



# ICC CODES - PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE "2009/2010 REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEARINGS"

- IBC - International Building Code (E, FS, G, S)
- IEBC-International Existing Building Code (EB)
- IFC-International Fire Code (F)
- IFGC - International Fuel Gas Code (FG)
- IMC - International Mechanical Code (M)
- IPC - International Plumbing Code (P)
- IRC - International Residential Code-Building (RB)
- IRC-International Residential Code-Plumbing/Mechanical (RP, RM)
- IWUIC- International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (IWUIC)

**CLOSING DATE: All Comments Must Be Received by February 8, 2010.** The 2009/2010 Final Action Hearings for the codes listed above, will be held May 14-23, 2010 in Dallas, TX.

1) Please type or print clearly: Public comments will be returned if they contain unreadable information.

Name:	Homer Maiel, PE, CBO			Date:	2/3/2010
Jurisdiction/Company:	City of San Jose				
Submitted on Behalf of:	ICC Tri-Chapter (Peninsula, East Bay, Monterey Bay Chapters)				
Address:	200 E. Santa Clara Street, Second Floor				
City:	San Jose	State:	CA	Zip +4:	95113-1905
Phone:	(408) 535-7765	Ext:	n/a	Fax:	408-292-6246
e-mail:	homer.maiel@sanjoseca.gov				

2) Copyright Release: In accordance with Council Policy #28 Code Development, all Code Change Proposals, Floor Modifications and Public Comments are required to include a copyright release. A copy of the copyright release form is included at the end of this form. Please follow the directions on the form. This form as well as an alternative release form can also be downloaded from the ICC website at [www.iccsafe.org](http://www.iccsafe.org). If you have previously executed the copyright release, please check the box below:

2009/2010 Cycle copyright release on file

3) Code Change Proposal Number:

Indicate the Code Change Proposal Number that is being addressed by this Public Comment: S26-09/10

4) Public Comment: The Final Action requested on this Code Change Proposal is: (Check Box)

Approved as Submitted (AS):
  Approved as Modified by this Public Comment (AMPC):
  Approved as Modified by the Code Committee as Published in the ROH (AM):
  Approved as Modified by Assembly Floor Action as Published in the ROH (AMF):
  Disapproved (D):

Attached Proposed Modifications and/or Reason Statements:

See Attached Individual Consideration Form

PLEASE USE SEPARATE FORM FOR EACH PUBLIC COMMENT  
 SUBMITTAL AS A DOCUMENT ATTACHED TO AN EMAIL IS PREFERRED  
 SEE BACK OF FORM FOR DIRECTIONS ON WHERE TO SEND PUBLIC COMMENTS

# INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION FORM

**S26-09/10**

**1509.1, 1509.2.4**

## Individual Consideration Agenda

This item is on the agenda for individual consideration because a public comment was submitted.

*Public Comment:*

**Homer Maiel, PE, CBO, City of San Jose, representing ICC Tri-Chapter (Peninsula, East Bay, Monterey Chapters), requests Approved as Submitted.**

**Commenter Reason:**

Section 1509.2.4 Exception 6 currently regulates unroofed *mechanical equipment screens, fences and similar enclosures*, but only gives guidance for the construction of those elements located on one-story buildings. Clearly, buildings of other story heights utilize rooftop mechanical equipment screens, fences and similar enclosures, but nothing in current Section 1509 specifically address roof screens on those taller buildings.

The fire resistance that is being proposed for mechanical equipment screens will be no more restrictive than those already stated in Exception No. 4 and 5 for the walls of *enclosures housing only mechanical equipment*. We believe that applying the same rules to roof screens is not more restrictive than the current code, it simply clarifies what should be required. The proposed change simply spells out that roof screens are intended to be regulated consistent with ICC staff interpretations of this section and its exceptions.

A question raised by one of the committee members relating to how the fire resistant construction of roof screens compares with what is permitted for roof coverings is not the subject of this proposal. We did not profess in the original reason statement or nor did we ever believe that there is any relationship between roof screens and roof coverings. Instead the premise of the code change was and still is that roof screens are very similar to walls of roof structure enclosures and should be regulated consistent with those existing provisions.

We ask that this simple change, to address roof screens on buildings over one-story in height be added to the code.

---

---

