



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 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Department of Enterprise Services, Room 2331
1500 Jefferson Street
Olympia, Washington 98501

MEETING DATE: January 27, 2017

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
	<p><u>Committee Members in Attendance:</u> Leanne Guier, Committee Chair; Steve Simpson, Council Chair; Andrew Klein; Phil Lemley; Doug Orth</p> <p><u>Committee Members Absent:</u> Dave DeWitte, Duane Jonlin, Traci Harvey, Diane Glenn</p> <p><u>Staff in Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Krista Braaksma</p> <p><u>Visitors Present:</u> Dave Hanson, Chuck Murray</p>
1. Welcome and Introductions	The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Committee Chair Leanne Guier. Introductions were made.
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved with the addition of approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.
3. Review and Approve Minutes	The minutes of the January 20, 2017 meeting were approved as written.
4. Legislative Update	<p>Leanne asked Tim Nogler to review the bills of interest.</p> <p>Tim stated he expected the tiny house bill, 1085, to be exec'd out of committee this week.</p> <p>Regarding 1213, use of greywater, Tim said met with Representative Farrell and Department of Health staff on this bill. It would greatly impact DOH, and they asked for more time to work on the issue. There was also concern expressed about this being a mandatory provision. Steve has some concerns with the greywater bill. It is likely there won't be enough greywater to do everything they want to do with it, so it would need to be supplemented with potable water and that could bring in cross connection issues. Bacterial growth within the tanks is also a concern. Tim noted there was also a question on whether the cost estimates were accurate and whether it was cost effective. DOH did support the idea, however.</p> <p>The next two, 1262 and 1263, had a hearing earlier this week. Tim noted he worked with Representative McBride on some of the language. Tim also clarified the bills would not be retroactive.</p> <p>The IPC bill, 1435, had been scheduled for a hearing but has since been pulled from the committee agenda. Tim isn't sure what will happen with the bill.</p>

HB [1436](#), SB [5412](#) and HB [1622](#) are pretty much the same. HB 1622 includes a fee increase for the Council. It's estimated that the bill would increase revenue by about \$150k a year. The biggest concern within the bills is moving the Council to "within the department of enterprise services" and how that would affect rulemaking. SB 5412 is currently scheduled for a hearing next week.

There are several bills addressing cross laminated timber. SB [5450](#), directs the Council to develop a code for the use of cross laminated timber. Tim noted the model code includes CLT in the 2015 IBC, so there is not really anything for the Council to do. Tim asked that Doug Orth take some time to discuss the issue with him offline. It is assumed this bill is seeking to allow tall wood frame buildings, but that is not specified in the bill. There is some concern that the definition for cross laminated timber is different than that in the model code. Doug noted there is some concern about shrinking of wood, but there is some construction being done on 5-10 story CLT buildings in England and New York. He is not seeing it in general use. Andrew said the only time he's seen it used is when the soil can't support the usual construction types.

The last bill, [5500](#), is similar to the other three state building code council bills but goes quite a bit farther. It establishes a 6-year code cycle and requires the legislature to pass a bill to update the state building code. It is scheduled for a hearing next week. Leanne asked the committee if they should share with the legislature all of the work the Council has done on the process this past year. Steve noted he sent out a memo on the changes and that should have gone to the legislators as well. Tim clarified that it only went to the legislative members of the Council, but it has been posted on the website. Steve said that without full Council agreement, it would be up to individual members sharing their opinions. Steve and Doug both spoke against a 6-year cycle. Doug felt it was important to stay coordinated with the model codes; it would be less disruptive to the industry and the code changes would be less severe. Steve felt it would be harder to achieve the statutory energy code goals on a 6-year cycle.

5. Other Business	Tim said staff would continue to monitor legislative activity. He also commented he hopes the initial flurry of bills is at an end.
6. Adjourn	There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.