



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

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

SUMMARY MINUTES

LOCATION: Spokane Fire Department Training Center
1618 N. Rebecca
Spokane, Washington

MEETING DATE: September 9, 2016

Members in Attendance: Steve Simpson, Council Chair; Dave DeWitte, Vice Chair; Eric Vander Mey; Jim Tinner; Leanne Guier

Other Council Members Present: Andrew Klein, Duane Jonlin, Traci Harvey, Diane Glenn

Staff in Attendance: Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma, Joanne McCaughan

Visitors Present: Al Audette, Linda Kent, Lee Kranz, Jennifer Gilliland, Dave Kokot, Chris Edmark, David Hanson, Greg Colvig, Randy Scott, Lisa Rosenow, Jed Scheuermann, Randy Vissia, Misty Moore, James Moore, Dean Giles

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Committee/Council Chair Steve Simpson welcomed everyone and introductions were made. He thanked Dave Kokot, former Council Chair, for hosting the meeting. Tim reminded the Council members that only Executive Committee members could vote on items.
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved. Tim Nogler noted the meeting notes from the July 19 were previously approved.
3. Review and Approve Minutes	The minutes of the August 9 meeting were approved as written.
4. Public Comments on Council Bylaws <i>Public Comments</i>	Steve asked if there were any comments from the public on the Council Bylaws. None offered. Tim Nogler provided an overview of the Bylaws and the process to amend them. They are not an administrative rule and therefore do not need to go through the rulemaking process. They must be approved by a 2/3 majority vote. There is no public hearing required; but this process is intended to allow opportunity for people to provide comments. Comments will be taken through September 30. The last amendments to the Bylaws were in April 2012, and focused mainly on the TAG process. Tim noted there was written testimony from the Building Industry Association of

	<p>Washington. He encouraged all members to go through the comments on the website. It is posted as two separate documents—the cover letter and a redline version showing suggested changes. The letter lays out five main elements they feel should be addressed, including budget review and the role of the Legislative Committee.</p> <p>Tim said there would need to be a document put together with changes for the Council’s consideration. The Committee would need to go through comments to see what the Council would like to move forward with. In addition to the written comments from BIAW, the Committee has also received several verbal comments.</p>
<p>5. Code Adoption Timeline</p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p>	<p>Steve moved the Committee on to the discussion of the proposed code adoption timeline.</p> <p>Lee Kranz, WABO Technical Committee, stated he was available to answer any questions. WABO feels the proposal to add more time to the code development process would give the TAGs more time to do their work and improve the quality of the codes. The code would still be adopted every three years, but it would take what is now a 9-month process and turn it into a 26-month process. Elongating the process would allow for better review and an overall improvement in the process.</p> <p>Steve and Tim worked together to produce a chart of the timeline, as requested at the last meeting, laying out how the code adoption process would work. It mirrors the ICC process by breaking up the codes into two groups, so the Council isn’t looking at all of the new codes in the same year. Group 1 is IBC, IFC and the Commercial Energy Code. Group 2 is IRC, IMC, UPC and the Residential Energy Code. The timeline also reflects the earlier availability of the ICC code. The Group 1 TAGs would begin to meet as soon as the codes were available. The adoption would occur at the end of the second year, but wouldn’t be effective for another year and a half. In the meanwhile, the Group 2 review process will have started and would be complete by the end of the third year. It would still be a three-year cycle. Steve felt the extra time allowed for the Group 1 codes to sit before enforcement would allow for a better review and provide more opportunity for public review.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin said there should be some rules or methodology for making changes to the Group 1 codes while the Group 2 review was going on. Tim said there would need to be some sort of policy decision made. Eric Vander Mey felt there could be two different sets of criteria for proposals—for correlation issues and errors. Steve felt life/safety issues should also be considered. Duane felt a third category for new information should also be included. Tim felt the delay between the TAG reports of the new code review and the submittal deadline would go a long way towards addressing those issues. There was also an extra month between the hearings and the final decision, intended to be a worksession of the codes prior to their adoption. Eric suggested holding two meetings in October—one to develop any new language based on testimony received and one meeting to provide a review that language.</p> <p>Jim Tinner voiced support of the new process timeline; he felt it would provide more time for the training of jurisdictional staff.</p> <p><i>Motion</i> Jim Tinner moved to recommend approval of the process timeline. Leanne Guier seconded the motion. Eric Vander Mey suggested adding the Group 1/Group 2 codes to the chart. His suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment to the motion.</p> <p>Dave DeWitte asked if the recommendation included the implementation</p>

	<p>language. Steve said that would be addressed under the next agenda item.</p> <p>The motion carried.</p>
<p>6. WAC 51-04 Draft Language (Related to the Timeline)</p> <p><i>Public Comment</i></p> <p><i>Motion:</i></p>	<p>Tim reviewed the draft language provided. He noted it only addressed the process timeline. There is still a need to develop language for local amendments and reconsideration. The Committee has received testimony on those issues and those comments will be incorporated into a future draft for the Council's consideration.</p> <p>Lee Kranz asked if the process timeline addressed the issues around availability of the UPC. Jed Scheuermann, IAPMO, said that, with the UPC in the Group 2 codes, availability should not be an issue.</p> <p>Lee also asked if the code groupings were consistent with the ICC groups. Andrew Klein replied that they were not the same, but since the codes would already be published there should not be any issue.</p> <p>Dave Kokot said that the IEBC should also be included as part of the Group 1 codes. He also provided comment on the local amendment review process and the challenges it presents. While there is no statutory direction on review, the requirements are very restrictive and say the local amendment must be based on a unique characteristic. There is no reason to have that language. He recommends removing the reference to "unique." Dave also had some comments on the reconsideration issue, feeling other parties beside the proponent should be able to request reconsideration.</p> <p>Lisa Rosenow suggested the Council put together a group of experts, outside of the TAGs, to review the codes, looking for any correlation, editorial or technical issues.</p> <p>Jim Tinner, speaking to Dave Kokot's comments, noted the probably intent behind the local amendment language was to provide consistent code requirements across the state for homebuilders.</p> <p>Jim Tinner moved to forward the draft language to the Council for consideration. Leanne Guier seconded the motion. The motion carried.</p> <p>Dave DeWitte asked when the language for the other issues would be addressed. Tim said the intent was to focus on one element at a time. Steve suggested that another meeting be scheduled to work out that language.</p>
7. Staff Report	<p>Tim noted there would need to be another meeting of the Executive Committee to continue with the language development for both the Bylaws and WAC 51-04, before filing for a public hearing and moving forward on adoption. He reminded the Committee that the Bylaws, not being adopted as a WAC, did not need to go through the full hearing process, but did need to be approved by a 2/3 majority of the Council.</p> <p>Leanne asked if there was a deadline for making these changes. Tim replied there was no deadline.</p> <p>Dave asked when the Bylaws would be discussed again. Tim noted it was on the Council agenda and would be included on the October Council agenda as well.</p>
8. Other Business	None
9. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 a.m.