



Smoke control is a life-safety system. The goal is a tenable path for evacuation or relocation — not “clearing smoke” for property. If the drawings do not define the intent, the method, and the verification plan, it becomes a late field redesign.

Original Masterbuild PE packet from Daily Code Talk on 2024 IMC 512.1–512.3. Confirm the adopted edition. Distinct from IBC/IFC Section 910 smoke/heat removal. This is not a smoke-control design.

☐ **512.1: minimum requirements for design, installation, and acceptance testing so occupants can move in a fire.**
Different intent and different method from Section 910 smoke/heat vents.

☐ **512.2: follow the applicable parts of IBC 909 and accepted engineering principles. Construction documents must show engineering analysis.**
AHJ pre-confirmation of the analysis method (hand calc vs computer model) belongs on M-001 before anyone sizes a fan.

☐ **512.3: systems tied to IBC 909 require special inspections and tests in the final installed condition (aligned with IBC 1704.5.5).**
Procedures, methods, and what will be inspected cannot be “TBD by contractor.” Many AHJs require a separate smoke-control permit.

The fail we see first

Calling atrium exhaust “smoke control” with no IBC 909 basis. Or a 910 vent labeled as 512. Or commissioning left to the contractor. If you cannot summarize the system on one page, the job will be painful.

What to send: whether IBC 909 smoke control is required (or you think it is), the building type / atrium / high-rise trigger, and any narrative or special-inspection note already on the set.

Send the comments. Not the County guideline.

Folio (does it start with 30?), process or UP number, and the comments PDF. Masterbuild will say which row is actually open.

masterbuildconsulting.com/send/

+1 (786) 398-6940 · Calendly: 30-minute scoping call

Masterbuild provides engineering services under a written scope. Not a smoke-control design. Confirm adopted 512 / IBC 909. This is not legal advice.