

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STATE AND CONSUMER SERVICES AGENCY
CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION
2525 NATOMAS PARK DR., SUITE 130
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
(916) 263-0916 Phone
(916) 263-0959 Fax
Email: BSC@dgs.ca.gov

Office Use Item No.

SFM 01/07

PARTICIPATION COMMENTS FOR THE NOTICE DATED MARCH 18, 2008
Written comments are to be sent to the above address.

WRITTEN COMMENT DEADLINE: MAY 12, 2008

Date: 4/23/08

From: Thomas Tietz
Name (Print or Type)

California Nevada Cement Association
Agency, jurisdiction, chapter, company, association, individual, etc.

<u>24657 Via Melinda</u>	<u>Yorba Linda</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>92887</u>
Street	City	State	Zip

I/We (do) (do not) agree with:

The Agency proposed modifications As Submitted on Section No. 708.1

and request that this section or reference provision be recommended:

Approved Disapproved Held for Further Study Approved as Amended

by the proposing state agency.

Suggested Revisions to the Text of the Regulations:

Reason: [The reason should be concise. If the request is for "Disapproval," "Further Study," or "Approve As Amend", identify at least one of the 9-point criteria (following) of Health and Safety Code §18930.]

Even though the Building, Fire, and Other Code Advisory Committee (CAC) voted to recommend disapproval of this proposed amendment, we support the CSFM's position that this amendment should be incorporated into the 2007 CBC based on the rationale provided in the Initial Statement of Reasons and as further modified in response the CAC recommendation for disapproval. This amendment will help to maintain the level of fire and life safety that was previously enjoyed under the 2001 California Building Code in buildings of these types of construction where all of the permanent partitions, which would obviously include tenant separation walls, were required to have a 1-hour fire-resistive rating. Providing these 1-hour fire partitions to separate individual enclosed tenant spaces will achieve better fire and life safety for the occupants of the building. They will protect not only the occupants themselves from a fire in their adjacent neighbor's tenant space, but also their property. And they provide an area from which the fire can be attacked and by which it can be contained by the responding fire department. This is especially important in buildings of these types of construction which are allowed to be larger and taller than the non-rated types of construction which have no built-in fire-resistive protection for the structural elements including the floors. These tenant separation walls will provide an enhanced degree of compartmentation commensurate with these types of construction which are intended to resist the spread of fire throughout the building by having built-in passive fire-resistive protection.

significant quantities of hot smoke to be generated. Such smoke could potentially move vertically through the building via the elevator hoistways unless the enclosed elevator lobbies are provided as specified in Section 707.14.1.

Regarding the proposed amendment to Exception 6 which excludes the Group I-2 occupancies from the option of using elevator hoistway pressurization in lieu of the required enclosed elevator lobbies, we also support that amendment. We believe that the pressurization of elevator hoistways is problematic and is certainly not desirable in Group I-2 occupancies. The pressurization system may drive dust and other contaminants within the air stream used to pressurize the elevator shafts into the building into areas where it may be very detrimental to the patients. Furthermore, in these type occupancies the patients will most likely remain in place and/or be relocated to an adjacent smoke zone on the same story where they will remain until they can be rescued and evacuated or moved to another safe location by the responding fire department. In such cases it is more desirable to rely on a passive type elevator lobby enclosure protection system rather than an active type air pressurization system for the elevator hoistways.