

## Results of International Code Council 2009 Final Action Hearing on Code Proposals



NASFM submitted six proposed changes to the International Code Council's 2007-2008 code cycle for 2009 edition of the I-Codes. The ICC's 2009 ICC Final Action Hearing in Minneapolis, Minnesota, was held in mid-September. NASFM representatives attended in force and achieved significant results. Besides focusing on its own submittals, NASFM worked with other groups to support coordinated efforts. The Final Actions on the proposals that NASFM submitted and supported are provided below.

Next year's Code Development Hearing will be in Baltimore, Maryland, in September 2009. For more information on how to get involved, please contact Allison Crowley at 202-737-1226 or [allison@firemarshals.org](mailto:allison@firemarshals.org).

### **F87, regarding Emergency Responder Radio Coverage:**

NASFM was a joint submitter with the ICC Code Technology Committee, the Joint Fire Service Review Committee, the International Association of Firefighters and the Fire Safety Directors of Greater New York. This proposal outlines the requirements for emergency responder radio coverage in existing buildings. It was passed in the Technical Committee and **was ratified at the Final Action Hearing by the membership.**

### **F105, regarding Inspection of Passive Fire Protection**

**Systems:** NASFM's proposal to require the annual visual inspection

of passive fire protection systems passed the Technical Committee hearing in Palm Springs and, despite efforts by the industry to overturn the action, **was ratified by the membership at the Final Action Hearing.**

**F288, regarding Structures Containing Polyurethane Foam:** A public comment was submitted on behalf of NASFM in support of a proposal to exempt all sprinklered structures containing polyurethane foam that met the Federal Mattress requirement. The original proposal, which was submitted by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, did not pass the Technical Committee hearing. During testimony, numerous members of the mattress and polyurethane foam industry testified and admitted on the record that their products presented a fire hazard. **The proposal was denied by the membership and as a consequence, NASFM withdrew the corresponding public comment in the IBC- General Code, G-29.**

**G124, regarding Building**

**Height and Area:** This proposal was submitted by NASFM to trim the height and area provisions of the IBC and allow additional height and area as the tradeoff for sprinklers. Currently in the IBC, one is allowed to install sprinklers



for the benefit of additional height and, without providing any more protection, take an area allowance. This proposal sought to allow an increase in height or area, but not both. The proposal did not pass the Technical Committee hearing in Palm Springs, and although it achieved the simple majority upon the voting of the membership, it was not enough to overturn the previous action of

Technical Committee and **was denied by default. As a result, NASFM withdrew its subsequent proposal G137, which dealt with a similar height and area topic.**



**RB64 and RB66, regarding Residential Sprinklers:** NASFM provided testimony and was a co-proponent of the public comment RB64 for residential sprinklers submitted by the IRC Fire Sprinkler Coalition. The proposal sought to add sprinkler requirements in new one- and two-family dwellings in accordance with NFPA 13D. In addition, proposal RB66 sought to add the same sprinkler requirements for

townhouses. This proposal passed the Technical Committee hearing in Palm Springs, while RB64 for one- and two-family dwellings did not. However, **both were ratified by the membership and passed in the Final Action Hearing, with the membership overturning the Technical Committee decision on RB64 overwhelmingly by reaching the two-thirds required.**

**RB 71, regarding Carbon Monoxide Alarms:** NASFM supplied testimony for this proposal requiring CO alarms in construction where fuel fire appliances are installed or have attached garages. The proposal was denied by the Technical Committee in Palm Springs this past March but because of the testimony provided by NASFM, this proposal **received the two-thirds needed to overturn the committee action and this resolution was passed by the membership in the Final Action Hearings.**

**RB 72, regarding Fire Alarms:** NASFM provided testimony for this proposal that mandates fire alarms becoming a permanent

fixture in the home and the property of the homeowner. This proposal was disapproved in Palm Springs by the Technical Committee, but **NASFM was able to achieve a two-thirds majority and overturn the committee action to ratify the proposal and it was passed by the membership in the Final Action Hearings.**

**M68, regarding Combustible Materials in Plenum Spaces:**

NASFM provided testimony opposing the Virginia Building Officials in an effort to disapprove this proposal to allow combustible materials in a plenum space. The proposal was disapproved in the Technical Committee in Palm Springs, and despite strong opposition, **NASFM was successfully able to uphold the committee decision to disapprove this proposal in the Final Action Hearing.**