

## 2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions Testimony Summary

| From   | Position | Summary  | Recommendation   |
|--|----------|--|--|
| Randall M. King<br>Kitsap Building<br>Association<br>(KBA) | Support  | <b>Section 903.3.1.2:</b> KBA supports Section 903.3.1.2 in an effort to preserve affordability of residential buildings by ensuring applicability of NFPA 13R systems are preserved. Lower density multi-family buildings otherwise would have been subjected to a full NFPA 13 system which would drastically increase the cost of construction. We commend this effort to keep housing affordability at the forefront of the code development conversation.                       | No action required   |
|  | Modify   | <b>Section 429:</b> IBC TAG removed the exception: “Meeting the requirements will alter the local utility infrastructure design on the utility side of the meter and will increase the utility side cost to the homeowner or the developer by more than \$1,000 per dwelling unit.” Kitsap Building Association would like to see that exception added back to the code before official adoption by the SBCC.  | <b>Council staff:</b> The exception was for one-and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified and currently it doesn't use the term “one-and two-family dwellings.” The exception was also eliminated.<br><a href="#">(See comparison document)</a><br><br><b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Maintain the current proposal |
| Miriam J. Villiard<br>Heritage<br>Builders NW,<br>LLC      | Support  | <b>Section 903.3.1.2:</b> Heritage Builders NW LLC supports Section 903.3.1.2. in an effort to preserve affordability of residential buildings by ensuring applicability of NFPA 13R systems are preserved. Lower density multi-family buildings otherwise would have been subjected to a full NFPA 13 system which would drastically increase the cost of construction. We commend this effort to keep housing affordability at the forefront of the code development conversation. | No action required   |
|  | Modify   | <b>Section 429:</b> Heritage Builders NW LLC would like to see that exception added back to the code before official adoption by the SBCC.   | <b>Council staff:</b> The exception was for one-and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified and currently it doesn't use the term “one-and two-family dwellings.” The exception was also eliminated.<br><a href="#">(See comparison document)</a><br><br><b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Maintain the current proposal |
| Ly Ho<br>Robison<br>Engineering Inc.                       | Modify   | <b>Section 909.11.1:</b> In the IBC commentary for IBC section 909.11.1, “The intent of the ventilation is focused on the proper function of the standby power source in terms of engine-driven generators having appropriate cooling air and combustion air. The requirement that it be from the outside is related to the protection of such ventilation from the effects of fire.” Based on this statement, generator standby   | <b>Council staff:</b> Specific language is not proposed.<br><br><b>BFP Recommendation:</b> No modification is needed   |

## 2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions Testimony Summary

| From  | Position   | Summary   | Recommendation   |
|---|------------|---|--|
|   |            | power would require ventilation, but another acceptable form of standby power is tap ahead of the main. The room for standby power using tap ahead of the main should not need to be ventilated. In the amendment, I would like to see a clear difference between the different types of standby power for the ventilation requirements.  |  |
| Andrea Smith –<br>Building Industry<br>Association of<br>Washington                     | Modify     | <b>Section 429:</b> This would increase utility side design by a cost factor of \$1,000 or more, per dwelling unit. BIAW would like to see that exception added back in before official adoption by the State Building Code Council.  | <b>Council staff:</b> The exception was for one-and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified and currently it doesn't use the term "one-and two-family dwellings." The exception was also eliminated.<br><a href="#">(See comparison document)</a><br><br><b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Maintain the current proposal |
| Tom Young -<br>Northwest<br>Concrete<br>Masonry<br>Association,<br>Seattle              | Disapprove | <b>Section 706.3:</b> Our membership is opposed to proposal GP1-80, which would allow, if approved, firewalls to be built with combustibile materials for Type 3 and 4 buildings. The proponent's primary reason for this was potential differential movement between dissimilar building materials. We believe this is something that can be addressed through proper design and detailing.  | No action required   |
| Shamim Rashid-<br>Sumar - NRMCA   | Disapprove | <b>Section 706.3:</b> This proposed amendment was based partly on the argument that Type 3 and Type 4 construction provide just as much fire resistance as non-combustible construction. I wanted to stress the point that a firewall is not the same as a fire resistance rated wall. Firewalls have to be designed and constructed in accordance with the code to allow collapse of a structure on either side, without collapse of the wall under fire conditions and that's why a firewall can function to separate a structure into two separate buildings. While fire resistance rated walls carry an hourly rating, they're not designed to withstand collapse in the same manner that's required for firewalls. | No action required   |
| Shamim Rashid-<br>Sumar - NRMCA   | Disapprove | Opposes the current proposal in Section 903.3.1.2 and as alternative proposes considering a proposal for 2024 IBC.  | <b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Disapprove: Keep 2018 language at 60'  |
| Beth Jarot -<br>Resilient and<br>Green Building<br>Specialist for the<br>City of Tacoma | Support    | <b>Appendix P100:</b> The City of Tacoma's Office of Environmental Policy and Sustainability supports the adoption of Appendix P100 as part of the building code amendment process to increase the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition materials. Future adoption of this appendix by our city will support a variety of city goals related to waste management, housing, climate, and economic development.   | No action required   |

## 2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions Testimony Summary

| From  | Position   | Summary   | Recommendation   |
|---|------------|---|--|
| Kathleen Petrie - King County   | Support    | <b>Section 429:</b> In support of an increase in EV infrastructure. We need to build some infrastructure in this code cycle at a minimum, to be prepared for the 8% of vehicles by 2025. To wait until the 2024 code cycle, it will be too late.  | No action required   |
| Stephen V. Skalko - P.E. & Associates, LLC  |            | <b>Section 706.3:</b> This proposal reduces the effectiveness of the fire walls by permitting the wall construction to be of combustible materials in buildings of Type III and IV construction. This is contrary to the fire safety objectives of the building code outlined above (i.e., firefighter safety and operations, occupant safety and property protection).   | No action required   |
| Stephen V. Skalko - P.E. & Associates, LLC  | Disapprove | <b>Section 903.3.1.2:</b> 21-GP1-021 loosens the height limit allowed for the residential building by increasing the allowable height from 30-feet above fire department vehicle access (typically at ground level) to be 60-feet above grade plane (average height of the ground around the building). That can result doubling of the present code permitted height of a building depending on the physical configuration of the land surrounding the building. In some cases, the height can be more than doubled if a sloped roof is used for the residential building because the building height gets measured to the average roof height based on slope and not to the peak of the roof. | <b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Disapprove: Keep 2018 language at 60'  |
| Annabel Drayton<br>Policy Associate<br>NW Energy Coalition;<br>representing:<br><br>ChargePoint;<br>Climate Solutions;<br>Forth;<br>NW Energy Coalition;<br>Tesla |            | <b>Section 429:</b> The EV proposal in Section 429 outlined in Section 429 provides a strong foundation and we offer the following comments to address recommended revisions to the EV proposal found in Attachments 1 and 2.<br><br>(See <a href="#">proposals</a> )   | <b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Maintain the current proposal  |
| Micah Chappell  | Modify     | Recommends modifications in two proposals – in Chapter 29 and Section 1110.2.<br><br>See proposed modifications:<br><a href="#">Section 1110.2.</a><br><br><a href="#">Chapter 29 &amp; Section 1110.2</a>  | <b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Further research needed for potential conflict with 2010 ADA Standards.<br><br><b>BFP Recommendation:</b><br>Agree with proposed modification. |
| Gerard Brown L&I  | Disapprove | Disapprove the proposal in Chapter 9 related to Elevator Fire Pitts   | No action required   |