

**Workgroup 2 Meeting
Virginia Housing Center
April 6, 2016**

Cindy Davis - Welcome and introductions of staff and everyone went around the room introducing themselves.

Cindy performed an overview of cdpVA.

CB-202 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ron Clements

clementsro@chesterfield.gov

Ambulatory Health Care Facility

Reason: Buildings or portions thereof used to provide medical care on less than a 24-hour basis that are not licensed by the VA Department of health as outpatient surgical hospitals. *Ambulatory Health Care Facility, Buildings or portions thereof that are licensed by the Virginia Department of Health as outpatient surgical hospitals.*

Comments:

Glenn Dean – At what point does a licensure come in? at what number?

Ron Clements – good questions, don't know. I was just trying to clean up the pieces on an oversight from last code change. Just Clarification.

Mr. Rhodes – Any discussions with the dental association. Only clarification.

Emory Rodgers – Ron's change is consistent with the boards action that they did not want doctors and dentist offices included in this category. They want it to remain as a B Occupancy and this is all that is happening here. If someone wants to go back, they would have to submit a code change to include doctors and dentists offices.

Dr. Bill Dodson - would like more information and clarification.

Vernon Hodge – just an editorial change.

No opposition

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

William.king@alexandriava.gov

Reason: Day support and day treatment facilities licensed by VA Department of Behavioral health & Development Services shall be classified as Group B occupancy when the following conditions are satisfied. 1. Participants who may require physical assistance from staff to respond to an emergency situation shall be located on the level of exit discharge. Any change in elevation within the exit access on the level of exit discharge shall be made by means of a ramp or sloped walkway.

Comments:

Bill King – DBHDS workgroup got together facilities to help those with disabilities. Specific that need assistance need to be on the level of exit discharge. Get rid of steps. Small facilities licensed by state. during the day, not overnight.

Glenn Dean – format or appropriateness technical within a group description.

Johnna Grizzard – I think this mirrors how R-3 and R-4 are set-up right now. It has similar language. AIA is working on a tweak.

Bill King – language clarification, same concept.

Mary Hefferd Kegley – anything to do with better med or urgent express?

Bill King - No, just to help those learn daily life skills

Emory Rodgers – These are for those present 290 businesses that are usually in strip malls, the people usually live in group homes and go to these businesses to learn daily life skills.

Bill King- This will be coming back.

Vernon – Are these providing custodial care? Should not be in B if providing custodial care. They should be on first floor buildings.

Johnna – Concerned about I-4 they should not be in a two story.

Emory Rodgers – These need to be accessible to get CMS payment and reimbursements. Start with relationship with operators and state agencies to make them clearer to the building officials. This will apply to all new facilities.

Michael Redifer – Adhoc committee with agency realize a degree with custodial care, more incidental. It was more incidental, we just wanted clarification.

Walter Lucas – Would this pertain to Goodwill? We classified a Goodwill store in Danville as an M.

Bill King – I don't think so. Basically a Group B facility. We will tweak and we will carry forward.

Linda Hale – This seems like this regards custodial care. It is a B use as long as the occupants don't require custodial care.

Mr. Snidow – Custodial care a different license?

Vernon Hodge - No If you go out and look at the facility.

Status: Pending

CB-307.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Dr. William Dodson representing the craft distillery industry and Ron Clements representing Chesterfield County.
Wyzj001@gmail.com and ClementsRo@chesterfield.gov

Reason:

2015 IBC (F) 307.1 High-hazard Group H

Comments: Dr. William Dodson – lets have uniformity. The storage of distilled spirits and wines in wooden barrels and casks. Distillation, blending, bottling, and other hazardous materials storage or processing, shall be in separate control areas complying with Section 414.2. Craft distillery operations in the State of Virginia are still hindered even after passage of the recent VA Bill allowing distilleries on farms. The “allowance” on farmland does not also grant distilleries “ag by right” status and therefore the distilleries are still held to “high Hazard” building and fire codes.

Michael Redifer – from 5 gallons to limiting outcry from winery folks in CA. Need limits of 55 maximum. Anyone have problems with unlimited?

Robby Dawson – I do.

Dr. Dodson – bottles are exempt, no limit on bottles.

Robby Dawson – I say set this aside now.

Emory Rodgers – This was tabled and the board would take a look at it. This breaks the wine and distilled spirits into separate issues. Legislation coming out in the 2018 codes.

Dr. Dodson – A big push to get this business in the State of VA and whichever process expedites this would be beneficial to our business tax base since we are extremely behind the rest of the US.

Robby Dawson –if a building code modification, this could happen faster.

Jeff Morrow – Most of this language is already in the fire code, I have already given the blessing to do a modification on a building in Fauquier County.

Cindy Davis - If ICC makes it less restrictive, we will go back and look at this?

Michael Redifer – Why is this in the fire code? That is why I have examined this and decided not to issue a modification.

Rick Witt –Committee votes and recommendations in July. It won't be voted on until October.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 4

Emory – I agree with Rick, this is just in the interim. As the Building Official such as in Sperryville they should be looking at building codes and fire codes.

Sean Farrell – If we move forward for a consensus approach at the workgroup meetings, it will allow applicants to point to this may be changed in this code cycle. You can certainly consider a code modification in the interim.

Dr. Dodson – There already is a quantity limit depending on the size of the building, anything over 12,000 sq. ft. so anything over that already requires a sprinkler system because there is a limitation in the code. All this is, to facilitate the craft distillers who are having problems getting started

Anyone opposed? – none opposed
This will move forward as consensus for support

CB-901.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

901.3 Modification – Persons shall not remove or modify any fire protection system installed or maintained under the provisions of this code or the IFC without approval by the building official. The building official shall notify the local fire official when approving installing, disabling, or removing a fire protection system.

Reason: Local fire officials need to learn when a building official approves installing, disabling or removing fire alarms, sprinkler system and other fire protection systems including for renovation or demolition. The building official is the best source for properly authorizing substantial changes to fire protection systems, thus to notify local fire official.

Comments: Workgroup 1 - Agreement that this will be tweaked and work on again.

Sean Farrell – William will work with VBCOA Rehab Committee with language.

Anyone work with Mr., Andrews on the VBCOA language?

Johnna Grizzard will work with Mr. Andrews.

CB-905.2(1) cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrew

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

F 905.2 Installation standard. Standpipe systems shall be installed in accordance with this section and NFPA 14. Pressure reducing valve settings shall be as approved by the local fire official.

Reason: NFPA 14 requires pressure reducing valves where discharge pressure over 175 psi (typically on lower levels in high rise building). Fire hose is harder to handle with high pressure, and standpipe discharges using pressure reducing valves often in narrow and turning spaces of stairwells. Fire official should have say in standpipe discharge pressure which firefighters use.

Comments: No support from workgroup. Moving forward as consensus to disapprove.

CB-905.2 (2) cdpVA-15 Proponent Timothy Anderson
tma@chesasprink.com

F 905.2 Installation standard

Timothy Anderson - Standpipe systems shall be installed in accordance with this section and NFPA 14.

Reason: In 1996 the VCC adopted the amendment to allow the automatic supply of standpipe systems to be omitted from buildings under 150' which are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system. This proposed amendment would allow the automatic supply for standpipe systems to be omitted in any building below 150' and equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system. The 150' limitation is the height where any local pumper truck should be capable of supplying the standpipe demand.

Comments:

Robby Dawson – This is a stretch that a standpipe should be able to reach 150'. We don't need this greater capacity.

Vernon – I have had discussions with Tim regarding this language and it will not work for this.

Consensus for disapproval.

F-403.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrew
William.andrews@rihmondgov.com

Reason:

403.5 Group E occupancies. Code considers children under the age of 2 ½ years old to need assistance to escape. Some schools are having children under the age of 2 ½ years old, who are children of the school's students or staff, in that school with their parent.

The fire official needs authority to regulate so these very young children who need assistance to escape are located where fast escape is easily arranged.

Comments:

This is already addressed under change of occupancy.
Discussed in Workgroup 1, consensus for disapproval, no support.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 6

William Andrews – this will allow the fire official to authorize where the children under 2 ½ years old can be located in the school.

Mr. Rhodes – Parents are not in with their children, children are somewhere in the building like church.

William Andrews – nothing in building code that says where infants can be located.

Sean Farrell – spaces have to be on exterior wall on lowest floor.

Harold Stills – It is in building code, the fire officials are likely to catch it.

Emory Rodgers - 102.6 or 106.5 ship it over to building officials.

No support, move forward as consensus for disapproval.

F-505.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

505.3 Address usage, only an officially approved address shall be used to identify that site. Exception: Mailing address may be to a post office box, and to another approved address.

Reason: Using different addresses confuses records and in an emergency can have serious consequences.

Comments:

William Andrews – everyone should have an officially approved number on each home for emergency purposes.

Robby Dawson – Maintenance Code says street number is on house. Place property maintenance language replicated in building code.

Vernon Hodge -Construction code requires it.

Consensus for disapproval

F-703.4 cdpVa-15 Proponent Justin Biller

jbiller@carilionclinic.org

2012 SFPC 703.4 Testing

Reason: Fire doors shall be inspected and functionally tested in accordance with NFPA 80 annually to confirm proper operation and full closure. In particular, Health Care Facilities in Virginia are facing enforcement of this requirement as part of ongoing

licensure/funding through State enforcement of NFPA 101, Life Safety Code, so it is also important that these requirements are consistent with local fire prevention code enforcement as well throughout the Commonwealth.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 7

Comments:

Robby Dawson to reach out to the proponent. This proposal will be continued.

F-901.6.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

901.6.1 Standards. Fire protection systems shall be inspected, tested and maintained in accordance with the referenced standards listed in Table 901.6.1. Standpipe pressure reducing valves with adjustable setting shall be at pressure approved by fire official, as part of five year flow test.

Reason: NFPA 14 requires pressure reducing valves where discharge pressure over 175 psi (typically on lower levels in high rise building). Fire hose is harder to handle with high pressure, and standpipe discharges using pressure reducing valves often in narrow and turning spaces of stairwells.

Comments:

Discussed in Workgroup 1

No support – consensus for disapproval

F-1030 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

Section 1030 Emergency Escape and Rescue

Reason: The Virginia fire code cannot require more than the building code, thus wordage which requires physical features in addition to such is void within Virginia's Fire Prevention Code. Beyond use group R-2 and R-3, fire officials need authority to require good maintenance of windows originally installed able to open, and designate existing windows as emergency escape, or access fresh air where escape is unsafe.

Comments: Addressed at Workgroup 1 William Andrews - No technical changes, what is an escape window?

No Support, move forward consensus for disapproval

Move Virginia Maintenance Code to end of session today.

R-102.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ron Clements

clementsro@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Rehabilitation Code 102.2 Scope.

Reason: Change of occupancy from R-5 to a commercial use is not specifically addressed in the VRC. Conversion of group R-5 single family dwellings to various commercial uses is a common change of occupancy.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 8

Comments:

Group R-5 structure 102 change

Ron Clements - VBCOA will be filing a change and I will be amending my 102 change.

Adding R-5 to the tables.

This was addressed in Workgroup 1.

Michael Redifer – R-3 relates R-5 with this.

Johnna – mixed use R-5 under the performance method.

No opposition. Consensus for approval.

R-301.1.2 cdpVa-15 Proponent Kenney Payne representing AIA-Virginia
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2015 International Existing Building Code

301.1.2 Proportional compliance method. No change to text.

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

Comments: This is an editorial.

Johnna Grizzard - No discussion with Rehab committee. I believe it is just to separate compliance method . Just to clarify.

Emory Rodgers – Kenney works a lot with BCOM.

Greg Revels– Is this on the national level?

Ron Clements – Kenney will submit at national level in 2021.

Johnna Grizzard- we will look at it.

Rick Witt - hold over to July and let rehab code review get with Kenney to see whether they will support it. There is an issue with the term “work area”.

Carry over

R-903.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Kenney Payne, representing AIA-Virginia and

R-1012.7.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Kenney Payne, representing AIA-Virginia wants to withdraw these two as per his email.

kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 9

M-101.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent VMC Rewrite Committee
2012 Virginia Maintenance Code

Reason: As requested by the Board of Housing and Community Development, DHCD staff undertook a review of the VMC to remove unenforceable construction provisions printed with the code. DHCD established a committee of stakeholders involved in and affected by the VMC to collaborate on and review the draft rewrites. This VMC rewrite represents consensus among those involved.

Comments:

Section 101 General

Section 101.2 Incorporation by reference.

Comment x1 and x2 Updating the edition number to 2015

Section 101.4 Arrangement of code provisions.

Comment X3 All references to Chapter 1 in the IPMC are deleted or changed so that there are no correlation issues; therefore, this administrative provision is no longer needed.

Comment x4 There is no need to differentiate between administrative provisions and technical provisions or to resolve conflicts as the text of the IPMC has been reviewed and modified to be within the scope of the VMC.

Comment x5 101.8 Definitions renumbering to 101.7

Comment x6 101.7 Definitions This note is no longer necessary due to the correlation of the provisions of the IPMC and the administrative provisions of the VMC.

Section 103 Application of Code

Comment x7 103.2.1 Maintenance of nonrequired components and systems. Changes recommended by VBCOA to clarify the application of the code to required and nonrequired components.

Section 104 Enforcement, Generally

Comment x8 These changes reflect changes in the law that is the basis for this section.

Comment x9 104.3.1 Certification of state enforcement personnel.

Changes to correlate with the moving of the code change training and continuing education requirements to the Virginia Certification Standards.

Comment x10 104.4.4 Requirements for periodic maintenance training and education.

Comment x11 104.4.5 to 104.4.4 Conflict of Interest
Renumbering

Comment x12 104.4.6 to 104.4.5 Records

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 10

Renumbering

Comment x13 Correction of an error in the 2012 edition. From 34990 to 3940

Section 201 General

Comment x14 201.3 Terms defined in other codes. Existing state amendment

Comment x15 201.5 Parts. This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x16 Code 202 General Definitions, Repairs, These terms are not used in the VMC and are therefore deleted.

Comment x17 Equipment Support, This term is not used in the VMC and is therefore deleted.

Comment x18 Imminent Danger, This term is not used in the VMC and is therefore deleted.

Comment x19 Labeled, These terms are not used in the VMC, therefore they are deleted.

Comment x20 Neglect, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x21 Openable Area, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x22 Pest Elimination, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x23 Strict Liability Offense, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x24 Structure Unfit for Human Occupancy, Existing state amendment.

Comment x25 Ultimate Deformation, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Comment x26 Unsafe Equipment, Existing state amendment.

Comment x27 Unsafe Structure, Existing state amendment.

Comment x28 Workmanlike, This term is not used in the VMC, therefore it is deleted.

Chapter 3 General Requirements

Section 301 General

Comment x29 301.2 Responsibility, The scope section is modified to delete the reference to the responsibility of persons as that is addressed in Chapter 1 and in state law. A statement is added to limit the application of “exterior property” provisions to only those applicable as “premises” in general are not regulated unless affecting a building or structure. The “responsibility” section is deleted for the same reason.

Comment x30 301.3 Vacant structures and land, This section is modified to delete the references to vacant land and to delete the language concerning blight as that is not within the scope of the VMC.

Section 302 Exterior Property Areas

Comment x31 302.2 Grading and drainage, Existing state amendments.

Comment x32 302.3 Sidewalks and driveways, These changes are necessary to reflect the scoping of the VMC to apply only to those aspects of exterior property regulated by the VCC.

Comment x33 302.4 Weeds, Existing state amendment.

Comment x34 302.5 Rodent harborage, Existing state amendment.

Comment x35 302.6 Exhaust vents, This is not a maintenance requirement, so it is deleted.

Comment x36 302.9 Defacement of property, Existing state amendments.

Section 303 Swimming Pools, Spas and Hot Tubs

Comment x37 303.2 Enclosures, Exception, Minimum standards are replaced with general language requiring maintenance of barriers in accordance with the code in effect at the time of construction. Since there is authorization in state law for a locality to have an ordinance requiring barriers for pools, a reference to local ordinances is added.

Section 304 Exterior Structure

Comment x38 304.1 General, The term “public” is deleted since the statutory scope of the code is to protect the citizens of the Commonwealth, in addition to the public.

Comment x39 Exceptions, Existing state amendment

Comment x40 304.3 Premises identification, Premises marking is required by the VCC, so the section is modified to only require maintenance of the identification method, or in accordance with local ordinance.

Comment x41 304.7 Roofs and drainage, Existing state amendment.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 12

Comment x42 304.14 Insect Screens, Existing state amendment.

Comment x43 304.18 Building security, While this section was deleted in the 2012 and previous editions of the VMC, there is a need for requiring the maintenance of security devices that were required by the code under which a building was constructed, or which have been provided, so general maintenance language has been added.

Walter Lucas 304.18 Does this include security systems?

Answer: Maintenance means to keep in good repair.

Comment x44 304.18 Basement hatchways, Existing state amendment.

Comment x45 304.19 Gates, Language recommended by VBCOA to be able to use the IPMC text for gates.

Section 305 Interior Structure

Comment x46 305.1 General, Occupant responsibility for violations is determined by Chapter 1 so this language is deleted.

Teresa Garber – If a handrail was placed there, not required, but the property owner put them in.

Sean Farrell – if not required and I put it up and if it is a hazard, repair or remove it.

Comment x47 305.1.1 Exceptions, Existing state amendment.

Section 306 Component Serviceability

Comment x48 306 Exceptions, Existing state amendment.

Section 307 Handrails and Guardrails

Comment x49 Removing construction requirements and adding a general statement requiring maintenance.

Section 308 Rubbish and Garbage

Comment x50 Existing state amendment.

Section 309 Pest Infestation and Extermination

Comment X51 Existing state amendment.

Infestation search - only if bug is affecting the building.

There has been an inquiry from a jurisdiction in northern Virginia.

Emory Rodgers - Maybe an issue that will keep coming back. Rodent infestation same as overgrown weeds, junk cars.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 13

Comment x52 These sections in the IPMC address who is responsible for code violations. Since that subject matter is covered in Chapter 1 and in state law, the sections are deleted.

Section 311 Aboveground Liquid Fertilizer Storage Tanks

Comment x53 Existing state amendment.

Chapter 4 Light, Ventilation and Occupancy Limitations

Section 401 General

Comment x54 The scope statement is changed to bring it in line with Chapter 1 and the statutory authority for the VMC.

Comment x55 Who is responsible for code violations is addressed in Chapter 1 and in state law, so Section 401.2 is deleted. Section 401.3 is deleted as it assumes that the IPMC construction requirements are enforceable.

Section 402 Light

Comment x56 All construction requirements in this section are deleted and replaced by a general statement requiring the maintenance of existing facilities.

Section 403 Ventilation

Comment x57 Construction requirements in the IPMC are deleted and maintenance and operational requirements left intact.

Section 404 Occupancy Limitations

Comment x58 Since there have been prior state amendments to this section addressing criteria for occupancy, a general statement is added to the beginning of the section authorizing the use of the section to the extent that it does not require alterations to be made, since that would be a construction requirement and not within the scope of the VMC.

Rick Witt – We need to revisit

Sean Farrell they apply but not alter, go with this until challenged.

Walter Lucas – you cannot use if it alters the building.

Ed Rhodes – how will this play into residential in air B&B?

Emory Rodgers – 404.05 essentially governs ceiling heights . two persons per bedroom Fixed or not, if you follow the statement.

Vernon Hodge - We need to make a code change because of this state law

Shaun Pharr – You are putting me in violation as the owner of apartment.
Property owner can place a limit on occupants.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 14

Ron Clements- Chip Dicks drafted two occupants to each room.
Needs to have a correlation issue between the construction code, maintenance code,
and laws.

Chapter 5 Plumbing Requirements

Section 501 General

Comment x59 The scope statement is changed to bring it in line with Chapter 1 and the statutory authority for the VMC.

Comment x60 Who is responsible for code violations is addressed in Chapter 1 and in state law, so this section is deleted.

Section 502 Required Facilities

Comment x61 This section is construction-related and therefore deleted.

Section 503 Toilet Rooms

Comment x62 This section contains all construction-related requirements, so it is deleted.

Comment x63 Maintenance requirements deleted in other sections are provided in this general section.

Comment x64 These sections were moved from Section 502 since the remainder of Section 502 was deleted.

Comment x65 The language is changed to only require maintenance of clearances provided.

Comment x66 Language addressing minimum criteria is deleted since it could require a building to be upgraded and language addressing lack of maintenance is left in.

Section 505 Water System

Comment x 67 Section 505.1 is reworded to delete construction-related requirements and add all maintenance requirements from the remainder of Section 505, Section 505.3 and 505.4 are existing state amendments.

Comment x68 Construction-related provisions deleted and maintenance provisions kept.

Section 506 Sanitary Drainage System

Comment x69 Removed the reference to connections as that is controlled by the VA Dept. of Health

Comment x70 The language in the IPMC is clarified to include all building drainage and sewer systems.

Workgroup 2

April 6, 2016

Page 15

Section 507 Storm Drainage

Comment x71 Existing state amendment.

Chapter 6 Mechanical and Electrical Requirements

Section 601 General

Comment x72 The scope section is changed to bring it in line with Chapter 1 and the statutory authority for the VMC and the responsibility section is deleted as in prior chapters.

Section 602 Heating and Cooling Facilities

Comment x73 All changes to this section are existing state amendments.

Section 603 Mechanical Equipment

Comment x74 Construction-related requirements are deleted and maintenance-related requirements left in.

Section 604 Electrical Facilities

Comment x75 Construction-related requirements are deleted and maintenance-related requirements left in Section 604.3.1.1 contains existing state amendments.

Sean Farrell – 604.3.2 Abatement of electrical hazards associated with fire exposure
Will check the water exposure under the fire code.

Section 605 Electrical Equipment

Comment x76 Construction-related requirements are deleted and maintenance-related requirements left in.

Section 606 Elevators, Escalators and Dumbwaiters

Comment x77 Existing state amendments.

Chapter 7 Fire Safety Requirements

Comment x78 The text in this chapter is revised to keep maintenance-related requirements and to delete construction-related or administrative requirements.

Section 704 Fire Protection Systems

(F) 704.1 General

Comment x79 The IFC may have requirements for upgrading fire safety systems, which would be in conflict with Chapter 1, so the reference is deleted.

(F) 704.1.1 Automatic sprinkler systems.

Comment x80 Language is added to clarify the use of the referenced standard.

Sean Farrell - How do we put things back in since in cdpVa it is already gone?
Recommendation to submit a code change based on the 2015 language and replacing it with new language.

No opposition. Move forward as consensus.

Adjourned at 1:30