



FIRE
PART 1 OF 1
WITH COMMENTS
Proposed Code Modifications

This document created by the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation -
850-487-1824

Total Mods for **Fire** in **Approved as Submitted: 5**

Total Mods for report: 8

Sub Code: Building

Date Submitted	7/16/2012	Section	403.4.7 Smoke removal	Proponent	amador barzaga
Chapter	4	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	Yes
TAC Recommendation	Approved as Submitted				
Commission Action	Pending Review				

Comments

General Comments	Yes	Alternate Language	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Maintaining smoke control requirements for High-Rise Buildings

Rationale

Smoke control for "high rise buildings" has been part of the FBC Section 909, since 2004. In order to maintain the same level of life safety for the citizens of the State of Florida we must maintain this requirement. Inclusion in the code is necessary to avoid diminishing the expected level of life safety that has been established by having this as a code item for over 8 years in the Florida Building Code.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Maintains current code provisions requirements.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Code provisions are the same found in the current code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Code provisions are the same found in the current code.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

This modification maintains minimum life safety requirements regarding smoke control in High-Rise Buildings.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This modification is consistent with the statute's requirement that any modification must maintain the same life safety protection of the FBC.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This modification allows the use of any material, products, methods or systems of construction already deemed acceptable by the Florida Building Code or any alternate materials, design and methods of construction and equipment acceptable to the code official.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

This modification maintains the same safety regulations required by the current code and in effect since 2004.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

YES

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

Proponent	Submitted	Attachments
Brad Schiffer	12/11/2012	No

Comment:

This proposal removes an IBC Code Section for smoke removal in post fire salvage and overhaul operations and replaces it with a requirement for a smoke control system.

The evidence provided of a Florida specific need is the higher odds of seniors living in high-rise structures assumed from the higher ratio of Florida's senior population. All states covered by the IBC have seniors living in high-rises and the ICC process does not focus on building safety based on odds.

The Fiscal Impact Statement misses the fact that this additional smoke control system requires costs of Engineered design, Code enforcement review, construction, testing and maintenance.

If no evidence or data is presented that exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code I would suggest we keep the IBC Code and add Smoke Control in accordance with Section 909 as Exception 4.

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	Submitted	Attachments
Pete Quintela	12/14/2012	No

Comment:

This proposal maintains the same level of life safety the citizens of the State of Florida have been entitled to since the Florida Building Commission approved the current language in 2004.

The information provided regarding seniors living in high rise structures, came from a governmental census on highest population areas where seniors live. Not to insinuate that seniors don't live outside of Florida, but when it comes to seniors living in high-rise buildings we lead all other states. To be specific the coastal areas, from West Palm Beach to the City of Miami have the highest concentration of buildings over 75 feet in 95% of the states that use the ICC codes.

Regarding fiscal impact, it does not change any way from what we are presently doing. Besides how can you be considering costs when you are saving lives? I am surprised when I hear professionals trying to save a dollar by weakening the codes, at the expense someone dying because the savings it brought in construction costs.

Yes, there may be additional costs in the design phase, plan review, construction, testing and maintenance. But the end result is a safer building. We do the same for generators for high-rise buildings and hospitals. Perhaps, we can save some money by not requiring generators or back-up power in surgery rooms?

I urge the Commission not to be misled by Mr. Schiffer's proposal to weaken the code.

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	Submitted	Attachments
Michael Goolsby	12/14/2012	No

Comment:

A building code is intended to be adopted as a legally enforceable document and must provide only requirements necessary to provide a minimum acceptable level of protection

Smoke control provisions have been considered by their previous inclusion in the State's uniform building code as meeting the minimum acceptable level of protection for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Florida.

Therefore I support the inclusion of these smoke control provisions as being in harmony with our obligation to provide a minimum acceptable level of protection for our citizens and as well as being consistent and in compliance with the Florida specific criteria required by statute.

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	Submitted	Attachments
Pete Quintela	12/14/2012	Yes

Comment:

Comment on Mod. 5170 This proposal maintains the same level of life safety the citizens of the State of Florida have been entitled to since the Florida Building Commission approved the current language in 2004.

The information provided regarding seniors living in high rise structures, came from a governmental census on highest population areas where seniors live. Not to insinuate that seniors don't live outside of Florida, but when it comes to seniors living in high-rise buildings we lead all other states. To be specific the coastal areas, from West Palm Beach to the City of Miami have the highest concentration of buildings over 75 feet in 95% of the states that use the ICC codes.

Regarding fiscal impact, it does not change any way from what we are presently doing. Besides how can you be considering costs when you are saving lives? I am surprised when I hear professionals trying to save a dollar by weakening the codes, at the expense someone dying because the savings it brought in construction costs.

Yes, there may be additional costs in the design phase, plan review, construction, testing and maintenance. But the end result is a safer building. We do the same for generators for high-rise buildings and hospitals. Perhaps, we can save some money by not requiring generators or back-up power in surgery rooms?

I urge the Commission not to be misled by Mr. Schiffer's proposal to weaken the code.

Proponent amador barzaga **Submitted** 12/14/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

F5170-G5

This modification is critical in providing for the life safety of Florida citizens and is an established pillar of efficient and safe building design. Sufficient justification relating to the specific need was reviewed and affirmed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in October. Consequently, I urge the Florida Building Commission to uphold the unanimous decision of the TAC and approve this modification for inclusion in the 2013 edition of the Florida Building Code.

403.4.7 Smoke removal.

~~To facilitate smoke removal in post fire salvage and overhaul operations, buildings and structures shall be equipped with natural or mechanical ventilation for removal of products of combustion in accordance with one of the following:~~

- ~~1. Easily identifiable, manually operable windows or panels shall be distributed around the perimeter of each floor at not more than 50 foot (15 240 mm) intervals. The area of operable windows or panels shall be not less than 40 square feet (3.7 m²) per 50 linear feet (15 240 mm) of perimeter.
Smoke control shall be provided in accordance with Section 909.~~

Exceptions:

- ~~1. In Group R-1 occupancies, each sleeping unit or suite having an exterior wall shall be permitted to be provided with 2 square feet (0.19 m²) of venting area in lieu of the area specified in Item 1.~~
- ~~2. Windows shall be permitted to be fixed provided that glazing can be cleared by fire fighters.~~
- ~~2. Mechanical air handling equipment providing one exhaust air change every 15 minutes for the area involved. Return and exhaust air shall be moved directly to the outside without recirculation to other portions of the building.~~
- ~~3. Any other approved design that will produce equivalent results.~~

I-2 occupancies that comply with Sections 407 shall not require smoke control systems in accordance with Section 909.

Comment on Mod. 5170 This proposal maintains the same level of life safety the citizens of the State of Florida have been entitled to since the Florida Building Commission approved the current language in 2004.

The information provided regarding seniors living in high rise structures, came from a governmental census on highest population areas where seniors live. Not to insinuate that seniors don't live outside of Florida, but when it comes to seniors living in high-rise buildings we lead all other states. To be specific the coastal areas, from West Palm Beach to the City of Miami have the highest concentration of buildings over 75 feet in 95% of the states that use the ICC codes.

Regarding fiscal impact, it does not change any way from what we are presently doing. Besides how can you be considering costs when you are saving lives? I am surprised when I hear professionals trying to save a dollar by weakening the codes, at the expense someone dying because the savings it brought in construction costs.

Yes, there may be additional costs in the design phase, plan review, construction, testing and maintenance. But the end result is a safer building. We do the same for generators for high-rise buildings and hospitals. Perhaps, we can save some money by not requiring generators or back-up power in surgery rooms?

I urge the Commission not to be misled by Mr. Schiffer's proposal to weaken the code.

Maintaining the current level of safety for our citizens remains critical. Seniors continue to flock to Florida as they retire; most take up residence in high-rise complexes for convenience, comfort and a sense of community. 2010 U.S. Census data indicate the State's population of individuals 65 years of age and older is 3,418,697. This represents the highest population of seniors in all states subject to the ICC. Respiratory ailments make the elderly easy victims of smoke inhalation. Additionally a large number of Seniors suffer from hearing or sight problems, Alzheimer`s disease or other illnesses and can have trouble finding exits, navigating stairs or seeking help.

Date Submitted	7/12/2012	Section	916	Proponent	Joe Bigelow
Chapter	9	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Approved as Submitted				
Commission Action	Pending Review				

Comments

General Comments	No	Alternate Language	Yes
-------------------------	----	---------------------------	-----

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

To carry forward carbon monoxide provisions of the 2010 FBC, to be consistent with the Florida Statutes and to implement the Commission plan to update the 2013 Code

Rationale

To be consistent with the Florida Statutes and to implement the Commission plan to update the 2013 Code

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Currently used under the 2010 Code, no new requirements being established

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

Currently used under the 2010 Code, no new requirements being established

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Currently used under the 2010 Code, no new requirements being established

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Carried over from the previous, field tested and proven to be effective

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Carried over from the previous, field tested and proven to be effective

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Carried over from the previous, field tested and proven to be effective

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Carried over from the previous, field tested and proven to be effective

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

To be consistent with the Florida Statutes and to implement the Commission plan to update the 2013 Code

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

5113-A1

Proponent Ann Stanton **Submitted** 11/15/2012 **Attachments** Yes

Rationale

Conflict in code between the Florida Building Code (Florida law) and the International Building Code. Having two separate sets of criteria for carbon monoxide that may conflict is ill advised. Florida-specific language was approved as submitted. This alternative language would change the code section numbers to replace the I-code language with the language from Florida law.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Would prevent alternate requirements on the same subject.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Provide a single set of criteria per Florida law.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Yes.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Yes.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

No.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

No.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

YES

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

YES

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

1st Comment Period History

08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

F5113-G1

Proponent Ken Cureton **Submitted** 9/21/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

The proposal provides for carbon monoxide control provisions as per 553.885 FS.

1st Comment Period History08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent	Ken Cureton	Submitted	9/21/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	-------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

Comment:

The proposal provides for carbon monoxide control provisions as per 553.885 FS.

F5113-G2**1st Comment Period History**08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent	Joseph Eysie	Submitted	9/23/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	--------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

Comment:

The Florida Natural Gas Association (FNGA) supports Mod 5113.

F5113-G3

916.1 Carbon monoxide protection.

Every separate building or an addition to an existing building for which a permit for new construction is issued and having a fossil-fuel-burning heater or appliance, a fireplace, an attached garage, or other feature, fixture, or element that emits carbon monoxide as a byproduct of combustion shall have an operational carbon monoxide alarm installed within 10 feet of each room used for sleeping purposes in the new building or addition, or at such other locations as required by this Code.

 916.1.1 Carbon monoxide alarm.

The requirements of Section 916.1 shall be satisfied by providing for one of the following alarm installations:

- 1. A hard-wired carbon monoxide alarm.**
- 2. A battery-powered carbon monoxide alarm.**
- 3. A hard-wired combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.**
- 4. A battery-powered combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.**
- 916.1.2 Combination alarms.**

Combination smoke/carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed and labeled by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory.

Exceptions:

- 1. An approved operational carbon monoxide detector shall be installed inside or directly outside of each room or area within a hospital, inpatient hospice facility or nursing home facility licensed by the Agency for Health Care Administration, or a new state correctional institution where a fossil-fuel burning heater, engine, or appliance is located. The carbon monoxide detector shall be connected to the fire-alarm system of the hospital, inpatient hospice facility, or nursing home facility as a supervisory signal.**
- 2. This section shall not apply to existing buildings that are undergoing alterations or repair unless the alteration is an addition as defined in Section 916.1.3.**
- 916.1.3**

Addition shall mean an extension or increase in floor area, number of stories or height of a building or structure.

908.7.1.1 Carbon monoxide protection. Every separate building or an addition to an existing building for which a permit for new construction is issued and having a fossil-fuel-burning heater or appliance, a fireplace, an attached garage, or other feature, fixture, or element that emits carbon monoxide as a byproduct of combustion shall have an operational carbon monoxide alarm installed within 10 feet of each room used for sleeping purposes in the new building or addition, or at such other locations as required by this Code.

908.7.1.1.1 Carbon monoxide alarm. The requirements of Section 916.1 shall be satisfied by providing for one of the following alarm installations:

1. A hard-wired carbon monoxide alarm.
2. A battery-powered carbon monoxide alarm.
3. A hard-wired combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.
4. A battery-powered combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.

908.7.2 916.1.2 Combination alarms. Combination smoke/carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed and labeled by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory.

Exceptions:

1. An approved operational carbon monoxide detector shall be installed inside or directly outside of each room or area within a hospital, inpatient hospice facility or nursing home facility licensed by the Agency for Health Care Administration, or a new state correctional institution where a fossil-fuel burning heater, engine, or appliance is located. The carbon monoxide detector shall be connected to the fire-alarm system of the hospital, inpatient hospice facility, or nursing home facility as a supervisory signal.
2. This section shall not apply to existing buildings that are undergoing alterations or repair unless the alteration is an addition as defined in Section 908.7.3 916.1.3.

908.7.3 916.1.3 Addition shall mean an extension or increase in floor area, number of stories or height of a building or structure.

~~[F] 908.7 Carbon monoxide alarms.~~ Group I or R occupancies located in a building containing a fuel burning appliance or in a building which has an attached garage shall be equipped with single station carbon monoxide alarms. The carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and be installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 720 and the manufacturer's instructions. An open parking garage, as defined in Chapter 2, or an enclosed parking garage ventilated in accordance with Section 404 of the *International Mechanical Code* shall not be considered an attached garage.

~~**Exception:** Sleeping units or dwelling units which do not themselves contain a fuel burning appliance or have an attached garage, but which are located in a building with a fuel burning appliance or an attached garage, need not be equipped with single station carbon monoxide alarms provided that:~~

- ~~1. The *sleeping unit* or *dwelling unit* is located more than one story above or below any story which contains a fuel-burning appliance or an attached garage;~~
- ~~2. The *sleeping unit* or *dwelling unit* is not connected by duct work or ventilation shafts to any room containing a fuel-burning appliance or to an attached garage; and~~
- ~~3. The building is equipped with a common area carbon monoxide alarm system.~~

-

~~[F] 908.7.1 Carbon monoxide detection systems.~~

~~Carbon monoxide detection systems, which include carbon monoxide detectors and audible notification appliances, installed and maintained in accordance with this section for carbon monoxide alarms and NFPA 720 shall be permitted. The carbon monoxide detectors shall be *listed* as complying with UL 2075.~~

Date Submitted	7/30/2012	Section	1008.1.7	Proponent	Jim Heise
Chapter	10	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Approved as Submitted				
Commission Action	Pending Review				

Comments

General Comments	Yes	Alternate Language	Yes
-------------------------	------------	---------------------------	------------

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

to maintain exceptions under 1008.1.7 Thresholds

Rationale

Language carried over from the 2010 Code.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC.
Continues improved efficiency in enforcing the code.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Helps protect the health and welfare of the public by having products properly water tested and labeled to these standards.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This will improve the code by reinstating these standards that exist in the Florida Code with the current edition.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This modification does not discriminate as it allows the use of any product that shows proof of meeting the code established standards.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

No adverse impact.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

YES

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

5719-A1

Proponent Jim Heise Submitted 12/13/2012 Attachments Yes

Rationale

Language carried over from the 2010 Florida Building Code

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC. Continues improved efficiency in enforcing the Code

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact as these provisions are currently being enforced by the 2010 FBC.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Helps protect the health and welfare of the public by having products properly water tested and labeled to these standards.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This will improve the code by reinstating these standards that already exist in the Florida Code with the current edition.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This modification does not discriminate as it allows the use of any product that shows proof of meeting the code established standards.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

No adverse impact

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

F5719-G1

Proponent Jim Heise Submitted 12/10/2012 Attachments No

Comment:

The intent of this mod was to delete the language of the base code under Chapter 10, Section 1008.1.7 and add my language. Without this mod, it would be physically impossible for anyone in Florida to replace an existing sliding glass door assembly and still maintain the required design pressures due to water testing requirements within.

1008.1.7 Thresholds.

Thresholds at doorways shall not exceed $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (19.1 mm) in height for sliding doors serving dwelling units or $\frac{1}{2}$ inch (12.7 mm) for other doors. Raised thresholds and floor level changes greater than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch (6.4 mm) at doorways shall be beveled with a slope not greater than one unit vertical in two units horizontal (50-percent slope).

Exceptions:

1. The threshold height shall be limited to $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches (197 mm) where the occupancy is Group R-2; the door is an exterior door that is not a component of the required means of egress and the doorway is not on an accessible route. In one- and two-family dwellings where the door discharges to the outside or to an exterior balcony or exterior exit access, the floor level outside the door shall be permitted to be one step lower than the inside, but not more than 8 inches (203 mm) lower.

2. For exterior doors serving dwelling units, thresholds at doorways shall not exceed the height required to pass the water resistance test of ANSI/AAMA/WDMA 101/I.S.2, or TAS 202 for high-velocity hurricane zones, or the maximum allowable height difference between interior floor level. Exterior floor level shall comply with the following:

LEVEL DIFFERENCE (inches)	AT PRIMARY DOOR
0	Pervious construction (e.g., wood decking with spaces)
$\frac{1}{2}$	Impervious construction (e.g., concrete, brick or flag stone)
LEVEL DIFFERENCE (inches)	AT SECONDARY DOOR
$\frac{1}{2}$	Pervious construction
4	Impervious construction

1008.1.7 Thresholds.

Thresholds at doorways shall not exceed $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (19.1 mm) in height above the finished floor or landing for sliding doors serving *dwelling units* or $\frac{1}{2}$ inch (12.7 mm) above the finished floor or landing for other doors. Raised thresholds and floor level changes greater than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch (6.4 mm) at doorways shall be beveled with a slope not greater than one unit vertical in two units horizontal (50-percent slope).

Exception: In occupancy Group R-2 or R-3, threshold heights for sliding and side-hinged exterior doors shall be permitted to be up to $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches (197 mm) in height if all of the following apply:

1. The door is not part of the required *means of egress*.
2. The door is not part of an *accessible route* as required by Chapter 11.
3. The door is not part of an *Accessible unit, Type A unit* or *Type B unit*.

1008.1.7 Thresholds.

Thresholds at doorways shall not exceed $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (19.1 mm) in height for sliding doors serving *dwelling units* or $\frac{1}{2}$ inch (12.7 mm) for other doors. Raised thresholds and floor level changes greater than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch (6.4 mm) at doorways shall be beveled with a slope not greater than one unit vertical in two units horizontal (50-percent slope).

Exceptions:

1. The threshold height shall be limited to $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches (197 mm) where the occupancy is Group R-2; the door is an exterior door that is not a component of the required *means of egress* and the doorway is not on an accessible route. In one- and two-family dwellings where the door discharges to the outside or to an exterior balcony or exterior exit access, the floor level outside the door shall be permitted to be one step lower than the inside, but not more than 8 inches (203 mm) lower.

2. For exterior doors serving *dwelling units*, thresholds at doorways shall not exceed the height required to pass the water resistance test of ANSI/AAMA/WDMA 101/I.S.2, or TAS 202 for high-velocity hurricane zones, or the maximum allowable height difference between interior floor level. Exterior floor level shall comply with the following:

<u>LEVEL DIFFERENCE</u> <u>(inches)</u>	<u>AT PRIMARY DOOR</u>
<u>0</u>	<u>Pervious construction</u> (e.g., wood decking with spaces)
<u>$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	<u>Impervious construction</u> (e.g., concrete, brick or flag stone)
<u>LEVEL DIFFERENCE</u> <u>(inches)</u>	<u>AT SECONDARY DOOR</u>
<u>$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	<u>Pervious construction</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Impervious construction</u>

Date Submitted	7/16/2012	Section	513 Smoke Control Systems	Proponent	amador barzaga
Chapter	5	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	Yes
TAC Recommendation	Approved as Submitted				
Commission Action	Pending Review				

Comments

General Comments	Yes	Alternate Language	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Maintaining smoke control requirements for High-Rise Buildings

Rationale

Smoke control for "high rise buildings" has been part of the Florida Building Code, Mechanical Section 513, since 2004. In order to maintain the same level of life safety for the citizens of the State of Florida we must maintain this requirement. Inclusion in the code is necessary to avoid diminishing the expected level of life safety that has been established by having this as a code item for over 8 years in the Florida Building Code. This change is consistent with notice for modification #5170.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Maintains current code provisions requirements.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Code provisions are the same found in the current code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Code provisions are the same found in the current code.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

This modification maintains minimum life safety requirements regarding smoke control in High-Rise Buildings.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

This modification is consistent with the statute's requirement that any modification must maintain the same life safety protection of the FBC.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

This modification allows the use of any material, products, methods or systems of construction already deemed acceptable by the Florida Building Code or any alternate materials, design and methods of construction and equipment acceptable to the code official.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

This modification maintains the same safety regulations required by the current code and in effect since 2004.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

YES

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Page 21 of 46

Proponent	Brad Schiffer	Submitted	12/11/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	---------------	------------------	------------	--------------------	----

Comment:

In addition to the comments presented for Modification #5170.

This Section of Code is for "...mechanical and passive smoke control systems that are required by the Florida Building Code"
This is not the place to add requirements.

F5173-G2

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	Michael Goolsby	Submitted	12/14/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	-----------------	------------------	------------	--------------------	----

Comment:

A building code is intended to be adopted as a legally enforceable document and must provide only requirements necessary to provide a minimum acceptable level of protection

Smoke control provisions have been considered by their previous inclusion in the State's uniform building code as meeting the minimum acceptable level of protection for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Florida.

Therefore I support the inclusion of these smoke control provisions as being in harmony with our obligation to provide a minimum acceptable level of protection for our citizens and as well as being consistent and in compliance with the Florida specific criteria required by statute.

F5173-G3

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	Pete Quintela	Submitted	12/14/2012	Attachments	Yes
------------------	---------------	------------------	------------	--------------------	-----

Comment:

Comment on Mod. 5173

This proposal maintains the same level of life safety the citizens of the State of Florida have been entitled and accustomed to since the Florida Building Commission approved the current language in 2004. The fact that this requirement has been in the code for all these years it establishes the basic minimum requirement for the State of Florida.

Keeping smoke control in high-rise buildings does not add any additional costs to what we are presently doing. Besides how can you be considering costs when you are saving lives? I am shocked to hear designers trying to save a dollar by weakening the codes.

A code change is usually originated because the safety components in a building failed and someone died, the end result is a safer building.

The Florida Building Code has been recognized nationally for being the code for others to follow. Trading building construction costs for casualties occurred by cheaper construction costs, is not something the Florida Building Code is known for, let's keep it that way.

I urge the Commission not to be misled by Mr. Schiffer's proposal to weaken the code.

F5173-G4

2nd Comment Period

10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012

Proponent	amador barzaga	Submitted	12/14/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	----------------	------------------	------------	--------------------	----

Comment:

This modification is critical in providing for the life safety of Florida citizens and is an established pillar of efficient and safe building design. Sufficient justification relating to the specific need was reviewed and affirmed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in October. Consequently, I urge the Florida Building Commission to uphold the unanimous decision of the TAC and approve this modification for inclusion in the 2013 edition of the Florida Building Code.

F5173-G5

1st Comment Period History

08/09/2012 - 09/23/2012

Proponent	BOAF CDC	Submitted	9/23/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	----------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

Comment:

The provision this is based upon has sunset with the other Florida Changes to the 2010 FBC

This code change is unnecessary as the provisions contained in the proposed amendment are adequately addressed in the applicable international code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

The amendment does not demonstrate by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variations addressed by the foundation code. Per FS 553.73 (7) (g)

The proposed amendment was does not appear to have been submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process.:

F5173-G1

[F] 513.1 Scope and purpose.

This section applies to mechanical and passive smoke control systems that are required by the ~~International~~ Florida Building Code, ~~or the International Fire Code~~ and shall apply to high rise buildings as defined in the Florida Building Code, Building. The purpose of this section is to establish minimum requirements for the design, installation and acceptance testing of smoke control systems that are intended to provide a tenable environment for the evacuation or relocation of occupants. These provisions are not intended for the preservation of contents, the timely restoration of operations, or for assistance in fire suppression or overhaul activities. Smoke control systems regulated by this section serve a different purpose than the smoke- and heat-venting provisions found in Section 910 of the ~~International~~ Florida Building Code, Building, ~~or the International Fire Code~~.

Comment on Mod. 5173

This proposal maintains the same level of life safety the citizens of the State of Florida have been entitled and accustomed to since the Florida Building Commission approved the current language in 2004. The fact that this requirement has been in the code for all these years it establishes the basic minimum requirement for the State of Florida.

Keeping smoke control in high-rise buildings does not add any additional costs to what we are presently doing. Besides how can you be considering costs when you are saving lives? I am shocked to hear designers trying to save a dollar by weakening the codes.

A code change is usually originated because the safety components in a building failed and someone died, the end result is a safer building.

The Florida Building Code has been recognized nationally for being the code for others to follow. Trading building construction costs for casualties occurred by cheaper construction costs, is not something the Florida Building Code is known for, let's keep it that way.

I urge the Commission not to be misled by Mr. Schiffer's proposal to weaken the code.

Maintaining the current level of safety for our citizens remains critical. Seniors continue to flock to Florida as they retire; most take up residence in high-rise complexes for convenience, comfort and a sense of community. 2010 U.S. Census data indicate the State's population of individuals 65 years of age and older is 3,418,697. This represents the highest population of seniors in all states subject to the ICC. Respiratory ailments make the elderly easy victims of smoke inhalation. Additionally a large number of Seniors suffer from hearing or sight problems, Alzheimer`s disease or other illnesses and can have trouble finding exits, navigating stairs or seeking help.

Date Submitted	8/2/2012	Section	R302.2	Proponent	Joseph Belcher
Chapter	3	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Approved as Submitted				
Commission Action	Pending Review				

Comments

General Comments	Yes	Alternate Language	No
-------------------------	-----	---------------------------	----

Related Modifications

None

Summary of Modification

Retains single two-hour fire rated wall exception for townhouses.

Rationale

The provision maintains the traditional exception allowing a single two-hour fire rated wall for townhouse separation. There was considerable discussion on this issue during the adoption of the FBC 2010. (Mod 4087) This is an unintended consequence in the adoption of the base code. The base code provides for a common one-hour wall because all residential occupancies are required to be protected by fire sprinklers. The Florida Legislature prohibits the adoption of the base code provisions requiring all residential occupancies to be protected by fire sprinkler systems, so adoption would decrease fire safety. Further, Florida Statute also defines townhouses and includes the exception allowing a single two-hour fire rated separation wall. (Ch. 471, F.S.) In adopting these provisions for the FBC 2010, the Commission recognized that it is doubtful the legislature would provide one set of criteria in law for townhouses and allow all others to use a different set of criteria.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No cost impacts as provisions are currently adopted.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No cost impacts as provisions are currently adopted.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No cost impacts as provisions are currently adopted.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Retains provisions for two-hour fire rated separation in townhouses which increases fire safety.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Improves the code by retaining provisions for two-hour fire rated separation in townhouses which increases fire safety.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

The provisions do not discriminate

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Improves effectiveness of the code by retaining provisions for two-hour fire rated separation in townhouses which increases fire safety.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

Adoption of the base code provision is predicated on the base code requirement that all residential occupancies are protected by fire sprinklers. The Florida Legislature has prohibited the adoption of such measures. Permitting a one-hour separation wall would be a considerable decrease in firesafety in these structures.

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

Proponent	BOAF CDC	Submitted	12/14/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	----------	------------------	------------	--------------------	----

Comment:

BOAF is in support of this change.

The provisions from the base code for a 1 hour separation are based on the requirement for a residential structure to be protected by a fire sprinkler system. As that is not allowed in FL we need to restore the 2 hour requirement for life safety.

F6011-G1

R302.2 Townhouses. Each townhouse shall be considered a separate building and shall be separated by fire-resistance rated wall assemblies meeting the requirements of Section R302.1 for exterior walls.

Exception: A common ~~1-hour~~ 2-hour fire-resistance-rated wall assembly tested in accordance with ASTM E 119 or UL 263 is permitted for townhouses if such walls do not contain plumbing or mechanical equipment, ducts or vents in the cavity of the common wall unless such materials and methods of penetration comply with Section R302.4. The wall shall be rated for fire exposure from both sides and shall extend to and be tight against exterior walls and the underside of the roof sheathing. Electrical installations shall be installed in accordance with Chapters ~~34 through 43~~. Penetrations of electrical outlet boxes shall be in accordance with Section R302.4.

Total Mods for **Fire** in **No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second: 3**

Total Mods for report: 8

Sub Code: Building

Date Submitted 8/2/2012	Section 1015	Proponent Ken Cureton
Chapter 10	Affects HVHZ No	Attachments No
TAC Recommendation	No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second	
Commission Action	Pending Review	

Comments

General Comments Yes **Alternate Language** Yes

Related Modifications

None

Summary of Modification

Modify SECTIONS 1015.1 and 1015.2.1

Rationale

To comply with s. 553.73(7)(a) Florida Statutes, the proposed modification will supplement the most current version of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC) base code with Florida specific requirements in accordance with the Commission's approved code change process for the update to the 2013 Florida Building Code. The proposed modification is necessary in order to maintain compliance with Florida Statutes.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

It does not. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

It does not. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

The proposed code change was submitted in accordance with the Commission's update process for the 2013 FBC in order to maintain compliance with Florida Statutes.

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

5985-A2

Proponent Joe Bigelow **Submitted** 12/6/2012 **Attachments** Yes

Rationale

Mod recieved "NAR" to resolve conflict with Section 1015.1 exception. The proposed alternate language deletes 1015.1 Section 1.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

The proposed code change was submitted in accordance with the Commission's update process for the 2013 FBC in order to maintain compliance with Florida Statutes.

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

F5985-G2

Proponent Brad Schiffer **Submitted** 12/9/2012 **Attachments** Yes

Comment:

To fix a current conflict within the FBC.

Proponent	Ken Cureton	Submitted	9/21/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	-------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

Comment:

The proposal provides for provisions with regard to travel distance and exists for Group R2 as per SB 442.

F5985-G1

Table 1015.1

SPACES WITH ONE EXIT OR EXIT ACCESS DOORWAY

OCCUPANCY	MAXIMUM OCCUPANT LOAD
A,B, E,F,M,U, <u>R2, R3</u>	49
H-1,H-2,H-3	3
H-4, H-5, I-1, I-3, I-4, R <u>R-1, R-4</u>	10
S	29

Modify SECTION 1015.2.1 as follows:

.Exceptions:

(1 – 2 No change.)

3. In Group R1 and R2 occupancies, the distance between exits is not applicable to common nonlooped exit access corridors in a building that has corridor doors from the guestroom or guest suite or dwelling unit, which are arranged so that the exits are located in opposite directions from such doors.

Modify 1015.1 as follows:

1015.1 Exits or exit access doorways from spaces.

Two *exits* or *exit access* doorways from any space shall be provided where one of the following conditions exists:

- 1. The *occupant load* of the space exceeds one of the values in Table 1015.1.

Exceptions:

~~1. In Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies, one means of egress is permitted within and from individual dwelling units with a maximum occupant load of 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2. Reserved~~

- 2. Care suites in Group I-2 occupancies complying with Section 407.4.3.

- 2. The *common path of egress travel* exceeds one of the limitations of Section 1014.3.

- 3. Where required by Section 1015.3, 1015.4, 1015.5, or 1015.6.

Where a building contains mixed occupancies, each individual occupancy shall comply with the applicable requirements for that occupancy. Where applicable, cumulative *occupant loads* from adjacent occupancies shall be considered in accordance with the provisions of Section 1004.1.

Table 1015.1

SPACES WITH ONE EXIT OR EXIT ACCESS DOORWAY

OCCUPANCY	MAXIMUM OCCUPANT LOAD
A,B, E,F,M,U, R2, R3	49
H-1,H-2,H-3	3
H-4, H-5, I-1, I-3, I-4, R R-1, R-4	10
S	29

Modify SECTION 1015.2.1 as follows:

.Exceptions:

(1 – 2 No change.)

- 3. In Group R1 and R2 occupancies, the distance between exits is not applicable to common nonlooped exit access corridors in a building that has corridor doors from the guestroom or guest

suite or dwelling unit, which are arranged so that the exits are located in opposite directions from such doors.

If an Affirmative Recommendation the current conflict should be removed by the following strike thru.

1015.1 Exits or exit access doorways from spaces.

Two *exits* or *exit access* doorways from any space shall be provided where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The *occupant load* of the space exceeds one of the values in Table 1015.1.

Exceptions:

~~1. In Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies, one *means of egress* is permitted within and from individual dwelling units with a maximum *occupant load* of 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an *automatic sprinkler system* in accordance with [Section 903.3.1.1](#) or [903.3.1.2](#).~~

Date Submitted 8/2/2012	Section 303.4	Proponent Alfonso Fernandez-Fraga
Chapter 3	Affects HVHZ No	Attachments No
TAC Recommendation No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second		
Commission Action Pending Review		

Comments

General Comments No	Alternate Language Yes
----------------------------	-------------------------------

Related Modifications

Proposed R324 Carbon Dioxide Alarms

Summary of Modification

We need to eliminate the requirement to require outside air to be introduced into single family homes and townhouses

Rationale

We need to remove the requirement to introduce outside air directly into single family homes and townhouses. If outside air is introduced continuously into the return air plenum of single family homes, gross quantities of unwanted and uncontrolled humidity will be introduced, especially when supply fans are set to run continuously without regard as to whether cooling and dehumidification is taking place.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code
None.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code
Minimal. The carbon dioxide alarm may be combined with the already-required smoke detector. It may add \$300 per dwelling unit, but this cost will be reduced as the Code-mandated quantities are produced.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code
The cost is the cost of the additional detection device, which today is (more or less) \$300 per dwelling unit. This cost will go down.

Requirements

- Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**
Yes. If indoor air quality is suspect, the alarm will go off.
- Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction**
Yes. The option to monitor air quality will use less energy than the continuous introduction of outside air.
- Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities**
No this does not discriminate.
- Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code**
No this does not degrade the effectiveness of the code, it is an improvement.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No

Alternate Language

2nd Comment Period	<u>10/31/2012 - 12/14/2012</u>
---------------------------	--------------------------------

5994-A4	Proponent Alfonso Fernandez-Fraga	Submitted 11/9/2012	Attachments Yes
	Rationale This mod needs to be reviewed by the Mechanical TAC. The additional R324 language is required because it indicates how and where to install the CO2 sensors.		
	Fiscal Impact Statement		
	Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code None.		
	Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code Minimal. The carbon dioxide alarm may be combined with the already-required smoke detector. It may add \$300 per dwelling unit, but this cost will be reduced as the Code-mandated quantities are produced.		
	Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code The cost is the cost of the additional detection device, which today is (more or less) \$300 per dwelling unit. This cost will go down.		
	Requirements		
	Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public Yes. If indoor air quality is suspect, the alarm will go off.		
	Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction Yes. The option to monitor air quality will use less energy than the continuous introduction of outside air.		
	Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities No this does not discriminate.		
Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code No this does not degrade the effectiveness of the code, it is an improvement.			
Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version? No			

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation.

Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 0.2 inch w.c (50 Pa) in accordance with [Section N1102.4.1.2](#), the dwelling unit shall be provided with ~~whole house mechanical ventilation in accordance with [Section M1507.3](#)~~; carbon dioxide alarms in accordance with Section R324, Carbon Dioxide Alarms.

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation.

Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 0.2 inch w.c (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.1.2, the dwelling unit shall be provided with ~~whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3~~; carbon dioxide alarms in accordance with Section R324, Carbon Dioxide Alarms.

SECTION R324 CARBON DIOXIDE ALARMS

R324.1 Carbon dioxide alarms.

For new construction, where required by other sections of this Code, an approved carbon dioxide alarm shall be installed outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in *dwelling units*.

R324.2 Carbon dioxide detection systems.

Carbon dioxide detection systems that include carbon dioxide detectors and audible notification appliances, installed and maintained in accordance with this section for carbon dioxide alarms, shall be permitted. Where a household carbon dioxide detection system is installed, it shall become a permanent fixture of the occupancy, owned by the homeowner and shall be monitored by an approved supervising station.

Exception: Where carbon dioxide alarms are installed meeting the requirements of Section R324.1, compliance with Section 315.2 is not required.

R324.3 Alarm requirements.

Single-station carbon dioxide alarms shall be installed in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Date Submitted 7/20/2012	Section R315	Proponent Ken Cureton
Chapter 3	Affects HVHZ No	Attachments No
TAC Recommendation	No Affirmative Recommendation with a Second	
Commission Action	Pending Review	

Comments

General Comments	Yes	Alternate Language	Yes
-------------------------	------------	---------------------------	------------

Related Modifications

None

Summary of Modification

Modify SECTIONS R315.1 through R315.3

Rationale

To comply with s. 553.73(7)(a) Florida Statutes, the proposed modification will supplement the most current version of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC) base code with Florida specific requirements in accordance with the Commission's approved code change process for the update to the 2013 Florida Building Code. The proposed modification is necessary in order to maintain compliance with Florida Statutes.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Proposed language is currently adopted by the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Yes. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

It does not. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

It does not. The Proposed language for this Modification is currently included in the 2010 Florida Building Code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

NO

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

The proposed code change was submitted in accordance with the Commission's update process for the 2013 FBC in order to maintain compliance with Florida Statutes.

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

5438-A1

Proponent Ann Stanton **Submitted** 11/27/2012 **Attachments** Yes

Rationale

Clean up the proposed mod relative to formatting and to reflect Florida law.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Yes. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Yes. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

No. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

No. This language reflects that in Florida law as shown in the 2010 Residential code.

Is the proposed code modification part of a prior code version?

YES

The provisions contained in the proposed amendment are addressed in the applicable international code?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

There is a lot of overlap with carbon monoxide provisions in the IRC, but Florida law takes precedence over the I-codes.

The amendment demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction of Florida exhibits a need to strengthen the foundation code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the foundation code and why the proposed amendment applies to the state?

OTHER

Explanation of Choice

This change reflects Florida law.

The proposed amendment was submitted or attempted to be included in the foundation codes to avoid resubmission to the Florida Building Code amendment process?

NO

F5438-G2

Proponent Joe Bigelow **Submitted** 12/6/2012 **Attachments** No

Comment:

mod 5438 recieved an "NAR" however staff respectfully requests that the TAC reconsider their position and support the original proposal for consistency with the law.

Proponent	Ken Cureton	Submitted	9/21/2012	Attachments	No
------------------	-------------	------------------	-----------	--------------------	----

Comment:

The proposal provides for carbon monoxide control provisions as per 553.885 FS.

F5438-G1

Modify SECTIONS R315.1 through R315.3 as follows:

R315.1 Carbon monoxide alarms.

For new construction, an approved carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in *dwelling units* within which fuel-fired *appliances* are installed and in dwelling units that have attached garages.

Carbon monoxide protection. Every separate building or an addition to an existing building for which a permit for new construction is issued and having a fossil-fuel-burning heater or appliance, a fireplace, an attached garage, or other feature, fixture, or element that emits carbon monoxide as byproduct of combustion shall have an operational carbon monoxide alarm installed within 10 feet of each room used for sleeping purposes.

Exception: This section shall not apply to existing buildings that are undergoing alterations or repair unless the alteration is an addition as defined in Section R315.1.3.

R315.1.1 Carbon monoxide alarm. The requirements of Section R315.1 shall be satisfied by providing for one of the following alarm installations:

- (1) A hard-wired carbon monoxide alarm.
- (2) A battery-powered carbon monoxide alarm.
- (3) A hard-wired combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.
- (4) A battery-powered combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.

R315.1.2 Combination alarms. Combination smoke/carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed and labeled by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory.

R315.1.3 Addition shall mean: An extension or increase in floor area, number of stories or height of a building or structure.

R315.2 Where required in existing dwellings. Reserved .

~~Carbon monoxide detection systems.~~ Carbon monoxide detection systems that include carbon monoxide detectors and audible notification appliances, installed and maintained in accordance with this section for carbon monoxide alarms and NFPA 720, shall be permitted. The carbon monoxide detectors shall be listed as complying with UL 2075. Where a household carbon monoxide detection system is installed, it shall become a permanent fixture of the occupancy, owned by the homeowner and shall be monitored by an approved supervising station.

~~Exception:~~ Where carbon monoxide alarms are installed meeting the requirements of [Section R315.1](#), compliance with Section 315.2 is not required.

R315.3 Alarm requirements. Reserved

~~Where required in existing dwellings. Where work requiring a permit occurs in existing dwellings that have attached garages or in existing dwellings within which fuel-fired appliances exist, carbon monoxide alarms shall be provided in accordance with [Section R315.1](#).~~

~~**R315.4 Alarm requirements.** Single-station carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and shall be installed in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions.~~

R315.1 Carbon monoxide protection. Every separate building or an addition to an existing building for which a permit for new construction is issued and having a fossil-fuel-burning heater or appliance, a fireplace, an attached garage, or other feature, fixture, or element that emits carbon monoxide as byproduct of combustion shall have an operational carbon monoxide alarm installed within 10 feet of each room used for sleeping purposes.

Exception: This section shall not apply to existing buildings that are undergoing alterations or repair unless the alteration is an addition as defined in Section R315.1.3.

~~**315.1 Carbon monoxide alarms.** For new construction, an approved carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in *dwelling units* within which fuel-fired *appliances* are installed and in dwelling units that have attached garages.~~

R315.1.1 Carbon monoxide alarm. The requirements of Section R315.1 shall be satisfied by providing for one of the following alarm installations:

- (1) A hard-wired carbon monoxide alarm.
- (2) A battery-powered carbon monoxide alarm.
- (3) A hard-wired combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.
- (4) A battery-powered combination carbon monoxide and smoke alarm.

R315.1.2 Combination alarms. Combination smoke/carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed and labeled by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory.

R315.1.3 Addition shall mean: An extension or increase in floor area, number of stories or height of a building or structure.

~~**315.2 Carbon monoxide detection systems.** **Reserved.** Carbon monoxide detection systems that include carbon monoxide detectors and audible notification appliances, installed and maintained in accordance with this section for carbon monoxide alarms and NFPA 720, shall be permitted. The carbon monoxide detectors shall be listed as complying with UL 2075. Where a household carbon monoxide detection system is installed, it shall become a permanent fixture of the occupancy, owned by the homeowner and shall be monitored by an approved supervising station.~~

~~**Exception:** Where carbon monoxide alarms are installed meeting the requirements of Section R315.1, compliance with Section 315.2 is not required.~~

~~**R315.32 Where required in existing dwellings.** **Reserved.** ~~**Where required in existing dwellings.** Where work requiring a *permit* occurs in existing *dwellings* that have attached garages or in existing dwellings within which fuel-fired *appliances* exist, carbon monoxide alarms shall be provided in accordance with Section R315.1.~~~~

~~**R315.43 Alarm requirements.** **Reserved.** Single-station carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and shall be installed in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions.~~