

December 19, 2024

Karl Aittaniemi  
International Code Council  
200 Massachusetts Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20001

**Regarding: Official ICC Complaint: Violation Of Code Of Ethics And ICC Consensus Procedures. David Tompos Sr. Compliance Guidelines And Conflict Of Interest Policy And ICC Consensus Procedures.**

Dear Karl Aittaniemi,

Janet Thome is officially requesting that you investigate my complaint against David Tompos Sr. , who is paid staff of ICC and up until recently was on the board of THIA.

His presence as a voting member of the committee is an over-reach of ICC'S involvement and he has a duty to be honest, but he is misleading the committee.

David Tompos Sr. is misleading the OSMTH 1215 with inaccurate information on why ICC/MBI 1200 and 1205 were disapproved at the 2024 IBC hearing 13 to 1. He has stated numerous times that it is because the building officials see tiny houses as RVs and that they do not like the term tiny house and have convinced the OSMTH committee to use the term Small Residential Unit ( SRU) and put a tiny house as a subcategory under a SRU.

The entire focus of the tiny house standard has shifted to the SRU. There should have been a new pins notification because this changes the standard entirely. My request for a new pins was denied.

I have pointed out numerous times that David Tompos Sr.'s involvement in the subject of certification was a conflict of interest, and that has also been ignored.

More than half of the country has adopted Appendix Q Tiny House and Appendix AQ Tiny House and brought the first understanding of what a tiny house is with the building officials, legislators, manufacturers, and consumers.


The SRU is an industry grab that David Tompos Sr. is pushing that will serve the large manufacturers that ICCNTA certifies and will squeeze out small manufacturers.

**2024 IBC Hearing**

**Micah Chappell City Of Seattle, State Building Code Council was the first to make a motion to disapprove the standards, he stated;**

*" IRC Appendix Q is not required to be adopted by states or it is not required to be used, and **tiny house is not defined in the IBC**. This proposal would take the tiny house, which is just a dwelling unit, and take the review and application requirements of that dwelling unit and push it to a standard.*

*I do not agree with that. When we are talking about tiny houses and Appendix Q, they are very specific, but there are two criteria here that are not defined, a tiny house on wheels, or a tiny house like the other modular buildings where it is possibly driven in and then craned onto a foundation. So blanket items for tiny houses, I do not agree with. "*



*After the IBC hearing, the committee decided to remove all tiny home terms, along with Appendix AQ Tiny House from the scope of the committee, the scope of the standards, and from the body of the standards 100% with the theory that there was no need to call out tiny houses, because they were "inclusive".*

### **Reasons For Disapproval At The IBC Hearing**

- The definition for off-site included modular buildings and components. Modular units are typically regulated by state specific requirements.
- **The definition for off-site construction includes tiny houses. Tiny houses are not address by the code, but are in Appendix Q.**
- **This blanket exception for tiny houses is too broad.**

- **Would this cause a conflict with the tiny house emergency escape and rescue openings?**
- *The definition of off-site construction is too broad-it could be read to include items such as prefabricated trusses, the **modular units** and sleep pods or precast panels.*

Thank you for your prompt attention to my complaint,

Janet Thome President  
[Tiny House Alliance USA](#)