# COMMISSION ACTION MATRIX – YELLOWBUILDING FIRE AND OTHER – STRUCTURAL DESIGN/LATERAL FORCES AD-HOC (BFO/SDLF) CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## 2022 California fire code, TITLE 24, PART 9 AGENCY: Office of the state fire Marshal, sfm 07/22

### LEGEND:

**CAC Actions:** Approve, Disapprove, Approve as Amended, Further Study Required

**Agency Responses:** Accept, Disagree, Withdraw

**CBSC Actions:** Approve, Disapprove, Approve as Amended, Further Study Required

**Matrix Paper Color** (for commission action only): GREEN = uncontested items, YELLOW = challenged items, SALMON = withdrawn, no action required

If using assistive technology, please adjust your settings to recognize underline, strikeout, italic and ellipsis.

* Model Code language appears upright
* Existing California amendments appear in *italic*
* Amended model code or new California amendments appear *underlined & italic*
* Repealed model code language appears ~~upright and in strikeout~~
* Repealed California amendments appear in *~~italic and strikeout~~*
* Ellipses ( ...) indicate existing text remains unchanged

**Chapter 9 FIRE PROTECTION AND LIFE SAFETY SYSTEMS**

Amend sections listed below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Number 7** | **Code Section** | **CACAction** | **Agency Response** | **Public Comments** | **Annotations** | **CBSCAction** |
| SFM 07/22-7-4 | **907.2.6.2, 907.2.9.3, 907.2.13, 907.5.1.1, 907.5.2.2, 907.5.2.3** | **Further Study** | **Accept** | 45-Day: S. Weiss-Ishai (SF Fire), Section 907.2.9.3Further Study, Criteria #6 | Delete references to Occupancy Group I-2.1.**CAC: FS under Criteria #6.** In Section 907.2.9.3, it is recommended to delete the Exception to #3 and clarify/clean up the language in the last paragraph. Associated with SFM 02/22 Part 2, Item 9-6.**45-Day:**  Commenter suggests revising the proposed amendment in section 907.2.9.3.**No changes to ET, see SFM response in FSOR.** |  |
| SFM 07/22-7-6 | **907.5.2.3.1 Public use areas and common use areas.** | **Approve** | **Accept** | 45-Day: S. Weiss-Ishai (SF Fire)Further Study, Criteria #6 | Add more specific clarifying example where strobes shall be provided.**CAC:** Suggested to consider editorial clean up on capitalization of the term “Normally Occupied Rooms.”**45-Day:** Commenter suggests revising proposed amendment regarding # 13.**No changes to ET, see SFM response in FSOR.** |  |

**Chapter 12 ENERGY SYSTEMS**

Amend existing and add new sections as listed below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Number 10** | **Code Section** | **CACAction** | **Agency Response** | **Public Comments** | **Annotations** | **CBSCAction** |
| SFM 07/22-10-2 | **1207.11.4, *Table* *1207.11.4 MAXIMUM AGGREGATE RATINGS OF ESS*** | **Further Study** | **Accept** | 45-Day: J. Costello, , LA County Fire Department (LACoFD), Disapprove, Criteria #1, 3, 4 | Amendment to provide clarity for the maximum threshold of kWh of ESS for each location on a property.**CAC: FS under Criteria #6.** Recommended to revise Table 1207.11.4 footnotes (the last sentence in the footnote a) to clarify the intent of the amendment. Editorial suggestion to the same footnote is to reference California Fire Code instead of International Fire Code or to remove the reference to the code and keep section only. Suggested to modify Section 1207.11.4 amendment to remove “of the California Fire Code” from the amendment. Associated with SFM 03/22 Part 2.5, Item 9-2.**45-Day:** The proposed allowances for Energy Storage Systems (ESS) in Group R-3/R-4 occupancies are a conflict with the intent and consistency for these same ESS units when located in occupancies other than Group R-3/R-4. There is insufficient substantiation provided for a “need” to increase the maximum allowable aggregate kWh-ratings of ESS for Group R-3/R-4 occupancies. **No changes to ET, see SFM response in FSOR.** |  |