

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions

Concise Explanatory Statement

From/Date	Position	Summary	Council Response
Randall M. King Kitsap Building Association (KBA) 02/09/2021 Written Testimony	Support	Section 903.3.1.2: KBA supports Section 903.3.1.2 in an effort to preserve affordability of residential buildings by ensuring applicability of NFPA 13R systems are preserved. Lower density multi-family buildings otherwise would have been subjected to a full NFPA 13 system, which would drastically increase the construction cost. We commend this effort.	The Council adopted Section 903.3.1.2 as proposed in the CR102.
	Modify	Section 429: IBC TAG removed the exception: "Meeting the requirements will alter the local utility infrastructure design on the utility side of the meter and will increase the utility side cost to the homeowner or the developer by more than \$1,000 per dwelling unit." Kitsap Building Association would like to see that exception added back to the code before official adoption by the SBCC.	The exception was for one- and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified, and the adopted version doesn't use the term "one- and two-family dwellings." The exception was also eliminated. (See comparison document) The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted Section 429 as proposed in the CR102.
Miriam J. Villiard Heritage Builders NW, LLC 02/09/2021 Written Testimony	Support	Section 903.3.1.2: Heritage Builders supports Section 903.3.1.2. in an effort to preserve affordability of residential buildings by ensuring applicability of NFPA 13R systems are preserved. Lower density multi-family buildings otherwise would have been subjected to a full NFPA 13 system which would drastically increase the cost of construction. We commend this effort to keep housing affordability at the forefront of the code development conversation.	The Council adopted Section 903.3.1.2 as proposed in the CR102.
	Modify	Section 429: Heritage Builders NW LLC would like to see that exception added back to the code before official adoption by the SBCC.	The exception was for one- and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified, and the adopted version doesn't use the term "one- and two-family dwellings." The exception was also eliminated. (See comparison document) The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted Section 429 as proposed in the CR102.

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions

Concise Explanatory Statement

From/Date	Position	Summary	Council Response
<p>Andrea Smith – Building Industry Association of Washington</p> <p>02/11/2021 Oral Testimony</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Modify</p>	<p>Section 429: Within the TAG process, the TAG members removed an exception that allows for an exemption of EV charging infrastructure installation if the utility infrastructure design was required to meet the increase look, and so, by doing so, it would increase utility side design by a cost factor of \$1,000 or more, per dwelling unit. BIAW would like to see that exception added back in before official adoption by the State Building Code Council.</p>	<p>The exception was for one- and two-family dwellings, as originally proposed. The language was further modified, and the final (adopted) version doesn't use the term "one-and two-family dwellings." The exception was also eliminated. (See comparison document)</p> <p>The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted Section 429 as proposed in the CR102.</p>
<p>Tom Young - Northwest Concrete Masonry Association, Seattle</p> <p>02/11/2021 Oral/Written Testimony</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disapprove amendment; maintain the model code language</p>	<p>Section 706.3: Industry is opposed to proposal GP1-80, which would allow firewalls to be built with combustible materials for Type 3 and 4 buildings. The proponent's primary reason for this was potential differential movement between dissimilar building materials. The industry believes this is something that can be addressed through proper design and detailing. ICC voted to "disapprove" a similar proposal with the committee stating, "there seems to be a lot of performance uncertainty," preferring to be careful with allowances for Type III/IV construction. The mentioned "performance uncertainty" relates to fire performance ---as it should -- not concerns with potential shrinkage between dissimilar materials.</p>	<p>The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted the amendments to Section 706.3 as proposed in the CR102.</p>
<p>Beth Jarot - Resilient and Green Building Specialist for the City of Tacoma</p> <p>02/11/2021 Oral Testimony</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>	<p>Appendix P: The City of Tacoma's Office of Environmental Policy and Sustainability supports the adoption of Appendix P100 as part of the building code amendment process to increase the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition materials. Future adoption of this appendix by our city will support a variety of city goals related to waste management, housing, climate, and economic development.</p>	<p>The Council adopted Appendix P as proposed in the CR102.</p>
<p>Kathleen Petrie - King County</p> <p>02/11/2022 Oral Testimony</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support</p>	<p>Section 429: In support of an increase in EV infrastructure. We need to build some infrastructure in this code cycle at a minimum, to be prepared for the 8% of vehicles by 2025. To wait until the 2024 code cycle, it will be too late.</p>	<p>The Council adopted Section 429 as proposed in the CR102.</p>

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions

Concise Explanatory Statement

From/Date	Position	Summary	Council Response
Shamim Rashid-Sumar – NRMCA 02/11/2021 Oral Testimony	Oppose	<p>Section 706.3: This proposed amendment was based partly on the argument that Type 3 and Type 4 construction provide just as much fire resistance as non-combustible construction. I wanted to stress the point that a firewall is not the same as a fire resistance rated wall. Firewalls have to be designed and constructed in accordance with the code to allow collapse of a structure on either side, without collapse of the wall under fire conditions and that's why a firewall can function to separate a structure into two separate buildings. While fire resistance rated walls carry an hourly rating, they're not designed to withstand collapse in the same manner that's required for firewalls.</p>	<p>The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted the amendments to Section 706.3 as proposed in the CR102.</p>
	Oppose	<p>Section 903.3.1.2.3. The proposed amendment will roll back previous changes that were made to the IFC and the IBC to limit the use of NFPA 13R sprinkler systems to buildings where the highest level is 30 feet or less above the level of the Fire Department vehicle access. The intent of these changes was to address more recent fire history in residential occupancies. Particularly, podium style developments all over the country. There have been similar fires here in the State of Washington in multi-family residential structures in Bothell, Lynnwood, and Olympia.</p> <p>The proponent offers an alternate proposal that was approved as part of the 2024 code development cycle.</p>	<p>The BFP Standing Committee, discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. In addition to all technical concerns, the proposed alternative was not proposed on time (the time allowed for statewide proposals), and if considered, will violate the Council procedure.</p> <p>The Council agreed with the BFP recommendations and adopted Section 903.3.1.2.3 as proposed in the CR102.</p>
Stephen V. Skalko - Northwest Cement Council 02/11/2021 Oral/Written Testimony	Oppose	<p>Section 903.3.1.2: 21-GP1-021 loosens the height limit allowed for the residential building by increasing the allowable height from 30-feet above fire department vehicle access (typically at ground level) to be 60-feet above grade plane (average height of the ground around the building). That can result doubling of the present code permitted height of a building depending on the physical configuration of the land surrounding the building. In some cases, the height can be more than doubled if a sloped roof is used for the residential building because the building height gets measured to the average roof height based on slope and not to the peak of the roof.</p>	<p>The IBC and the IFC TAGs, as well as the BFP Standing Committee, discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. In addition to all technical concerns, the proposed alternative was not proposed on time (the time allowed for statewide proposals), and if considered, will violate the Council procedure.</p> <p>The Council agreed with the TAGs and the BFP recommendations and adopted Section 903.3.1.2.3 as proposed in the CR102.</p>

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions

Concise Explanatory Statement

From/Date	Position	Summary	Council Response
Stephen V. Skalko - Northwest Cement Council 02/11/2021 Oral/Written Testimony	Oppose	Section 706.3: This proposal reduces the effectiveness of the fire walls by permitting the wall construction to be of combustible materials in buildings of Type III and IV construction. This is contrary to the fire safety objectives of the building code outlined above (i.e., firefighter safety and operations, occupant safety and property protection).	The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted the amendments to Section 706.3 as proposed in the CR102.
Annabel Drayton Policy Associate NW Energy Coalition 03/11/2022 Written Testimony	Support with modification	Section 429: The EV proposal in Section 429 outlined in Section 429 provides a strong foundation and we offer the following comments to address recommended revisions to the EV proposal found in Attachments 1 and 2. (See proposals)	The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended the Council adopts the initial proposal as submitted with the CR-102. The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted Section 429 as proposed in the CR102.
Micah Chappell WABO 02/11/2021 03/11/2022 Oral/Written Testimony	Modify	Recommends modifications in two proposals – in Chapter 29 and Section 1110.2. The first modification was proposed on February 11, and further modified for the public hearing on March 11. See proposed modifications: Section 1110.2. Chapter 29 & Section 1110.2 2021 IBC Proposed Modifications to CR-102	The IBC TAG recommended modifications to the initial proposal based on the testimony. The BFP Standing Committee recommended further research for potential conflict with 2010 ADA Standards. The recommended modifications were further amended, and the BFP Committee changed the recommendation to “accept proposed modifications.” The Council adopted the initial proposals as modified.
Ly Ho Robison Engineering Inc. 03/11/2022 Written Testimony	Modify	Section 909.11.1: In the IBC commentary for IBC section 909.11.1, “The intent of the ventilation is focused on the proper function of the standby power source in terms of engine-driven generators having appropriate cooling air and combustion air. The requirement that it be from the outside is related to the protection of such ventilation from the effects of fire.” Based on this statement, generator standby power would require ventilation, but another acceptable form of standby power is tap ahead of the main. The room for standby power using tap ahead of the main should not need to be ventilated. In the amendment, I would like to see a clear difference between the different types of standby power for the ventilation requirements.	The testimony was not related to a proposed amendment in Section 909.11.1. The Council took no further action.

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions Concise Explanatory Statement

From/Date	Position	Summary	Council Response
Gerard Brown Department of Labor & Industries, Public Safety Elevator Program Manager 03/11/2022 Oral/Written Testimony	Oppose	Chapter 9. Disapprove the proposal in Chapter 9 related to Elevator Fire Pits. The proposed amendment eliminates crucial fire sprinklers located in elevator pits and machine rooms, diminishes life safety as it pertains to the elevator riding public. The same amendment was also adopted as an emergency rule and further readopted.	The BFP Standing Committee discussed the testimony and recommended “adopt as submitted.” The Council agreed with the recommendations and adopted the amendments to Chapter 9 as proposed in the CR102.
Dave Kokot 03/11/2022 Oral/Written Testimony	Support	Adopt the proposal in Chapter 9 related to Elevator Fire Pits.	The Council adopted the amendments to Chapter 9 as proposed in the CR102.

Important Documents and Links:

[Initial Submittal – CR-102 with Proposals](#)
[2021 IBC Proposed Modifications to CR-102](#) (Approved by the SBCC as proposed on April 22, 2022)
[CR-103: 2021 IBC as adopted by the SBCC on April 22, 2022](#)
[2021 IBC Public Testimony Summary](#)
[IBC/IFC Public Hearing 2/11/2022](#)
[IBC/IFC/WSEC Public Hearing 3/11/2022](#)
[IBC Written Testimony](#)
[2021 IBC Preliminary Cost Benefit Analysis](#)
[2021 IBC Final Cost Benefit Analysis](#)
 Council Meeting April 22, 2022 – [Recording Link](#)

2021 International Building Code-Nonstructural Provisions

Concise Explanatory Statement

Changes from proposed (CR-102) to adopted (CR-103) version

WAC	Section	Change	Rationale/Discussion
WAC 51-50-0429	429.4	Adds a sentence in the first paragraph to clarify that no fewer than one for each type of EV charging system shall be accessible.	Provides consistency with Section 1107.2.1.
WAC 51-50-0429	429.4	Changes the reference to Section 429.3 with a reference to Section 429.2.	Corrects an oversight.
WAC 51-50-0504	Table 504.4	Corrects the allowable number of stories above grade plane for S1 and S2 occupancy Groups (sprinklered)	Corrects an oversight. The Council voted to continue adoption of the existing amendment in footnote "i" and to modify the table to align with changes in the model code. The model code changes were not incorporated in the initial submittal.
WAC 51-50-1005	1005.1	Exception 1: Changes the reference to Section 1029 with a reference to Section 1030. Exception 2: Changes the reference to Section 3114 with a reference to Section 3116.	Incorporates section renumbering in the model code.
WAC 51-50-1014	1014	Changes the title from "Location" to "Handrails."	Consistency with the model code.
WAC 51-50-1014	1014.2	Changes the title from "Location" to "Height and Location."	Provides clarity and consistency; no change in regulatory effect.
WAC 51-50-1014	1014.3	Deletes Section 1014.3.	The newly proposed Sections 1014.2.2 and 1014.3 are the same. There is no need for the same language to be repeated in two different sections.
WAC 51-50-10170	Table 1017.2	Modifies footnote "a" as following: Section 411.2: Replaces "buildings" with "areas" at the end of the sentence. Section 3114: Renumbering (Section 3114 is changed to 3116).	Corrects an oversight; incorporates changes in the model code.
WAC 51-50-1110	1110.2	Exception 2: The reference to Section 1107 is replaced with a reference to Section 1108. Exception 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modifies Exception 3 to clarify that the language applies to single-user all-gender toilets. • Changes the initially proposed amendment by deleting the last sentence. 	The modification in Exception 2 corrects an oversight. The modification in exception 3 aligns the language with the interpretations on national level and the application throughout the state.
WAC 51-50-2902	2902.1.1	Deletes Section 2902.1.1	The state amendment matches the model code language; there is no need for the state amendment to be maintained.
WAC 51-50-2902	2902.1.1.2	Deletes the last sentence, currently requiring at least one urinal for men's facilities serving 26 or more persons.	Aligns the existing state amendment with the charging language of Chapter 29 in the 2021 IBC.
WAC 51-50-2902	2902.1.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaces the term "gender-neutral with "all-gender." • Modifies the title to read "Urinals for all-gender facilities." • Deletes the last sentence, currently requiring at least one urinal for men's facilities serving 26 or more persons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporates the nationally recognized term. • Aligns the title with the intent in the body of the section. • Aligns the existing state amendment with the charging language of Chapter 29 in the 2021 IBC.
WAC 51-50-2902	2902.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exception 6: Replaces the term "gender-neutral with "all-gender." • Exception 7: Replaces the reference to Section 405.3.4 of the International Plumbing Code with a reference to IBC Section 1210.3.1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporates the nationally recognized term. • The International Plumbing Code is not adopted in Washington State; the privacy for water closets is addressed in IBC Section 1210.3.1.
WAC 51-50-2902	2902.2.2	Replaces the term "gender-neutral with "all-gender."	Incorporates the nationally recognized term.