



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

SUMMARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Center Place, Room 109
Spokane Valley, Washington

MEETING DATE: September 20, 2013

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 10:05 a.m. <u>Members in Attendance:</u> Ray Allshouse, Council Chair; Dave Kokot, Vice Chair; Tom Balbo; Rod Bault; John Chelminiak; Dave DeWitte; Paul Duffau; Duane Jonlin; Mark Kulaas; Dave Peden; Jeff Peterson; Steve Simpson; Eric Vander Mey; Rod Mutch <u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Joanne McCaughan; Peggy Bryden <u>Visitors Present:</u> Don Dashiell, Jim DeTro, Randy Vissia, Larry Andrews, Mike Manus, Andy Rorie, Traci Harvey, Chris Edmark, Mike Fowler, Jeff Randall, Dana Brandt, Jeanette McKague
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved as written.
3. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda	None were given.
4. Review and Minutes of June 14, 2013 and June 28, 2013 Motion 2	Duane Jonlin moved the minutes of June 14 and June 28 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved.
5. Public Hearing on Proposed Rules	Tim Nogler gave a summary of the Lodging House Sprinkler Proposed Rule. The TAG said the sprinkler rule should apply where adopted by the local jurisdiction. This however, was overlooked during the rule making process, so this rule is to be consistent with the TAG recommendation that provides that these owner-occupied lodging houses shall be equipped with fire sprinklers only where required by local jurisdictions.
Public Comment	Traci Harvey , Fire Protection Engineer with Spokane Valley Fire Dept. We feel the language of the model code should stand as the lodging homes are commercial ventures, they are allowing the public in as would any other hotel/motel situation. The life safety issues should be addressed. The I-codes have a history of allowing trade-offs for sprinkler systems and we feel that this is written in the same vein as the model code. You have a commercial building that typically should be built

	<p>following the IBC requirements, but if you sprinkler it they are giving you an exception to do a construction trade-off to IRC requirements which is with the current methodology in the I-codes. We feel it should remain as is and not stricken.</p>
Two Family Dwelling Separation	<p>Tim Nogler pointed out that this is the IRC. This was filed after the others so the actual published hearing date is October 18, 2013 dealing with supporting assemblies in two family dwellings and under certain circumstances they would not be required to be fire resistant rated.</p>
CO Alarms	<p>This is an amendment proposed by the Dept. of Corrections to add into the exceptions. These facilities are considered Group R and are monitored by staff which is the same exception as there is for licensed boarding homes.</p> <p>There was no one who wished to speak on this matter.</p>
PV Installations	<p>Dave Kokot reported there was a special TAG that was held to address the fire code requirements for 2012 PV installations. The TAG went through the model code and some of the proposals of the 2015 code. They also went through some clarification documents and brought some clarification in wording. In general we had consensus on all items, but one. The group was very positive. The TAG membership was representative of the PV side as well as the fire safety side.</p>
Public Comment	<p>Andy Rorie with Spokane Valley Fire Dept. He provided an operational perspective on the impact of adopting Section 605.11.3.2 Exception #5. This would allow for an exemption for buildings under 10,000 sq. ft.; they would be exempted from review, which basically means all residents in the valley. He has some real concerns with this. We have access requirements, vent hole requirements and egress requirements to get off the other side of the building. The impact of this is tremendous. There are a lot of issues with this already. We have a choice of putting ourselves in a situation of greater risk or we can opt out of using that as a tactic; in such cases we may not be making an aggressive interior attack on a fire and would likely cause higher fire loss. It is important that this issue is addressed in a way to allow us to take care of this in the manner we are accustomed to.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin asked what in particular would you like to see in our rules for the future of PV. Rorie states it is important where the PV is located. Typically we want ladder access which is either going to be a roof ladder placed by a ground ladder or an area ladder which is over a bearing wall, typically where we like to walk, so along an exterior wall. We need to have the vent holes high on the structure and we need a similar egress route along a ridge off the building on the other side. Those are the things that if they were not there would be a big issue for us.</p> <p>Jeff Peterson asked if this is the same process you would use for a three story building. Rorie states you are not going to use vertical ventilation if you have an intact wall between the floor and the roof. You would use positive pressure, which are fans to create greater than atmospheric pressure to direct fire flows in a horizontal path which is much more challenging and a lot more criteria to use that effectively. Most residential buildings we can use vertical ventilation because</p>

they are an open floor structure even if they start in the basement they immediately involve the floor above that so we can use this type of ventilation in residential buildings. We would not use it in all cases, but it is the primary method.

Dave Kokot asked what education does the fire team have in regard to solar power. **Rorie** states the education is limited in everything. Jacks of all trades, but masters of none.

Jeff Randall, Power Trip Energy testified next. He submitted an email yesterday to SBCC and he also submitted a comment letter on June 13 to the BFP Committee. His written comments to the BFP committee specifically related to the roof coverage option. Also he would like to address the comments by the Spokane Valley Fire person. Are they going to be able to get safely on that roof? That depends on where it is. In Item #5 the exemption we are talking about does not exempt out all the provisions of the fire code and safety standards. What they are exempt from is only the roof set-backs standards which include set-backs from the peak, and set-backs from the gutter to the peak for accessing the peak. One specific provision that he was concerned about is 605.11.3.1, Roof Access Points and that provision states that roof access points “shall be located in areas that do not require the placement of ground ladders over openings such as windows or doors, and located at strong points of building construction in locations where the access point does not conflict with overhead obstructions such tree limbs, wires or signs.” That would mean the fire dept. would have ability to make sure every PV system is complying with that point. Exception #5 of Section 605.11.3.2 does not exempt PV arrays from that provision.

Secondly the letter submitted yesterday brought up that the City of Boulder adopted the fire code on Tuesday night. It included a provision similar to the draft that we included and it still provided a 12 inch set-back. Item #5 was drafted in a very short period of time within the last 20 minutes of the final TAG meeting. The PV folks wanted to talk more about the issue, but we couldn’t get the fire folks to tell us how much of the roof was needed for fire access. Other states say that 66% of the roof is going to be enough and I recommend changing our language to be the same as Boulder’s language.

Chris Edmark with Thurston County. The fire code official determines... maybe what it should say the local fire district. Because they are the ones going to be fighting the fire and determining if roof access is too steep. A lot of these variables can be worked with at this level and they can work with the individual putting the panels on to find a suitable tactic and have a response plan for that.

Dana Brandt with Eco Tech Energy Systems. He would like to address Section 605.11.3.2, Exception #5 and give a little bit of context for how that was drafted. As we walked through the model code and the provisions that were there and tried to apply that to the solar installations that had already been done in the area, we noted that the model code looks at each individual group service and required set-backs from all of the edges and as we apply that to buildings with multiple roof faces, we’ve found it to be unnecessarily restrictive. We could put a picture of a building up there and look at how the model code would affect that if we would

	<p>apply it to each roof surface, but it was obvious that wasn't necessary. Exception #5 was an attempt to acknowledge that the code was too restrictive in the way that it applied and acknowledging that there is enough roof left unobstructed by the solar panels, and sufficient access given to the building, that the fire could be effectively fought.</p> <p><u>Rebuttal Phase:</u></p> <p>Andy Rorie commented that the access sounds good; however one of the things being exempted is the 3 ft. set-back from the ridge. Vent holes are cut on the ridge for several reasons. The standard vent hole, which is the national standard, is 4 ft. by 4 ft. So even at 3 ft. we couldn't cut a standard vent hole in a roof. He was talking about a 12 in. ridge set-back; that's ineffective. You don't need access to a roof if you only have 12 in. space to work in at the ridge. You won't cut a vent hole on it, it is ineffective. You have to relieve the pressure of the attic. If you are going to move forward with the good pathway on the ridge, you have to a portion of the ridge that is clear. A 3 by 3 or a 4 by 4 would be the preference for a vent hole.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin asked in regard to the ridge, isn't it just as easy for the firefighter to cut that vent hole on the north side where nobody will put solar. Rorie stated there are a couple of issues. One, we have to have access off the roof from both directions and the other is wind direction; the vent hole it has to be on the downwind side because you can't fight the fire when wind is blowing into the vent hole. It doesn't have to be both sides.</p> <p><u>Re-rebuttal Phase:</u></p> <p>Jeff Randall stated the City of Boulder included the 12 in. standard as ventilation, so pardon him if he misspoke. He suspects the reason it was brought up by fire folks about having roofs that are steep and having a ladder that can go over the top and that is why the 12 in. is there and they concluded there would be some 4 ft. areas to cut into for the vent hole.</p>
Plumbing Code	<p>Steve Simpson reported on the Plumbing Code which refers to several things. 604.11 is a substantive change to a state amendment limiting the lead content of pipe fittings and fixtures to a maximum of 0.25%. This content is set by federal law and the new limitations are effective January 4, 2014. Manufacturers will no longer be allowed to make or sell products that do not meet the federal standards. The remainder of the changes proposed correlate the state plumbing code with the Dept. of Health requirements. These include: citing new statutory language in the definition of Certified Backflow Assembly Tester; referencing water purveyors in the definition of Water/Wastewater Utility correcting terminology in Section 603.5 for consistency with DOH rules; noting that remediation of discovered cross connection shall conform to DOH rules (Sections 1603.11.2.3, 1604.12.2.3 and 17-2.2.3); and clarifying that, per DOH rules, reduced pressure principle backflow preventers are not an allowable device for connecting potable water to reclaimed water systems.</p>
Public Comment	<p>Larry Andrews we don't have a problem with this as plumbers, but the real issue is our inventories that we have in our systems. His company has \$30,000 of these</p>

	<p>lead products in his shop. As of today's date he can't buy products to replace them with because they are not available. We have been buying leaded products to get us by. In the past when they wrote this law the manufacturers were not allowed to manufacture any more after a certain date and you were able to purge your inventory of what you had. The background is NSF did testing on this, but never proved there was any leaching under the current standard, but someone has decided that this lead standard needs to happen. The other bad thing about the new lead standard is that all the lead materials that are made in the new lead standard are not recyclable. In the past when the manufacturers were manufacturing these brass products they could sweep them up on the floor and re-melt it down and reuse it. The way the formula works now you can't do that and meet the standard. So you throw it all away. What does that do to the impact on the cost? It is 30% more for the same product that you had before. We've all petitioned the EPA to allow the products that we have to be purged and they have not made any rules yet on any of this. This is bad because the tub valve you have in your house or the toilet or the shower valve in your house or the hose bib those can be leaded products, but the water out of your kitchen sink and all the piping coming from there has to be no leaded products. Anyone that knows about backflow prevention, the water turning on one faucet runs from one place to the other a lot of times. So, it really wasn't a well written law. Everyone is petitioning so we give an interim period so at least the people that have these products can purge their inventory.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin asked what is a reasonable amount of time to allow for that transition. Andrews said the way the economy is right now, for his company, he would say 4 to 5 years. Before the economy went bad his company was doing a house or two a week, then the faucet shut off. So he has scads of fittings sitting in the shop. We were set up to do 10 to 12 houses a month. I've been sitting on this material for almost five years now and we are trying to purge it. You take a brass nipple out of his truck and you turn them around and you can't tell the difference. It's not marked; you can't tell if it is lower lead than the low lead we already have.</p>
<p>Energy Code</p>	<p>Duane Jonlin gave an overview of this proposed rule. There are a couple of major things and a couple of minor things. The first one is to agree with a petition to move Ferry, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, and Stevens counties from Climate Zone 6B to Climate Zone 5B so that local consultants and builders from this area could more easily work in these areas. The other was a work around that allowed a higher than 30% glazing for a prescriptive path for commercial buildings, especially high rise buildings. Beyond that there are several corrections and technical changes that have been found in inputting the original code.</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Don Dashiell, chairman of the board of Stevens County Commissioners. The Commissioners would like to thank SBCC for the emergency rule to move Stevens County and the other northern tier counties to Climate Zone 5B rather than 6B. We ask the Council to adopt this change in the proposed permanent rule. Please include for the record in your consideration all previous oral and written comments made by the Stevens County Commissioners. Our area of the state has been hit hard by the downturn of the economy and building industry and without</p>

	<p>this change our county will have a disproportionate negative impact and cost burden on our local small businesses and consumers. This will also negatively affect our ability to tract and build commercial businesses to strengthen our local economy. We have historically sent our building personnel to Spokane to receive training on new code revisions. We also depend on the surrounding region for networking questions relating to the code. By separating only the four northern counties into a separate climate zone and hence different regulations we will lose our effectiveness to adequately be trained and apply the code; especially since our county represents one half of 1% of all the residential building in the state and an equal percentage of the commercial construction. Our county has been working with homeowners, businesses and construction professionals over the years to avoid using foam insulation on the outside of buildings. One of the reasons is the cost of the products and long cost recovery period. Another reason is insects, particularly carpenter ants, and we have examples of this in our county. Some older homes that used foam in the region had to remove the outside materials and apply fiberglass insulation to rid their homes of the insects. It is a huge health concern for us as we want people to avoid infestation and not have to apply chemicals to treat this issue. By moving us back in to Climate Zone 5B we can avoid insects, health and economic concerns</p> <p>Jim Detro, chairman of the board of Okanogan County Commissioners and would concur with Chairman Dashiell of Stevens County. With reference to the Climate Zones, the Commissioners respectfully request the Council approve to move Ferry, Okanogan, Pend Oreille and Stevens counties from Climate Zone 6B to Climate Zone 5B. This allows consistency with all our adjacent counties provides less financial impact due to the additional training that would be incurred to the builders and contractors working within our areas and jurisdictions. We respectfully support and request the amendment. Thank you for the emergency rule.</p> <p>Mike Manus, Pend Oreille County Commissioner. He is here on behalf of the citizens of Pend Oreille County. We also want to stay with the emergency rule and have that rule made permanent, changing Pend Oreille County back to Zone 5B and the reasons are evident as the other commissioners have stated. It is a financial burden on our county as well as training costs for the county and the builders and most of the materials come out of Spokane. One of the biggest problems we would be facing without this change is the fact that Spokane will get 6 in. door jambs and this means the four northern counties will have to special order the door jambs, window jambs, etc. because they won't carry those items just for the four counties, because we have very little building. Thank you.</p> <p>No Rebuttal offered.</p>
<p>6. Motions to Adopt Expedited Rules from June Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion</p>	<p>Tim Nogler stated this Residential Energy motion mostly references subsections and typographical errors. Duane Jonlin made a motion to accept this expedited rule for Residential Energy. The motion was seconded by Eric Vander Mey. The motion was approved.</p>
<p>Commercial Energy</p>	<p>Tim Nogler said these changes were typographical errors in the code. These were posted and no testimony was received during the comment period. Duane</p>

Motion	Jonlin made a motion to accept the proposed expedited rule for Commercial Energy. Eric Vander Mey seconded the motion. The motion was approved.
Fire Code Motion	Tim Nogler stated there was legislation that was passed that altered the emergency drills that are required. Under statute now there are fewer evacuation drills and there are additional drills for part of the statute; Section 405 of the Fire Code is amended to reflect that. Dave Kokot made a motion to amend the Fire Code with the new wording. Steve Simpson seconded the motion. The motion passed.
7. Committee Reports Executive Committee	Ray Allhouse chaired yesterday’s Committee meeting. There is an update on the Process Improvement. Tim Nogler summarized this report. The outcome is that we would have a document to look at and schedule another meeting in late October to consider some of the issues that were brought up. The public testimony ground rules were discussed. We have done an initial round of work on staff workload, duties and specifying the time commitment for the Green Building Code TAG. Tim wants to do that overall for Council functions to give Council members and stakeholders a good background of knowledge and what each element of our process takes to be implemented. Tom Balbo drafted a document to address some of the issues we have with public perception and participation. There is a suggestion that we develop public forums on various topics, and that we have these meetings on a quarterly basis. Most of the meeting time was spent talking about the code cycle. A proposal developed by staff was presented to suggest how an extended code development cycle could work. This would allow for an extra round of public comment for people to provide input to the Council. This presentation is posted on the SBCC website. If the proposal is adopted, it would have an impact on our work plan which we need to have developed and finalized by the end of the year. The goal is to increase public involvement and to provide a more thorough review of proposed code changes. This would allow for additional time for input and additional focus on the codes in an interim year.
Public Comment	Larry Andrews with Andrews Mechanical. He understands the need for a time limit, but SBCC meets on the east side of the state only once a year and the rest of the time you are on the west side. The three minutes seems a short time to speak. Mark Kulaas has a question. When we first started the emergency rule discussion with the three northern tier counties we heard today and before is the rules changed for us. Gary Nordeen provided testimony that for those counties the rules were not changing from 2006. The rules were not changing, but they believed that the rules were changing; so where is the missing link in the communications. We have to ask ourselves that. Are we doing a good job getting notice out? Where are some of the gaps that we might help plug with other entities? One of the counties had their building official on the line on a conference call saying that the rules had changed. This is problematic. For one for this group perception and PR. Are those building officials going back home and telling their elected officials what is really going on here? Do we need Washington Association of Counties to step up more toward their building

	<p>officials and make sure this information is getting out there? Because four counties believed we changed the rules on them. He sees this as a perception problem. They need to know what is happening and how to work with their constituency. How do we improve communications on these codes and what is the expectation of moving up the implementation ladder? Ray Allshouse commented Mark's remarks were very germane. The input from Tom referred to how we could better engage the associations to help with the education as well as perception. Tom Balbo agreed with Mark the perception of how we do business is not known. We want to meet with other groups and associations at least quarterly to get their input and we could start working on changes before we make a hard line on proposals. He also proposes doing a forum in possibly 4-5 places around the state. Duane Jonlin reported giving 35 presentations on SBCC. He feels that giving these types of presentations should be part of the duties of the Council members. Dave Kokot stated the fire code did put on several presentations across the state.</p>
BFP Committee	<p>Dave Peden, as the chair, reported the BFP Committee met yesterday. Most of the meeting was spent looking at five different interpretations. We received public comment on each of them. We tabled three of the interpretations. The first was about townhouses regarding separation. We had a draft answer which only added to the confusion and we needed to further clarify it. Another meeting was scheduled before the October Council meeting to determine a more clear interpretation. Tim Nogler stated the confusion is that in the model code there is a sprinkler requirement and in the state code there is not.</p> <p>Dave Peden continued stating the next interpretation was school portables. This was tabled as well. It is probably the most controversial one discussed. It involves sprinklering and definitions of clusters. We think we need to receive public comment in the October meetings before a final answer can be given. Tim added the question is when sprinklers are required and at what point fire separation is required for a portable school classroom which has been defined since the early 90's to be a maximum of 5,000 ft. . There is also concern about the occupant load. There has been a great deal of feedback from school districts and OSPI. The Council may want to consider rulemaking along with the interpretation. Dave Kokot added that the Fire Code TAG thought the language was clear, but others didn't feel that way.</p>
Public Comment	<p>Traci Harvey, Fire Protection Engineer. She sent in an email to Joanne which is in essence a re-write to clarify the intent, which removes exemption #2 and putting the 50 occupant load into the main body of the code. This makes it read Group E buildings over 50 occupants require sprinklers. The exemption for the portables stating would then apply when you have an occupant load less than 50, but then you would have the cluster limit.</p> <p>Dave Peden reported the next interpretation involved CO alarms and was a request from the City of Bellevue. Joanne McCaughan stated this first question was in fact a typo. The code should read R-2. There are no exemptions in R-2 occupancies. The second question was about single station CO alarms placed in common areas. We based the answer on NFPA 720, Section 3.3.22.1 which</p>

	<p>defines a CO detection system as “a system or portion of a combination system that consists of a control unit, components, and circuits arranged to monitor and annunciate the status of the CO initiating devices and to initiate the appropriate response to those signals.” The answer is yes, under some conditions a single station alarm would meet the definition of a household CO detection system, where two or more alarms are interconnected. This decision should be made at the discretion of the local official. Question #3 asks whether it is okay to put CO alarms inside the bedrooms if there is no hall outside the bedroom. The answer is yes. This interpretation was approved by the Committee.</p>
	<p>Dave Peden said the next interpretation referred to Section 3002.4 regarding the installation of an elevator, and was a request from the City of Kent. The committee unanimously approved the interpretation. Tim stated this section of the code refers to the size of the car for the elevator. The language appears to say in buildings with four or more stories in height an elevator shall be provided. This was not the intent. The intent was to say in buildings which are required to have an elevator, the car should be sized to accommodate a stretcher. So the answer to the question is no, only where there is an elevator already required are you required to have the larger car size.</p> <p>Dave Peden said the final interpretation concerns temperature control. This interpretation was tabled. It seemed simple at first, but there is a code provision that requires minimal heat if a building has human occupants. However there are facilities such as a truss manufacturing plant that have doors wide open and there are a few people making things, but it would be very problematic to heat it to 68 degrees. We need to rework this one and come up with a better answer.</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Larry Andrews with Andrews Mechanical. This is a hard one to write a code on. The design engineer is looking at the facility and where the temperature should lie. There needs to be flexibility for people to do what they want, if we don't we are handcuffing them and costing lots of energy. It is a total waste. Most people who work in these types of facilities put a jacket on. It is really hard to write a code where one spot must be at 68 degrees. That's okay for an office, but what happens when people leave this facility? He would like to see it drop down to 50 degrees and the only time people get 68 degrees is when they are in here. Need to leave it flexible for the industry to do what they need to.</p> <p>Eric Vander Mey suggested the Council find why this was put in the Energy and Mechanical code from ICC.</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Larry Andrews with Andrews Mechanical appreciates the help SBCC has always given him. Everybody east of the Cascades thinks that the insulation is not required. On Page 25 of the handout is the 2009 code which refers to swimming pools that's why nobody in the plumbing industry thinks that they are supposed to insulate hot water piping in homes. If insulation in hot water pipes was required it should have been put in before the section on swimming pools. That's the problem with our system. What we need from the Council is a person that goes out and sees what is being implemented. In this instance there is overkill. If you put a half inch on and your temperature is between 120 and he'd like to see it go down to at least 48, for dehumidification properly to work. The</p>

	<p>in radiant cooling he must continually insulate the pipe all the way. He can't stop at the joist space because there will be condensation coming down. This code reference is like buying a tire that is capable of going 200 mph and the cost for the tire is 10 times more, but the speed limit is 70 mph and the car can only go 100 mph. That is a total waste, nobody will do it, both will get you there and no more fuel will be saved. The R-6 insulation is a total waste. You are spending money that you will never get a gain off of. The R-.2.2 will do a fine job; it is a half inch thick. The other code reference is R403.2.1; a minimum of R-8 on duct work. The duct work is inside the building. There is no difference in the net value. The only time you would gain some value if you had a zone system and you had every room insulated and you keep the door closed and then reduce the temperature in other points of the building; then you could have some gain. He would like both of these repealed under an emergency rule action because you are costing people money and they aren't saving any. Metal duct work is a lot better way to go.</p> <p>Mike Fowler recommends the Energy Code TAG look at the aspirational code. The Council should provide direction of energy only or green building only.</p>
<p>8. Green Building TAG Report</p>	<p>Steve Simpson reported on this as chair of the TAG. He thanked the TAG and Council staff for the work they did. The report gives a bit of background and what we accomplished this past year. On the 2010 agenda what the group was tasked with was to essentially gather information on all programs and invite presenters from the green building organizations and we did that. You can see who was in those and obviously there was detail as to what we covered. He referred to Page 10 to talk about the recommendations made by the TAG. Those present came to a consensus on the following recommendations to the Council. They would like to continue the TAG's work through December 2014. That work would be the second bullet point and third bullet point on the original workplan for 2010. That would be to evaluate and cost/benefits and the regulatory/problematic barriers associated with the various codes already reviewed by the TAG. As Tim discussed earlier, there is a draft budget estimate that is being reviewed. It estimates the staff time/cost for meeting development, writing draft reports, setting up meeting places, etc. This estimate did not include the estimated cost for the managing director or the TAG chair's time. The TAG needs some direction. The TAG members are very energetic and want to be involved.</p> <p>Dave Kokot stated there was a lot of constituent interest in this Green Building TAG. He supports the continuation of the TAG work through December 2014, contingent upon the budget issue. There is some really good work coming out of this effort.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin feels this could have pieces in the plumbing, energy and the building code so this didn't require another code book, etc. because each piece would require more management.</p> <p>Joanne McCaughan with SBCC staff wanted to thank Steve for the comments on the report and wondered if Council members have had a chance to read the report. She suggested that they take a look at the report to see what was done and</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p>	<p>how much time was spent by the TAG, and if there are questions that they be addressed at a future Council meeting.</p> <p>Mike Fowler member of the Green Building TAG thinks the best course of action is to have an aspirational and a green code that overlay into our existing code. This is most direct. Then have the local jurisdiction have the ability as to what is needed in their own location.</p> <p>Steve Simpson made a motion to continue the Green Building TAG work through December 2014. Paul Duffau seconded the motion. Tim Nogler said this work is estimated to be one quarter of an FTE and could be worked into the budget. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>Eric asked when the next meeting would be. Staff noted it has not yet been scheduled.</p>
<p>9. Staff Report</p>	<p>Tim Nogler stated there was no fee increase, but there was an updated budget appropriation. However, the previous biennium was the lowest revenue in a decade which reflects the reduced number of building permits. We will be spending out our fund balance in this biennium.</p> <p>The Budget proviso is in the packet. The Governor’s message indicates this is substantive law and is not valid. The Governor’s office has indicated they would support the SBCC and we are proceeding as if that proviso is invalid. We have members traveling to the ICC hearings in October so we would be funding that activity and previously we couldn’t do that.</p>
<p>10. Other Business</p>	<p>Dave Kokot indicated that later this month there will be a Wildlife Urban Interface conference held in Wenatchee. The purpose of the conference is to evaluate obstructions and barriers to wildfire prevention, and to bring together interested parties to share information related to developing prevention tactics in their communities. Dave will be chairing one of the sessions, and some Council staff will be in attendance. We hope to provide a report back to the Council</p>
<p>11. Adjourn</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.</p>