

Organizations that Support Adoption of Package C

1. American Institute of Architects – Wisconsin Society
2. American Society of Civil Engineers – Wisconsin Section
3. Associated Builders and Contractors of Wisconsin
4. Associated General Contractors of Greater Milwaukee
5. Associated General Contractors of Wisconsin
6. Building Owners and Managers Association of Milwaukee
7. League of Wisconsin Municipalities
8. Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors Association of Wisconsin
9. Wisconsin Association of Consulting Engineers
10. Wisconsin Builders Association
11. Wisconsin Building Inspectors Association
12. Wisconsin Insurance Alliance
13. Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce
14. Wisconsin Realtors Association
15. American Society of Interior Designers – Wisconsin Chapter
16. National Fire Sprinkler Association
17. Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers
18. Wisconsin Fire and EMS Legislative Leadership Coalition, representing:
 - Professional Firefighters of Wisconsin
 - Wisconsin State Fire Chiefs' Association
 - Wisconsin Fire Inspectors Association
 - Wisconsin Chapter of the International Association of Arson Investigators
 - Wisconsin Society of Fire Service Instructors
 - Wisconsin State Firefighters Association
 - Wisconsin EMS Association

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – PROPOSAL C

Wisconsin Adoption of International Code Council® Codes and the National Fire Protection Association's *Fire Prevention Code*®

The following rule adoption proposal has been developed subsequent to public hearings that were held in January 2001 on a rule package which proposed to adopt four construction-related ICC codes and the ICC's *International Fire Code*®.

Chapters Comm 61 to 65 from the public hearing rule package are retained, with minor changes to accommodate editorial corrections and to reflect the technical-based hearing testimony that the Department of Commerce concluded was beneficial.

Chapter Comm 66 from the hearing package is replaced with a proposed revised chapter Comm 14. The revised Comm 14 substitutes NFPA's *Fire Prevention Code* (NFPA 1) for the fire prevention standards that are currently in Wisconsin's fire prevention code, subject to several modifications. The revised Comm 14 also includes updated administrative elements.

The most significant modification of NFPA 1 is to not apply any of the NFPA 1 design and construction requirements. This includes not applying the associated design and construction requirements from NFPA's *Life Safety Code*® (NFPA 101), which are referenced in NFPA 1. This modification is proposed as a means to avoid any conflicts with the Comm 61 to 65 design and construction requirements for new public buildings or places of employment, and any conflicts with all previous design and construction requirements for existing facilities.

A second modification is to not apply any of the NFPA 1 requirements for properties which are not public buildings or places of employment.

A third modification is to not apply the NFPA 1 chapters and sections that address topics which are currently regulated by Commerce codes other than Comm 61 to 65, such as flammable liquids in Comm 10.

Another modification is to allow municipalities to receive written approval from the Department to use the ICC's *International Fire Code* (IFC) in lieu of NFPA 1.

Consequently, except where the IFC is used in lieu of NFPA 1, Comm 14 (and the incorporated NFPA 1 and the referenced NFPA 101) would regulate all of the following:

1. The use and operation of all public buildings and places of employment, that exist on or after the effective date of the rules.
2. The inspection, testing and maintenance of all fire safety features for all public buildings and places of employment, that exist on or after the effective date of the rules.

Comm 61 to 65 (and the four incorporated ICC construction-related codes and the *International Fire Code*, as referenced in those four ICC codes) would regulate the design and construction of all public buildings and places of employment, that are built after the effective date of the rules. (The four incorporated ICC construction codes are the *International Building Code*®, the *International Energy Conservation Code*™, the *International Mechanical Code*®, and the *International Fuel Gas Code*®.)

This rule adoption alternative includes a commitment to conduct a full and open comparison of the above five ICC codes to NFPA's corresponding Consensus Codes Set, including the NFPA 5000™ Building Code, when that code set becomes available.



Standard Test Methods for Fire Tests of Building Construction and Materials¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E 119; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reappraisal. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reappraisal.

This standard has been approved for use by agencies of the Department of Defense. Consult the DoD Index of Specifications and Standards for the specific year of issue which was adopted by the Department of Defense.

INTRODUCTION

The performance of walls, columns, floors, and other building members under fire exposure conditions is an item of major importance in securing constructions that are safe, and that are not a menace to neighboring structures nor to the public. Recognition of this is registered in the codes of many authorities, municipal and other. It is important to secure balance of the many units in a single building, and of buildings of like character and use in a community; and also to promote uniformity in requirements of various authorities throughout the country. To do this it is necessary that the fire-resistive properties of materials and assemblies be measured and specified according to a common standard expressed in terms that are applicable alike to a wide variety of materials, situations, and conditions of exposure.

Such a standard is found in the methods that follow. They prescribe a standard exposing fire of controlled extent and severity. Performance is defined as the period of resistance to standard exposure elapsing before the first critical point in behavior is observed. Results are reported in units in which field exposures can be judged and expressed.

The methods may be cited as the "Standard Fire Tests," and the performance or exposure shall be expressed as "2-h," "6-h," "1/2-h," etc.

When a factor of safety exceeding that inherent in the test conditions is desired, a proportional increase should be made in the specified time-classification period.

1. Scope

1.1 The test methods described in this fire-test-response standard are applicable to assemblies of masonry units and to composite assemblies of structural materials for buildings, including bearing and other walls and partitions, columns, girders, beams, slabs, and composite slab and beam assemblies for floors and roofs. They are also applicable to other assemblies and structural units that constitute permanent integral parts of a finished building.

1.2 It is the intent that classifications shall register performance during the period of exposure and shall not be construed as having determined suitability for use after fire exposure.

1.3 *This standard should be used to measure and describe the response of materials, products, or assemblies to heat and flame under controlled conditions and should not be used to describe or appraise the fire-hazard or fire-risk of materials, products, or assemblies under actual fire conditions. However, results of the test may be used as elements of a fire-hazard*

assessment or a fire-risk assessment which takes into account all of the factors which are pertinent to an assessment of the fire hazard or fire risk of a particular end use.

NOTE 1—A method of fire hazard classification based on rate of flame spread is covered in Test Method E 84.

1.4 The results of these tests are one factor in assessing fire performance of building construction and assemblies. These test methods prescribe a standard fire exposure for comparing the performance of building construction assemblies. Application of these test results to predict the performance of actual building construction requires careful evaluation of test conditions.

1.5 The values stated in inch-pound units are to be regarded as the standard. The values given in parentheses are for information only.

1.6 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

2. Referenced Documents

- 2.1 *ASTM Standards:*
C 569 Test Method for Indentation Hardness of Preformed Thermal Insulations²

¹ These test methods are under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E-5 on Fire Standards and are the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E05.11 on Construction Assemblies.

Current edition approved April 15, 1995. Published June 1995. Originally published as C 19 - 1917 T. Last previous edition E 119 - 95.

These test methods, of which the present standard represents a revision, were prepared by Sectional Committee A2 on Fire Tests of Materials and Construction, under the joint sponsorship of the National Bureau of Standards, the ANSI Fire Protection Group, and ASTM, functioning under the procedure of the American National Standards Institute.

² Discontinued—See 1987 Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol 04.06.

of flaming, and production of smoke.

8.2 Reports of tests involving wall, floor, beam, or ceiling constructions in which restraint is provided against expansion, contraction, or rotation of the construction shall describe the method used to provide this restraint.

8.3 Reports of tests in which other than maximum load conditions are imposed shall fully define the conditions of loading used in the test and shall be designated in the title of the report of the test as a restricted load condition.

8.4 When the indicated resistance period is 1/2 h or over, determined by the average or maximum temperature rise on the unexposed surface or within the test sample, or by failure under load, a correction shall be applied for variation of the furnace exposure from that prescribed, where it will affect the classification, by multiplying the indicated period by two thirds of the difference in area between the curve of average furnace temperature and the standard curve for the first three fourths of the period and dividing the product by the area between the standard curve and a base line of 68°F (20°C) for the same part of the indicated period, the latter area increased by 54°F·h or 30°C·h (3240°F·min or 1800°C·min) to compensate for the thermal lag of the furnace thermocouples during the first part of the test. For fire exposure in the test higher than standard, the indicated resistance period shall be increased by the amount of the correction and be similarly decreased for fire exposure below standard.

NOTE 6—The correction can be expressed by the following equation:

$$C = 2I(A - A_s) / 3(A_s + L)$$

where:

- C = correction in the same units as I,
- I = indicated fire-resistance period,
- A = area under the curve of indicated average furnace temperature for the first three fourths of the indicated period,
- A_s = area under the standard furnace curve for the same part of the indicated period, and
- L = lag correction in the same units as A and A_s (54°F·h or 30°C·h (3240°F·min or 1800°C·min)).

8.5 Unsymmetrical wall assemblies may be tested with either side exposed to the fire, and the report shall indicate the side so exposed. Both sides may be tested, and the report then shall so indicate the fire endurance classification applicable to each side.

TEST SPECIMEN

9. Test Specimen

9.1 The test specimen shall be truly representative of the construction for which classification is desired, as to materials, workmanship, and details such as dimensions of parts, and shall be built under conditions representative of those obtaining as practically applied in building construction and operation. The physical properties of the materials and ingredients used in the test specimen shall be determined and recorded.

9.2 The size and dimensions of the test specimen specified herein are intended to apply for rating constructions of dimensions within the usual general range employed in buildings. If the conditions of use limit the construction to smaller dimensions, a proportionate reduction may be made

in the dimensions of the specimens for a test qualifying them for such restricted use.

9.3 When it is desired to include a built-up roof covering, the test specimen shall have a roof covering of 3-ply, 15-lb (6.8-kg) type felt not in excess of 120 lb (54 kg) per square (100 ft² (9 m²)) of hot mopping asphalt without gravel surfacing. Tests of assemblies with this covering do not preclude the field use of other coverings with a larger number of plies of felt and asphalt or with gravel surfacing.

9.4 Roofing systems designed for other than the use of built-up roof coverings shall be tested using materials and details of construction representative of field application.

CONDUCT OF FIRE TESTS

10. Fire Endurance Test

10.1 Continue the fire endurance test on the specimen with its applied load, if any, until failure occurs, or until the specimen has withstood the test conditions for a period equal to that herein specified in the conditions of acceptance for the given type of construction.

10.2 For the purpose of obtaining additional performance data, the test may be continued beyond the time the fire endurance classification is determined.

11. Hose Stream Test

11.1 Where required by the conditions of acceptance, subject a duplicate specimen to a fire exposure test for a period equal to one half of that indicated as the resistance period in the fire endurance test, but not for more than 1 h, immediately after which subject the specimen to the impact, erosion, and cooling effects of a hose stream directed first at the middle and then at all parts of the exposed face, changes in direction being made slowly.

11.2 *Exemption*—The hose stream test shall not be required in the case of constructions having a resistance period, indicated in the fire endurance test, of less than 1 h.

11.3 *Optional Program*—The submitter may elect, with the advice and consent of the testing body, to have the hose stream test made on the specimen subjected to the fire endurance test and immediately following the expiration of the fire endurance test.

11.4 *Stream Equipment and Details*—The stream shall be delivered through a 2½-in. (64-mm) hose discharging through a National Standard Playpipe of corresponding size equipped with a 1⅛-in. (28.5-mm) discharge tip of the standard-taper smooth-bore pattern without shoulder at the orifice. The water pressure and duration of application shall be as prescribed in Table 1.

11.5 *Nozzle Distance*—The nozzle orifice shall be 20 ft (6 m) from the center of the exposed surface of the test

TABLE 1 Conditions For Hose Stream Test

Resistance Period	Water Pressure at Base of Nozzle, psi (kPa)	Duration of Application, min/100 ft ² (9 m ²) exposed area
8 h and over	45 (310)	6
4 h and over if less than 8 h	45 (310)	5
2 h and over if less than 4 h	30 (207)	2½
1½ h and over if less than 2 h	30 (207)	1½
1 h and over if less than 1½ h	30 (207)	1
Less than 1 h, if desired	30 (207)	1

PRIORITIZED LISTING OF OUR REQUESTED CHANGES

1. In **IBC Table 705.4 FIRE WALL FIRE-RESISTANCE RATINGS** a reduction of the existing provisions of **Comm 51.02 (13) Fire Division walls** from a minimum of four (4) hours to two (2) hours in Group F-2, S-2, R-3 and R-4 occupancies exists. Though one might argue that the fire load in these occupancies is small and burnout of the contents might take place in an hour, this is ignoring the additional fuel supplied by the wood frame construction of building types III, IV & V. When all of these fire loads are combined, a fire duration of more than two hours is possible, leaving no factor of safety. **REQUEST: Increase the required fire resistance rating of Group F-2, S-2, R-3 & R-4 from two hour fire resistance rating to at least three (3) hours.**

2. In **IBC Table 705.4 FIRE WALL FIRE-RESISTANCE RATINGS** In Group A, B, E, H-4, I, R-1, R-2, U, three (3) hour fire walls are required; however, note "a" of the table permits the ratings to be reduced to two (2) hours in buildings of Types II and V construction. While a reduction in Type II (noncombustible) construction may have some merit since the structure does not add fuel to the fire, one should question why the reduction does not apply to Type I construction. Also, the logic of permitting the reduction in Type V (wood frame buildings) while requiring a three (3) hour rating in Type I buildings must be questioned. **REQUEST: Delete footnote "a" and combine all occupancies in the first two rows of the table with the required fire resistance rating of at least three (3) hours.**

3. In **SECTION 705 FIRE WALLS, 705.1 General**. Under this section, each portion of a building separated by one or more fire walls shall be considered a separate building. Then, under **705.6 Vertical continuity**, it states that fire walls shall extend from the foundation to a termination point at least thirty (30) inches above both adjacent roofs. Then a series of exceptions to the vertical continuity follow. In **Comm 51.02 (13) FIRE DIVISION WALLS**, no exceptions are allowed in the extension of thirty six (36) inches above the roof except in noncombustible buildings. **REQUEST: Delete exceptions 1, 2, 4, 5 & 6 of 705.6 Vertical continuity.**

4. In **SECTION 705.3 Materials**, Fire walls shall be of any approved non-combustible materials. Then allows an exception of Type V construction. Type VA Type VB (Protected and unprotected wood frame) to be of combustible construction. Since each portion of a building separated by one or more fire walls shall be considered a separate building, and since fire walls are the last line of defense in preventing fire spread from one building to another, it makes no sense to allow barriers that burn, **REQUEST: Delete the exception to IBC 705.3 Materials.**

5. In **Comm 62.1610** of the modifications to the IBC, in **Table 62.1610**, an "At-Rest Condition" column was added. Since this refers to rigid foundation walls, masonry or concrete, a conservative estimate of the added cost for this would be about \$150 per foundation and for no good reason. If the rest of the world doesn't need the extra resistance to lateral soil pressures, why does Wisconsin? Also, if the column on the At-rest Condition is added, a separate structural analysis will be needed on all foundation walls under this category, raising the costs per foundation even higher. Real problems and extra construction costs can be avoided by deleting this column. **REQUEST: Remove the At-rest Condition from Comm 62.1610.**

6. In **Comm 62.1614 Earthquake loads - general**. (1) Every structure, and portion thereof, shall as a minimum, be designed and constructed to resist the effects of earthquake motions and assigned a Seismic Design Category as set forth in IBC section 1616.3. Structures determined to be in Seismic Design Category A, and the following structures need only comply with the requirements in IBC section 1616.4. Since most or all of Wisconsin is in Seismic Design Category A, and the IBC in **Section 1620 EARTHQUAKE LOADS-DESIGN, DETAILING REQUIREMENTS AND STRUCTURAL COMPONENT LOAD EFFECTS**, excludes structures assigned to Seismic Design Category A, why does Wisconsin want to increase design costs when we most likely will never have an earthquake that would cause structural damage to buildings or injury to our citizenry. Fire, which is a very real threat to our buildings and citizens doesn't rate any concern but non-existent earthquakes do? I'm afraid we do not understand this logic! **REQUEST:** Remove all reference to Seismic Design or at least limit it to those areas in Southern Wisconsin where the minor faults occur. Why should all of our buildings throughout the state require extra design costs needlessly?

7. If we can realize the changes above, we would be in favor of adopting the ICC family of codes as presented by the Department of Commerce.

Wisconsin Concrete Masonry Association

Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
<p>High Tech Enrollments: Provide additional funding and positions for the Economic Stimulus Package, including: Allocating \$13.5 million to create programs for students majoring in high demand fields, such as MIS, biotechnology and engineering including: <u>GPR/fee total (BOR request)</u> Chippewa Valley, \$3,803,135 Green Bay, 750,000 La Crosse, 1,029,600 Oshkosh, 551,440 Parkside, 527,303 Platteville/Fox Valley, 726,704 River Falls, 374,950 Stevens Point, 2,379,309 Superior, (balance GPR/fee split) Whitewater 2,045,548 Colleges 1,300,000 Extension SBDC 940,800 134.3 FTE positions</p>	<p>Economic Stimulus Package Provide approximately \$8,312,500 GPR, \$4,237,500 fees and 74 positions biennially for selected UW Economic Stimulus initiatives. (Other GPR cuts total \$11,293,800 biennially) (Other PR reductions total \$1,175,500 biennially)</p> <p><u>GPR/fee total</u> Chippewa Valley, \$5,850,000 Green Bay, 750,000 La Crosse, Oshkosh, Parkside, Platteville/Fox Valley, 1,846,000 River Falls, 577,000 Stevens Point, Superior, Whitewater 3,077,000 Colleges Extension SBDC 450,000 74 FTE positions</p>	<p>Support full funding of the Economic Stimulus package (Senate) If the overall funding is reduced, preserve the Regents authority to allocate the funding.</p>
<p>Madison Initiative – Provide an additional \$16.2 million GPR and 45 positions.</p>	<p>No additional funding above Gov/JFC</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>
<p>Milwaukee Idea – Provide an additional \$17.5 million GPR and 120 positions.</p>	<p>No additional funding above Gov/JFC</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>
<p>STEPS - Provide an additional \$738,200 and 1.5 positions.</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>
<p>WTCS and UW Student Transfer -Provide an additional \$1,105,000 and 22.5 positions</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>
<p>Libraries - Provide an additional \$4.7 million</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>
<p>Collaborative Languages Program - Provide an additional \$857,500 GPR</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Support funding (Senate)</p>

Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
Study Abroad Scholarships - Provide an additional \$1.5 million GPR	Not included	Support funding (Senate)
Advising - Provide an additional \$1.3 million GPR, \$750,000 PR and 29.5 positions	Not included	Support funding (Senate)
Lawton and AOP - Increase funding by 7% in each year and link annual increases to the average tuition increase. \$1.5 million	Not included	Support funding (Senate)
WATF funded technology items – retain \$6.5 million in funding for Learning Innovations, Internet 2 and ADL-CoLab. Delete \$750,000 for wireless networking and L.I.	WATF – delete all funding, except \$500,000 for digital mammography machine.	Support funding (Senate)
PR Positions - Allow the UW Board of Regents to create program revenue positions.	PR Positions - Allow the UW Board of Regents to create program revenue positions.	Support agreement of both houses

Other Items

Solid and Hazardous Waste Education Centers - Restore funding and 4 positions; also require UWEX to work with DNR to perform reviews of 5% of the responsible units each year.	SHWEC – Restored 2 positions and \$337,000 SEG-PR.	Support restoration of 4.5 FTE
Forestry Demonstration and Education Center \$400,000 in SEG to multiple partners to develop the Forestry Demonstration and Education Center in Milwaukee. UWEX is a partner.	Forestry Demonstration and Education Center \$400,000 in SEG to multiple partners to develop the Forestry Demonstration and Education Center in Milwaukee. UWEX is a partner.	Neutral
Woodland Manager Leadership. \$50,000 SEG to UWEX to develop educational programs focusing on woodland manager techniques and leadership.	Woodland Manager Leadership. \$50,000 SEG to UWEX to develop educational programs focusing on woodland manager techniques and leadership.	Neutral

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT
 Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
Senate Initiatives		
<p>LTE - Create a two-year pilot and 100 FTE positions at UW-Madison to address the use of long-term LTEs. Require that LTE's at Madison receive paid vacation and sick leave.</p>		<p>Support positions and pilot program. Oppose providing sick leave and vacation for all LTE's at UW-Madison.</p>
<p>Undocumented students – allow those who have graduated from a Wisconsin high school and meet all other requirements for resident tuition to be eligible for resident tuition.</p>		<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Pharmacy Internship Board – Abolish on 12/31/01 and reallocate \$110,000/yr. from UW System to DOA for WI Patient Safety Institute. Responsibility for pharmacy internship program remains with Board of Regents.</p>	<p>Pharmacy Internship Board – Abolish on 12/31/01 and reallocate \$110,000/yr. from UW System to DOA for WI Patient Safety Institute. Responsibility for pharmacy internship program transferred to Dept. of Regulation and Licensing.</p>	<p>Support Assembly. Internship program should be overseen by Pharmacy Examining Board at DRL, not UW.</p>
<p>Economic Development Study - Provide \$300,000 for a study by the Center for Economic Development at UW Milwaukee of Fond du Lac Avenue corridor</p>		<p>Unopposed if funded.</p>
<p>Management Intensive Grazing - \$100,000 (PR) annually for the next six years to UWEX for the multi-agency land and water education grant program for grants to producers interested in grazing and nutrient management.</p>	<p>Not included</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>UWSP College of Natural Resources -Designate as Watershed Center.</p>		<p>Neutral</p>
<p>UW Hospital Authority Board – Conflict of interests prohibited. No member of the board may hold interest in, be employed by, or affiliated with a person providing goods and services to the authority.</p>		<p>Oppose – The restriction is overly broad and board members are already covered by state ethics laws.</p>

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT

Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
Assembly Initiatives		
	<p>WTCS Transfer - Require all four-year UW campuses to accept all WTCS general education courses and courses in the credit transfer initiatives between the UW and WTCS. Allow Legislative standing committees to permit exceptions.</p> <p>Fuel and utilities - Cut the UW System funding increase by 20%, a \$4.3 million GPR cut.</p> <p>Auxiliary Reserves - Cut \$5 million over the biennium from institutional balances.</p> <p>GPR Cut - Tuition Increase - Cut GPR funding by \$6.0 million and replace with an out-of-state tuition increase of 2.5 percent per year above the Board of Regents increase.</p>	<p>Oppose - The UW System already accepts 21 general education credits, most WTCS associate degrees only require 15 general ed. credits.</p> <p>Oppose - there is no assurance that the JFC would appropriate these funds in a.s.13.10</p> <p>Oppose - student fees would likely have to be raised to cover this loss as funds are planned for existing expenses.</p> <p>Oppose - Out of state tuition is already high. Madison and Milwaukee have the 2nd highest in their peer groups. The comprehensives have the 6th highest of 33 in their peer group. Students may go elsewhere in which case the revenue will not appear.</p>
	<p>Memberships - Require agencies to reduce funding for memberships by 20%.</p>	<p>Oppose - many university memberships are critical to accreditation and faculty quality.</p>
	<p>Drivers Education - Eliminate the Drivers Education program (\$123,800)</p>	
	<p>Ag. Initiative - Transfer \$250,000 funding to WISARD (GPR Lapse)</p>	
	<p>Humanities Council - Provide a \$50,000 grant.</p>	

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT

Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
	<p>Credits-to-Degree - Require the UW System to ensure that at least 70 percent of undergraduate majors can be completed with 124 credits or less.</p> <p>Tuition Flexibility - Provide the Board of Regents with full tuition flexibility</p>	<p>Oppose – Credit requirements are critical to national accreditation</p> <p>Not requested in this biennium by the Regents because of existing flexibility.</p> <p>Oppose – The PK-16 Council has just been launched by DPI, WTCS, WAICU and UW System. This commission would be redundant.</p>
	<p>Post Secondary Education Commission - Require a study of the creation of a commission that would be responsible for providing a comprehensive and coordinated statutory and policy framework for all post secondary education and training.</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Tax Credit - Incorporate Assembly Bill 320, that provides a business education tax credit to be effective July 1, 2003.</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Selective Service - Incorporate Assembly Bill 243, that restricts state employment and student financial aid based on failure to register</p>	<p>Amend: the state should follow the federal process in which final determination of non-compliance rests with the financial aid office based on their review of the information letter provided by selective service.</p>
	<p>EdVest - Incorporate Assembly Bill 298 relating to the "grandparents deduction."</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>Vehicle Fleet - Combine the mechanics personnel of the DOA and UW fleet (may/may not reduce funding by \$151,400 annually.) Provide only funding for Subcompacts.</p>	<p>Oppose if funding is cut. Funding will still be required to perform the maintenance, whether done by DOA or UW.</p>
	<p>Positions – Eliminate any 100% GPR funded position that has been vacant for more than 6 months as of 7/1/01. An agency may move the position to another funding source.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT
 Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
	<p>Positions – Require UW/other PR funded agencies to lapse any savings resulting from the Supreme Court retirement decision to the general fund.</p> <p>Employees – Eliminate public employees length of service payments.</p>	<p>Oppose – In addition to being impossible to calculate, retirement savings should be used to hire new faculty and staff.</p> <p>Oppose any reductions in employee benefits making it difficult to retain employees</p>
	<p>Pay Plan – Provide a pay increase of 0% in 2001-02 and 2% in 2002-03 for classified staff</p>	<p>Oppose – insufficient to attract and retain employees</p>
	<p>Stem Cell Research – Ban the use of human embryos and fetal body parts including cells from research. Allow the use of embryos in existence before 1/1/02</p>	<p>Oppose – this ban would limit potential life saving research be conducted at UW-Madison. Currently, no public funds are going to fund this research.</p>
	<p>Domestic Abuse – ensure that medical students are trained in dealing with domestic abuse.</p>	
	<p>Sex Offender Notification – require institutions to notify students upon request if a sex offender is a student or employee on campus.</p>	
	<p>Health Services – Prohibit organizations that engage in abortion-related activities from receiving public funds for pregnancy programs extending protections under the conscience clause laws.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT
 Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
Higher Education Aids Board		
<p>Study - Require the DOA to undertake a study of the development of a tuition grant program that provides state payment of two years of postsecondary education.</p>		Neutral
<p>WHEG - Provide a 7% annual increase for WHEG for UW students; 4.5% for WTCS students; 3.0% for private school students, and link annual WHEG increases for the UW, WTCS and the minority undergraduate retention grant to the average annual tuition increase</p>	<p>WHEG - Provide a 2% annual increase for WHEG for UW, WTCS and private school students</p>	Support 7% annual increases and linking to future tuition increases (Senate)
<p>Nursing Loans - Provide \$25,000 to HEAB for the loan forgiveness program for nurses that remain in Wisconsin upon graduation.</p>	<p>Provide \$450,000 in a new nursing loan program.</p>	Neutral
Department of Public Instruction		
<p>Precollege Scholarships - Increase by \$900,000 the scholarship money available for precollege attendance.</p>		Support
Building Commission		
<p>All Agency Funds - Approve the recommendations of the Building Commission and restore \$79.1 million general fund supported borrowing to the 2001-03 Building Program for repair & maintenance</p>	<p>Restore \$25 M General Fund Supported Borrowing to the 2001-03 biennium for repair/maintenance.</p>	Support recommendation of Governor and Building Commission (Senate)
<p>Enumerate other BioSTAR Initiative projects at total funding level of \$290 million, including \$140.5 million in general fund supported general obligation bonding beyond the 2001-03 biennium, using the Building Commission's schedule of debt</p>	<p>No increase beyond JFC action.</p>	Support recommendation of Governor and Building Commission (Senate)

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT
 Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
authorization.	Utility Service Study: Directs Building Commission to hire a consultant to ensure PR facilities are paying fair share of utility costs.	Neutral.

Building Program

Restore \$40 million in general fund supported bonding for facilities maintenance and repair projects at UW campuses for the 2003-05 biennium.	No action.	Support recommendation of Governor and Building Commission (Senate)
Provide bonding revenue to construct a new asphalt parking lot for a new baseball field and seating stadium at the UW-Parkside .	No action.	Neutral
Public broadcasting - Maintain current law regarding to operational structure for public broadcasting.	Retained creation of a new private governing board.	Support current law (Senate)
	Delete equipment budgets from major projects that use GPR bonding. Instead, use Master Lease program paid from operating funds. Bonding reduction of approx. \$7.6 M to \$8.8 M for UW System. (\$-14.4 M for all agencies)	Support recommendation of Governor, Building Commission, and JFC.
	Reduce Systemwide Classroom Improvements by \$2M GPR Bonding (to new total of \$8 M)	Support Recommendation of Governor and Building Commission and JFC
	UW-Stevens Point Fine Arts Center: Increase gifts by \$250,000; reduce project by \$4,459,800; move project into 03-05 biennium.	Support recommendation of Governor and Building Commission and JFC
	UW-Milwaukee Klotsche Phy Ed Addition/Remodeling: Increase gifts by \$500,000.	Support recommendation of Governor and Building Commission and JFC.

DRAFT UW System: Comparison of Senate and Assembly Budget Proposals DRAFT
 Changes in each house are to the Joint Finance Committee version of the budget

Senate Version	Assembly Version	System Position
	UW-Madison Mechanical Engineering, Phase 1: Move project to 2003-05, and include Phase 2 funding. (-\$6.5 M GPR in 01-03, +\$23 M in 03-05)	OK to move to 03-05 (Assembly)
	UW-Milwaukee Lapham Science Renovation (\$9.9M): reduce by \$858,000 GPR	Support recommendation of Governor, Building Commission and JFC.
	UW-Madison: Delete Golf Course Expansion (\$15.5M Gifts/PR)	Support recommendation of Governor, Building Commission and JFC.
	UW-Superior Health/Wellness Center: delete project (\$13.4M GPR and \$2.4M Gifts/PR)	Support recommendation of Governor, Building Commission and JFC.

Legislature

Require Legislative Council to create a study committee to examine how the state's research universities, business community and state government can foster economic development within the state to assist and develop scientific and technology-based industry.		Neutral
--	--	---------

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 16, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: 201 West Washington Ave., Room 3B

CITY: Madison

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
MICHAEL MCGREAL	FIREDYNE ENGINEERING, R.	TINLEY PARK, IL			✓
EP BUCKRIGER	MADISON FIRE DEPT	MADISON WI	✓		
MARCIA CARLSON	UW MADISON / FPPM	MADISON WI			✓
LARRY CORNELLIER JR	PYRO SALES INC.	Clinton WI		✓	
PRADIP P. TOLAT	STATE OF WI / DOA / DFD	MADISON - WI			✓
LARRY CORNELLIER SR	CONNELLY FIREWORK CO.	Beloit Wis		✓	
JOHN MIEUKE	ABC OF WI	MADISON	✓		
Mark Haggerty	Prairie du Chien Fire	Prarie du Chien WI		✓	
THOMAS WEBER	MIDDLETON FIRE DISTRICT	MIDDLETON WI			✓
WARREN BAUER	AIA WIS. & POTTER LAWSON INC	MADISON, WI	✓		
WILLIAM SETHENBURG	BOON INTERVENTIONS	Country Club Hills IL	✓		
JOE HEIMSCHE	CITY OF WATERTOWN				✓
Henry K. BUTTS	FIRE DEPT. CITY OF WATERTOWN	WATERTOWN, WI			-
Timothy A Resnussen	Howard Fire Dept	Green Bay WI			✓
JIM DOLAN	BOA / ICA				✓
BILL BALSACK	AIA WISCONSIN	Madison	✓		
ROBERT SHIPLEY	AIA WISCONSIN	MADISON	✓		
David Seane	DHFS	MADISON			✓
David Bloom	Town of Madison Fire Dept	Madison WI		✓	
Sheel Gertlach	State Farm Insurance	Madison, WI			

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 16, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: 201 West Washington Ave., Room 3B

CITY: Madison

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
Gunnar Bergersen	Wis Fire Works Assoc	Madison			✓
Joe Strahl	WEP PFFW	MADISON	✓		
AMY HASSEMAN	KNAPP-SCHMIDT ATTORNEYS	MADISON	✓		
SANDY GORDON	WIS-CHAPTER ASID	MADISON	✓		
Chet Gerlach	State Farm Insurance	Madison			✓
Jim Coulter	AOC of Wis	Madison	✓		
TIMOTHY PENNO	ELECTRIC COMPANIES ASSN	MILWAUKEE			✓
Karolyn Beebe	concerned citizen	Madison			✓
SKIP SHARPE	TOWNSHIP OF BROOKFIELD FD	BROOKFIELD		✓	
RANDALL SELNOW	OREGON AREA FIRE-EMTS	OREGON, W		✓	
ROSS DEPAOLA	INTEGRATED ENERGY SERVICES	MADISON WI	✓		
LINDA GRUBB	CITY OF MADISON	" "			✓
HARRY SALZER	" "	" "			✓
Dennis Allen	City of Sun Prairie	Sun Prairie WI			✓
BRADLEY LIGGETT	CITY OF BELoit FIRE DEPT	BELoit WI		✓	
Greg Hanson	Temp. Sust. Inc	MADISON WI	✓		
Sigm Shephard	Alliant Energy	Madison / Fond du Lac			✓
ZORBA NOMAOMA	Alliant Energy	Madison			✓
JENNIFER HARGRELL	Daily Reporter	Madison			✓
Mike Beckman	City of Burlington F.F.S.	Burlington WI			✓

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73 DATE: January 16, 2001
 RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings TIME: 9:30 AM
 LOCATION: 201 West Washington Ave., Room 3B CITY: Madison

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing for		
			Support	Opposition	Information
ROBERT STEDMAN	CITY OF WAUKESHA Fire Dept	WAUKESHA, WI		X	
Kevin L Timm	City of Two Rivers Fire Dept	Two Rivers, WI		X	
Eugene R. Reese Jr.	Wisconsin Fire Inspectors Assn.	Appleton, WI		X	
Tom Sykora	67th Assembly Rep	Chippewa Falls, WI			X

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 18, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Turtleback Conference Center

CITY: Rice Lake

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
Walter Hoyey	City of Ashland/WI Fire Chiefs	Ashland WI		X	
Walt Hoyey	City of Washburn/WI Fire Chiefs	Washburn		X	
Gary A. Fujlas	Alhona Fire Dept. - Fire Inspector	Alhona, WI			X
Sahet Harter	City of Eau Claire Fire	Eau Claire, WI		X	
Jeff Amo	BLACK NUMM FACES FIRE CHIEF	BLACK NUMM FACES, WI		X	
ROBERT STEDMAN	CITY OF WAUKESHA FIRE DEPT	WAUKESHA, WI		X	
Lyle V. Koerner Jr.	City of Eau Claire Fire Dept	Eau Claire			X
Ron CHRISTENSON	TITAN AIRE INC	OSSEO, WI	X		
Tony Bower	Chippewa Falls Fire & Emergency Service	Chippewa Falls, WI		X	
Jack Running	Township F.D.	Eau Claire, WI		X	
RANDALL MATSON	THE TURKEY STORE CO.	PRYOR, WI			X
MARK YOUNG	CITY OF SUPERIOR WI	SUPERIOR WI	X		
Dennis Nivarel	Rice Lake Fire Dept.	Rice Lake, WI		X	
BARRY KUENKEL	Cumberland Fire Dist.	Cumberland WI		X	
David Bloem	WI State Fire Chiefs Assoc	Madison WI		X	
Paul H. Miller	self	Howard WI			X
Dawn P. Ferguson	NORTHWARDS Apen. Assoc	RICE LAKE WI	X		X
Jim Solheid	City of Chetek	Chetek	X		
JAMES RICE	Red Kargin Corp	Cumberland	X		

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 23, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: State Office Building

CITY: Green Bay

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
PAUL HANLON	New London Fire Dept	New London WI			
SIM KROWERZ	MAINTENANCE FIRE DEPT	MANITOWOC WI		✓	
ROBERT STEDMANN	CITY OF WAUKESHA FIRE DEPT.	WAUKESHA, WI		✓	
GREGG CLEVELAND	WI STATE FIRE CHIEFS	MARSHFIELD, WI		✓	
SIM STORMEN	WI STATE FIREFIGHTERS	PICKEREL WI		✓	
SIM DOAN	ICL				
Eugene Perronne	Cascade Fire Dept	Cascade WI		✓	
GARY DASKER	Eastern WI Fire Extn	WALDO WI		✓	
LeRoy KENNING	SUBWAY CO. FIRE CHIEFS	Plymouth, WI		✓	
JOHN E BAKES	Wisconsin Fire Dept. Sherburne			✓	
DAN GENIGER	NATIONAL FIRE SPRINKLER ASSN	WHITE FISH BAY, WI	✓		
Norbert Buresz	"	MILWAUKEE, WI	✓		
Randy Pinchard	Village Denmark	Green Bay WI			✓
Todd Bushmaker	Two Rivers Fire Dept	Two Rivers WI		✓	
FRANK M. KOHL AIA	KLOIBER & Assoc. Architects	GB	✓		
JEFF JANSEN	KLOIBER & ASSOC ARCHITECTS	GREEN BAY, WI	✓		
David Bloom	GREEN BAY FIRE DEPT.	GREEN BAY, WI		✓	
DANIEL J. ROARTY	WI State Fire Chiefs Assoc	Madison WI		✓	
ROB WATSON	DIMENSION II	GREEN BAY, WI	✓		
MELANIE PARMA	SOMERVILLE INC	GB, WI			✓
	SOMERVILLE INC.	GB, WI			✓

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 23, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: State Office Building

CITY: Green Bay

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
LARRY WIEST	CITY OF GREEN BAY	GREEN BAY, WI			X
MIKE ALPHE	CITY OF DECATO	DECATO, WI			X
LEO COETRIGHT	PACE CORP. - APPLETON	APPLETON WI			X
Tommy W. Lisen	App Green Bay Fire	Green Bay		X	
R. Kiser	Dept of Commerce	Appleton		X	
Dick Tilling	Grand Chute Fire	Grand Chute		X	
Larry Wilson	Green Bay Fire	Green Bay		X	
DANIEL GINSBACH	WISCONSIN FIRE	WISCONSIN		X	
Ken Kopp	Nekoosa Fire Dept	Nekoosa WI		X	
Sandy Topp	Options for Independent Living	Green Bay	X		X
John Messner	"	Green Bay	X		X
David Messner	City of Kaukauna				
GERALD KOCKEN	KOCKEN & ASSOCIATES	DEPERE WI	X		
PETE KUEHN	D.J. BOLD CONSTRUCTION	APPLETON, WI			X
CURTIS W. ALIESTE	VIERBICHER & ASSOCIATES ENGINEERS/ARCHITECTS/WI				
Keith Kiesow	Town of Menasha Fire Dept.	Menasha, WI			X
Neil Cameron	Appleton Fire Dept	Appleton, WI			X

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 25, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Waukesha County Technical College, Room B0201

CITY: Pewaukee

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
LAWRENCE J. WOLKI	WAUKESHA FIRE DEPT	WAUKESHA WI		X	
JEFF BERRY	Waukegan Fire Dept	Waukegan WI		X	
DEL VARECH	BEAVER DAM FIRE DEPT	BEAVER DAM, WI		X	
David Bloom	WI State Fire Chiefs Assoc	Madison, WI		X	
Gary Streicher	West Allis Fire Dept	West Allis		X	
JIM ZADDEL	WEST ALLIS FIRE DEPT.	WEST ALLIS WI		X	
John & Patricia R	EAGLE Fire Dept	EAGLE WI		X	
Paul D. Coats	American Forest & Paper Assoc.	Johnst, IL	X		
BRUCE ERICKSON	WAUKESHA CO ASSOC OF FIRE CHIEFS	SUSSEX WI		X	
AUSS SPAHN	GREENFIELD F. D.	GREENFIELD, WI		X	
Jerry Hammernik	Oak Creek F.D.	Oak Creek WI		X	
Tom Schlei	WCTC Fire Training	Pewaukee WI		X	
Bob Schumacher	Am. Society of Civil Engineers	Milw. WI		X	
Kevin Biern	Pewaukee Fire	Pew. WI		X	
Phil Fierz	WAUKESHA FIRE	WAUKESHA WI		X	
BILL SCHUMBERG	BOKS INTERNATIONAL	Brookfield, WI	X		
SKIP SHARPE	TOWNSHIP OF BROOKFIELD F.D.	BROOKFIELD, WI		X	
DAVID TRINKNER	ARCHITECTURE 2000	MILWAUKEE WI	X		
JEFF GOTHMAN	State Senator Margaret Farrow	Pewaukee			X
Luiza Winters	Interior Design Coalition of WI	Cedarburgs			X

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 25, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Waukesha County Technical College, Room B0201

CITY: Pewaukee

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
DAN NOWAK	CITY OF OAK CREEK	OAK CREEK, WI	X		
PAUL WANK	WCMA	SUSSEX, WI		X	
ART JCOGA	WSFSI	RACINE, WI		X	
Mike Boehmer	City of Burlington FD	Burlington, WI		X	
Wm F RAUSCH	Thiensville Vol. F.D.	Thiensville, WI		X	
Jim CREGAN	RAISERD vol F DEPARTMENT	RAISERD, WI		X	
JAMES A. POENBERG	CITY OF MEQUON-FIRE DEPT	Mequon, WI		X	
CURTIS WITZLUB	" " " "	" "		X	
Jeff Weiss	Miller-Weyers-Krueger	Lenoxa, WI		X	
RON BERTZKE	NEW BERLIN F.D.	NEW BERLIN, WI		X	
GARY PEDDON	GREENDALE F.D.	GREENDALE, MI, WI			X
STEVEN MARSSES	AUTOMATIC FIRE	BROOKFIELD			X
DAVID T. EROMANN	GREENDALE FIRE	GREENDALE		X	
PETE CASPERATH	GREENDALE F.D.	GREENDALE		X	
DAVID KAKATSEH	CITY OF MILWAUKEE	MILWAUKEE	X		
CHRIS RUSTE	" "	MILWAUKEE	X		
Ray HOLZMANN	CITY OF WAUKESHA	WAUKESHA	X		
JOHN NEDZGA	CITY OF BROOKFIELD	BROOKFIELD	X		
John Block	" "	BROOKFIELD	X		
Tom NOWAK	CITY OF HOUNSATA F.D.	HOUNSATA	X		

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73 DATE: January 25, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Waukesha County Technical College, Room B0201 CITY: Pewaukee

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
RANDALL SELLNOW	OREGON AREA FIRE-EMS	OREGON WI		X	
W. SCOTT SAZUKA	BURG INSPR VILLAGE OF GREENDALE	GREENDALE, WI	X		
BRUCE ROBERTS	Wauwatosa Fire	Wauwatosa WI		X	
JEFF KOFFIE	MUKWAGO FIRE	MUKWAGO WI		X	
JOHN KLINGSO	Eagle Fire Dept	EAGLE WI		X	
Brian Charlesworth	Waukesha Fire Dept	Waukesha WI		X	
RUBEN STEDMAN	CITY OF WAUKESHA FID	WAUKESHA, WI		X	
Richard Ompereil	SOUTH MIDWAUKEE FID	SOUTH MIDWAUKEE WI		X	
Roland Poppy	Greenfield FID	Greenfield		X	
Dave Bublitz	Franklin F.I.D.	Franklin WI		X	
RICHARD DEANIZ	CUDAHY FID	CUDAHY WI		X	
Dean Redman	WAYWATOSA FID	WAYWATOSA, WI		X	
MATT YINTER	Pewaukee F.I.D.	Pewaukee WI		X	
PANDORA BENDER	MILWAUKEE	MILWAUKEE		X	
Bill Wall	ICBO	Fansas City, MO	X		
ROBERT MEREC	VILLAGE OF CRAFTON				
Larry Jedd	Rainier Fire Dept.	Rainier			
JOHN EASON	SELF	OREGON WI	X		
LIMOTHY PENNO	ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSN	MILWAUKEE			
Kevin Keith	Delafield Fire	Delafield WI		X	

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73

DATE: January 25, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings

TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Waukesha County Technical College, Room B0201

CITY: Pewaukee

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
<u>Brian Kober</u>	<u>Village of Jackson</u>	<u>Jackson WI 53031</u>	<u>X</u>		
<u>HARRIET WEISS, AISTD</u>	<u>Interior Design Coalition of WI</u>	<u>Milwaukee, WI</u>	<u>X</u>		
<u>Chris Schoenbeck</u>	<u>Sprinkler Fitters Local 183</u>	<u>MILWAUKEE, WI</u>			<u>-</u>
<u>Steve Jendusa</u>	<u>Local 1848, Oak Creek FF</u>	<u>Oak Creek WI</u>		<u>X</u>	
<u>Charles Witty</u>	<u>Town of Mt. Pleasant</u>	<u>Town of Mt. Pleasant</u>		<u>X</u>	
<u>Scott Blubert</u>	<u>Commonly Architects</u>	<u>MILWAUKEE</u>	<u>X</u>		
<u>Colleen M. Leuen</u>	<u>Sussex Fire Dept.</u>	<u>Sussex WI</u>			<u>-</u>
<u>Mike Wojewski</u>	<u>Greendale Fire</u>			<u>X</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD

RULE NO.: Chs. Comm 4, 14, 16, 50 to 64, 66, 69, and 73 DATE: January 25, 2001

RELATING TO: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings TIME: 10:00 AM

LOCATION: Waukesha County Technical College, Room B0201 CITY: Pewaukee

Name	Representation (Business, Assoc., Group, Self, etc.)	City and State	Appearing in Support	Appearing in Opposition	Appearing for Information
THOMAS R. JOHNSON	VILLAGE OF GRAFTON	GRAFTON, WI	X		
FREDERICK BAUMGART	CITY OF FRANKLIN	FRANKLIN, WI	X		
D. WHEATON	CITY OF WAUKATOSA	WAUKATOSA	X		
JOHN DAVIS	CITY OF BROOKFIELD FD	BROOKFIELD, WI		X	
DEMON'S HILL ROAD	CITY OF BROOKFIELD FD	BROOKFIELD, WI		X	
Carl Wastayto	Public	Madison, WI	X		

Comparison of IFC 2000, Wisconsin's Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66, and NFPA 1 2000 Automatic Sprinkler Threshold Requirements

Different occupancies require automatic fire sprinkler systems at different times. Wisconsin Comm 50-64 for example has different thresholds for where an automatic sprinkler system must be installed in the different types of occupancies it defines. The International Fire Code (IFC) and the Fire Prevention Code NFPA 1, also have different threshold requirements for the occupancies that they define. The purpose of this comparison table is to identify the differences between the requirements of these three codes and their respective occupancies regarding where a sprinkler system must be installed; and ultimately to identify what changes would occur in Wisconsin Code if either the IFC or NFPA 1 were adopted as the base document for the fire prevention code in the state of Wisconsin.

There are three main situations common among the three codes that are used to trigger the use of an automatic sprinkler system. One trigger occurs when the building in question reaches a certain height. The codes list a threshold height at which the building must be protected with an automatic sprinkler system. The second common trigger among the three codes is occupant load. The codes list a threshold number of people that may be in the occupancy in question at which point the building must be protected with an automatic sprinkler system. The third and final common trigger is floor area. The codes list a square footage threshold at which point an automatic sprinkler system is required for the building.

The Sprinkler Threshold Table is divided up by occupancy so the differences between Wisconsin Code, the IFC, and NFPA 1 can be seen more clearly. The sprinkler thresholds (using the three common categories listed above) are listed occupancy by occupancy, comparing all three codes for each occupancy. The occupancies defined by Wisconsin Code, the IFC, and NFPA 1 do not match up exactly; for this reason, notes are added to the table when necessary as well as an additional document located at the end of the table (pages 34-36) that lists exceptional thresholds that do not fall under a common category for the three codes.

Finally, there is a document (pages 37-44) that summarizes the material from the Sprinkler Threshold Table from the point of view of Wisconsin code. This document is also divided up by the type of occupancy. The purpose of this summary outline is to show how Wisconsin code would change its sprinkler thresholds if either the IFC or NFPA 1 were adopted. For each occupancy, a listing of revised sprinkler triggers that would occur if the IFC were adopted is listed, and a listing of revised sprinkler triggers that would occur if NFPA 1 were adopted is listed.

Introduction

This comparison shows where and when automatic sprinkler systems are required in the International Fire Code (IFC), pertinent Wisconsin codes (Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66), and NFPA 1 (which adopts NFPA 101). There are 3 major categories used to more easily show what triggers the use of automatic sprinklers in the 3 different codes. The categories are building height, occupant load, and floor area. The comparison is guided by the 26 occupancy groups defined by the IFC. Each IFC occupancy is then followed by comparable Wisconsin and NFPA 1 occupancies on the same page to make for a clearer comparison. An additional column is added for other requirements, exceptions, and comments because not all of the sprinkler requirements fall strictly under the 3 chosen criteria.

Here is an example comparison:

Example Table				
Occupancy	Maximum Height of Building Before Sprinklers are Required	Maximum Occupant Load in Building Before Sprinklers Are Required	Maximum Floor Area in Square Feet Before Sprinklers are Required	Other Requirements, Exceptions, or Comments
IFC Example	3 stories	No requirement	5,000*	*Sample explanation or exception
Wisconsin Example	No requirement	No requirement	No requirement	Automatic sprinkler systems are required in all Wisconsin "Example" occupancies.
NFPA 1 Example	N/A	N/A	N/A	

- An asterisk(*) will be used to guide the reader to the comment column for an important exception, explanation, or reference.
- If an explanation or exception is too lengthy for the purposes of this table, a code section may be referenced for further study.
- "No requirement" indicates that the occupancy does not require sprinklers based on the 1 specific category.
- If all columns list "No requirement," this does not necessarily mean that this occupancy has no sprinkler requirements, it would indicate that the occupancy in question does not require sprinklers based on the 3 chosen criteria. In our example, The Wisconsin example occupancy has "No requirement" listed in all 3 columns, however, if you look at the comment column, you will see that sprinklers are required throughout the entire occupancy regardless of building height, occupant load, or floor area.
- "N/A" is used when a code does not define a comparable occupancy or the defined occupancy cannot realistically have sprinklers installed (e.g. outdoor stadium).
- At the end of this document, there is a page of additional sprinkler requirements that would not fit logically into the tabulated comparison.

**Table of Contents by Occupancy for Comparison of IFC, Wisconsin Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66, and NFPA 1
Automatic Sprinkler Threshold Requirement**

IFC Occupancies	Page	Wisconsin Occupancies	Page(s)	NFPA 1 Occupancies	Page(s)
Assembly Group A-1	4	Factories, Offices, and Mercantile Buildings	10, 12, 13 and 21	New Assembly	4, 6, 7 and 9
Group A-2	6	Theaters and Assembly Halls	4, 6, 7, and 9	Existing Assembly	5, 6, 8 and 9
Group A-3	7	Schools and Other Places of Instruction	11	New Educational	11
Group A-4	9	Residential Occupancies	23 and 28	Existing Educational	11
Group A-5	9	One- and Two-Family Dwellings	27	New Health Care	18
Business Group B	10	Multifamily Dwellings	25	Existing Health Care	18
Educational Group E	11	Health Care Facilities	18	New Detention and Correctional	19
Factory Group F-1	12	Detention and Correctional Facilities	19	Existing Detention and Correctional	19
Group F-2	13	Hazardous Occupancies	14, 15, and 16	New Hotels and Dormitories	23
High-Hazard Group H-1	14	CBRF's	17 and 28	Existing Hotels and Dormitories	23
Group H-2	14	Child Day Care Facilities	20	New Apartment Buildings	25
Group H-3	15	Storage [Comm 52.013 (6)]	29 and 31	Existing Apartment Buildings	26
Group H-4	15			Lodging or Rooming Houses	24
Group H-5	16			One- and Two-Family Dwellings	27
Institutional Group I-1	17			New Residential Board and Care	17 and 28
Group I-2	18			Existing Residential Board and Care	17 and 28
Group I-3	19			New Mercantile	22
Group I-4	20			Existing Mercantile	22
Mercantile Group M	21			New Business	10
Residential Group R-1	23			Existing Business	10
Group R-2	25			Industrial	12 and 13
Group R-3	27			Storage	30 and 32
Group R-4	28			New Day-Care	20
Storage Group S-1	29			Existing Day-Care	20
Group S-2	31				
Miscellaneous Group U	33				

**Comparison of IFC, Wisconsin Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66, and NFPA 1
Automatic Sprinkler Threshold Requirements**

Occupancy	Maximum Height of Building Before Sprinklers are Required	Maximum Occupant Load in Building Before Sprinklers Are Required	Maximum Floor Area in Square Feet Before Sprinklers are Required	Other Requirements, Exceptions, or Comments
<p>IFC Group A-1 903.2.1.1 Assembly uses, usually with fixed seating, intended for the production and viewing of the performing arts or motion pictures.</p>	1 story	300	12,000	Automatic sprinkler systems are also required in every building containing a multi-theater complex. 903.2.1.1.
<p>Wisconsin Theaters and Assembly Halls Comm 55</p>	60 feet	No requirement*	No requirement	<p>*Comm 55.02 contains a table entitled Maximum Capacities which lists maximum occupant loads for theaters and assembly halls dependent upon Type of construction, whether or not sprinkler protection exists, and whether or not a stage is present. See section 52.012 (4) for requirements on sprinklers for stage areas requiring proscenium separations.</p>
<p>NFPA 1 New Assembly NFPA 101 12.3.5</p> <p>Note: NFPA 101 has 1 new assembly occupancy group, there are no subdivisions within this occupancy. All sprinkler requirements for the different assembly groups of the IFC and Wisconsin code may be compared to the requirements of NFPA 101 section 12.3.5.</p>	75 feet	300	No requirement	<p>See Section 12.3.5 for further provisions and exceptions concerning sprinkler protection for new assemblies. See Section 12.4.4 for high-rise requirements.</p>

**Comparison of IFC, Wisconsin Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66, and NFPA 1
Automatic Sprinkler Threshold Requirements**

Occupancy	Maximum Height of Building Before Sprinklers are Required	Maximum Occupant Load in Building Before Sprinklers are Required	Maximum Floor Area in Square Feet Before Sprinklers are Required	Other Requirements, Exceptions, or Comments
<p>NFPA 1 Existing Assembly NFPA 101 13.3.5.1 (continued from previous page)</p> <p>Note: NFPA 101 has 1 existing assembly occupancy group, there are no subdivisions within this occupancy. All sprinkler requirements for the different assembly groups of the IFC and Wisconsin code may be compared to the requirements of NFPA 101 section 13.3.5.1.</p>	75 feet	No requirement	No requirement	Section 13.4.4 requires automatic sprinkler systems in high-rise buildings that house assembly occupancies in high-rise portions of the building and all levels below.

**Comparison of IFC, Wisconsin Comm 20-25, 50-64, 66, and NFPA 1
Automatic Sprinkler Threshold Requirements**

Occupancy	Maximum Height of Building Before Sprinklers are Required	Maximum Occupant Load in Building Before Sprinklers Are Required	Maximum Floor Area in Square Feet Before Sprinklers are Required	Other Requirements, Exceptions, or Comments
IFC Group A-2 903.2.1.2 Assembly uses intended for food and/or drink consumption.	1 story	300 for restaurants	5,000 for restaurants	
Wisconsin Restaurants, Night Clubs, and Dance Halls Comm 55 and 52.013 (4)	60 feet	1,000 for restaurants 300 for dance halls and nightclubs.	12,000 for restaurants 5,000 for dance halls and nightclubs.	
NFPA 1 New Assembly NFPA 101 12.3.5	75 feet	300	No requirement	See section 12.3.5 for comparable requirements. See Section 12.4.4 for high-rise requirements.
NFPA 1 Existing Assembly NFPA 101 13.3.5	75 feet	No requirement	15,000	See section 13.3.5 for comparable requirements. Section 13.4.4 requires automatic sprinkler systems in high-rise buildings that house assembly occupancies in high-rise portions of the building and all levels below.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179

Page 36 of 11

Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73

Hearing Location: Mailed in

Relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment

Comments:
Oral or
Exhibit No.

Presenter,
Group Represented,
City and State

Comments/Recommendations

58

Madison, Wisconsin

problem with tougher codes, but is vehemently against any retroactive aspects of code changes.

59

Michael L. Green
Bruce Rosenau
R.G. "Cecil" Segelken
William Nemitz
Chuck Marohl
Dick Rodell
Inspection and Zoning Services
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

The proposed rules look very good, except for Comm 62.1805 - Alternate setback and clearance. The IBC code should be left as it exists in section 1805.3.5. The building official should not be given the responsibility of allowing alternate setbacks and clearances and not be able to require an investigation and recommendation of a registered design professional.

60

Richard H. Walter,
Wisconsin Concrete Masonry Association
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

States while he generally favors adoption of a model code, adoption of the IBC before problems are ironed out is a mistake. Indicates he is involved with a broad-based national organization for masonry, the Masonry Alliance for Codes and Standards (MACS). MACS is concerned with the reduction of fire safety requirements in the IBC and the increased costs of buildings designed under the IBC structural requirements. MACS is funding a study to perform trial structural designs to determine the cost impact of adopting the IBC. Early adoption by Wisconsin would mean the cost-impact study would be meaningless. Assumes his comments will not be persuasive in stopping the early adoption, so provides notes on specific areas where problems exist.

Objects to modifications to Table 62.1610. Objects to changing soil under active conditions from 45 pcf to 60 pcf. States if the column on the at-rest condition is added, then Tables in 1805.5 on concrete and masonry

Disagree that the modification requires the building official to allow alternative setbacks without all the necessary information nor that it will not permit them to call for an investigation and recommendation by a registered professional.

The department will evaluate and study the development with national model code staff.

Agree in part. The Wisconsin amendment to the Table will be removed (i.e., the IBC value of 45 pcf will be left unchanged). IBC Table 1610.1 already has footnotes c.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179		Hearing Location: Mailed in	
Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73			
Relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>foundations have to be changed to reflect the at-rest condition. States this change will create havoc and result in higher, unwarranted construction costs. Submits the following lateral soil load problem to explain the objection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lateral Soil Problem</p> <p>Assumes published average values for compacted soils of the Unified Soil Groups. For Group SM (from Naval Facilities Engineering Command) backfill, a moist unit weight of $\gamma = 122$ pcf and a $\phi = 30^\circ$ was selected. Assumes active earth pressure, K_a, will be developed, not the at-rest pressure K_o. The reasoning for this assumption is that K_o pressures will be developed for absolute rigid walls only. Even the slightest movement, on the order of 0.1% as indicated by Terzaghi, will allow the development of K_a pressures, or for a 9-foot wall, a movement of under an inch at the top. It is assumed that the typical connection in construction of the first floor diaphragm will allow such movement, and the foundation walls, although constructed of concrete or masonry, will rotate slightly about the base. Therefore, the K_a as defined by Rankine will be used:</p> $K_a = \tan^2(45^\circ - \phi/2)$ <p>Or for $\phi=30^\circ$, $K_a = 0.33$.</p> <p>Thus, with an equivalent fluid weight (EFW) = $K_a \gamma = 40.3$ pcf, or if 42 pcf is selected, or, to ease the selection of the wall sections, EFW = 45 p/sf per vertical foot or pcf is used. With an assumed slight rotation to the top for the active earth pressure development, the EFW envelope to represent the actual irregularly shaped pressure diagram of the lateral earth pressure shall be TRIANGULAR.</p>	<p>and d. that specify an increase in design lateral soil load for relatively rigid walls. The added column just reflects, in a numerical fashion, those increased loads. As the loads were already specified in the Table's footnotes and not reflected in subsequent Table 1805.5, it is also the Department's position that the at-rest condition not be reflected in Table 1805.5.</p> <p>It is understood that the application of the active condition column will apply in most cases, as is the case in the example problem. The Department feels it is important that, for those cases where the at-rest condition applies, clear values be provided.</p>
		Agrees that the majority of IBC chapter 17 should not be adopted.	Noted.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Hearing Location: Mailed in

Page 38 of 1

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179

Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73

Relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment

Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>Indicates walls of solid units cannot be grouted, and Table 62.2109-1, under Type of Masonry should read "Single wythe walls of solid units or grouted walls of hollow units."</p>	<p>Disagree. Table 62.2109-1 was originally taken from the Canadian Building Code, approved for the August, 1985 WI Code issue, and was reprinted verbatim. The intent of the "Openings" Table is to allow slightly higher value for single wythe walls of solid units or grouted walls of solid units (collar joints grouted in multi wythe walls). All other masonry, the category that single-wythe grout hollow units fall under, requires use of slightly lower values relative to lateral support.</p>
		<p>States to keep designers from thinking the joint spacing in Table 62.2109-2 is a desired spacing, and to include expansion joints for clay masonry, change Comm 62.2109 (3) (b) to state "Vertical control or expansion joints shall be provided in masonry walls at the spacings listed in Table 62.2109-2 or at closer intervals." Indicates that the spacings are maximum spacings and will not prevent minor cracking.</p>	<p>Agree in part. The term control joints will be replaced with the industry recognized term movement joints, in lieu of the suggested control and expansion joints. The language under Comm 62.2109 (3) (b) does not have to be expanded to say or at closer intervals as the Table is already clearly labeled "maximum spacing." The existing footnotes already suggest even more movement joints, depending upon specific job circumstances.</p>
		<p>Recommends removing all reference to earthquakes and seismic conditions in Comm 62.1614, because wind load will govern in all cases. States the expense to run two separate designs, for earthquake and wind, is an unwarranted expense, based on Wisconsin's history. Including earthquake design will impact affordable buildings.</p>	<p>Disagree. It has been shown by calculation that wind loads will not govern in all cases in Wisconsin, therefore the seismic design requirements have been retained.</p>
		<p>States the air-barrier exception should apply to a masonry wall as a concrete wall in Comm 62.1403.</p>	<p>Disagree. It is inappropriate to waive the requirements for an air retarder in a conventional, concrete masonry wall, in that no data has been presented to justify such an exception.</p>
		<p>Questions that the Department does not want unqualified people to test</p>	<p>Agree. The Wisconsin amendment to the section will be</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179		Hearing Location: Mailed in	
Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73			
Relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>concrete in the field and laboratory in Comm 62.1905. Believes the Department does not want this to happen.</p> <p>States that IBC section 705 reduces the current rating of firewalls from 4 hours to 2 hours in group F-2, S-2, R-3, and R-4 occupancies. This leaves no safety factor and ignores the increased fuel from wood frame buildings, thus firewalls need a fire resistance of at least 3 hours. Also, IBC section 705.3 permits firewalls of combustible construction in type VA and VB constructed buildings. Firewalls are the last line of defense in preventing fire-spread from one building to another. It makes no sense to allow barriers that burn, thus delete the exception to IBC 705.3 Materials.</p> <p>Questions Footnote a in Table 705.4, which requires 3-hour firewalls, but allows firewalls to be 2 hours in Type II and V buildings. Questions the logic of requiring 3-hour firewalls in Type I, but not in Type V (wood frame buildings), thus delete Footnote a and combine all occupancies in the first two rows of the Table with a required 3-hour rating.</p> <p>Notes that IBC section 705.6 requires firewalls to extend 30 inches above the adjacent roof, but allows numerous exceptions to the vertical continuity, in contrast to Comm 51.02, which requires extensions to 36 inches without exception. Delete exceptions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 under 705.6</p> <p>Recommends referencing ASHRAE Standard 90.1-99 instead of 90.1-89 in Comm 63.0900 because of the legislative edict to meet or exceed the latest ASHRAE requirements.</p>	<p>removed.</p> <p>Disagree that the Wisconsin rules should retain the 4HR fire resistive rating for all fire division walls. Wisconsin rules currently permit the use of 2HR firewalls in some occupancies (hospitals and nursing homes of any construction class and some hotels, motels, rooming houses and dormitories). The performance requirements for the functioning of firewalls that are called for in the IBC are far more restrictive than our current code. Also the additional Safety requirements found throughout the IBC offset the need to keep our historic fire division wall requirements.</p> <p>Disagree. Wisconsin does not currently require the 36" extension "in all cases" as implied by the presenter. Some of the exceptions included within the IBC are similar to the current Wisconsin Commercial Building Code.</p> <p>Disagree. Where newer editions are not already adopted under our current Wisconsin code, the proposed code should use the same editions of the standards that are referenced in the 2000 IMC to be consistent with model code timeframes.</p> <p>The Department of Energy (DOE) has not yet issued its</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179

Hearing Location: Mailed in

Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73

Relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment

Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
61	Robert Ritger City of Onalaska Fire Department Onalaska, Wisconsin	<p>Indicates when the Department set out to explore the adoption of a new building and fire code, the fire service was informed that the Department would be open-minded and work with the different groups. States the Department informed them a comparison would be done of several different codes. States his displeasure that the Department has decided to drop the comparison and decided to take the IBC/IFC to hearings for adoption.</p> <p>States this move concerns him, along with hacking up the IFC code the Department planned to adopt. Feels the hacking up of codes has gotten Wisconsin into trouble in the past and has created confusing codes. Indicates that the Department claims the comparison was dropped because NFPA codes are not ready for a comparison. Indicates the Department should wait, do the comparison, and do the job right. Indicates he has not formed an opinion on which code is better for Wisconsin, but firmly believes the</p>	<p>acceptance of the 1999 ASHRAE 90.1 Standard as the energy efficiency code for commercial buildings under the Energy Policy Act (EPACT) law. (The DOE's web site indicates that the determination will be made sometime this winter.) After publication of the determination in the Federal Register, states will have two years to adopt the standard as part of their commercial building code.</p> <p>Under s. 101.27(3)(b) 1., the Department must review ch. Comm 63 and submit changes for legislative review within 18 months of publication of a new ASHRAE 90.1 Standard. The Department is not required to adopt the ASHRAE standard or any other standard. In accordance with the current project timeline, submittal of the final draft of the new ch. Comm 63 is planned for May 2001, fulfilling this requirement.</p> <p>See response to Exhibit 1 for a description of the planned code comparison, and a description of how NFPA 1 and 101 will apply instead of the IFC.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Hearinghouse Rule Number: 00-179

Hearing Location: Mailed in

Page 44 of 108

Rule Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16,46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73

relating to: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment

Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
65	Joseph J. Messersmith, Jr. Portland Cement Association Rockville, Virginia	<p>when a model code is adopted, it is adopted in full with no exclusions that could create confusion? Restates the WFLA position that adoption should be placed on hold pending a comparison of the ICC codes with NFPA codes.</p> <p>Voices objection to replacing the provisions of Comm 51.02 (13) for fire division walls with the firewall provisions of IBC section 705. Notes that firewalls are the last line of defense to prevent fire-spread from one building to another, and it does not make sense to construct barriers of less than 4-hour ratings, with materials which can burn, thus delete the exception 705.3. Indicates the current code requires 4-hour fire division walls and that IBC Table 705.4 permits firewalls of 2 hours for Groups F-2, S-2, R-3, and R-4, which should have a fire resistance rating of 3 hours.</p> <p>Indicates the occupancies in the first row of Table 705.4 require firewalls of 3 hours, but Footnote a allows the walls to be reduced to 2 hours. Delete the footnote and combine the first two rows with a fire resistance rating of at least 3 hours.</p>	<p>codes will apply instead of the IFC. The current corresponding Comm codes, such as Comm 10 for flammable liquids, will be reviewed and may be updated to reflect the model fire code requirements.</p> <p>Agree that firewalls are one of the last lines of defense, but disagree that only 4HR fire resistive walls can satisfy or provide for this intent. Wisconsin currently permits the use of 2HR fire division walls in hospitals and nursing homes as well as some hotels, motels, dormitories, CBRF's and rooming houses.</p>
66	Wisconsin State Fire Chiefs Association (WSFCA) Madison, Wisconsin	<p>States WSFCA and the Wisconsin Fire and EMS Coalition support delaying adoption of any building or fire code until a comparison of the ICC and NFPA codes can be done. Indicates Wisconsin has had its own codes for 85 years that can be utilized until a comparison can be completed. Submits an attached petition with 1729 signatures (see attached Appendix C) supporting the delay until the comparison is completed.</p>	<p>States if a careful analysis is not completed prior to adoption, Wisconsin will miss an opportunity to adopt the most comprehensive suite of codes. Indicates each day, disasters kill or injure citizens and firefighters, and many times, investigations show that inadequate codes contributed to or caused the injuries or loss of life.</p> <p>Urges that during the comparison, the codes should be updated to meet the</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Building Rule Number: 00-179

Hearing Location: Pewaukee

Building Number: Comm 4, 14, 15, 16, 46, 50 to 64, 65, 66, 69, and 73

Building Title: Construction and Fire Prevention for Public Buildings and Places of Employment

Exhibit No.	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
<p>Presented by: Group Represented, City and State Paul Wank Wisconsin Concrete Masonry Association Sussex, Wisconsin</p>	<p>Generally pleased to see Wisconsin pursuing adoption of a unified model code, but is opposed to the fire safety compromises in the IBC. States adoption of a model code would make it easier for Association members to ship products to other states. Agrees most of the IBC chapter 17 requirements for structural tests and special inspections should not be applied in Wisconsin, as they are needed in areas of high seismic activity, which does not occur here.</p> <p>Is concerned the model codes have been slowly and steadily reducing the quality of fire walls. Concrete block fire walls have performed as designed for over 80 years. They do not burn, do not add fuel to a fire, and do not emit poisonous fumes, but unfortunately their use will be greatly reduced in the new code, as they are replaced by fire suppression and detection systems with less fire-wall containment. Indicates those systems will not provide equal performance, in part because the testing standard for fire-rated walls does not reflect the increases in fuel content in furnishings and floor/wall coverings that have occurred since the 1930's, and because the testing standard allows a less-rigorous hose-stream test for nonmasonry walls. Believes the corresponding current Uniform Building Code requirements are superior. Advocates that concrete block walls be given an equal footing to compete with the newer, unproven systems which rely on fewer fire walls of lesser quality, by changing the proposed Comm 62 sprinkler and fire-wall requirements to be consistent with the UBC requirements. Also asks the Department to remain cognizant of these concerns when considering future code revisions that seek to further reduce the quality of fire-wall construction.</p>	<p>Support and opposition are noted.</p> <p>Agency Response</p> <p>Agree that masonry (concrete block) firewalls perform well, but cannot agree that they must be used to the exclusion of all other fire resistive walls. The Department believes that overall, the IBC as modified provides for greater fire safety than the current Wisconsin Commercial Building Code.</p>
<p>Oral</p> <p>Arthur Scola Wisconsin Society of Fire Service Instructors, and the Racine County Fire Chiefs Association Sturtevant, Wisconsin</p>	<p>Requests the Department conduct a comparison of the ICC suite of codes and NFPA's <i>Fire Prevention Code</i> and <i>Life Safety Code</i>, before adopting of the ICC codes.</p>	<p>See response to Exhibit 1 for a description of the planned code comparison, and a description of how NFPA 1 and 101 will apply instead of the IFC.</p>