



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 COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

**LOCATION:** SHORELINE CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
17500 Midvale Avenue  
Shoreline, Washington

**MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2015

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m. <u>Members in Attendance:</u> Dave Kokot, Council Chair; Steve Simpson, Vice Chair; Rod Bault, Dave DeWitte; Paul Duffau ; Al French; Diane Glenn; Leanne Guier; Duane Jonlin; Mark Kulaas; Doug Orth; Dave Peden; Sandra Romero; Jim Tinner; Eric Vander Mey; Rep. Tana Senn; Rep. Vincent Buys <u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Joanne McCaughan <u>Visitors Present:</u> Dave Cantwell, G.F. Scheueramann, Fred Volkers, Lee Kranz, JJ McCoy, Jim MacRay, Tracy Harvey, Al Audette, Chuck Murray
2. Review and Approve the Agenda of October 16, 2016	The agenda was approved as written
3. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda	JJ McRae, feels this marijuana issue has become political matter. He then read a poem
4. Review and Approve Minutes of September 11, 2015	The minutes were posted on the website. These minutes were approved as written with some corrections requested by the chairman.
5. Committee Recommendations on 2015 Code Adoption	First the summary of the BFP Committee recommendation was given. Dave Peden is the Committee Chair. All items will not be discussed due to the time limitations. There were 136 amendments on the proposed rule. Twelve items received testimony. It is the goal of the Council to look at the changes and decide whether to move them forward for permanent rule. The first five items were administrative. There was also compost storage to recycles and addition definitions based on 2015 code. Item 6 dealt with marijuana growing and processing. There will be a Marijuana Advisory Group after the new year. The Committee recommends following the WABO recommendation on this item. <b>Duane Jonlin</b> , does the drying encompass drying and packaging? Does it fit in Group-U? No that is processing. <b>Diane Glenn</b> not going far enough for allowing those that just do snipping and packaging. These items would be discussed in the marijuana TAG. <b>Dave DeWitte</b> is confused on what we are now

acting on. **Tim** reported that more work is needed on this item and this would happen through a technical group and involve the industry. They could strike the language around growing and leave it to the local jurisdiction, processing would be under Group F, inspection is to be under the First Code. Processing is up in the air, per Doug Orth. The committee has a hard time with the concept. If someone is clipping, hanging or drying they don't stay in the building. It is not a place of employment. **Dave Peden** agreed. The TAG needed industry experts. We could then go into emergency rule after the TAG met following the legislative session.

**Diane Glenn**, noted that some facilities that are divided up doing parts of the process in one area and another place where they did another part of the process.

**Kokot** indicated the Building Code regarding the occupancy classification.

**Sandra Romero**, is now more confused. Is there to be a greenhouse rule and not an extraction issue. **Kokot** said that is correct. **Sandra** is concerned we may adopt something today that might impact more than we intend. **Doug Orth** agrees, stating we are starting from a position and then relaxing it later. He feels we should adopt the emergency rule later. The recommendation of the committee is not binding with this Council. He feels the Council should accept the industry standard for F-1 for hazardous activity. We are not prepared to make that decision today. Emergency rule can come after the first of the year.

**Jim Tinner**, read the definition of an agriculture building. Mark Kulaas states in his area they grow cherries and they process them in an F occupancy. If that is a place of employment with safety issues they need to be considered an F occupancy. Marijuana should be considered as any other horticultural product.

**Dave DeWitte**, moved to accept the Committee's recommendation.

**Sandra** noted that this would cover all plants not just marijuana.

**Nine in favor; five opposed. Motion carries.**

**Item 14, Smoke Removal** clarification on how this is to be addressed after 2018. The Committee recommends striking the section.

**Duane Jonlin**, moved the Council follow the Committee's recommendation to strike the section. **The motion was unanimous.**

**This deals with electric vehicle charging, Section 427. Incorrect references in this section.** The Committee recommended this adoption to the rule brought forward by Rep. Senn. The changes include the location of the conduit. **Rod Bault** asked if there could be space for accessible parking. Yes was the answer.

**Dave Peden** noted the Committee recommended adoption of this change

**Steve Simpson** moved the Council accept this motion. **The motion carried.**

**#27 This is from L&I making editorial correction.** The Committee recommends this correction. **Jim Tinner** moved to approve the correction. **Steve Simpson** seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

**Dave Kokot** suggested the editorial ones be held until the end

**This section that clarifies exiting from electrical equipment rooms.** WABO is

	<p>suggesting it be revised for clarity. The Committee made a slight change to this language. <b>Jim Tinner</b> moved to approve. Seconded by <b>Duane Jonlin</b>. <b>The motion was approved.</b></p> <p><b>Item 43</b>, was a correction on Group R-2 language.</p> <p><b>Item 1006, Exits and Exit Access Doorways.</b> WABO proposed revisions to clarify from NEC</p> <p><b>Dave Peden</b> noted there was a language modification and the motion was to accept that from the Committee.</p> <p><b>Bottle Filling Stations #106.</b> This new section is a state amendment. The proposed adopted it under the building Code because we use Ch. 29 for plumbing fixtures. The Committee accepted the amendment. <b>Dave DeWitte</b> doesn't feel this will have much impact as desired. <b>Steve Simpson</b> moved to approve this amendment. <b>Jim Tinner</b> seconded the motion. The motion carried with two nay.</p> <p><b>Item 3005, Machine Room Venting</b> There was no recommendation. The suggestion is that the last part of the sentence be stricken. <b>Duane Jonlin</b> recommends leaving it as is.</p> <p><b>Item 3009.</b> The Committee made a recommended change. Seattle requested this be removed; requiring hoistway vents. There was significant amount of testimony on both sides. These occupancies would be other than R-1 and R-2, or mid-rise buildings. <b>Dave Peden</b> moved to accept the Committee's recommendation to modify the amendment. <b>Steve Simpson</b> seconded the motion. <b>The motion carried.</b></p> <p><b>Swimming Pools and Spas, #31 09</b> In the past the code has only dealt with is the barriers. However this code deals with construction and function of the pool.</p>
	<p>The Dept. of Health suggested this specific language. The Committee has recommended adoption of it. This amends the proposed rule. They also are exclusively operated for physical therapy or rehab under the supervision of a licensed medical practitioner. This category is one where the Dept. of Health do not regulate. They are asking this be regulated under the building code. The committee recommended this for approval. The motion was voted on and approved.</p> <p><b>Duane Jonlin</b> moved the Council direct staff to make the editorial changes and develop the building code amendments as modifies in this meeting. <b>Steve Simpson</b> seconded the mot.</p> <p><b>Sandra Romero</b> asked if she voted against 2 sections can she still vote for the entire proposal. She wants to be cautious about the perception as it has come back to bite her in the past.</p> <p><b>The motion passes with 3 abstentions.</b></p> <p><b>The Council took a 10 minute break.</b></p> <p><b>The Council meeting reconvened at 11:15 a.m.</b></p> <p><b>RESIDENTIAL CODE</b></p>

**The Scope of the Code, R101.2**, the Committee did not make a recommendation on the B&B issue. The proposal would allow the 1 and 2 guestrooms houses to be in compliance with the IRC. **Duane Jonlin** asked if there was strong objection to the amendment and what was the summary of that objection. **Dave Kokot** expressed concerns in the fire industry in regard to the enforcement.

**The Committee recommended no change so no action is necessary.**

There was quite a bit of testimony from the sprinkler people. However the Committee did recommend adoption as proposed. **Diane Glenn** stated the TAG recommended not to forward, from the builders felt it was due to the cost. There were no stats for fires in the townhomes. Where is the evidence of failure to increase the cost of townhomes. **Dave DeWitte**, what were the reasons the committee recommended the sprinklers. They did not recommend approval. There were several comments among members pointing out the reasons they didn't feel this was necessary. **Rep. Senn** asks if the two-hour wall is required.

**Diane Glenn** moves the Council deny the amendment. **Duane Jonlin** seconded the motion. **Motion carried 10 to 4.**

**PV Systems, #R324** There is state language that allows for an exceptions to meeting the structural requirements. To clarify the proposed amendment adds the language to the exception to say detached non-habitable Group U are not subject to the requirements of this section for structure and fire safety. **Duane Jonlin** moved the Council accept the motion. **Steve Simpson** seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

**IRC 329. Swimming pool** same issue as IBC. This was moved and carried.

**Tim Nogler** lets the Council know that the revision means Appendix V would reverts to local adoption.

**Duane Jonlin** moved the Council adopt the residential code amendments as modified In this meeting. **Sandra Romero** seconded the motion.

#### **IFC Code**

This was a proposal for a new section to go into Ch. 11, which is the retroactive requirement in the Firs Code. The Committee reported this was new testimony the TAG has not reviewed, their recommendation was to forward this to Council Non-approval was the recommendation from the Committee. The problem is not the radio signals, but the low E glass. In the next code cycle we looking at exempting certain size buildings; Bellevue has VHF and UHF. It was recommended to be forwarded to the Fire Code TAG.

**Item 903.2.3 Group E Duane Jonlin** discussed Group E as broader than just small children, older children can move out of the structure. **Dave Kokot** notes that E occupancy has to be treated differently than the I-4 occupancy. Have daycares changed some since 1981? Yes they are major differences, they have worked closely with state fire marshal. They do the inspection; they cannot take a position. **Duane Jonlin** brought up the discussion of children's safety. He feels that the WABO proposal would be sufficient. **Dave Kokot** noted there are strip mall daycares with no fire separation. **Jim Tinner** reported he was aware of

stripmalls.

**Dave Kokot** discussed the TAG decision, and that only one member votes in opposition of the concept now proposed the amended language.

**Sandra Romero** moved to adopt the amendment as written. **Dave Peden** seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Motion carried; twelve for, one against and one abstention.

**Item 62.** There was no discussion on this motion which was approved.

**Item 63** This proposal was recommended with some modification. **Doug Orth** asked about the construction phase in this situation. He appreciates the modifications as proposed. However he still feels like more may be need to be done on this issue.

**Sandra Romero** asked for some clarification on the proposal which **Dave Kokot** explained with comments by other members of the Council as well.

**Duane Jonlin** moved this Council accept this amendment as modified by **Dave Kokot**. **Doug Orth** seconded the motion. **The motion carried with one against.**

**907.10.3.** This is dealing with the registration of maintenance of fire alarm systems. This is consistent with the RCW. **Jonlin** moved to approve. **Dough Orth** seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

**Item 125** deals with existing requirement regarding smoke separation of elevator shafts. Prevents fire and smoke from going from floor to floor. **Duane Jonlin** asks how Seattle handles this situation. **Maureen Traxler** states that it applies to existing buildings where the construction is being done.

**Diane Glenn** states this would be onerous. **Dave Kokot**, states once elevators were put in lobbies were required/. The TAG recommended this for consideration.

**Jim Tinner** asked about the maturity of the building and recommends this be it be moved to the Fire Code TAG. The motion was to move this proposal back to the Fire TAG by Doug. **Diane Glenn** Seconded the proposal. **Motion passed.**

**Item 128, TAG proposal regarding CO systems.** This should have said this was to be moved back to the TAG/

**Item 133.** Proposed changes in modifications to Ch. 30 Emergency Rule to be put in place. This has been requested to be moved forward to the Marijuana TAG for review. There will be revised wording for the emergency rule that is currently in place. This wording should be ready by the next meeting. **Steve Simpson** moved the Council forward this to the Marijuana TAG yet to be formed. **Jim Tinner** then asks what happens to the CO2 issues addressed. **Kokot** replied this would have to be discussed with the Marijuana TAG and the Fire TAG. **Duane** seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

**Tim Nogler** noted at the next meeting we would look at the revisions to the emergency rule and make any needed revisions.

**Appendix K** needs to be modified to Appendix N. **Jim Tinner** moved the Council to adopt the 2015 as amended to include the editorial changes. Seconded and

unanimously accepted.

The Council took a 10 minute break.

#### PLUMBING CODE

**Steve Simpson** as the TAG chair reported on the Plumbing Code. They met six times and went through all the chapters adopted by the state under the RCW. There were some major changes in the plumbing code this year in a positive nature.

The changes were based upon the changes in the model code organization. In Ch. 2 , they took all the definitions and put them in each chapter which changed Ch. 2/ Section 301.3.2 Proposal 15-34 amends the language in the 2015 Plumbing Code. This section of the code has never been modified.

Steve asked Jed Scheurman from IAMPO to comment on the shields and admittance valves. There was quite a bit of negative testimony at the Shoreline meeting on this issue. **Orth** asked what the basis of the opposition. **Steve** the alternate means and methods is the open forum to use methods of equivalence

**Diane** agrees with Jim that documentation is helpful to understand why something does not comply with the code. It would help us understand.

**Duane** noted it is not advisable to use existing language from another code, simply put in the directions for the code. **Steve** asks if he should add that last sentence to the alternate means and methods section. **Steve** moved that the Council use the current UPC language in Section 301.2.3 and add the sentence as a Washington State Amendment. **Jim Tinner agrees. The motion carried.**

**Steve** indicated Line Item 6 received a lot of discussion and deals with alternate means and methods. This deals with materials use and energy efficiency. Much of the discussion deals with AA needs, but also deals with some other components. **Steve** made a motion to deny this proposal P-34. **Al French** seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

**Item 7. Circuit Venting.** Previously in the appendix, now moved to Ch. 7. This will change the way we construct buildings from now on. A lot of what was done with DOH in Ch. 6 and water rules.

908.2.4 was not adopted. There was no discussion.

Chapter 15, 15-P11. 1501.1.1 was coordinated with DOH on residential flushing. This is prohibited only if accessible by residents. The concern about the grey water is the bacteria. **Sandra Romero** indicated because of the drought we are trying to get more use out of the water. Sandra feels we should find different methods for flushing our toilets. **Duane Jonlin** feels this is excessive also. **Jim Tinner** agrees with Steve that blocks could be contaminated. **Rep. Buys** reminded the Council there is a difference

between reclaimed water and grey water. Grey water comes from the residence (purple pipe).

Jed Scheuremann, a previous plumbing inspector for Oregon was asked to comment on this issue. He indicated he did not know of any problems then with the reclaimed water on legitimately installed systems.

**Steve** indicated there is no language at this time to change this amendment. **Eric Vander Mey** suggested working directly with DOH to modify this if necessary. **Dave Kokot** suggested that Sandra put her concerns in writing and work with the Plumbing TAG on this issue/

Section 1501.2 was amended to harmonize with DOH rules for grey water. There were several in Ch.15, from DOH that had no concerns.

The remaining existing amendments were renumbered and retained. The amendments to the former Section 1702.12 was renumbered Section 1601.11.1 and modified with new code language. There was no discussion Log #35. The discussion around Ch. 17 is specific to all of the referenced standards. There was an IAPMO change in this section which made it mandatory.

**Steve Simpson** made a motion to adopt the 2015 UPC with the changes made today. The motion was seconded. **The motion passed.**

#### **MVE Committee**

The MVE Committee met yesterday and was summarized by Eric Vander Mey the Committee chair. They met for 3 and ½ hours discussing the Energy Code and the Mechanical Code.

There was limited public testimony on the Mechanical Code. There were some clarifications needed. They deemed these corrections to be editorial. Eric made reference to each

**Duane Jonlin** moved to approve the changes as recommended by the Mechanical Code TAG. The motion was seconded by **Dave DeWitte**. **The motion carried.**

**The Energy Code** then was summarized by Eric Vander Mey. First the committee went through some of the editorial changes received. These changes were determined to be errors, omissions or changes to help clarify the code. This list is posted on the website.

Next the committee discussed the dedicated outdoor air system (DOAS). They discussed the changes that were to be made due to the public comment and came to a unanimous vote on that issue. The committee discussed having a meeting next Thursday prior to the Council meeting where they will formally review the language prior to the Council meeting. The DOAS changes were mentioned individually by Eric. Following this he expanded on some of the other changes made. All to make the code more clarified. Eric also mentioned the committee was looking for some great ideas coming from the proponents.

	<p><b>Duane Jonlin</b> stated that the biggest deterrent on the DOAS came from the engineers. The method that Eric is proposing makes DOAS the primary system and provides an exception to do high efficiency VAV.</p> <p><b>Eric</b> then reviewed the mass wall discussion from the committee. The cost and savings were discussed at length in the committee meeting. <b>Dave Peden</b> feels the studies are still very confusing. He is hoping for some clarity on the issue.</p> <p>They received a lot of positive comments on the energy code. Also discussed was the metering issue.</p> <p>On the residential side of the code they discussed the mini-split option for building using electric heat. Some felt this was too much change too fast. The point system was also discussed. Duane explained the difference from small house to larger house credits.</p> <p>Eric said in closing he would encourage all members to re-read the goals for the energy code before the next meeting to remind us what the objectives are. He reminds the Council that by the end of the year we need to report our progress to the legislature the energy savings and compliance with the DOE.</p> <p><b>STAFF REPORT</b></p> <p><b>Tim Nogler</b> reported the staff would work with the committee members to schedule a committee meeting for next week. The Council meeting is scheduled for the 20<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m. in Olympia for the final adoption of the Energy Code.</p>
12. Other Business	None.
13. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.