

General Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting

Final Meeting Summary Day 1

Date: January 5, 2026

Location: 4224 Cox Rd, Glen Allen, VA 23060 - Virginia Housing Center

Time: 9:00 AM

Attendees:

VA Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) Staff:

- **Jeff Brown** – Deputy Director of Building and Fire Regulation
- **Florin Moldovan** – State Building Codes Office Director
- **Chris Scott** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Brian Hilderbrand** – Construction Regulation Administrator
- **Chad Lambert** - Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Thomas King** - Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Travis Luter** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Rajan Eng** - Training and Development Specialist, Virginia Building Code Academy
- **Stephen Reynolds** - Training and Development Specialist, Virginia Building Code Academy
- **Joseph Dennie** – Policy Analyst, Policy and Legislative Services

Stakeholders:

- **Abigail Thompson** – Gentry Locke
- **Andrew Clark** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Andrew Milliken** – Stafford County Fire Marshal’s Office, Virginia Fire Services Board (VFSB) Codes and Standards Committee
- **Bob Shippee** – Sierra Club
- **Chris Barfield** – University of Virginia, Building Official’s Office
- **Corian Carney** – York County, Independent Alliance of the Electrical Industry (IAEI) - Virginia Chapter
- **Dan Willham** – Fairfax County, Virginia Building and Code Officials Association (VBCOA)
- **David Sharp** – Fairfax County
- **DeAnthony “D.A.” Pierce** – VBCOA Energy Committee
- **Dennis Hart** – Virginia Plumbing and Mechanical Inspectors Association (VPMIA), VBCOA PMG Code Committee
- **Donny Groh** – National Elevator Industry Educational Program (NEIEP)
- **Doug Banks** – Henrico County
- **Dwayne Smith** - Virginia Department of General Services

- **Eric Lacey** – Responsible Energy Codes Alliance (RECA)
- **Gerry O’Connor** – Eaton
- **Greg Cavalli** – Virginia Department of Fire Programs (VDFP)
- **James Walls** - Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute (CISPI)
- **Jason Laws** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA
- **Jason Vandever** – North American Insulation Manufacturers Association (NAIMA)
- **Jonathan Sargeant** – Omega Flex
- **Joseph Wages Jr.** – National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)
- **Joseph “Tread” Willis** – Prince William County, IAEL - Virginia Chapter
- **Joshua Jones** – Henrico County
- **Justin Koscher** – Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturer’s Association (PIMA)
- **Kara Alley** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Katelyn Jordan** – Virginia Farm Bureau
- **Kyle Kratzer** – Fairfax County, Vice President of VBCOA
- **Lee Stoermer** - Loudoun County Fire Marshals Office
- **Mark Graver** – City of Waynesboro, VBCOA Region III
- **Matthew Robinson** - Spotsylvania County, VFSB
- **Michael Dellinger** – Albemarle County, VBCOA Region IV
- **Michele Throckmorton** – City of Chesapeake
- **Mike O’Connor** – Virginia Petroleum and Convenience Marketers Association (VPCMA), Virginia Propane Gas Association (VAPGA)
- **Peter Broadbent** – Virginia Cable Telecommunications Association (VCTA)
- **Paul Messplay** – Hanover County
- **Richard Moore** – Henrico County
- **Ricky Davis** - Rockingham County
- **Ron Clements** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA Admin and Existing Building Code Committees
- **Russell Furr** – City of Alexandria Fire Marshal’s Office
- **Ryan Celestino** – City of Newport News, IAEL - Virginia Chapter
- **Shahriar Amiri** – Arlington County
- **Steve Shapiro** – Apartment & Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA), Virginia Apartment and Management Association (VAMA)
- **Sydney Roberts** – Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA)
- **Syris Spinks** – City of Chesapeake
- **Tony Gardner** – Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute (CISPI)
- **William “Rick” Hinson** – American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)

VIRGINIA PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE (VPMC) PROPOSALS

PM104.4-24 – DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Jeff Brown** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A and Paul M** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

PM106.8-24 – Michelle Throckmorton (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Michelle T** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** highlighted that this proposal came from the Unsafe Structures Study Group and he is in support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

PM107.5-24 – Eric Mays (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Shahriar A** expressed that he has concerns that due process could be compromised by computer software.
- III. **Opposition**
 - a. None

PM606.1-24 – Shahriar Amiri (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Shahriar A** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** speaking for himself, and **Dan W** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

STATEWIDE FIRE PREVENTION CODE (SFPC) PROPOSALS

FP105.3.1-24 - DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

FP107.11-24 – Greg Cavalli (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Greg C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Andrew C** asked if this was the same proposal that came up in the last cycle.
 - b. **Greg C** answered that it was not.
 - c. **Andrew C** noted that the Reason Statement states that joint recommendations between the Board of Housing and Community Development (Board) and the Virginia Fire Services Board are to be included in a report that has not been made public. **Andrew C** asked if this proposal is similar to proposals or recommendations in the report.
 - d. **Greg C** responded that this proposal does not represent a joint recommendation under the report. The Virginia Fire Services Board approved of all their recommendations, but they have not reached consensus with the Virginia Board of Housing and Community Development.
 - e. **Andrew C** reiterated that his concern is that this proposal doesn't reflect what joint recommendations could come from the two boards.
 - f. **Andrew M** asserted that if the boards have objections to this proposal, they can discuss it at the board meeting, and it would seem more appropriate to show that there is consensus among the stakeholders than non-consensus among the stakeholders because of potential board opposition.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Andrew C** expressed opposition.

FP107.12-24 Greg Cavalli (Non-Consensus as Modified)

- I. **Jeff B** announced that there was a floor modification to this proposal, which was shared on the screen.
Greg C provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** asked what Consumer Price Index was used.
 - b. **Greg C** clarified that proposal FP107.11-24 increased existing fees, and this proposal introduces new fees based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) going back to 2009.
 - c. **Steve S** explained that the concern is the number of new fees and their associated costs. **Steve S** questioned the justification of the costs of new fees.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S** expressed opposition.
 - b. **Andrew C** expressed opposition for the same reason as opposition to proposal FP107.11-24.

Florin M clarified for stakeholders that what was in cdpVA and the agenda at the time of the meeting were the proposals, as submitted, and did not reflect any floor modification text shown during the meeting. Floor modifications introduced during the meeting and shared on the screen are intended to highlight changes to the original proposal, in legislative format, and not changes to the model code or the existing regulation. Following the conclusion of the meeting, all floor modified proposals will be updated in cdpVA to show the final proposal.

FP107.12.1-24 – Greg Cavalli (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Gregg C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Shahriar A** declared that it makes sense to adjust fees because business costs increase.
 - b. **Steve S** expressed that the determination of fees was now being taken out of the hands of the stakeholders and will only be decided by the Board of Housing.
 - c. **Shahriar A** responded that localities are allowed to increase permit fees without a consensus process so fees for the State Fire Marshal’s Office to perform inspections should be treated the same way.
 - d. **Andrew C** questioned what the Consumer Price Index has to do with the cost for government services.
 - e. **Mark G** declared that he feels this proposal adds an administrative burden to state government and was in opposition.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Andrew M** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.

- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S, Andrew C, and Mark G** expressed opposition.

FP112.1-24 - Eric Mays (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

FP112.5(1)-24 – DHCD Staff on behalf of the Technical Review Board (TRB) (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Travis L** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Ron C, Dan W, and Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

FP307.2-24 – John Miller (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Jeff B** announced that there was a floor modification to this proposal, which was shared on the screen.
Andrew M provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification and indicated that the VFSB feels that this is a good change.
- II. **Opposition**
 - a. None

FP501.5-24 – Andrew Millikin (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Matthew R** and **Russel F** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

FP904.2.2.1-24 – Lee Stoermer (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Jeff B** announced that there was a floor modification to this proposal, which was shared on the screen.
Lee S provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Shahriar A** asked why only Type I hoods are addressed and not all other fire suppression systems in a building.
 - b. **Lee S** replied that not having the plans on site for Type I hoods is an issue because inspectors are finding cooking equipment is not matching the fire suppression set up. Equipment in commercial kitchens gets rearranged by cleaning crews, etc., whereas a sprinkler system does not get changed around.
 - c. **Rick H** asked how the phrase “shall be available” is enforceable because you can’t cite them for not being available.
 - d. **Lee S** replied that the second part of the proposal requires a plan if changes are made.
 - e. **Dan W** agreed that the term “available” lacks definition and weakens the enforcement position.
 - f. **Shahriar A** suggested eliminating the first sentence and making the second sentence the main body.
 - g. **Steve S** pointed out that old buildings are not going to have approved plans on site.
 - h. **Shahriar A** commented that if cooking equipment has been moved around and there are no approved plans showing it, then the fire marshal can cite it. They don’t need the original approved plans on site to do that.
 - i. **Lee S** agreed to modify the proposal based on Shahriar A’s recommendation.
 - j. **Jeff B** announced that the first sentence will be struck through and will be part of the floor modification.
 - k. **Rick B** proposed requiring an approved layout plan for the kitchen, mounted on a wall, like an emergency exit, so approved plans on site would not be required.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

FP1208(1)-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew Milliken** provided an overview of the proposal.
Jeff B clarified for the stakeholders that this proposal is like another proposal that was deemed Consensus for Approval at a previous meeting. When two or more similar

proposals reach Consensus for Approval, DHCD staff will flag those for the Board with the suggestion that only one gets approved so as not to cause a conflict in the regulations.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Shahriar A** questioned the necessity of the exception as this could mean that the exception must be included in every section that involves one- and two-family dwellings
- b. **Andrew M** responded that the exception is intentional because the Statewide Fire Prevention Code is not routinely applied to one- and two-family dwellings because the routine inspection is exempt. However, there is no general assumption that the Statewide Fire Prevention Code does not apply to single family dwellings.

III. **Support**

- b. **Matthew R, Russell F, and Tread Willis** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

FP4106.1.3-24 – Gerry Maiatico (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Shahriar A** expressed support but denoted that he has a problem with the exception and its intent.
- b. **Andrew M** supported the intent but believes that the exception creates a loophole where it is not a mobile food truck but also not a permanent structure.
- c. **Rick H**, speaking for himself, submitted that as a former building official he would not know how to apply the proposal.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Andrew M** and **Rick H** expressed opposition.

FP6112-24 – Lee Stoermer (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Jeff B** announced that there was a floor modification to this proposal, which was shared on the screen.

Lee S provided an overview of the proposal and the floor modification.

Florin M alerted the stakeholders that DHCD staff did not have the opportunity to thoroughly review the floor modification prior to the meeting for potential errors, typos, and conflicts with existing regulations because of timing. **Florin M** encouraged the stakeholders to take some time to read through the floor modification before opening the proposal up for discussion.

Lee S highlighted the changes in the modification from the original proposal at the request of **Steve S**.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Shahriar A** brought up Section 6112.4.1 Unsafe conditions (new text) in the proposal and posed that he did not understand how to interpret the word “suspicion”.
- b. **Andrew M** pointed out that he believed the intent is to confirm a leak with some type of measuring device and not rely on sense of smell.

III. **Support**

- a. **Mike O, Andrew M, Russell F, and Shahriar A** expressed support

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

TRADES PROPOSALS

E2701.1.1-24 – Eric Mays (Non-Consensus)

I. **Tread Willis** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Shahriar A** indicated that he is a part of inner jurisdictional meetings that have had a lot of discussion regarding this proposal.
- b. **Cory C** noted that National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) has done research that has shown that having receptacles serving island and peninsula countertops and work surfaces is either as unsafe or more unsafe than not having them. NFPA has added the option to not have receptacles serving these countertops and work surfaces.
- c. **Gerry O** brought up that there have been approximately 10,000 recorded emergency room cases since the early 90’s.
- d. **Tread W** added that this change is to the National Electrical Code and would include R-2 and R-3 dwelling units.
- e. **Dan W** stated that having cords on the counters that can drape off whether there are receptacles on the side or not, there is going to be a tradeoff either way because people will just use extension cords.
- f. **Gerry O** remarked that kitchen appliances are required to have a cord that is 24 inches or less, which is why the two-foot and four-foot rule for receptacle locations on kitchen countertops exist. So, these codes are designed to be aligned with the standards for these appliances.
- g. **Kyle K** commented that this proposal still does not prevent a receptacle from being installed on the countertop at the edge of an island where a cord could hang over the side.

- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Cory C, Ryan C, Gerry O,** and **Kyle K** expressed opposition.

E2701.1.1(1)-24 – Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Cory C** believed that there was a misunderstanding why GFCI protection was added in basements. This was added based on the type of floor finish that is often found in residential basements.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Cory C** and **Paul M** expressed opposition.

RE3601.8-24 – Cory Carney (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Cory C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Ryan C** spoke in support as a current inspector; the options are often troublesome for the contractors as well as other inspectors.
 - b. **Gerry O** concurred, noting that the 2023 National Electrical Code (NEC) language was burdensome to the installer and the home builder.
 - c. **Andrew C** brought up an issue expressed by builders – not having the option of installing the service disconnect inside the dwelling unit; and noted that he is trying to understand what “within sight of the dwelling unit” means.
 - d. **Cory C** responded that you are not allowed to have only an interior disconnect. As far as removing the ability to disconnect it from the interior, it must be disconnected on the outside, whether you call it an emergency disconnect or a service disconnect, this makes no difference. It still must be disconnected from the exterior. The easier option is to just install the service disconnect outside. Now you can put your panel board anywhere in that house that you want.
 - e. **Gerry O** added once you take the main breaker and put it on the outside, a main breaker panel board is no longer required. What you're doing is moving the main breaker from inside or in a main panel board, putting it on the outside, and then feeding the panel board inside at any location. It doesn't have to be within a certain distance of entering the building.
 - f. **Andrew C** asked for clarity if the Board will hear feedback from stakeholders between now and their May meeting.

- g. **Jeff B** stated that proposals will go in front of the Board for consideration regardless of consensus or non-consensus. If the position of a stakeholder on any given proposal changes between now and then, they could submit a public comment for the Board’s consideration or speak in front of the Board during the public comment portion of the meeting.

III. **Support**

- a. **Ryan C, Gerry O, and Joseph W** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Andrew Clark** expressed opposition.

RE3702.14-24 – Kyle Kratzer (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Opposition**

- a. None

RE3901.4.2(1)-24 Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.

Jeff B reiterated to the stakeholders that this proposal is like another proposal (E2701.1.1-24) already heard. When there are similar proposals, regardless of whether it is Consensus for Approval or Non-Consensus, DHCD staff will flag those for the Board.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Shahriar A** proclaimed that homeowners aren’t going to get permits to install future receptacles and they will just use extension cords. Anything is better than the unedited current code.

III. **Support**

- a. **Shahriar A** expressed support

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Cory C** expressed opposition

M507.1-24 Dennis Hart (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Dennis H** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Opposition**

- a. None

M1103.1(1)-24 Dennis Hart (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Dennis H** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

M1109.3.2-24 Thomas Deary (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dennis H** stated that requiring ventilation and drainage for shafts that are not otherwise required will introduce inconsistent requirements that are not tied to a demonstrable increase in risk. The proposal maintains the internal level of safety while applying the code only where the risk justifies additional control.
 - b. **Steve S** noted that this is going to decrease construction costs because we will no longer have to ventilate pipe shafts that aren't required to be ventilated.
 - c. **Shahriar A** questioned why the proposal was needed because a single-family dwelling will not exceed the maximum limit on refrigeration so a shaft would not be required anyway.
 - d. **Florin M** clarified the proposal was not intended to apply to single-family dwellings. It is intended to apply to a dwelling in a commercial building where you might only have a single dwelling unit in a mixed-use occupancy. In this situation, the designer would have a choice to run uninterrupted piping with no joints through a shaft that doesn't have to meet the requirements of a shaft.
 - e. **Steve S** added that the third paragraph of the reason statement explains that you don't have to ventilate the shaft if the shaft isn't required.
 - f. **Shahriar A** countered that the code does not impose requirements on non-required equipment in Chapter 1 of the Virginia Construction Code (VCC).
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dennis H** and **Steve S** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Shahriar A** expressed opposition.

M15-24 Thomas Deary (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** asked if these editions of the standard are what is in the 2024 International Mechanical Code (IMC).
 - b. **Dennis H** answered that the 2024 editions have not been adopted in the 2027 IMC and they will be the 2022 editions.
 - c. **Steve S** was against putting in a standard that has not yet been recognized by the

IMC.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S** expressed opposition.

RM-FG2442.3-24 Kyle Kratzer (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. None

III. **Support**

- a. **Shahriar A** and **Dennis H** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

P306.2.5-24 James Walls (Non-Consensus as Modified)

- I. **James W** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Steve S** shared concern over the language, “Trench width shall be controlled to not exceed...”.
- b. **James W** responded that the language was taken from ASTM D2321 and “controlled” means the trench width as the minimum width to withstand the side wall.
- c. **Steve S** proposed to remove the word “control”, both instances in the second sentence.
- d. **James W** agreed to the modification.
- e. **Florin M** asked if the residential occupancies 75 feet in the exception refers to the height of the building or floor height above grade. **Michael D** noted that he had similar questions.
- f. **James W** responded that he was fine with adding “above grade” as a floor modification.
- g. **Dennis H** stated that they were not aware of widespread failures of plastic piping.
- h. **Shahriar A** questioned where the 16-inches and 12-inches come from and why the exception only applies to residential occupancies.
- i. **Mark G** commented that picking out sections out of a standard could leave out the nuance that goes along with it.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Dennis H, Shahriar A, and Mark G** expressed opposition.

P306.3.1-24 James Walls (Non-Consensus)

- I. **James W** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dennis H** had the same comments as proposal P306.2.5-24. Also, the added costs were a concern of the PMG committee, specifically the added costs associated with third-party testing.
 - b. **Steve S** seconded that concern.
 - c. **Dan W** commented that the Engineer of Record language is not specific as to who that would be.
 - d. **Ron C** brought up that there are certain installations in Virginia that do not require an engineer, and testing can be submitted by a contractor.
 - e. **Michael D** reiterated his comments for proposal P306.2.5-24 regarding grade plane, which also applies to this proposal.
 - f. **Shahriar A** remarked that when the code sets certain standards for different types of materials, you follow the standard. It is not the place of the code to add additional requirements because of the type of material.
 - g. **Rick H** explained that engineers are not going to seal documents just because someone wants a seal. Engineers are going to have to be involved on many levels, otherwise they cannot legally seal it, and that adds serious cost.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dennis H, Steve S, Shahriar A, and Rick H** expressed opposition.

RP2903.10.1-24 Kyle Kratzer (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A** and **Dan W** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

ENERGY CONSERVATION PROPOSALS

EC-1301-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Eric L** pointed out that this proposal attempts to address a lot of the other things that are attempted in other later proposals on the agenda. What this proposal does is start Virginia on the path of catching up with the rest of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) which is several iterations behind.
 - b. **Sydney R** commented that SEEA has worked with the Pacific Northwest National Lab to do independent analysis of the impact of adopting the 2024 IECC on home buyers in Virginia and the payback is very short.
 - c. **Steve S** raised the concern that this proposal is getting rid of all the amendments that the Board has adopted trying to balance energy efficiency and affordability.
 - d. **Andrew C** stated that we have reached the point of diminishing returns by balancing energy efficiency with cost of living.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Eric L, Sydney R, Justin K, and Jason V** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S, Andrew C, Dennis H** representing himself, **Rick H** representing himself, and **Tread Willis** representing himself, expressed opposition.

EC-C402.1.6(1)-24 William Penniman (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Bob S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Eric L** remarked that applying Appendix CD to F, S, and U buildings is comparable to the 2006 edition of the IECC which cuts roof insulation and wall insulation by 50%, 70% more heat loss through windows, and 2.6 times more heat loss through skylights. This proposal limits this approach to buildings that are not intended to be heated for human occupancy.
 - b. **Shahriar A** commented that Virginia has a bad habit of going back and amending things that the rest of the country has gotten rid of for decades and is in support of the previous proposal (EC1301-24).
 - c. **Andrew C** brought attention to the fact that this proposal does not apply to residential buildings.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Eric L, Justin K, Jason V, and Sydney R** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EC-C403.7.4.1-24 Tread Willis (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Tread W** provided an overview of the proposal which included a floor modification.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Rick H** asked if this proposal lowers costs.
 - b. **Tread W** replied that it does.
 - c. **Bob S** asked for clarification on what the exception does.
 - d. **Tread W** replied that this applies to two over two units with no interior common space.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Rick H** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EC-C405.15-24 Steve Shapiro (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Steve S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Bob S** commented that there is a lot of room for exceptions and flexibility and does not see the need for the deletions.
 - b. **Joseph W** contributed that the section was shown to be cost effective by Pacific Northwest National Lab analysis.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Rick H, Cory C, and Andrew C** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Bob S and Joseph W** expressed opposition.

EC-C405.17(1)-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Sydney R** pointed out that the cost of electric vehicle infrastructure is less during new construction than doing it as a retrofit. It's about 400% less. It's also to supply equipment for multi-family buildings where residents may not have the power or authority to install equipment for themselves.
 - b. **Steve S** reiterated that a work group be formed to study all the issues around electric vehicle charging.
 - c. **Andrew C** raised the issue that electric vehicle infrastructure not only impacts the cost of a building but also land development for developers.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Eric L, Sydney R, and Joseph W** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S, Andrew C, Rick H, Cory C, and D.A. Pierce** expressed opposition.

EC-C409-24 William Abrahamson (Non-Consensus)

I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Jason V** added that Phius has been shown to save money.
- b. **Bob S** contributed that passive houses have lower energy bills and is a great option to add.
- c. **Steve S** noted that it is a proprietary system with a reference standard that may not comply with ICC requirements for reference standards.
- d. **D.A. Pierce**, representing himself, stated that during the Energy Sub-Workgroup it was discussed that there is no fair way to get to this option for compliance.

III. **Support**

- a. **Jason V, Bob S, and Paul M** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S, Dennis H** representing himself, **D.A. Pierce** representing himself, and **Shahriar A** expressed opposition.

REC-R402.1.2-24 D.A. Pierce (Non-Consensus as Modified)

I. **D.A. Pierce** provided an overview of the proposal.

Jeff B announced that there was a floor modification to this proposal, which was shared on the screen.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Justin K** spoke in support of the floor modification and raised the concern that the existing requirement for R-13+1 does not provide enough exterior continuous insulation to avoid condensation issues in a wall cavity. Related to the cost of construction, he noted that using continuous insulation offers builders the opportunity to optimize their design, whether it be using continuous insulation that can also function as the air and water barrier, using that continuous insulation to offset the need for wood sheathing, or employing other wall bracing techniques. He acknowledged that the proposal would increase the cost of construction but offered that there are ways to address the increase. He further noted that, from a consumer standpoint, the proposal is cost effective for Virginia climate zones.
- b. **Eric L** commented that the current wall insulation requirements have been in place since the 2012 code cycle. Single family home permits in Virginia since the 2012 code cycle are around a quarter million. Meaning that many homes have been built to a standard that is well behind the model codes and will cost more to heat and cool. Wall insulation is also unlikely to be upgraded at any point during home's useful life.
- c. **Rick H** responded that this increases costs and that nobody has died due to homes

having less stringent insulation requirements than the current model codes.

- d. **Mark G** added that this would have a huge impact on the cost of a home because it would force builders to use 2x6 construction.
- e. **D.A Pierce**, speaking for himself, acknowledges that the proposal would increase the cost of construction, but the cost of energy would decrease over the life of the house.

III. **Support**

- a. **Justin K, Dennis H, Jason V, Eric L, Cory C, and Sydney R** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Rick H, Mark G, and Andrew C** expressed opposition.

REC-R402.1.2(1)-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Sydney R** commented that builders are already doing it and know how to do it so there is no reason not to continue.
- b. **Cory C**, speaking for York County, lamented that he has granted a lot of modifications to use R-49 ceiling insulation and would like to see that requirement return as it does in the 2024 International Residential Code (IRC).
- c. **Michael D**, speaking for Albemarle County, echoed Cory C's statement.
- d. **Andrew C** confirmed that he is aware of a lot of localities doing code modifications to go back to R-49 insulation.
- e. **Rick H**, representing himself, also confirmed that a lot of building officials in his area are writing code modifications.
- f. **Kyle K**, representing himself, claimed that he would like to see an increase in wall insulation and a reduction in ceiling insulation.
- g. **Shahriar A** appreciated the thought of coming to a compromise but believed that Virginia cannot keep doing the same thing repeatedly.

III. **Support**

- a. **Sydney R, Bob S, Jason V, and Shahriar A** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Cory C, Michael D, Andrew C, Rick H, and Kyle K** expressed opposition.

REC-R402.1.2(2)-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Bob S** commented that upfront costs exist, but the payback is quick and is a huge net positive.
- b. **Justin K** raised the concern that Virginia is several code cycles behind the current model codes, and these changes are real savings to homeowners. **Justin K** also expressed that

it is not realistic to believe that homeowners have the power to influence insulation requirements when purchasing a new home because those decisions are made well in advance of the buyer taking possession of the home and it is disingenuous to suggest that home buyers can just go out and buy efficiency.

- c. **Sydney R** pointed out that the payback period is only nine years.
- d. **Jason V** stated that a better building envelope makes the house more comfortable which could allow an owner to adjust the thermostat to a degree or two.
- e. **Andrew C** reiterated his stance that the upfront costs of homeownership outweigh energy efficiency cost increases that payoff in the future. Market demand is surging at price points that these proposals collectively are making infeasible to build.
- f. **Kyle K** representing himself, expressed support for proposal REC-R402.1.2-24 as opposed to this proposal because of where Virginia is regarding construction prices.

III. **Support**

- a. **Bob S, Justin K, Sydney R, and Jason V** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Andrew C, Mark G, Kyle K, and Rick H** expressed opposition.

REC-R402.1.2(4)-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** declared that this proposal is very similar to the last proposal and did not see a need for discussion because the talking points would be the same.

Jeff B announced that if everyone wants to stand on their previous comments, this proposal will be marked as Non-Consensus.

REC-R402.1.3-24 Andrew Clark (Withdrawn)

REC-R402.4.1.2-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Sydney R** stressed that for the durability advantages to a tighter building envelope as insulation is increased, there also needs to be an increase in air tightness to keep the humid air out of building cavities. This is a risk mitigation measure for home builders.
- b. **Steve S** stated that he has been collaborating with **Eric L** on some things that might be able to be worked out. He noted that he will continue to work with **Eric L** prior to the Board meeting and remove their opposition if they are able to work out the issues. **Andrew C** echoed **Steve S's** comments.
- c. **D.A. Pierce** inquired if the proponent was open to adding an allowance for four air changes per hour for climate zones three through five for single- and two-family dwellings as an exception.
- d. **Mark G** commented that rarely are blower door test results below three air changes, and

to achieve that would require a significant number of callbacks to contractors to discover where the source of the leak is coming from.

III. **Support**

- a. **Bob S, Sydney R, and D.A. Pierce** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S, Andrew C, Mark G, and Rick H** expressed opposition.

REC-R402.4.1.2(1)-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** provided that this proposal was similar to proposal REC-R402.4.1.2 and there was no need to discuss.
- II. **Opposition**
 - a. **Andrew C** and **Steve S** expressed opposition.

REC-R403.14-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** emphasized that the code should not be legislating what people do in their bedrooms.
 - b. **Andrew C** agreed that a ceiling fan should be a consumer choice.
 - c. **Cory C** explained that the NEC does not require an overhead box to be installed in a bedroom. If a box is installed then it should be a ceiling fan rated box, but it is still not required equipment.
 - d. **Michael D** added that this would increase costs.
 - e. **Tread W**, speaking for himself, opined that the volume of lighting is more important than air flow.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S, Andrew C, Michael D, Rick H, and Tread W** expressed opposition.

REC-R404.1-24 Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Bob S** pointed out that this proposal seems to be a reduction with no offsetting tradeoff.
 - b. **Joseph W** remarked that this section already has four exceptions.
 - c. **Sydney R** brought up that this proposal was discussed at the Energy Sub-Workgroup meeting and there were no strong reasons or good examples of why this would be necessary and that it would probably be more expensive to buy less efficient bulbs.

- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Bob S, Joseph W, and Sydney R** expressed opposition.

REC-R404.2-24 Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** supported the proposal in the name of individual choice.
 - b. **Cory C** explained that energy savings are negligible.
 - c. **Bob S** declared that he did not see any justification for further eroding the standards.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S, Cory C, Ryan C, and Rick H** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Bob S** and **Joseph W** expressed opposition.

REC-R404.5-24 William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bob S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Sydney R** mentioned that several municipalities are starting to incorporate this into their local ordinances, so it makes sense to have a statewide code for consistency.
 - b. **Steve S** reminded the group that the codes are supposed to be the minimum codes to protect health, safety, and welfare and now we are going to tell everybody they must supply electric vehicle spaces and equipment. **Steve S** also added that electric vehicle language is in Appendix RE, and the whole purpose of the appendices is for people to adopt them if they want and not make the appendices part of the code.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Sydney R** and **Joseph W** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S, Rick H, Cory C, Tread W, and Andrew C** expressed opposition.

REC-R405.2-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **D.A. Pierce** acknowledged that it is less stringent with the limits that were offered up by the proponent, but most builders do not build to software simulation. VBCOA was opposed to any tradeoffs or allowances based on equipment efficiencies written in the code.

- III. **Support**
 - a. **Bob S, Jason V, and Sydney R** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **D.A. Pierce and Rick H** expressed opposition.

REC-R405.2(2)-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Jason V** stated that it is shortsighted to trade off building equipment such as mechanical or lighting for a building component that will last forever.
 - b. **Justin K**, referring to some of his earlier comments, indicated that this is getting into that consumer protection, delivering something to the owners that they may have very little control over; therefore he supports the modest efficiency this proposal is after.
 - c. **Sydney R** explained that the importance of a backstop cannot be overstated and supports having a performance path that allows flexibility.
 - d. **D.A. Pierce** opposed any modifications to the software simulated path of compliance and wanted to leave in place any flexibility that exists.
 - e. **Eric L** clarified that the performance path uses Virginia's prescriptive baseline as its foundation, so if we don't modify this, then we are allowing the Virginia prescriptive path to weaken the software model. This proposal is trying to bring the software modeling back up to an equivalent level to an unamended 2024 IECC and not something less than code.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Jason V, Justin K, and Sydney R** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **D.A. Pierce** expressed opposition.

REC-R408.2.9-24 Eric Lacey (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Eric L** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **D.A. Pierce** remarked that equipment can change but the thermal envelope remains the same and should not be reduced.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **D.A. Pierce and Jason V** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Andrew C** expressed opposition.

**VIRGINIA CERTIFICATION STANDARDS (VCS) AND VIRGINIA AMUSEMENT DEVICE
REGULATIONS (VADR) PROPOSALS**

CS10-24 – DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** and **Andrew C** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

**CS51-24 – DHCD Staff on behalf of the Building Code Academy Advisory Committee (BCAAC)
(Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **David S** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Tread W** declared that four more hours per year on average is a small ask to ensure that we are doing the minimum requirements to ensure that we have a safe place to live, work, and play for everybody here in Virginia.
 - b. **Dennis H** added that it is easier than ever to get continuing education hours with different online education, webinars, etc.
 - c. **Kyle K** noted that anybody who is here today and tomorrow almost satisfies the two-year requirement for their continuing education.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Tread W, Cory C, Dennis H, Andrew M, Ryan C, Kyle K, and Rick H** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

**AD40-24 – DHCD Staff on behalf of the Amusement Device Technical Advisory Committee (ADTAC)
(Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Ryan C** and **Rick H** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

AD40(1)-24 – Victoria Baselice (Withdrawn)

AD75-24 – Cory Carney (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Cory C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Florin M** alerted the stakeholders that ADTAC had been added as a co-proponent but the agenda that was sent out did not reflect that.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

General Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting

Final Meeting Summary Day 2

Date: January 6, 2026

Location: 4224 Cox Rd, Glen Allen, VA 23060 - Virginia Housing Center

Time: 9:00 AM

Attendees:

VA Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) Staff:

- **Jeff Brown** – Deputy Director of Building and Fire Regulation
- **Florin Moldovan** – State Building Codes Office Director
- **Chris Scott** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Brian Hilderbrand** – Construction Regulation Administrator
- **Chad Lambert** - Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Thomas King** - Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Travis Luter** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Rajan Eng** - Training and Development Specialist, Virginia Building Code Academy
- **Stephen Reynolds** - Training and Development Specialist, Virginia Building Code Academy
- **Joseph Dennie** - Policy Analyst, Policy and Legislative Services
- **Kenrick Cameron** - Policy Analyst, Policy and Legislative Services

Stakeholders:

- **Alyssa Brown** – Changing Tables
- **Andrew Clark** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Andrew Milliken** – Stafford County Fire Marshal’s Office, Virginia Fire Services Board (VFSB) Codes and Standards Committee
- **Angela Navarro** – Virginia League of Conservative Voters
- **Chris Barfield** – University of Virginia, Building Official’s Office
- **Chris Reynolds** – Atlantic Builders
- **Chris Sampl** - Fairfax County, Office of the Fire Marshal
- **Dan Boyle** - Hemphiciency
- **Dan Willham** – Fairfax County, Virginia Building and Code Officials Association (VBCOA)
- **David Beahm** – Warren County, VBCOA
- **David Sharp** – Fairfax County
- **Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker** – Virginia House of Delegates 2025, 5th District
- **Delegate Paul Milde** - Virginia House of Delegates 2025, 64th District

- **Dennis Hart** – Virginia Plumbing and Mechanical Inspectors Association (VPMIA), VBCOA PMG Code Committee
- **Doug Banks** – Henrico County
- **Duru Meric** - Amazon
- **Francie Mitchell** – Children’s Assistive Technology Services (CATS)
- **Gregg Black** – George Mason University
- **Gregg Fields** – City of Alexandria
- **Heather Wasnick** - Amazon
- **James Walls** - Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute (CISPI)
- **Jared Hoernig** – Virginia Emergency Management Association
- **Jason Laws** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA
- **Jen Hackney** – Changing Tables
- **Joseph Wages Jr.** – National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)
- **Joshua Jones** – Henrico County
- **Kara Alley** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Kelsey Wright** - Virginia House of Delegates 2025, 5th District
- **Kyle Kratzer** – Fairfax County, Vice President of VBCOA
- **Maggie Davison** – Virginia Distributed Solar Alliance
- **Mark Graver** – City of Waynesboro, VBCOA Region III
- **Mark Price** – City of Martinsville
- **Matthew Robinson** - Spotsylvania County, VFSB
- **Michael Dellinger** – Albemarle County, VBCOA Region IV
- **Mike O’Connor** – Virginia Petroleum and Convenience Marketers Association (VPCMA), Virginia Propane Gas Association (VAPGA)
- **Monica Thrower** – Changing Spaces Campaign
- **Nicholas Bowles** – Halifax County
- **Paul Messplay** – Hanover County
- **Ricky Davis** - Rockingham County
- **Richard Hankins** – Partnership for Smarter Growth
- **Ron Clements** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA Admin and Existing Building Code Committees
- **Russell Furr** – City of Alexandria Fire Marshal’s Office
- **Sarah Thomas** – Virginia Association for Commercial Real Estate (VACRE)
- **Scott McStacy** – Seed to Structure
- **Shahriar Amiri** – Arlington County
- **Sonal Shah** – Northern Virginia Bird Alliance
- **Steve Shapiro** – Apartment & Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA), Virginia Apartment and Management Association (VAMA)
- **Sydney Roberts** – Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA)
- **Tom Blackburn** – Northern Virginia Bird Alliance

- **Tony Gardner** – Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute (CISPI)
- **Trieste Lockwood** – Permit Power
- **William “Rick” Hinson** – American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC)

Virginia Construction Code (VCC) PROPOSALS

B101.2(2)-24 – Angela Navarro (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Angela N** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Sydney R** expressed that decisions regarding electric vehicle ready infrastructure are typically made before there is a buyer for a home. The buyer will be facing a much higher cost to install equipment after the home is built. One point that was discussed yesterday was the system’s impact. Including this in the code is important and initiates the conversation with the utility company. If the impact is unsurpassable with the utilities, then you get a pass.
 - b. **Steve S** reiterated that a work group should be formed to study all the issues around electric vehicle charging. Until such time when the workgroup is stood up, they are in opposition.
 - c. **Andrew C** highlighted that the cost drivers of electric vehicle ready infrastructure occur in the land development process. Utilities gold plate infrastructure requirements to accommodate new subdivisions or new multi-family buildings that are going to be equipped with electric vehicle charging stations. That is the opposite of what a lot of localities are trying to promote, which is walkable, denser communities, and smaller lot subdivisions that have less of an infrastructure impact and less of an impact on the natural environment around it. He suggested that the focus should be on trying to figure out how to get utilities to right size their infrastructure requirements, so from a construction and land development perspective, we can incorporate these changes with minimal impact to the consumer and builder.
 - d. **Ron C** questioned whether electric vehicle charging stations in a parking lot are within the scope of the uniform statewide building code.
 - e. **Rick H** expressed concern with dealing with fire from electric vehicles and how increasing costs affect affordable housing.
 - f. **Mark G** stated that the electric vehicle appendix has specific provisions that leave the owner out of the decision-making process. There are a lot of design decisions that go into putting in electric vehicle infrastructure and the appendix makes those

decisions for you. **Mark G** believed that a code that narrows things down to only one pathway is not a good code.

- g. **Angela N** brought up that utility companies can proactively plan for infrastructure to support a new community that might have higher load because of future electric vehicles. **Angela N** agreed with **Andrew C** that there needs to be communication with the State Corporation Commission around the question of whether the utilities are gold plating infrastructure.
- h. **Chris R** seconded **Rick H's** concerns with affordability.
- i. **Rick H** stated that he doesn't want to have to pay for something that he will never use and that the code is intended to create safety at the lowest cost.
- j. **Shahriar A** chimed in that at some point Virginia needs to move forward with this to some degree.

III. **Support**

- a. **Sydney R** and **Joseph W** expressed support

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S, Andrew C, Ron C, Rick H, Mark G,** and **Chris R** expressed opposition.

B103.5-24 – David Beahm (Non-Consensus)

- I. **David B** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Michael D** stated that keeping the section untouched is necessary.
- b. **Ron C** agreed with **Michael D** and felt it takes away his ability to work with the agencies involved in functional design. **Ron C** also believed that there may be a legal conflict as state law requires them to coordinate with the health department for sewage disposal systems before issuing permits.
- c. **Doug B**, speaking for himself, voiced that the proposal appears to allow the beginning of construction without having the proper sanitary facilities.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Michael D, Ron C,** and **Doug B** expressed opposition.

B103.7-24 – DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. None

III. **Support**

- a. **Michael D** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

B105.2-24 – DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Ron C** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B107.1-24 – David Beahm (Non-Consensus)

- I. **David B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Andrew C** asked if the provision comes out of state law.
 - b. **David B** responded that it does.
 - c. **Andrew C** questioned if building code can get ahead of state law.
 - d. **Jeff B** replied that if a proposal goes to the Board that conflicts with state law, the proposal will be sent to the attorney general for them to weigh in and advise the Board if there is a potential conflict.
 - e. **Ron C** added that this proposal would require a bill since the code section specifically calls out the state law that this comes from.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Ron C, Michael D, Dan W, and Shahriar A** expressed opposition.

B109.2-24 – David Beahm (Non-Consensus)

- I. **David B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S**, speaking for himself, highlighted the following concerns for new one- and two- family dwellings:
 - i. Section 109.2 Exception 1 - Eliminating the requirement for the elevation of the lowest floor from a Site Plan because this information is necessary in a special flood hazard area.
 - ii. Section 109.4 Exception – Eliminating the requirement to review the plans.
 - iii. Section 109.5 Exception – Same reason as Section 109.4 exception.
 - iv. Section 113.7.2 Exception – RDP as an approved third-party inspector.
 - v. Section 116.1 Exception 3 – Certificate of occupancy issued at the time of

permit issuance.

- b. **Andrew M** pointed out that new Exception 2 in Section 109.2 uses the word “generally, and in the new exception in Section 109.4 a Class A contractor cannot be a design professional because the Class A contractor is not an individual and cannot stamp and sign drawings. **Andrew M** questioned what date do you put on the Certificate of Occupancy under new Exception 3 in Section 116.1. Is it the date when the permit is issued before the inspections are done, or after the final inspections have been approved?
- c. **Ron C** indicated that VBCOA Admin Committee is also in opposition based on all the reasons already stated by others.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S, Shahriar A, Michael D, Andrew M, and Ron C** expressed opposition.

B109.3.1-24 Duru Meric (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Duru M** provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Ron C** questioned what happens when a Registered Design Professional (RDP) is not involved. There are several building types that Virginia allows to be designed without an RDP being involved. **Ron C** did not see the value in this proposal as it adds more confusion and probably adds more time than it saves.
- b. **Duru M** responded that not having deferred submittal language is causing confusion on the authority having jurisdiction’s (AHJ) side and the architect’s side as to when those submittals should be submitted. The industry standard is to have them submitted by the general contractor or the licensed professionals preparing them, not by the Architect of Record (AOR) or the Structural Engineer of Record (SEOR).
- c. **Shahriar A** conceded that this is a real issue because of ambiguity and what is acceptable to submit to one jurisdiction should be good enough for all the others. However, **Shahriar A**, speaking for himself, was opposed to the term, “are not limited to”, in the proposal.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Ron C, Shahriar A, and Michael D** expressed opposition.

B109.4-24 – Delegate Paul Milde (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Delegate Paul M** provided an overview of the proposal.

Jeff B noted that a Study Group on Expediting Permits and Certificates of Occupancy was convened during this code development cycle. The group’s discussions and feedback directly

informed the development of this proposal.

II. Discussion

- a. **Chris R** voiced to the group to consider assigning timelines, not just for the benefit of the builder but also the consumer.
- b. **Andrew M**, representing himself, believed that the proposal provides reasonable improvements to processes and notifications.
- c. **Ron C** expressed mild opposition to the current version of the proposal. VBCOA Admin Committee had additional concerns with the original version of the proposal, and thanked **Delegate Milde** for being open to their input. **Ron C** noted that after careful consideration they still have some concerns over how the role of the third-party process would work, whether adequate reviews could be handled by third-party for everything that is required to be reviewed, as well as some concerns with the timeframes.
- d. **Michael D** stated opposition except for third-party reviews. The time frames in the proposal are unrealistic for small one-man shops. This is fine if a project is on a public water sewer system, but they cannot dictate to the applicant that they have to have concurrent Virginia Department of Health or a Virginia Department of Transportation approval.
- e. **Rick H** agreed with **Michael D** and added that fixed timelines will not fix the problem. There is a time problem.
- f. **Shahriar A** reminded the group that yesterday there was non-consensus for raising fees for state fire marshal services. Those fees are going to provide additional staffing levels to do it faster. This proposal is an unfunded mandate. Code officials have an ethical responsibility not to just rubber stamp for the sake of meeting a timeline.
- g. **Mark G** declared that he is a small shop and he is the only one doing plan reviews. If he goes on vacation, he could be in violation of this proposal.
- h. **Dan W** had concerns over the “other structures” deadline because his locality gets really big projects at a time and being required to meet a timeline mandated by law is troubling.
- i. **Gregg F** disagreed with the Cost Impact statement that the proposal would not increase or decrease cost. Cost will either be increased by increased staff to meet the timelines, or the cost of third-party review. **Gregg F** also highlighted that it is much easier to change things on paper than out in the field. If things get missed in plan review and require tearing out stuff in the field, that will be costly as well.
- j. **Delegate Paul M** countered that the costs can be passed down to the applicants, so he was not convinced that it is an affordability issue. The term “within a reasonable time” is not a fair way to approach permits and creating predictability is a fair thing to do to your customers. If the timelines are the issue, he is open to discussing what they should be. Creating predictability creates more affordability.
- k. **David B** pointed out that they are not allowed to increase fees arbitrarily to pass costs along. Fees must be approved, and most jurisdictions are not going to

increase fees.

- I. **Mark G** asserted that in order to determine a correct timeline, the nature of applications coming in waves needs to be factored in. There could be a quiet period and then a very busy period where these timelines can't be met. Small departments would need to have a part-time staff member to help when needed.

III. **Support**

- a. **Chris R, Andrew M, and Andrew C** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Ron C, Michael D, Rick H, Shahriar A, Mark G, Dan W, Gregg F, and David B** expressed opposition.

B109.4(1)-24 – Anthony Smith (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Maggie D** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Ron C** expressed that this proposal prohibits plan review of solar installations. These could be huge installations with significant electrical and fire safety impacts on buildings. Effectively, the contractor will be able to self-certify their own code compliance. This really sets a dangerous precedent and what justifies this over other types of equipment?
- b. **Dan W** added that this proposal would allow any system to be put on an existing roof without any kind of structural evaluation to see if the existing roof can hold the new load.
- c. **Maggie D** countered that they are submitting a stamped structural letter, racking plan, and electrical plans. What they are finding is there are different interpretations of what existing building code needs to be applied. These are not permanent fixtures. **Maggie D** further explained that what they are seeking is consistency across localities and questioned if the people reviewing these projects have the qualifications to understand what they are looking at.
- d. **Shahriar A** highlighted that the proposal does not require a structural drawing sealed and signed by an RDP. The RDP required in the exception could be an electrical engineer that has nothing to do with a structural evaluation. The other things to worry about are fire fighter access to the roof and for access for maintenance of the equipment.
- e. **Michael D** contributed that class A contractors in his area that install solar equipment have no clue what firefighter access is. Giving them carte blanche is a bad idea.
- f. **Andrew M** suggested concern over using the term "rooftop electrical equipment". If the proponent is talking about photovoltaic (PV) equipment, then call it that.

III. **Support**

- a. **Trieste L** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Ron C, Rick H, Dan W, Shahriar A, Andrew M, Kyle K, Michael D, and Andrew M** expressed opposition.

B113.6-24 – Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Shahriar A** commented that this is how the code should be administered.
 - b. **Kyle K** explained that he advocates to the students in his Virginia Building Code Academy classes to include code sections on their inspection results and plan reviews.
 - c. **Andrew M**, speaking for himself, notes that this has been a fire code requirement for a long time.
 - d. **Dave S** noted that this is a much-needed change and echoed **Kyle K** in that this is what is taught in Core.
 - e. **Michael D** objected to the Cost Impact statement that the proposal will decrease the cost because it will cost his jurisdiction a lot of money to include code sections with the code language because the current software they use cannot do that.
 - f. **Andrew M** commented that the proposal is just calling for a reference to a code section not the code section language verbatim.
 - g. **Andrew C** agreed with **Andrew M** that that was the intent.
 - h. **Michael D** stated that he does not like the idea of adding the code section number because that opens it up to an appeal if the wrong code section is cited. **Michael D** also highlighted that citing code sections is going to slow down inspections and increase cost.
 - i. **Andrew C** countered that it should save time and money by not having to go back and forth communicating with the builder.
 - j. **Shahriar A** called out that it is the code enforcers' duty and responsibility to cite the code they are enforcing.
 - k. **Ricky D** emphasized that small localities have combination inspectors and must deal with many different types of inspections on a job. It would slow them down to have to stop and look everything up. Many builders and homeowners do not even have code books, so they won't understand the code sections anyway.
 - l. **Andrew C** believed that giving a builder some more information will give them something to focus on which will result in less back and forth and may result in less re-inspections.
 - m. **Mark G** echoed **Ricky D's** comments and added that a lot of contractors do not want to know the code sections, they just want to be told what to do.
 - n. **Matthew R**, speaking for himself, reminded the group that any document that code enforcers put forth is a legal document and they are not fully executing their job if they are not stating the code.
- III. **Support**

- a. **Shahriar A, Kyle K, Steve S, Andrew M** representing himself, **Dave S, Rick H, Chris B,** and **Ron C** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Michael D, Ricky D, David B, Gregg F,** and **Mark G** expressed opposition.

B113.7-24 – Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Trieste L** conveyed that the intent is to streamline third party inspection processes for rooftop-mounted photovoltaic (PV) systems.
- b. **Shahriar A** questioned why there is a carve out for PV systems. Shahriar A also brought up that building officials cannot issue a code violation based on a photograph that someone else provides.
- c. **Andrew M**, speaking for himself, asked the proponent to clarify the intent, explaining that as written, the proposal appears to mandate the acceptance of third-party inspection reports (which could include videos or photos) if the jurisdiction does not allow photographs or videos as part of the inspection by the locality. He noted that the concept floated around before is, if the jurisdiction cannot meet the timeline for the inspection, then they must allow third party inspections, but the proposal does not say that.
- d. **Trieste L** explained that the intent was that if the building department offers remote inspection, then you would need to have a third-party policy. She agreed that it could benefit from rewording.
- e. **Andrew M** shared concern that photographs and videos are not tests and inspections.
- f. **David B** expressed opposition to the language requiring three working days for third-party applications.
- g. **Mark G** clarified that a photograph and a videotape do not constitute a report.
- h. **Michael D** voiced concern over the proposal taking away the building official's ability to approve third party inspection agencies and what the minimum requirements they must meet. **Michael D** also had concerns over licensure as a Registered Design Professional (RDP), being a qualifying criterion for a third-party inspector as there are plenty of RDPs who know nothing about building code.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Shahriar A, Ron C, Andrew M, David B, Mark G,** and **Michael D** expressed opposition.

B119.5(1)-24 – Eric Mays (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.

- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S** representing himself, **Shahriar A**, **Dan W**, **Dennis H** representing himself, **Michael D**, and **Gregg F** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B202-24 – Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** introduced a friendly amendment to change the “dead end” definition to “dead end corridor”.
 - b. **Ron C** confirmed that **Allison C** was in support of the change.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S**, **Shahriar A**, **Kyle K**, and **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B302.1-24 – Kenny Hackworth (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** commented that he doesn’t think the changes to Section 302.1 are necessary.
 - b. **Florin M** replied that this was done just for correlation.
 - c. **Dan W** noted that exceptions to other occupancies are not delineated in this list.
 - d. **Shahriar A** proposed a friendly amendment.
 - e. **Florin M** mentioned that DHCD Staff could have put the revisions in the base document but left it as a proposal since it was already submitted. Item 2 was added for correlation for what was already in Item 6 and Item 8. **Florin M** asked for confirmation of what the floor modification is.
 - f. **Shahriar A** responded to take out “State Regulated Care Facilities (SRCFs)” wherever they appear.
 - g. **Florin M** suggested not having changes to Section 302.1.
 - h. **Shahriar A** removed his friendly amendment.
 - i. **Dan W** proposed to not add “313 for State Regulated Care Facilities (SRCFs)” under B.
 - j. **Jeff B** asked the group if they were okay with supporting the proposal as is and stated that it might be better to clean up later.

- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B406.2.7-24 – Ernie Little (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Mark G** asked if the 2026 National Electrical Code (NEC) will have these provisions in it, particularly signage.
 - b. **Andrew M** replied that the proposal is close to what is in the NEC but did not remember if signage requirements are in the 2026 NEC.
 - c. **Mark G** indicated that it is important to make sure that the proposal is not conflicting with the NEC.
 - d. **Andrew M** noted that this proposal has more flexibility, particularly the language requiring the emergency disconnect to be within sight of the equipment which gives the option to identify which charging stations are controlled by which emergency disconnects.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Michael D, Russell Furr, Chris Sampl, and Matthew R** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B406.2.7(1)-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **David B** asked if the referenced UL 2750 and NFPA 88A standards are already incorporated into ICC.
 - b. **Andrew M** responded that he did not believe that they are incorporated into ICC as standards.
 - c. **Doug B** asked how this will look in the future with existing parking garages where electric vehicle charging stations get installed.
 - d. **Andrew M** responded that you would start with the Existing Building Code and then must comply with the current standards of the Virginia Construction Code (VCC).
 - e. **Mark G** asked how many vehicle fires referenced in **Andrew M's** introduction of the proposal were in sprinklered buildings.
 - f. **Andrew M** replied that he did not know, but more parking garages are now incorporating sprinklers. The ICC recently lowered the threshold for when sprinklers are required due to changing materials in cars from mostly metal to more plastics and foams.

- g. **Shahriar A** notified the group that ICC had an ad hoc committee to deal with energy storage unit mobility devices, and we will probably see some changes appear in Chapter 12 of the 2027 International Fire Code (IFC).
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Steve S, Matthew R, and Shahriar A** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B407.4.1.1-24 – Eric Mays (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** stated that the model code has progressed far past where the Virginia amendment was and it is much better to bring in the model code language.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B706.3-24 – Shahriar Amiri (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Shahriar A** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** argued that the proposal conflicts with existing provisions for fire walls which can allow the use of Fire Retardant Treated (FRT) lumber.
 - b. **Shahriar A** countered that UL or Warnock Hersey have not tested any assemblies using FRT, so you cannot just use FRT to build a fire wall.
 - c. **Andrew M** expressed that the proposal basically deletes the section and doesn't add anything.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed opposition.

B907.5.2.1.2-24 – Richard Gordon (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Paul M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** asked how much per square foot this proposal would increase cost.
 - b. **Paul M** replied that he did have that information.

- c. **Andrew M** summarized his understanding to be that a switch would be integrated with the building operation system to shut down the ambient noise.
 - d. **Gregg Black** asked how this system is going to tie into sound systems that are brought into A occupancies as part of the traveling shows and are not permanently built into the building.
 - e. **Shahriar A** suggested that the visible alarms requirement in the code section are the solution.
 - f. **Andrew M** contributed that he does not believe the intent was to apply the requirements to temporary arrangements and configurations. An argument can be made that the average ambient noise is not going to be greater than 105 dBA for most events, and the ambient noise will only be greater than 105 dBA occasionally which would negate this requirement from kicking in.
 - g. **Michael D** commented that this system would reduce the voice emergency response volume.
- III. **Support**
- a. **Dan W** and **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
- a. **David B** expressed opposition.

B917.1.1-24 – Gregg Black (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Gregg B** provided an overview of the proposal which is a variation of proposal B917.1, which was heard during the October General Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Jared H** stated that this proposal connects the code official with a campus subject matter expert.
 - b. **Chris B** noted that the University of Virginia is already doing this.
 - c. **Dan W** expressed that this is not something building officials should be regulating.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Jared H, Chris B,** and **Andrew M** representing himself, expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dan W** expressed opposition.

B918.1-24 – Matthew Bonifant (Non-Consensus as Modified)

- I. **Chris Sampl**, on behalf of the proponent, provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification. **Florin M** brought awareness to the group that DHCD staff has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review the floor modification due to the timing of submittal, and invited stakeholders to review the floor modification thoroughly.
- II. **Discussion**

- a. **Gregg F** expressed relief that the proposal shifts the acceptance testing responsibility from the locality to the owner.
- b. **Dan W** drew attention to the fact that his locality has done building code modifications to allow wireless communication systems.
- c. **Steve S** explained that the prior code split the responsibility between the owner and the locality. Now the responsibility is all on the owner and it is a huge cost that includes fees and maintenance tests.
- d. **Chris Sampl** pointed to Exception 6 of Section 918.1 and clarified that the intent is for all jurisdictions to opt out if they don't want to have in-building communication requirements.
- e. **Ron C** indicated that jurisdictions requiring these systems are doing so outside of the requirements of the current code, and that Exception 6, as modified, is not doing what is being claimed it is doing. **Ron C** elaborated the way the proposal is currently written does not get the locality out of a requirement.

III. **Support**

- a. **Andrew M, Russell F, Gregg F, Dan W, and Shahriar A** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S** and **Ron C** expressed opposition.

B918.2-24 – Matthew Bonifant (Non-Consensus as Modified)

- I. **Chris Sampl**, on behalf of the proponent, provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification. **Florin M** brought awareness to the group that DHCD staff has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review the floor modification due to the timing of submittal, and invited stakeholders to review the floor modification thoroughly.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Doug B** asked how this proposal differs from the present requirement for non-required equipment.
 - b. **Andrew M** explained that the difference between this proposal and the previous proposal is that this proposal establishes if a building owner chooses to provide non-required equipment, the acceptance testing of that equipment is now not the responsibility of the locality.
 - c. **Chris Sampl** added that the proposal provides an avenue for wireless emergency communication without having to get a code modification. The majority of the country already allows wireless communication.
 - d. **Steve S** remarked that if the system is voluntary then there is no opposition.
 - e. **Ron C** indicated that voluntary systems are already allowed in the code and there is no need for code sections all over the code covering maintenance and testing requirements for voluntary systems.
 - f. **Andrew M** countered that the code as currently written does not simply allow voluntary emergency communications without adding responsibility to both the owner and the locality. This takes responsibility off the locality since it is voluntary.

- g. **Ron C** stipulated that if the locality is not providing equipment, you're exempt from this section. Electively installing it, does not undo Exception 6.
 - h. **Shahriar A** questioned why this section is different from anything else that is voluntary as addressed in Chapter 1. If you provide stairs that are not required, they still must meet certain safety criteria.
 - i. **Gregg F** mentioned that it is hard to grasp a voluntary code requirement where the voluntary requirement is not an exception to a mandatory requirement.
- III. **Support**
- a. **Andrew M, Chris Sampl, and Steve S** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
- a. **Ron C** and **Gregg F** expressed opposition.

B1006.3.4(1)-24 – Andrew Clark (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- Jeff B** announced to the stakeholders that this proposal is similar to proposal B1006.2.1(1)-24, which was already heard at a previous General Stakeholder Meeting. When there are similar proposals, regardless of whether it is Consensus for Approval or Non-Consensus, DHCD staff will flag those for the Board.
- II. **Discussion**
- a. **Andrew M** asked if the proposal was submitted by the Home Builders Association.
 - b. **Andrew C** confirmed that it was.
 - c. **Richard H** stated that single stair reform is a valuable tool to solve our affordable housing issue. There was a study done in Minnesota that found that an eight-story single stair building with 6,000 square feet per floor had a lower fire risk than an eight-story building that has two staircases.
 - d. **Dan W** expressed opposition and recommended relying on what has been approved at the national level and with the study group that Virginia put together. The additional provisions that this proposal provides do not appear to be equivalent to providing compensation for the additional height and occupant load for a single exit.
 - e. **Andrew M** expressed frustration that what is in this proposal was not included in the discussions that were had, and provided thirteen specific reasons why this proposal is not good for Virginia.
 1. Section 1006.2.1 is for exits from rooms or spaces on a floor, not exits from a floor. The addition of item four is shown as essentially not appropriate for that section.
 2. Section 1006.2.1 item four only applies to six story buildings and not four and five story buildings and skips all the new requirements in Section 1006.3.4 and Table 1006.3.4(1).
 3. Proposed Section 1006.3.4(6) would allow single exit stairs in buildings more than six stories, if they are not high rise, which doesn't match the scope indicated in the Reason Statement.

4. Proposed Section 1006.3.4 Item 6.1 allows up to six dwelling units per floor if the floor area is 3000 square feet or less, which seems to conflict with the limitations proposed in Table 1006.3.1 which limits single exit stair buildings to a maximum of four units per floor.
 5. Proposed Section 1006.3.4 Item 6.2 has an exception that eliminates any added construction type benefit to this section that it's intended to provide, since an R-2 over six stories already must be of a Type I or Type IV construction per Section 504.4.
 6. Proposed Section 1006.3.4 Item 6.10 does not make any sense as written, and is also probably not accurate for the doors into stairs serving four more stories, since the stair enclosure is required in two hours, not one hour, this proposal has at least two, if not three, sets of new requirements for single exit stairs that seem to overlap and conflict and would be extremely confusing as proposed.
 7. Proposed Table 1006.3.4 Item 1, Note a, would now apply to four, five, and six story buildings, but Section 1031 reference for emergency escape and rescue openings only applies to buildings of one to three stories.
 8. Proposed Table 1006.3.4 Item 1, Note d, seems to indicate that four and five story single exit stair buildings do not have to comply with Section 1006.3.4.2.
 9. Proposed title to Section 1006.3.4.2 indicates that it is only applicable to six-story buildings. So, it sounds like it's not in ten, four, five or seven story buildings.
 10. Proposed Section 1006.3.4.2 Item 4 would only apply to four stories but would not apply to the fifth and sixth floor.
 11. The Reason Statement says this proposal incorporates the same safety measures and design standard safeguards developed and supported by the fire service and other stakeholders, but the proposal does not apply them equivalently as compared to the consensus proposal.
 12. The Reason Statement indicates that the proposal provides an equivalent level of safety but provides no basis as to how it is in any way equivalent to the current or even the consensus proposal.
 13. The Reason Statement further indicates that this proposal adds additional protection beyond those in the consensus proposal that are appropriate for six story construction and ensures an equal or greater level of occupant safety through strengthened fire-resistance, detection, and egress requirements, but again, doesn't specifically indicate where those are located or how they are accomplished in this proposal.
- f. **Andrew C** questioned what requirements are needed to add the two additional stories from the four-story proposal that would satisfy fire services.

III. **Support**

- a. **Richard H** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Dan W, Russel F, and Andrew M** expressed opposition.

B1110.4-24 – Monika Thrower (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Monika T** provided an overview of the proposal.

- II. **Discussion**

- a. **Steve S** asked if there were other organizations that promulgate a standard other than IAPMO Z1390 related to adult changing tables.
- b. **Shahriar A** responded that this is an ANSI standard.
- c. **Dan W** stated that he serves on the Egress Committee for ICC and there was a proposal to add that in.
- d. **Dennis H** added that the standard was approved at the second committee action hearing on a proposal for the 2027 code.
- e. **Rick H** verified for clarification that adult changing stations are already in the 2024 IBC and that this proposal is adding more locations where they would be required.
- f. **Mark G** asked the group if everyone was aware of what a “state park visitor center” is as stated in Item 6 and if the term needs to be defined.
- g. **Jeff B** pointed out that the Items 4, 5, and 6 don’t have a limitation on the number of fixtures, so these would apply to every state park visitor centers not just based on use group.
- h. **Kyle K** inquired about directional signage in Section 1110.4.5 and what was the intent.
- i. **Monika T** answered that they are looking for an actual sign like what you see for restrooms or elevators.
- j. **Shahriar A** offered the example of three banks of toilets and two of them do not have adult changing stations, then you put directional signage to lead you to the toilet that has the adult changing station.
- k. **Alyssa B** stated that when she uses the bathroom, there is signage saying that there are handicapped accessible stalls and there is also signage in family rooms.
- l. **David B** suggested that proposed Section 1110.4.6 solves the signage issue.
- m. **Mike O** alerted the group that he is a member of the Statewide Directional Signing Committee that regulates Virginia’s blue highway signs. This proposal would require bathroom signage on those signs which are limited to 12 numbers or letters per panel.
- n. **Alyssa B** warned that anyone could become disabled at any time and how would you feel if you could no longer go into public because of the cost of signage.
- o. **Monica T** mentioned that not every disability is the same. Monica T and her son can be totally secluded if she does not have somewhere to go to change her son who is totally dependent on her.
- p. **Delegate Elizabeth B-P** claimed that this issue is important for inclusivity, accessibility and dignity, and courage.

- q. **Mike O** expressed this proposal has not been heard by the workgroups and that there has been no outreach to outside industries.
 - r. **Shahriar A** responded to Mike O's comment that these discussions take place at the ICC level and the A117.1 committee has been working on this for a long time.
 - s. **Paul M** mentioned that this proposal has nothing to do with Mike O's comment regarding VDOT signage.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A, Michael D, Delegate Elizabeth B-P, Dan W,** and **Paul M** expressed support.
 - IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Mike O** expressed opposition.

B1110.20-24 – Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Delegate Elizabeth B-P** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Gregg F** commented that the proponent worked closely with the VBCOA Building Code Committee and the proposal helps maintain sanitary conditions, reduces the risk of spreading disease and pathogens.
 - b. **Dan W** added that he is on the VBCOA Building Code Committee and worked with the proponent. The committee provided a lot of comments to the proponent and it appears that most of the comments were addressed.
 - c. **Matthew R** remarked that adequate facilities have always been a challenge for parents
 - d. **Trieste L** echoed the other commentors, that supporting sanitary efforts in public is very practical.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Gregg F, Matthew R,** and **Trieste L** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

B1210.1.1-24 – Tanya Pettus (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Steve S** recommended that this proposal should be introduced at the national level first and questioned where the ten-pound requirement comes from.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S** and **Dan W** expressed opposition.

B2403.6-24 – William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Tom B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Sonal S** advised that as availability and awareness increases for these products, the cost will be driven down.
 - b. **Steve S** commented that these requirements are beyond the intent of the code to provide the minimum for health, safety, and welfare. The costs are also enormous. Also, it is not known if the reference standard being proposed has been reviewed to see if it meets the ICC requirements for reference standards.
 - c. **Dan W** agreed with **Steve S** that this proposal is outside of the scope of the VCC.
 - d. **Andrew C** alerted the group that the lead time to get some of these products is eight to ten months.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Steve S, Dan W, Andrew C, Rick H, and Paul M** expressed opposition.

B3104.1.1-24 – Mekonnen Gebresillasi (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** commented that AASHTO is a structural standard that does not have any safety criteria related to pedestrian bridges, and that this is the wrong section of the code to try to bring in AASHTO.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dan W** and **Doug B** expressed opposition.

B3105.2-24 – Mekonnen Gebresillasi (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W**, representing VBCOA, explained that canopies are different from awnings. Awnings are part of the building façade, hence the non-combustible frame requirement. Canopies are not required to be connected to a building at all, so there is no reason for canopies to be held to the same frame requirements of awnings.
- III. **Support**
 - a. None
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dan W** expressed opposition.

B3500(1)-24 – Rick Hinson (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Rick H** provided an overview of the proposal and requested a floor modification – update to E329-25a edition instead of E329-21.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** asked what the “A” stands for in E329-25A.
 - b. **Rick H** responded that it does not stand for “Appendix”. The new edition requires certification for special inspection agencies and that is who will be impacted. He did not anticipate an impact on a jurisdiction’s costs.
 - c. **David B** asked if Rick H was trying to get ahead of the competition with this proposal.
 - d. **Rick H** stated that some of the competition is already ahead.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A, Michael D,** and **Paul M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

VIRGINIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE (VEBC) PROPOSALS

EB102.2-24 – Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Paul M** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB102.2.2-24 – Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Andrew M** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB103.9-24 – Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A** and **Paul M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB202(1)-24 – Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Florin M** announced that **Steve S** spoke with the proponent and wanted to introduce a floor modification to replace the word “Either” with “Any”.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Paul M, Michael D,** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB307-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Paul M, Michael D,** and **Dan W** expressed support
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB401.1-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **David B** asked if this proposal was a companion to proposal EB102.2-24.
 - b. **Ron C** responded that it was.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A, Paul M, Michael D,** and **Dan W** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB403.1-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Paul M** and **Michael D** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB506.2-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Dennis H** and **Michael D** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB602.3.4-24 Allison Cook (Withdrawn)

EB702.2-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Florin M** asked for clarification if the intent was to address alterations or additions that convert existing buildings into building types within the scope of Chapter 4 of the VCC, as well as alterations that create building features within the scope of Chapter 4 of the VCC.
 - b. **Ron C** confirmed that that was the intent and provided examples of a high rise being a building type, and a legitimate stage being a feature, both within the scope of Chapter 4 of the VCC.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Shahriar A, Andrew M,** and **Michael D** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB706.2-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.

- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Andrew M** and **Paul M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB801.2-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Shahriar A** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Ron C** added that this proposal may or may not apply to high rise buildings.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Gregg F** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

EB801.3-24 Allison Cook (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **Dan W** asked for clarification that the proposal allows the addition of one story without requiring a fire service access elevator.
 - b. **Shahriar A** commented that this was correct.
 - c. **Andrew M** voiced concern over the second exception because if an owner is willing to spend the money to increase the number of stories to a building, then the new work should incorporate all the protections that would be necessary. Andrew M added the example of adding one story with an occupied roof where the roof area is not considered a story.
 - d. **Shahriar A** countered that adding a fire service access elevator to a high rise building that does not already have one is very expensive. Adding a fire service access elevator does not just involve altering an elevator shaft, but also potentially shear walls. Currently, the code does not require adding a fire service access elevator if the number of stories increase in an existing high-rise building. This proposal adds that requirement if more than one story is added.
 - e. **Matthew R** brought up that the example being given is changing the building from office use to a residential use which is a change of occupancy.
 - f. **Ron C** reminded the group that this proposal does not exempt any vertical additions from the requirements in Chapter 7 of the VEBC.
 - g. **Doug B** cited Section 601.1 and indicated that a non-conformity cannot be created.
 - h. **Shahriar A** answered that if the existing building is conforming to the building code under which it was built and the new addition applies to the current code, then you are not

extending a non-conformity.

III. **Support**

- a. **Gregg F** and **Shahriar A** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Andrew M, Matthew R,** and **Doug B** expressed opposition.

EB805.2.1.1-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Opposition**

- a. None

EB901.1-24 Allison Cook (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Ron C** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. None

III. **Support**

- a. **Paul M** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

VIRGINIA RESIDENTIAL CODE (VRC) PROPOSALS

RB311-24 – Kyle Kratzer (Consensus for Approval as Modified)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Dan W** asked why “habitable” was chosen instead of “occupiable”.
- b. **Kyle K** replied that occupiable space does not pose the same fire hazards as a habitable space because the amount of time, presumably, spent in the space is greater for habitable spaces. The word “habitable” is defined in the International Residential Code (IRC). The word “occupiable” is not.
- c. **Kyle K** offered a floor modification to remove the Virginia amendment and add “and detached accessory structures with habitable space” in the 2024 IRC section.
- d. **Dan W** reasoned that “habitable” should be removed and replaced with “occupiable” because a detached accessory structure could be a workshop that you don’t live in.
- e. **Andrew M** agreed with **Dan W’s** reasoning.

- f. **Kyle K** clarified that the intent was not to capture a situation like a detached garage with a large storage room above it. It was to capture an office with a bathroom as an example. What we are trying to avoid here is egress through the garage from a habitable space.
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Paul M** and **David B** expressed support.
 - IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

RB314.3-24 – Kyle Kratzer (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. None
- III. **Support**
 - a. **Andrew M** expressed support.
- IV. **Opposition**
 - a. None

RB318.7.6-24 – Andrew Clark (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew C** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Discussion**
 - a. **David B** asked if the proposal is trying to remove a landing with two steps or less, even if the door swings out over it.
 - b. **Dan W** asked if exceptions three and four are new because they are not underlined.
 - c. **Andrew C** verified that the strikeouts are what is coming through the next code cycle.
 - d. **Kyle K** asked how Virginia amendments that are already approved in the 2021 VRC will get affected by this change.
 - e. **Florin M** explained that exceptions one, three, and four will come into the 2024 VRC unmodified because they are new and not modified by Virginia. If Andrew C’s proposal gets approved, exception two would be overridden by the existing amendment. So, we would carry forward the existing amendment to comport with the size of the riser.
 - f. **David B** expressed opposition because the proposal takes out the exterior landing for all exterior doors.
 - g. **Kyle K** points out that the main egress door must have a landing, but all the other doors can have two risers directly out of the door. That’s already been in the code since 2012.
 - h. **Joshua J** proclaimed that Section R311.3.2 in the 2012 Virginia Residential Code

says that a landing is not required where a stairway of two or fewer risers is located on the exterior side of the door.

- i. **David B** withdrew his opposition and reiterated that he just wants landings at a minimum to be at the required egress.

III. **Opposition**

- a. None

RB324.7-24 – William Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Sonal S** provided an overview of the proposal which is the residential companion to proposal B2403.6-24.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Steve S** proclaimed that he had the same opposition as proposal B2403.6-24.

III. **Support**

- a. None

IV. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S** expressed opposition.

RB339-24 – Scott McStacy (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Scott M** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Discussion**

- a. **Doug B** asked if the intent is to get the material into the code or is the intent for there to be an informative appendix much in the same way as straw bale construction.
- b. **Scott M** responded that the intent was to get it anywhere in the code as there are a half dozen houses about to use this material and the code lacks guidance for the inspectors.
- c. **David B** asked if this was a non-structural wall infill.
- d. **Scott M** verified that the material is not meant to carry weight and be structural like concrete. The product does get hard but can be applied many ways such as cast like plaster, placed like blocks in between studs, or it can be sprayed into a wall cavity with a backing board.
- e. **Mark G** asked what kind of weight it has.
- f. **Scott M** expounded that the material is about 25% of the weight of concrete. A block two feet long, one foot in height, and one foot in width, weighs approximately eight to nine pounds.
- g. **Kyle K** asked what challenges has the industry faced.
- h. **Scott M** answered that the only way to get it approved in Virginia is through the alternative methods or materials section in the code.
- i. **Mark G** asked if the material is compatible with metal conduit within a cavity.
- j. **Scott M** replied that it is and the life span is 200 years.
- k. **Gregg F** asked if this appendix is already in the 2024 IRC and if the material is

proprietary.

- l. **Scott M** responded that the provisions are in Appendix BL in the 2024 IRC and that it is not proprietary.
- m. **Andrew C** asked how many homes have used this material nationally or internationally.
- n. **Scott M** surmised that there are hundreds and are mainly in Minnesota and California.
- o. **Joshua J** asked how the code sections line up if Appendix BL is adopted into the 2024 VRC.
- p. **Dan W** asked if the proposal would get the appendix into the VRC as an appendix or would the contents of the appendix get into the code as regular code language in the VRC.
- q. **Florin M** clarified that the provisions would still be housed under the appendix in the 2024 VRC, but they would become part of the code, and it would work exactly like the current tiny house provisions.

III. **Support**

- a. **Dan B, Gregg F, David B, Paul M, and Mark G** expressed support.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. None

RB408.4-24 – Dean Bragg (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Florin M** provided that the proposal does not show any changes to the code and DHCD staff were not able to reach the proponent for clarification.
- II. **Opposition**
 - a. **Dennis H** representing himself, and **Kyle K** expressed opposition.