



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

1500 Jefferson Street SE • P.O. Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 407-9280 • fax (360) 586-9088 • e-mail sbcc@des.wa.gov • www.sbcc.wa.gov

Approved 6-13-14

SUMMARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Shoreline City Hall, Council Chambers
17500 Midvale Avenue
Shoreline, Washington

MEETING DATE: March 7, 2014

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p>Meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m.</p> <p><u>Members in Attendance:</u> Ray Allshouse, Council Chair; Dave Kokot, Vice Chair; Tom Balbo; Rod Bault; Paul Duffau; Duane Jonlin; Mark Kulaas; Jeff Peterson; Sandra Romero; Steve Simpson; Eric Vander Mey, Rod Mutch</p> <p><u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Joanne McCaughan; Peggy Bryden</p> <p><u>Visitors Present:</u> Suzanne Mayr, Kraig Stevenson, G.F. Schenermann, Mark Sniffen, Jeff LaFlam, Gregg Schrader, Bob Lloyd, Tom Young, Gary Nordeen, Chris Edmark</p>
2. Review and Approve Agenda	<p>The agenda was approved with a Budget Report added to Staff Report.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda	<p>Kraig Stevenson, ICC, has a general comment regarding proposed changes. Remember the moratorium on code adoption process and the claim the codes change too much. Wherever possible please defer the changes to 2015 code cycle.</p> <p>Jeff LaFlam, Fire Marshal of North Shore Fire Dept., and Chair of Washington Fire Sprinkler Coalition (WFSC). A report was issued in 1973 by the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control called America Burning. The report recommended the support of necessary technology to improve automatic extinguishing systems in all kinds of dwellings. These systems in residences would save lives and save other expenses to the nation. The national average cost for installation of sprinklers in residences is \$1.35/sq. ft. The WFSC has the primary purpose of provide education of sprinklers and promote installation. There are many misconceptions about residential fire sprinklers. Jeff would like this to be a regular item on the agenda and asks the Council members to contact him if there are any questions regarding fire sprinklers.</p>
4. Review and Approval of January 10, 2014 Minutes	<p>Steve Simpson moved the Council approve the minutes of January 10, 2014. The motion was seconded by Jeff Peterson. The motion carried.</p>

5. Committee Reports
MVE Committee-2014 Code
Change Proposals

Eric Vander Mey reported as the chair of the MVE Committee. The Committee met yesterday to discuss the code proposals received and the code interpretations received. There were 29 code proposals for the Energy Code and there were five or so for the Mechanical Code. We reviewed how the staff had determined if the proposal was policy, editorial or technical in nature. The Energy Code had 18 that were considered technical or policy and would be referred to the Energy TAG in 2015. There were six proposals that were editorial in nature which were proposed for expedited rule. One proposal was recommended for an interpretation. One of the Mechanical Code proposals was referred to the Building, Fire, and Plumbing Committee as it refers to a Building Code section. Two were deferred to the Mechanical Code TAG for the 2015 cycle. The final one was forwarded as an expedited rule as it was editorial.

Tim Nogler recommended the Council approve the Committee’s recommendation and the editorial issues should be moved to the next Council meeting to give the Council time to review them.

Ray Allshouse asked for public comment on the MVE proposals. There was none.

Motion

Eric Vander Mey made a motion to approve the MVE Committee’s recommendations on the proposals. **Tom Balbo** seconded the motion.

Eric continued to report on the interpretations received by the MVE Committee. Approximately 15 interpretations were received and some were approved as drafted. Others require revision before being posted. There were also some that were not accepted. **Duane Jonlin** asked staff to indicate which were unaccepted.

Jeff Peterson indicated some of the proposals were tabled as well. **Eric** stated the Pierce County 01 was a “work in progress”, 02 the language is to be revised based on the recommendations, 03 we need to technically change what the code states therefore we will work with the proponent on this, 04 is in the same category as 03, 05 was approved as written, 06 was approved with minor modifications, 07 we are planning to revise the language, 08 is as proposed moving forward, 09 was tabled until more discussion could be had with Duane, 10 the summary is to be revised, 11 more research is to be done, 12 was approved, 13 approved as submitted, 14 more research is needed, this may be changed to an emergency rule if there is significant hardship, 15 was approved, 16 was tabled.

Duane asked about #12 regarding vestibules. The Committee agreed that this rule applies to an exit only door. He asked for the Committee’s logic on this. **Eric** said the doors without exterior hardware that couldn’t be opened from the outside would be the type of uses that would be exit only. He said these doors are often left open in retail buildings

Duane then asked about the intent of the decision regarding the high efficiency glazing exception for the 30% glazing rule. The training on this has assumed the exception differently. Duane’s request is that we make some modification to make the code say “what I think it says”. **Eric** said he reviewed the minutes where this was originally discussed. Eric feels the MVE Committee should

	<p>meet again to discuss this. Tim said a meeting would be scheduled in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Eric continued stating there was a brief Staff Report on the Aspiration Code. Tim added there was concern from the Committee on whether we were proceeding with the Aspiration Code.</p>
<p>BFP Committee-2014 Code Change Proposals, TAG Report-Portables</p>	<p>Dave Kokot as the vice chair of the Committee reported the BFP Committee met earlier today. There were five proposals they reviewed; two from the Building Code, one from the Fire Code and two related to the Residential Code. The first was forwarded on to the Building Code TAG for 2015 cycle. Number 14-04 was tabled, 14-03 was forwarded to the Fire Code TAG for the 2015 code cycle, 14-02 and 14-05 were forwarded to the PV TAG for review.</p> <p>There was one item referred to the Committee that we didn't take action on. It was a proposal forwarded from the Energy Code to the Building Code.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin asked about the fixture count (14-04). Dave Kokot said based on the wording of the code it was up to the architect to determine how many fixtures would be used. We tabled it because the proponent said he would entertain a change to allow the architect's proposal to be approved. Duane feels we should refer this proposal back to the proponent and point out the line in the code and see if there is still a request.</p> <p>Ray asked for public comment on this item.</p> <p>Steve Crawford with a school district feels there is a need to clarify things. Our district has seven different jurisdictions and it is hard to get a commitment until you have completed the design and submitted it. Our latest elementary school has a total of 2780 occupants in the building. A number of jurisdictions are basing the number of plumbing fixtures on the number of occupants. The proposal was asking how exactly that wording gets resolved. The same building has 28 regular classrooms, two for special ed., which is 584 kids and four to eight future portables puts it at 744 occupants. We are really providing more than what is required for the 744 students. For males we provide 14 water closets, for females 22. The 2780 occupants would require 28 water closets for males and 47 for females. So it's over three times on the design occupancy versus the square footage calculation. It is over double. There is a reasonable solution. This has never been a real issue. The issue now is the jurisdiction doubling the number of toilet fixtures from the number that has been provided in recent buildings.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin referred to a table in the code asking Mr. Crawford if he saw the line above that said use 100 ft./occupant for Group E. Mr. Crawford looked at Table 2902 and didn't see that. Tim Nogler reminded the group this chapter is amended by the state. Duane feels this should be researched more. Dave Kokot indicated this is why it was tabled. Tim Nogler suggested working with the proponents on this and bringing it back to the Council at the next Council meeting.</p> <p>Chris Edmark with Thurston County said the old Chapter 29 did say what Duane</p>

<p>Motion</p>	<p>quoted, but in the current code it does not.</p> <p>Dave Kokot moved the Council take the recommendations of the BFP Committee forward. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried.</p> <p>Dave Kokot continued saying the Committee did not take action on the proposal referring to the Building Code from the Energy Code. We wanted to forward that to the Council today. Tim Nogler said this proposal refers to guards on roofs for existing buildings that have equipment within ten feet of the roof's edge and now one is required to retrofit the guards. This is being enforced in some jurisdictions. The action would be to create some clear language of what needs to happen.</p> <p>Duane said these are conditions where the roof was constructed according to the code at the time. If the code gets more stringent over time you don't have to upgrade the building. The jurisdictions may be misinterpreting the code in this instance.</p> <p>Kraig Stevenson, representing ICC said in the 2015 Mechanical code there is a correlation and an exception to this guard. He supports this going to the 2015 code cycle.</p> <p>Steve Crawford said the interpretation carries over to LNI who has been reviewing the roof top safety issues and making significant requests for changes to comply with current codes for buildings that have been built long ago and it is a pretty significant issue. This costs hundreds of thousands of dollars per building.</p> <p>Larry Andrews is the proponent of the proposal. He states in order to get on a roof the worker needs to be roped and harnessed. We had a unit on the roof and we made more room that was there before. Then an engineer looked at it and because the guard has to be engineered to take the load the cost was \$4-5,000. The roof was designed for snow load. The owner can't afford this extra requirement</p> <p>Pete ? with Snohomish School District. We have faced a similar situation on the number of buildings that were built in the 60's. The engineered solution required cutting a five foot square hole in the roof through the insulation down to the structural system to attach the mechanism to support the anchor and then you have to reinsulate and reroof the building. In one case the initial requirement was for about 30 different locations. We haven't been able to let people on the roof to maintain the buildings for several months. This is an ongoing issue.</p> <p>Jeff Peterson said this seems to be a fairly important issue which needs urgency. He recommends the Committee put this forward as an emergency rule. Another suggestion was to create an interpretation to handle the situation.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>Dave Kokot moved this proposal be forwarded to the Building Code TAG for consideration as an emergency rule. Eric Vander Mey seconded the motion.</p> <p>Duane recommended this be handled with an interpretation and get the revision into the next code edition. Dave Kokot feels it is up to the TAG whether they do an interpretation or an emergency rule.</p> <p>The motion carried.</p> <p>Dave Kokot stated there were two other items discussed in the BFP meeting.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p>	<p>There were two interpretations. These were presented to the Fire Code TAG. The first refers to the emergency voice alarm. The group reviewed this and agreed that if there was a previous fire alarm it is not required to comply with retroactive requirements to upgrade the fire alarm system. Also if less than 50% of the square footage of the building is involved then the upgraded alarm is not required. The third question refers to square footage. When looking at the buildings the square footage is calculated for each building separately.</p> <p>Dave Kokot made a motion the interpretation for the Fire Code be approved as written. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried.</p> <p>Tim Nogler summarized the next interpretation from Spokane Valley. It refers to IRC 102.7.2 which is based on a RCW. The legislature passed a law stating for a Group R-3 dwelling you don't have to meet full code for new construction. This was used as a way to encourage moved residences for affordable housing. The question is does this apply to a newly constructed basement and stairway. The answer is no. The newly constructed portion of the building must meet the code. The second question asks does the newly constructed stairway and basement need to comply with the currently adopted Residential Building Code. Yes, is the answer provided.</p> <p>Dave Kokot made a motion to approve the interpretation as written. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried.</p>
<p>Legislative Committee</p>	<p>As the chair was unavailable, Tim Nogler summarized this report. He stated there were a number of bills introduced this session. There was only one we were tracking that passed the House and the Senate. This dealt with childcare facilities, HB2191. The state licensing agency cannot request the childcare center meet the local building code; unless they get the local building department to agree and make that call.</p> <p>He said there were a number of other items. One reducing the required floor area. Another had a requirement for a place to store food waste and compost in apartment buildings. There was a bill to have a joint legislative task force to look at the electrical code and adoption of the electrical code to consider whether or not SBCC could provide that. The bill did not move.</p>
<p>6. Green Building TAG</p>	<p>Steve Simpson reported on this. He first thanked Marty Gillis of Federal Way for hosting the TAG's meetings. The TAG discussed the Council's January action and then discussed the TAG review assignments. TAG membership was also clarified. The next meeting is March 21 at the City Hall of Federal Way.</p> <p>Tim stated the TAG stepped up to the idea of reviewing the IGCC which is in a code adoption cycle. We will give input to the national organization. We have a great group working on all the aspects of the code.</p>
<p>7. Emergency Rule Making</p> <p>Fire Code 907.2.3, Group Fire Alarms</p>	<p>Dave Kokot reported the BFP had two emergency rules in this morning's meeting.</p> <p>This request is from Spokane Valley. The 2012 code made significant changes to the fire alarm requirements for E occupancies. It requires emergency voice</p>

<p>Motion</p>	<p>alarms on anything over the occupant load of 30. The 2015 language has changed that. They recognized this was causing financial hardships. The language of the 2015 code was received from Spokane Valley which revises the code back to the 2009 version for the requirements where if there are 50 or less occupants no fire alarm system required. Between 51-100 a manual system is required and 101 and over 101 the emergency voice system required. The TAG determined to forward this on to the Committee for approval. The Committee recommends approval by the Council on this.</p> <p>Public comment was given as follows.</p> <p>Jeff Laflam with WSAFM supports this proposal to move it forward as an emergency rule.</p> <p>Dave Kokot moved the Council accept this code proposal for emergency rule.</p> <p>Steve Simpson seconded the motion.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin feels a strict code official could say if you don't have emergency voice system then you must have the manual fire alarm system. It looks as though to use exception 2 you must have the manual system even if it was less than 50 occupant load. Dave Kokot said with the lower occupant load you have a smaller space which doesn't require a system. Also if there are concerns about this it can be reviewed again under the permanent rule process.</p> <p>The motion carried.</p>
<p>Fire Code 903.2.3, Portable Classroom Fire Sprinklers</p>	<p>Dave Kokot states for this proposal, dealing with portable classrooms, the BFP recommends an emergency rule. There was quite a bit of public testimony on this issue where it was determined there was a mixed interpretation of the code language. The TAG had a total of three meetings on this. The language proposed was a consensus by the TAG. In summary the portable classroom definition has been updated, the "tricky" wording has been replaced with a more up to date definition of the portable. We also added a definition of cluster as it applies to portable classrooms. We are trying to align the fire alarm requirements closely to the building sprinkler requirements for E occupancies. The cluster number is now 6,000 sq. ft because most portables are 2,000 sq. ft. This will allow districts to get three portables rather than just two. There was language added to clearly show the exceptions are independent of each other. The second exception states it is allowed to have an occupant load of 98 in the portable and there are two direct exits from each classroom in compliance with Ch. 10 and at least one exit is accessible; making fire sprinklers not required. The school districts are very comfortable with this language. The TAG feels this is a positive direction. The emergency rule will help the districts which are nearing the time they would order the portables for the next school year.</p> <p>Duane suggested one clarification under the definition of cluster. Jeff Peterson has a concern with exception 2 and the ramp situation. Dave Kokot feels this was addressed by the TAG and would be 80% resolved.</p> <p>Kraig Stevenson with ICC has a copy of the 1991 code which was the original and was called by legislative staff. There are three components of an egress</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p>	<p>system. There is exit access, exit and exit discharge. He thinks Council is trying to get to exit discharge not just to an exit. The system is not complete until there is exit discharge. You also don't have anything there to determine whether this system should be consistent with the type of construction as required for the school. Kraig also wonders if the Council is going to address combustible and noncombustible decking systems.</p> <p>Jeff LaFlam with WSAFM states his organization supports this proposal and asks the Council to move it forward as an emergency rule.</p> <p>Steve Crawford with Issaquah School District states this discussion has been very agreeable and constructive. He appreciates everyone's involvement in clarifying some things. He doesn't think there is any big issue with "wordsmithing." The most important thing to the school districts is the emergency rule. The districts are looking at ordering portables this summer so it is a timely issue for them.</p> <p>Chris Edmark with Thurston County wishes to thank the Council and Committee that worked on this issue. It will get us going forward in the right direction. Those that have concerns about the portables should really visit them to understand how small the portables are.</p> <p>Dave Kokot moved the Council accept the emergency rule as recommended by the TAG. Tom Balbo seconded the motion.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin proposed a motion that would say "clusters are multiple portable school classrooms that are not separated according to the requirements of the Building Code for separate buildings." There was no second on this motion.</p> <p>Duane also moved in exception #2 the final phrase read "in clusters of portable school classrooms shall be separated from other clusters as required by the Building Code." There was no second on this motion either.</p> <p>Jeff Peterson makes an amendment to exception #2 asking after the word direct and before exterior include "independent." The amendment was seconded by Tom Balbo. The amended motion carried.</p>
<p>IRC R302.2, Townhouse Separation</p>	<p>Tim Nogler states this is a proposed emergency amendment to R302.1 in the Residential Code referring to exterior walls fire resistant construction and R302.2 which deals with townhouses. This mandatory language creates two methods for separating townhouses and replaces the language currently under R302.2. The new language reads the townhouses shall be separated by one of the following methods. First is a one-hour wall with a sprinkler system in accordance with the standards in both townhouses. The second method is a two hour wall with no sprinkler requirement. The third method refers back to R302.1 which has the tables indicating fire separation distance and fire rating for the walls.</p> <p>This was considered necessary because in the 2012 code there was a change not to adopt any state amendment and use the model code provisions for townhouse separation. It was assumed there were sprinklers in the townhouses. In order to address this it needed to provide the two options.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p>	<p>Jeff Peterson stated in the last meeting he requested this be deferred for an emergency rule making of 90 days which would allow planners, etc. to have time to react to these changes.</p> <p>Dave Kokot agrees there should be a delay but 90 days is too long.</p> <p>Jim Tinner, as City of Bellingham, Building Official states Bellingham has a townhome project in process now and the builder has put their project on hold waiting for this decision. He would encourage the Council not to delay this decision any longer. To clarify, the table in the IRC dealing with the nonsprinklered buildings has a misconception. In the IRC model code the only buildings these would apply to would be accessory buildings. It would never apply to a single family duplex or townhome. The table shouldn't be under any consideration.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin moved the Council accept this emergency rule as it is written.</p> <p>Dave Kokot seconded the motion.</p> <p>Eric Vander Mey wishes to address the concerns that Jeff Peterson has regarding the date of implementation. Three months from January would be April 15. Jeff stated he would be satisfied with April 1 as a implementation date.</p> <p>Jim Tinner with Bellingham City said the builder would abide by the Council decision of today.</p> <p>The amendment effective date is April 1. The amendment passed.</p> <p>Emergency Rule for R302.2. The motion carried.</p>
<p>8. Staff Report – Lean Project: Proposal Form</p>	<p>Tim Nogler reported on a Lean project revising the code amendment form. We are looking at expediting, improving, and eliminating extra steps. The Lean program is being followed throughout the state. We expect to continue to do more of these types of projects. The form has been simplified and focused on the economic impact information. There also is a form, for internal use only, to determine if the proposal is editorial, technical or policy. This also allows for staff to go back to proponents to get more information. The economic impact is an issue in preparation for the next adoption year. This process will help screen the proposals that need more information from the proponent. Tim encouraged the Council to look at the new form which is on the website. He feels it would be helpful to have a discussion at the Council level later this year to see how can we put a process in place to effectively look at the proposals that come in.</p>
<p>Budget Update</p>	<p>Tim Nogler distributed a handout for Council's review. Tim then reminded the Council a fee increase was requested last year. This fee has been the same since 1989. We have managed with this revenue stream by reducing staff significantly in the late 90s. We have had issues with recession and some issues with payments into the fund. The handout was explained by Tim stating that cities and counties remit their funds to the State Treasurer which is put in SBCC's dedicated fund. The recession has caused a drop in the revenue received. In reviewing the reports, there appears to be some anomalies and we are working with several jurisdictions on these. We have to remember these permits are only building permits. Duane</p>

	<p>feels the number for revenue should be bigger since the recession is mostly over. Tim stated there could be more revenue in the next four months. Tom Balbo asked if we could find a trend in the period. Tim said we are looking at that. Rod Bault asked what the rent was in the previous building SBCC was housed. Tim indicated the rent has gone up significantly. The GA building rent was roughly \$15/foot and here the rent is more than twice that amount. He continued by saying we need to look at a new source of revenue as we are in a decline. At this time we rely quite a bit on volunteer time. We are continuing to try to get in the Governor's budget. We can maintain this level for about another year, then we will have to make some cuts.</p> <p>Jeff Peterson added there could be a real problem because with builders it can take up to ten years to feel the full result of the recession.</p> <p>Eric asked if we had an idea of how many commercial versus residential permits we had. Tim indicated this was looked at last year and about 30% of the permits were commercial last year.</p>
9. Other Business	<p>Tim Nogler indicated there was no Other Business. He reminded Council the next meeting would be on May 9 in Shoreline.</p>
10. Adjourn	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.</p>