



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

BUILDING, FIRE AND PLUMBING COMMITTEE MEETING

LOCATION: CenterPlace Regional Event Center
2426 N. Discovery Place
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

MEETING DATE: September 13, 2018

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Committee Chair Steve Simpson. <u>Members in Attendance:</u> Steve Simpson, Chair; Andrew Klein, Vice Chair; Diane Glenn; Traci Harvey; Doug Orth; <u>Committee Members Absent:</u> Rep. Vincent Buys, Jim Tinner <u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Richard Brown, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma, Ray Shipman, Lori Yantzer <u>Visitors Present:</u> Bob Plumb, Linda Newcomb, Todd Beyreuther, Scott Peterson, Dennis Richardson, Jed Scheuermann, John Williams, Alan Spaulding, Micah Chappell, Terry Beals, David Nehren, Joe Mayo, Kim Barker, Ryan Smith
2. Review & Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved as written.
3 Review and Approve June 7, 2018 Minutes	The minutes were approved as written.
4. TAG Reports Unfinished TAG Business <i>Motion:</i> IBC/IEBC TAG Report IFC TAG Report <i>Motion:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IEBC 706.4, 806.5: Recommended for approval by the SBCC as modified. ○ IBC 420.2: Tabled. The wrong document was posted on the SBCC web site. ○ IBC 504.4.1, 909.6.3: Recommended for approval by the SBCC as modified. ○ IBC 902.1.1, 913.2.1: Recommended the SBCC review without a recommendation from the BFP Committee. <p>Move the above, as noted, forward to the SBCC. The motion carried.</p> <p>The following received public testimony. B01-2018, B02-2018, B04-2018, B05-2018, B10-2018, B14-2018, B37-2018, BF01-2018, BF02-2018 and BF03-2018.</p> <p>The <i>Group 1 Code Change Proposals – 2018 IBC/IEBC Proposals</i> documents were considered.</p> <p>The following received public testimony: F15-2018.</p> <p>The <i>Group 1 Code Change Proposals – 2018 IFC TAG</i> document was considered.</p> <p>Except as noted above, the <i>Group 1 Code Change Proposals – 2018 IBC/IEBC Proposals</i> and <i>Group 1 Code Change Proposals – 2018 IFC TAG</i> were recommended to move forward for consideration by the SBCC as noted. Those items</p>

Testimony
B01-2018 IEBC 706.4, 806.5

that received public testimony were recommended to move forward for SBCC consideration. The motion carried.

John Williams -Thank you for the opportunity to address this. This is essentially a proposal that relates to seismic concerns and our I-2 condition 2 hospitals across the state.

For many years, we've been aware that when it comes to the [inaudible] hospitals across the state. We've got some challenges when it comes to existing buildings. We've always been of the position that when it comes to adopting new versions of the building codes and chapter 16 and associated references are the best way for us to be prepared, and keep new buildings in the state of readiness. Existing buildings and structures are a challenge. This is an attempt to go into the existing building code. In Chapter 8 where we are talking about level 2 alterations. Insert a requirement that would require hospitals, which are undergoing Level 2 alterations to have a seismic assessment of those critical infrastructure systems that might be uncovered when you are doing that renovation. So if you're going into an area, and you're ripping out some stuff and you're taking down the ceiling, you expose some of those critical infrastructure things like medical gas, central electrical etcetera. We would like to require facilities to come in, do the assessment and report that back to the facility and back to the Department of Health. The goal here is not a retroactive requirement to fix any issues, but to give the owners the best understanding and awareness that we can.

To help them understand how well prepared they are for a seismic event and give them the opportunity to consider this when they're thinking about capital cycles and where they may want to plan in accordance with upgrades in the future. That is essentially it, the original proposal, we tried to do something with level 1, but we got some feedback that might be a little aggressive, so we backed off and headed for more intensive renovations with level 2 and above renovations which is where this requirement kicks in. With that I am here to answer questions.

Steve Simpson- I just have one question. Who is going to do the evaluations of these facilities? It does not state in this. Is the building doing that on their or is a structural guy coming out to do it? I guess what is the mechanism?

John Williams- My intent with this and it may not be clear: These systems are evaluated and that is funded thru the building owner as part of that project. It would be a component of the project, and we didn't specify any credential or type of requirement for the evaluator itself. The owner bears that cost and it's done by a third party professional.

Steve Simpson- Ok perfect, that's what I needed to hear, thank you.

Doug Orth- You mentioned specifically this applies to hospitals. I'm reading this proposal and I'm not picking up how it's being focused on Hospitals.

John Williams – In the [inaudible] it said, in group I2 provision 2, oh and it should include psychiatric hospitals as well. Condition 2 is that subset of [inaudible] It doesn't include nursing homes, and but includes more intensive facilities like hospitals and psychiatric hospitals.

Doug Orth- Are we fixing something that's broken?

John Williams- We believe it is. We believe that existing hospitals, we've got existing building stock that ranges up to 50 or 60 years plus. Hospitals are built for a long term, they tend to stay around. The structures on campuses can persist over a long period of time. Facilities {inaudible} of what their actual physical plan is, and it's not always where we think it should be.

Doug Orth- Lastly, has this been through any other public review process or is this it?

Steve Simpson- John, let me answer that. It was supposed to go to the building Tag, and they did not have time to deal with that, is that correct?

Richard- No, it actually did go thru the building Tag, and the Building Tag and requested that they drop [pause] John, what was it they requested was that you drop out of this?

John- There were two specific requirements. The initial one, was we initially applied this to level 1 alterations, and I tend to agree that was probably a little aggressive. A level 1 operation is a much more simplistic level of work, so we dropped that. The other comment that was made was, there was some question about what regulatory agency would be provided with a copy of the report, and what were they supposed to do with that? For our purposes, we think that the Department of Health awareness on this is important as well. We tried to create an inventory and understand what our existing infrastructure is like in critical facility. Instead of giving this to the local building official and putting the onus on that person to collect the data and try to figure out what to do with it. We instead just replaced that with the Department of Health. Basically, my office would be collecting that information. And there could have been other ones.

Richard, but those are the ones we responded to.

Doug Orth- Well help me understand the process then, if this report goes to The Department of Health instead of the AHJ, how are retrofits implemented and enforced?

John Williams- In this particular proposal there is no requirement to retro fit. This is basically a requirement to inspect those existing buildings and provide a report that says, these infrastructures systems have a high likelihood of surviving an event or they don't. The only requirements that are in here that deals with retrofit arguably exist within the Code already. That would be to say the modified or altered components shall be provided with seismic bracing. We believe that already exists within the code, we are just providing a signpost to remind designers and facilities not to forget about it. We do sometimes get questions about it.

Doug Orth- Therein lies the retrofit. This modification requires; new or modified components, shall be provided with seismic bracing or required by the IBC. So they send this report to the Department of Health and if the AHJ doesn't know that it's not in compliance, with IBC whose going to tell them?

John-Williams- This report would only be created, if an existing project already exists. The first thing that has to happen, is a level 2 alteration has to be performed. I believe that level 2...they're probably already going to go in to get a permit for that work and they are going to be coming to the Department of Health to get approval to do that work, so we think in the context there's always going to be a permit process with the local AHJ's, they're going to be working...If there's a report that says some particular component of the system is delivered to the Department of Health then we, as a normal course of action coordinate with the local AHJ, and provide them with copies of our plan reviews and responses. So if we notice anything that isn't coordinated with or isn't picked up, then that would be the opportunity for us to reach out to the reviewer or building official and make that catch.

Steve Simpson- John, I just want to make sure we clarify it for all of us in the room. So this is just essentially...At the Department of Health, this Section would require that any person making modifications to a level 2 facility, to have either...the building is going to fall over if it shakes, or The buildings not going to fall over. You're going to have that document at the Department of Health, and that's all this does. Correct?

John Williams- There's two parts, the very first part that says "If you're engaging in a renovation and you're modifying something, that modified component has to be brought up to current bracing requirements with the IBC. So that's going to be part of that alteration that's permanent. The report that's going to be provided,

is going to be for the things that are exposed, and those are things that might not be worked on. If you're doing a level 2 alteration to move some walls around and you drop the ceilings out and at that point you can see all of the medical gas piping and the central, electrical, duct work, we know you're moving walls so we know that those have to be appropriately braced. Since you've got the ceiling open, we want the ability to take a look at those critical infrastructures systems, and that's the piece that they report on. And that's the piece that they provide back to us and have in the past, and we keep that.

Doug Orth- it sound to me like you're expanding the seismic upgrade requirements from current Code. Specifically where it says "if you pull those ceiling's down and you pull all the mechanical out, and you see what's up there new or modified components shall be provided with seismic bracing as required by the IBC. Is that not already in the code? Or are we adding something to the Code?

John Williams- That's the piece that we believe is already in the Code.

Doug Orth-Then why do we need it?

John Williams- That's the piece that's just a clear signpost for folks who are doing These types of renovation.

Richard- John, this is Richard, and I am going to try to channel the conversation that we had at the Tag, and I did you and the group here a disservice by saying these were all issues that were reviewed by the Tag at the last meeting that the proponent was asked to come back. So these have all been heard by the Tag. We're really only addressing the question that the Tag asked them to address or to modify. Having said that, what this was what sold me on this is something that hadn't been done in 10 years. Most of these institutions already have reports on their internal infrastructures systems. So they don't need to do anything, they're already done. It's already on file What this does is basically good practice. If you've got something opened up, I'm sorry this is a bad analogy, but if when you're going in, and you're looking at your MRI, and they're looking at your back and they notice that you've got Some tumors [inaudible] they're just saying...Look around when you're in that hole and write a report, if you don't have a report in the last ten years. A lot of the systems have just been exposed with this action. Really it's just a reporting issue.

Doug Orth- I completely agree with that. If that's the objective, I would take Out the sentence on line 2, after the alterations, scratch out, beginning with the word new, all the way to the end of that sentence.

Richard Brown- John you okay with that?

Doug Orth- Because if it's already in the Code, it seems to me you're introducing confusion by covering the same issue twice.

John-Williams- I'm totally agreeable to taking out the technical provisions. I think that kind of leaves us with a sentence fragment, so if I could expand just a little bit and say, if we can change the first sentence to read, "In group I2 condition 2 hospitals, for critical mechanical, electrical, plumbing or communications systems are exposed at I level 2 alteration, then to leave the rest of that sentence, then say the exposed critical system shall be evaluated. That would pick up the recording piece.

Steve Simpson-So we will open it up to public comment here in Spokane. Hearing none, and on the phone to come up with what to do with this particular...

Doug Orth-I move that we forward this on with recommendation to the Council, with modifications that we just discussed.

Steve Simpson- Do I have a second?

[Inaudible]

Steve Simpson- Ok we have a motion and a second. The motion is clearly that we forward this on to the full group, and we're going to have the modified language printed out tomorrow so we can see exactly what it's going to say.

Richard Brown- True but I think that's a level of detail that the Council will not be able to get to tomorrow.

Steve Simpson- Ok, so we are in agreement that rewording this section as discussed here in this meeting is going to be ok. Council Members on the phone, I am going to open this up for discussion. Is there any discussion from either Dianne, or Andrew?

Dianne - I'm good with it.

Steve Simpson- Hearing no discussion, all those is favor signify by saying Aye...

Are there any opposed? Are there any abstentions? Motion carries. Ok, first one down.

B10-2018 IBC 420.2

Richard Brown- John, please send me that revised text, just email it to me.

John Williams- Will do.

Allen Spaulding- We provided a minority report on this, I'm not sure if that was made available to the BFP committee members, but we just wanted to take the opportunity [inaudible]. Some might remember about a year ago, there were some concerns by a few in the design community regarding fire barriers that separate dwelling or sleeping units. It ultimately resulted in legislative inquiries and a request to the State Building Code Council and ended up having a special Tag. We were really asked to, both the State Building Code Council and the Department of Health, to really work this issue. This was an attempt by us to respond to that legislative inquiry. We had multiple discussions about this. We actually believed that what we wrote in our proposed amendment for 420.2 was really just a clarification of what the code already allows with some exceptions, and perhaps maybe one new component that we tried to address. As a [inaudible], I'm not sure you folks have that up [on the screen]. Oh yes, you do have that. Oh, this looks like older one. We were asked by the Tag to come up with a definition for a care suite, which we did. Scroll down so we can see what the proposed language is. We have a newer version that we had a provided last time we met on August 29 as a result of the Tags recommendation. I don't think this is a current copy. Do you agree John?

John Williams- Yes, I think we had a definition there that we changed dwelling units to dwellings.

Steve Simpson- John, we actually have the definitions, on page 4 of this proposal. I think that's what you're looking for.

Allen Spaulding- Anyway, just to let you folks know that we are continuing to try to work at resolving any confusion there might be in regards to what we believe is currently allowed in the building code. As well as perhaps suggest a new provision that we believe has already been outlined as being acceptable for [inaudible] We think that there is precedent already in the [inaudible]. Anyhow, not sure if this is the current version or not, but I can make sure you folks get one. I have a copy of what we submitted at the August 29th Tag meeting. I'll get that sent over to either Ray or Richard here ASAP. We were just continuing to address and respond to the legislative inquiry and want the council to know that we continue to be supportive of trying to address that issue. What else would you like to add to that Mr. Williams?

John Williams- The reason we brought this up, is we wanted to remind folks, that this was a request of the Building Code Council,

we wanted to respect that request and remind people that this request may come up again, and we need to give it the due diligence and involvement that it needed and bring our recommendation back to the council. This was our assessment of the problem and we felt it was an honest attempt in clarifying it. We don't believe that the code is broken, but we think that the code might be a little unclear. There does not seem to be a lot of confusion out there but there is some, and we want to be respectful of that, we believe it is kind of incumbent on us to be as clear as we can and prevent surprise to facilities. A couple of facilities were honestly surprised. When you get a surprise during design or permitting, it causes cost and creates delays, and we do not want that to happen.

Steve Simpson- Thank you John, so I am going to open it for discussion with Council in the room. Discussion?

Doug Orth- What are the ramifications of this change of designation from a dwelling unit to a sleeping unit? How does that play out?

Alan Spaulding- We're not actually proposing that we change the designation from sleeping unit to dwelling unit. Really, what we are trying to do is clarify one of the pieces of confusion. I think if you look at the existing definitions of dwelling unit. Some people can read it to say that, a hotel like the Holiday Inn, a hotel that has a lot of sleeping rooms inside of it, with a centralized cooking kitchen, can be called a dwelling unit. That's not a common interpretation, but that was the interpretation that we heard so we just wanted to clarify that. The exceptions are essentially outlining some of the options for folks that have groups of people who are sleeping together. Whether it's in a shelter like scenario where you have several people sleeping in the same room, or another scenario would be like if you had a suite of rooms like you might see in a dorm room is the example that comes to my mind which may not be the best one. Where you have several bedrooms surrounding a centralized living area. We wanted to provide some clarification and help people find a reasonable level of safety but not getting to the point where we are in some congregate living room scenarios providing fire petitions between every single bedroom in a suite of rooms.

Richard Brown- Al, this is Richard, let me just take another stab at it. This proposed amendment will reduce the cost of construction, operation and maintenance. Currently the rule requires fire partitions, This proposed exception offers a less expensive alternative.

Doug Orth - Richard, what was the issue that came up in the earlier committee meeting that affected mechanical? We discussed this briefly. We made a ruling on a Code interpretation earlier today, that

it was going to be changed if this went into effect. I can't remember what it was.

Alan Spaulding- Ok that looks like the current version, Thank you Krista.

Steve Simpson- Ok, so I am looking at my fellow group here trying to figure out what we are going to do with this particular item. I'll open It up to discussion. Is there any public comment in the room?

Micah Chappelle- We did have some comments on this, I was on the building code Tag. Some of the questions we had obviously the last sentence in 420.2, "A building containing multiple sleeping units and a centralized kitchen shall not be classified as dwelling units" We didn't understand where they got that information, it's already in the definition of the dwelling units, and the sleeping units. They are very specific already. We did not feel that sentence was needed. The other point that I think we made (I can't read that, I think it's the current one). We recommended they remove groups R2 because that would mean non- transient hotels and motels would not have fire separation walls between them (is what this says). It says, "Residential sleeping suites containing a maximum of 5 sleeping residents" So any non-transient hotel room that's got a kitchenette for week long stays, that has two queen beds with essentially 4 occupants, they're not going to have any separation walls. Maybe on the new modified one...

Richard Brown- This is the new modified one.

Alan Spaulding- Maybe we were closer to ok with this, so those were some of the concerns, the last sentence in 420.2 and exception number one. We just felt like some of this was redundant or not needed.

Steve Simpson- So since the committee here doesn't have the correct information, I think I'd urge this group to either forward this onto tomorrow's meeting if we have time to deal with it then, under other business or however you want to deal with it. Under the building fire plumbing meeting, we could bring this up again. But without having the current [inaudible].

Richard Brown- This is the current information.

Steve Simpson- But that's not the information we looked at. Without taking a ton of time here, I'd like to know what the Committee wants to do with this one.

[Inaudible] It was definitely a big discussion here. It seems like early on there was some similar proposals for a fix. Obviously nothing as

far as The Building Code Tag, I am not sure if the history they got is here. So not having looked at this version.

Doug Orth- I'm remember in the last cycle it was in the adult family home section, they were having to do extensive fire separation walls in the sleeping areas so this is an attempt to fix that isn't it? I am not confident enough that I have my brain wrapped around this well enough to make a decision on this.

Richard Brown- We're actually going to have to kick this to the council meeting, because this hasn't been posted, well the wrong thing has been posted.

Steve Simpson- At this time as the Chair of the Council, I need to have one of my fellow constituents make a motion that we table this until another council meeting.

[Inaudible] I make a motion to table this until another council meeting.

Doug Orth- I second it.

Steve Simpson- Any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying Aye....Are there any opposed? Are there any abstentions? They ayes have it, motion carries.

*B14-2018 IBC 504.4.1,
909.6.3*

Richard Brown- Dave Kokot is the proponent. Again, this is one that the Tag has asked for a resubmittal.

Jim Tinner- The IBC was amended some time ago to allow a fifth story of wood frame construction on R1 and R2 occupancies. The provisions included a requirement to pressurize the stair towers to keep smoke out. And then I believe it was the 2015 to clarify that the Code was changed to say that stairway pressurization had to comply with section 909, and 909 is smoke controlled systems. So it's being interpreted so that these systems have to be full blown smoke controlled systems, and that was never the intent. It's adding a lot of extra costs and a lot of extra confusion. Dave Kokot, suggested that we rewrite this in, to clarify that it is not intended as a smoke controlled system, but merely to keep smoke out of these stair towers of these 5 story buildings. Dave couldn't make it today, but he will be at the meeting tomorrow.

Steve Simpson- So that is the background, I am going to open it up for public comment on the telephone, or WebEx. Not hearing anything, I am going to open it up for public comment in the room. I am not seeing any comments, so Doug, you have the floor.

Doug Orth, I have a question Jim, I'm reading section 909.6.3, and the added language. Are you satisfied that this gets us to where it

needs to be and it restricts to just stairways or elevators and not to the overall building smoke control?

Jim Tinner- I am reasonably sure that it gets us there Doug. A full blown smoke control adds tens of thousands of dollars of unnecessary costs that was not intended.

Doug Orth-[To have] the consultant write the plan is twenty five thousand. I wouldn't know that except I just paid for it on two buildings. I had to [inaudible] the plan before they would give [inaudible] it wasn't a deferred submittal.

Jim Tinner- I agree, it's a huge unnecessary expense.

Steve Simpson- Barring no discussion on this issue, what's this Committee's pleasure?

Doug Orth- I make a motion that we forward this to Council with recommendation to approve.

Jim Tinner- Second.

Steve Simpson- I have a motion and two seconds. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor say Aye. Are there any opposed? Are there any abstentions? The ayes have it, motion carries.

*BF03-2018 IBC 902.1.1,
913.2.1*

Richard Brown – The last one is IBC section 902.1. 1 and 913.2.1 access and protection to fire pump rooms, Eric VanderMey will be waxing poetic.

Steve Simpson- I believe he's in the room. Would you like to take us through this Eric as a proponent? Do you need a copy of it Eric? I have it right here.

Eric VanderMey- I do not know where this one actually ended up. I missed the last meeting.

Richard Brown- When this went before the Tag, there was a great deal of discussion and as it turns out, Bellevue has already wrote an amendment addressing this specific issue. The Tag actually approved the Bellevue language but had not actually seen it. The Tag could not move it forward [because this was discussed at the final TAG meeting], we had to move it to this group. But this is exactly the language the Tag requested be moved forward.

Eric VanderMey- Yes, so this intended to provide a reference to the NFPA section, we went thru multiple revisions how exactly we

wanted this worded. We ended up landing on the Bellevue language. So this is essentially trying to provide better clarification for the Code for fire pump rooms and how they need to be accessed as required by NFPA 20 which is already referenced by the building Code. Then it kind of clarifies the NFCA language which doesn't match exactly with the building Code language. Mostly editorial it just took multiple revisions, so we could agree on where to put this in the code and how to state it.

Steve Simpson- So it would be useable.

Eric VanderMey – Correct

Richard Brown- I'd like to push back just slightly. This is more than editorial; it is conflicting goals of the Building Code. One is the sanctity of the fire egress stairway that nothing can enter it once you are in it, that there is no other way that nothing else can happen. That versus the need for the Fire Department Staff to get to the pump room. Mostly this is dealing with high rise building issues. How do you access that pump? For technical reasons, it needs to be located [where it is] not accessible from an outside door.

Eric VanderMey- So this provides additional clarification to follow the Intent of NFPA 20 and to clarify exactly what is an acceptable pathway to the Fire pump room ...[inaudible] it can't be immediately adjacent to the exterior.

Steve Simpson- Ok, so thank you. Questions?

Doug Orth- In the explanatory paragraph, paragraph 5, you clarified this passageway, is not synonymous with an exit passageway and therefore not subject to significant [inaudible] of allowable penetrations. Does that clarification need to be in the actual code? I can see a year or two or three down the road, somebody's going to be reading that and applying exit passageways descriptions to it.

Eric VanderMey- So yeah, Bellevue has specifically structured that second sentence to say the enclosed passageway and not to say the enclosed exit passageway. That is very intentional how Bellevue crafted that sentence.

Steve Simpson- Make sure we don't have to follow more stringent guidelines.

Eric VanderMey- Right because an exit passageway is clearly defined by Chapter 10 and it's essentially an extension of the stairwell.

Doug Orth- So, what I'm getting at, is a year or two from now, somebody comes along and [inaudible] says, "Oh, this is a passageway so it has to follow these exit passageway rules.

Eric VanderMey- What I will also tell you is, the city of Bellevue's amendments also have an informative note paragraph directly below this that has multiple sentences. We do not do informative notes at the state level. So again, this was our best attempt at clarifying that this is a requirement as referenced by NFCA 20 that requires something in the building Code as to and providing some general language as how to connect these [inaudible].

Doug Orth- If this comes back for interpretation. I will be retired by then. (laughter)

Traci- I agree, I think back on [inaudible]. The tail end of this, the confusion we used to have between corridors, and hallways and passageways, and then they standardized all this stuff. Are we kind of getting back to where you could have that same confusion unless you put [inaudible].

Doug Orth- Could you use a different word than passageway? Maybe access way? Do you think that term [inaudible].

Steve Simpson – Then you have to put a definition in there.

Eric VanderMey - Yes, the Tag went round and round on this, and they decided to default to the Bellevue language.

Traci- But if they have to have an explanatory note. We all know from general knowledge, that if your code has to have a note to tell you how to use it, you probably should check that code section

Eric VanderMey- Yes, when you read the NFPA section it doesn't help.

Steve Simpson- Ok, so Richard, do you have something to add?

Richard Brown- Yes. During the tag discussion, it really was, and it is certainly up to you people to decide whether or not you want to include an explanation. Because of using the specific terms that they use the connection between the sacred exit and the pump room, there is a vestibule and the terms are right. So we do not need an explanation note, it does not help that. You can still run pipes, you can still run some things through this connection corridor that you cannot run through in the stairwell. I know that Lee was the one talking about this, and he said, "Just pull the explanation out". But I can guarantee we will be here again with an interpretation request to put this in. But then, that's more in keeping with how the Council

has been dealing with codes, and dealing with interpretations. This is the first time to my knowledge, and Krista can correct me, that we've done the interpretation in the code language.

Doug Orth- That's not in the Code language is it?

Richard Brown- No, but we actually put the interpretation in the Code language.

Doug Orth- But that interpretation will not end up in the Code language will It?

Steve Simpson- It would as a Washington State amendment. Ok, so we have had a chance to discuss, how about the folks in the audience? Folks on the phone?

Jim Tinner- I am philosophically opposed to this because the exit passageways and interior exit stairways are supposed to have zero openings other than those required for exiting. I am a little ok with it based on the vestibule language, but the vestibule doesn't talk about having its own fire resistivity or amount of smoke that can escape it into the stairway. So I would say I would be ok with approving this, provided we require that vestibule to be fire resistant to some extent with the minimum amount of smoke leakage.

Steve Simpson- Ok, so the group has a decision to make and because I am the chair I don't have any say in this, so I am going to entertain a motion.

Jim Tinner- I move that we approve this language with added language that the vestibule has to be the equivalent fire resistivity above the interior exit, stairway or exit passageway, and that smoke leakage be equivalent to that allowed, out of a fire resistant corridor.

Traci- Second.

Steve Simpson- I have a motion and a second, and I'm not going to repeat what Jim said. So he said some stuff about the vestibule, and had to be the same characteristics of what's in the exit access corridor. So I'm paraphrasing, hopefully that's ok. I'm going to open it up for discussion with the Council.

Doug Orth- So Jim, I think that my question is, with the language you just added, does that allow for mechanical or electrical conduits to pass through this space?

Jim Tinner- No they are not supposed to.

Doug Orth- That's what I thought.

Jim Tinner- Only those items that serve the interior exit stairway or the exit passageway.

Doug Orth- So the intent of this thing before was to make the radiant those passageway walls fire resistant and not less than the fire rating resistance of the fire pump room itself. So they are making those two equivalent, they were not putting the same pass through restrictions that would be on an exit passageway so I think therein lies the disconnect.

Steve Simpson-Ok is there any other discussion? I am going to ask that The Managing Director of the State Building Code Council do a roll call vote on this issue please.

Richard Brown- Andrew? Approved. Dianne? Aye. Traci? Aye, Duane? abstain.

Doug? I'm going to vote no. Jim? Aye.

Steve Simpson- So if my math is correct, we have three Ayes, one Nay, and one abstention. That means I have to...I am going to say Nay. So motion fails. It's a simple majority on a regular deal would normally be the three.

Richard Brown- No, because we have six people here. So three's not in the majority, it's a tie, we need four.

Steve Simpson, Ok and so I voted No, so I would entertain another motion.

Doug Orth- I move that we move this proposed amendment forward to the Council tomorrow for consideration with a neutral recommendation.

Steve Simpson- Do I have a second?

Traci- Second.

Steve Simpson – So I have a motion to move this forward to tomorrow's Council meeting, with a neutral recommendation to the Building Fire and Plumbing Code committee and we have a second, is there any discussion on this motion?

Doug Orth- You going to be there in the room tomorrow Jim?

Jim Tinner- No, I'm going to be there by phone.

Steve Simpson- Any other discussion? Ok hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying Aye. Are there any Nays? Any abstentions? Motion carries.

B02- 2018 IEBC 1002.1.

Allen Spaulding w/the State Department of Health Construction Review Program.

I thought I would just jump in with what is identified as Log number B02- 2018. It was a proposal made by our program to modify the International Existing Building Code. Section 1002.1 the recorded recommendation was not to approve, but we have notes to suggest otherwise that it was approved by The Tag. I am just respectfully asking to go back to the minutes and check those. We believe that it was supported by the Tag, and the recommended not approving might have been an error. If you can check on that, that would be most appreciative.

Steve Simpson- Great Allen, we will check on that. Thank you.

Richard Brown- Allen, just to be technically correct. If you are mistaken, do we take this as public testimony?

Steve Simpson- Allen, if for some reason, there's a miscommunication and we got the minutes right and it was rejected by the Tag, would this be your opportunity to disagree with that on public record?

Allen Spaulding – That's correct.

Steve Simpson- Thank you.

F15-2018 IFC 903.2.8

Bob Plumb-Fire Marshall from Chelan County- I don't know which one of these it would be, but it was an amendment to 903.2.8. the group R sprinkler requirements to create an exemption for something that isn't defined in the Code, vacation rentals. This process started for me back at the first of the year. Trying to come up with a solution for our county, with all of the vacation rentals that we've got. My initial request was for a code interpretation for whether the vacation rentals would be considered under the International Residential Code, or under the IBC/IFC Code set. When it went in for the interpretation, they sort of threw it back at us saying they couldn't give an interpretation because it would require a code change. That brought me to a point now where I submitted this proposed Exception 2. My understanding was that it was disapproved as it made the Code more confusing with the wording I have.

Steve Simpson- Ok it was F15. So it was disapproved and you would like it to be reconsidered?

Bob Plumb-Yes I would like it to move forward. I have to say that every time I think about this, I come up with a different viewpoint on it. I think Richard feels the same way. I think the first thing that really needs to be done, is to decide whether it is going to be under the International Residential Code or under the International Fire and Building Codes, because it changes the whole aspect. If it's under the Residential Code you would go back to the amendment that they made to Section 101.2 where they require sprinklers in Bed and Breakfasts with more than 2 guestrooms and that would conflict with this where I've got it at 6 or fewer guestrooms would be accepted.

Steve Simpson- Ok, Thank you for your public comment. We will pass that forward onto the Council and we'll go from there. Any other questions?

Jim Tinner- Can I make a comment? The council weighed in on this last Code cycle, and I believe it was at the request of City of Spokane. The gentlemen from Chelan is correct. The Council said that owner occupied with two or fewer guestrooms being rented did not have to be sprinklered, with 3 to 5 it did have to be sprinklered. It fell under the IRC. 6 or more became IBC transient hotels. I don't recall if we required 13 D or 13R Fire sprinkler, but that's not much of an impact. That's only about, and fire folks correct me if I am wrong, it's only about 150 gallons of water. It's not a lot.

BF02-2018 Mass Timber

Steve Simpson- Did we find the code section for the tall wood building? Ok, so please introduce yourself?

Linda Newcomb w/American Institute of Architects Washington State Council- I want to move forward with the Amendment that deals with cross laminated lumber for Tall Wood Buildings.

Steve Simpson- Is that one by the Building Code, has that one been approved?

Richard Brown- Yes for amendments to the 2015 and 2018 Codes.

*BF01-2018 IBC/IFC
3101/3801*

Terry Beals w/Sound Transit- We'd like to support the recommendation for approval to move forward to the full council regarding the Code change proposal addressing NFPA-130 to the IBC and IFC. We don't see it on the screen right now but we would like to support that recommendation going forward.

Richard Brown-Terry, this is Richard, Council Staff, this is BF01-2018 and the Tag has recommended approval.

Terry Beals- Ok, thank you very much.

	<p><u>Terry Beals</u>- One more comment, on behalf of Sound Transit, we would just like to thank the committee members for their effort and support.</p> <p><u>Steve Simpson</u>- Ok thank you,</p> <p><i>B05-2018IBC 308.3.3</i> <u>Richard Brown</u>- We've received a written public comment on B05 308.3.3</p> <p><u>Steve Simpson</u>- Ok.</p> <p><i>B04-2018 303.4, 309.1, T1004.5</i> <u>Micah Chappell</u> - I would like to recommend moving forward to the full council B04-2018 art galleries classifications. We felt this was a good amendment. I think that there were just some minor items in the occupant load table that were questioned. Overall they like the amendment and thought it was useful to smaller jurisdictions so I would like that one to be moved forward. Do you want me to do these one at a time?</p> <p><u>Steve Simpson</u>- As far as our process today, we're taking public Comment on whether the Tag specifically disapproved correct?</p> <p><u>Micah Chappell</u>- Correct.</p> <p><i>B37-2018 IBC 1006.3.3</i> <u>Micah Chappell</u>- The only other one I had on here that we would like to have another review on, was B37-2018, the single exits that adds a clarification to the Code that allows single exit provision to function for a portion of the building instead of the building as a whole, as long as that portion can be still be [inaudible] apart. There was a lot of good discussion on that one.</p> <p><u>Steve Simpson</u>- Thank you for your comments on that, we will deliberate on them. Is there any other comments? I am going to close the reports, and I am going to be looking at the group and hopefully we have some kind of a recommendation moving forward.</p> <p><u>Doug Orth</u>- I make a motion that we move forward with the recommending the ones the Tag has approved, as well as those that asked for reconsideration that the Council will look at those items.</p> <p><u>Steve Simpson</u>- Ok do I have a second? I have a second on the motion, and Jim Tinner was the second. Ayes have it and motion carries.</p>
<p>5. Interpretation Requests</p> <p>City of Everett</p> <p><i>Motion:</i></p> <p>City of Kirkland</p>	<p>Structural renovation, IEBC 1302.</p> <p>Approve the interpretation as written. The motion carried.</p> <p>Smoke alarms, IRC R314.2.2.</p>

<p><i>Motion:</i></p> <p>City of Bellingham</p> <p><i>Motion</i></p> <p>Benton County</p> <p><i>Motion</i></p>	<p>Approve the interpretation as written. The motion carried.</p> <p>Stair enclosure pressurization, IBC 504.4.1</p> <p>Request consideration by the SBCC. The motion carried.</p> <p>IBC Fire flow requirements</p> <p>Approve the interpretation as modified. The motion carried.</p>
6. Staff Report	None.
7. Other Business	None.
8. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:36 p.m.