

BFP COMMITTEE NOTES

MARCH 9, 2017

Committee members present: Jim Tinner, Chair; Andrew Klein, Vice-Chair; Robert Graper; Traci Harvey; Phil Lemley, Doug Orth; Steve Simpson

Guests present: David Tworkowski, NEMA; Bruce Verhee; John Monsebroten; Al Audette; Cathy Carlson; Margaret Spitznas; Corey Thomas; Dan Shier; Kim Barker; Michael Groesch;

Meeting called to order at 2:00 P.M. A quorum is present.

Agenda reviewed and approved.

(Note: WebEx mic was not picking up during the first few minutes of the meeting while the attendance was taken and the agenda approved/reviewed.)

Interpretation IBC 504.3 and 502.4.1 reviewed. Jim T. offered background on the issue. Height limitations don't go beyond 5-story for Type 4; the purpose is first floor retail.

Jim explained that the question is really that there's a bonus on Type 5-A; Jim asked why they can't get that for Type 4? Tim noted the written interpretation can be amended to allow A, B, or M in Answer 1.

Doug Orth had a question about the number of stories for occupancies in Question 2. Question 1 does not relate to Type IV? No that is heavy timber. Tim noted heavy timber already allows an extra story; this was allowing an extra story with light frame construction. You would need to provide stair pressurization. For Type 4, the extra story is already allowed. RG asked about modifying the question. Jim wanted to know more about why the Council approved the extra story in the past. Tim explained the reasoning. Jim suggested a code change proposal for the 2018 cycle.

Rob G. discussed the number of stories for egress, noting if there is a pedestal it is considered a separate building. Jim agrees with Tim regarding code change proposal. He noted however that this may not be important in the near future, due to use of Cross Laminated Timber (CLT), the use of which is becoming much more common in the building industry.

Tim noted that question 3 deals with CLT, it is in the IBC, must comply with the code restrictions. Would need to go to an alternate method to allow additional stories. ICC has an ad hoc committee that is looking at the issue of higher/taller wood buildings. (18.24. ?)

Kim Barker/City of Bellingham staff asked for the code reference. Tim replied it is the 2015 IBC 604.2; Andrew pointed out it should be 602.4, as there is not any section 604 in the 2015 IBC. Andrew/Doug moved to accept as modified. Approved.

Interpretation 17-Feb02 from Snohomish County/Fire District 7. Traci explained that the Fire Code worked on this in 2015; it was a question re: CO2; ICC added operational permits on compressed gasses for CO2 beverage systems. The TAG moved to include all of the CO2 systems over 100 lbs., not just beverage system; the risk is the same. We may have missed a sub-note where it talks about the beverage system. Was 105.6.4 and Table 105.7.3 intended to include other applications - yes, the intent

BFP COMMITTEE NOTES

MARCH 9, 2017

was to catch all references, not limited to just beverage systems. The answer is yes, it is not just beverage dispensing systems; it was a sub-note that the TAG missed.

Question 2. RE fire permit requirements. If more than 100 lbs. of liquefied CO₂ is installed in a facility, then what, if any, kind of fire construction permit is required? Also, is CO₂ considered to be a gas even though it is in a liquefied state, but is dispensed as a gas? Traci explained that even though it is liquefied it would still be covered under the compressed gas section.

Bruce B. asked if it also applies to fire protection systems with more than 100 lbs. of CO₂? Traci says yes, CO₂ does not discriminate, but if the annual report is in compliance the local official may waive it if they deem it appropriate. CO₂ fire protection systems are few and far between.

(Grace Yuan - joined the meeting and thanked the committee for being willing to work on the school alarms issue).

Dan S. there were two in Spokane, but those have been taken out. CO₂ issue is rarely a problem.

SS moved approval; Rob G. seconded. Approved.

Group E School alarms; Tim explained the history of the issue, re: Legislative budget proviso directing the Council to allow schools to use the alarm system and not use the emergency voice alarm system that had been required in the 2015 code. Emergency rules were established, and the issue was sent to the Fire Code TAG to establish language for the Fire Code and Building Code. At this point the purpose is to develop language for the emergency rule, to be filed prior to July 1, 2017. The Council has the opportunity to review this issue tomorrow as well as in May and June meetings.

Traci explained the process that the TAG went through; we did not have a quorum at the last meeting. The parties are in agreement that this language developed by the schools coalition is what was intended; WSAFM is in support of the language; they would like to see it moved forward to the Council for action at tomorrow's meeting. Jim asked if the TAG had considered whether or not the language should also be adopted in the IEBC.

Traci noted some of the IEBC language was used to model the language; however, that code was not referenced in the budget proviso. Tim noted Ch. 11 of the IFC is Existing Buildings; there was discussion about that, we had a reference included earlier, but the TAG determined it to be unnecessary; they wanted the specific language to be in this section.

Jim just wanted to be sure there was no conflict with the IEBC.

Dave Tworkowski/NEMA spoke about the importance of the emergency voice communication systems. Cannot go backwards in safety. No trade-offs through electrical; the intent of having the system removed puts everyone in danger, students and all building occupants are or at risk; it is going backwards. At NEMA they want to ensure good understanding of all the different systems governed under NFPA 72/Fire alarm and signaling systems installation standard. Should install according to 72, when directed to install a system by the AHJ. If we go backwards everyone is at risk.

BFP COMMITTEE NOTES

MARCH 9, 2017

Jim T. asked if NEMA believes the proposed language is going backwards. Dave T. answered that NEMA wants the awareness that fire alarm systems are an important part of educational occupancies; would love to see that stay within the code.

Tim explained the proposal and the concern that NEMA has, they have recent correspondence with us; they want a reference to 'installation in compliance with NFPA 72,' under both 2.7 and 2.9. Is it a guideline or a standard? 'In a manner consistent with' does not specify that all the elements of the standard apply. That was the concern.

Doug O. asked for a synopsis of the budget proviso. Tim explained it is not in effect once the new budget is adopted, and a new fiscal year occurs on July 1. Does the new proposed language meet the requirements/concerns that were brought up in the proviso, re: redundant systems or requirements, i.e., the ability to broadcast voice messages or customized messages. The concern is whether it complies with NFPA 72 or not? The language says 'consistent with NFPA 72' guidelines. Jim T. asked what the problem was concerning using NEMA's suggested language.

Traci noted we are trying to codify an alternative method; they were trying to mimic the alternative method language from the IFC, i.e., basically mimicking equivalent/alternative method language. This is just in regard to NFPA 72.

Grace Yuan noted the draft as shown is supported by the Puget Sound School Coalition; it recognizes two pathways, the traditional and an alternative pathway that meets the same performance standards; urge to adopt this today. Steve Crawford/Issaquah School District commented that in the state school plan, schools statewide must address many different kinds of emergency events and hazards in addition to fires, and be prepared to address them. What has been proposed in this proposal would allow them to provide enhanced safety for building occupants.

Doug O. asked for clarification from NEMA, they want the language to be 'in compliance with' rather than 'consistent with.' David T. responded that NEMA believes the installation should 'comply with' NFPA 72.

Jim asked for final comments before moving forward to bring the issue to the Council, if the task for the TAG is to move this to the Council at tomorrow's meeting. Tim explained the timeframe.

Jim is comfortable with moving this to the Council for action. Traci emphasized the Schools Coalition and the Fire service worked together and have agreed to this language. Doug O. asked what the issue is for 'compliant' rather than 'consistent'; Traci explained the nuances of the issue, re: evolving technologies. She explained there is precedent for this; better systems may be developed in the future. A question about Section 2.7, and whether the system is used for day to day business? No, there are separate systems.

Phil L moved/Doug O seconded to move this to the full Council tomorrow. Carried unanimously.

Tim explained that the NICET certification date of July 1, 2017 is coming up soon; we have heard from many of the alarm companies who are concerned with the upcoming date as training is needed. The

BFP COMMITTEE NOTES

MARCH 9, 2017

proposal is to move the date out by a year to 2018; we have had significant testimony in favor of this, and no testimony against.

Margaret Spitznas of the Electronic Security Association of WA noted their organization is in support of changing the date; This is a life safety issue; a majority of their members would be in support of the extended compliance proposal, as they don't have enough certified staff at this time; it would create a backlog on fire inspections.

Motion to move to Council Rob G./Doug O.; motion carried unanimously.

Staff report: Tim explained the new cycle and the need to update the TAG membership; initially spend 2 to 4 meetings to review new provisions and existing state amendments and how those are affected by the 2018 codes; they would produce a report in early 2018 to publish/post, with a submittal period to propose modifications/state amendments in early 2018. The Council would review the proposals, and another round of TAG review would follow. This process will start in fall 2017 with the publication of the new codes.

Jim noted there is current proposed language on the cycle; it is with the House Local Government Committee. Tim noted the proposed language in the Legislature has a 6-year cycle, and legislative action will be required to act in order to implement them. Tim explained that the Council was originally an advisory body to the Legislature. As for the current proposal, it is unclear how relevant the Council would be under that bill, if it passed and if the Governor approved it. The bill is SB 5500; Doug O. notes it would likely change if it is carried forward by the Legislature.

Tim reported he will be providing a workshop at the WABO Education Institute, with 65-70 code officials having registered to attend.

No other business. Meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.