

SUMMARY
WORKGROUP 2
MEETING 2018 Code
Change Cycle

July 1, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. Remote

Meeting Link

<https://vadhcd.adobeconnect.com/workgroup/>

Meeting-Specific Notes:

- Reordered review of Energy proposals
- Request Submitted by Proponent to withdraw **FP604.8** by Jay Hall

Ms. Davis welcomed everyone to the Workgroup meeting and thanked them for participating in the process. Future workgroup dates were provided.

FP101-18 - Tall Wood Appendix (IFC)

Proponents: John Catlett (catlettcodeconsulting@gmail.com)

Comments: Mr. Catlett agrees that both this proposal and its companion proposal (BU101-18, introduced to Workgroup 2 at the 6/30 meeting) could use some clarification.

Results: Carryover to August meeting

Ms. Davis thanked all of the stakeholders that worked on the next two proposals of fire code edits. She acknowledged the hundreds of hours of work that went into finalizing these edits.

FP103.2.1 (VFSB SFPC Edit Part 2)-18 (Edits Chapters 27 & 50-56)

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Public Comments for: FP103.2.1 (VFSB SFPC Edit Part 2)-

Comments: Proposal from the Fire Code Edit Workgroup

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP103.2.1 (VFSB SFPC Edit Part 3)-18 Edits Chapters 57-67

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov); Thomas King (thomas.king@dhcd.virginia.gov)

Comments: Proposal from the Fire Code Edit Workgroup

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP202(4)-18: Adds a “cooking tent” definition

Proponents: Linda Hale of Loudoun County Fire Marshal’s Office (Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)

Comments: Ms. Davis wishes to clarify whether this would apply even to a 10x10” pop-up tent, or just anything that is producing grease-laden vapors. Ms. Hale indicated that this could be for a pop up.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP319.1.1-18: Adds wheel chocks and minimum distance provisions for food preparation vehicles

Proponents: Linda Hale of Loudoun County Fire Marshal’s Office (Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)

Comments:

- Mr. Beahm representing himself questions whether the non-registered-vehicles that are not road-worthy are considered mobile food preparation vehicles.
- Ms. Hale (Loudoun County) clarifies that the vehicles themselves might not even need to be mobile or in working order; if they have wheels, they are applicable. They can still cause problems regardless of their road-worthiness.
- Mr. Dawson of NFPA is in support of the proposal on the grounds of food trucks that are up on cinderblocks would still apply; they don’t fall under building codes because they aren’t structures.
- Mr. Beahm representing himself agrees on principle, but wishes for more clarified language to limit the interpretation. However, he does not oppose.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP319.2.1-18: Designated AHJ for food truck permit

Proponents: Linda Hale of Loudoun County Fire Marshal’s Office

(Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)

Comments:

- Mr. Dyer of SFMO supports the proposal FP319.2.1-18
- Mr. Beahm representing himself supports this change.
- Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) mentions that this would support economic recovery for small businesses
- Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee) supports this change
- Ms. Davis (DHCD) clarifies that Ms. Hale (LCFMO) will add language to clarify that it is referring to a Virginia local government and language for food trucks coming in from out-of-state, to address concerns raised by the group and bring the proposal back in August.

Results: Carryover to August, plan to approve then with more specific language added

FP405.2-18: Fire and evacuation drill frequency (TABLE)

Proponents: Andrew Milliken representing Stafford County Fire Marshal's Office
(amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Comments: Mr. Milliken brings up the fact that emergency evacuation drills are required in Group R-2 occupancies that are designed or developed and marketed to senior citizens 55 years of age or older.

- Mr. Pharr of AOBA/VAMA worked closely with Mr. Milliken on this proposal and clarified the language within the body of the proposal to include the following clause:
Emergency evacuation drills are required in Group R-2 occupancies that are designed or developed and marketed to senior citizens 55 years of age or older in accordance with 42 U.S. Code, Section 3607(b)(2).
- Mr. Moss with VBCOA will support as long as the above modification is made.

Results: Consensus for Approval as Modified

FP407.2-18: Material Safety Data Sheets

Proponents: Aaron Engi

Comments: Mr. Milliken speaks on behalf of the Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee. They are in support.

Results: Consensus for Approval.

FP604.8-18: Testing of battery powered emergency lights and exit signs

Proponents: William Hall (william.hall@vadoc.virginia.gov)

Comments: Withdrawn by Proponent

Results: Withdrawn

FP609.2-18: Cooking operations producing grease laden vapors

Proponents: Andrew Milliken representing the Stafford County Fire Marshal's Office
(amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Comments:

- Ms. Cook of Arlington County wishes to clarify whether this could have any possibility of being a retrofit requirement.
- Ms. Davis of DHCD seeks clarification on whether this proposal would require ventilation to be in place, including mechanical ventilation
- Mr. Payne representing AIA Virginia suggests the language could be more specific regarding whether the grease-laden vapor-producing devices would be held to required ventilation of the spaces
- Ms. Hale suggests this proposal offers direction on use for those who may be confused about what the issue with grease-laden vapors actually is - that the current language

included in the code is sometimes confusing when carrying out guidelines

- Mr. Moss of VBCOA, Mr. Catlett representing himself, Ms. Cook of Arlington County, and Ms. Eggerton of Alexandria all lend suggested language to this proposal to help further clarify
- Ms. Hale of Loudoun County's Fire Marshal's Office speaks in support based on helping define what the initial issue is that would require this amendment in the first place
- Ms. Eggerton of Alexandria points to Mechanical Code as a source of potential problem areas when interpreting this piece of code
- Ms. Cook of Arlington County mentions how the hood ventilation requirements have evolved and is concerned regarding the potential for retro-fit requirements down the line - she does not currently support
- Mr. Moss of VBCOA suggests clarifying language, citing partnership with Mr. Milliken on this concept previously. Mr. Milliken has no objection to making Mr. Moss's proposed change to the language to add further clarity.
- Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) suggests that a proposed definition change should be run through the mechanical code group because the proposed change could run into issues with the mechanical code.
- Ms. Davis (DHCD) agrees - motion to carry over to August
- Mr. Catlett suggests wordsmithing this to ensure there is no conflict between the codes.
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia concurs with Ellen
- Mr. Grace (Fairfax County) concurs as well.
- Mr. Moss and Mr. Milliken resolve to work together to come up with revised language

Additional Public Comments:

Submitted by William Andrews in cdpVA UTC Suggest add "commercial" to clarify not apply within residences. Expect readers understand intent for inside, not outdoors. 2000 IFC sec. 609.2 read: "A type I hood shall be installed at or above all commercial food heat-processing appliances that produce grease vapors or smoke. Exceptions: Food heat-processing appliances installed within a dwelling unit."

"Commercial Food Heat-Processing Appliance" was defined as in a food-processing establishment, which noted include any building or a portion thereof used for the processing of food. Helps fire official citing portable cooking risk which use not approved by building official. Instead of fire official citing vague unsafe condition or use other than as approved by building official, then need refer to or get building official to verify did not approve that type cooking activity there.

Results: Carryover to August meeting

FP807.5.4-18: Group I-3 exception for combustible decorative materials

Proponents: William Hall, Virginia Dept of Corrections (william.hall@vadoc.virginia.gov)

Comments: Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee) is in support.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP2306.2.1-18: SWCB regulated tanks

Proponents: DHCD Staff. Mr. Brown of DHCD provides context and explanation for this proposal. This proposal was a collaborative effort with DEQ to provide additional pointers in the SFPC where the State Water Control Board regulations should be referenced for certain tanks. Ms. Davis (DHCD) lends further support.

Comments: Mr. Milliken of the Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee says the FSBCSC has not yet reviewed this proposed change. However, he finds it straightforward and is in support of the proposal.

Ms. Davis of DHCD reassures Mr. Milliken and everyone in the meeting that if a proposal winds up being problematic to one of the stakeholders once it is at the Board review stage, it can still be pulled for further consideration.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP2306.2.1.1-18: Inventory records for underground tanks

Proponents: DHCD Staff : Mr. Brown of DHCD and Ms. Meadows of DEQ lend context to this proposal.

Comments:

- Mr. Milliken representing Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee suggests we “stick close to the Model Code language”
- Ms. Davis of DHCD agrees that the state water control board would supersede ... is there national language we could use to more accurately mirror?
- Ms. Meadows of DEQ confirms that DEQ is fine with adding back in the last sentence.
- Mr. Brown of DHCD says that this is about record-keeping
- Ms. Hale of Loudoun County Fire Marshal’s Office agrees that this can be workable so long as we un-strike the last sentence

Results: Consensus for Approval - as Modified (Un-striking the last sentence)

FP2403.2.1.3-18: Areas adjacent to spray booths

Proponents: Joseph Willis, Prince William County (jwillis@pwcgov.org); Haywood Kines, Prince William County (hkines@pwcgov.org); Mr. Willis provides context for the reasoning behind this proposal.

Public Comments for: FP2403.2.1.3-18

Discussion by Haywood Kines Jan 31, 2020 20:58 UTC

Comments:

- Ms. Davis (DHCD) wishes to clarify whether this would potentially

affect retroactive work; Mr. Willis says no, it wouldn't.

- Mr. Milliken of Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee supports this; it cleans up an old Virginia code.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP5003.1.1(1)-18: Adds a footnote to MAQ table for new A2L refrigerants

Proponents: Julius Ballanco (JBENGINEER@aol.com) of Daiken

Comments:

- Ms. Hale of Loudoun County Fire Marshal's Office and VPMIA are opposed. She is concerned about the lack of specificity with the language of "mildly flammable," and that the proposal seems to go beyond the scope of what the Fire Marshals' office is able to execute. She believes the proposal is premature.
- Ms. Davis offers the option to Mr. Ballanco to carry over the proposal if he is willing to work with the other groups who are opposed.
- Mr. Ballanco agrees to work with Loudoun County and VPMIA in order to carry the proposal over to Workgroup 4.
- Mr. Milliken adds that the proposal also needs to be in accordance with the Fire Code edits.

Results: Carryover to Next Meeting

FP5003.1.1(2)-18: Adds a footnote to MAQ table for A2L refrigerants

Proponents: Julius Ballanco (JBENGINEER@aol.com) of Daiken

Comments:

- Ms. Hale of LCFMO voices concerns about jurisdiction, ability for Fire Officials to be able to put this code change into practice. She does not believe this proposal has been vetted properly and is not in support.
- Mr. Grace of Fairfax County, Mr. Beahm representing himself, all move to carry over.

Results: Carryover to Next Meeting

FP5703.1.2-18: Classified locations for combustible liquids

Proponents: DHCD Staff (sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov)

Comments: This is an editorial change only. No one in opposition.

Results: Consensus for Approval

FP5704.2.13.1.1-18: Exceptions for out of service tanks

Proponents: DHCD Staff (sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov)

Comments: Mr. Brown from DHCD explained that this was a result of the meeting with DEQ to align SWCB regs with USBC and SFPC regulations.

- Mr. Millken for Stafford County opposes.
- Ms. Meadows for DEQ mentions how this fire code requirement is currently in direct conflict with SWCB laws and regulations and as such, has created a lot of confusion for fire officials.
- Mr. Brown (DHCD) restates attempt to clean up this language so that compliance is achievable by all parties involved
- Mr. Milliken (Stafford County) suggests that revised language may make it more possible to move toward consensus but that in its current written state, the fire officials would be tasked with enforcing DEQ's regulations.

Results: Carryover to August

FP5707.1-18: On-demand Mobile Fueling Operations

Proponents: Irene Koulouris; Mr. Catlett of Catlett Consulting speaks to lend background to this proposal.

Comments:

- Ms. Davis (DHCD) provided background and overview of the process related to this proposal. Since mobile fueling is prohibited by state law, this will obviously be consensus for disapproval. However, it is being discussed as the proponent did not withdraw the proposal. Additionally DHCD has been tasked with creating a report that details concerns with mobile fueling for members of the General Assembly. This conversation provides an opportunity to identify concerns. It is anticipated that a stakeholder group will be convened this fall for a fuller discussion.
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia clarifies with Mr. Catlett and the proponents that all the language should be underlined as it is new language.
- Mr. Beahm representing himself would like to know whether Exception No. 3 would be deleted
- Ms. Davis (DHCD) clarifies that the only removal would be a result of what is already illegal in the state of Virginia
- Mr. Catlett (Catlett Consulting) responds that this proposal would not remove the exemption
- Ms. Hale (Loudoun County) has concerns about trying to address this proposal preemptively - before it is legal in Virginia. She believes it is premature.
- Mr. Beahm representing himself concurs that this proposal is premature.
- Mr. Catlett (Catlett Consulting) invites other workgroup members to address further questions to him between this meeting and fall 2020

Results: Consensus for Disapproval

PM604.3.1.1-18: Third party electrical inspectors

Proponents: Haywood Kines (hkines@pwcgov.org)

Comments:

- Mr Catlett makes a comment on language, but he doesn't have any concerns with the code change itself.
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia also makes a note on language; he doesn't believe the word "inspector" should be capitalized, but he has no issue with the code change itself.
- Everyone is in support for this proposal.

Results: Consensus for approval

EB601.4(3)-18 Energy conservation

Proponents: Eric Lacey (eric@reca-codes.com); Energy Subworkgroup

Comments: Mr. Mang of Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association thanks the group for their hard work on this.

Results: Consensus for Approval

E501.1: Deletes existing building provisions of the VECC

Moved from June 30th meeting

Proponents: Laura Baker of Responsible Energy Codes Alliance (RECA), Eric Lacey of RECA

Comments: This is the first in a series of proposals brought forth by RECA this code cycle. They believe it is important to have energy requirements in the VEBC, instead of just in the VECC.

Results: Consensus for Approval

E502 Moves VECC existing building provisions to VEBC

Moved from June 30th meeting

Proponents: Laura Baker, Eric Lacey of RECA

Comments:

- Ms. Cook of Arlington County opposes the proposal as written, but suggests bringing it forth at the August meeting
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia suggests "building system" versus "building" language
- Mr. Beahm representing himself agrees.
- Mr. Pharr of AOBA/VAMA agrees with them, as well.
- Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) appreciates the "not overloading the existing system" piece of language, but also supports compromise with languaging.

Results: Carry over to August meeting

E503-18 Deletes existing building provisions of the VECC

Moved from June 30th meeting

Proponents: Laura Baker, Eric Lacey of RECA

Comments: Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia suggests we modify the language to say “Chapter 6 of the VEBC”

Results: Consensus for Approval with Modification

E504.1 Moves VECC existing building provisions to VEBC

Moved from June 30th meeting

Proponents: Laura Baker, Eric Lacey

Comments:

- Ms. Cook of Arlington County suggests there’s more refining to do.
- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) is not sure that the language regarding “repair” would necessitate a change, and that it may set a problematic/unsustainable precedent. Also brings up a cost issue.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington) and Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) both suggest carrying over and working together to ensure that the language included in this doesn’t already cover what has been included in 2015 code.
- Mr. Pharr mentions that AOBA/VAMA oppose E504.1

Results: Carry over to August

RE503.1.1.1 Replacement fenestration

Moved from June 30th meeting

Proponents: Eric Lacey (RECA)

Comments:

- Supported by Energy Subworkgroup
- Mr. Lacey (RECA) suggests this proposal is no longer necessary as it has already been covered by a previous proposal’s contents.
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) voices disapproval.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington) states: “The way I read this ... [is] that this only applies when a building owner / tenant selects to replace fenestration, it does not require upgrading to meet energy requirements if they aren't already replacing the fenestration as part of the project.”
- Mr. Brown of DHCD confirms with Mr. Lacey (proponent) that he would like to withdraw this proposal

Results: Withdrawn

EB601.4(1)-18 Energy conservation

Proponents: Eric Lacey, Responsible Energy Codes Alliance (eric@reca-codes.com)

Comments: Because we already covered the materials in a previous proposal this cycle for Energy Conservation to be added into the Existing Building Codes, this is withdrawn by the proponent

Results: Withdrawn

EB601.4(4)-18 Energy conservation/Roof replacement

Proponents: Jeff Mang, Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association

(jeff.mang@hoganlovells.com); Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com); Energy Subworkgroup

Comments: Proponent says we have already covered the elements he wished to cover in this proposal and elects to withdraw.

Results: Withdrawn

EB701.4-18 Moves VECC existing building provisions to VEBC

Proponents: Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey (eric@reca-codes.com)

Comments:

- Mr. Payne with AIA Virginia opposes because energy conservation does not change based on occupancy. Currently, a change of occupancy requires a greater degree of each of the six elements; energy conservation is not one of the six.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington County) does not believe we can reach consensus if we carry this proposal over. If there's interest in revisiting and redefining, then there's potential for consensus for approval, but she is concerned about the huge cost implications.
- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) shares cost concerns. Not in support.
- Ms. Baker maintains that these are not new requirements, but she would rather work to compromise on the other two proposals, so agrees for this one to move forward as non-consensus.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington) wishes for cost statement to make its way to the Board; it is a substantial cost increase and she underscores that the Board should recognize this fact.

Results: Non-Consensus

EB202(1)-18: Change of occupancy definition

Proponents: Michael Dellinger (mdellinger@albemarle.org)

Discussion by Kenney Payne Apr 17, 2020 19:19 UTC

Comments: This proposal is withdrawn by the proponent to be able to lend support to a very similar proposal - EB202(2) proposed by Casey Littlefield

Results: Withdrawn

EB202(2)-18: Change of occupancy definition

Proponents: Casey Littlefield

Public Comments for: EB202(2)-18 Discussion by Kenney Payne

Comments:

- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) is concerned about the interpretation of the word “electrical” for Change of Occupancy. He also believes the VEBC already includes the language that would provide guidelines for what this proposal is supposed to cover.
- Mr. Kines (Prince William County) argues that there are several ways in which this proposal could be applied; he speaks in support of the proposal.
- Mr. Moss (VBCOA) agrees with Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) and would not be in favor of this change. Mr. Beahm (representing himself) agrees.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington) and Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) both assert that there are many reasons change of occupancy would require upgrades, including electrical.
- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) suggests that this change is not necessary, supports punting this one to the next code cycle.

Results: Non-Consensus

EB307-18: Roof covering and repair

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com); Ronald Clements Jr (clementsro@chesterfield.gov); Mr. Payne provides history and context on this proposal

Comments: This is a technical change. No dissent voiced.

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB402.1-18: Change of occupancy

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments:

- Mr. Payne provides context for the proposal regarding how this proposal would duplicate what is at the national code levels.
- Ms. Eggerton of Alexandria wonders if it is in alignment with DOJ standards, which Mr. Payne explains that it is. Ms. Eggerton is satisfied with his explanation of requirement compliance and is in support of the proposal.

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB402.1.4.2-18: Roof/ceiling assembly

Proponents: Jeff Mang, Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (jeff.mang@hoganlovells.com); Energy Subworkgroup

Comments:

- Mr. Brown of DHCD clarifies that this proposal was mistakenly assigned subject matter code “EB” and should have been “E” since it is energy related. DHCD staff will rename the proposal “E402.1.4.2-18” .
- Mr. Pharr of AOBA/VAMA and Ms. Eggerton of Alexandria voice support for this proposal.
- Mr. Lacey (Fairfax County) supports this too.

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB404.3-18: Alterations affecting area of primary function

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments: Mr. Pharr of AOBA/VAMA supports EB404.3

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB405.1-18: Historic buildings

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments: None

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB502.1.1-18: Repairs to structural concrete

Proponents: Stephen Szoke, American Concrete Institute (steve.szoke@concrete.org)

Comments: Stephen Szoke absent; no other support for approval.

Results: Consensus for Disapproval

EB504.1.6-18: Smoke alarms

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Public Comments for: EB504.1.6-18 Discussion by Kenney Payne

Comments: Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) and Mr. Beahm (representing himself) support the proposal if moved to Chapter 3

Results: Consensus for Approval as Modified

EB701.4: Moves VECC existing building provisions to VEBC

Proponents: Laura Baker, Eric Lacey of RECA

Comments:

- Ms. Baker explains that this proposal is designed to move VECC existing building language over in the VEBC Change of Occupancy chapter.
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia voices concern about moving the language over; currently, energy conservation requirements are not triggered by a Change of Occupancy. This would be a complete reversal, to which he is opposed.
- Ms. Cook of Arlington County mentions that she doesn't think we will reach consensus on this proposal; due to the current economic climate. There would be heavy financial implications. Thus, she is not in support.
- Mr. Payne brings up that if there is an alteration to a structure related to a change of occupancy, that may trigger energy conservation requirements - but as it stands, for existing buildings with no alterations, he is not in support.
- Ms. Cook (Arlington County) wishes to see the cost statement; Ms. Baker claims there isn't any because it is already contained within the VEBC. Ms. Cook believes this is factually incorrect, and that it is contained within the body of the Virginia Energy Code, but that to add it to the VEBC would have a large financial impact.

Results: Non-Consensus

EB704.1-18 Fire protection

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments:

- Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee) dissents in practice regarding sprinklers, on the basis of language that could be redefined as "fire areas"
- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) suggests that Mr. Milliken's interpretation of the code would be a "tremendous change" from how it has historically been interpreted
- Ms. Cook (Arlington) supports this code change proposal because it is clarifying
- Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee) patently disagrees with Mr. Payne.

Results: Non-Consensus

EB801.1-18 Revising and reorganization of VEBC/VECC

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments: Withdrawn

Results: Withdrawn

EB1401.1-18 Evaluation process

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments: There were additional substantive changes in certain places that cdpVA would not accept, so are not shown in the main part of the proposal, so those additional changes are outlined in the reason

statement and Mr. Payne wanted to make sure everyone was aware that those additional changes were there and are part of the proposal. With those changes taken into account, this is Consensus for Approval

Results: Consensus for Approval

EB1101.18(1)-18 High-rise fire sprinklers

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Public Comments for: EB1101.18(1)-18 Discussion by Kenney Payne (AIA Virginia)

Comments: Discussion regarding sprinklers versus fire areas

Results: Withdrawn

EB1101.18(2)-18 Address identification

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com)

Comments:

- Ms. Hale (Loudoun County) and Mr. Beahm (representing himself) lend discussion to clarity of Authority Having Jurisdiction.
- Mr. Milliken representing the Virginia Fire Services Board and Standards states that the committee was not in support of this.
- Mr. Milliken (VFSB) asserts that he would like to amend the last sentence in order to be able to fully support this proposal. Mr. Beahm suggests reworking some of the language but doesn't have strong feelings about it one way or the other.
- The workgroup is in favor of this proposal going back to Mr. Payne for further workshopping of the language, with the intent to bring it forward in August for final review.

Results: Carry over to August for final review