



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

### BUILDING, FIRE AND PLUMBING COMMITTEE SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

**MONITOR** Enterprise Services, Rm 2331  
**LOCATION:** 1500 Jefferson Street  
Olympia, Washington

**MEETING DATE:** May 8, 2014

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p>Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.</p> <p><u>Members in Attendance:</u> Dave Peden, Chair; Ray Allshouse; Tom Balbo; Steve Simpson; Rod Bault</p> <p><u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Joanne McCaughan; Peggy Bryden</p> <p><u>Visitors Present:</u> Kraig Stevenson, John Williams, Grace Yuan, Rob Van Slyke, Ray Mou, Jan Himebaugh, Raymond Mou, Tom Hudson.</p>
2. Review and Approve Agenda	<p>The agenda was approved with the modification of TAG report there is no need for Committee Action.</p>
3. 2014 Code Amendment Proposals	<p><b>Tim Nogler</b> summarized the plumbing fixture proposal. This is Log 14-04 submitted by Raymond Mau. Between the 2009 and 2012 the SBCC made a substantial change, as we dropped the state amendment that has been in the state for many years and adopted the model code with some amendments. The Table 2902.1 was adopted as published by ICC; where the number of plumbing fixtures was greatly increased for Group E or school buildings. This amendment is recommending the actual number of occupants in the building be used for the number of fixtures. The Council asked how the occupant load was determined and who does that determination. The Council asked the proponent to come up with different language based on the discussion and for the Committee to review and recommendation for the Council.</p> <p><b>Dave Peden</b> asked for public comment. He asked that comments not be repeated and be three minutes or less.</p> <p><b>Ray Mou</b> with Erickson McGovern Architects states the</p>

indent of the proposals is to acknowledge there was some sort of assessment determining that the previous amendments to the 2003 – 2009 IBC were not allowing enough fixtures as required for schools. We are wanting to negotiate a medium so there would be a gradual increase. The second one is to give guidance to the Building Officials, and with their ability to approve the number of fixtures because there was confusion in Ch. 10

**Kraig Stevenson** with the ICC states the SBCC is trying to base the number of fixtures on the number of people using the building. Section 1004.1.2 is buried in Ch. 29, but put it in Ch. 10 which would be 104.1.2 where it will be more available to Building Officials and refer to Footnote E. This will make things more clear.

Brian House with Hardness Engineers noted in reviewing the commentary and other state codes he would assert the occupancy should not be based on egress for the whole building. At Lincoln High School fixtures were measured for a year. There was no adverse impact and the school was using the older code system. There was no additional benefit to the school by adding additional fixtures.

**Tom Hudson** working with North Shore School District on high school and the Building Official is reluctant to determine actual occupants in the building. The Building official requiring to go through the table. He calculated using the 2009 code and another calculation using the 2012 code using the actual occupants. Under the old code it gave there was a design occupant load of 2250. Using the 2012 code the number was 6587 occupants. We then worked pulling out spaces that aren't normally occupied during the day. For this school we will end up with 93 fixtures using the new code. Under the old code it would be 67 fixtures. If we used the numbers out of the table we would have had over 130 fixtures. A substantial increase.

**Grace Yuan** with Puget Sound School Coalition thanked SBCC for working with the schools on these issues. We have taken the first step in dealing with this issue; however we need to take action on one of the amendments. Cost versus benefits need to be considered.

Rob Van Slyke with Bethel School District expressed his thanks for letting them speak to the group. He wants to allow fixture numbers to be maintained at the lower levels. There would be increased water and sewer costs as more fixtures are required. Rob asks the Committee to please

support one of the two amendments.

**Dave Peden** asked Tim to give the options available. **Tim** stated there would be a recommendation to give to the Council tomorrow. The options would be approve as submitted, approve as modified, deny or table. The Council will need to take action to move forward with this into rule making or adopt as an immediate rule to put it into effect. This can be considered for further discussion.

**Ray Allshouse** asked for input from the plumber on the Council, Steve Simpson. **Steve** said if we limit the number of fixtures and there was a remodel, would that require more fixtures at that point. If we take away facilities due to an actual number, how can we determine the actual number and whose determination would that be?

**Dave Peden** stated the Council needs to consider the financial impacts of code provision within Washington. It appears we have a cost to school construction. There doesn't seem to be a problem with the old method. He likes the proposal to compromise. There is a proposal that should be further evaluated.

**Motion**

**Ray Allshouse** moved the Committee approve the Amendment One. Steve Simpson seconded the motion.

**Tom Balbo** said when the architect submits his documents there is a coversheet on them which has a list which states the occupancy load. **Ray Mou** are there and those occupant loads, but approved by the jurisdiction having authority. **Ray** is in support of the motion

**Kraig** notes we need to bring in building officials who are experienced this may be an educational issue for them We need to collaborate to fix the problem.

**Dave** called for the vote to move forward with Amendment One. **The motion carried.** This is a recommendation to the Council.

**Log #14-06 Tim** summarized this. It was discussed in the last Council's meeting and there were questions about it. The Council referred this to the Building Code TAG.

**Brian House** gave some comments on this sharing his concern over safety and the placement of the guards and the color of the railing. It has a visual impact. The railing goes right to the edge of the roof and they are not secure. These are costly in existing buildings.

**Kraig Stevenson** with ICC. This has been in the code for

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Motion</b></p>	<p>over 20 years. E108-12 has been approved for the 2015 codes.</p> <p><b>Dave Peden</b> expresses concern about the guards that are installed and gives the illusion of safety, but it is not. This is a life safety issue. Both <b>Steve</b> and <b>Ray</b> are in agreement with Dave. This is to go to the TAG for discussion.</p> <p><b>Tom Balbo</b> states these have to be tied in to the building structure whether it is steel or a main beam which makes this pretty expensive.</p> <p><b>Dave Peden</b> asked Tim to arrange for a TAG meeting to review this item. Tim agreed to arrange this meeting.</p> <p><b>Ray Allshouse</b> moved the Committee refer this to the TAG for review. <b>Steve Simpson</b> seconded the motion. <b>The motion carried.</b></p>
<p>4. Interpretation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Motion</b></p>	<p><b>Tim</b> stated this is a request from the City of Bellevue on the amendment to the Fire Code having to do with access to roof where solar panels exist. This was reviewed by the vice-chair of this committee and his comments were taken into consideration. <b>Tim</b> reads the answer suggested to the interpretation.</p> <p><b>Ray Allshouse</b> moved to approve the interpretation as drafted. <b>Steve Simpson</b> seconded the motion. <b>The motion carried.</b></p>
<p>5. TAG Report – IRC TAG Solar PV</p>	<p><b>Ray Allshouse</b> reported there is no need for action today because they couldn't come to a decision. Therefore we have arranged for another meeting which will occur on May 22. The issues was discussed at great length.</p>
<p>6. Staff Report</p>	<p><b>Tim Nogler</b> reported the Council meeting is tomorrow. Under TAG reports we will be discussing TAG membership and the make-up of the TAG. We have had much interest on the process.</p> <p>There is a new license entitled Enhanced License. This deals with the elderly with mental impairments who are in state hospitals. They want to move them into a residential environment. DSHS and DOH are asking for SBCC's help in this effort.</p>
<p>8. Other Business</p>	<p><b>John Williams</b> with DOH asks for an interagency request. DOH licenses hospitals, nursing homes, etc. They also have responsibility to provide safety for these facilities. Over the years DOH has worked with SBCC and ICC to</p>

	<p>provide parity between IFC/IBC and NFPA. DOH now wants to move toward a different path for consistent. The feds have opened up their rules for comments, which is rare. We as a State would like to use our own State building and fire codes for the purpose of like safety, historically CMS has not given the state that authority. John asked if the Council sees any issues for DOH in regard to using the SBCC. He wants to be able to state support if there is any. The comment period is only open until June 14.</p> <p><b>Dave Peden</b> asked if this could be discussed at the Council meeting on Friday or if it should be discussed more in another Committee meeting. It was agreed to give a report to the Council tomorrow and to also arrange for another Committee meeting. <b>Tim</b> suggests suggested we arrange for this meeting later this month.</p>
9. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 a.m.

DRAFT