



# Washington State Building Code Council

*Improving the built environment by promoting health, safety and welfare*

1500 Jefferson Street SE • P.O. Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504  
(360) 407-9280 • fax (360) 586-5366 • e-mail [sbcc@ga.wa.gov](mailto:sbcc@ga.wa.gov) • [www.ga.wa.gov/sbcc](http://www.ga.wa.gov/sbcc)

## SUMMARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

**LOCATION:** DES Building, Presentation Room  
1500 Jefferson Street  
Olympia, WA 98501

**MEETING DATE:** March 10, 2017

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p><b><u>Members in Attendance:</u></b> Steve Simpson, Council Chair; Dave DeWitte, Vice Chair; Leanne Guier; Traci Harvey; Duane Jonlin; Andrew Klein; Phil Lemley; Doug Orth; Jim Tinner; Eric Vander Mey</p> <p><b><u>Members Absent:</u></b> Al French, Diane Glenn, Robert Graper</p> <p><b><u>Staff in Attendance:</u></b> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Joanne McCaughan; Dawn Cortez, AAG</p> <p><b><u>Visitors Present:</u></b> Lee Kranz, Jon Siu, Lisa Rosenow, Jed Scheuermann, Herschel Rostov, Kathleen Petrie, Bruce Verhee, Cathie Carlson, Steve Crawford, Thomas Knoll, Grace Yuan, Sue Coffman, William Parmer, Farrell Presnell, Karen Stewart, Michael Groesch, David Hanson, Suzanne Mayr, Jan Rohila, Deborah Williams</p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Council Chair Steve Simpson. Introductions were made.</p>
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The <a href="#">agenda</a> was approved as written.
3. Review and Approve Minutes	The minutes of <a href="#">January 6, 2017</a> , were approved as written.
4. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda	<p><b>Lee Kranz</b>, Washington Association of Building Officials technical code development committee chair, spoke to a letter he'd written the Council regarding the state amendment for balcony and deck live loads. Although this amendment did not pass for inclusion in the 2018 International Residential Code, he recommends that the Council retain the state amendment in order to be consistent with ASCE 7-10.</p> <p><b>Jon Siu</b>, City of Seattle, agreed, and noted that California has also adopted a 60 lb. live load requirement.</p> <p>Jim Tinner noted the ASCE standard applied to all multifamily except townhouses and he felt they should not be treated differently.</p> <p>Jon Siu said there are some minor reductions to the spans in the tables they prepared, using standard engineering design principles, but nothing significant. The number of bolts on the ledger connection also increased. Tim Nogler clarified that <a href="#">Interpretation No. 16-11</a> provided span tables for the state amendments.</p>

<p><i>Motion</i></p>	<p><b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to table discussion regarding the state amendment to Table R301.5 until the review of the 2018 IRC. <b>Andrew Klein</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried.</p>
<p>5. Seattle <a href="#">Solar Ready Ordinance</a></p> <p><i>Public Comment:</i></p> <p><i>Motion:</i></p>	<p>Steve Simpson introduced the issue, noting that the Council voted on this previously with a 7 to 5 vote. He believed that the issue would be concluded with a simple majority vote, rather than a Council majority. The Council has since concluded that the 8-member Council majority should apply to local amendments to the codes named in statute as well as state amendments and model code adoption, so the issue is now being re-voted.</p> <p>Kathleen Petrie, City of Seattle, summarized the ordinance that modifies Appendix U as adopted by the Council in 2015. Seattle has two unique aspects to consider when adopting codes. The first is Seattle's Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy use, and residential construction is a key component in the plan. The other part is the Construction Codes Advisory Board. The Seattle code must be approved through the CCAB. The CCAB felt these were necessary changes to Appendix U before the city can adopt it.</p> <p>The Council discussed the ordinance, the cost impacts of the changes, the structural requirements, and whether a self-imposed requirement presented a "unique" condition.</p> <p>Greg Gilda, chair of the CCAB, asked the Council to support their process and approve the local amendment.</p> <p><b>Duane Jonlin</b> moved to approve the local amendment. <b>Leanne Guier</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried, with 9 affirmative votes and one abstention.</p>
<p>6. Committee Reports</p> <p><i>Executive Committee</i></p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p>	<p>Tim Nogler reported on the Executive Committee meeting held on February 24. He noted there was currently a vacancy in the secretary position, and Joanne McCaughan will be retiring next month, so there will also be a vacant Codes Specialist position. Regarding his pending retirement, he and DES Human Resources are recommending a double-fill for the manager position, to allow him to stay on staff for a short time and assist the new manager. He is also working on funding availability for staffing through the budget process. Tim outlined five methods for moving forward with the hiring process. 1) Wait and see what happens at the Legislature; 2) Direct DES to hire staff; 3) Develop a memorandum of understanding with DES to determine the roles each agency will play; 4) Work more informally with DES on a coordinated hiring process; and 5) Create an Ad Hoc Committee for the hiring process, which could include DES personnel. Tim also spoke with the director of DES this morning, who felt there was a good basis for cooperation and was not concerned with who ultimately makes the hiring decision.</p> <p>The Council discussed the benefits of a MOU and the timeline for hiring staff, as well as the funding for staff, and the advisability of waiting to hire for the other vacancies after the managing director. Tim noted the usual timeline for hiring is between 30 to 60 days, but for the managing director it could go up to 90 days depending on the candidates. When asked how long the double-fill would last, Steve indicated it was anticipated to be about two months.</p> <p><b>Farrell Presnell</b>, Assistant Director of Contracts, Procurement and Risk Management where the Council is housed within DES, felt the hiring could be done cooperatively and should focus on finding the right candidate for the position.</p>

<p><i>Motion(s)</i></p>	<p><b>Lee Kranz</b>, WABO, said the Council should look for candidates who would work with stakeholders for consensus.</p> <p>Bruce Verhee felt that, from a training perspective, rather than double filling the manager position, Tim's time would be better spent writing a desk manual or history so his experience would benefit more than just the immediate hire.</p> <p><b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to have the Executive Committee meet with DES at the earliest opportunity to draft a memorandum of understanding for the hiring process, to be then approved by the Council. <b>Duane Jonlin</b> seconded the motion. The <b>motion carried</b>, 9 to 1.</p> <p><b>Dave DeWitte</b> moved to have the managing director move forward with hiring a Codes Specialist. <b>Duane Jonlin</b> seconded the motion. <b>Doug Orth</b> suggested a <b>friendly amendment</b>, which was accepted, to have Tim report back to the Council with budget information and recommendations on how to move forward with the hiring. <b>Motion carried</b>, 6 to 4.</p>
<p><i>MVE Committee</i></p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p>	<p>Eric Vander Mey, Chair of the MVE Committee, reported the Committee met yesterday and looked at a number of interpretation requests. He noted they came to consensus on the answers and if anyone had specific questions, he could address them.</p> <p>Lisa Rosenow, Northwest Energy Efficiency Council, said she supported the MVE Committee interpretations with two exceptions. The first is in regards to building additions, on whether the provision applies to existing buildings and how it affects additions. They would like further clarification and some comments on thresholds. The other is in regards to whether it applies to low energy spaces, where there is limited opportunity for savings. She noted these questions came in from the public during their training efforts.</p> <p>Eric said the Committee also discussed the DOE determination report for equivalency with ASHRAE 90.1-2013. The Committee felt the 2015 code had met the determination.</p> <p>The legislative report still needs to be completed. It lacks the necessary study of the incremental change over the 2012 edition. The funding for that study is still undetermined. Tim noted it will be important to know what the goal is for the 2018 energy code, with the commercial code development beginning this fall. There was no recommendation from the Committee on how to move forward. There was also no recommendation from the Council.</p>
<p><i>BFP Committee</i></p>	<p>Jim Tinner, Chair of the BFP Committee, reported they had two interpretation requests. The first was in regards to 5-story wood framed buildings, allowable occupancies and type of construction. The other dealt with storage of carbon dioxide.</p> <p>Traci Harvey, Chair of the Fire Code Technical Advisory Group, reported on their work on the language regarding emergency voice alarms. The discussion was based on the language developed last year for Section 907.2.3 and <a href="#">revisions suggested</a> by the Puget Sound School Coalition. She noted there were a couple of items, 2.7 and 2.9, where NEMA asked for alternate wording. Rather than using "compliant with", Traci is suggesting "in accordance with" which is more consistent with model code language.</p> <p>Tim said the intent is to have the Council begin the filing process for adopting the permanent rule. There is currently an emergency rule that has been in place since the proviso. The intent is to have the new language take effect when that rule expires in June.</p>

<p><i>Public Comment</i></p> <p><i>Motion</i></p>	<p><b>Steve Crawford</b>, Issaquah School District and PSSC, agreed with the proposed change. “In accordance with” means you meet the intent. They’re looking to provide a safe environment and often deal with incidents other than fire that need two-way communication systems rather than the standard one-way fire notification.</p> <p><b>Cathie Carlson</b>, Bethel School District, also supported the change, saying they want to be consistent with the underlying code.</p> <p><b>Grace Yuan</b>, PSSC, thanked the Council for working with them on the issue and asked they move forward on the proposal.</p> <p><b>Traci Harvey</b> moved to go forward with permanent rulemaking with the modified language including the change to “in accordance with.” <b>Duane Jonlin</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>The Council took a 30-minute lunch break at noon.</p>
	<p>Tim announced that this would be Joanne McCaughan’s last Council meeting. She will be retiring at the end of April. Steve Simpson congratulated Joanne on her retirement and thanked her for all of her work over the years. Joanne also thanked the Council for the opportunity and commended them for all the work they do.</p>
<p>7. Emergency Rule Request <i>NICET Effective Date</i></p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p> <p><i>Motion</i></p>	<p>Traci Harvey spoke to the amendment adopted with the 2015 code requiring NICET certification for fire alarm contractors. The initial rule included a one-year delay in the effective date, to July 1, 2017. Since that time, the Council has heard from industry representatives that there will be shortage of personnel meeting this requirement. She proposes extending the date an additional year, to July 1, 2018. Jim Tinner also noted there is a requirement for two years of experience before you can apply for certification, so the delay will allow for personnel to meet the requirements.</p> <p>None provided; however, there is substantial testimony <a href="#">posted on the website</a>.</p> <p><b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to file an emergency rule to extend the effective date for NICET certification, and to begin the process for permanent rulemaking. <b>Andrew Klein</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried with no opposing votes.</p>
<p>8. Local Ordinance <i>Mercer Island</i></p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p>	<p>Tim introduced <a href="#">the request</a>, stating the jurisdiction had previously adopted a sprinkler ordinance with the 2003 code, along with a coalition of other eastside jurisdictions. The ordinance applied to IRC buildings over 5000 square feet. The new request amends the previous ordinance, removing the area threshold and extending the requirement to remodels as well. They’re also adding provisions for fire alarms in certain residential occupancies.</p> <p>Herschel Rostov, Mercer Island Fire Marshal, noted their City Council is supportive of fire sprinklers in alterations as well as alarms in those homes considered less than substantially renovated. He cited the predominance of large homes structured more like commercial properties than traditional homes, along with steep slopes, narrow roads and driveways and other geographical difficulties as the unique criteria the city must deal with. There is also limited water supply for fire flow. He felt the requirement represents a small amount of money given the large renovation budgets for these homes.</p> <p>The Council spent some time discussing the proposed ordinance and questioning Mr. Rostov.</p> <p>None provided.</p>

	<i>Motion</i>	<b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to approve the local ordinance. <b>Eric Vander Mey</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
9. Council Bylaws		<p>Tim Nogler introduced the comments that had been submitted over the last year on the <a href="#">Council Bylaws</a>. Two of the 19 items were acted on at the January meeting. He noted that the two-thirds vote of the Council necessary for adoption of changes to the Bylaws would require a unanimous vote of the members present today.</p> <p>Steve asked that the Council begin with item 19, which he felt was the most critical. It deals with majority voting requirements on code items and would clarify which items need a majority vote of the Council. Doug Orth felt there was still some ambiguity in the language.</p> <p>After discussion, the Council felt this change should be supported.</p>
	<i>Public Comment</i>	None offered. Steve asked if there was any comment on any item other than 19. There was no comment offered.
	<i>Motion</i>	<p><b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to approve the change as noted in Item 19 of the Bylaws summary. <b>Doug Orth</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>The Council discussed whether to move forward and vote item by item or choose those that have the most importance. They began working through the document but took no action until Item 6, dealing with office term limits. There was much discussion on the relative merits of term limits and the need to clarify the language as to whether the limits applied to only one office or both. There was a motion by Andrew Klein to not make any changes, which was subsequently withdrawn as the need for clarification was made apparent.</p>
	<i>Motion</i>	<p><b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to change the language to read “The Council Chair or Vice-Chair may not serve more than two consecutive one-year terms of office.” <b>Doug Orth</b> seconded the motion. The <b>motion failed</b> to achieve a two-thirds majority vote.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin moved to not make any changes to this section. Dave DeWitte seconded the motion. The motion was subsequently withdrawn after discussion.</p> <p><b>Duane</b> moved to call for a limit of not more than 3 one-year terms of office. <b>Andrew Klein</b> seconded the motion, but asked for a friendly amendment to specify three consecutive terms total in either position. <b>Eric Vander Mey</b> suggested that friendly amendment be further clarified by using two separate sentences, each addressing one of the offices. The friendly amendment from Eric was accepted. A third friendly amendment was requested and accepted to change it to two years for each office. The final amended language reads “The Council Chair may not serve more than two consecutive one-year terms of office as chair. The Council Vice-Chair may not serve more than two consecutive one-year terms of office as vice-chair.” The <b>motion carried</b> unanimously.</p> <p>The remainder of the Bylaws was tabled until the next Council Meeting.</p>
10. Executive Session		The Council announced they would be going into executive session for seven minutes to discuss personnel matters. The executive session was then extended an additional five minutes.
11. Staff Report		Tim Nogler reported on the issue of providing Council members with agency email boxes. The agency quoted a price of about \$5 per member per month. Council members would need to sign into the Outlook web application to access their emails. Steve asked that the topic be added to the May agenda for Council discussion.

	Tim notified the Council he has been contacted by legislative members with concerns over the requirements for licensed care/residential treatment facilities.
12. Other Business	None.
13. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

DRAFT