

## **International Building Code 2015 Edition – Fire Safety**

### **Public Comment:**

Section: 913.2.2 – Circuits Supplying Fire Pumps

This overly simplistic wording is in potential conflict with NFPA 70 National Electric Code. Additionally, this wording could be taken as requiring a specific product be utilized to comply with this section of the code. The wording should state, "Shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70." NFPA 70 puts forth several methods for code compliance. This new wording is more consistent with other references to NFPA contained within this code section.

### **Committee Comments:**

WY - I think it makes sense to eliminate the section as stated.

MG - I did not look up the code change proposal for 2018, but I assume this newer language is better aligned with NFPA. It seems like a reasonable modification to change to the 2018 language.

JK - This section was added and there is nothing in the 2009 code that covers the issue other than the fact the 2009 code references NFPA 20. Thus the 2009 code with the reference to the NEC covers the protection of the cables with three options, but the addition to the 2015 IBC cuts out options (1) and (2).

I don't agree with the commenter that the wording should be changed since it is adequately covered in the 2009 code, but agree that Section 913.2.2 Circuits supplying fire pumps should be eliminated since it limits protection of cables to only one of the three options available in the NEC.

KM - I agree with John the current wording limits the protection of cables supplying fire pumps. Therefore section 913.2.2 should be eliminated.

RM - Agree, section 913.2.2 should be eliminated.

CC - Agree to previous comments, section 913.2.2 should be eliminated.

WGMS – I concur with the committee sentiment that the language in the 2009 IBC is preferable to that in the 2015 IBC. In addition, I would reject the proposed modification and use the 2009 IBC language.

**Recommendation to RAC:** The committee recommends that the RAC not adopt this section and allow the 2009 IBC language to remain, and furthermore reject the proposed language modification.