

Workgroups 2 and 4 Agenda

Meeting Date and Time: February 28, 2013 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Location: Virginia Housing Center, 4224 Cox Road, Glen Allen, Virginia 23060

Lunch provided by reservation only. Please email Monica Cousins (Monica.Cousins@dhcd.virginia.gov) by February 22, 2013 if you would like to have a lunch ordered for you.

AGENDA

1. VCC 408.9 Windowless buildings (**Handout p. 1**)
2. VCC 427 I-3 Lockup areas (**Handout p. 3**)
3. VCC 508.2.3 Allowable building area and height (**Handout p. 6**)
4. VCC 509 Incidental uses (**Handout p. 7**)
5. VCC 703.7 Marking of fire-rated assemblies (**Handout p. 8**)
6. VCC 806.1.2 Combustible decorative materials (**Handout p. 9**)
7. VCC 903.2.7 M occupancy sprinklers (**Handout p. 11**)
8. VCC 908.7 E occupancies carbon monoxide detectors (**Handout p. 12**)
9. VCC 1009.1 Stairways (**Handout p. 14**)
10. VCC 1022.5 Penetrations (**Handout p. 15**)
11. VCC 1106.1 Accessible parking table (**Handout p. 16**)
12. VCC 1106.3 Outpatient clinics accessible parking (**Handout p. 17**)
13. VCC 1403.5 Exterior wall flame test (two proposals) (**Handout p. 18**)
14. VCC 2308.3.2.2 Light-frame construction (**Handout p. 21**)
15. VCC 2603.5.5 Exterior wall assembly fire test (**Handout p. 22**)
16. VCC 2701.1.3 Generators in assisted living facilities (**Handout p. 24**)
17. VCC 3006.4 Elevator control room ratings (**Handout p. 27**)
18. VCC 3006.7 Machine-room-less elevator work platform (**Handout p. 28**)
19. VCC IPC 405.3.2 Lavatory location in schools (**Handout p. 29**)
20. VCC IECC C402.1.1 Vertical fenestration (**Handout p. 30**)
21. VCC IECC C402.4.8 Recessed lighting (**Handout p. 31**)
22. VRC 912.4.1 Stairways (**Handout p. 32**)
23. VMC 606.1 Semi-annual elevator inspections (**Handout p. 33**)
24. SFPC 308.1 Use of open flames for cooking (**Handout p. 34**)
25. SFPC 308.1.4 Grills on decks (**Handout p. 36**)
26. SFPC 404.3.2 Fire safety plan (**Handout p. 41**)
27. SFPC 506.1 Fire service keys (includes VCC 3003.3) (**Handout p. 42**)
28. SFPC 607.1 References to existing buildings (**Handout p. 44**)
29. SFPC 703.1 Owner inspection of fire-rated elements (**Handout p. 46**)
30. SFPC 5601.2.4.1 Blasting and fireworks insurance (**Handout p. 47**)
31. SFPC 5607.16 Blast records (**Handout p. 49**)
32. SFPC 5608.4.1 Comets and mines (**Handout p. 54**)

(continued next page)

Sub-workgroup proposals

- Tanker truck parking (**Handout p. 56**)
- Assisted living facilities (**Handout p. 59**)
- Exhaust hoods for domestic appliances in commercial buildings (**Handout p. 65**)

New Business

Adjournment

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Sections 408.6 and 408.9**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

408.6 Smoke barrier. Occupancies ~~in~~ classified as Group I-3 shall have *smoke barriers* complying with Sections 408.8 and 709 to divide every *story* occupied by residents for sleeping, or any other *story* having an *occupant load* of 50 or more persons, into no fewer than two smoke compartments.

408.9 Windowless buildings. Smoke control. ~~For the purposes of this section, a windowless building or portion of a building is one with nonopenable windows, windows not readily breakable or without windows. Windowless buildings shall be provided with an engineered smoke control system to provide a tenable environment for exiting from the *smoke compartment* in the area of fire origin in accordance with Section 909 for each windowless *smoke compartment*. Provide an engineered smoke control system in accordance with Section 909 for each smoke compartment. The engineered smoke control system shall provide an environment capable of the timely evacuation and relocation of occupants from the smoke compartment where the fire originated.~~

Exception: Smoke compartments with openable windows or windows that are readily breakable.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The application and interpretation of smoke barriers, smoke compartments, windowless buildings, and smoke control systems, oftentimes varies among building officials because the path of determination can be confusing. Should an office area have a smoke control system because it is on the same "story" as an I-3? Should a kitchen have a smoke control system because it is a "portion of a building" that also has an I-3 occupancy?

408.6 Smoke barrier: The proposal makes it clear that smoke barriers apply *only* to those spaces classified as I-3. The current text implies that *any* occupancy in an I-3 requires smoke barriers. This might include a kitchen that is on the other side of a separated corridor; or a dining room located down the corridor; or an office suite located 300 feet away, all because they are "occupancies in Group I-3" and/or are on the same "story" as a Group I-3. Since the proposed text clarifies that smoke barriers apply only to spaces that *are* Group I-3; the kitchen (B), dining room (A-2), and office suite (B) would not be required to have smoke barriers; thus, they would not be required to have smoke compartments; thus they would not be required to have an engineered smoke control system.

408.9 Windowless buildings. This paragraph changes terms so often, it can be confusing and has been interpreted in different ways across the Commonwealth. The text begins with *windowless* buildings, and then jumps immediately to *any* building. It then requires a smoke control system in a *windowless building*, but ends the paragraph requiring a smoke control system in each smoke *compartment*. So, is a smoke control system required in:

- Only windowless buildings
- In portions of buildings, regardless of whether it is windowless or not
- Only smoke compartments
- All of the above

The confusion has meant buildings with I-3 occupancies throughout the Commonwealth are not designed the same. Some building officials have required all areas in a windowless building to have a smoke control system. Some building officials have required a smoke control system only in each smoke compartment, and not throughout the entire building. Some building officials have required other areas of the building not classified as I-3 (not a windowless building, but in a building that has smoke compartments) to have a smoke control system.

So, is the issue about "windowless buildings" or "smoke control?"

If one assumes the code wants a smoke control system only in a windowless smoke compartment (as the last sentence implies), then why confuse matters with windowless buildings and portions of a building? The proposed text attempts to clarify that a smoke control system is required in smoke compartments only, and deletes the confusion of adding windowless buildings or portion of buildings. An exception was added to omit the smoke control system if there are methods by which the products of combustion could be ventilated.

"Tenable" was deleted since it is not defined by the building code, and can be interpreted to mean, "capable of being occupied" or "capable of being held or maintained", which is the opposite of what needs to occur – which is to evacuate the occupants from the smoke compartment where the fire originated – not allow the occupants to remain in and occupy the smoke compartment.

The new heading (Smoke Control) gets straight to the intent of the code without confusing and unnecessary language.

When the proposed *changes* to Section 408.6 are combined with the *existing* text in Section 408.6.1 and the proposed *changes* to Section 408.9, the need for smoke barriers, smoke compartments, and a smoke control system should be simplified and can be applied equally and interpreted consistently throughout the Commonwealth.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: January 9, 2013

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 202; Section 408.2.1, and new Section 427**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add new definition in Section 202 as follows:

LOCKUP AREA. An area located in an occupancy other than I-3, containing holding cells and associated rooms or spaces, where occupants are restrained or detained for penal or correctional purposes, by the use of security measures not under the occupant's control, and where occupants do not inhabit or sleep within the holding cells and associated rooms or spaces.

Add new subsection 408.2.1 as follows:

408.2.1 Lockup areas. For lockup areas, refer to Section 427.

Add new Section 427 as follows:

SECTION 427
LOCKUP AREAS

427.1 Applicability. The provisions of Sections 427.1 through 427.3 shall apply to all parts of buildings and structures that contain a *lockup area* as defined herein.

427.2 Classification. Lockup areas shall be permitted to be classified as the main occupancy, provided all of the following are met:

1. Aggregate lockup areas shall not occupy more than 10 percent of the building area of the story in which they are located and shall not exceed the tabular values in Table 503, without building area increases.
2. Detainee occupant load of each lockup area shall not exceed 30.
3. Aggregate detainee occupant load per story shall not exceed 120.
4. No occupant shall be detained for more than 24 hours in a lockup area.
5. Compliance with the following:
 - a. Section 408.3.7.
 - b. Section 408.3.8.
 - c. Section 408.4.
 - d. Section 408.7.

6. Requirements of the main occupancy in which the lockup area is located shall be met.
7. Building or structure in which the lockup area is located shall be provided throughout with a *fire alarm* system in accordance with Section 907.2.6.3.
8. Building or structure in which the lockup area is located shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.

427.3 Separation. Each lockup area shall be separated from each other and adjacent spaces by smoke partitions in accordance with Section 710.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The goal is to allow lockup areas in occupancies other than I-3, without applying I-3 provisions to the entire building (including, height limitations and smoke control system) based on the limited area of the lockups.

I-3 is defined, in part, as buildings "that are *inhabited*" which must then be further defined as one of 5 conditions – where each condition refers to *sleeping* areas. Thus, it appears areas where detainees do not sleep and are held for a limited time do not meet the definition of an I-3 occupancy. However, I-3 is the closest occupancy classification (occupants under restraint or security and are generally incapable of self-preservation) and is almost always applied to such lockup / holding cell areas – which creates ambiguities, including Section 408.2, and onerous requirements for the rest of the occupancies within the main building.

Section 408.2 has been interpreted and enforced differently by building officials throughout Virginia, and by removing lockup areas from Section 408 and thus its potential to be classified as an I-3 occupancy, consistency could then be achieved and would benefit the designers, owners, and ultimately the Commonwealth.

This code change proposal takes some portions of two code change proposals (G33-12 and G37-12) which were "Disapproved" by the General Code Committee at the 2012 ICC Code Development Hearing in Dallas. The code change would address those situations where you have lockup areas / holding cells located within *other* occupancies such as: courthouses, police stations, security offices (arenas, stadiums, airports, shopping mall, etc.), customs facilities, immigration facilities, and similar types of facilities, where the detainees are there for a limited time, do not inhabit or sleep in the holding cell, and the occupant load and aggregate area is limited.

Some of the reasons for disapproval of G33-12 and/or G37-12 included the following:

1. Confusion with psychiatric, neonatal, and dementia wards.
2. Occupant load of 50 seems too high and inconsistent with other IBC criteria and further coordination with I-3 occupant loads should be made.
3. No limitations on how many lockup facilities could be located within a building (could be used to replace I-3 occupancies).
4. Built-in systems were preferred over contacting the fire department.
5. Concerned with use of terms "trained and practiced."
6. Smoke barriers may make observation difficult.
7. Sprinklers were not required throughout the building, and only within the lockup facility.
8. A time limit needs to be placed upon the use of such facilities.

This code change proposal attempts to address the above reasons/concerns as follows (numbers correspond to above):

1. The new term *lockup area* would have its own definition and the requirements would be located under a new section, thus avoiding any potential for confusion with other I-related requirements except those specifically identified.
2. The proposed occupant load of 30 would be a compromise between 10 (identified in Tables 1015.1 and 1021.2(2)) which would be too low; and 50 which was deemed by the Committee to be too high.
3. Limitations are established by the following:
 - a. Limited to 10% of the building area per story.
 - b. Detainee occupant loads would be limited to 120 per story.
4. Lockup areas would still be required to meet all *selected* requirements of I-3, including automatic alarm and detection systems, means of egress, glazing, and locks.
5. Those terms are not used.
6. Smoke barriers would not be required since lockup areas are not sleeping areas, the lockup areas are not "in" an I-3 occupancy. Smoke partitions would be required.
7. An NFPA-13 sprinkler system and fire alarm system would be required throughout the building or structure.
8. No detainee shall occupy a lockup area more than 24 hours a day – thus avoiding the potential for the need to "sleep" within the lockup area.

NFPA 5000 recognizes the need for such an approach, and includes provisions for such lockup areas.

Construction costs should be reduced (no smoke control system, no need for Type I or IIA construction if lockup areas are on a 3rd floor or higher, and no need to fire-rate the enclosing and supporting construction) - compared to if I-3 requirements were applied to the rest of the building in which lockup areas are located.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: January 9, 2013

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 IBC, Section 508.2.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

508.2.3 Allowable building area and height. The allowable *building area and height* of the building containing accessory occupancies shall be based on the allowable *building area and height* for the main occupancy in accordance with Section 503.1. ~~The height of each accessory occupancy shall not exceed the tabular values in Table 503, without increases in accordance with Section 504 for such accessory occupancies.~~ The *building area* of the accessory occupancies shall be in accordance with Section 508.2.1.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This proposed code change G126-12 was "Approved as Submitted" by the General Code Committee at the 2012 ICC Code Development Hearing in Dallas. The accompanying supporting statement is repeated below:

The current text of 508.2.3 literally limits the location of an accessory occupancy in a building to the tabular height in Table 503 for the occupancy of the accessory occupancy. Imposing this limit is a total contradiction to what the accessory occupancy design option was intended to allow. When literally applied, an office building of Type IIC construction that is allowed to be 4 stories in height with sprinklers, could not have closets or storage rooms above the 2nd story as they are a Group S-1 (storage) occupancy and the tabular height limit in Table 503 is 2 stories.

And I emphasize "tabular" height limit because as the code is currently written, no height increase can be taken for a fully sprinklered building used when determining the vertical location of an accessory occupancy.

Another example would be linen storage rooms (Group S-1) in hotels of Type IIB construction. Based on Table 503 the tabular building height limit (in stories) for a Group S-1 occupancy is 2 stories, where the hotel (Group R-2) is allowed to be up to 5 stories when sprinklered. Because Group S-1 occupancies are not allowed above the 2nd story, linen storage closets would not be allowed above the 2nd story – a hotel cannot literally function without those storage spaces.

Without this code change many building designs as we know them today would continue to literally not be allowed.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Table 509 Incidental Uses**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add small Storage Rooms back to incidental use table as follows (no other changes to the Table are part of this proposal):

**TABLE 509
INCIDENTAL USES**

ROOM OR AREA	SEPARATION AND/OR PROTECTION
Storage rooms 100 square feet or less	1 hour or provide automatic sprinkler system

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Until recently, it has always been implied that small storage rooms 100 SF or less were considered part of the main occupancy, (1) by its inclusion in the legacy BOCA codes, and (2) since storage rooms over 100 SF were included in the "incidental use" table through the 2006 IBC. However, in the 2009 IBC, storage rooms were removed from the Table and now must be classified as S-1 or S-2, and addressed as an accessory, non-separated mixed use, or separated mixed use.

This becomes problematic when there may be small storage rooms that now must be classified as S-1 or S-2 on upper floors. For example, when applying mixed use in B occupancy buildings of IIB or IIA construction, an S-1 storage room cannot be placed above the 3rd floor in accordance with Table 503 and Section 504.

This code change proposal adds back the previous legacy recognition that *small* storage rooms 100 SF or less could be considered an "incidental use" within the main occupancy in which they are located. They would still need to be separated with rated construction or provided with a sprinkler system. Storage rooms *greater than* 100 SF would still need to be classified as S-1 or S-2, and addressed accordingly.

A similar code change (G42-12) was "Approved as Submitted" by the General Code Committee at the 2012 ICC Code Development Hearing in Dallas. In that proposal, such small storage rooms were classified as "accessory" spaces, however, they did at least recognize that an option other than classifying them as S-1 or S-2 was necessary to deal with such *small* storage rooms.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 VCC, Section 703.7**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

703.7 Fire-resistance assembly marking. ~~Concealed~~ Where there is an accessible concealed floor, floor-ceiling or attic space, fire walls, vertical fire separation assemblies, fire barriers, fire partitions, and smoke barriers, or any other wall required to have protected openings or penetrations, shall be designated above ceilings and on the inside of all ceiling access doors which provide access to such fire rated assemblies by signage having letters no smaller than one inch (25.4 mm) in height. Such signage shall indicate the fire-resistance rating of the assembly and the type of assembly and be provided at horizontal intervals of no more than eight feet (2438 mm).

Note: An example of suggested formatting for the signage would be "ONE HOUR FIRE PARTITION."

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This is similar language which was "Approved as Submitted" by the Fire Safety Code Committee at the 2012 ICC Code Development Hearing in Dallas. The accompanying supporting statement, in part, is repeated below:

Section 703.7 was meant to require that the markings on fire-resistance rated assemblies only where there is an accessible space. This proposal modifies the code language to state that requirement more clearly. As written, this section requires the marking to be located in a concealed accessible space, so it requires construction of a concealed space where one would not otherwise be installed.

The term "fire separation assemblies" is no longer a defined term in the VCC (legacy term from BOCA days); therefore, it should be deleted. Since shaft enclosures and stairways are required to be constructed with fire barriers, those are already covered by the charging language.

Since there may be situations where a protected opening may be required by provisions of the code other than those found in Chapter 7, the added language "or any other wall . . ." would address those occurrences.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 806.1.2, Exception 1**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Revise Exception 1, add new Exception 2, and renumber Exception 2 to Exception 3, as follows:

[F] 806.1.2 Combustible decorative materials. The permissible amount of *decorative materials* meeting the flame propagation performance criteria of NFPA 701 shall not exceed 10 percent of the specific wall or ceiling area to which it is attached.

Exceptions:

1. In auditoriums or similar types of spaces in Group A, the permissible amount of decorative material meeting the flame propagation performance criteria of NFPA 701 shall not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate wall area where the building is equipped throughout with an *automatic sprinkler system* in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 and where the material is installed in accordance with Section 803.11.
2. In auditoriums or similar types of spaces in Group A, the permissible amount of fabric partitions suspended from the ceiling and not supported by the floor, and meeting the flame propagation performance criteria of NFPA 701 shall not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate wall area where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.
3. The amount of fabric partitions suspended from the ceiling and not supported by the floor in Group B and M occupancies shall not be limited.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Outside of a proscenium curtain (which is addressed in Section 410.3.5), it appears you would not be able to install any other type of curtain in an auditorium or other similar types of spaces (such as recital, rehearsal, and dance halls/studios) where the curtains exceed 10%, unless you could utilize Section 806.1.2, Exception 1.

However, Exception 1 as currently written requires compliance with Section 803.11.

- Section 803.11 involves *interior finishes*, not *decorative materials*, but it appears the exception treats *decorative materials* as *interior finishes* due to its reference to installation requirements within Section 803.11
 - So, are curtains considered a *decorative material* or an *interior finish* (or maybe even a wall or partition – in which case the code change would look closer to the current Exception 2)?
 - If an *interior finish*, then Section 806 would not be applicable at all
 - Therefore, the code must intend *decorative materials* (in this case, curtains) are not an *interior finish* – even if it exceeds 10%
- If we must then meet Section 803.11 for the installation of curtains:
 - Curtains are not directly attached to a substrate, so 803.11.1 would not be applicable
 - Curtains are not furred construction, so 803.11.1.1 would not be applicable
 - Curtains are not dropped ceilings, so 803.11.2.1 would not be applicable
 - Curtains do not entail heavy timber construction, so 803.11.3 would not be applicable
 - Curtains are not directly applied to a wall, ceiling, or structural element, so 803.11.4 would not be applicable
 - That leaves 803.11.2 – set out construction; however, curtains are not considered walls (or are they?) or ceilings, so it would appear 803.11.2 is not applicable
 - Even if curtains had to be installed per 803.11.2
 - Curtains, as a loose material, are not tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 (which tests materials against walls or ceilings), so 803.1.1 would not be applicable
 - The code Commentary even states, the tests are not applicable to materials that are not capable of supporting themselves, or of being supported
 - Curtains, as a loose material and a textile, are not tested in accordance with NFPA 286 (room corner test), so 803.1.2 would not be applicable
 - So, how can you comply with set-out construction when your decorative material (curtain) is not tested per the referenced sections?

Therefore, the code change proposal:

1. Maintains Exception 1 for those decorative materials that would not be considered curtains/draperies.
2. Exceptions 1 and 2 include other locations where curtains are typically required, including A-1 facilities other than just auditoriums (which is not listed under Section 303 Assembly Group A), and similar type of spaces in A-3 (e.g., dance, rehearsal, and recital halls and studios).
3. New Exception 2 allows for those situations where you may have curtains such as borders, walk-arounds, travelers, cycloramas, etc., that exceed 10% and you want to utilize the exception, but could not due to the installation requirements of 803.11 – by deleting the installation requirements of 803.11.
4. New Exception 2 uses the same terminology found in 806.1.2, Exception 2 (now #3) rather than using the term “curtains” or “draperies.”
5. All exceptions still require compliance with NFPA 701, which should be the only criteria *decorative materials* or fabric partitions should meet; otherwise, if they had to meet ASTM E84, UL 723, or NFPA 286, then they should not be considered *decorative materials*, and they should be considered *interior finishes* or walls.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual x Government Entity Company

Name: Frank Castelvechi, III PE

Representing: County of Henrico Building Inspections

Mailing Address: PO Box 90775, Henrico VA 23273

Email Address: cas13@co.henrico.va.us

Telephone Number: 804 501 4375

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VA Construction code 903.2.7 base document

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

~~E. Change Section 903.2.7 of the IBC to read:~~

~~903.2.7 Group M. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings containing a Group M occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:~~

- ~~1. A Group M fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m²).~~
- ~~2. A Group M fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This proposed change is to go with the language in the 2012 IBC IFC now that ICC has fixed the unreasonable zero threshold for this more hazardous merchandise and replaced it with a more reasonable 5000 sq ft threshold for upholstered furniture and mattresses.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 9/28/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: draft Workgroups 2 and 4 CO alarms E occupancies
Representing: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 USBC 908.7 CO alarms

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Amend section 908.7 Group I, R and Group E occupancies for only K-12 educational grades, operated by local school boards....

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):
HB 2201 was tabled to allow the 2012 USBC regulatory process to address this issue to require CO alarms in K-12 grades operated by local school boards. The delegate didn't intend to broaden the scope to include private schools or higher educational E occupancies. There was not intent to have these single-station CO alarms to be connected or have a building-wide notification system, but these technical issues should be vetted with the experts and the stakeholders. Sought is a mandate, but being an options requires discussion.

Submission Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



2013 SESSION
13102886D

HOUSE BILL NO. 2201

Offered January 10, 2013

A BILL to amend and reenact § 22.1-138 of the Code of Virginia, relating to public school buildings; carbon monoxide detectors.

Patron-- Filler-Corn

Referred to Committee on Education

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That § 22.1-138 of the Code of Virginia is amended and reenacted as follows:

§ 22.1-138. Minimum standards for public school buildings.

A. The Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation minimum standards for the erection of or addition to public school buildings governing instructional, operational, health and maintenance facilities where these are not specifically addressed in the Uniform Statewide Building Code.

B. The regulations established pursuant to subsection A shall include a provision requiring that all new construction of, additions to, and alterations of public school buildings include the installation of at least one carbon monoxide detector.

C. By July 1, 1994, every school building in operation in the Commonwealth shall be tested for radon pursuant to procedures established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for radon measurements in schools.

School buildings and additions opened for operation after July 1, 1994, shall be tested for radon pursuant to such EPA procedures and regulations prescribed by the Board of Education pursuant to subsection A of this section. Each school shall maintain files of its radon test results and make such files available for review. The division superintendent shall report radon test results to the Department of Health.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 1009.1**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

1009.1 General. Stairways serving occupied portions of a building shall comply with the requirements of this section.

Exception: Stairways that do not serve as an exit or provide access to an exit do not need to comply with Sections 1009.2 and 1009.3.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Clarification is needed to ensure the provisions of Section 1009.2 or 1009.3 are not applied to stairways other than winders, spiral, curved, or alternating. All other provisions for stairways would still apply.

For example, a building may have a "monumental" stairway that is not an exit or an exit access stairway. The code change proposal attempts to avoid the interpretation that the stairway must still be designed to meet either an exit or exit access stairway, since Section 1009.1 could be interpreted that all stairways must comply with 1009.2 or 1009.3.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: August 3, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)

600 East Main Street

Suite 300

Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 1022.5**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

1022.5 Penetrations. Penetrations into and openings through interior exit stairways and ramps are prohibited except for required exit doors, equipment, and ductwork necessary for independent ventilation or pressurization, sprinkler piping, standpipes, electrical raceway for fire department communication systems, and electrical raceway serving the interior exit stairway and ramp and terminating at a steel box not exceeding 16 square inches (0.010 m²). Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714. There shall be no penetrations or communication openings, whether protected or not, between adjacent interior exit stairways and ramps.

Exceptions:

1. Membrane penetrations shall be permitted on the outside of the interior exit stairways and ramp. Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714.3.2.
2. Through-penetrations shall be permitted for primary and secondary structural framing other than columns. Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714.3.1.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Structural framing is allowed to penetrate other rated assemblies, including rated corridor walls, exit passageways, and other fire barriers and rated construction (e.g., those elements governed by Chapter 6). As long as the penetrations are fire-stopped and/or installed and tested as required by Section 714.3.1, the level of safety due to the penetration of an interior exit stairway should be equivalent to that of an exit passageway or corridor that was penetrated by structure.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: August 3, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name (Representing): *Ken Fredgren*, Chairman, Reston Accessibility Committee of Reston Citizens Association, 703-391-9019, fredgren.k@gmail.com. (Lead contact.)
Teri Barker-Morgan, Program Manager, Virginia Board for People with Disabilities, Richmond, 804-786-9381, Teri.Barker@vbpd.virginia.gov.
Gayl Brunk, Executive Director, Valley Associates for Independent Living (VAIL), Harrisonburg, 540-433-6513, gayl@govail.org.
Marcia DuBois, Program Coordinator, Community Based Services-Field Rehabilitative Services, Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services, Richmond, 804-662-7083, Marcia.DuBois@dars.virginia.gov.
Karen Michalski-Karney, Executive Director, Blue Ridge Independent Living Center, Roanoke, 540-342-1231, kmichalski@brilc.org.

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): USBC, Virginia Construction Code Table 1106.1

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Modify table as shown:

TABLE 1106.1
ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL PARKING SPACES PROVIDED	REQUIRED MINIMUM NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE SPACES
1 to 25	1
26 to 50	2
51 to 75	3
76 to 100	4
101 to 150	5
151 to 200	6 7
201 to 300	7 8
301 to 400	8 10
401 to 500	9 12
501 to 1000	≥ 2.5% of total
1,001 and over	20 25, plus one two for each 100, or fraction thereof, over 1,000

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This proposal results from the initial review by DHCD workgroups of proposals submitted by a legislative study group (the HJR 648 Study Group). This proposal is offered as an additional compromise to the compromise proposal submitted by the HJR 648 study group and is being submitted by groups involved in the HJR 648 study.

The compromise builds on the first compromise proposal of requiring only additional accessible parking spaces in larger parking lots whereas the HJR 648 proposal increased the number of accessible spaces beginning with lots with a minimum of 26 parking

spaces. In addition, this second compromise proposal reduces the proposed percentage change of accessible parking spaces from 3% to 2.5% in parking lots with 501 to 1000 spaces.

It is believed that a companion proposal requiring accessible parking spaces to be provided, if not already present, when a parking lot is restriped, will serve to increase accessible spaces in the smaller parking lots.

The table has not been revised in the 20 years since it was created, and our demography has changed appreciably. The proponents and others have noted that the table treats warehouses the same as restaurants, doctors' and dentists' offices, theaters, and grocery stores, implying that they serve the same people with the same frequency.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
The Jackson Center
501 N. 2nd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-1321

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: 2011 HJR 648 Workgroup

Representing: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): USBC, Virginia Construction Code Section 1106.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section 1106.3 to read as follows:

1106.3 ~~Hospital-outpatient~~ Outpatient clinics and ambulatory health care facilities. At least 10 percent, but not less than one, of care recipient and visitor parking spaces provided to serve ~~hospital outpatient~~ clinics and ambulatory health care facilities shall be accessible parking spaces.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This proposal would require slightly more accessible parking spaces at newly constructed outpatient clinics and ambulatory surgery centers. The IBC already requires the additional spaces for medical facilities which are on hospital campuses.

Examples: An office would provide 2 accessible parking spaces if it had 20 parking spaces or 3 accessible parking spaces if it had 30 parking spaces. Minimal but efficacious changes.

Doctors and dentists, their associations and health insurance companies all repeatedly stress the critical importance of preventive health care. This proposal makes it more feasible for people with mobility limitations to participate in the preventive health care imperative, the purposes of which are to enhance people's quality of life, keep people out of hospitals insofar as possible and reduce health care costs.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
The Jackson Center
501 N. 2nd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-1321

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 1403.5**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Delete the section in its entirety without substitution:

~~**1403.5 Vertical and Lateral Flame Propagation.** Exterior walls on buildings of Type I, II, III or IV construction that are greater than 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade plane and contain a combustible water resistive barrier shall be tested in accordance with and comply with the acceptance criteria of NFPA 285.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

There are materials that are available, tried and tested by long-term proven history of performance as weather barriers, without demonstrated data suggesting these materials contribute to personal loss of life or injuries and/or property damage. Section 1403.2 of the IBC requires weather-resistive barriers while Section 1403.5 requires them to be tested to the NFPA 285 standard if they are a combustible water resistive barrier; however, many (if not all) of these materials that are traditionally used and have proven their value will now not be able to meet the NFPA 285 test standard.

We are not aware of any empirical data suggesting this is a problem, much less a life-safety problem; rather, this appears to be a solution looking for a problem.

The 40-foot requirement could possibly affect two story buildings (with higher floor-to-floor heights on a sloping site) and will affect nearly all 3-story buildings. So, this change will affect a large portion of buildings constructed in Virginia each year.

This is a case that will lead to unintended consequences if the code suddenly makes it nearly impossible to provide water-resistive barriers in exterior walls, especially, given that 75% of construction litigation relates to water-related problems. If this paragraph is not deleted or minimized in some other way (increasing the height, allowing for exceptions such as fully -sprinklered buildings, etc.), then we are likely to face significant problems in the future with the failure of exterior water barriers.

Cost Impact: The proposed code change will *reduce* the cost of construction between \$25,000 - \$35,000 per exterior wall assembly type. On average, there may be as many as 3 or more different exterior wall assemblies per project; thus, equating to a potential cost savings of approximately \$100,000 per project. Since the NFPA 285 test is for an "assembly" and not just components, then technically, a test would need to be conducted every time a single component changes within an exterior wall assembly (components could include veneers, insulation, WRB, back-up, sheathing, and interior finishes).

- For example, you may have a building that changes from a brick veneer to siding = two tests @ \$25,000/test.
- You may have an exterior wall assembly that switches from CMU back-up to studs = two tests @ \$25,000/test.
- You may brick-on-CMU and brick-on-studs; and siding-on-CMU and siding-on-studs = four tests @ \$25,000/test.
- If you have varying interior finishes on each of the exterior wall assemblies (some may have just painted gypsum, some may have wall-coverings, some may have paneling, some may have decorative materials, etc.), then technically, a separate NFPA 285 test must be conducted for each of the different "assemblies"

Therefore, you can see the potential cost impact this new code requirement will inflict on Virginia construction – and was done so without data suggesting it is even warranted.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: November 29, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Keith P. Nelson, AIA

Representing: Self

Mailing Address: 2751 Prosperity Ave, Suite 450 Fairfax, VA 22031

Email Address: knelson@wje.com

Telephone Number: (703) 641-4601

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 1403.5

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

~~1403.5 Vertical and Lateral Flame Propagation. Exterior walls on buildings of Type I, II, III or IV construction that are greater than 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade plane and contain a combustible water resistive barrier shall be tested in accordance with and comply with the acceptance criteria of NFPA 285.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Proposed Outcome - Based on recent ICC testimony, it is clear that the addition of 1403.5 is an over-reaching reaction to previous laboratory test results (not documented loss). The addition of this requirement will have unanticipated consequences, including severe cost implications, and should be removed from the code.

Detailed Justification - Section 1403.5 is a new addition to the IBC. Based on ICC testimony this section was added based on laboratory test results in accordance with NFPA 285 and not documented loss of life or property damage. NFPA 285 is an assembly test that does not allow for substitution of materials (including substitution of manufacturers) within an assembly; this makes the test nearly project specific. Costs for NFPA 285 testing are reported to range from \$15,000 to \$50,000. Based on existing Chapter 26 requirements, wall assemblies typically containing foam plastics were testing and passed. These identical wall assemblies were tested with the addition of a combustible WRB and subsequently failed. On a parallel track, based on ICC testimony, several WRB manufacturers have tested their products in accordance with NFPA 285 without additional combustible products in the wall, i.e. foam plastics, and passed. While it is understandable that the proponents of adding Section 1403.5 wanted to address their laboratory observations, the addition of this section expands the requirement for NFPA 285 to any non-combustible construction including a combustible WRB. This will affect most, and possibly all, wall assemblies used in Washington, DC, at a cost of \$15,000 to \$50,000 per assembly. Projects typically contain multiple wall assemblies which multiplies this cost. Most importantly, the requirement for providing successful NFPA 285 test data is required in existing code language for the assemblies that triggered the addition of Section 1403.5.

Finally, see the attached Code Change Proposal as submitted to the ICC on the behalf of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) representing the NIBS Building Enclosure Technology and Environment Council (BETEC).

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Chris Snidow Representing: Self

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 90775 Henrico Virginia 23273

Email Address: sni@co.henrico.va.us Telephone Number: 804.501.4363

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): IBC Section 2308 CONVENTIONAL LIGHT-FRAME CONSTRUCTION

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

SECTION 2308 "CONVENTIONAL LIGHT-FRAME CONSTRUCTION"

Revise 2308.3.2.2 as follows:

First Paragraph, third sentence:

"Blocking at *of* rafters *is required above braced wall panels. All blocking* used need not be full depth...."

Third Paragraph, first sentence:

"...lateral forces shall be transferred from the roof diaphragm to the braced wall over the full length of the braced wall ~~the~~ panel by blocking..."

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Revision of IBC to make it congruent with requirements of IRC Chapter 6.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: June 11, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IBC, Section 2603.5.5**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

2603.5.5 Vertical and lateral fire propagation. ~~The exterior wall assembly shall be tested in accordance with and comply with one of the following: acceptance criteria of NFPA 285.~~

~~**Exception:** One-story buildings complying with Section 2603.4.1.4.~~

- ~~1. One-story buildings complying with Section 2603.4.1.4.~~
- ~~2. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.~~
- ~~3. The exterior wall assembly shall be tested in accordance with and comply with the acceptance criteria of NFPA 285.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The fire source of the NFPA 285 test originates on the inside of the building. Thus, a sprinkler system should address the fire / flames prior to the flames breaking outside the window opening and progressing up the cavity and/or exterior of the wall assembly. Thus, a fully sprinklered building should be an acceptable alternative to the referenced NFPA test, especially given its potential cost impact (refer below).

Option #1 is already allowed as an exception, and Option #3 is currently part of the original Section language. So, this code change proposal merely adds one other option to consider – and one that could potentially save \$100,000 or more per project.

Another factor to consider is the code requirement for “continuous insulation” (‘ci’). With the requirement for ‘ci’ we will have exterior wall assemblies with insulation *outside* of CMU and/or stud back-ups (not *inside* studs like has been typically done prior to the ‘ci’ requirements – because that is not considered “continuous” by code definition). So, on the one hand, the code basically requires insulation in the cavity of the wall assembly and on the other hand, requires that insulation be tested as part of an assembly. So, the chances of being able to avoid the NFPA 285 testing has been basically eliminated.

Cost Impact: The proposed code change will *reduce* the cost of construction between \$25,000 - \$35,000 per exterior wall assembly type. On average, there may be as many as 3 or more different exterior wall assemblies per project; thus, equating to a potential cost savings of approximately \$100,000 per project. Since the NFPA 285 test is for an "assembly" and not just components, then technically, a test would need to be conducted every time a single component changes within an exterior wall assembly (components could include veneers, insulation, WRB, back-up, sheathing, and interior finishes).

- For example, you may have a building that changes from a brick veneer to siding = two tests @ \$25,000/test.
- You may have an exterior wall assembly that switches from CMU back-up to studs = two tests @ \$25,000/test.
- You may brick-on-CMU and brick-on-studs; and siding-on-CMU and siding-on-studs = four tests @ \$25,000/test.
- If you have varying interior finishes on each of the exterior wall assemblies (some may have just painted gypsum, some may have wall-coverings, some may have paneling, some may have decorative materials, etc.), then technically, a separate NFPA 285 test must be conducted for each of the different "assemblies"

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: November 29, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



1. Change Sections 334.10(2) and 334.10(3) of NFPA 70 to read:
 - (2) Multifamily dwellings not exceeding four floors above grade and multifamily dwellings of any height permitted to be of Types III, IV and V construction except in any case as prohibited in 334.12.
 - (3) Other structures not exceeding four floors above grade and other structures of any height permitted to be of Types III, IV and V construction except in any case as prohibited in 334.12. In structures exceeding four floors above grade, cables shall be concealed within walls, floors or ceilings that provide a thermal barrier of material that has at least a 15-minute finish rating as identified in listings of fire-rated assemblies.

For the purpose of Items 2 and 3 above, the first floor of a building shall be that floor that has 50% or more of the exterior wall surface area level with or above finished grade. One additional level that is the first level and not designed for human habitation and used only for vehicle parking, storage or similar use shall be permitted.

Add Section 2701.1.2 to the IBC to read:

2701.1.2 Temporary connection to dwelling units. The building official shall give permission to energize the electrical service equipment of a one- or two-family dwelling unit when all of the following requirements have been approved:

1. The service wiring and equipment, including the meter socket enclosure, shall be installed and the service wiring terminated.
2. The grounding electrode system shall be installed and terminated.
3. At least one receptacle outlet on a ground fault protected circuit shall be installed and the circuit wiring terminated.
4. Service equipment covers shall be installed.
5. The building roof covering shall be installed.
6. Temporary electrical service equipment shall be suitable for wet locations unless the interior is dry and protected from the weather.

Add Section 2701.1.3 to the IBC to read:

2701.1.3 Assisted living facility generator requirements. Generators installed to comply with regulations for assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services shall be permitted to be optional standby systems.

Change Section 2702.2.17 of the IBC to read:

2702.2.17 Group I-2 and I-3 occupancies. Emergency power shall be provided in accordance with Section 407.11 for Group I-2 occupancies licensed by the Virginia Department of Health as a hospital, nursing or hospice facility. Emergency power shall be provided for doors in Group I-3 occupancies in accordance with Section 408.4.2.

CHAPTER 28 MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

Change Section 2801.1 of the IBC to read:

2801.1 Scope. Mechanical appliances, equipment and systems shall be constructed and installed in accordance with this chapter, the International Mechanical Code and the International Fuel Gas Code. Masonry chimneys, fireplaces and barbecues shall comply with the International Mechanical Code and Chapter 21 of this code.

2013 SESSION
13101094D

HOUSE BILL NO. 1511

Offered January 9, 2013

Prefiled January 3, 2013

A BILL to amend and reenact § 63.2-1732 of the Code of Virginia, relating to assisted living facilities; access to temporary emergency electrical power source.

Patrons-- Hope, Krupicka and Plum

Referred to Committee on Health, Welfare and Institutions

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That § 63.2-1732 of the Code of Virginia is amended and reenacted as follows:

§ 63.2-1732. Regulations for assisted living facilities.

A. The Board shall have the authority to adopt and enforce regulations to carry out the provisions of this subtitle and to protect the health, safety, welfare and individual rights of residents of assisted living facilities and to promote their highest level of functioning. Such regulations shall take into consideration cost constraints of smaller operations in complying with such regulations and shall provide a procedure whereby a licensee or applicant may request, and the Commissioner may grant, an allowable variance to a regulation pursuant to § 63.2-1703.

B. Regulations shall include standards for staff qualifications and training; facility design, functional design and equipment; services to be provided to residents; administration of medicine; allowable medical conditions for which care can be provided; and medical procedures to be followed by staff, including provisions for physicians' services, restorative care, and specialized rehabilitative services. The Board shall adopt regulations on qualifications and training for employees of an assisted living facility in a direct care position. "Direct care position" means supervisors, assistants, aides, or other employees of a facility who assist residents in their daily living activities.

C. Regulations for a Medication Management Plan in a licensed assisted living facility shall be developed by the Board, in consultation with the Board of Nursing and the Board of Pharmacy. Such regulations shall (i) establish the elements to be contained within a Medication Management Plan, including a demonstrated understanding of the responsibilities associated with medication management by the facility; standard operating and record-keeping procedures; staff qualifications, training and supervision; documentation of daily medication administration; and internal monitoring of plan conformance by the facility; (ii) include a requirement that each assisted living facility shall establish and maintain a written Medication Management Plan that has been approved by the Department; and (iii) provide that a facility's failure to conform to any approved Medication Management Plan shall be subject to the sanctions set forth in § 63.2-1709 or 63.2-1709.2.

D. Regulations shall require all licensed assisted living facilities with six or more residents ~~to be able to connect by July 1, 2007, to have~~ a temporary emergency electrical power source *available on-site and to be able to connect to and utilize such temporary emergency electrical power source* for the provision of electricity during an interruption of the normal electric power supply, *in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents and ensure the continued delivery of vital services for residents.* ~~The installation~~ *Such temporary emergency electrical power source shall be sufficient to provide power for continued operation of internal systems necessary for the safe operation of the facility including heating, ventilation and cooling systems; emergency lighting and fire protection systems; elevators; and refrigeration and cold storage facilities for the preservation of food. Installation of any temporary emergency electrical power source by a licensed assisted living facility shall be in compliance with the Uniform Statewide Building Code.*

E. Regulations for medical procedures in assisted living facilities shall be developed in consultation with the State Board of Health and adopted by the Board, and compliance with these regulations shall be determined by Department of Health or Department inspectors as provided by an interagency agreement between the Department and the Department of Health.

F. In developing regulations to determine the number of assisted living facilities for which an assisted living facility administrator may serve as administrator of record, the Board shall consider (i) the number of residents in each of the facilities,

(ii) the travel time between each of the facilities, and (iii) the qualifications of the on-site manager under the supervision of the administrator of record.

G. Regulations shall require that each assisted living facility register with the Department of State Police to receive notice of the registration or reregistration of any sex offender within the same or a contiguous zip code area in which the facility is located, pursuant to § 9.1-914.

H. Regulations shall require that each assisted living facility ascertain, prior to admission, whether a potential resident is a registered sex offender, if the facility anticipates the potential resident will have a length of stay greater than three days or in fact stays longer than three days.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Michael D Redifer

Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com

Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): IBC Section 3006.4

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change IBC Section 3006.4 as follows:

3006.4 Machine rooms and machinery spaces, control rooms and spaces . Elevator machine rooms and machinery spaces and control rooms and spaces shall be enclosed with *fire barriers* constructed in accordance with Section 707 or *horizontal assemblies* constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both. The *fire-resistance rating* shall be not less than the required rating of the hoistway enclosure served by the machinery. Openings in the *fire barriers* shall be protected with assemblies having a *fire protection rating* not less than that required for the hoistway enclosure doors.

Delete exceptions 1 and 2

Exceptions:

- ~~1. Where machine rooms and machinery spaces do not abut and have no openings to the hoistway enclosure they serve the *fire barriers* constructed in accordance with Section 707 or *horizontal assemblies* constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both, shall be permitted to be reduced to a 1-hour *fire-resistance rating*.~~
- ~~2. In buildings four stories or less above grade plane where machine room and machinery spaces do not abut and have no openings to the hoistway enclosure they serve, the machine room and machinery spaces are not required to be fire-resistance rated.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

Additional terminology has been introduced into the ASME A17.1 Standard which relates primarily to controls for machine-room-less elevators. Although not machines, these devices are crucial components of the elevator operating system and are defined in the standard. Because this equipment and these devices are critical to the continued operation of the elevator during fire service, they should be afforded the same protection as the elevator hoistway. There will be some additional cost impact related to providing increased fire resistance ratings in some circumstances.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Michael D Redifer

Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com

Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VCC Section 3006.7

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Revise VCC Section 3006.7 as follows:

3006.7 Machine-room-less designs. Where machine-room-less designs are utilized they shall comply with the provisions of ASME A17.1 and incorporate the following:

Delete Item 1 in its entirety and renumber Items 2 and 3 to Items 1 and 2 respectively.

3006.7 Machine-room-less designs. Where machine-room-less designs are utilized they shall comply with the provisions of ASME A17.1 and incorporate the following:

- ~~1. Where the elevator car top will be used as a work platform, it shall be equipped with permanently installed guards on all open sides. Guards shall be permitted to be of collapsible design, but otherwise must conform to all applicable requirements of this code for guards.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The ASME A17.1 Safety Code for Elevators addresses car top railings and provides for the location, strength, clearances, etc. The allowance of collapsible railings compromises safety for elevator mechanics and inspectors since there is no design standard for their operation. Experience has shown that these collapsible railings, when used, create tripping and fall hazards and interfere with required refuge space and means of evacuating the elevator car when necessary. There may be increased cost involved by providing minimum required clearances within the hoistway.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12-13-12

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2012 IPC, Section 405.3.2**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

405.3.2 Public lavatories. In employee and public toilet rooms, the required lavatory shall be located in the same room as the water closet.

Exception: In educational use occupancies, the required lavatory shall be permitted to be located adjacent to the room or space containing the water closet provided that not more than one operational door is between the water closet and the lavatory.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This code change proposal was "Approved as Submitted" by the Plumbing Code Committee at the 2012 ICC Code Development Hearing in Dallas. The reasoning is repeated below:

This has been a long standing practice in school construction. It is geared towards helping educate children on the importance of personal hygiene. This arrangement also allows for group wash fixtures to be located adjacent to core toilet rooms. This allows the instructors to wait outside and assure the children wash their hands upon exit of the toilet room. More commonly, it permits the installation of the lavatory to be located within the classroom when water closets are installed in the classroom itself. So when a child uses the facilities they walk through a single door (no different in concept to exiting a typical toilet stall) into the classroom where the instructor can assure hands are washed.

This will almost always result in cost savings. Currently, in situations where a toilet room with a lavatory is provided within a classroom (as is required for grades PK-1 in Virginia, and oftentimes is also provided for other grades and Special Education classrooms), a sink must also be provided within the classroom itself for training and other general functions and purposes – thus requiring two lavs/sinks per classroom/space. By allowing the lavatory to be within the classroom, the sink could be omitted, thus saving costs multiplied by the number of classrooms/spaces requiring such lavs/sinks.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Stephen Turchen

Representing: Virginia Building & Code Officials Association

Mailing Address: Suite 316 / 12055 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, VA 22035

Email Address: Stephen.turchen@Fairfaxcounty.gov

Telephone Number: 703-324-1653

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 IECC Section C402.1.1

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

C402.1.1 Insulation and fenestration criteria. [Revise last sentence only as follows:]

The thermal envelope of buildings with a vertical fenestration area or skylight area that exceeds that allowed in Table C402.3 shall comply with the building envelope provisions of ANSI / ASHRAE / IESNA 90.1 the maximum area allowed under Sections C402.3.1, C402.3.1.1, or C402.3.1.2, as applicable, shall be evaluated as indicated in Sections C407.6, C407.6.1, and C407.6.2.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This change clarifies two important issues when evaluating thermal envelopes of commercial buildings. The prescriptive requirements of thermal envelopes are limited by vertical fenestration area and skylight area. However, these limits are not defined by Table C402.3, but rather in the code language of Sections C402.3 and its sub-sections. Assuming that vertical fenestration and skylight areas are within the allowable limits of the code text, then the prescriptive values of Table C402.3 can be applied. The more critical issue is how to proceed if the stated limits are exceeded. The current paragraph directs the user to building envelope provisions of ASHRAE Standard 90.1; see Section 5 of that standard. Presumably the current IECC intent is that 90.1 / Section 5 be used in lieu of IECC Section C402. This intent conflicts with **C401.2 Applicability**, which tells the IECC user to, effectively, use either the IECC in its entirety or Standard 90.1 in its entirety for commercial buildings; see options 1 and 2 under C401.2. The proposal addresses this potential conflict by directing the IECC user to certain sub-sections of IECC Section **C407 Total Building Performance**. The cited sections under C407.6 allow the user to employ an envelope analysis tool that has been approved by the building official under C407.6.1 ("limited scope"), without getting involved in the more complex full building performance analysis discussed in all of C407. Note that by not directing the IECC user to Section C407 when fenestration / skylight areas are exceeded, another potential conflict with Section C401.2 (Option 3) is also avoided. Impact of the change will help ensure that both designers and code officials have a well-defined enforcement path for all thermal envelope situations in commercial buildings, and that such enforcement will be more uniformly implemented throughout the State.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Matt Westheimer

Representing: VBCOA Energy Conservation Committee

Mailing Address: 401 Lafayette Street, Williamsburg, VA. 23185

Email Address: mwest@williamsburgva.gov

Telephone Number: 757-220-6135

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VCC (IECC Section C402.4.8)

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section C402.4.8 as shown:

Recessed lighting. Recessed luminaires installed in the building thermal envelope shall be sealed to limit air leakage between conditioned and unconditioned spaces. All recessed luminaires shall be IC-rated and labeled as having an air leakage rate or not more 2.0 cfm (0.944 L/s) when tested in accordance with ASTM E 283 at a 1.57 psf (75 Pa) pressure differential. All recessed luminaires installed in the thermal envelope shall be sealed with a gasket or caulk between the housing and interior wall or ceiling covering.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Only Recessed lighting which is installed in the thermal envelope should have to be sealed.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 3/21/12 modified 6/25/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)

600 East Main Street

Suite 300

Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Organization

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA

Representing: VSAIA

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): **2009 IEBC, Section 912.4.1, Exception 1**

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add the following to Exception 1 as follows:

1. Stairways shall be enclosed in compliance with the applicable provisions of Section 803.1 for stairways not otherwise addressed in Section 912.7.2.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

There appears to be a conflict between Section 912.4.1, Exception 1 – which sends you to Section 803.1 – and Section 912.7.2. Both sections are applicable when a change of occupancy is made to a higher hazard category, and both sections apply to stairways and their enclosure. However, Section 912.7.2 allows exceptions to the enclosure of interior stairways, whereas Section 803.1 has no such enclosure exceptions.

The code change proposal would clarify that Section 912.7.2 applies to *interior* stairways, and Section 803.1 would apply to *all other* stairways – as it appears the code intended.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: August 3, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Michael D Redifer Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VMC 606.1

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Revise VMC Section 606.1 as follows:

606.1 General. Elevators, dumbwaiters and escalators shall be maintained in compliance with ASME A17.1. The most current certificate of inspection shall be on display at all times within the elevator or attached to the escalator or dumbwaiter, be available for public inspection in the office of the building operator or be posted in a publicly conspicuous location approved by the code official. A six-month periodic inspection and an annual periodic inspection and test is required of elevators and escalators. A locality shall be permitted to require a six-month periodic inspection and test. All periodic inspections shall be performed in accordance with Section 8.11 of ASME A17.1. The code official may also provide for such inspection by an approved agency or through agreement with other local certified elevator inspectors. An approved agency includes any individual, partnership or corporation who has met the certification requirements established by the VCS.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The frequency of inspections and tests recommended in the ASME A17.1 Safety Code for Elevators are the result of years of expert experience represented on the A17.1 Inspections Committee and Standards Committee. These experts have both the knowledge and experience in elevator safety to make decisions on elevator safety issues based on the science of performance and safety of the equipment. Although this may result a moderate cost impact in those localities not already implementing the six-month inspection option, the reduction of the recommended inspection frequency runs counter to our responsibility to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: December 13, 2012

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Draft for Workgroup 1 and 3 meeting
March 12th.

Representing: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 SFPC T107.2 Open flames and IFC 308.1 and 308.1.6.2

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add exception for the use of sterno canisters used to warm food in serving trays

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):
Steno canisters are used in most all occupancies, primarily in A, R-1's and less frequently in B, M, I and E occupancies. SB 961 tabled in the 2013 General Assembly highlights the need to discuss the issue and whether there should be an operational permit and fee required as an open flame, the risks involved, fire data and how to enforce. A local issue was apparently resolved to table the bill, but it remains an issue that should be discussed in the underway 2012 SFPC regulatory cycle.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



2013 SESSION
13101986D

SENATE BILL NO. 961

Offered January 9, 2013

Prefiled January 8, 2013

A BILL relating to the issuance of annual operational permits for certain open burning.

Patron-- Ebbin

Referred to Committee on General Laws and Technology

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. § 1. *That the Board of Housing and Community Development shall promulgate regulations in accordance with the Administrative Process Act (§ 2.2-4000 et seq. of the Code of Virginia) to allow food vendors servicing community events on any public street, road, or other public or private ground to obtain an annual operational permit for open burning when (i) the permit is limited to use at community events and (ii) the open flame that the vendor uses at such events is limited to flammable hydrocarbon jelly packaged in a small can for use as a portable heat source for cooking.*

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individualxxx Government Entity Company

Name: Andrea H. Pitts Representing: self

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 926, Fredericksburg, VA 22404

Email Address: pitts.andrea@gmail.com Telephone Number: 703-518-4473

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2009 SFPC, subsection 308.1.4

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Modify Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC (incorporating by reference the 2009 IFC) to read:

"1. One- and two-family dwellings, but the open-flame cooking device shall not be operated within 10 feet of combustible construction located on another lot."

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

I request that the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) amend subsection 308.1.4 ("Open-flame cooking devices") of Section 308 ("Open Flames") of the 2009 Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code (SFPC) insofar as it states a particular exception (Exception 1) for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" from the general prohibition and safety requirement that is established there.

Subsection 308.1.4 states: "Charcoal burners and other open-flame cooking devices shall not be operated on combustible balconies or within 10 feet (3048 mm) of combustible construction." The subsection then enumerates three exceptions to this safe-distance rule. The first exception (Exception 1) is "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings." The other two exceptions are "[w]here buildings, balconies and decks are protected by an automatic sprinkler system" and "LP-gas cooking devices having LP gas container with a water capacity not greater than 2 1/2 pounds [nominal 1 pound (0.454 kg) LP-gas capacity]."

Subsection 308.1.4 recognizes by its general prohibition that open-flame cooking conducted at a distance of 10 feet or less from combustible construction is not safe. Hence its general safety requirement: "Charcoal burners and other open-flame cooking devices shall not be operated on combustible balconies or within 10 feet (3048 mm) of combustible construction."

The proposed language amends Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to show that the exception for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" to the general prohibition against operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction applies only to the "one- [or] two-family dwelling[]" on the lot where the

device is being used and not to combustible construction on a neighboring lot. The proposed language amends Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to show that the particular exception for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” to the general prohibition against operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction applies only to the one- or two-family dwelling on the lot where the device is being used and not to combustible construction on a neighboring lot.

There would be no cost impact involved in adopting this proposal.

In support of the proposed amendment, the following points are offered:

1. The proposed amendment clarifies Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 by expressing the intention behind the exception for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” to the rule prohibiting open-flame cooking within 10 feet of combustible construction. Commentary on the DHCD (Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office) website concerning previous subsection 307.5, now subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC, states: “The exception [is] in recognition of the occupant's level of control and lack of exposure to others. . . .” In other words, the exception contemplates a situation in which the operator of the open-flame cooking device has “control” of the “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” and the premises on which it sits and of which the operator is an “occupant.” In that situation, the exception indicates, the open-flame cooking device may be placed within 10 feet of the excepted dwelling. Exception 1, however, was not intended to put neighboring combustible construction at risk from open-flame cooking by suspending the general rule that open-flame cooking may not take place within 10 feet of combustible construction. Indeed, the above-cited commentary expresses the assumption that when an open-flame cooking device is operated on premises where a “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” sits, there is a “lack of exposure to others.” That is, Exception 1 for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” assumes that the property of others would not be at risk because there would be enough space between neighboring buildings, and between buildings and property lines, that a neighbor's combustible construction would not be within 10 feet of any open-flame cooking taking place on the premises containing the excepted “one- [or] two-family dwelling[].” When, however, that is not the case—when open-flame cooking on premises containing the excepted “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” can take place within 10 feet of neighboring combustible construction--then the neighboring combustible construction is protected by the general rule of subsection 308.1.4 prohibiting the operation of an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction. Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” was not intended to place combustible construction on neighboring lots at risk. The language of the proposed amendment of subsection 308.1.4 expresses the intended meaning of the exception to the safe-distance rule for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings.”
2. To conclude otherwise would lead to illogical results. Subsection 308.1.4 cannot mean that the operator of an open-flame cooking device can bring it 10 feet or closer from combustible construction (be it a dwelling, a garage, or other combustible construction) on neighboring premises just because he happens to have a “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” on the premises where he is cooking. Were that the case, the subsection would be granting a personal license to the operator of an open-flame cooking device located on the same premises as a one- or two-family dwelling to cook as close to combustible construction on neighboring lots as he could get (perhaps, indeed, to protect his own one- or two-family dwelling from the risks presented by the cooking). Not only is this an absurd result, it also is contradicted by the basic wording of Exception 1 as it stands now (and would stand after the proposed amendment). That wording ascribes the exception to the safe-distance rule not to the operator of the open-flame cooking device but to the “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” itself.
3. Amendment of subsection 308.1.4 in accordance with its intended meaning would aid local officials and protect the public, thus advancing the purpose of the SFPC. Such an amendment also would bring subsection 308.1.4 in line with another provision of the SFPC, subsection 305.4 (“Deliberate or negligent burning”). This provision states: “It shall be unlawful to deliberately or through negligence set fire to or cause the burning of combustible material in such a manner as to endanger the safety or persons or property.”

It warns that risky activity, even if it does not result in actual harm to persons or property, is in itself unlawful if it endangers the safety of the persons or property. Subsection 308.1.4 was intended to warn, and implicitly does warn, that operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of a combustible structure is risky activity and therefore prohibited except in limited cases. The SFPC regulates risky activity in order to prevent fires before they happen, and in this case, both the public and the operator of the open-flame cooking device would benefit from more clarity.

4. The proposed amendment of the language of Exception 1 in subsection 308.1.4 for “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” makes it clear that the operator of an open-flame cooking device on premises containing such a dwelling is not entitled to place combustible construction on neighboring lots at risk by exposing it to open-flame cooking at a distance of 10 feet or less. Otherwise, the risk of fire and associated harm from open-flame cooking could be transferred by the operator of the cooking device from the “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” on the premises where the open-flame cooking takes place to neighboring combustible construction. Such a result is inconsistent with the principal purpose of the SFPC: to protect the public from fires and from the danger of fires.

5. The 2009 SFPC seems to bring townhouses, or at least certain townhouses, within the ambit of the “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” exception to the safe-distance requirement in subsection 308.1.4. In the 2009 SFPC, Section 202 (“General Definitions”), the four Group R occupancy categories (R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4) defined in prior versions of the SFPC are amended by the addition of a fifth category: “R-5 Detached one and two-family dwellings and multiple single-family dwellings (townhouses) not more than three stories high with separate means of egress and their accessory structures.” It is stated with this definition: “The terms ‘R-5’ and ‘one- and two-family dwelling’ where used in this code shall be interchangeable.” This statement equates certain townhouses with a “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[]” and thus brings them under Exception 1 to the safe-distance requirement of subsection 308.1.4. However, this de facto amendment of Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to include certain townhouses ought to be reconsidered.

The amendment of the Group R occupancy categories appears to have been added for purposes involving other provisions of the code. The 2009 SFPC defines “townhouse” in Section 202 as “a single-family dwelling unit constructed in a group of three or more attached units in which each unit extends from the foundation to roof and with open space on at least two sides.” However, the R-5 occupancy category added in the 2009 SFPC covers only “townhouses” that are “not more than three stories high.” If the amendment to Section 202 establishing the R-5 occupancy category had as one of its purposes to amend the exemption in subsection 308.1.4 to the 10-foot safety requirement so that it now included townhouses, there would be no principled reason to exclude townhouses having more than three stories. If the exception to the safe-distance requirement in subsection 308.1.4 were expanded to include townhouses, there would be a conflict with the 2009 International Fire Code (IFC). The IFC (Section 202, “General Definitions”) contains the same definition of “townhouse” as the 2009 SFPC. It is noted, as well, that the 2009 SFPC and the 2009 IFC contain in their respective Sections 202 the same definitions of “dwelling unit,” (the term used in the definition of “townhouse”) and of “dwelling” (the term used in subsection 308.1.4). “Dwelling” is “[a] building that contains one or two dwelling units used, intended or designed to be used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied for living purposes.” “Dwelling unit” is “[a] single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.” But the IFC does not contain a fifth category of Group R occupancy like that added in the 2009 SFPC, nor does the IFC have any other provision that makes townhouses equal to “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” for purposes of the code. Subsection 308.1.4 of the IFC contains the same three exceptions to the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking as are found in subsection 308.1.4 of the SFPC. Thus, subsection 308.1.4 of the IFC contains the exception for “[o]ne and two-family dwellings.” However, the 2009 IFC contains no provision that has the effect of extending the same exception to townhouses.

Like all versions of the SFPC, the 2009 code incorporates by reference the contemporaneous edition of the

IFC: in this case, the 2009 edition of the IFC is incorporated by reference in Subsection 103.1 of Section 103 (“Incorporation by Reference”) of the SFPC. Subsection 103.2.1 (“Other amendments”) of the 2009 SFPC states, as do previous versions of the SFPC, that the Virginia “Board of Housing and Community Development (BHCD)” might “delete, change or amend provisions of the IFC and referenced standards” and that “[w]here conflicts occur between such changed provisions and the unchanged provisions of the IFC and referenced standards, the provisions changed by the BHCD shall govern.”

In subsection 103.2.1, however, the SFPC contains a “Note” stating, as in previous versions of the SFPC, that when the state code deletes, changes, or amends provisions of the IFC, it is because “conflicts have been readily noted” previously between the IFC and the regulatory scheme of the SFPC. The Note reserves to regulators the authority to continually assess the applicability of the IFC in other areas, where they must make judgments about the whether the IFC serves the goals and purposes of regulatory scheme of the SFPC: “in some areas, judgment will have to be made as to whether the provisions of the IFC and its references standards are fully applicable.”

Subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC should reflect the 2009 IFC by excluding all townhouses from the category of “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” to which Exception 1 to the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking is ascribed. The inclusion of certain townhouses in the category of excepted “[o]ne- and two-family dwellings” appears to be only the de facto result of expanding the R-5 occupancy category in order to address other concerns, and it creates inconsistencies that cannot be easily explained. For example, a three-story single-family dwelling would be an excepted dwelling under Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 but a three-story townhouse would not be.

However, the de facto inclusion of certain townhouses in the category of premises that are excepted under Exception 1 in subsection 308.1.4 from the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking does not contradict the intention, or defeat the purpose, of that subsection. The assumption behind Exception 1 is, again, that when open-flame cooking takes place on premises containing a “[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[],” there is a “lack of exposure to others.” The concern behind subsection 308.1.4, with its general safe-distance rule, is precisely with the risk that open-flame cooking presents to neighboring combustible construction. It is assumed, as observed above, that on premises containing a one- or two-family dwelling, open-flame cooking will take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction. This assumption is not invalidated when townhouses are contemplated. In most cases, the yard on which a townhouse sits would be sufficiently wide and deep to allow a clearance of more than 10 feet. Most residential lots, including those for townhouses, have yards (most often, back yards) that are sufficiently wide and deep to allow the occupant to operate an open-flame cooking device at a distance of more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction. It would be a rare case in which the largest yard available under zoning or other local laws for open-flame cooking on a lot containing a “one- [or] two-family dwelling[]” was too shallow or too narrow to allow the activity to take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction.

6. But the modification of Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 should not focus, or hinge, on the size of the excepted one- or two-family dwelling’s lot or the distance from the excepted dwelling to the lot line. Those factors do not always provide de facto enforcement of the safe-distance rule (i.e., more than 10 feet). In many instances, the occupant of the lot on which the excepted dwelling sits could operate the open-flame cooking device close enough to the lot line to be within 10 feet of combustible construction situated on a neighboring lot. Thus, for example, Exception 1 should not be modified to read: “One- and two-family dwellings where the dwelling is at least 10 feet from the lot line.” The language suggested in this proposal is more effective because it directly states the rule.

7. In addition, to address the rare cases in which the largest yard available under zoning or other local laws for open-flame cooking on a lot containing a “one- [or] two-family dwelling[]” --regardless of whether that term continues to include certain townhouses or not--was too shallow or too narrow to allow the activity to

take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction, a Note can be added to subsection 308.1.4. The Note can state that when because of the size of the lot on which open-flame cooking takes place a distance of more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction cannot be maintained, then the maximum distance allowed by the size of the lot must be maintained, but in no event less than 7 feet (or other number selected by regulators).

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: January 6, 2013

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Zack Adams

Representing: Virginia Tech

Mailing Address: 459 Tech Center Drive; Blacksburg, VA 24061

Email Address: adamsz@vt.edu

Telephone Number: 540.231.5985

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 404.3.2

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Delete 404.3.2 4.8 as follows:

404.3.2 Fire safety plans. Fire safety plans shall include the following:

4. Floor plans identifying the locations of the following:

~~4.8. Portable fire extinguishers.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Portable fire extinguishers are required to be conspicuous (906.5) and unobstructed/unobscured or otherwise marked (906.6) where installed. It provides no tangible benefit to put fire extinguisher locations on a floor plan, since these plans would most likely *not* be used as a reference when responding to a fire emergency. It also adds an additional level of complexity to these drawings which makes them less useful and harder to interpret. Finally, where fire extinguishers are provided for employee use, those employees must be trained per OSHA and such training would include instruction on the location of those extinguishers (see http://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=STANDARDS&p_id=9811).

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: October 9, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Michael D Redifer

Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com

Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VCC 3003.2.1, SFPC 506.1 and SFPC 506.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

delete in entirety without substitution

Virginia Construction Code Section 3003.2.1
Statewide Fire Prevention Code Sections 506.1 and 506.3

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The requirements for fire service elevator keys including the allowance of non-standardized elevator keys placed in a lock box have been addressed through an exception to IFC 607.5 and inclusion of the key box standard UL1037 in IFC 506. With these changes, the building owner may exercise the option of providing non-standardized keys in a key box to which fire service personnel are given access. This arrangement closely follows the requirements of the ASME A17.1 standard and eliminates the overly burdensome mandatory requirement of providing a jurisdiction-specific fire service elevator key for all elevators within the locality and should result in lower cost to the building owner.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Michael D Redifer

Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com

Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): IBC 3003.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

change IBC Section 3003.3 as follows

3003.3 Standardized Ffire service elevator keys. All elevators shall be equipped to operate with either a standardized or non-standardized fire service elevator key in accordance with the *International Fire Code*.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

This change along with one proposed to eliminate Virginia amendments serves to clarify it is the building owner who has the option of providing a non-standardized key in an appropriate key box to which fire service personnel are provided access. A reduction cost for the building owner should result.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Robby Dawson

Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC – listed sections for deletion of existing building references

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section 607.1 to read:

607.1 Emergency Operation. Existing elevators with a travel distance of 25 feet (7620 mm) or more shall comply with the requirements in Chapter 11. ~~New elevators shall be provided with Phase I emergency recall operation and Phase II emergency in-car operation in accordance with ASME A17.1 of Section 506.3 and the Virginia Maintenance Code (13VAC5-63-450).~~

Change Section 704.1 to read:

704.1 Enclosure. ~~Interior vertical shafts including, but not limited to, stairways, elevator hoistways, service and utility shafts, that connect two or more stories of a building shall be enclosed or protected as required in Chapter 11.~~ New floor openings in existing buildings shall comply with the *International Building Code*.

Change Section 903.6 to read:

903.6 Where required in existing buildings and structures. ~~An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided in existing buildings and structures where required in Chapter 11 in accordance with Section 102.7 of this code.~~

Delete Section 905.11:

~~**905.11 Existing buildings.** Where required in Chapter 11, existing structures shall be equipped with standpipes installed in accordance with Section 905.~~

Change Section 907.1 to read:

907.1 General. This section covers the application, installation, performance and maintenance of fire alarm systems and their components in new and existing buildings and structures. The requirements of Section 907.2 are applicable to new buildings and structures. ~~The requirements of Section 907.9 are applicable to existing buildings and structures.~~

Delete Section 907.9:

~~**907.9 Where required in existing buildings and structures.** An approved fire alarm system shall be provided in existing buildings and structures where required in Chapter 11.~~

Change Section 1029.4 to read:

[B] 1029.4 Operational constraints. *Emergency escape and rescue openings* shall be operational from the inside of the room without the use of keys or tools. Bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are permitted to be placed over *emergency escape and rescue openings* provided the minimum net clear opening size complies with Section 1029.2 and such devices shall be releasable or removable from the inside without the use of a key, tool or force greater than that which is required for normal operation of the

escape and rescue opening. ~~Where such bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are installed in existing buildings, and where smoke alarms shall be~~ installed in accordance with Section 907.2.11 and approved by the building official regardless of the valuation of the *alteration*.

Change title page to read:
Chapters ~~1211~~ through 19
Reserved

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Along with the continued deletion of Chapter 11 for construction requirements for existing buildings out of the SFPC, this change is to delete or change those other sections within the body of the SFPC that still make reference to a chapter that's deleted or provide for an obvious conflict with the USBC.

The change to Section 1029.4 is to ensure bars, grills, grates and other such barriers are not installed without some other compensating measure for ensuring safety and egress.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: DRAFT WG 2 and 4

Representing: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Email Address: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC IFC 103.2 to 103.2.1 , 109.1 and 703.1 annual inspection

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

703.1 Delete ~~“Such elements shall be visually inspected by the owner annually and properly repaired, restored or replace when damaged, altered, breached or penetrated.”~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):
The STRB recently rendered a decision that stated 703.1 was not enforceable in the SFPC as it was preempted by SFPC administrative provisions in 103.2 and 109.1. This is a new section that also needs to be vetted with building owners to determine the annual cost and what buildings will be covered and how will that be determined by an owner or fire official without assistance from the building department. If such an annual inspection is necessary then there needs to be some authorization and vetting done along with an approval process perhaps by a local fire prevention ordinance based on some adopted standards in the SFPC and coordinated with the USBC VMC that can also be used to enforce breaches of any fire resistance elements.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Robby Dawson

Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5601 2 4 1 and 5601 2 4 2 for minimum insurance

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

5601.2.4.1 Blasting. Before approval to do blasting is issued, the applicant for approval shall file a bond or submit a certificate of insurance in such form, amount, and coverage as determined by the legal department of the jurisdiction to be adequate in each case to indemnify the jurisdiction against any and all damages arising from permitted blasting but in no case shall the value of the coverage be less than ~~\$500,000~~1,000,000.

Exception: Filing a bond or submitting a certificate of liability insurance is not required for blasting on real estate parcels of five or more acres conforming to the definition of "real estate devoted to agricultural use" or "real estate devoted to horticultural use" in § 58.1-3230 of the Code of Virginia and conducted by the owner of such real estate.

5601.2.4.2 Fireworks display. The permit holder shall furnish a bond or certificate of insurance in an amount deemed adequate by the legal department of the jurisdiction for the payment of all potential damages to a person or persons or to property by reason of the permitted display, and arising from any acts of the permit holder, the agent, employees or subcontractors, but in no case shall the value of the coverage be less than ~~\$500,000~~1,000,000.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The present minimum of \$500,000.00 has been in place since the adoption of the '87 edition of the SFPC and has not changed since. With the '87 edition of the code \$500,000.00 was a significant amount of money. That's no longer true in today's economy. Based upon the rate of inflation calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$500,000 in 1987 equates to \$1,018,120 in today's dollars (http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm).

Blasting contractors are carrying insurance coverage measured in multiple millions of dollars and would not be adversely affected by an increase in the minimum required amount.

Based upon an impromptu survey of professional firework companies, self-employed Pyrotechnicians and volunteer fire departments that conduct fireworks displays for their community, an increase of the minimum above the current \$500,000 is not an issue or challenge. Without a known exception, the professional companies are currently carrying \$5 million, \$10 million, \$25 million or more of insurance and would not be hampered in any way to a minimum of \$2 million. Volunteer fire companies, on the other hand, are carrying \$1,000,000 right now.

Additionally, property and injury claims resulting from fireworks accidents routinely exceed \$1,000,000 for even the smallest of public display accidents.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)

Main Street Centre

600 E. Main St., Ste. 300

Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Robby Dawson

Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5607.16 and new Table 5607.16

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section 5607.16 to read as follows:

5607.16 Blast records: A record of each blast shall be kept and retained for at least five years and shall be readily available for inspection by the *fire code official*. The record shall ~~contain the following minimum data:~~ be in a format selected by the blaster and shall contain the minimum data and information indicated in Table 5607.16.

- ~~1. Name of contractor;~~
- ~~2. Location and time of blast;~~
- ~~3. Name of certified blaster in charge;~~
- ~~4. Type of material blasted;~~
- ~~5. Number of holes bored and spacing;~~
- ~~6. Diameter and depth of holes;~~
- ~~7. Type and amount of explosives;~~
- ~~8. Amount of explosive per delay of 8 milliseconds or greater;~~
- ~~9. Method of firing and type of circuit;~~
- ~~10. Direction and distance in feet to nearest dwelling, public building, school, church, commercial or institutional building;~~
- ~~11. Weather conditions;~~
- ~~12. Whether or not mats or other precautions were used;~~
- ~~13. Type of detonator and delay period;~~
- ~~14. Type and height of stemming; and~~
- ~~15. Seismograph record when utilized.~~

Exception: Subdivisions 8 and 13 of this section are not applicable to *restricted blasters*.

(See new Table 5607.16 on attached pages.)

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This change is to provide guidance and some measure of uniformity of the information gathered and retained. Without such guidance the quality and value of information recorded will vary by location, company, and certified blaster. This information has value when conducting an investigation on a claim of damage, for instance, whether that investigation is conducted by the fire official or an insurance company. At the very least, such comprehensive information has definite value to the blaster themselves.

Four (4) fire officials and nine (9) users of explosives, both large and small blasting contractors, were invited to evaluate the proposed change. Comments and suggestions were seriously considered and incorporated into refining the change. It must be pointed out that the change does not require a blaster to use this particular table or format so long as whatever record format is chosen by the blaster produces the same minimum information. But it is suggested the table be reproduced large enough in the code to fill-in the blanks or spaces in the event a blaster uses the table as printed in the code for their chosen format.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)

Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

**Table 5607.16
Blast (shot) Record**

Block 1				
General Information				
1	Blast date:	Blast No.:	Blast Time:	Permit No.:
2	Blast location by address including city, county or town:			
3	Blast location by GPS coordinates: <input type="checkbox"/> check box if unknown			
4	Name of Permit Holder:			
5	Name of Blaster in charge (print):			
6	Signature of Blaster in charge:			
7	Certification Number of Blaster in charge:			

Block 2			
General environmental conditions			
1	Weather (Clear? Cloudy? Overcast?)	Wind direction and speed @ _____ mph	Temperature F° / C°
2	Topography: (Flat? Hilly? Mountainous?)	Distance from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Distance from nearest inhabited building determined by: <input type="checkbox"/> GPS coordinates <input type="checkbox"/> Measurement <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated
3	Use of nearest inhabited building? (Dwelling? Business? Apartment Building? School?)	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building determined by: <input type="checkbox"/> GPS instrument <input type="checkbox"/> Compass <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated
Additional Blaster notations on environmental conditions:			

Block 3			
Shot layout and precautions taken (N/A = Not Applicable)			
1	No. of holes	Diameter of hole(s)	Depth of hole(s)
2	Were any holes decked? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	How many holes were decked? <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	How many decks per hole? <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	(If applicable, indicate on any attached shot pattern drawing which holes were decked and the number of decks for the hole[s].)		
3	Shot pattern <input type="checkbox"/> Check this box if only single hole.	Depth of sub-drilling	Drilling angle
4	Burden	Spacing of holes	Water height
5	Stemming height	Material used for stemming	Check box for flyrock precautions taken <input type="checkbox"/> Mats <input type="checkbox"/> Overburden <input type="checkbox"/> None taken
Additional Blaster notations on shot layout and precautions:			

Block 4			
Seismic control measures (N/A = Not Applicable)			
1	Was Scaled Distance Formula used? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Indicate which Scaled Distance equation was used. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> $W(lb)=[D(ft)/50]^2$ <input type="checkbox"/> $W(lb)=[D(ft)/55]^2$ <input type="checkbox"/> $W(lb)=[D(ft)/65]^2$	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms based on Scaled Distance. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2	Was seismograph used? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Seismograph manufacturer and model number: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Seismograph serial number: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
			Seismograph's last calibration date. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3	Distance and direction seismograph from blast site <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Distance determined by: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> GPS coordinates <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Measurement	
4	Seismograph <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Geophone Minimum Frequency _____ Hz Seismograph Microphone Minimum Frequency _____ Hz	Seismograph recordings: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Transverse _____ in/s _____ Hz Vertical _____ in/s _____ Hz	
5	Seismograph trigger level <input type="checkbox"/> N/A _____ in/s _____ dB	Longitudinal _____ in/s _____ Hz Acoustic _____ dB _____ Hz	
Additional Blaster notations on seismic control measures:			

Block 5				
Quantity and product				
1	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms Interval <input type="checkbox"/> Delay not used _____ lbs	Initiation (Check) <input type="checkbox"/> Electric <input type="checkbox"/> Non-electric <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic		
2	Max. No. of Holes/Decks per 8 ms interval <input type="checkbox"/> Delay not used _____ lbs			
3	Max. Wt. or sticks of Explosive per hole _____ lbs	Firing device manufacturer and model: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Explosive Product listing (Attach additional pages as needed.)				
4	<u>Manufacturer</u>	<u>Product name, description or brand</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Unit weight (lb)</u>
5	Total explosive weight in this shot:			lbs.
Additional Blaster notations on product and quantities:				

Block 6	
Completion of shot record and general comments	
General comments on shot not included in notes above:	
Date shot report completed:	Time shot report completed:
Printed name and signature of person completing shot report if different from Block 1, Lines 5 and 6.	(Print)
	(Signature)



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Robby Dawson

Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov

Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5608.4.1 through 5608.4.2

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add Sections 5608.4.1 through 5608.4.2 to read:

5608.4.1 Non-splitting, non-bursting comets and mines. For non-splitting or non-bursting comets and mines containing only stars or non-splitting or non-bursting comets, the minimum required radius of the display site shall be 50 ft per in. (15.24 m per 25.4 mm) of the internal mortar diameter of the largest comet or mine to be fired, one-half that shown in Table 5608.4.

5608.4.2 Special distance requirements. The minimum distance requirements of Table 5608.4 shall be adjusted as follows:

1. Chain-fused aerial shells, comets, and mines. For chain-fused aerial shells and comets and mines to be fired from mortars, racks, or other holders that are sufficiently strong to prevent their being repositioned in the event of an explosive malfunction of the aerial shells, comets, or mines, the minimum required radius shall be the same as that required in 5608.4 and 5608.4.1. For chain-fused aerial shells and comets and mines to be fired from mortars, racks, or other holders that are not sufficiently strong to prevent their being repositioned in the event of an explosive malfunction of the aerial shells, comets, or mines, or if there is doubt concerning the strength of racks holding chain-fused mortars, based upon the largest mortar in the sequence the minimum required radius shall be double that required in 5608.4 and 5608.4.1.

2. Group H and I facilities, bulk storage of Hazardous Materials. Distances from the point of discharge of any firework to a health care or detention and correctional facility, or the bulk storage of materials that have flammability, explosive, or toxic hazard shall be at least twice the distances specified in Table 5608.4.

3. Roman candles and cakes. The minimum required spectator separation distance for roman candles and cakes that produce aerial shells, comets, or mine effects shall be the same as the minimum required radius specified in Table 5608.4.

4. Angling of Mortars. Aerial shells, comets and mines, and Roman candles and cakes shall be permitted to be angled if the dud shells or components are carried away from the main spectator area and either of the following requirements is satisfied:

(a) The offset specified in Table 5608.4 is followed.

(b) The separation distance is correspondingly increased in the direction of the angle.

If the offset provided in Table 5608.4 is followed, the mortars or tubes shall be angled so that any dud shells or components fall at a point approximately equal to the offset of the mortars or tubes from the otherwise required discharge point but in the opposite direction.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This is a coordinated change to the existing SFPC Table 5608.4.

The referenced NFPA 1123-10 standard for aerial displays has additional distance requirements that are based on 70 feet per inch of shell or mortar tube diameter. As a base-line, the '09 edition of the SFPC was amended to reflect a distance of 100 feet per inch of shell or mortar diameter and this change is to ensure the distances contained in the NFPA standard are based upon the SFPC base-line distance of 100 feet. This change will correct what was effectively an oversight when making the '09 technical change.

The NFPA 1123-10 sections reviewed and considered for inclusion in this change are:

4.6.1.2

5.1.3.2

5.1.3.3.1 and 5.1.3.3.2

5.1.3.4.2 and 5.1.3.4.3 (no change to this NFPA 1123-10 section proposed)

5.1.3.4.1 and 5.1.3.4.2

5.1.3.5.1 and 5.1.3.5.2 (no change to this NFPA 1123-10 section proposed)

5.1.4.1 and 5.1.4.3

5.2.1.3.1 and 5.2.1.3.2

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)

Main Street Centre

600 E. Main St., Ste. 300

Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov

Fax Number: (804) 371-7092

Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: _____

Representing: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Email Address: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC 3406.6.2.1

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

3406.6.2.1 Parking near residential, educational and institutional occupancies and other high-risk areas. Tank vehicles shall not be left unattended at any time on residential streets, or within 5-150 feet (152 m) of a residential area, apartment or hotel complex, educational facility, hospital or care facility. Tank vehicles shall not be left unattended at any other place that would, in the opinion of the fire chief, pose an extreme life hazard.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The current requirement for 500 feet is overly restrictive compared to other code sections and standards as indicated below:

3406.6.2.3 Duration exceeding 1 hour. Tank vehicles parked at one point for longer than 1 hour shall be located off of public streets, highways, public avenues or alleys, and:

1. Inside of a bulk plant and either 25 feet (7620 mm) or more from the nearest *lot line* or within a building *approved* for such use; or
2. At other *approved* locations not less than 50 feet (15 240 mm) from the buildings other than those *approved* for the storage or servicing of such vehicles.

In this case, the very next code section allows parking in approved locations not closer than 50 ft from buildings, but does not specify what kind of buildings and does not identify any type of area or use.

Table 3405.3.4(2) of the SFPC provides minimum distances from property lines and buildings for dispensing, use, mixing and handling of flammable and combustible liquids. **It is important to note that even for UNSTABLE liquids in tanks of up to 50,000 gallons, the most restrictive distance is 120 feet from a property line and 40 feet from a**

building on the same property. A tank of unstable flammable liquid up to 12,000 gallons is only required to be 37.5 feet from the property line and 12.5 feet from a building on the same lot. Most tanker trucks haul less than 9,000 gallons.

NFPA 30 for flammable and combustible liquids has similar distance requirements for above ground tanks generally requiring 1/6 of the diameter of the tank (not to exceed 175') or approximately 30 feet.

NFPA 58 which is a referenced standard in section 3811.2 of the SFPC permits LP tanker trucks to park a minimum of 50 feet from buildings.

Language in the commentary indicates that, "The parking of tank vehicles is as important as above-ground tank storage".

Given the examples above of other flammable above-ground tank location requirements, it seems reasonable to change the distance required in section 3406.6.2.1 to a distance that still far exceeds the requirements for above ground tanks holding flammable and combustible liquids.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information

(Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: _____

Representing: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 3406.6.2.1 _____

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

3406.6.2.1 Parking near residential, educational and institutional occupancies and other high-risk areas. Tank vehicles shall not be left unattended at any time on residential streets, or within 5150 feet (152 m) of a residential area, apartment or hotel complex, educational facility, hospital or care facility. Tank vehicles shall not be left unattended at any other place that would, in the opinion of the fire chief, pose an extreme life hazard.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

Commentary language for this section states "the facilities adjacent to the tank vehicle may represent a potential for large loss of life". The term "large loss of life" and the following examples of large facilities imply that this requirement is not meant to be applied to single family dwellings in remote areas. By eliminating "residential area", the ambiguous language is removed but high population facilities remain protected.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150



2008 NFPA 58 Excerpt:

9.7.2 Parking Outdoors.

9.7.2.1 Vehicles shall not be left unattended on any street, highway, avenue, or alley, except for necessary absences from the vehicle associated with drivers' normal duties, including stops for meals and rest stops during the day or night, except as follows:

- (1) This requirement shall not apply in an emergency.
- (2) This requirement shall not apply to vehicles parked in accordance with 9.7.2.3 and 9.7.2.4.

9.7.2.2 Vehicles shall not be parked in congested areas.

9.7.2.3 Where vehicles are parked off the street in uncongested areas, they shall be at least 50 ft (15m) from any building used for assembly, institutional, or multiple residential occupancy.

9.7.2.4 Where vehicles carrying portable containers or cargo tank vehicles of 3500 gal (13m³) water capacity or less are parked on streets adjacent to the driver's residence in uncongested residential areas, the parking locations shall be at least 50ft (15m) from a building used for assembly, institutional, or multiple residential occupancy.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: Workgroup 2, Sub-workgroup 1 on Assisted Living Facilities

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 International Building Code (IBC) (with 2009 Virginia amendments)

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change the following definitions in Section 202 of the IBC as shown:

24-HOUR CARE BASIS. The actual time that a person is an occupant within a facility for the purpose of receiving care. It shall not include a facility that is open for 24 hours and is capable of providing care to someone visiting the facility during any segment of the 24 hours.

CUSTODIAL CARE. Assistance with day-to-day living tasks; such as assistance with cooking, taking medication, bathing, using toilet facilities and other tasks of daily living. Custodial care ~~include~~ includes occupants ~~who~~ that have the ability to respond to emergency situations and evacuate at a slower rate and/or or who have mental and psychiatric complications, or both, except that in the case of assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services and classified as the occupancy condition indicated in either Section 308.3.2 or Section 310.6.2, and in hospice facilities, custodial care may include occupants who require verbal or physical assistance while responding to an emergency situation to complete building evacuation.

GROUP HOME. A facility for social rehabilitation, substance abuse or mental health problems that contains a group housing arrangement that provides custodial care but does not provide ~~acute~~ medical care.

Change Section 308.2 of the IBC to read as shown:

308.2 Definitions. The following terms are defined in Chapter 2:

24-HOUR CARE BASIS.

(remainder of Section 308.2 unchanged)

Change Section 308.3 of the IBC to read as shown:

308.3 Institutional Group I-1. This occupancy shall include buildings, structures or portions thereof for more than 16 persons, excluding staff, who reside on a 24 hour basis in a supervised environment and receive custodial care. The persons receiving care are capable of self-preservation. Buildings of Group I-1, other than assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services, shall be classified as the occupancy condition indicated in Section 308.3.1. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services shall be classified as one of the occupancy conditions indicated in Sections 308.3.1 or 308.3.2. This group shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Alcohol and drug centers
- Assisted living facilities
- Congregate care facilities
- Convalescent facilities
- Group homes
- Halfway houses
- Residential board and ~~custodial~~ care facilities
- Social rehabilitation facilities

Exception: In Group I-1 occupancies classified as the occupancy condition indicated in Section 308.3.1, not more than five of the residents may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation when all residents that may require the physical assistance reside on a single level of exit discharge.

Add new Sections 308.3.1 and 308.3.2 to the IBC and change existing Sections 308.3.1 and 308.3.2 of the IBC as shown:

308.3.1 Condition 1. This occupancy condition shall include buildings in which all persons receiving custodial care who, without any assistance, are capable of responding to an emergency situation to complete building evacuation. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services in this occupancy condition are those licensed for ambulatory residents or participants.

308.3.2 Condition 2. This occupancy condition shall include buildings in which there are any persons receiving custodial care who require verbal or physical assistance while responding to an emergency situation to complete building evacuation. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services in this occupancy condition are those licensed for non-ambulatory residents or participants.

~~308.3.2~~ 308.3.3 Six to sixteen persons receiving custodial care. A facility ~~such as above~~, housing not fewer than six and not more than 16 persons receiving such custodial care, shall be classified as Group R-4.

~~308.3.4~~ 308.3.4 Five or fewer persons receiving custodial care. A facility ~~such as the above~~ with five or fewer persons receiving such custodial care shall be classified as Group R-3 or shall comply with the International Residential Code provided an automatic sprinkler system is installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.3 or with Section P2904 of the International Residential Code.

Change Section 310.6 of the IBC as shown:

310.6 Residential Group R-4. This occupancy shall include buildings, structures or portions thereof for more than five but not more than 16 persons, excluding staff, who reside on a 24-hour basis in a supervised residential environment and receive custodial care. ~~The persons receiving care are capable of self-preservation. Buildings of Group R-4, other than assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services, shall be classified as the occupancy condition indicated in Section 310.6.1. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services shall be classified as one of the occupancy conditions indicated in Sections 310.6.1 or 310.6.2.~~ This group shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Alcohol and drug centers
- Assisted living facilities
- Congregate care facilities
- Convalescent facilities
- Group homes
- Halfway houses
- Hospice facilities
- Residential board and ~~custodial care~~ facilities
- Social rehabilitation facilities

Group R-4 occupancies shall meet the requirements for construction as defined for Group R-3, except as otherwise provided for in this code.

310.6.1 Condition 1. This occupancy condition shall include buildings in which all persons receiving custodial care, who without any assistance, are capable of responding to an emergency situation to complete building evacuation and hospice facilities. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services in this occupancy condition are those licensed for ambulatory residents or participants.

310.6.2 Condition 2. This occupancy condition shall include buildings in which there are any persons receiving custodial care who require verbal or physical assistance while responding to an emergency situation to complete building evacuation. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services in this occupancy condition are those licensed for non-ambulatory residents or participants.

Exceptions:

1. Group homes licensed by the Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services that house no more than eight persons with one or more resident counselors shall be classified as Group R-2, R-3, R-4 or R-5. Not more than five of the persons may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation.
2. In Group R-4 occupancies classified as the occupancy condition indicated in Section 310.6.1 other than hospice facilities, not more than five of the residents may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation when all residents who may require the physical assistance from staff reside on a single level of exit discharge and other than using a ramp, a change of elevation using steps or stairs is not within the path of egress to an exit door.
3. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services that house no more than eight persons, with one or more resident counselors, and all of the residents are capable of responding to an emergency situation without physical assistance from staff, may be classified as Group R-2, R-3 or R-5.
4. Assisted living facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services that house no more than eight persons, with one or more resident counselors, may be classified as Group R-5 when in compliance with all of the following:
 - 4.1. The building is protected by an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3 or Section P2904 of the IRC.
 - 4.2. Not more than five of the residents may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation.
 - 4.3. All residents who may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation reside on a single level of exit discharge and other than using a ramp, a change in elevation using steps or stairs is not within the path of egress to an exit door.
5. Hospice facilities with five or fewer occupants are permitted to comply with the IRC provided the building is protected by an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with IRC Section P2904 or IBC Section 903.3.

Change Section 420 of the IBC as shown:

SECTION 420
GROUPS I-1, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4

420.1 General. Occupancies in Groups I-1, R-1, R-2 ~~and~~ R-3 and R-4 shall comply with the provisions of Sections 420.1 through ~~420.5~~ 420.6 and other applicable provisions of this code.

(no change to Sections 420.2 and 420.3)

420.4 Smoke barriers in Group I-1 Condition 2. Smoke barriers shall be provided in Group I-1 Condition 2 to subdivide every story used by persons receiving care, treatment or sleeping and to provide other stories with an occupant load of 50 or more persons, into no fewer than two smoke compartments. Such stories shall be divided into smoke compartments with an area of not more than 22,500 square feet (2092 m²) and the travel distance from any point in a smoke compartment to a smoke barrier door shall not exceed 200 feet (60 960 mm). The smoke barrier shall be in accordance with Section 709.

420.4.1 Refuge area. Refuge areas shall be provided within each smoke compartment. The size of the refuge area shall accommodate the occupants and care recipients from the adjoining smoke compartment. Where a smoke compartment is adjoined by two or more smoke compartments, the minimum area of the refuge area shall accommodate the largest occupant load of the adjoining compartments. The size of the refuge area shall provide the following:

1. Not less than 15 net square feet (1.4 m²) for each care recipient.
2. Not less than 6 net square feet (0.56 m²) for other occupants.

Areas or spaces permitted to be included in the calculation of the refuge area are corridors, lounge or dining areas and other low hazard areas.

~~420.4~~ 420.5 Automatic sprinkler system. Group R occupancies shall be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.2.8. Group I-1 occupancies shall be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.2.6. Quick response or residential automatic sprinklers shall be installed in accordance with Section 903.3.2.

~~420.5~~ 420.6 ~~Smoke detection and fire alarm systems and smoke alarms.~~ Fire alarm systems and smoke alarms shall be provided in Group I-1, R-1 ~~and R-2~~ and Group R-4 occupancies in accordance with Sections 907.2.6, 907.2.8 ~~and 907.2.9~~ and 907.2.10, respectively. Single- or multiple- station smoke alarms shall be provided in Groups I-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 in accordance with Section 907.2.11.

Change Section 504.2 of the IBC as shown:

504.2 Automatic sprinkler system increase. Where a building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, the value specified in Table 503 for maximum building height is increased by 20 feet (6096 mm) and the maximum number of stories is increased by one. These increases are permitted in addition to the building area increase in accordance with Sections 506.2 and 506.3. For Group R buildings equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2, the value specified in Table 503 for maximum building height is increased by 20 feet (6096 mm) and the maximum number of stories is increased by one, but shall not exceed 60 feet (18 288 mm) or four stories, respectively.

Exception: The use of an automatic sprinkler system to increase building heights shall not be permitted for the following conditions:

1. Buildings, or portions of buildings, classified as a Group I-1 Condition 2, of Type IIB, III, IV or V construction or Group I-2 occupancy occupancies of Type IIB, III, IV or V construction.
2. Buildings, or portions of buildings, classified as a Group H-1, H-2, H-3 or H-5 occupancy.
3. Buildings where an automatic sprinkler system is substituted for fire-resistance rated construction in accordance with Table 601, Note d.

Change Section 709.5 of the IBC as shown:

709.5 Openings. Openings in a smoke barrier shall be protected in accordance with Section 716.

Exceptions:

1. In Group I-1 Condition 2, Group I-2 and ambulatory care facilities, where doors are installed across corridors, a pair of opposite- swinging doors without a center mullion shall be installed having vision panels with fire-protection- rated glazing materials in fire-protection-rated frames, the area of which shall not exceed that tested. The doors shall be close fitting within operational tolerances, and shall not have undercuts in excess of 3/4-inch, louvers or grilles. The doors shall have head and jamb stops, astragals or rabbets at meeting edges and shall be automatic-closing by smoke detection in accordance with Section 716.5.9.3. Where permitted by the door manufacturer's listing, positive-latching devices are not required.
2. In Group I-1 Condition 2, Group I-2 and ambulatory care facilities, horizontal sliding doors installed in accordance with Section 1008.1.4.3 and protected in accordance with Section 716.

Change Section 903.2.6 of the IBC as shown:

903.2.6 Group I. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings with a Group I fire area.

Exceptions:

1. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2 shall be permitted in Group I-1 Condition 1 facilities.
- ~~2. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.3 shall be allowed in Group I-1 facilities when in compliance with all of the following:~~
 - ~~2.1. A hydraulic design information sign is located on the system riser~~
 - ~~2.2. Exception 1 of Section 903.4 is not applied, and~~
 - ~~2.3. Systems shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements of Section 903.3.1.2.~~
- 2.3. An automatic sprinkler system is not required where Group I-4 day care facilities are at the level of exit discharge and where every room where care is provided has at least one exterior exit door.
- 3.4. In buildings where Group I-4 day care is provided on levels other than the level of exit discharge, an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with 903.3.1.1 shall be installed on the entire floor where care is provided and all floors between the level of care and the level of exit discharge, all floors below the level of exit discharge, other than areas classified as an open parking garage.

Change Section 903.2.8 (and all subsections) of the IBC as shown:

903.2.8 Group R. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3 shall be provided throughout all buildings with a Group R fire area.

~~903.2.8.1 Group R-3 or R-4 congregate residence. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.3 shall be permitted in Group R-3 or R-4 congregate residences with 16 or fewer residents.~~

903.2.8.2 Group R-4 Condition 1. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.3 shall be permitted in Group R-4 Condition 1.

903.2.8.3 Group R-4 Condition 2. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.2 shall be permitted in Group R-4 Condition 2. Attics shall be protected in accordance with Sections 903.2.8.3.1 or 903.2.8.3.2.

903.2.8.3.1 Attics used for living purposes, storage or fuel fired equipment. Attics used for living purposes, storage or fuel fired equipment shall be protected throughout with automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.2.

903.2.8.3.2 Attics not used for living purposes, storage or fuel fired equipment. Attics not used for living purposes, storage or fuel fired equipment shall be protected in accordance with one of the following:

1. Attics protected throughout by a heat detector system arranged to activate the building fire alarm system in accordance with Section 907.2.10.
2. Attics constructed of non-combustible materials.
3. Attics constructed of fire-retardant-treated wood framing complying with Section 2303.2.
4. The automatic fire sprinkler system shall be extended to provide protection throughout the attic space.

~~903.2.8.2~~ 903.2.8.4 Care facilities. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.3 shall be permitted in care facilities with 5 or fewer individuals in a single family dwelling.

Change Section 903.3.1.3 of the IBC as shown:

903.3.1.3 NFPA 13D sprinkler systems. Automatic sprinkler systems installed in one and two-family dwellings, Group R-3, and ~~R-4 congregate residences~~ Condition 1 and townhouses shall be permitted to be installed throughout in accordance with NFPA 13D.

Change Section 907.2.6.1 of the IBC as shown:

907.2.6.1 Group I-1. In Group I-1 occupancies, an automatic smoke detection system shall be installed in corridors, waiting areas open to corridors and habitable spaces other than sleeping units and kitchens. The system shall be activated in accordance with Section 907.5.

Exceptions:

1. For Group I-1 Condition 1, smoke detection in habitable spaces is not required where the facility is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.
2. Smoke detection is not required for exterior balconies.

Change Section 1018.1 of the IBC as shown:

1018.1 Construction. Corridors shall be fire-resistance rated in accordance with Table 1018.1. The corridor walls required to be fire-resistance rated shall comply with Section 708 for fire partitions.

Exceptions:

1. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in an occupancy in Group E where each room that is used for instruction has at least one door opening directly to the exterior and rooms for assembly purposes have at least one-half of the required means of egress doors opening directly to the exterior. Exterior doors specified in this exception are required to be at ground level.
2. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors contained within a dwelling or sleeping unit in an occupancy in Group I-1 and Group R.
3. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in open parking garages.
4. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in an occupancy in Group B which is a space requiring only a single means of egress complying with Section 1015.1.
5. Corridors adjacent to the exterior walls of buildings shall be permitted to have unprotected openings on unrated exterior walls where unrated walls are permitted by Table 602 and unprotected openings are permitted by Table 705.8.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

This proposal was developed by a sub-workgroup of Workgroup 2, a workgroup consisting of client groups and affected parties with expertise in the technical aspects of the code, established as part of the 2012 code change process to assist in evaluating proposals and addressing issues in the use of the International Codes and standards as part of the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code. This proposal is taken from proposal submitted and approved in the International Code Council's code development process for the 2015 International Building Code (IBC). Minor changes were made to it to accommodate Virginia's current amendments to the IBC. Essentially the proposal establishes two new classifications (I-1 Condition 2 and R-4 Condition 2) in the IBC. These classifications apply to Assisted Living Facilities licensed by the Virginia Department of Social Services and will permit residents needing assistance in evacuating to be present due to enhanced safety requirements inherent in the new classifications, such as the use of a full building sprinkler system (NFPA 13 system) and smoke detection systems. While the R-4 Condition 2 classification does not have as many safety features required as the I-1 Condition 2 classification, the R-4 facilities are small, having only up to 16 residents.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number: _____

Proponent Information (Check one): Individual Government Entity Company

Name: J. Kenneth Payne, Jr., AIA (on behalf of) Representing: VSAIA/VPMIA/VBCOA PMG

Mailing Address: 3200 Norfolk Street, Richmond, VA 23230

Email Address: kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com Telephone Number: 804.794.7555

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2012 IMC, Section 505.1, 505.3 (new), and 507.2.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

**SECTION 505
DOMESTIC KITCHEN EXHAUST EQUIPMENT**

505.1 Domestic systems. Where domestic range hoods and domestic appliances equipped with downdraft exhaust are located within dwelling units provided, such hoods and appliances shall discharge to the outdoors through sheet metal ducts constructed of galvanized steel, stainless steel, aluminum or copper. Such ducts shall have smooth inner walls, shall be air tight, shall be equipped with a backdraft damper, and shall be independent of all other exhaust systems.

Exceptions:

1. In Group R buildings, ~~Where~~ installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and where mechanical or *natural ventilation* is otherwise provided in accordance with Chapter 4, *listed and labeled* ductless range hoods shall not be required to discharge to the outdoors.
2. Ducts for domestic kitchen cooking appliances equipped with downdraft exhaust systems shall be permitted to be constructed of Schedule 40 PVC pipe and fittings provided that the installation complies with all of the following:
 - 2.1. The duct shall be installed under a concrete slab poured on grade.
 - 2.2. The under floor trench in which the duct is installed shall be completely backfilled with sand or gravel.
 - 2.3. The PVC duct shall extend not more than 1 inch (25 mm) above the indoor concrete floor surface.
 - 2.4. The PVC duct shall extend not more than 1 inch (25 mm) above grade outside of the building.
 - 2.5. The PVC ducts shall be solvent cemented.

505.2 Makeup air required. Exhaust hood systems capable of exhausting in excess of 400 cfm (0.19 m³/s) shall be provided with *makeup air* at a rate approximately equal to the *exhaust air* rate. Such *makeup air* systems shall be equipped with a means of closure and shall be automatically controlled to start and operate simultaneously with the exhaust system.

505.3 Other than Group R. In other than Group R occupancies, where electric domestic cooking appliances are utilized for domestic purposes, such appliances shall be provided with domestic range hoods. Hoods and exhaust systems for such electric domestic cooking appliances shall be in accordance with Sections 505.1 and 505.2. In other than Group R occupancies, where fuel-fired domestic cooking appliances are utilized for domestic purposes, Type I or Type II hoods shall be provided as required for the type of appliances and processes in accordance with Sections 507.2.

**SECTION 507
COMMERCIAL KITCHEN HOODS**

507.2.3 Domestic cooking appliances used for commercial purposes. Domestic cooking appliances utilized for commercial purposes shall be provided with Type I or Type II hoods as required for the type of appliances and processes in accordance with Sections 507.2, 507.2.1 and 507.2.2. Domestic cooking appliances utilized for domestic purposes shall comply with Section 505.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Currently, the interpretation and application of when a Type I or II hood is required for domestic or residential type appliances is inconsistent. This has created numerous and costly issues usually resulting in the requirement to provide a Type I hood over a domestic appliance, or request a code modification. Oftentimes, if it is a commercial facility, any domestic or residential cooking appliance within the facility is also classified as a commercial cooking appliance – thus typically requiring a Type I hood – where a domestic or residential hood would otherwise be sufficient to meet the intent of the code, which is captured in the IMC Commentary (excerpts below).

The following are examples of kitchens serving occupancies that, depending on the nature of the cooking and the code official's interpretation of this section, might require only a Type II hood, a residential-type hood or no hood at all for the cooking appliances: church assembly halls; child care facilities; office or factory lunch rooms; employee break rooms; police and fire stations; bed-and-breakfast lodgings; VFW and similar halls; domestic-type kitchens in institutional occupancies; cooking classrooms; cooking demonstration displays and charity soup kitchens.

Some common scenarios that come up are the type of hoods that are required in a life science classroom in a high school (i.e., a classroom used to teach, among other things, cooking to students) and the type of hood required over a cooking appliance(s) in a fire station. In both cases, the type of cooking is the deciding factor on the type of hood required.

Typically, students in a life science class are learning to prepare meals that are the same as those that are prepared for a family in a residential dwelling unit. In most cases, residential-type range/ovens are installed in the classroom. As such, the same byproducts that are produced in a kitchen in a dwelling unit would be produced in the classroom. Based on the residential style of cooking that is being taught, it would seem appropriate that the same type of hood installed in a residential dwelling could be installed over the residential range/ovens used in a classroom. Therefore, a Type I or II hood would not be required and residential kitchen hoods that are ducted to the outdoors could be installed.

In the case of a kitchen located in a fire station, once again it depends on the type of cooking and the intended use of the facility. Meals prepared in a kitchen in a fire station that has a residential-type range/oven that is only intended to be used to prepare meals for the fire fighters on that particular shift is similar, if not the same, as those prepared in a home environment. As such, the same byproducts that are produced in a kitchen in a dwelling unit would be produced in the kitchen in the fire station. Based on the residential style of cooking that is being performed, it would seem appropriate that the same type of hood installed in a residential dwelling could be installed or, in a case where the space meets its ventilation requirements in Chapter 4 of the code, no hood at all.

It is important to note that cooking appliances installed in commercial occupancies do not necessarily require the installation of a Type I or II hood. There are a number of installations in a commercial occupancy where residential-type cooking occurs that would not require a commercial kitchen hood. Lunchrooms and breakrooms in commercial businesses often have residential ranges/ovens installed. In addition, many multiple-family residential buildings (e.g., condominiums and townhomes) have a clubhouse or community room that the residents can reserve for special functions. Typically these are seldom used, and when they are, it is to warm food or bake frozen food like pizza, lasagna or premade appetizers. Based on the residential style of cooking that is performed on these appliances, it would seem appropriate that the same type of hood installed in a residential dwelling could be installed or there may be no hood at all.

The proposed code change utilizes the recently ICC approved M76-12 (for the 2015 IMC) as a guide (with some Virginia amendments) in combination with the context of the IMC commentary. The proposed Virginia amendments limit the domestic cooking appliances that can utilize domestic range hoods to *electric* appliances only and the hoods must exhaust to the outdoors.

Cost Impact: This proposed code change should result in potentially tens of thousands of dollars worth of savings if a domestic range hood could be utilized in lieu of a Type I hood and all of its associated requirements.

The M76-12 "Supporting Statement" is included below for reference:

Reason: The intent of this proposal is to clarify requirements and address new situations as Assisted Living and Nursing Home designs change.

Current requirements for domestic appliances used for domestic purposes are geared towards Group R facilities. When a stove is located in another use group, often a requirement for commercial hoods is misapplied. In a residential dwelling unit, often a range hood is not required if there is enough ventilation. Given the different types of facilities, this proposal would always require a hood when a range was provided in another use group.

As the style of assisted living facilities and nursing homes attempts to produce a more residential atmosphere, domestic ranges are provided either within the unit (some assisted living) or in common use areas (assisted living or nursing home residential 'suites'). Residents use this equipment for light cooking duties (few people and only occasional meals) or special cooking (i.e., cookies, cakes). If this equipment is used for cooking for a large number of residents on a regular basis, it is being used for commercial purposes, and it would fall under 507.2.3.

Hospitals or outpatient rehab facilities sometimes have domestic ranges in occupational therapy and dietician areas. The goal being to provide residents with training on good eating habits when they are at home.

Changes to 505.1 would allow residential and areas such as business break rooms to allow for recirculation if the mechanical system is designed for it.

The ICC Board established the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) as the venue to discuss contemporary code issues in a committee setting which provides the necessary time and flexibility to allow for full participation and input by any interested party. The code issues are assigned to the CTC by the ICC Board as "areas of study". Information on the CTC, including: meeting agendas; minutes; reports; resource documents; presentations; and all other materials developed in conjunction with the CTC effort can be downloaded from the following website: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/cc/ctc/index.html>. Since its inception in April, 2005, the CTC has held twenty-two meetings – all open to the public.

Cost Impact: Reduction