6	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAOc) – need to coordinate with S116		AS 9-5
S130	1705.3.1	Bonnie Manley, AISI		QAC (SEAOc) - editorial		W
S131	1705.3.4	Homer Maiel, ICC Tri-chapter	omit suspended ceiling systems from the list of items that should have special inspection	QAC (SEAOc) – oppose		AS 10-3 DF failed
S132	1705.3.6, 1705.4.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAOc) – oppose		AS 12-2
S133	1702.1, 1707.1, 1707.5 thru 1707.9	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAOc) - support		AS
S134	1705.3, 1707.1	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAOc) – support; see also S129		AS 13-1
S135	1707.2	Bonnie Manley, AISI		QAC (SEAOc) - editorial		W
S136	1707.2	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Exception for UT and MT testing on OMF frame removed	QAC (SEAOc) - support	This is addressed in AISC 341-10 now.	AM 14-0
S137	1708, 1708.1, 1708.4, 1708.5	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAOc) - support		AS 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
S138	1708.3	Bonnie Manley, AISI		QAC (SEAoC) – support	Addressed in S136	AS 14-0
S139	1710.2, 1710.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc		QAC (SEAoC) – removal of structural observation is in contrast with the primary purpose of better enforcement BCC (SEAoC) – concur with QAC	Attempt to remove structural observation criteria when required by BO and EOR	D 13-1
S140	1715.5	Thomas Culp, Aluminum Extruders Council				D 14-0
S141	1715.5.1	William Koffel, Glazing Industry				D 14-0
S142	1715.5.2	Joseph Hetzel, Door and Access System	proposed code change is to expand the sentence on “garage doors” to include reference to “rolling doors”			AS 14-0
S143	1715.5.2, ch. 35	John Woestman, Door Safety Council				D 8-7
S144 PT1 S144 PT2	1715.6 (N), 202 IRC R308.6.1	Julie Ruth, AAMA	clarifies that tubular daylighting devices (TDDs) are unit skylights and therefore subject to the testing and labeling requirements of the IRC for same.	QAC (SEAoC) – does not belong to Chapter 17 BCC (SEAoC) – too specific	I don't think both committees that voted on this are on the same page, there will be a difference between IBC/IRC	D 11-3 AS 10-1
S145	1716.1, 2303.1, 2303.5, 2304.9.3	Randall Shackelford Simpson Strongtie		QAC (SEAoC) – provision should not have been here BCC (SEAoC) – concur to delete as proposed		AS
S146 PT1 S146 PT2	1801.1 IEBEC 1202.2	Patrick Vandergriff Modular Building Institute	The code addresses temporary structures, but fails to determine the foundations for temporary structures	JSL – Proposal is superfluous since building official can impose requirement for design of such foundation support depending on permanency of occupancy		D 14-0 D 14-0
S147	1803.2	Homer Maiel, ICC Tri-Chapter	Unreasonable hardship and cost to require a geotechnical report for an addition where the existing foundation system has proved to be adequate	JSL – Current exception already includes 1803.5.2, 1803.5.3 and 1803.5.10 as permissible for building official to waive investigation report requirements. 1803.5.8 is on compacted fill which needs to be verified if such compacted fill extend to include the area of addition/ expansion. There is merit to consider some relief under 1803.5.11 for buildings assigned to SDC C, D, E or F. Other proposals may be more acceptable	This would have been a good provision if approved as it will remove the need for a soils report for additions for single family dwelling. Will need to push for something like this in future code hearing.	D 12-2
S148	1803.5.11, 1803.5.12	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton Inc	The purpose for this proposal is to correlate the IBC with the ASCE 7-10 (TC-1-CH11-103-R2)	Jsl – Need to reconcile technical and editorial changes in TC-1CH11-103-R3		AM 14-0
S149	1803.5.12	Ali Fattah, ICC San Diego chapter	The current requirement is onerous on small structures and light framed structures as well as for retaining walls	JSL – Concur with proponent reason statement on earthquake impact from earth pressure. For basement condition, the EQ induced pressure from retained earth would be critical when there is substantial difference in retaining depth on opposite sides of building and if the floor diaphragm is too thin to serve transmitting the additional impact lateral force from one side to the opposite side. SoSC – support SSC (SEAoC) – support BCC (SEAoC) - supports, noting that this limitation was previously in code and was removed.	This change effective only require soils report on retaining wall 12 ft or more in height. May be a good proposal, but more study and it's affect will need to be considered by structural code committee.	AS 8-6
S150	1803.5.12	Jim Rossberg, SEI of ASCE	This proposed change coordinates the provision of the IBC with those of the 2010 edition of ASCE 7.	SoSC – Support if same wording as ASCE 7-10 SSC(SEAoC) – support		D 14-0
S151	1807.3.2.1	Brian Johnson, P.E.	Clarifies eq. 18-1 and notations	JSL – Concur with editorial correction to formula for 'A'. Disagree with the revision to move the 12 feet limitation out of the 'd'. This non-constraint flag-pole provision has been in the code since prior to 1973 UBC in that manner, and serve the purpose for design. When embedment depth exceeds 12 feet, better understanding of the soil profile and detail analysis of the lateral deflection are prudent. Reference to deep pile foundation provision in 1810.2 should be considered		D
S152	1807.3.2.1, 1807.3.2.2	Brian Johnson, P.E.	Clarifies eq. 18-2 is applicable for SI units	JSL – As stated in proponent's reason statement, the equation portion of $\{1+[1+4.36A/(S_b)]^{1/2}\}$ becomes dimensionless, no		D 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				modification to this section is necessary; negative		
S153	1807.3.2.1, 1807.3.2.2	Brian Johnson, P.E.	Bring limitation to match 1804.3.1	JSL – The formulae are for constraint condition where lateral deflection at the top would not control design. Additional limitation to 'd' is not warranted		D 14-0
S154	1807.3.2.2	Brian Johnson, P.E.	Clarifies restriction of 12 feet should be on soil pressure	Disagree with proponent. See also S153		D 14-0
S155	1810.3.3.1.5	Lori Simpson, Treadwell & Rollo	With well known soil conditions, the uplift capacity is well-defined and should not be reduced by a factor of safety of 2 for temporary loading conditions.	JSL – The added language will cause design assumption be supported by a geotech report before the 1.5 factor can be use. Prefer original language.		D 14-0
S156	1810.3.3.1.6	Lori Simpson, Treadwell & Rollo	Allowing only the weight of the piles and soil in the block is unreasonably conservative; not only the weight but also the shear resistance will be developed during an uplift loading event	JSL – Either the shear resistance or the combined gravity loads can be used for uplift resistance, but question if the combined ultimate shear strength and gravity should be combined. Get geotech opinion.		AS 12-2
S157	1810.3.9.7 (N)	Michael Morgano, GRL Engineers	Due to the installation methods required for cast-in-place piles, it is not possible to inspect the element after installation. Integrity testing via pulse echo methods is commonly available	JSL – There is probably a need for a field test standard, but is the DOT document a consensus document? Should not geotech give a recommended procedure in geotech report on testing procedure? BCC(SEAoC) - did not discuss		D 14-0
S158	1810.4.8	Michael Morgano, GRL Engineers	Adds automatic monitoring equipment to provision in measuring grouting pressure	JSL – Without a recognized ASTM standard or ASCE recommended procedure including the skill of the inspector, there can only be non-uniform enforcement of automatic monitoring device; oppose		D
S159	1810.4.8	Michael Morgano, GRL Engineers	Adds requirement of records every two feet for monitoring grout volume	JSL – See item S159. The measurement at two feet increment may slow down projects.		D
S160	1901.3, 1901.4, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1909	Matthew Senecal, ACI	Proposal removes provisions in the IBC that do not add new code requirements but either inform the user where information is located in ACI 318 or repeats ACI 318 information; proposal also deletes ACI 318 section references	JSL – Reference to specific sections in reference standard helps enforcement agencies to ensure specific design conditions are met. Furthermore, the re-organization of ACI 318-14 will most certainly create further impositions for users to locate where in the reference standards the provisions are listed and may easily overlook significant requirements. As a minimum proper reference to a chapter within ACI 318. This proposal may have merit for adoption in future code cycle after 2014. Sections 1904 through 1907 and 1909 were requested by building officials to be included in IBC to accommodate modifications to fit material specific or other local conditions. Changes to ACI 318 can become a slow process. Removal from the model code is not warranted at this time. BCC(SEAoC) – support with section number remain	All the sections dealings with concrete mixing and detailing are now referenced back to ACI. This will make it difficult for inspectors who do not have a copy of ACI with them in the field to have requirement all contained in building code.	AS 14-0
S161	1903.3, ch.35	Steve Heller, Insulating Form Association	Adds reference to ASTM E2634, standard Spec for Flat Wall Insulating Concrete Form (ICF) System	JSL – Need to review council policy #28 available on Sept 24. If ICF system has an ICC-ESR then it would fit better under alternate material. No additional language to the code is needed		AS 14-0
S162 PT1 S162 PT2	T1704.3, T1704.4, 1704.4.1, 1708.2	Matthew Senecal, ACI	ACI proposes to remove all references to specific sections in ACI 318 from the IBC, but not change the technical intent of any provision. This removal would allow ACI to submit an administrative change in Group B and give ACI Committee 318 one more year to complete their task of reorganization.	JSL – Reference to specific sections in reference standard helps enforcement agencies to ensure specific design conditions are met. Furthermore, the re-organization of ACI 318-14 will most certainly create further impositions for users to locate where in the reference standards the provisions are listed and may easily overlook significant requirements. As a minimum proper reference to a chapter within ACI 318. This proposal may have merit for adoption in future code cycle after 2014. Section deleted will not permit public scrutiny of modifications to ACI 318 in future years due to short public comment period and the lack of flexibility of ACI 318 to consider public comment at the end of any given code cycle. BCC (SEAoC) – We need to have section number to remain in		D 10-4 D 11-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				order to track change when ACI re-organize code; Defer tables 1704.3 and 1704.4 to QAC		
S163	1908.1, 1908.1.10, 1912	Matthew Senecal, ACI	See item S162	See comment under S163. SoSC – hold until we get ballot items to main committee SSC – Oppose due to anticipated extensive re-format in 2014 BCC (SEAOc) – oppose; section number to remain in order to track changes when ACI re-organize code		D 13-1
S164	1908.1.2	Alan Robinson, SEAOC	Proposal gives requirement under which design and detailing need to conform to special structural wall system provisions in ACI-318 section 21.9, and further enhances minimum life safety building performance under earthquake forces in SDC D, E or F.	JSL – ACI 318 intended to have special reinforced/ detailed structural elements in high seismic regions, but is unwilling to place the SDC categories in ACI 318. This code change clarifies the need to conform to the 21.9 when designing tilt-up panels in the high SDC. SoSC – Support CRSC – in favor SSC (SEAOc) – editing; contact Kelly Cobeen BCC (SEAOc) – support; this was pointed out to ACI during discussion in the 07/08 code cycle; ACI failed to come up with code change for ACI 318-11		D 12-2 DF failed
S165	1908.1.3	Alan Robinson, SEAOC	Modification separates wall piers designed for structures assigned to SDC C from those assigned to SDC D, E or F.	JSL – Recently, ASCE 7 SSC has adopted this provision in chapter 14; and also state agencies have move to amend the model code to incl this provision SoSC – Support CRSC – in favor SSC (SEAOc) – editing; none come thru BCC (SEAOc) – Support; BSSC and ASCE 7 concur with change		AS 14-0
S166	1908.1.8	Homer Maiel, ICC Tri-chapter	Limits plain concrete footing to Group U occupancies	JSL – This does not solve the issue of permissible plain concrete basement wall up to 8 feet in height. The modification is superfluous; minimum size No. 4 bar is already stipulated in subsection (c) where the exception has been written. The additional wording of SDC D, E or F will exclude req't from other SDC.	This proposal would have required a min. #4 top and bottom on plain concrete footing in SDC D, E, F. Unfortunately it failed. This is a concern.	D 9-5
S167	1908.1.9	Kevin Moore, Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Removes sill bolt from Appendix D when anchor meets requirements of new D.3.3.7 (bolt size and dimension limitations) and defer design to 2305	JSL – This proposal is based on the test conducted under the purview of SEAOC Seismology. While the code change will defer design from ACI Appendix D to 2305 when specifics of D.3.3.7 are met, it does not eliminate the basic issue for sill bolts under D.3.3.6 CRSC – support SSC (SEAOc) – support BCC (SEAOc) – lean positive; proposal is limited to one size bolt and ought to be expanded to cover other sizes; concerns on application to existing buildings	Eliminates the need for ACI 381 Appendix D under certain conditions.	AM
S168	1908.1.9	Alan Robinson, SEAOC	Revises D.3.3.6 deleting the 0.5 reduction factor, and adds D.3.3.7 for sill bolt (w/o size limitation)	JSL – This proposal is based on conclusion of the test which showed that both the bolt and wood sill behaved in a ductile manner. The modification to D.3.3.6 enables design of sill bolts in general in conformance with ACI appendix D, maintained this code change does not conflict with S167 jk – would like to see more test of different size bolts CRSC – will not oppose SSC(SEAOc) – Concern about hold-down using D.3.3.6 is not founded, proposal affects shear only BCC(SEAOc) – strong support;		D
S169	1910.2 (N)	Daniel Walker, National Sunroom Assoc	Patio cover slab and footing (from Appendix I)	JSL – The code does not prohibit construction of slab on grade to support minor structures subject to engineering design. Addition language for patio may preclude flexibility of similar types of		D 13-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				structures supported on a slab-on- grade. Opponent – no need to provide criteria since Ch18 already cover slab req'mt		
S170	1911.1	Richard Hess, Hess Engineering	Invokes ASD table for seismic load combination for light frame structures three-story or less	JSL – T1911.2 has been in used as allowable service loads for embedded bolts in concrete for several decades. There is no failure in properly installed concrete sill anchors to preclude the use of this table for combined earthquake loading. This proposal removes analysis of sill bolts from the complexity of ACI 318 App. D ; Does not conflict with S167, S168 Sbcc - support CRSC – Oppose based on application to three story SSC (SEAOc) – no strong objection BCC (SEAOc) – strongly support		D
S171 PT1 S171 PT2	2101.2, 2101.2.7(N),ch.35 IRC R606.1	Jason Thompson, Phil Samblanet, MSJC	Reference to TMS 403-09, Direct Design Handbook for Masonry Structures	JSL – Since the TMS document is written as a design handbook and not a standard for code enforcement, it should not be included as a mandatory requirement, particularly when the reference material is based on out-dated material (e.g. ASCE 7-05) which will make this provision conflicting with other sections of code jk - Code change S171 would introduce an "empirical" design procedure for reinforced ordinary and special masonry buildings. Everyone should read the Reason for this proposed IBC code revision at the end of the proposal. This is not a part of the MSJC Standard TMS 402 SSC (SEAOc) – oppose; SoSC –oppose; should not mandate design handbook in code; not conform to strength design; no required calculation for SDC D, E or F; no signature of A/E; diaphragm no design BCC (SEAOc) – oppose		AS AS 11-0
S172	2101.3	Jason Thompson, MACS	Editorial change to “construction documents” related to conduits, pipes and sleeves	JSL – Harmless editorial		AS
S173	2102.1	Jason Thompson, Phil Samblanet, MSJC	Modifications to definitions and removal of various inappropriate terms	Editorial BCC		AS
S174	2102.1	Jason Thompson, Phil Samblanet, MSJC	Modifications to various definition consistent with those of ASTM and TMS standards	Editorial BCC		AS
S175	2103.5(N), ch.35	Jason Thompson, MACS	Add reference to ASTM C1364, Architectural cast stone	JSL – Verify with ICC council policy #28 for standards posting for adoption		AS
S176	2107.1.2, 2107.2	Tom Young, MACS	Directs code user to the ASD load combinations in Chapter 16 and clarifies the permissible one third increase in allowable stresses using the alternative load combinations	TMS 402-11 is leaning towards eliminating the one-third stress increase by appropriately changing the allowable stress increase. This proposal is not needed SoSC – oppose; lap splice changed in 2005 MSJC and repeated in 2008 MSJC		D
S177	2107.3, 2107.3.1(N)	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Alternate design provision for lap splices; removes prohibition of 2.9.1.7.1.1	JSL – Modification permits the use of TMS 402 lap splice equation jk - This proposal is about splicing rebar in "allowable stress" design. This proposal would be an alternative to that written in MSJC TMS 402 Section 2.19.7.1.1 which uses the equation for "strength" design. This was voted on and approved for the 2005 and 2008 Edition. Proponent would allow the splice length to be that given in the 2002 Edition of the MSJC Standard. The "strength" equation for splicing reinforcement first appeared in the 2005 Edition. BCC (SEAOc) –Suggest NCSEA to delete this proposal; contrary to past NCSEA actions to support national standards SSC(SEAOc)- negative; not an improvement		AS
S178	2108.3	Mathew Senecal, ACI	Replace referenced section with language that	JSL – Suggest rewrite as follows: 3.3.4(c) Mechanical splices		D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
			would identify the source information in ACI 318. Note that the ACI 318 reference section number is not correct since it should be Section 21.1.6.	shall be classified as Type 1 or 2 according to Section 21.12.6.1 in accordance with the requirements for mechanical splices in special moment frames and special structural walls of ACI 318 BCC (SEAOc) – AM to include section numbers		
S179	2109.1.1, 2308.2, 2308.2.1	Eric Stafford, Business and Home Safety	Correlate prescriptive limits for empirical design of masonry and conventional wood frame construction with other proposals that are updating the wind speed maps in the IBC and the IRC.	JSL – In accordance with item S84, the wind speed should be either "ultimate wind speed" or "nominal wind speed" Proponent need to further clarify BCC BCC (SEAOc) – did not discuss		D 12-1
S180	2113.1	Jim Buckley, MACS	Make language consistent with IRC 1003.1 for fireplaces/ smoke chamber			AS
S181	2113.20	Jim Buckley, MACS	Make language consistent with IRC 1003.19 for chimney fireblocking			AS
S182	2113.9.1(N), 2113.9.3(N) IRC R1003.9.1(N)	Jim Buckley, MACS	Make provisions for chimney caps consistent with ASTM C1283 and C315			AS
S183	2113.12	Jim Buckley, MACS	Make language consistent with IRC 1003.12 for flue lining			AS
S184	2204.2.1	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Editorial clarification on provisions of anchor rods			AM
S185	2206.5(N)	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Allowance for incidental loads in truss design	JSL – Is there any basis for 300 and 100 lbs for top and bott chord? Why not use 300 at top chord and 200 at bott chord in accordance with T1607.1 items 29 &31? Sbccc – lean to support BCC (SEAOc) – unclear location of point load		W
S186	2208.1	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Portion of provision for storage racks will be under ASCE 7-10			AM
S187	2208.1, ch. 35	Bonnie Manley, RMI	Update reference to ANSI/ MH 16.1-11 for steel storage rack			D
S188	1604.3.3, 2209.2.1	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Deletes reference to outdated ASCE 3 on composite slabs and steel decks	JSL – See item S191 BCC (SEAOc) – lean positive		AS
S189	2209.1 thru 2209.1.1.3, 2209.2 thru 2209.3.6(N)	Bonnie Manley, AISI	Adds Cold-Formed Steel Special Bolted Moment Frames (CFS-SBMF) requirements (modifications to AISI S110) Note: These changes are developed to respond to questions posted by SEAOCC to BSSC ballots have not been resolved in ASCE 7 SSC ballot	See remark for S107 Review this item with Hale/ Kersting SSC (SEAOc) – oppose; Tom Hale to write statement BCC (SEAOc) – Concur with SSC, but need a technical reason to oppose		AM
S190	2209.2.1	Roy Reiterman, WRI	To eliminate confusion on whether steel reinforcement is required for the above elevated composite slab section; adds reference to ACI 318	See item S191		D
S191	2209.2.1, 2209.2.1.1, ch.35	Thomas Sputo, SDI	Changes reference from ASCE 3 to ANSI/ SDI-C1.0-06 (#CP 28)	JSL – Concur with modification		D
S192	2209.2.1, 2209.2.1.1(N), ch.35	Thomas Sputo, SDI	Same as S191 except standard will be ANSI/ SDI-C1.0-10	JSL – There is only one alternate for temperature reinforcement shown. Fiber was debated in last code cycle and was decided that the use of fiber should be for other than structural purposes, prefer S191 wording		AS
S193	2209.2.1	Thomas Sputo, SDI	Deletes reference to outdated ASCE 3 on composite slabs and steel decks			AS
S194	2209.2.2, 2209.2.2.1	Thomas Sputo, SDI	ANSI/ SDI- C1.0-10 incorporated the intent not to rely on fiber reinforcement in design			AS
S195	202, 2302.1, 2304.11.2.3	Philip Brazil, Reid Middleton, Inc	Relocate definition of durable wood from chapter 23 to 202			AS
S196	2302.1	Edward Keith, Wood Assoc.	ASTM Standard D5456 recognizes 4 types of structural composite lumber. This proposal adds the two types missing from the existing definition			AS
S197	2302.1	Harvey Manbeck, National Frame A	Adds definition of post-frame building system	JSL – Some verbiage is needed to ensure the system, if freestanding, need to be design for lateral forces BCC (SEAOc) –		D

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				did not discuss		
S198	2303.1.1, 2303.1.1.1(N), 2301.1.1.2	Sam Francis, AF&PA	Incorporates Am Lumber Stds Assoc. update of end-jointed lumber for use in fire resistive rated assembly	JSL – Does the standard provide for test procedure/ quality assurance?		AM
S199 PT1 S199 PT2	2303.1.4, 2304.6.2, T2306.3, ch. 35 IRC R604.1	Edward Keith, Engineered Wood Assoc	Proposal recognizes a new national consensus standard for wood structural panel siding products (ANSI/APA PRP 210-08)	JSL – Need further study how the table value for staple fasteners were derived BCC (SEAoC) – No strong objection; but more reference books to use	New standard added for structural wood panel, will need to eventually update plan check requirement to reference this new standard.	AS AS 11-0
S200 PT1 S200 PT2	2304.1.4 IRC R503.2.1, R503.2.1.1, R602.3	Edward Keith, Engineered Wood Assoc	Nomenclature change that reflects the newest versions of National Standards PS 1 and PS 2. Wood structural panels are required to be in conformance to DOC PS 1 and PS 2			AS AS 11-0
S201	2303.2, 2303.2.1 – 2303.2.3 IRC R802.1.3, R802.1.3.1 to .3	Joe Holland, Hoover Treated Wood Products	Proposed language removes interpretation problem and will improve enforcement			D
S202	2304.8.4.2, 2304.8.5.2	Jeff Linville, AITC	Proposal allows other than the prescriptive nailing patterns, and allows predrilled holes to prevent splitting.	JSL – This may be a practical matter on predrilled holes. Needs substantiation with tests to know if lateral shear capacity can be maintained. BCC (SEAoC) – lean negative		D
S203	2304.9.5, 2304.9.5.1 - 2304.9.5.3	Gary Enlich, NAHB	Clarifies requirements for fasteners in treated wood by inserting the words “nuts and washers”	Jsl – Editorial BCC (SEAoC) – lean positive		AS
S204	2304.9.5.1, 2304.9.5.3	Randall Shackelford Simpson Strong-Tie	Purpose of this code change is to permit wood screws and lag screws that are galvanized in accordance with ASTM B 695, Class 55 to be used in contact with fire-retardant and preservative-treated wood.			D
S205	2304.11.6	Hemel Maiel, ICC Tri-chapter	Clarifies durable species or preservative treated wood are limited to those interior floors with exposure to soil instead of all floors in the building and balcony framing	BCC (SEAoC) –Concur; but where is map on exposure		D
S206	2304.13 (N)	Jason Thompson, MACS	Require buildings constructed with wood I-joists and trusses for the floor or roof system to have placards placed on the building to warn emergency responders of these construction features and allow them to proceed with caution if entering the building during a fire emergency.	JSL – Unnecessary provision for building code. BCC (SEAoC) – oppose; legal implication; user unfriendly		D
S207 PT1	2302.1, 2303.1, 2303.1.12(N), 2304.13(N)	John Woestman, CLMA	Proposes to include requirements for wood plastic composite exterior deck components	Opponents – unfair competition, exclude other if this is adopted based upon proposed definition, concern with install per manuf. instruction NCSEA – no design method for these types of material	This would create a new chapter in the code for composite material. Not sure what fire rating this would achieve if used as a building material.	D
S208	2305, 2306, 2307, 2308.11.2, 2308.12.2	Brad Douglas, AF & PA	Coordinates provisions of the IBC with those in the AF&PA consensus standard, <i>Special Design Provisions for Wind and Seismic (SDPWS)</i> .	JSL – SDPWS-08 still uses the same terminology as in current code. BCC (SEAoC) –change should not be made to half the table until such time that we can justify staple value affecting seismic design	Concern regarding the use of staples. NDS doesn't even have this in their standards. The proponent would remove nails from these table and force users to go to NDS for design value. Leaving just the staples will make people think that staples should be used.	AM 12-2
S209	2305.1.2 (N)	James Russel, City of Palo Alto	Currently Section 2305 does not contain any information about design of sill plate anchor bolts. This proposal compliments modifications to ACI 318 Section D.3.3 permitting use of the lateral design value of bolt attaching a wood sill plate to concrete specified in AF&PA NDS Table 11E	JSL – This proposal is to compromise S167, which is introduced based on the test conducted under the purview of SEAOC Seismology. While the code change will defer design from ACI Appendix D to AF & PA NDS for 5/8 inch diameter sill bolts, it does not eliminate the basic issue for other size sill bolts under ACI 318 D.3.3.6; not checking concrete strength may be non-conservative SoBCC – this seems misplaced and is not supported	Proponent is ok with disapproval since S207 was disapproved	D 14-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:
ASSEMBLY:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
				SSC (SEAoC)– support		
S210	T2306.2.1(1)	Edward Keith, Engineered Wood	Clarifies figures with legends (no technical change)	SoSC - support SSC (SEAoC)– positive BCC (SEAoC) – OK with figures	This is a good change and clarifies the panel diagram loading.	AM 13-1
S211	2308.3.2, 2308.3.2.1(N), 2308.3.2.2	Robert Rice, ICC Southern Oregon chapter	Separates the top plate connection requirements from the bottom plate connections for clarity. A reference is added to point to the connection requirements	JSL – Remove “ Exception : Blocking at rafters need not be full depth when there are no braced wall lines above but shall extend to within 2 inches (51 mm) from the sheathing above.” BCC (SEAoC) – Support AM to remove exception 2308.3.2.2 for chord and drag, concern with cross-grain bending SSC - negative	Need to pay attention to this detail. It may be a concern for transfer of seismic load from sheathing to wall.	AM 10-4
S212	2308.3.2, fig.2308.3.2(1)(N) fig.2308.3.2(2)(N)	Robert Rice, ICC Southern Oregon chapter	Provides prescriptive methods to accomplish the connection whether with solid blocking or when solid blocking is impractical	JSL – Unnecessary verbiage, and removes flexibility for designer; Disagree with Figure A which show blocking stop 2” below sheathing Sbcc - Proposal provides prescriptive detailing for shear load transfer in light frame construction. Code committee opinion is that these requirements don't belong in the code. Oppose. SSC (SEAoC) – negative BCC (SEAoC) – Oppose to short blocking NCSEA – opposes	Not sure if this is needed. It would try to allow a code prescriptive option of transferring shear at trusses without having the benefit of an engineer analyzing and detailing for the situation.	D 12-2
S213	2308.9.2.3	Edwin Huston, NCSEA	Tall flat wise stud construction is not appropriate for exterior walls which are subject to wind loads. Proposal limits use of 24” o.c. spacing and flat stud to interior walls and partitions.			D 8-6
S214 PT1 S214 PT2	2308.9.4 IRC R602.9	Robert Rice, ICC Southern Oregon C	Clarifies cripple stud size to match studs above and requirements for less than 14” height			D 14-0 ASF failed D 11-0
S215	2308.12.4, T2308.12.4	Ali Fattah, ICC San Diego Chapter	Adds clarity to the IBC by showing percentage of wall that is required to be solid	Agree with proposal but suggest add a footnote to maintain a minimum length of braced panel. BCC(SEAoC) - Support; Proposal makes editorial change to table callouts from dimensions to percentages to be consistent with IRC	Not sure if this is a good or bad code change. Structural committee should evaluate.	AS 14-0
S216	T2308.12.4, 2308.12.4.1(N)	Gregory Mahoney, Sacramento Valley Building Officials	Clarifies alternate braced wall panels may be substituted for braced wall panels in Seismic Design Categories D and E.	SoSC – oppose; two sides of 48” panel does not behave same as one side 96” panel BCC (SEAoC) – lean positive	Not sure if this is a good or bad code change. Structural committee should evaluate.	AS 14-0
S217	2406.1	Don Davis, ICC Utah chapter	Clarifies that wire glass is not permitted in hazardous location.			D 14-0
S218 PT1 S218 PT2	2406.1, 2406.4, 2406.4.2, .4.3 (N)	Roger R. Evans, ICC Utah chapter	Eliminate conflicts, create consistency, and ease the use of the safety glazing requirements		Need to study all the proposed changes and revisions. However, it appears this is a good proposal.	AM 9-4 AS 10-1
S219 PT1 S219 PT2	2406.2 IRC R308.3.1	William E. Koffel, Glazing Industry	Attempt to address mounting of mirrors on ceilings			AS 13-0 AS 11-0
S220	2406.4	Thomas B. Zuzik, Artistic Railing Inc	Provide some criteria for glazing mounted on ceiling.	JSL – Should be subjected to bracing requirement for ceiling and also non-structural element under ASCE 7	Not sure how this would even apply during plan check as it is rarely if ever shown on plans.	D 13-0
S221	2407.1.1	Michael Gardner, Gypsum Assoc	Reflects the use of the composite standard ASTM C 1396 glazing design	JSL – This proposal is more confusing than what is in chapter 16 loading NCSEA – concern that it redirect load to glass only and not to the frame support, how is load transferred to the guard support, so would rather keep existing language		D 9-4
S222 PT1	T2506.2, T2507.2 IR702.2.1, R702.2.2, 702.3.1, Fig. 721.5.1(2), (3)	Keith Poerschke, National Gypsum Co.	Gypsum wallboard protecting steel column by incorporating modifications by ASTM C17 subcommittee, which is responsible for the C1325 standard			AS 13-0
S223	2509.2	Jose M. Estrada, USG	The purpose of this proposal is to include an ASTM material standard for base for tile			D 13-0
S224 PT1	2509.2, R702.4.2	Keith Poerschke, National Gypsum	Editorial name change based on ASTM C 1325, which changed to cementitious backer units			AS

PUBLIC HEARING:

COMMITTEE:

AS = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED, AM = APPROVED AS MODIFIED, D = DISAPPROVED

ASSEMBLY:

ASF = APPROVED AS SUBMITTED BY FLOOR, AMF = APPROVED AS MODIFIED BY FLOOR, DF = DISAPPROVED BY FLOOR, W = WITHDRAWN

ITEM NO.	CODE SECTIONS	PROPONENT	SUMMARY OF PROPONENT'S STATEMENT OF REASON	POSITIONS OR COMMENTS BY ASSOCIATIONS, AGENCIES, COMMITTEE PANEL OR INDIVIDUALS	PERSONAL COMMENTS, NOTES, & OBSERVATIONS	CDH ACTION
S225 PT1	2510.6, R703.6.3	Kimdolyn Boone, Dupont Bldg	Make revision to water resistive barrier, allow for different water proofing method			AM 11-2
S226 PT2	1505.2, R902.1	Craig Thompson, Copper Develop				AS
S227	1609.1.2.1, ch. 35	Vicki Lovell, AMCA	Adds reference to AMCA 540-08, Test Methods for Louvers Impacted by Wind Borne Debris			AS 14-0
S228	2211.2 (N), 2211.2(N), ch. 35	Victor Azzi, SMA	Adds provisions on industrial grade steel shelving based on SMA MH 28.1-08, Specifications for Design, Testing, Utilization and Application of Industrial Grade Steel Shelving			W
S229	2211.1 (N), 2211.2 (N), ch. 35	Victor Azzi, SMA	Adds provisions on industrial work platform based on SMA MH 28.3-08, Specifications for Design, Mft and Install of Industrial Steel Work-Platform	JSL – No information on designing for earthquake; SEAOC should oppose.		D

LEGEND:

- NCSEA = National Council of Structural Engineers Association
- NCSEA EBS = National Council of Structural Engineers Associations, Code Advisory Committee, Existing Buildings Subcommittee
- BCC (SEAoC) = Building Code Committee of Structural Engineers Association of California
- JSL = James Lai, Chairperson of SEAOSC Seismology Committee
- QAC (SEAoC) = Quality Assurance Committee of Structural Engineers Association of California
- APA = Engineered Wood Association
- AF&PA = American Forest and Paper Association
- CRSC = Code Resource Support Committee of BSSC
- SBCC =
- BSSC = Building Seismic Safety Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences
- NAHB = NAHB
- AISI = American Iron and Steel Institute
- SBCI = Structural Building Components Industry