



BCIC LLC
10151 University Blvd. #195
Orlando, FL 32817

December 29, 2009

Mr. Mo Modani
Department of Community Affairs
Building Codes and Standards
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

RE: Summary of Comparison of Changes- 2009 NFPA 101 and IBC

We are pleased to submit this report which chronicles the changes made in the 2009 NFPA 101 and the IBC from the 2006 editions. The scope of this project is to review the 2009 *changes* to the IBC and compare them to the 2009 edition of the NFPA 101 and to review the 2009 *changes* to the NFPA 101 and compare them to the 2009 IBC to determine if any conflicts exist due to the *changes* in either of the codes. There were a series of discussions with the Department of Community Affairs regarding what constitutes a conflict for the purposes of this study. Staff directed that a conflict is defined as a construction specification such as a dimension in one code that would prevent compliance with the other code.

Initially three matrixes were created from the changes provided by the Department of Community Affairs. The matrixes created were: 1) 2009 changes to the International Building Code, 2) 2009 changes to NFPA 101 and 3) 2009 changes to the Referenced Standards of the NFPA 101. In determining potential conflicts, staff directed us to screen each code change from the matrix to determine if the change was one that had the potential of providing a conflict as it is defined for this project. When a code change had the potential of a conflict, the corresponding code section from either the IBC or NFPA 101 was added to the matrix as well as the corresponding Florida specific code change (if one applied). The IBC or NFPA 101 code changes were reviewed to determine if a conflict existed and the result of this review and possible recommendations or comments are provided in the matrix column titled "Recommendation".

The Referenced Standards review was conducted differently than the code change matrixes. The 2009 IBC underwent substantial changes and in some cases significant changes to Referenced Standards, most of which have little use or a corresponding standard in the NFPA 101. Therefore, each Referenced Standard in NFPA 101 was compared to any corresponding

Referenced Standard in the IBC. When there were differences, the newest Referenced Standards tended to be in the 2009 IBC.

Recommendation;

As has been stated there are no conflicts with the IBC 2009 and the NFPA 101 as defined for this project, however there are differences in the codes. The differences of course emanate from the different cultures that produce the codes and how they are to be used. BCIC recommends that the more recent standards adopted in the IBC be adopted for use in the Florida Fire Prevention Code. There are differing requirements in NFPA 101 §18.5.4.2 and IBC/FBC §708.13.4. The differences in these code sections are unique and warrants review by the Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council. NFPA 101 states that the “trash” room is not required to be greater than one hour. The IBC and FBC state that the trash rooms have to be separated by not less than one hour construction (indicating that it could be greater). One code states a “not to exceed” requirement and the other states a “minimum” requirement, potentially creating a conflict and the only way to comply with both codes is to have a 1 hour termination room.

If you should have any questions, feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized initials 'MK'.

Medard Kopczynski, CBO