The ICC Code Development Process
(Where did these codes come from anyway?)

Robert Rice C.B.O,
Josephine County Building Safety Director
Topics

• ICC Model Code Development
  – How does the ICC process work?
  – Who are the players?
  – What is currently in process?
  – What’s in the future?

• Oregon’s Code Adoption Process
– We will look at the ICC code change process and we will see that;

- It’s open (transparent)
- It’s fair
- It’s available to anyone that has an issue w/ the codes and thinks something needs changed
It’s coming to a city near you!

Portland, OR
Pre-1994 Legacy Building Code Groups

BOCA: (Northern and Eastern States)
Building Officials and Code Administrators International, Inc.
Established 1915

ICBO (Western States)
International Conference of Building Officials
Established 1922

SBCCI (Southern States)
Established 1940
Since the early part of the last century, these nonprofit organizations developed the three separate sets of model codes used throughout the United States.
Although regional code development had been effective and responsive to our country’s needs, the time came for a single set of codes. The nation’s three model code groups responded by merging into the International Code Council (ICC) and by developing codes without regional limitations known as the International Codes.
So, we know who ICC is (we code officials).

But, who are these people that actually writes the codes?
Lawmakers in Washington DC
Lawmakers in Washington DC
Any interested person or group

You and me!
Anyone can participate

But, it does help to be a little crazy
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INSANITY

Everyone’s crazy.

CODE GEEKS just have a hard time hiding it.
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15 ICC I-Codes

Building:
International Building Code (IBC)
International Residential Code (IRC)

Fire:
International Fire Code (IFC)
International Wildland Urban Interface Code (IWUIC)

Plumbing and Mechanical
International Fuel Gas Code (IFGC)
International Mechanical Code (IMC)
International Plumbing Code (IPC)
International Private Sewage Disposal Code (IPSDC)
15 ICC I-Codes (cont)

Existing Buildings:
- International Existing Building Code (IEBC)
- International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC)

Specialty:
- International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)
- ICC Performance Code for Buildings and Facilities
- International Zoning Code (IZC)
- International Green Construction Code (New)
- International Pool and Spa Code (New)
• **Characteristics of International Codes**

• **Each code is comprehensive**

• **All codes are coordinated and compatible with each other**

• **All codes are developed according to the same process in the same forum**

• **All codes reference consensus national standards**
• **Coordination of I-codes**

• **Defined scope of each code**

• **Interdependence and reliance on the entire family of codes - cross referencing and duplication of provisions within code scopes**

• **Issues resolved in a single and central public forum**

• **Single interpretation applies to all codes**
Development Process Goal

Utilize a process open to all parties with safeguards to avoid domination by proprietary interests.
Development Process Goal

ICC Governmental Consensus Process achieves this with the final vote resting with those enforcing the codes (us).
The participants:

- Code officials
- Design professionals/consultants
- Trade associations
- Builders/contractors
- Manufacturers/suppliers
- Government agencies
- Property owner/maintenance groups
- Insurance companies
- Anyone with an interest
Gary Ehrlich, P.E.
National Home Builders Association
Steve Orlowski
National Home Builders Association
Kelly Cobeen, P.E. S.E.
Structural Engineer and co-author of “Design of Wood Structures”, McGraw/Hill
Professor Dan Dolan, P.E. S.E.
University of Washington
Ed Keith, P.E.
American Plywood Association
Randy Shackleford, P.E.
Simpson Strong-Tie
Robert Rice, C.B.O.
Building Safety Director
Josephine County Oregon
TEAMWORK

A Few Harmless Flakes Working Together Can
Unleash an Avalanche of Destruction.
• **The Process**

• Hearings are according to “Robert’s Rules of Order” as modified by CP-28 where;
  
  – Motions are made, seconded,
  – Discussed with;
    
    • Support for the proposal
    • Opposition to the proposal
    • Rebuttal
    • Re-rebuttal
  
  – Then Voted on. (By committee at CDH and by Governmental Representatives at FAH)
• **The Process**

• **Hearings are according to “Robert’s Rules of Order” as modified by CP-28 where;**

  – **Proponents get 2 minutes to speak**
    • There can be multiple speakers in support and each get 2 minutes

  – **Opponents get 2 minutes to speak**
    • There can be multiple speakers in opposition and each get 2 minutes

  – **Proponents get 1 minute each for rebuttal**

  – **Opponents get 1 minute each for re-rebuttal**
• The Process
• Open
• Transparent
• Balance of Interest
• Due Process
• Appeals Process
• Consensus
The proposal “As Submitted” is to add the underlined language (Removed language would be shown struckout).
A descriptive “Reason” statement is required
A "Cost Impact" statement is required.
The initial proposal goes to the Code Development Hearing where it is heard by the committee

- 15 Code Committees. One for each code.
- IBC has 4 Subcommittees
  - General (IBC-G)
  - Means of Egress (MOE) (IBC-E)
  - Fire Safety (IBC-FS)
  - Structural (IBC-S)
- IRC 2 Subcommittees
  - General (IRC-G)
  - Building/Energy (IRC-BE)
- Anyone can attend and testify. No cost to attend the hearings
Code Committees for the Code Development Hearings

- Materially affected interests represented
- Not less than 33% of each committee is to be regulators (i.e. code officials)
- All meetings in public forum
- All actions and reasons for action published
Code Development Hearing
(Presenters are speaking to the Committee)

- Committee action
  - Approval as Submitted (AS)
  - Approval as Modified (AM)
  - Disapproval (D)
  - The committee action is essentially a “motion” and becomes the “motion on the floor” at the Final Action Hearings
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Code Development Hearing
(Speaking to the Committee)

• Assembly action (rare) is where an individual or group wants to immediately challenge the action of the committee

  - All members of ICC can vote on an assembly action in response to committee action (e.g. Overturn committee action)

  - Successful assembly action results in an automatic public comment for the Final Action Hearings
Original Proposal was modified and then the committee action was “Approved as Modified”

During testimony, (“on the floor”) another individual proposes a modification to the original proposal
Public Comment Submittal (Phase II)

- Allows anyone to submit a “Public Comment” (PC) in response to the results of the Code Development Hearing

- The PC can be to modify the original proposal or,

- The PC can be a request to “Disapprove” or “Approve” the original proposal
Public Comment Submittal

• Disagree with the committee action
  – Request “Approval”
  – Request “Disapproval”

• Disagree with the assembly action

• Propose revisions (“modifications”) to the code change. Further revisions proposed in legislative format.

• Public Comments are then published in the Final Action Agenda

• If there is no PC submitted, the committee action “motion” is on the consent agenda
During the Public Comment period (after the code development hearings) another individual proposes an additional modification to the proposal that had already been modified from its original version.

Individual Consideration Agenda

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

Public Comment:

Larry Wainwright, WTCA, representing the Structural Building Components Industry, requests Approval as Modified by this Public Comment.

Further modify proposal as follows:

2308.9.1 Size, height and spacing. The size, height and spacing of studs shall be in accordance with Table 2308.9.1 except that utility-grade studs shall not be spaced more than 18 inches (460 mm) o.c., or support more than a roof and ceiling, or exceed 8 feet (2438 mm) in height for exterior walls and load-bearing walls or 10 feet (3048 mm) for interior non-load-bearing walls. Studs shall be continuous from a support at the bottom sole plate to a support at the top plate to resist loads perpendicular to wall. The support shall be a foundation or floor, ceiling or roof diaphragm or shall be designed in accordance with accepted engineering practice.

Exception: Jack studs, trimmer studs and cripple studs at openings in walls that comply with Table 2308.9.5.

Commenter’s Reason: This is an editorial change to more clearly communicate the intent of the proponent. The terms “top” and “bottom” are replaced with “sole plate” and “top plate”, which are used in the referenced table 602.3(1).

Final Action: AS AM AMPC____ D
Final Action Hearing
(Speaking to the Assembly)

• Anyone can attend and testify. No cost to attend the hearings.

• Agenda:
  – Consent agenda: Block vote on approval of the committee action for all code changes which did not receive a public comment or successful assembly action
  – Individual Consideration Agenda: Vote individually on each code change which received a public comment or successful assembly action
Moderators facilitate the hearings (and keep things on track)

- During CDH, it’s between the proponents/opponents and the committee
- During the FAH, it’s between the proponents/opponents and the assembly
Final Action Hearing

Final vote on whether or not to change the code rests with the Governmental Member Representatives – those who enforce the code and are charged with the public’s safety

– Open, fair and objective with no proprietary interest
Final Action Hearing
Assembly casts final votes
• ICC Council Policy 28-05 is available on ICC’s webpage

Vote count required for various actions at the Final Action Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action (see note)</th>
<th>Desired Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>2/3 Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3 Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Simple Majority to sustain the Public Hearing Action or; 2/3 Majority on additional modifications and 2/3 on overall AM
Final vote after support and opposition speakers
Results of Code Development

- First edition of full family of I-Codes in 2000
- Editions follow every 3 years after 2000
- The 2015 code cycle is divided into three groups
- Group A, Group B and a new Group C
• **Group A**
  – IBC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, IPSDC

• **Group B**
  – Admin, ICCPC, IEBC, IECC, IFC, IPMC, ISPSC, IRC, IWUIC, IZC

• **Group C (New)**
  – IgCC
- The schedule for upcoming cycles is available on ICC’s webpage (www.iccsafe.org)
# 2012/2013/2014 ICC Code Development Schedule

(Updated May 18, 2012)

This update removes the IgCC from Group B to a new Group C in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step in Code Development Cycle</th>
<th>2012 — Group A Codes</th>
<th>2013 — Group B Codes Admin, ICCPC, IEBC, IECC, IFC, IPMC, ISPSC, IRC, IWUIC, IZC</th>
<th>2014 — Group C Code IgCC (See notes for date information)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Edition of I-Codes Published</td>
<td>April 30, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline For Receipt of Applications For All Code Committees</td>
<td>June 1, 2011 (updated: September 1 for IECC and IZC, August 1 for IgCC and ISPSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Posting of &quot;Proposed Changes to the I-Codes&quot;</td>
<td>March 12, 2012</td>
<td>March 11, 2013</td>
<td>March TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICC remains dedicated to a single family of comprehensive and coordinated model codes. The ICC process allows all interests to participate in the code development process.
But, the ICC codes (and other national codes) are merely a developed set of model code standards that have no authority.

Until a local governmental body (State, City County, etc.) adopts the code, it is un-enforceable.
Oregon State Adoption Process

- Process starts with the appropriate “model” code (Typically an ICC code. Other model codes include NFPA and IAPMO).
- Any interested person can submit a code change proposal. Proposals need to meet certain criteria defined in OAR for “reason” and cost impact.
- The proposals are reviewed by a committee.
- Any person can attend the hearings and testify.
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The committee is made up of industry representatives, Building Officials, Engineers, Homebuilders and others.

The committees serve the purpose of reviewing the proposed changes and adoption of each specialty code.
State Adoption Process (Cont.)

- Committee makes recommendation to the appropriate BCD board.

- The board reviews the committee recommendations and sends board recommendation to the Director of BCD for approval or denial.
State Adoption Process (Cont.)

The Board

- The Board is permanent, appointed by the Governor and serves the purpose of dealing with all the issues regarding each specialty code.

- (See Oregon Building Codes Division webpage for additional information on committees and boards)
In the case of the residential code, the 2009 IRC “model” code became our 2011 Oregon Residential Specialty Code.
Questions or comments?

Robert W. Rice
rrice@co.josephine.or.us

OBOA
Oregon Building Officials Association
Committed to Building Safety

ThinkPermit
Protect your home. Protect your family.
For additional information:

- **Oregon Building Codes Division**
  - [www.cbs.state.or.us/external/bcd/](http://www.cbs.state.or.us/external/bcd/)

- **International Code Council**
  - [www.iccsafe.org](http://www.iccsafe.org)

- **Oregons Current Codes**
  - [www.ecodes.biz](http://www.ecodes.biz)