



TechNotes

Editor-Victoria B. Valentine, P.E. Issue# 340 SPECIAL EDITION January 15, 2016

This issue of TechNotes was written by Jeffrey M. Hugo, CBO, Manager of Codes. He serves as a member on the ICC Fire Code Action Committee (FCAC) representing NFSA. He is also the author the *Code Corner* in [SQ Magazine](#) and the editor of the [Fire Sprinkler Guide](#). Questions concerning this guide can be sent directly to Jeffrey at: hugo@nfsa.org

Please distribute to all local fire and building code inspectors, plan reviewers and officials.

1st Step Voting Guide for January 18 - January 25 Group A

The Public Comment Hearings in Long Beach, CA for the Group A cycle encountered an onsite technical problem with the voting devices. The ICC Board of Directors has ruled that a portion of the hearings for ICC Governmental members shall be re-voted by those in attendance with a voting device. ICC has issued two documents that fully address this issue [here](#) and [here](#).

The Online Governmental Consensus Vote (OGCV) for Group A has not occurred yet. There are two rectifying steps that need to happen prior to the OGCV. This guide is the first step and a second guide will be issued near to the January 28th voting period.

This voting guide is only applicable to:

1. ICC Governmental members who attended the Public Comment Hearings in Long Beach, CA
2. Was issued a voting device

The National Fire Sprinkler Association encourages voting in support with the following motions listed below:

EGRESS

- **E 40-15:** Support the As Submitted motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED provides a clarification on an exception for exterior rescue where fully sprinklered.
- **E 97-15 and E 105-15:** Support the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR DISAPPROVE A vote for DISAPPROVE supports many other industries and code officials stance on removing fire sprinkler protection for so-called resilient construction. These proposals come from industries who have repeatedly attempted, unsuccessfully, to remove tried and true fire sprinkler trade-offs that have been in the codes for decades.

- **E 145-15:** Support the As Submitted motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the committee motion to provide options for fully sprinklered R-2 and R-3 basement windows.

FIRE SAFETY

- **FS 1-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED removes the current confusing IBC Section 703.4 and modifies other sections with the intent to prohibit fire sprinklers used to promote a fire rating on un-rated glazing and other un-rated materials.
- **FS 2-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED will remove the current IBC Section 703.4. This section specifically prohibits fire sprinklers to be used as part of a listed assembly for fire rated products. This section is poorly written and is negative for sprinklers that protect glazing assemblies. Code officials need a code that is clear and the previous Section 703.3 provides clear guidance to the code user for alternative protection methods.
- **FS 27-15:** Support the As Modified motion and VOTE FOR AS MODIFIED - A vote for AS MODIFIED creates a uniform and consistent method for code officials to apply property line issues for access to fire pump and fire sprinkler riser rooms.
- **FS 35-15:** Support the As Submitted motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - An AS SUBMITTED vote correlates the fire pump room construction criteria in Chapter 7 of the IBC to Chapter 9 of the IBC. This motion was approved in Long Beach.
- **FS 41-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED establishes enhanced criteria for draftstopping in attics. This proposal provides multilayered draftstopping above every four units (or 5,000 sq. ft, whichever is smaller) for unsprinkered attics and will improve building performance with NFPA 13R systems.

GENERAL

- **G 33-15:** Support the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR DISAPPROVE - A vote DISAPPROVE will agree with the committee that the proposed language is detrimental to residential sprinklers in the IRC. This proposal removes the residential sprinkler requirement for medical and custodial care facilities when in a residential structure constructed according to the IRC. A jurisdiction that prohibits sprinklers in the IRC will have these IBC facilities unsprinklered.
- **G 41-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED correlates the requirements for sprinklers in lodging houses from the IBC to the IRC. While the IRC has lodging house sprinkler requirements, having the same requirements in Chapter 3 of the IBC is consistent code text.
- **G 88-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED clarifies that when sprinklers in the atrium ceiling are removed, it is only for a low hazard fuel load.
- **G 140-15, G 152-15, G 171-15:** Support the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR DISAPPROVE A vote for DISAPPROVE supports many other industries and code officials stance on removing fire sprinkler protection for so-called resilient construction.

These proposals come from industries who have repeatedly attempted, unsuccessfully, to remove tried and true fire sprinkler trade-offs that have been in the codes for decades.

- **G 147-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the changes that the General Committee had requested for accessory occupancy increases for residential and I-1 Condition 1 occupancies.
- **G 200-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the work of the ICC Code Technology Committee and permits fully sprinklered buildings to eliminate elevator lobbies on upper floors.

EXISTING BUILDING CODE

- **EB 28-15:** Support the As Submitted motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the IEBC committee's support for this fire sprinkler trade-off correlation in the IEBC.
- **EB 59-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the committee action taken on EB 61 to provide a sprinkler threshold for Level 3 Alterations. This action would require fire sprinklers for Level 3 Alterations when there is sufficient water at the building site versus the current floor level without adding a new fire pump.
- **EB 60-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote for AS SUBMITTED supports the committee action taken on EB 61 to provide a sprinkler threshold for Level 3 Alterations. This action would require fire sprinklers for Level 3 Alterations when there is sufficient water at the building site versus the current floor level without adding a new fire pump.
- **EB 61-15:** Support the AS MODIFIED motion and VOTE FOR AS MODIFIED - A vote of AS MODIFIED supports the committee action. This action would require fire sprinklers for Level 3 Alterations when there is sufficient water at the building site versus the current floor level without adding a new fire pump.
- **EB 86-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote of AS SUBMITTED addresses the concerns of the committee and restores the original values back. Chapter 14 has several glitches from when it was transferred from IBC Chapter 34 and this proposal fixes this section and correlates language used with the IEBC and IBC.
- **EB 88-15:** Oppose the Disapproved motion and VOTE FOR AS SUBMITTED - A vote of AS SUBMITTED addresses the committee's concerns for increasing the values in column F for suppression style systems.

There are many more proposals and motions that do not affect fire sprinklers and NFSA encourages all governmental members to look thoroughly through the proposals in cdpACCESS and get more involved in the code development process.

The National Fire Sprinkler Association thanks all who participated and supported the ICC process for the development of the 2018 editions in Cycle A. Please continue to support the ICC for Cycle B and future editions.