

Workgroups 1, 2, 3 & 4
Virginia Housing Center
August 17, 2016

Cindy Davis welcomed everyone and all attendees introduced themselves.

C103.3(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: College Laboratory Sub-workgroup of DHCD's Workgroup Two)
Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov

Reason:

DHCD staff note: Changes to the proposal subsequent to the July 20, 2016 Workgroup Two meeting is outlined in the document below. This proposed code change attempts to address the limiting factors of MAQs within facilities (via the use of control areas).

Zach Adams gave an overview of this proposal. The group worked on this for 2 ½ years with stakeholders from George Mason, University of Virginia, VATECH, University of Richmond, William & Mary, nationally UCLA, Washington Seattle, Department of General Services-Chris Raha, Emory Rodgers, State Fire Marshals, Kenney Payne with AIA. We had a very broad constituent base and Vernon Hodge headed up these efforts.

Comments:

Chris Raha with DGS stated that this proposal will impact many universities and colleges research facilities that we would regulate as a building official. We support this 100%.

Cindy Davis asked for other comments and hearing none said this will be **moving forward as consensus for approval.**

C-104.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: William Andrews, representing City of Richmond's Fire Marshal's Office
William. Andrews@richmondgov.com

Reason:

Fire officials are responsible for applying the fire code on maintenance and periodic testing of the fire protection systems, plus local fire officials coordinate emergency responses to sites (including state). Local fire officials need to learn when a building official approve installing, disabling or removing fire alarms, sprinkler system, and other fire protection systems (including for renovation or demolition).

William Andrews gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Rick Witt stated he is still not totally for this. Not in favor. More behaviorally than cooperation.

Moving forward as non-consensus

C-105.2.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Debra McMahon

Debra.mcmahon@fairfaxcounty.gov

Reason: The purpose of this proposed code addition is to get permit technicians recognized for their technical expertise on a state level. Permit technicians are responsible for reviewing, processing and issuing build/trade permits per the provisions of the Virginia Construction Code.

Debra McMahon gave an overview of her proposal.

Comments:

Cindy Davis stated that after some discussions the name has been changed to paraprofessional.

Richard Bartell stated this definition doesn't bring anything forward, leave to each locality.

Move forward as consensus for disapproval.

CB-202(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne, representing AIA-VA

kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Withdrawn

CB-303.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne, representing AIA-VA

kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason:

Although it was discussed to consider going back to the 2009 IBC format where these subsections were handled as exceptions, we decided against that approach. Although it may not seem like it, it is the opinion of AIA-VA to try to be as consistent with the I-codes as possible, and if proposing changes, try to work with the existing formatting as much as possible unless a different format enhances the code change.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Zach Adams stated he supported this change; however he asked for a clarification of 303.1.2, can it be more than 50 persons?

Move forward as consensus change

CB-304.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: William King representing DBHDS Ad-Hoc Group

William.king@alexandriava.gov

Reason:

This proposal was created by a work-group including representatives from the VA Department of Behavioral Health & Development Services (DBHDS) to address concerns on classification that have arisen with the location of licensed Day Support and Day Treatment facilities.

Johnna Grizzard gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Emory Rodgers stated that the senior staff that operates the license of these facilities is in attendance today. Part of the reason for developing this code change is the decentralization of these types of individuals from centralized facilities to community facilities part of the DOG settlement. This is not custodial service because CMS which reimburses operators would not do so if they were considered custodial which are handled by DSS not DBHDS.

Kenney Payne asked if approved it will be formatted? Building shall be sprinkled in Accordance with...903.1.1.

William Andrews stated that there should be limitations to occupancy load travel distance for people who need assistance.

Ron Clements stated he agreed with adding the reference and to change the wording– to be located day support and day treatment.

Johnna Grizzard wanted to make sure any participants that need assistance need to located be on lower floors. Are there any of these facilities where everyone is capable of evacuating?

Barry Lee stated that sometimes they may.

Chanda Bragg stated we do place the day support on the first floor.

Cindy Davis stated the general agreement that the language in exception 3 should say that day support and day treatment more than 3 stories above grade must be fully sprinkled in accordance with 903.1.1

Kenney Payne suggested using “shall”.

One opposition

Move forward as non-consensus

CB-717.5.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Richard Grace and Shawn Strausbaugh
Richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov; plumbers96@yahoo.com

Reason:

We are submitting this proposal for only the simple reason that we have adopted this requirement through the USBC technical amendment process since the adoption of the IBC (starting with edition 2000). It is not clear why this was not included/adopted in the 2012 edition of the VCC other than it was an oversight.

Bob Adkins gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Cindy Davis stated that this just put back the VA state amendment which was originally there.

Move forward as consensus

CB-906.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Jim Tidwell representing Fire Equipment Manufacturers' Association.
jimtidwell@tccfire.com

Reason:

The Virginia Building and Fire Codes require portable fire extinguishers in almost all occupancies (A,B,E,F,H, I, M, R-1, R-4, and 5). However, the code provides an exception for three occupancies if they are equipped with quick response sprinklers (A,B, and E). The reason for this exception is unknown, and has no known data to support it.

Comments:

Rick Witt stated he didn't see any reason to strike this.

Shaun Pharr stated that he is urging for consensus for disapproval. What I have consistently heard from fire officials is to immediately exit the building don't be persuaded by this data being reported. We need to recognize that this proposal over time will saddle Virginia's new office buildings, multi family buildings, universities, churches and other places of assembly with millions of dollars of unnecessary costs.

Zach Adams stated he totally agrees, we want employees to evacuate not fight fires.

Move forward for consensus of disapproval

CB-1023.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason:

Structural framing is allowed to penetrate through other rated assemblies, including rated corridor walls, shafts, and other fire barriers and rated construction (e.g., those elements governed by Chapter 6) or penetrate into, including fire walls. Otherwise, each stairway enclosure would be its own “mini-building” with independent structural framing which is not required by code.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Bob Adkins stated he is still against this proposal. His biggest concern is they don't even have membrane penetration protection devices. Stairways are designed to get people out of the building. They should be the most ridged enforced fire separation in the code.

Kenney Payne stated they would be willing to limit this to steel if this is an issue, but the IBC does allow for penetration as an option. You can go with the rate of assembly or go with a fire stop system.

Bob Adkins said he still disagreed.

Johnna Grizzard stated she wondered if you had a beam that was protected or wrapped in assembly could that not be protected in the joint system.

Kenney Payne said he would be willing to limit this to steel, however, he does not want to withdraw the proposal.

Cindy Davis asked do you want us to limit this to steel and Move it forward and let the board decide or carry it over to the second half?

Kenney Payne said **move it forward as non-consensus.**

Matt Hunter stated if the code permits any type of material to penetrate through, as long as it is protected does it matter what material it is? As long as it is protected in accordance of the code.

Ron Clements said there is already an exception.

Two oppositions

This will Move forward as non-consensus.

CB-2308.4.1.1 cdpVa-15 Proponent: Matthew Hunter and John Catlett representing American Wood Council
mhunter@awc.org and Jcatlett@awc.org

Reason: The update of Table 2308.4.1.1(1) Girder Spans and header Spans for Exterior Bearing Walls is proposed. Updated spans address use of Southern Pine No. 2 in lieu of Southern Pine No. 1. #2 grades were not included in the table.

Matthew Hunter gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

CE-1301.1.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Andrew Grigsby
Andrew@leap-va.org

Reason: During the last code update cycle, VA opted for a “go slow” approach and opted not to include the great majority of the efficiency gains obtained by the 2012 IECC. So our residential code is only very modestly more efficient than the 2009 IECC. It’s time to get caught up. These stricter energy codes are a good investment for homebuyers and renters of all income levels and promote quality and professionalism in the homebuilding industry.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Bob Adkins asked a question regarding eliminating the visual inspection option. He is ok as long as this will be put back in.

Cindy Davis stated this will not be added in.

Bob Adkins stated he objects to this proposal.

With this objection, we will move **forward as non-consensus**

CE-C402.4.3 cdpVA-115 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance
eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: The purpose of this proposed code change is to maintain the calculation of projection factor and the simple SHGC requirement that is currently being enforced in Virginia. The result of this proposal will be to maintain exactly the same fenestration SHGC and trade-off ability permitted in the current Virginia commercial energy code, or “business as usual” on commercial fenestration SHGC.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Don Surrena asked if this was increasing the requirement to be more stringent?

Charlie Gerber asked what about in the winter time.

Andrew Grigsby stated even in winter we are cooling in commercial buildings. It provides a net energy savings for the building operator.

Several opposed, HBA

Move forward as non-consensus

CE-R402.1.1(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey

eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: This proposal would make Virginia's energy code consistent with the 2015 IECC requirements for wall insulation.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Charlie Gerber asked – would this proposal tighten the energy envelope?

Andrew Grigsby stated yes it does. We are improving the R-value.

Charlie Gerber stated this comes into the whole house ventilation issue. He doesn't think this is good by making the internal environment less healthy.

Kris Bridges asked about the payback for this? 1-Is there a readily available R-20 batt for a 2x4 wall? 2-What is the long term payback?

Andrew Grigsby stated to his knowledge there is not an R-20 batt for a 2x4 wall. There are many ways to achieve an R-20 wall. The Department of Energy considered their savings was 3-5 years for payback.

Walter Lucas stated he is against this. This should be an individual homeowner's suggestion, not place this in the building codes.

Andrew Grigsby stated most home owners don't know hill of beans about energy they are relying on the homebuilders' expertise and knowledge.

Mr. Surrena stated that the majority of the states are still in the 2009 energy code VA had amended the 2009 Code and went up to R-15 which was compromised to go above that. There are approximately 8-10 states that have amended the 2012 codes and that section to similar to what VA has done. It would take 60 to 80

between 2009 and 2012 codes. It may be cost effective to the second or third homeowner.

Richard Bartell stated the VCC is the least probable regulation. It is one step away from an illegal building. It is the bare minimum legal requirement for a structurally sound building. We are not the quality code people. We set the bar at the bottom level.

Mike Toalson stated this is a significant increase of cost. If homebuyer's want this option, do so individually but not for this code change.

Amy Dzura said that VA took the model codes to the minimum level and to get back in line with the model codes is the minimum standards we should be building to.

Richard Bartell stated we don't rely on the federal government to set standards – in the Commonwealth of Virginia. We rely on what Virginia does.

Move forward as non-consensus

CE-R402.1.1(3) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance
eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: The level of ceiling insulation required by the 2012 IECC and IRC is most cost-effective when installed at initial construction, when equipment and laborers are already present.

Move forward as non-consensus

CE-R402.3.6 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance
eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: This proposal improves efficiency by clarifying that replacement fenestration must meet the same level of efficiency as fenestration used in new construction. This code requirement has been in the IECC for over a decade, and for good reason – about $\frac{3}{4}$ of all windows installed in buildings every year are replacement windows.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Mike Toalson and the HBA objects to these windows.

Move forward as non-consensus

CE-R402.4.1.2 (1) cdpVA-15 Andrew Grigsby
Andrew@leap-va.org

Cindy Davis asked that since these next four proposals deal with whole house ventilation and since we are having another ad-hoc meeting on September 12, can we carry over these proposals to this workgroup?

Andrew Grigsby replied yes. He stated that he had a power point slide to show the group.

Mr. Surrena stated they used this exact data at the code hearings to show that 3 changes per hour is too stringent. MD still can't meet the 3 changes per hour. The visual inspection by inspectors was doing far better than believed. Alabama did well.

Amy Dzura stated Alabama has an incentive program MD changed from 5-3 this past year. KY still allows statewide visual inspection. Alabama now requires testing.

Walter Lucas asked if there is any data in where a house that has a visual inspection for whole house ventilation has 5 changes per hour in VA?

Mr. Surrena stated that MD is required by statute by law to adopt the latest code within a number of weeks after it has been published. They still have problems with this.

Mr. Toalson stated we have lots of issues with this. Move into small workgroup.

Cindy Davis stated we will **Move forward as carrying over in the small workgroup.**

CE-R402.4.1.2 (2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance
eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: The 2012 and 2015 IECC both require every new home to be objectively tested for air leakage, and must achieve air leakage no higher than 3 ACH50. A home can be made tighter for relatively low cost, and the benefits are significant.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of this proposal regarding duct tightness.

Comments:

Richard Bartell asked if anyone had run any of these tests in VA to see where we stand?

Teresa Westin with Dupont stated she supported having this testing. She has a question about data. I don't believe visual inspection is sufficient. I think you need to do both.

Haywood Hines stated he teaches the residential energy class. He has a problem with the localities that do not do visual inspection at all where the ducts are outside the envelope and then don't require a duct test. They can't confirm either.

Emory Rodgers suggested for our September 12 meeting, we contact Dominion Energy or Washington Gas Light providers for duct and door blower testing data.

Cindy Davis stated this will **Move forward as carrying over in the small workgroups**

CE-R404.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Emory Rodgers

Errpp1242@verizon.net

Reason: There is no need to retain the 2009 IRC 50% of lamps. The federal DOE requires manufacturers to only produce the high efficiency lamps. By the time the 2015 USBC is effective in 2018 and the one year grace period in 2019; all lamps will be high efficacy lamps.

Emory Rodgers gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

None

Move forward to board as consensus

CE-R405.5.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance

eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: Virginia currently assumes a fixed 15% fenestration area in its performance path, in direct conflict with every edition of the IECC since 2006 (and Virginia's previous Uniform Code). This results in an approximately 1.6% to 3.2% reduction in energy efficiency for below-average glazed homes, as compared to a scenario in which Virginia applied the glazing area assumption as published in the IECC.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview on this proposal about glazing.

Comments:

Mike Toalson recalled before the amendments in 2012 if you had greater than 15% fenestration you had to make up the difference, less than 15% fenestration you would receive a credit. We want to balance the code.

Move forward as non-consensus

CE-R406.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Eric Lacey representing Responsible Energy Codes Alliance

eric@reca-codes.com

Reason: The purpose of this proposal is to clarify that the Energy Rating Index calculation does not include the impact of on-site power production, whether renewable or not. It also provides more specific guidance to software providers in order to help maintain consistency between software and code compliance on this particular issue.

Andrew Grigsby gave an overview of this proposal in attempts to clarify the issue.

Comments:

Richard Bartell stated that essentially what you are saying is that is someone produces their own power, net zero, it is no good because you want them to live with less leakage even they are a net zero?

Mike Toalson stated that if you use less energy you don't get credit for it.
Clarification as already required.

Cindy Davis stated that regardless if this is a social issue, this particular code change is just a clarification to what is already required by the energy raters so this is not doing anything new.

Move forward as non-consensus

CR-E3902.16(1) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bryan Holland representing National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)

Bryan.Holland@NEMA.org

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 death in 2013 was electrical malfunction.

Bryan Holland gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Mike Toalson stated on behalf of the HBAV members, we believe the numbers are greatly exaggerated. We ask for a compromise and ask for non-consensus.

Kris Bridges said while all new appliances may comply with the current arc fault issues, he can't support this because of all the existing appliances out there.

Bryan Holland stated he didn't make up the statistics, those are the state statistics. If you think the cost of the numbers he provided are too low, double them. \$400 per home to go from bedrooms to all the brand circuits that are that are identified in this section, that cost is easily justified by the losses that are occurring in Virginia fires. I argue that the statistics are too low on the fire side.

Mr. Surrena asked if these electrical malfunctions are they strictly arc faults or are they a combination of electrical malfunctions that may have occurred?

Haywood Hines stated there are means to hold down cost. the devices are already on the market. This is not an exorbitant cost.

Mr Surrena asked about the difference in cost between the arc fault receptacle and the regular receptacle.

Bryan Holland stated that a regular receptacle would be around 69 cents and an arc fault receptacle could be \$45.

Move forward as non-consensus

CR-E3902.16(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Haywood Kines
hkines@pwcgov.org

Reason: The report indicated the second leading cause of residential fire death in 2013 was electrical malfunction. 84 percent of all electrical fires occurred in 1&2 family dwellings. The leading factors contributing to the ignition of residential building fires were due to electrical malfunction (41%), unspecified short-circuit arcing (25%), and short-circuit arcing from defective or worn insulation (12%)

Haywood Kines gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Charles Gerber stated we may need clarification to take to the next step.

Two exceptions

Move forward as non-consensus

CR-G2439.7.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Thomas Clark representing VPMIA & VBCOA PMG Committee
tdclark@pwcgov.org

Reason: The addition of screws or other fasteners would cause lint to be trapped and cause dryer vent fires.

Thomas Clark gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Move forward as consensus on all four duct installations.

CR-P2602.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Carl Dale
Carl.dale@scc.virginia.gov

Reason: In February 2014, a home exploded in Stafford County, Virginia. 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.

Carl Dale gave an overview of his proposal. He stated they had made a few minor changes to the proposal.

Comments:

Dean Cody from Columbia Gas gave an overview regarding tracer wires.

John Ainslie asked if this tracer wire on this private waterline that leaves the house, Miss Utility is called by an excavating contractor. Is it going to be the responsibility of Miss Utility to mark the lines.

Dean Cody said it is not Miss Utility that marks the lines, it is the responsibility of each utility to mark the lines. Without the tracer line, you cannot possibly mark the line.

Mr. Surrena so the private line gets a tracer wire put on, someone calls Miss Utility because they are going to change the gas line, who marks the private utility line for this homeowner.

Mr. Napier stated he is for tracer lines He just has a problem with individual companies locating these lines. Miss Utility should locate these tracer wires.

John Ainslie asked isn't this a requirement on sewer lines?

Charlie Gerber stated he was a little confused, sewer lines were proposed by VA-SCC, now water lines are being proposed. Why would gas utilities check to see if water and sewer lines are checked?

Art Lipscomb asked why you wouldn't you want it to 2" instead of 12".

Peter Panagotopoulos with SEC stated when we are called, the gas camera crew comes out to find the tracer wire from the easement to the house. We locate all utilities as well.

Steve Lane with American Water agrees with this proposal. This helps utility companies.

Emory Rodgers stated that you may need to amend this to take out lawn sprinklers.

John Ainslie thinks this is very well intended. Is this cost a little high? I hate new homes having to pay the cost and not being used. Hate to do for nothing.

Mr. Surrena stated that it should be water service lines.

Carl Dale said we are willing to make this change "water service to the structure".

Move forward as consensus with the change.

CR-R303.4 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Mike Moore
mmoore@newportventures.net

Reason: Virginia already requires whole house mechanical ventilation for low-rise dwelling units in all cases unless a builder follows the performance path of the energy code, has a blower door test result greater than 5 ACH50, and is still able to meet the performance requirements of the code.

Mike Moore gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Mike Toalson asked if this is consistent with the whole house ventilation section.

John Ainslie asked if we could strike out whole house and replace with mechanical ventilation. This is just a different reference.

Emory Rodgers just wanted to make sure that this doesn't affect that we have 5 air exchanges.

Move forward as consensus

CR-R311.2.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Ron Clements representing interior passage subworkgroup
clementsro@chesterfield.gov

Reason: At the DHCD Work Group 3 meeting held on May 10, 2016 a number of attendees expressed an interest in meeting separately to discuss drafting a code change to clarify the interior passage (R311.2.1) code section in the USBC. The intent was to clarify the code provisions and address some questions that had developed out of enforcement of the provisions.

Ron Clements gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Moving forward as consensus

CR-R408.1 cdp VA-15 Proponent: Michael Eutsey and Charles Bajnai
mjeutsey@hanovercounty.gov and bajnaic@chesterfield.gov

Reason: The change in text for R408.1 now matches the VCC. The exception has been added to cover foundation offsets such as bumpouts created for a gas fireplace or a bay window.

Michael Eutsey gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

None

Move forward as consensus

CTG-310.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bob Torbin

Bob.torbin@omegaflex.net

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.

Mr. Torbin gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Charlie Gerber asked none of this involves field applied jackets?

Bob Torbin said no

Bob Adkins asked if Mr. Torbin knew how many products on the market that has ANSI LC1 listing?

Bob Torbin said there are currently 3.

Move forward as recommendation for consensus

CTM-506.5.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Richard Grace representing the VPMIA and VBCOA PMG Committee

Richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov

Reason: Pollution Control Units have been manufactured by numerous companies for several years. This limits the amount of smoke, grease and other particulates at the exhaust outlets of commercial cooking appliances.

Bob Adkins gave an overview of this

Comments:

Charlie Gerber said the problem he has is it appears in code books the possible confusion the requirement of this. I don't see anything that said it is not required. I think this would cause confusion.

Kenney Payne stated that this reference to 2012. Usually if it is an option, it would say installation shall.

Don Surrena stated that it indicates that it would have to be listed and labeled in accordance with 1978. Will this eliminate others that would have been able to be used previously? All units or just this one?

Proponent has said they would add "as required or as installed"

Emory Rodgers prefers "as installed".

One opposition

Move forward as non-consensus

CTM-607.6.2.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Thomas Clark representing VPMIA & VBCOA PMG Committee
tdclark@pwcgov.org

Reason: The Fire performance measured by ANSI/UL 263 is based upon the assumption that air movement will be effectively stopped at the start of a fire.

Mr. Clark gave an overview of his proposal

Comments:

Charlie Gerber stated he was confused as what this does because the smoke detectors are already in the code. Also a little confused about the timing of the operation when this shuts down.

Cindy Davis asked if you are adding a new standard shouldn't you be referencing this standard in the requirement. 555C

Don Surrano stated if you are referencing this standard, if you want that standard to pertain to this, don't you need to call out the section?

Bob Adkins said this doesn't change to what we are to be doing everyday. This is already required we are just listing the requirements.

Richard Bartell says he has a real problem with #4.

Kenney Payne stated there was a typo "devises".

Rick Witt stated you could remove #4.

Cindy Davis is there a consensus if you incorporate the standard into the body of the text and eliminate #4?

Move forward with consensus as amended.

CTS-305.2.4 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Robert Adkins representing Prince William County
radkins@pwcgov.org

Reason: To identify mesh barriers as temporary barriers and not permanent.

Bob Adkins gave an overview of his proposal.

Kris Bridges stated he had a problem with temporary hanging.

Kenney Payne just adding temporary in the heading it still needs to be in the text

Carry this one over

F-112.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Richard Witt

witr@chesterfield.gov

Reason:

Rick Witt gave an overview of his proposal

Comments:

Taking annually out, adding as necessary

Move forward as consensus

F-507.5.1 cdpVa-15 Proponent: Mike Toalson representing Home Builders

Association of Virginia

mltoalson@hbav.com

Carried over

F-703.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Zachary Adams

adamsz@vt.edu

Reasons: While we agree it is imperative that the integrity of fire-resistance construction be maintained, to require an annual inspection imposes a substantial burden on the owner, especially where an extensive amount of square footage is occupied.

Zach gave an overview of his proposal

Comments:

Rick Witt stated we are in full support of the modifications

Robby Dawson stated that Option 2 is reasonable, take out annually.

Rick Witt stated this may be good for a small building.

Emory Rodgers stated the maintenance code official has a stake in this.

Kenney Payne asked why couldn't we say less frequent?

VA Community College rep said this is a retroactive requirement for buildings that have been standing for years.

Carry over

F-703.4 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Justin Biller representing self
jbbiller@carillionclinic.org

Reason: In particular, Health Care Facilities in Virginia are facing enforcement of this requirement as part of ongoing licensure/funding through State enforcement of NFPA 101, Life Safety Code, so it is also important that these requirements are consistent with local fire prevention code enforcement as well throughout the Commonwealth.

Comments:

Rick Witt suggested carrying this over, I have a call in to Justin

Carry over

F-1030.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Andrew Milliken representing Stafford County Fire Marshal's Office
amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov

Move forward as consensus for disapproval

F-2304.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Robby Dawson
dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Reason:

Mobile fueling operations have started in other states and have become a fire risk to the community.

Comments:

Robby Dawson asked that we **carry over**

F-5003.1.4 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Robby Dawson
dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Reason: This proposal was developed in cooperation with Mike O'Conner and Renee Hooper of VA DEQ in response to concerns over the original change to 5003.3.1.4.

Robby Dawson gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Mike O Connor stated we are in good shape here.

Move forward as consensus

M-101.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: VMC Rewrite Committee
Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov

Moved forward as full consensus

M-202(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Phillip Storey representing Legal Aid Justice Center

phil@justice4all.org

Reason: The appeals challenged the City of Richmond's application to threaten with condemnation owner-occupied homes it claimed met VMC Section 202's definition of Structure Unfit for Human Occupancy because they lacked "primary heating systems."

Phillip Storey gave an overview of this proposal.

Cindy Davis said staff said if we remove those 3 words (Required or provided) it did lose something that could cause the argument that it is not required and I don't have to provide it, therefore I don't have to comply. Would this be more appropriate for another code change?

Will come back to this.

M-603.1 cdpVA-15 Phillip Storey representing Legal Aid Justice Center

phil@justice4all.org

Reason: Both the existing (2012) language and the amended language proposed in the VMC Rewrite Committee's document require full maintenance of installed mechanical appliances that are not required by the code, which could be costly and unjustified by health and safety concerns.

Phil Storey gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

John Walsh is in accordance with this.

Robby Dawson asked if this is not required, do we have to do maintenance on it?

Rick Witt stated to Robby Dawson that he had some concerns or issues.

Michael Redifer stated we could separate this, if not required they don't need to be maintained.

Richard Bartell said he thinks this needs to move forward and discuss later.

Emory Rodgers said add unintended consequences.

Sean Farrell stated if it is regulated by the code it needs to be maintained

Will carry this over

M-604.3.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Haywood Kines

hkines@pwcgov.org

Reason: The proposal adds a Third Party Field Evaluation Body to the list that may provide a report to the AHJ documenting the equipment exposed to water damage from flooding or Fire Fighting has not sustained any damage.

Haywood Kines gave an overview of this proposal.

Richard Bartell asked if there was a definition of third party evaluation?

Bob Adkins stated this will add more money to flooded buildings.

Greg Revels said this has been in the code for a long time. What problems have you had with this.

Ron Clements asked about this language “third party inspector that is approved by Section 113.1.

Move forward with Ron Clements comments as non-consensus

R-101.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: The proposed new title “Virginia Existing Building Code” (VEBC) follows the model code “International Existing Building Code” (IEBC) for which it is named.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

R-101.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: The entire paragraph has been converted to a list format, which is much easier to read and understand.

Kenney Payne gave an overview to his proposal.

Comments:

Moved forward as consensus

R-202(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Robby Dawson should we say approved by the building official?

Moved forward as consensus as amended

R-202(5) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bob Orr representing VBCOA VRC Committee
borr@culpepercounty.gov

Reason: These definitions are not in line with those in the Virginia Construction Code addressing buildings or structures under active permit.

Kenney gave an overview of this proposal

Comments:

Richard Bartell is this cited as dangerous?

Moved forward as consensus

R-301.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: Tried to simplify the language when determining compliance methods, including taking an “exception” (which is actually a 4th compliance method) and giving it its own “section” like the other compliance methods.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Bob Adkins stated he didn’t know how you decided to quantify this?

Ron Clements the objection in making it its own exception is subject to approval.
VBCOA wants the separate path.

Chris Raha asked by complying with the code under which it was constructed does this eliminate any requirements of accessibility?

Move forward as consensus with Option A

R-301.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Kenney Payne gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Robby Dawson said if you are bringing in IFC how are we going to know how to capture the language. If it is pointing to IFC leave it.

Ron Clements stated all we were trying to do to is to keep you from having an IFC and a SFPC on your desk. This has nothing to do with the rewrite. We were not trying to shortchange the fire code.

Johnna Grizzard asked could this add to the prescriptive method?

Chris Raha asked since Chapter 9 of the fire code speaks to the existing buildings and the maintenance fire alarm systems are we taking it out of the fire code now? Are we going to have two different sources?

Vernon Hodge said I think they were trying to bring in maintenance language. I think we need to take a good hard look at this.

Ron Clements said this is not intended to be the prescriptive method.

We will look at it again, have committee meet again

This will be carried over

R-301.1.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-Virginia

kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: The term “Work Area” when used to describe an entire “compliance method” leads to confusion among owners, designers, reviewers, code and fire officials. Work area is a defined term and involves reconfigures spaces.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

R-303.1 cdpVA-15 Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA

kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: Reroofing and roof repair are clearly an “existing building” scope of work and should be in the VEBC.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Chris Snidow said this simplifies this for VA.

Chris Raha asked about 707.3.2 and you said this is not in the IBC, is this because of the design standards today that do not permit this standard?

Rick Fargan with Community Colleges said with this code requirement we are going to hire an engineer. The Rehab Code is forcing us into. I am in favor of this proposal.

Move forward as consensus

R-505.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Ron Clements representing VBCOA VRC Committee.

clementsro@chesterfield.gov

Reason: The current VRC is silent on how to calculate work areas in pedestal buildings designed per IBC 510. This change clarifies that the areas on either side of the horizontal assemblies should be used as the “building area” for application of the 50% calculation in 505.1.

Ron Clements gave an overview of his proposal.

Chris Raha asked how does this apply to fire alarm systems?

Move forward as consensus

R-805.3.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: In the case of 805.3.2 and 805.4.1.1, the more appropriate term should be common path of egress travel distance not just travel distance.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Ron Clements stated if you are a part of the alterations increasing the occupant load by definition after obtaining occupancy and Chapter 10 would kick in and will make you go farther. You have to provide all the requirements for IBC.

Move forward as consensus

R-808.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Johnna Grizzard
grizzardj@chesterfield.gov

Reason: The 2012 VCC currently permits application of the VRC for reconstruction, alteration or repair in group R-5 occupancies as an exception to VCC 103.5. There is also a forthcoming proposal for the 2015 Virginia code change cycle to more clearly specify the VRC is applicable to R-5 occupancies.

Johnna Grizzard gave an overview of her proposal

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

R-903.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason: The revision to the header is to avoid potential confusion as the charging paragraph is only about stairways, and not shafts and vertical openings.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

R-904.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Reason; It could be interpreted that VRC Section 904.2 (the “charging” paragraph) requires installation throughout the building, as it would be required “for new construction.” However, VRC Sections 904.2.1 and 904.2.2 clearly only require such installation in work areas only.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Move forward as consensus

Cindy Davis stated that we had two items of discussion before we wrap up. She gave an overview of this Legislation Chapter 524. Should there be a code change on this? Should fire code match what the new legislation says. Nothing needs to be done just discussion now.

Robby Dawson stated that he had followed this bill pretty closely. This does not conflict with the existing state fire prevention code.

Cindy Davis asked the question to the group, should the fire code match what the new law states? There is no code change.

William Andrews said he is opposed to this.

Cindy Davis stated that our second topic of conversation is regarding the mulch situation. Robby Dawson then gave an overview of this topic. Legislation was only specific to Harrisonburg.

Walter Lucas asked how we can enforce this.

Richard Bartell asked if this is happening in other states.

Kenney Payne asked if no code change comes forward, what happens?

Tyler Craddock asked what kind of building code should we write?

Robby Dawson stated we shouldn't do anything until after the litigation.

John Walsh stated this is a zoning issue.

Mike Toalson stated a simple solution is to ban smoking.

Robby Dawson said the 18” came from the Department of Forestry website.

Linda Hale stated it is on their Department of Forestry website.