

**DHCD WORKGROUP FOUR (WG4) MEETING  
2015 CODE CHANGE CYCLE**

**JUNE 1, 2016, 9:30 A.M.  
VIRGINIA HOUSING CENTER**

Welcome, introductions and overview of cdpVA by Cindy Davis.

**C-113.4.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Campbell Gilmour**  
[Campbell.Gilmour@comcast.net](mailto:Campbell.Gilmour@comcast.net)

2012 Virginia Construction Code  
113.4.1 Testing of Radon Systems

**Reason:** Intent: To ensure mandatory radon mitigation systems are tested for effectiveness to certify the safety of the public.

**Comments:**

This proposed change was from a citizen.

This was reviewed by Workgroup 3 with no support. The Home builders were against this proposal.

Consensus for disapproval from Workgroup 4

Emory Rodgers - USBC allows localities to do this. Currently the radon enforcement is up to the locality to adopt this. They can choose to enforce it or not. There are only two currently in Virginia that is enforcing the radon testing.

Skip Harper – Discussed a situation in Rockingham County. Per the discussion, a more serious issue with radon was discovered. In a conditioned crawl space you would need a system. In this instance, they had a conditioned crawl space, the system was installed, they had a test done and there were levels of 40 to 50, before they added exhaust to the piping that was leaving the house. Once they did that and covered the return air path from the crawlspace back into the house, that is required by the conditioned crawl space, then their level dropped down to 3. I brought this to the attention of Richard Moore with the VBCOA and the IRC Committee and hopefully we can try to fix this glitch in the conditioned crawl space opening back into the home.

**CE-R403.2.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Andrew Grigsby**  
[Andrew@leap-va.org](mailto:Andrew@leap-va.org)

2012 Virginia Energy Conservation Code  
R403.2.2 Sealing (Mandatory)

**Reason:** There is no substitute for a pressure test of the ductwork. Any person who actually has tested ductwork knows that, unless every inch of the entire duct system is readily visible, then only a mechanical test would have a hope of finding all of the leaks. Mr. Grigsby is recommending that the visual inspection option be deleted for the duct testing.

**Comments:**

Mike Toalson – Since this is a statewide code, there are not enough testers qualified in certain rural parts of the state. If this is going to be a statewide mandate, we need some assurance of the cost. Mr. Grigsby was going to go back and collect more information to help us understand this. The HBAV, at this time, would prefer not to have this mandated.

Consensus from Workgroup 3 is that this is on hold – revisit at next workgroup.

Vernon Hodge – I believe Mr. Grigsby will attend the next Workgroup 3 to bring his information to explain this in more detail.

Shawn Strausbaugh – I see he has added new standards as follows: IECC 2012, IECC 2015. I am not in favor of this proposal.

Vernon Hodge -I believe he is trying to say to go back to the model code and don't have the VA Amendment to allow visual inspection of duct work.

Haywood Kines – I believe there is a staffing issue in the localities for this. They don't have the manpower for this.

Shawn Strausbaugh – I am confused by that statement, you have the option to do visual inspections. Either way, something has to be verified, plain and simple.

Mike Toalson – the installer was verified.

Emory Rodgers – Shawn is here representing the VPMIA and the Energy VBCOA folks have a stake in this. They need to weigh in public comment with the home builders. Door test and duct test

Rick Witt – concerned with requiring the building official signing off on the certificate of occupancy with only a visual test. What is our responsibility if we go to third party testing? We have to wait to sign off.

Vernon Hodge – Back in the 2009-2012 cycles when we added the state amendments to the duct testing visual inspection amendment first in 2009 and then in 2012 the whole house was added. There was a lot of discussion who was going to be doing visual inspections and that is up to the contractor. The language that we used made it clear that the building officials could not require the contractors to do the visual inspection. That if visual inspection was chosen, the

local building department had to ensure that the visual inspection was done. They could opt to have a third party do the inspection, there was language added about the qualifications of the inspector. This was more towards the issue if you are going to do the duct testing or the whole house testing. In 2012 there was some language of qualifications to iron out what criteria the building officials would use to accept who is doing the test.

Cindy Davis – Your concern is that if you do a visual test you are basing it on what you witnessed opposed to relying on third party testers? There are a lot of questions around this particular issue, hopefully by August, these issues will have been worked out.

**CR-E3902.16 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bryan Holland, representing NEMA**  
[Bryan.Holland@NEMA.org](mailto:Bryan.Holland@NEMA.org)

2015 International Residential Code  
E3902.16 Arc-fault circuit-interrupter protection

**Reason:** According to the U.S. Fire Administration's National Fire Incident Reporting System, an estimated 372,900 residential building fires were reported to fire departments within the United States each year between 2011-2013 and caused an estimated 2,530 deaths, 13,125 injuries and \$7 billion in property loss. The report also indicated the second leading cause of residential fire deaths in 2013 were electrical malfunction.

**Comments:**

Bryan Holland -

Requesting a change to the base document that is being rolled over from the 2012 VA Residential Code. What appears has happened, the 2005 NEC which corresponds to the 2006 IRC only had a mandate for AFCI protection of branch-circuit types for bedrooms. Since that time we have gone through 2 additional code cycles where there have been expansions of AFCI protection based on substantiations submitted from the Consumer Product Safety Commission of US Fire Administration and from NEMA to code making panel 2 has been incorporated into those documents. The 2008 NEC which also corresponds with the 2009 IRC expanded bedrooms to other similar rooms of a dwelling. There was no expansion of the 2011. There was expansion again in 2014 which is proposed for adoption in VA under the 2015 codes, this corresponds to an addition of kitchens and laundry areas and again substantiated with a national consensus process of issues where fire is still occurring within dwellings from arcing faults. This proposal asks for the 2015 base document that only requires the bedroom to be expanded to all the areas identified in the base document of the 2015 IRC. To substantiate the reason statement, I have attached some documents which I hope you will take the time to read. Three of them are from the U.S. Fire Administration. Virginia is included in the national statistics.

There are \$9 million losses each year. AFCI protection would help. Benefits would be safer homes and will far out way the money spent.

Vernon Hodge – The questions is whether to use international codes or VA codes? He found our base document as a starting place. I can work with Bryan to update this proposal by correcting the language, underlining, etc.

Mike Toalson – We are in significant opposition to this code change because of the liability factor. Right now the industry is mixed.

Bryan Holland – Product standard has to be harmonized with appliance standards. It does show where the fire originated, such as, overloaded receptacles, plugs, bad connection, or rodents.

Rick Witt – What room doesn't require an AFCI, home office, bathrooms, garages or outdoors?

Haywood Kines -Condos and apartments have been in this before and loose connections still apply. If technology is here we should take advantage of it.

Mike Toalson – In order to get a consensus from our builders, let's label this as pending. We can share more info with our members to get this going forth.

Cindy Davis – We will work on this in next Workgroup 4.

Emory Rodgers – Place in the proposal to what is not included such as home offices, bathrooms, garages or outdoors.

Consensus to carryover to August 17 meeting.

Bryan Holland – I will be glad to work on this and to get Mike Toalson more information to help pass this proposal.

**CTG-310.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bob Torbin**  
[Bob.torbin@omegaflex.net](mailto:Bob.torbin@omegaflex.net)

2015 International Fuel Gas Code  
310.1 Pipe and tubing

**Reason:** The use of a CSST product with a protective, arc resistant jacket is an equivalent method of protection against electrical arcing damage caused by high voltage transient events such as lightning strikes. The protective jacket is designed to locally absorb and dissipate the arcing energy or conduct it away. The jacket, in essence, disrupts the focus of the arc and reduces the energy level below the threshold value that can cause a perforation of the tubing wall.

**Comments:**

Bob Torbin - gave an overview of the reason statement. Black jackets don't require additional bonding and they will provide additional protection. We were challenged by NFPA. Bonding is not required for black jackets.

Haywood Kines – Is there a difference in the black jacket than the standard yellow jacket and how can we know the difference?

Bob Torbin – The fittings are the same whether black or yellow. New fitting is unique to their jacket.

Rick Witt – questioned if this been approved at 2018 ICC?

Bob Torbin – We believe this will be finalized at ICC and may fall into the 2018 or 2021 cycle.

Emory Rodgers questioned whether this was the language for approval at ICC?

Shawn Strausbaugh – no objections to their language, no guarantee it would be in 2018 ICC.

Consensus – we will wait and see

**CTM-506.5.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Shawn Strausbaugh representing VPMIA & VBCOA PMG code**  
[sstrausbaugh@arlingtonva.us](mailto:sstrausbaugh@arlingtonva.us)

2012 Virginia Mechanical Code  
Section 202 Definitions  
Pollution Control Unit

**Reason:** Pollution Control Units have been manufactured by numerous companies for several years. The desire to limit the amount of smoke, grease, and other particulate at the exhaust outlets of commercial cooking appliances has driven the use of these units as numerous entities are requiring these types of units to be installed. These units and there minimum construction and installation standards need to be addressed in the mechanical code.

**Comments:**

Shawn Strausbaugh – In 2018 IMC to place in the 2015 VA Mechanical Code.

Mike Toalson – We hope this doesn't make the cost higher

Shawn Strausbaugh – Code doesn't say you have to install this.

Mike Toalson – Do you know what the additional cost may be?

Shawn Strausbaugh – Cost justification just not sure what the cost is.

Mike Toalson – I object to this.

Greg Revels – Why was this added and not add to all the provisions?

Shawn Strausbaugh – VPMIA is considering modifications.

Cindy we need some modifications.

Shawn Strausbaugh – Standard is better off.

Greg Revels – we shouldn't think that this is on the way. I can grant a modification according to the 2018 ICC Code. I am not a big advocate of amending the code. I would rather get it into the national code and modify the Virginia code.

Rick Witt – If we can take advantage of what is in the 2018 code. I would rather it be in code instead of write a modification every time.

Emory Rodgers – We try to have as few amendments as possible. On this one, not only as it is a mechanical code issue. This is more a philosophical issue.

Shawn Strausbaugh – We are still collaborating on other issues but we are working through the process. This does not require you to install this equipment; you don't have to install it.

Vernon Hodge – If you want to modify I will help in the process.

Mike Toalson – What are the options like this, what do you think the cost would be? Pollution device it is not required by code.

Greg Revel – This is not a safety requirement but if you do install, you have to place in a safe way.

Shawn Strausbaugh - most are exterior exhaust.

Carry forward as pending

**CTP-603.3 cdpVA-15 and CR-P2602.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Carl Dale, VA State Corporation Commission**  
[Carl.dale@scc.virginia.gov](mailto:Carl.dale@scc.virginia.gov)

2015 International Plumbing Code

### 603.3 Tracer Wire

**Reason:** In February 2014, a home exploded in Stafford County, VA. The explosion was caused by damage to a nonmetallic water service utility line (water lateral) that had not been installed with a tracer wire and had not been located prior to excavation. This excavation damaged the water lateral in the process of installing the natural gas utility service line. When the water was turned on for final occupancy permitting, the escaping water created an abrasive spray on the gas utility service line. The gas utility service line then ruptured due to the abrasive spray. Natural gas migrated into the home and found an ignition source which destroyed the home. Natural gas migrated into the home and found an ignition source which destroyed the home just days prior to occupancy.

**Comments:**

Carl Dale - reviewed proposal and asked that we add tracer wire for new water services. The cost is minimal and asking contractors to look at tracer wires

Mike Toalson – within 5 feet of the house?

Rick Witt – I believe this was an anomaly and a real strange event.

Carl Dale – We have contractors everyday laying wire in the trenches. This would bring another layer of public safety inspection to construction sites across the Commonwealth.

Shawn Strausbaugh – Do we change IRC provisions?

Shawn Strausbaugh We have had this in sewer system since 2009. My concern is private well systems. Why are we not mimicking the same language?

Haywood Kines – I’m not sure the electrical circuit is needed.

Shawn Strausbaugh – VPMIA and VBCOA didn’t see it necessary in water. I will correct the accessible terminology.

Carl Dale - We will tweak the language.

Vernon Hodge – Shawn Strausbaugh and Carl Dale will work together on the language.

Emory Rodgers – Apparently water systems can do this on their own. Water authorities can do this on their own.

Consensus – more work is needed on both of these – bring back to workgroups 3 and 4.

**CT-S305.2.10 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Michael Redifer**  
[mredifer@nvva.gov](mailto:mredifer@nvva.gov)

2015 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code

305.2.10 Barrier setbacks.

**Reason:** Establishing a setback from lot lines equal to the clear zone dimension of 36 inches (305.2.9) will ensure future activity by adjacent property owner will not require relocation of the barrier in order to maintain the established level of safety.

**Comments:**

Michael Redifer not in attendance.

This was brought up at the Workgroup 3 Meeting and the Consensus was for disapproval.

Consensus – for disapproval

**Items for discussion**

Section M1506 Exhaust Ducts and Exhaust Openings Whole house ventilation

Mike Toalson – I think this is a mess. My recommendation would be to have a small group to see if VA really wants to adopt this. We need to form an adhoc group.

We had a small group to clarify this. DHCD will work on getting a workgroup together.

Haywood Kines – Would this be IMC and IRC?

Cindy Davis – It would depend on the group.

Emory Rodgers - Check to see if the research labs group has come up with something.

Cindy Davis - Let Jane know if you would like to be on the committee. Maybe Mike Toalson plus a few builders, Shawn Strausbaugh, energy people should also be apart of this committee.

Those suggesting interest in this adhoc committee:

Michael Toalson

Shawn Strausbaugh

Tom Coghil