



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

1500 Jefferson Street SE • P.O. Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 407-9280 • fax (360) 586-9088 • e-mail sbcc@des.wa.gov • www.sbcc.wa.gov

BUILDING, FIRE & PLUMBING SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Shoreline City Hall, Council Chambers
Shoreline, Washington

MEETING DATE: June 13, 2013

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting was called to order by Dave Peden at 1:00 p.m. <u>Members in Attendance:</u> Dave Peden, Committee Chair; Dave Kokot; Rod Bault; Ray Allshouse; Steve Simpson <u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Joanne McCaughan; Peggy Bryden <u>Visitors Present:</u> Chris Herman, Jan Rohila, Jack Olsen, Jeremy Smithson, Annie O'Rourke, Jeff Randall
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved with the following modifications. Under Other Business Tim Nogler added an items dealing with the Plumbing Code and dealing with separation for townhouse construction
3. TAG Reports – IRC Report	<p>Tim Nogler gave a summary of the TAG reports received which were IRC, CO Alarms, Solar PV and Plumbing. These included proposals received this year. The TAGs are now making their recommendations to the Committee and the Council will act on these at their meeting June 14, 2013. Public hearings on these proposals will occur in September and October and a Council meeting is scheduled for November for the final decision.</p> <p>The IRC had one proposal received for amendment it was 13-003 which dealt with R302.3.1. The recommendation from the TAG is to approve for rulemaking as modified by the TAG. Under the IBC you are exempted from protecting supporting construction of horizontal assemblies under certain conditions and the IRC requires the protection of that supporting construction. The proposal states in order to make this consistent with the IBC to provide an exception where automatic sprinklers are installed in accordance with appendix R in both dwelling units; or all required smoke alarms in both units</p>

<p>CO TAG Report</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p>	<p>are interconnected in such a manner that the actuation of one alarm will activate all alarms in both units. The staff note indicates the amendment is needed to address a critical life/safety need and to permit the use of modern technical methods, devices and improvements.</p> <p>Annie O'Rourke, the proponent, who is on the phone, reported she was available to answer any questions.</p> <p>Ray Allshouse moved the Committee recommend to the Council to enter into rulemaking. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Dave Kokot reported the CO TAG received two proposals. One related to the DOC facilities, 13-001; the other relates to CO Alarms in Condos, 13-002. The TAG recommends the DOC proposal be forwarded. The TAG did not recommend the Condo proposal be forwarded. The DOC proposal was to allow for exception of prisons and work releases to ensure those facilities are properly monitored.</p> <p>Jack Olsen, the proponent, was available to answer questions. Tim Nogler asked for clarification on R-2 occupancies. Are they residences? Mr. Olsen said they are, due to their highly restrictive rules of things being brought in to the facilities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p> <p>Dave Kokot made a motion the Committee recommend the Council adopt the proposed change on 13-001 for rulemaking. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Dave Kokot continued with 13-002 stated this proposal asked for exception of CO alarms in condos. The facility this exception referred to has an attached garage which is contrary to what the original CO requirements were. The TAG therefore recommended this proposal not be accepted.</p>
<p>PV TAG Report</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p>	<p>Dave Kokot moved that 13-002 not be accepted and not be forwarded on for rulemaking. Ray Allshouse seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The proponent on this was corrected to Nita Rhinehart.</p> <p>Dave Kokot reported the TAG had public testimony from the industry as well as the fire service. The TAG was very meticulous in reviewing this. They took the language from model code and received consensus on all of the language with the exception of one. The</p>

recommendation of the TAG is to forward this to the Council. A minority report received from Hank Teran with Fire Marshals, and two people abstained from voting.

Jeff Randall, the proponent indicated he was available to answer any questions.

Joanne McCaughan read the minority report in to the record. **Mr. Teran** is not in support of the amendment as he feels that exception 5 is arbitrary.

Chris Herman with Senergy Systems of the PV industry states his industry is not married to the 10,000 s.f. number. It can be negotiated, but there needs to be an exception where the majority of the systems installed could be done without having to be reviewed by a fire official. That would be an onerous requirement. He has asked several times if a firefighter has been encumbered by having solar panels on a roof when fighting a fire and he never received a clear answer. It seems they are borrowing problems.

Jeff Randall thinks this is worth discussing at the public hearings. This is an issue for the solar folks. After six meetings we never had a discussion or a vote on this topic. Solar only needs a small section of a roof. Typically the south roof is the only section suitable for solar. The rest of the building's roof is unencumbered by solar and the question is can't we use this south roof. We could never get a response on this. There was reluctance from the fire folks on this. Encourage the language stay as it is and have more discussion at the public hearing.

Jeremy Smithson with Puget Sound Solar concurs with what **Jeff Randall** said and agrees with his written comments that were sent in. The area used by solar panels is typically not that big and leaves plenty of roof access and ventilation. There should be an exception.

Dave Kokot moved the PV TAG recommendation be taken forward to Council for rulemaking. **Steve Simpson** seconded the motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Steve Simpson reported the Plumbing TAG did not have a quorum at their meeting however; there was good attendance from the DOH. The TAG reviewed 15 code changes for 2012. Two of those were withdrawn by the proponent. The TAG recommends that five of the

DRAFT

Motion

Plumbing Code TAG Report

<p>Motion</p>	<p>remaining proposals be disapproved and three approved as submitted. Five proposals to be approved with modifications suggested by the TAG. 13-04 was withdrawn by the proponent. 13-05, Backflow Preventer, has a recommendation of disapproval.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to deny the language of 13-05. Dave Kokot seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-06, Certified Backflow Assembly Tester, is recommended to be approved as modified.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to accept the language as modified of 13-06 and forward this to the Council. Ray Allshouse seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-07, Water/Wastewater Utility, is recommended to be approved as modified.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to accept the language as modified of 13-07 and forward it to the Council. Ray Allshouse seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-08, 603.4.3, Access and Clearance, is recommended to disapprove.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to disapprove 13-08. Ray Allshouse seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-09, Prohibited Locations, TAG recommended to disapprove.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to disapprove 13-09. Rod Bault seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-10, Protection from Lawn Sprinklers and Irrigation Systems, was recommended for approval as submitted.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to approve 13-10 and forward to Council. Ray Allshouse seconded motion. The motion carried.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>13-11, Protection from Fire Systems, was recommended for approval as submitted.</p> <p>Ray Allshouse made a motion to forward 13-11 to the Council for rulemaking. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>13-12, Lead Content, refers to upcoming Federal Law stating all plumbing fixtures and fittings contain no more</p>

	<p>than 0.25% lead. Based on information received by an IAPMO representative on a TIA, the TAG is recommending denying the amendment and go with the errata when it is adopted.</p> <p>Motion Ray Allhouse made a motion to move 13-12 forward to Council as modified. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>Motion 13-13 and 13-17 refer to two different sections, but they have similar language; Connection to Potable or Reclaimed (recycled) Water Systems. Steve Simpson moved the approval of 13-13 as modified and denial of 13-17. Ray Allhouse seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>Motion 13-14, 13-15 and 13-18, Discovery of Cross Connection. Language was added to this by the TAG and it is recommended to be approved as modified. Steve Simpson made a motion to forward 13-14, 13-15 and 13-18 to the Council as modified. Dave Kokot seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>4. Interpretations – IBC 1509.7, Snohomish County</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>IBC 308.2 & 310.1/IFC 202, Washington State DOH</p>	<p>Tim Nogler reported on the interpretation. The question from Snohomish County Fire District 1 states: is the intent only that the classification of roof will not be reduced and does not harm if the panel classification is greater than that of the roof itself? The recommended answer is yes. Rooftop mounted PV systems shall have the same or greater fire classification as the roof assembly required by Section 1505. There was some discussion among the Committee on this answer. Ray commented the code is a minimum. As written the code allows the roof to exceed the minimum. He suggested a change to the interpretation to read “this section should be interpreted” to replace “could be amended”.</p> <p>Dave Kokot made a motion to accept the interpretation as modified. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>Tim Nogler presented this interpretation which asks three questions. The answer to question 1 is yes. The state amendment to IBC 310-4 Residential Group R-2 lists assisted living facilities as licensed by Washington state. The proposed answer to question 2 is, the local building</p>

<p>IRC/IBC, Mixed Use, Thurston County</p>	<p>official designates occupancy classification based on the use and number of occupants, among other factors. The answer to question 3 is yes. See answer #1. The threshold for requiring Group I-2 nursing home care for a resident is determined by the licensing and inspection agencies and the caregivers. This response has been confirmed with DOH that a review of residents to determine if acute care is needed. If this is the case, the resident would be moved.</p> <p>Motion Ray Allshouse moved to approve this interpretation as written. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. There was some discussion among the Committee members. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>IRC101.2, Lodging Houses, Clallam County</p>	<p>Tim Nogler stated this interpretation is from Thurston County. The question refers to dwellings with mixed occupancies and which code applies. The proposed answer is the IRC applied to detached one and two family dwellings and townhouses. A dwelling unit within a mixed occupancy building is not detached and must comply with the IBC.</p> <p>Motion Dave Kokot moved the Committee accept the interpretation as it is written. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>IBC 903.2.3, Group E Automatic Sprinkler Systems</p>	<p>Tim Nogler reported this question comes from Clallam County asking does SBCC require fire sprinklers in live/work units and/or owner-occupied lodging houses. The answer is no. The intent is to permit the use of the IRC for these occupancies.</p> <p>Motion Ray Allshouse agrees this was the intent of the SBCC. He moved the interpretation be approved as written. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Tim Nogler recommends the Committee forward this to the Council for rulemaking. Ray Allshouse makes the motion this interpretation be forwarded to Council for rulemaking. Dave Kokot seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>IBC 903.2.3, Group E Automatic Sprinkler Systems</p>	<p>Dave Kokot reported this interpretation came to the Council at the last meeting. The question is does SBCC Interpretation 11-05 apply to an existing church with a new day care center (with occupant load of 15) being added? The answer is it is left up to local jurisdiction's</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p>	<p>interpretation of the code. Dave Kokot (fire industry) feels the answer to the question should be yes, sprinklers are required in all Group E occupancies other than the two listed exceptions. Ray Allshouse (building official) feels the answer to the question is no, sprinklers are not required. Previous legislation and state law points were discussed by Committee members. Ray feels as long as they could keep the count below 50 they would not have to sprinkle the building or do fire barriers. Dave states both the church and the day care are high risk facilities and therefore should require either the sprinklers or the fire separation. There was more discussion by the Committee members.</p> <p>Ray Allshouse moved to have this interpretation go to the Council for their review and conclusion. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. Ray feels it needs to be rewritten to show both sides of the answer. Tim pointed out this issue has been heard by the Council before. The option to table this was also raised. The motion was carried unanimously to table the interpretation.</p>
<p>5. Legislation – SB5620, Fire Drills</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p>	<p>Dave Kokot stated within the requirements of the bill it states that there needs to be three drills for lockdown, one drill for shelter in place and three drills for fire evacuation in accordance with state fire code. Previously it was one drill for lockdown and six drills for fire evacuation. There is also one additional drill to be determined by the school. Joanne McCaughan pointed out that the lockdown language was taken out last year.</p> <p>Ray Allshouse made a motion that this be forwarded to the full Council recommending expedited rulemaking to comply with the new law. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>6. Staff Report</p>	<p>Tim Nogler reported nearing the end of the biennium; however we do not have a budget from the legislature. The Governor’s office did share a contingency plan in the event there is no budget by July 1. Tim has done a first round of allotment based on the previous budget; however we don’t know what the appropriation will be at this time.</p> <p>Tim continued stating that DES has a new director, Chris Liu and our division director has left. DES has reorganized our division and SBCC is now under the Legal Services Division reporting to the assistant director, Ro Marcus. She is formally of OFM and will be a great</p>

	resource for SBCC. This change takes effect July 1.
7. Other Business	<p>Steve Simpson reported the City of Bellingham is going to allow the IPC as the approved alternate code in their city. Our legislative mandate is that we adopt the Uniform Plumbing Code and we use that throughout the state. Steve thinks this will create a controversy and would like to bring it to the Council’s attention. He feels the Council should write a stern letter to Bellingham, similar to the letter written to Richland regarding the Energy Code. There was discussion among the Committee that SBCC is not an enforcement body.</p> <p>Tim Nogler pointed out an interpretation request is expected from Pierce County dealing with the IRC TAG and the fire separation of townhouse units. The reference table states that if the townhouse separation is five feet or more it requires a one hour separation barrier and if the townhouse is less than five feet then a sprinkler system is required. It is assumed if there is zero separation or a common wall there are sprinklers. The exception under the townhouse provision allows a one hour common wall. The question is what is the separation to be for townhouses? Tim said the 2012code created a new table stating if the townhouse is five feet you can have a one hour separation. The TAG decided it was covered if you referred to the tables.</p> <p>Dave Kokot mentioned a possible interpretation from the Fire Marshal’s office regarding the E occupancy requirements for sprinkling. There are some wording issues with what is a cluster.</p>
Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.