Robert F. McDonnell
Governor

James S. Cheng
Secretary of
Commerce and Trade

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

William C. Shelton
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Ainslie, Chairman and Members of the Board of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the FSB/BHCD Statewide Fire Prevention Code Development Committee

FROM: Emory Rodgers, Deputy Director
DHCD – Division of Building and Fire Regulation

DATE: March 14, 2013

SUBJECT: FSB/BHCD Statewide Fire Prevention Code Development Committee consideration of code changes for the Proposed 2012 Statewide Fire Prevention Code (SFPC)

We have attached the December 20, 2012 summary of your meeting where you approved consensus code changes. The State Fire Marshal asked that his fee proposals not be considered as he was still reviewing his overall fee programs. These approved code changes will be incorporated into the proposed 2012 SFPC that will be reviewed by the BHCD's CSC on March 25, 2013 and then approved by the Board of Housing and Community Development (BHCD) on May 20, 2013.

All SFPC code changes vetted in the DHCD Workgroup meetings held up to March 12th are being considered at this meeting. Code changes submitted after February 28, 2013 and up to July 1, 2013, will be considered in the final phase of the 2012 regulatory process and vetted in the late summer and early fall with stakeholders.

For your March 25, 2013 meeting there will be consensus code changes in Tab 1 recommended for approval as submitted/amended or denial. You can block vote those consensus code changes after discussion. You may also want to pull-out of the block code changes that would then be individually discussed and voted upon.

Those code changes that are deemed to be non-consensus in Tab 2 will be discussed individually and voted upon with your options being approval as submitted/amended or denial; deferring for consideration on May 20th; deferring to the final regulatory approval later in 2013; and, carrying over to the 2012 SFPC regulatory code change cycle. Your decisions made at this meeting will be reviewed by the BHCD's Codes and Standards Committee and the BHCD on May 20, 2013.

Fire Services Board & Board of Housing and Community Development
STATEWIDE FIRE PREVENTION CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
2012 CODE CHANGE CYCLE – BOOK 4
March 25, 2013

Opening Statement

TAB 1 - SFPC Consensus Code Changes: Approve individually or as a block

TAB 2 - SFPC Non-Consensus Code Changes

TAB 3 – Summaries

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Robby Dawson Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): Statewide Fire Prevention Code – various sections as listed below

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

103.2. Amendments: All requirements of the referenced codes and standards that relate to fees, ~~permits,~~ unsafe notices, disputes, condemnation, inspections, ~~scope of enforcement~~ and all other procedural, and administrative matters are deleted and replaced by the provisions of Chapter 1 of the SFPC.

Table 107.2
Operational Permit Requirements (to be filled in by local jurisdiction)

Description	Permit Required (yes or no)	Permit Fee	Inspection Fee
~~**Battery systems.** A permit is required to install stationary lead-acid battery systems having a liquid capacity of more than 50 gallons (189 L).~~			
Compressed gas. An operational permit is required for the storage, use or handling at normal temperature and pressure (NTP) of compressed gases in excess of the amounts listed below. **Exception:** Vehicles equipped for and using compressed gas as a fuel for propelling the vehicle. **PERMIT AMOUNTS FOR COMPRESSED GASES** **TYPE OF GAS** — **AMOUNT (cubic feet at NTP)** Corrosive — 200 Flammable (except cryogenic fluids and liquefied petroleum gases) — 200 Highly toxic — Any amount Inert and simple asphyxiant — 6,000 Oxidizing (including oxygen) — 504 Pyrophoric — Any amount Toxic — Any amount ~~For SI: 1 cubic foot = 0.02832 m3~~			
Covered and open mall buildings. An operational permit is required for: 1. The placement of retail fixtures and displays, concession equipment, displays of			

highly combustible goods and similar items in the mall.
2. The display of liquid- or gas-fired equipment in the mall.
3. The use of open-flame or flame-producing equipment in the mall.

LP-gas. An operational permit is required for:
1. Storage and use of LP-gas.
   Exception: A permit is not required for individual containers with a 500-gallon (1893 L) water capacity or less or multiple container systems having an aggregate quantity not exceeding 500 gallons (1893 L), serving occupancies in Group R-3.
2. Operation of cargo tankers that transport LP-gas.

Cryogenic fluids. An operational permit is required to produce, store, transport on site, use, handle or dispense cryogenic fluids in excess of the amounts listed below. Exception: Operational permits are not required for vehicles equipped for and using cryogenic fluids as a fuel for propelling the vehicle or for refrigerating the lading.

Explosives, fireworks and pyrotechnics. An operational permit is required for the manufacture, storage, handling, sale or use of any quantity of explosive, explosive materials, fireworks, ~~or~~ pyrotechnic special effects, or pyrotechnic special effects material within the scope of Chapter ~~33~~56.
Exception: Storage in Group R-3 or R-5 occupancies of smokeless propellant, black powder and small arms primers for personal use, not for resale and in accordance with the quantity limitations and conditions set forth in Section 5601.1, exceptions 4 and 12.

Type of Cryogenic Fluid	Inside Building (gallons)	Outside Building (gallons)
Flammable	More than 1	60
Inert	60	500
Oxidizing (includes oxygen)	10	50
Physical or health hazard not indicated above	Any amount	Any amount

~~For SI: 1 gallon = 3.785 L.~~

Fumigation, ~~and~~ thermal and insecticidal fogging. An operational permit is required to operate a business of fumigation, ~~or~~ thermal or insecticidal fogging and to maintain a room, vault or chamber in which a toxic or flammable fumigant is used.

Hazardous materials. An operational permit is required to store, transport on site, dispense, use or handle hazardous materials in excess of the following amounts:

Type of material	Amount
Combustible liquids	See Flammable and Combustible Liquids
Corrosive materials	
Gases	See Compressed Gases
Liquids	55 gallons
Solids	1000 pounds
Explosive materials	See Explosives
Flammable materials	
Gases	See Compressed Gases
Liquids	See Flammable and Combustible Liquids
Solids	100 pounds
Highly toxic materials	
Gases	See Compressed Gases
Liquids	Any amount
Solids	Any amount
Oxidizing materials	
Gases	See Compressed Gases
Liquids	
Class 4	Any amount
Class 3	1 gallon[a]
Class 2	10 gallons
Class 1	55 gallons

Solids				
Class 4	Any amount			
Class 3	10 pounds[b]			
Class 2	100 pounds			
Class 1	500 pounds			
Organic peroxides				
Liquids				
Class I	Any amount			
Class II	Any amount			
Class III	1 gallon			
Class IV	2 gallons			
Class V	No permit required			
Solids				
Class I	Any amount			
Class II	Any amount			
Class III	10 pounds			
Class IV	20 pounds			
Class V	No permit required			
Pyrophoric materials				
Gases	See Compressed Gases			
Liquids	Any amount			
Solids	Any amount			
Toxic materials				
Gases	See Compressed Gases			
Liquids	10 gallons			
Solids	100 pounds			
Unstable (reactive) materials				
Liquids				
Class 4	Any amount			
Class 3	Any amount			
Class 2	5 gallons			
Class 1	10 gallons			
Solids				
Class 4	Any amount			
Class 3	Any amount			
Class 2	50 pounds			
Class 1	100 pounds			
Water-reactive Materials				
Liquids				
Class 3	Any amount			
Class 2	5 gallons			
Class 1	55 gallons			
Solids				
Class 3	Any amount			
Class 2	50 pounds			
Class 1	500 pounds			
a. 20 gallons when Table 5003.1.1(1) Note k applies and hazard identification signs in accordance with Section 5003.5 are provided for quantities of 20 gallons or less. b. 20 pounds when Table 5003.1.1(1) Note k applies and hazard identification signs in accordance with Section 5003.5 are provided for quantities of 200 pounds or less.				
Open flames and candles. An operational permit is required to ~~remove paint with a torch; use a torch or open-flame device in a hazardous fire area; or to~~ use open flames or candles in connection with assembly areas, dining areas of restaurants or drinking establishments.				
Open flames and torches. An operational permit is required to remove paint with a ~~torch~~; or to use a torch or open-flame device in a wildfire risk area.				
Places of ~~A~~assembly~~/educational~~. An operational permit is required to operate a place of assembly~~/educational occupancy~~.				
For SI: 1 cubic foot = 0.02832 m3. 1 gallon = 3.785 L., 1 pound = 0.454 kg.				

301.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2 for the activities or uses regulated by Sections 306, 307, 308 and 315.

307.2 Permit required. A permit shall be obtained from the *fire code official* in accordance with Section ~~105.6~~107.2 prior to kindling a fire for recognized silvicultural or range or wildlife management practices, prevention or control of disease or pests, or a bonfire. Application for such approval shall only be presented by and permits issued to the *owner* of the land upon which the fire is to be kindled.

308.2 Permits required. Permits shall be obtained from the *fire code official* in accordance with Section ~~105.6~~107.2 prior to engaging in the following activities involving open flame, fire and burning:
1. Use of a torch or flame-producing device to remove paint from a structure.
2. Use of open flame, fire or burning in connection with Group A or E occupancies.
3. Use or operation of torches and other devices, machines or processes liable to start or cause fire in or upon wildfire risk areas.

315.2 Permit required. A permit for miscellaneous combustible storage shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

501.2 Permits. A permit shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

601.2 Permits. Permits shall be obtained for refrigeration systems, battery systems and solar photovoltaic power systems as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

901.2 Construction documents. The *fire code official* shall have the authority to require and receive copies of *construction documents* and calculations for all *fire protection systems* ~~and to require permits be issued for the installation, rehabilitation or modification of any *fire protection system*~~*to be installed, rehabilitated or modified*. ~~*Construction documents* for *fire protection systems* shall be submitted for review and approval prior to system installation.~~

901.3 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

2001.3 Permits. For permits to operate aircraft-refueling vehicles, application of flammable or combustible finishes and hot work, see Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2101.2 Permit required. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2201.2 Permits. Permits shall be required for *combustible dust*-producing operations as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2301.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2401.3 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

2501.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2601.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2701.5 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2801.2 Permit. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

2901.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

3001.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

3103.4 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

3201.2 Permits. A permit shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

3401.2 Permit required. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5001.5 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

5101.2 Permit required. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5201.3 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5301.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5401.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5501.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5601.2 Permit required. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2 and regulated in accordance with this section.

5701.4 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Sections ~~105.6~~107.2 ~~and 105.7~~.

5801.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

5901.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6001.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6201.2 Permits. Permits shall be required for organic peroxides as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6301.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6401.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6501.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

6601.2 Permits. Permits shall be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~107.2.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The overall objective for this proposed change is to ensure the proper and accurate coordination of the code's permit provisions and to clearly identify how reference standards are to be applied and when.

1. Section 103.2 amends by eliminating "permits" and "scope of enforcement" from this section. The corrected sections If the SFPC now correctly identity what section of the SFPC (107.2) identifies which operational permits are required. If the term "permits" remains, confusion is created that the permitting requirements in the explosives chapter are not enforceable. But with the proper reference to 107.2, it becomes clear that not only are permits potentially required, they are referenced back to the proper administrative provisions of chapter 1.

   The "scope of enforcement" is also removed to clearly indicate those referenced standards (like NFPA) do have limitations on their scope. Without the deletion of this section, one could argue the door is left wide open to take the standard out of context or there is no basis for the standard to be used. The SFPC already has a catch all provision in 102.4 that clearly states any conflict between the SFPC and a reference standard – such as differences in scope – that the SFPC prevails.

2. References to the permit section of Chapter 1 are often encountered in the technical chapters of the code. When encountered in a technical chapter, this proposed change will provide for the proper and accurate reference of the Chapter 1 permit provisions.

3. The changes to Table 107.2 are intended to incorporate the changes found in the 2012 edition of the IFC with the following notable differences:
   a. An operational permit requirement for battery systems was deleted from the IFC in October 2004 through action by the ICC Code Correlation Committee (CCC). The stated reason for the CCC action was,

      "Section 105.6.5 is the only section in 105.6 that contains the word "install", which clearly indicates that the permit requirement is one of construction, not operation.

      Section 105.6.5 was added to the code by code change F203-99 (AM). It originally said "...install or operate..." but the modification deleted the phrase "...or operate...". At that time, there was only one section, 105.6, that

regulated all permits.

In the same code change cycle, code change F46-99 (AM) divided Section 105.6 into the current separate Required Operational Permits Section 105.6 and Required Construction Permits Section 105.7.

Since both code changes F46-99 and F203-99 were approved simultaneously, relocating the new construction-oriented permit requirements created by F203-99 for the installation of battery systems from Section 105.6 to the new Section 105.7 should have been accomplished as a correlation change prior to publication of the 2000 edition, however it was overlooked. This correlation change will place the permit requirement for installation of battery systems into the proper section."

(The ICC references to Section 105.6 equate to SFPC Section 107.2.)

b. For fumigation, thermal and insecticidal fogging, the model code deleted the reference to "thermal" treatment but its felt this treatment must be retained. To produce high temperatures (thermal) within a building or space may still be a viable method for treating bed bug infestations. One of the methods of thermal pest control is the use of propane. If propane is used to treat bed bug infestations, then a permit may have to be obtained through or coordinated with other chapters of the code such as Chapter 61, Liquefied Petroleum Gas. The changes shown are for the benefit of clarity and distinction for the 3 methods of treatment; fumigation, thermal and fogging.

c. The SI units of measurement are relocated to the end of the table as opposed to repeating them in multiple locations. The units of measurement would still be applicable throughout the table.

d. Through an omission, the '09 edition of the SFPC did not have notes "a" and "b" as they relate to liquid and solid oxidizing hazardous materials. This change properly puts those notes back into the table.

e. As a statewide minimum, the added language regarding explosives, display fireworks and pyrotechnics reflects the combining of separate IFC model code lines and its list of required operational permits. This produces no fundamental or significant operational changes within or for the SFPC and **does not** impact "permissible fireworks".

f. The exception for the line for explosives is a reiteration for propellants and primers found in Chapter 56 and those contained in previous editions of the SFPC. There's no attempt to change those SFPC exceptions.

g. As a point of information, no edition of the referenced IFC model code has had educational occupancy listed for operational permits, hence the reason for deleting the reference for educational occupancies. The option to amend the code to include Group E is still available at the local level.

4. The change to Section 901.2 allows the fire official to require and receive copies of construction documents related to the installation, rehabilitation or modification of fire protections systems. It is those documents that establish the benchmark for which a level protection or performance is to be maintain for the life of the building and its systems.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/5/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

VIRGINIA DHCD

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: DHCD Staff (Suggested revisions to the FSBCC proposal on permits)

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC permit sections

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

103.2 Amendments. All requirements of the referenced codes and standards that relate to fees, permits, unsafe notices, disputes, condemnation, inspections, scope of enforcement and all other procedural, and administrative matters are deleted and replaced by the provisions of Chapter 1 of the SFPC and the applicable amendments to the provisions of the referenced codes and standards set out in this code.

Amendments to Table 107.2 (as set out in the FSBCC proposal)

Replace the language in all permits sections indicated in the FSBCC proposal with permissive language to match the language in Section 107.2 of the SFPC and correct the back reference in those sections to Section 107.2 as indicated in the provision below:

301.2 Permits. Permits ~~shall~~ may be required as set forth in Section ~~105.6~~ 107.2 for the activities or uses regulated by Sections 306, 307, 308 and 315.

901.2 Construction documents. (delete the FSBCC amendment to this section and substitute the changes to Section 109.2 of the SFPC shown below):

109.2 Coordinated inspections. The fire official shall coordinate inspections and administrative orders with any other state and local agencies having related inspection authority, and shall coordinate those inspections required by the USBC for new construction when involving provisions of the amended IFC, so that the owners and occupants will not be subjected to numerous inspections or conflicting orders. The fire official may request copies of relevant construction documents and calculations from the USBC inspection authority for alterations to existing fire protection systems.

Note: The USBC requires the building official to coordinate such inspections with the fire official.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

This suggested DHCD staff proposal follows the intent of the FSBCC proposal to correlate the permit provisions in the International Fire Code (IFC) with the permit provisions in the SFPC, but eliminates unintended consequences that would be the result of the FSBCC proposal. The FSBCC proposal deleted the term "permits" and the phrase "scope of enforcement" from Section 103.2. That would have more far reaching implications than just correlating the permit provisions of the IFC as there are permit and scope requirements in sections not referenced in the FBSCC proposal that are in conflict with Chapter 1 of the SFPC and would become enforceable. The staff proposal accomplishes the same purpose without the conflicts by adding clarification that state amendments to the IFC are also enforceable as written.

The staff proposal uses the term "may" in the permit sections in the IFC since Section 107.2 of the SFPC does not require permits, but only authorizes the enforcing agency to determine which permits it will require.

The FSBCC amendments to the construction document section for fire protection systems is moved to Chapter 1 of the SFPC where there is already a provision for coordination between the USBC and the SFPC.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): X☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: John Catlett Representing: VBCOA Administration Committee

Mailing Address: 301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Email Address: john.catlett@alexandriava.gov Telephone Number: 703.746.4182

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code Section No(s): SFPC 106.4

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Proposed Change: Modify 106.3, create new section 106.4, and renumber existing sections 106.4, 106.5, 106.7

106.3 **Inspections**. The fire official is authorized to conduct such inspections as are deemed necessary to determine the extent of compliance with the provisions of this code. ~~and to approve reports of inspection by approved agencies or individuals. All reports of such inspections by approved agencies or individuals shall be prepared and submitted in writing for review and approval. Inspection reports shall be certified by a responsible officer of such approved agency or by the responsible individual.~~ The fire official is authorized to engage such expert opinion as deemed necessary to report upon unusual, detailed or complex technical issues in accordance with local policies.

106.3.1 **Observations** When, during an inspection, the fire official or authorized representative observes an apparent or actual violation of another law, ordinance or code not within the official's authority to enforce, such official shall report the findings to the official having jurisdiction in order that such official may institute the necessary measures.

106.4 **(New) Approved inspection agencies and Individuals.** The fire official may accept reports of inspections or tests from individuals or inspection agencies approved in accordance with the fire official's written policy required by Section 106.4.1. The individual or inspection agency shall meet the qualifications and reliability requirements established by the written policy. Reports of inspections by approved individuals or agencies shall be in writing, shall indicate if compliance with the applicable provisions of the SFPC have been met and shall be certified by the individual inspector or by the responsible officer when the report is from an agency. The fire official shall review and approve the report unless there is cause to reject it. Failure to approve a report shall be in writing within two days of receiving it stating the reasons for rejection.

106.4.1 **(New) Third-party inspectors.** Each fire official charged with the enforcement of the SFPC shall have a written policy establishing the minimum acceptable qualifications for third-party inspectors. The policy shall include the format and time frame required for submission of reports, any prequalification or preapproval requirements before conducting a third-party inspection and any other requirements and procedures established by the fire official.

106.4.2 **(New) Qualifications** In determining third-party qualifications, the fire official may consider such items as DHCD inspector certification, other state or national certifications, state professional registrations, related experience, education and any other factors that would demonstrate competency and reliability to conduct inspections.

~~106.4~~ 106.5 Alternatives

~~106..5~~ 106.6 Modifications.....

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):
There has been an indication that the administrative provisions of the Statewide Fire Prevention Code did not permit the acceptance of third party inspection reports from approved agencies or individuals. This change would align the SFPC with the USBC in requiring a written policy that describes the minimum qualifications and requirements for third-party inspectors or agencies.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: August 2, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: taso@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: DHCD Staff (Suggested revisions to the VBCOA Admin Committee proposal on third party inspections)

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 106.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Amend Section 106.3 of the SFPC to read as follows:

106.3 Inspections. The fire official is authorized to conduct such inspections as are deemed necessary to determine the extent of compliance with the provisions of this code and to approve reports of inspection by approved agencies or individuals in accordance with written policy. All reports of such inspections by approved agencies or individuals shall be prepared and submitted in writing for review and approval. Inspection reports shall be certified by a responsible officer of such approved agency or by the responsible individual. The fire official is authorized to engage such expert opinion as deemed necessary to report upon unusual, detailed or complex technical issues in accordance with local policies.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

This suggested DHCD staff proposal scales back the VBCOA Admin Committee proposal for third party inspection policies as there were comments in the DHCD-sponsored workgroup meetings that the SFPC already provided for third party inspections. However, this proposal establishes the need for a written policy for such approvals to afford the opportunity for interested parties to be involved in the approval of the policy established by the local enforcing agency. This issue comes from legislative concerns addressing the use of overtime fees and other considerations in the use of third party inspections under the SFPC.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☒Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Zack Adams Representing: Virginia Tech

Mailing Address: 459 Tech Center Drive; Blacksburg, VA 24061

Email Address: adamsz@vt.edu Telephone Number: 540.231.5985

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 404.3.2

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Delete 404.3.2 4.8 as follows:

404.3.2 Fire safety plans. Fire safety plans shall include the following:
4. Floor plans identifying the locations of the following:
~~4.8. Portable fire extinguishers.~~

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):
Portable fire extinguishers are required to be conspicuous (906.5) and unobstructed/unobscured or otherwise marked (906.6) where installed. It provides no tangible benefit to put fire extinguisher locations on a floor plan, since these plans would most likely *not* be used as a reference when responding to a fire emergency. It also adds an additional level of complexity to these drawings which makes them less useful and harder to interpret. Finally, where fire extinguishers are provided for employee use, those employees must be trained per OSHA and such training would include instruction on the location of those extinguishers (see http://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=STANDARDS&p_id=9811).

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: October 9, 2012

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)

____ As Submitted ____ As Amended ____ Disapproved ____ Carry over ____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐ Individual ☒ Government Entity ☐ Company

Name: Michael D Redifer Representing: VAESA

Mailing Address: 2400 Washington Avenue 3rd flr Newport News, VA 23607

Email Address: mredifer@nngov.com Telephone Number: 757-926-8861

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): VCC 3003.2.1, SFPC 506.1 and SFPC 506.3

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

delete in entirety without substitution

Virginia Construction Code Section 3003.2.1
Statewide Fire Prevention Code Sections 506.1 and 506.3

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The requirements for fire service elevator keys including the allowance of non-standardized elevator keys placed in a lock box have been addressed through an exception to IFC 607.5 and inclusion of the key box standard UL1037 in IFC 506. With these changes, the building owner may exercise the option of providing non-standardized keys in a key box to which fire service personnel are given access. This arrangement closely follows the requirements of the ASME A17.1 standard and eliminates the overly burdensome mandatory requirement of providing a jurisdiction-specific fire service elevator key for all elevators within the locality and should result in lower cost to the building owner.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted ____ As Amended ____ Disapproved ____ Carry over ____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Robby Dawson Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC – listed sections for deletion of existing building references

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section 607.1 to read:

607.1 ~~Emergency~~ ~~o~~Operation. Existing elevators with a travel distance of 25 feet (7620 mm) or more shall comply with the requirements ~~in Chapter 11. New elevators shall be provided with Phase I emergency recall operation and Phase II emergency in-car operation in accordance with ASME A17.1.~~of Section 506.3 and the Virginia Maintenance Code (13VAC5-63-450).

Change Section 704.1 to read:

704.1 Enclosure. ~~Interior vertical shafts including, but not limited to, *stairways*, elevator hoistways, service and utility shafts, that connect two or more stories of a building shall be enclosed or protected as required in Chapter 11.~~ New floor openings in existing buildings shall comply with the *International Building Code*.

Change Section 903.6 to read:

903.6 Where required in existing buildings and structures. An *automatic sprinkler system* shall be provided in existing buildings and structures ~~where required in Chapter 11~~in accordance with Section 102.7 of this code.

Delete Section 905.11:

~~**905.11 Existing buildings.** Where required in Chapter 11, existing structures shall be equipped with standpipes installed in accordance with Section 905.~~

Change Section 907.1 to read:

907.1 General. This section covers the application, installation, performance and maintenance of fire alarm systems and their components in new and existing buildings and structures. The requirements of Section 907.2 are applicable to new buildings and structures. ~~The requirements of Section 907.9 are applicable to existing buildings and structures.~~

Delete Section 907.9:

~~**907.9 Where required in existing buildings and structures.** An *approved* fire alarm system shall be provided in existing buildings and structures where required in Chapter 11.~~

Change Section 1029.4 to read:

[B] 1029.4 Operational constraints. *Emergency escape and rescue openings* shall be operational from the inside of the room without the use of keys or tools. Bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are permitted to be placed over *emergency escape and rescue openings* provided the minimum net clear opening size complies with Section 1029.2 and such devices shall be releasable or removable from the inside without the use of a key, tool or force greater than that which is required for normal operation of the

escape and rescue opening~~. Where such bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are installed in existing buildings~~, and where smoke alarms ~~shall be~~are installed in accordance with Section 907.2.11 and approved by the building official regardless of the valuation of the *alteration*.

Change title page to read:

Chapters ~~12~~11 through 19
Reserved

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

Along with the continued deletion of Chapter 11 for construction requirements for existing buildings out of the SFPC, this change is to delete or change those other sections within the body of the SFPC that still make reference to a chapter that's deleted or provide for an obvious conflict with the USBC.

The change to Section 1029.4 is to ensure bars, grills, grates and other such barriers are not installed without some other compensating measure for ensuring safety and egress.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: DHCD Staff (Suggested revisions to the FSBCC proposal on existing building provisions in the IFC)

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): IFC sections on existing buildings

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Revise Section 607.1 of the IFC to read as follows:

607.1 ~~Emergency operation~~ Existing elevators. Existing elevators ~~with a travel distance of 25 feet (7620 mm) or more shall comply with the requirements in Chapter 11. New elevators shall be provided with Phase I emergency recall operation and Phase II emergency in car operation in accordance with ASME A17.1~~ shall be maintained and operated as installed and approved.

Revise Section 704.1 of the IFC to read as follows:

704.1 Enclosure. ~~Interior~~ The enclosure protection in vertical shafts including, but not limited to, stairways, elevator hoistways, service and utility shafts, that connect two or more stories of a building shall be ~~enclosed or protected as required in Chapter 11. New floor openings in existing buildings shall comply with the International Building Code~~ maintained as installed and approved.

Revise Section 903.6 of the IFC to read as follows:

903.6 Where required in existing buildings and structures. ~~An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided in existing buildings and structures where required in Chapter 11~~ The fire official is authorized to enforce the retrofit requirements for sprinkler systems as indicated in Section 102.7 of this code.

Delete Section 905.11 of the IFC:

~~905.11 Existing buildings. Where required in Chapter 11, existing structures shall be equipped with standpipes installed in accordance with Section 905.~~

Revise Section 907.1 of the IFC to read as follows:

907.1 General. ~~This section covers the application, installation, performance and maintenance of fire~~ Fire alarm systems and their components ~~in new and existing buildings and structures. The requirements of Section 907.2 are applicable to new buildings and structures. The requirements of Section 907.9 are applicable to existing buildings and structures~~ shall be maintained and operated as installed and approved.

Delete Section 907.9 of the IFC:

~~907.9 Where required in existing buildings and structures. An approved fire alarm system shall be provided in existing buildings and structures where required in Chapter 11.~~

Revise Section 1029.4 of the IFC to read as follows:

[B] 1029.4 Operational constraints. Emergency escape and rescue openings shall be maintained operational from the inside of the room ~~without the use of keys or tools. Bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are permitted to be placed over emergency escape and rescue openings provided the minimum net clear opening size complies with Section 1029.2 and such devices shall be releasable or removable from the inside without the use of a key, tool or force greater than that which is required for normal operation of the escape and rescue opening. Where such bars, grilles, grates or similar devices are installed in existing buildings, smoke alarms shall be installed in accordance with Section 907.2.11 regardless of the valuation of the alteration~~ as installed and approved.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

This suggested DHCD staff proposal follows the intent of the FSBCC proposal to remove references to the requirements in the IFC which are construction related and apply to existing buildings and to change those references to be within the scope of the SFPC, which is to require the maintenance and proper operation of those fire protection features installed and approved under the USBC.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

VIRGINIA DHCD

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Robby Dawson Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5601 2 4 1 and 5601 2 4 2 for minimum insurance

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

5601.2.4.1 Blasting. Before approval to do blasting is issued, the applicant for approval shall file a bond or submit a certificate of insurance in such form, amount, and coverage as determined by the legal department of the jurisdiction to be adequate in each case to indemnify the jurisdiction against any and all damages arising from permitted blasting but in no case shall the value of the coverage be less than $~~500,000~~1,000,000.

Exception: Filing a bond or submitting a certificate of liability insurance is not required for blasting on real estate parcels of five or more acres conforming to the definition of "real estate devoted to agricultural use" or "real estate devoted to horticultural use" in § 58.1-3230 of the Code of Virginia and conducted by the owner of such real estate.

5601.2.4.2 Fireworks display. The permit holder shall furnish a bond or certificate of insurance in an amount deemed adequate by the legal department of the jurisdiction for the payment of all potential damages to a person or persons or to property by reason of the permitted display, and arising from any acts of the permit holder, the agent, employees or subcontractors, but in no case shall the value of the coverage be less than $~~500,000~~1,000,000.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

The present minimum of $500,000.00 has been in place since the adoption of the '87 edition of the SFPC and has not changed since. With the '87 edition of the code $500,000.00 was a significant amount of money. That's no longer true in today's economy. Based upon the rate of inflation calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, $500,000 in 1987 equates to $1,018,120 in today's dollars (http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm).

Blasting contractors are carrying insurance coverage measured in multiple millions of dollars and would not be adversely affected by an increase in the minimum required amount.

Based upon an impromptu survey of professional firework companies, self-employed Pyrotechnicians and volunteer fire departments that conduct fireworks displays for their community, an increase of the minimum above the current $500,000 is not an issue or challenge. Without a known exception, the professional companies are currently carrying $5 million, $10 million, $25 million or more of insurance and would not be hampered in any way to a minimum of $2 million. Volunteer fire companies, on the other hand, are carrying $1,000,000 right now.

Additionally, property and injury claims resulting from fireworks accidents routinely exceed $1,000,000 for even the smallest of public display accidents.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Robby Dawson Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5607.16 and new Table 5607.16

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Change Section 5607.16 to read as follows:

5607.16 Blast records: A record of each blast shall be kept and retained for at least five years and shall be readily available for inspection by the *fire code official*. The record shall ~~contain the following minimum data:~~ be in a format selected by the blaster and shall contain the minimum data and information indicated in Table 5607.16.

~~1. Name of contractor;~~
~~2. Location and time of blast;~~
~~3. Name of certified blaster in charge;~~
~~4. Type of material blasted;~~
~~5. Number of holes bored and spacing;~~
~~6. Diameter and depth of holes;~~
~~7. Type and amount of explosives;~~
~~8. Amount of explosive per delay of 8 milliseconds or greater;~~
~~9. Method of firing and type of circuit;~~
~~10. Direction and distance in feet to nearest dwelling, public building, school, church, commercial or institutional building;~~
~~11. Weather conditions;~~
~~12. Whether or not mats or other precautions were used;~~
~~13. Type of detonator and delay period;~~
~~14. Type and height of stemming; and~~
~~15. Seismograph record when utilized.~~

~~**Exception:** Subdivisions 8 and 13 of this section are not applicable to *restricted blasters*.~~

(See new Table 5607.16 on attached pages.)

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This change is to provide guidance and some measure of uniformity of the information gathered and retained. Without such guidance the quality and value of information recorded will vary by location, company, and certified blaster. This information has value when conducting an investigation on a claim of damage, for instance, whether that investigation is conducted by the fire official or an insurance company. At the very least, such comprehensive information has definite value to the blaster themselves.

Four (4) fire officials and nine (9) users of explosives, both large and small blasting contractors, were invited to evaluate the proposed change. Comments and suggestions were seriously considered and incorporated into refining the change. It must be pointed out that the change does not require a blaster to use this particular table or format so long as whatever record format is chosen by the blaster produces the same minimum information. But it is suggested the table be reproduced large enough in the code to fill-in the blanks or spaces in the event a blaster uses the table as printed in the code for their chosen format.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

Table 5607.16
Blast (shot) Record

Block 1				
	General Information			
1	Blast date:	Blast No.:	Blast Time:	Permit No.:
2	Blast location by address including city, county or town:			
3	Blast location by GPS coordinates: ☐check box if unknown			
4	Name of Permit Holder:			
5	Name of Blaster in charge (print):			
6	Signature of Blaster in charge:			
7	Certification Number of Blaster in charge:			

Block 2			
	General environmental conditions		
1	Weather (Clear? Cloudy? Overcast?)	Wind direction and speed @_____mph	Temperature F° / C°
2	Topography: (Flat? Hilly? Mountainous?)	Distance from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Distance from nearest inhabited building determined by: ☐ GPS coordinates ☐ Measurement ☐ Estimated
3	Use of nearest inhabited building? (Dwelling? Business? Apartment Building? School?)	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building determined by: ☐ GPS instrument ☐ Compass ☐ Estimated
Additional Blaster notations on environmental conditions:			

Block 3

Shot layout and precautions taken (N/A = Not Applicable)

1	No. of holes	Diameter of hole(s)	Depth of hole(s)
2	Were any holes decked? ☐ Yes ☐ No	How many holes were decked? ☐ N/A (If applicable, indicate on any attached shot pattern drawing which holes were decked and the number of decks for the hole[s].)	How many decks per hole? ☐ N/A
3	Shot pattern ☐ Check this box if only single hole.	Depth of sub-drilling	Drilling angle
4	Burden	Spacing of holes	Water height
5	Stemming height	Material used for stemming	Check box for flyrock precautions taken ☐ Mats ☐ Overburden ☐ None taken

Additional Blaster notations on shot layout and precautions:

Block 4

Seismic control measures (N/A = Not Applicable)

1	Was Scaled Distance Formula used? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Indicate which Scaled Distance equation was used. ☐ N/A ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/50]^2$ ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/55]^2$ ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/65]^2$	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms based on Scaled Distance. ☐ N/A
2	Was seismograph used? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Seismograph manufacturer and model number: ☐ N/A	Seismograph serial number: ☐ N/A Seismograph's last calibration date. ☐ N/A
3	Distance and direction seismograph from blast site ☐ N/A	Distance determined by: ☐ N/A ☐ GPS coordinates ☐ Estimated ☐ Measurement	
4	Seismograph ☐ N/A Geophone Minimum Frequency _____Hz Seismograph Microphone Minimum Frequency _____Hz	Seismograph recordings: ☐ N/A Transverse _____in/s ____ Hz Vertical _____in/s ____ Hz Longitudinal _____in/s ____ Hz Acoustic _____dB ____ Hz	
5	Seismograph trigger level ☐ N/A _____ in/s _____dB		

Additional Blaster notations on seismic control measures:

Block 5

Quantity and product

1	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms Interval ☐ Delay not used _____ lbs	Initiation (Check) ☐ Electric ☐ Non-electric ☐ Electronic
2	Max. No. of Holes/Decks per 8 ms interval ☐ Delay not used _____ lbs	
3	Max. Wt. or sticks of Explosive per hole _____ lbs	Firing device manufacturer and model: ☐ N/A

Explosive Product listing (Attach additional pages as needed.)

4	Manufacturer	Product name, description or brand	Number of units	Unit weight (lb)

5	**Total explosive weight in this shot:** lbs.

Additional Blaster notations on product and quantities:

Block 6

Completion of shot record and general comments

General comments on shot not included in notes above:

Date shot report completed:	Time shot report completed:
Printed name and signature of person completing shot report if different from Block 1, Lines 5 and 6.	(Print)
	(Signature)

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: DHCD Staff (Suggested revisions to the FSBCC proposal on blasting records)

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5607.16

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

5607.16. Blast records. A record of each blast shall be kept and retained for at least five years and shall be readily available for inspection by the code official. The record shall ~~contain the following minimum data:~~ be compiled by filling out Form 5607.16 in Appendix K.

~~1. Name of contractor;~~
~~2. Location and time of blast;~~
~~3. Name of certified blaster in charge;~~
~~4. Type of material blasted;~~
~~5. Number of holes bored and spacing;~~
~~6. Diameter and depth of holes;~~
~~7. Type and amount of explosives;~~
~~8. Amount of explosive per delay of 8 milliseconds or greater;~~
~~9. Method of firing and type of circuit;~~
~~10. Direction and distance in feet to nearest dwelling, public building, school, church, commercial or institutional building;~~
~~11. Weather conditions;~~
~~12. Whether or not mats or other precautions were used;~~
~~13. Type of detonator and delay period;~~
~~14. Type and height of stemming; and~~
~~15. Seismograph record when utilized.~~

~~Exception: Subdivisions 8 and 13 of this section are not applicable to restricted blasters.~~

(See the attached Form 5607.16)

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

The FSBCC proposal references a form, but does not require its use, yet mandates that all the information required by the form be provided. The DHCD staff suggested revision just makes the use of the form mandatory. If the use of the form is not mandatory, then it would be better to just expand the list of information to be required. The form could still be in an appendix, but it would only be voluntarily used.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: _____

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

Form 5607.16
Blast (shot) Record

Block 1	General Information			
1	Blast date:	Blast No.:	Blast Time:	Permit No.:
2	Blast location by address including city, county or town:			
3	Blast location by GPS coordinates: ☐check box if unknown			
4	Name of Permit Holder:			
5	Name of Blaster in charge (print):			
6	Signature of Blaster in charge:			
7	Certification Number of Blaster in charge:			

Block 2	General environmental conditions		
1	Weather (Clear? Cloudy? Overcast?)	Wind direction and speed @_____mph	Temperature F° / C°
2	Topography: (Flat? Hilly? Mountainous?)	Distance from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Distance from nearest inhabited building determined by: ☐ GPS coordinates ☐ Measurement ☐ Estimated
3	Use of nearest inhabited building? (Dwelling? Business? Apartment Building? School?)	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building:	Direction from blast site to nearest inhabited building determined by: ☐ GPS instrument ☐ Compass ☐ Estimated
Additional Blaster notations on environmental conditions:			

Block 3

Shot layout and precautions taken (N/A = Not Applicable)

1	No. of holes	Diameter of hole(s)	Depth of hole(s)
2	Were any holes decked? ☐ Yes ☐ No	How many holes were decked? ☐ N/A (If applicable, indicate on any attached shot pattern drawing which holes were decked and the number of decks for the hole[s].)	How many decks per hole? ☐ N/A
3	Shot pattern ☐ Check this box if only single hole.	Depth of sub-drilling	Drilling angle
4	Burden	Spacing of holes	Water height
5	Stemming height	Material used for stemming	Check box for flyrock precautions taken ☐ Mats ☐ Overburden ☐ None taken

Additional Blaster notations on shot layout and precautions:

Block 4

Seismic control measures (N/A = Not Applicable)

1	Was Scaled Distance Formula used? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Indicate which Scaled Distance equation was used. ☐ N/A ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/50]^2$ ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/55]^2$ ☐ $W(lb)=[D(ft)/65]^2$	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms based on Scaled Distance. ☐ N/A
2	Was seismograph used? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Seismograph manufacturer and model number: ☐ N/A	Seismograph serial number: ☐ N/A Seismograph's last calibration date. ☐ N/A
3	Distance and direction seismograph from blast site ☐ N/A	Distance determined by: ☐ N/A ☐ GPS coordinates ☐ Estimated ☐ Measurement	
4	Seismograph ☐ N/A Geophone Minimum Frequency _____Hz Seismograph Microphone Minimum Frequency _____Hz	Seismograph recordings: ☐ N/A Transverse _____in/s ____ Hz Vertical _____in/s ____ Hz Longitudinal _____in/s ____ Hz Acoustic _____dB ____ Hz	
5	Seismograph trigger level ☐ N/A _____ in/s _____dB		

Additional Blaster notations on seismic control measures:

Block 5

Quantity and product

1	Max. Allow. Chg. Wt. per 8 ms Interval ☐ Delay not used _____ lbs	Initiation (Check) ☐ Electric ☐ Non-electric ☐ Electronic
2	Max. No. of Holes/Decks per 8 ms interval ☐ Delay not used _____ lbs	
3	Max. Wt. or sticks of Explosive per hole _____ lbs	Firing device manufacturer and model: ☐ N/A

Explosive Product listing (Attach additional pages as needed.)

4	Manufacturer	Product name, description or brand	Number of units	Unit weight (lb)
5	**Total explosive weight in this shot:**			**lbs.**

Additional Blaster notations on product and quantities:

Block 6

Completion of shot record and general comments

General comments on shot not included in notes above:

Date shot report completed:	Time shot report completed:
Printed name and signature of person completing shot report if different from Block 1, Lines 5 and 6.	(Print)
	(Signature)

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☐Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Robby Dawson Representing: Fire Services Board Code Committee

Mailing Address: 1005 Technology Park Drive, Glen Allen, VA 23059

Email Address: dawsonj@chesterfield.gov Telephone Number: 804-748-1426

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): SFPC Section 5608.4.1 through 5608.4.2

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Add Sections 5608.4.1 through 5608.4.2 to read:

5608.4.1 Non-splitting, non-bursting comets and mines. For non-splitting or non-bursting comets and mines containing only stars or non-splitting or non-bursting comets, the minimum required radius of the display site shall be 50 ft per in. (15.24 m per 25.4 mm) of the internal mortar diameter of the largest comet or mine to be fired, one-half that shown in Table 5608.4.

5608.4.2 Special distance requirements. The minimum distance requirements of Table 5608.4 shall be adjusted as follows:

1. Chain-fused aerial shells, comets, and mines. For chain-fused aerial shells and comets and mines to be fired from mortars, racks, or other holders that are sufficiently strong to prevent their being repositioned in the event of an explosive malfunction of the aerial shells, comets, or mines, the minimum required radius shall be the same as that required in 5608.4 and 5608.4.1. For chain-fused aerial shells and comets and mines to be fired from mortars, racks, or other holders that are not sufficiently strong to prevent their being repositioned in the event of an explosive malfunction of the aerial shells, comets, or mines, or if there is doubt concerning the strength of racks holding chain-fused mortars, based upon the largest mortar in the sequence the minimum required radius shall be double that required in 5608.4 and 5608.4.1.

2. Group H and I facilities, bulk storage of Hazardous Materials. Distances from the point of discharge of any firework to a health care or detention and correctional facility, or the bulk storage of materials that have flammability, explosive, or toxic hazard shall be at least twice the distances specified in Table 5608.4.

3. Roman candles and cakes. The minimum required spectator separation distance for roman candles and cakes that produce aerial shells, comets, or mine effects shall be the same as the minimum required radius specified in Table 5608.4.

4. Angling of Mortars. Aerial shells, comets and mines, and Roman candles and cakes shall be permitted to be angled if the dud shells or components are carried away from the main spectator area and either of the following requirements is satisfied:

(a) The offset specified in Table 5608.4 is followed.

(b) The separation distance is correspondingly increased in the direction of the angle.

If the offset provided in Table 5608.4 is followed, the mortars or tubes shall be angled so that any dud shells or components fall at a point approximately equal to the offset of the mortars or tubes from the otherwise required discharge point but in the opposite direction.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and impact of the proposal):

This is a coordinated change to the existing SFPC Table 5608.4.

The referenced NFPA 1123-10 standard for aerial displays has additional distance requirements that are based on 70 feet per inch of shell or mortar tube diameter. As a base-line, the '09 edition of the SFPC was amended to reflect a distance of 100 feet per inch of shell or mortar diameter and this change is to ensure the distances contained in the NFPA standard are based upon the SFPC base-line distance of 100 feet. This change will correct what was effectively an oversight when making the '09 technical change.

The NFPA 1123-10 sections reviewed and considered for inclusion in this change are:

4.6.1.2
5.1.3.2
5.1.3.3.1 and 5.1.3.3.2
5.1.3.4.2 and 5.1.3.4.3 (no change to this NFPA 1123-10 section proposed)
5.1.3.4.1 and 5.1.3.4.2
5.1.3.5.1 and 5.1.3.5.2 (no change to this NFPA 1123-10 section proposed)
5.1.4.1 and 5.1.4.3
5.2.1.3.1 and 5.2.1.3.2

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 12/7/12

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR TASO (Technical Assistance and Services Office)
Main Street Centre
600 E. Main St., Ste. 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: tsu@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7140 or (804) 371-7150

VIRGINIA DHCD

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐ Individualxxx ☐ Government Entity ☐ Company

Name: Andrea H. Pitts Representing: self

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 926, Fredericksburg, VA 22404

Email Address: pitts.andrea@gmail.com Telephone Number: 703-518-4473

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 2009 SFPC, subsection 308.1.4

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Modify Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC (incorporating by reference the 2009 IFC) to read:

"1. One- and two-family dwellings, but the open-flame cooking device shall not be operated within 10 feet of combustible construction located on another lot."

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

I request that the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) amend subsection 308.1.4 ("Open-flame cooking devices") of Section 308 ("Open Flames") of the 2009 Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code (SFPC) insofar as it states a particular exception (Exception 1) for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" from the general prohibition and safety requirement that is established there.

Subsection 308.1.4 states: "Charcoal burners and other open-flame cooking devices shall not be operated on combustible balconies or within 10 feet (3048 mm) of combustible construction." The subsection then enumerates three exceptions to this safe-distance rule. The first exception (Exception 1) is "[o]ne-and two-family dwellings." The other two exceptions are "[w]here buildings, balconies and decks are protected by an automatic sprinkler system" and "LP-gas cooking devices having LP gas container with a water capacity not greater than 2 1/2 pounds [nominal 1 pound (0.454 kg) LP-gas capacity]."

Subsection 308.1.4 recognizes by its general prohibition that open-flame cooking conducted at a distance of 10 feet or less from combustible construction is not safe. Hence its general safety requirement: "Charcoal burners and other open-flame cooking devices shall not be operated on combustible balconies or within 10 feet (3048 mm) of combustible construction."

The proposed language amends Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to show that the exception for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" to the general prohibition against operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction applies only to the "one- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" on the lot where the

device is being used and not to combustible construction on a neighboring lot. The proposed language amends Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to show that the particular exception for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" to the general prohibition against operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction applies only to the one- or two-family dwelling on the lot where the device is being used and not to combustible construction on a neighboring lot.

There would be no cost impact involved in adopting this proposal.

In support of the proposed amendment, the following points are offered:

1. The proposed amendment clarifies Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 by expressing the intention behind the exception for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" to the rule prohibiting open-flame cooking within 10 feet of combustible construction. Commentary on the DHCD (Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office) website concerning previous subsection 307.5, now subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC, states: "The exception [is] in recognition of the occupant's level of control and lack of exposure to others. . . ." In other words, the exception contemplates a situation in which the operator of the open-flame cooking device has "control" of the "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" and the premises on which it sits and of which the operator is an "occupant." In that situation, the exception indicates, the open-flame cooking device may be placed within 10 feet of the excepted dwelling. Exception 1, however, was not intended to put neighboring combustible construction at risk from open-flame cooking by suspending the general rule that open-flame cooking may not take place within 10 feet of combustible construction. Indeed, the above-cited commentary expresses the assumption that when an open-flame cooking device is operated on premises where a "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" sits, there is a "lack of exposure to others." That is, Exception 1 for "[o]ne-and two-family dwellings" assumes that the property of others would not be at risk because there would be enough space between neighboring buildings, and between buildings and property lines, that a neighbor's combustible construction would not be within 10 feet of any open-flame cooking taking place on the premises containing the excepted "one- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]." When, however, that is not the case—when open-flame cooking on premises containing the excepted "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" can take place within 10 feet of neighboring combustible construction--then the neighboring combustible construction is protected by the general rule of subsection 308.1.4 prohibiting the operation of an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of combustible construction. Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" was not intended to place combustible construction on neighboring lots at risk. The language of the proposed amendment of subsection 308.1.4 expresses the intended meaning of the exception to the safe-distance rule for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings."

2. To conclude otherwise would lead to illogical results. Subsection 308.1.4 cannot mean that the operator of an open-flame cooking device can bring it 10 feet or closer from combustible construction (be it a dwelling, a garage, or other combustible construction) on neighboring premises just because he happens to have a "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" on the premises where he is cooking. Were that the case, the subsection would be granting a personal license to the operator of an open-flame cooking device located on the same premises as a one- or two-family dwelling to cook as close to combustible construction on neighboring lots as he could get (perhaps, indeed, to protect his own one- or two-family dwelling from the risks presented by the cooking). Not only is this an absurd result, it also is contradicted by the basic wording of Exception 1 as it stands now (and would stand after the proposed amendment). That wording ascribes the exception to the safe-distance rule not to the operator of the open-flame cooking device but to the "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" itself.

3. Amendment of subsection 308.1.4 in accordance with its intended meaning would aid local officials and protect the public, thus advancing the purpose of the SFPC. Such an amendment also would bring subsection 308.1.4 in line with another provision of the SFPC, subsection 305.4 ("Deliberate or negligent burning"). This provision states: "It shall be unlawful to deliberately or through negligence set fire to or cause the burning of combustible material in such a manner as to endanger the safety or persons or property."

It warns that risky activity, even if it does not result in actual harm to persons or property, is in itself unlawful if it endangers the safety of the persons or property. Subsection 308.1.4 was intended to warn, and implicitly does warn, that operating an open-flame cooking device within 10 feet of a combustible structure is risky activity and therefore prohibited except in limited cases. The SFPC regulates risky activity in order to prevent fires before they happen, and in this case, both the public and the operator of the open-flame cooking device would benefit from more clarity.

4. The proposed amendment of the language of Exception 1 in subsection 308.1.4 for "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" makes it clear that the operator of an open-flame cooking device on premises containing such a dwelling is not entitled to place combustible construction on neighboring lots at risk by exposing it to open-flame cooking at a distance of 10 feet or less. Otherwise, the risk of fire and associated harm from open-flame cooking could be transferred by the operator of the cooking device from the "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" on the premises where the open-flame cooking takes place to neighboring combustible construction. Such a result is inconsistent with the principal purpose of the SFCP: to protect the public from fires and from the danger of fires.

5. The 2009 SFPC seems to bring townhouses, or at least certain townhouses, within the ambit of the "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" exception to the safe-distance requirement in subsection 308.1.4. In the 2009 SFPC, Section 202 ("General Definitions"), the four Group R occupancy categories (R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4) defined in prior versions of the SFPC are amended by the addition of a fifth category: "R-5 Detached one and two-family dwellings and multiple single-family dwellings (townhouses) not more than three stories high with separate means of egress and their accessory structures." It is stated with this definition: "The terms 'R-5' and 'one- and two-family dwelling' where used in this code shall be interchangeable." This statement equates certain townhouses with a "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" and thus brings them under Exception 1 to the safe-distance requirement of subsection 308.1.4. However, this de facto amendment of Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 to include certain townhouses ought to be reconsidered.

The amendment of the Group R occupancy categories appears to have been added for purposes involving other provisions of the code. The 2009 SFPC defines "townhouse" in Section 202 as "a single-family dwelling unit constructed in a group of three or more attached units in which each unit extends from the foundation to roof and with open space on at least two sides." However, the R-5 occupancy category added in the 2009 SFPC covers only "townhouses" that are "not more than three stories high." If the amendment to Section 202 establishing the R-5 occupancy category had as one of its purposes to amend the exemption in subsection 308.1.4 to the 10-feet safety requirement so that it now included townhouses, there would be no principled reason to exclude townhouses having more than three stories. If the exception to the safe-distance requirement in subsection 308.1.4 were expanded to include townhouses, there would be a conflict with the 2009 International Fire Code (IFC). The IFC (Section 202, "General Definitions") contains the same definition of "townhouse" as the 2009 SFPC. It is noted, as well, that the 2009 SFPC and the 2009 IFC contain in their respective Sections 202 the same definitions of "dwelling unit," (the term used in the definition of "townhouse") and of "dwelling" (the term used in subsection 308.1.4). "Dwelling" is "[a] building that contains one or two dwelling units used, intended or designed to be used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied for living purposes." "Dwelling unit" is "[a] single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation." But the IFC does not contain a fifth category of Group R occupancy like that added in the 2009 SFPC, nor does the IFC have any other provision that makes townhouses equal to "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" for purposes of the code. Subsection 308.1.4 of the IFC contains the same three exceptions to the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking as are found in subsection 308.1.4 of the SFPC. Thus, subsection 308.1.4 of the IFC contains the exception for "[o]ne and two-family dwellings." However, the 2009 IFC contains no provision that has the effect of extending the same exception to townhouses.

Like all versions of the SFPC, the 2009 code incorporates by reference the contemporaneous edition of the

IFC: in this case, the 2009 edition of the IFC is incorporated by reference in Subsection 103.1 of Section 103 ("Incorporation by Reference") of the SFPC. Subsection 103.2.1 ("Other amendments") of the 2009 SFPC states, as do previous versions of the SFPC, that the Virginia "Board of Housing and Community Development (BHCD)" might "delete, change or amend provisions of the IFC and referenced standards" and that "[w]here conflicts occur between such changed provisions and the unchanged provisions of the IFC and referenced standards, the provisions changed by the BHCD shall govern."

In subsection 103.2.1, however, the SFPC contains a "Note" stating, as in previous versions of the SFPC, that when the state code deletes, changes, or amends provisions of the IFC, it is because "conflicts have been readily noted" previously between the IFC and the regulatory scheme of the SFPC. The Note reserves to regulators the authority to continually assess the applicability of the IFC in other areas, where they must make judgments about the whether the IFC serves the goals and purposes of regulatory scheme of the SFPC: "in some areas, judgment will have to be made as to whether the provisions of the IFC and its references standards are fully applicable."

Subsection 308.1.4 of the 2009 SFPC should reflect the 2009 IFC by excluding all townhouses from the category of "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" to which Exception 1 to the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking is ascribed. The inclusion of certain townhouses in the category of excepted "[o]ne- and two-family dwellings" appears to be only the de facto result of expanding the R-5 occupancy category in order to address other concerns, and it creates inconsistencies that cannot be easily explained. For example, a three-story single-family dwelling would be an excepted dwelling under Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 but a three-story townhouse would not be.

However, the de facto inclusion of certain townhouses in the category of premises that are excepted under Exception 1 in subsection 308.1.4 from the safe-distance requirement for open-flame cooking does not contradict the intention, or defeat the purpose, of that subsection. The assumption behind Exception 1 is, again, that when open-flame cooking takes place on premises containing a "[o]ne- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]," there is a "lack of exposure to others." The concern behind subsection 308.1.4, with its general safe-distance rule, is precisely with the risk that open-flame cooking presents to neighboring combustible construction. It is assumed, as observed above, that on premises containing a one- or two-family dwelling, open-flame cooking will take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction. This assumption is not invalidated when townhouses are contemplated. In most cases, the yard on which a townhouse sits would be sufficiently wide and deep to allow a clearance of more than 10 feet. Most residential lots, including those for townhouses, have yards (most often, back yards) that are sufficiently wide and deep to allow the occupant to operate an open-flame cooking device at a distance of more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction. It would be a rare case in which the largest yard available under zoning or other local laws for open-flame cooking on a lot containing a "one- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" was too shallow or too narrow to allow the activity to take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction.

6. But the modification of Exception 1 of subsection 308.1.4 should not focus, or hinge, on the size of the excepted one- or two-family dwelling's lot or the distance from the excepted dwelling to the lot line. Those factors do not always provide de facto enforcement of the safe-distance rule (i.e., more than 10 feet). In many instances, the occupant of the lot on which the excepted dwelling sits could operate the open-flame cooking device close enough to the lot line to be within 10 feet of combustible construction situated on a neighboring lot. Thus, for example, Exception 1 should <u>not</u> be modified to read: "One- and two-family dwellings <u>where the dwelling is at least 10 feet from the lot line</u>." The language suggested in this proposal is more effective because it directly states the rule.

7. In addition, to address the rare cases in which the largest yard available under zoning or other local laws for open-flame cooking on a lot containing a "one- [or] two-family dwelling[ ]" --regardless of whether that term continues to include certain townhouses or not--was too shallow or too narrow to allow the activity to

take place more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction, a Note can be added to subsection 308.1.4. The Note can state that when because of the size of the lot on which open-flame cooking takes place a distance of more than 10 feet from neighboring combustible construction cannot be maintained, then the maximum distance allowed by the size of the lot must be maintained, but in no event less than 7 feet (or other number selected by regulators).

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: January 6, 2013

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street
Suite 300
Richmond, VA 23219

Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov
Fax Number: (804) 371-7092
Phone Numbers: (804) 371-7150

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF BUILDING AND FIRE REGULATION

Code Change Form for the 2012 Code Change Cycle

Code Change Number:_____

Proponent Information (Check one): ☐Individual ☒Government Entity ☐Company

Name: Joel S. Baker Representing: County of Roanoke

Mailing Address: 5204 Bernard Drive, Roanoke, VA 24018

Email Address: jbaker@roanokecountyva.gov Telephone Number: 540-776-7300

Proposal Information

Code(s) and Section(s): 503.1, Exception 1

Proposed Change (including all relevant section numbers, if multiple sections):

Modify Exception 1.
In lieu of the requirements of this section and Sections 503.2 and 503.3, ~~F~~fire apparatus access roads shall be permitted to be provided, constructed and maintained in accordance with written policy and standards that establish fire apparatus access road requirements and such requirements shall be identified to the owner or his agent prior to the building official's approval of the building permit.

Supporting Statement (including intent, need, and cost impact of the proposal):

Would permit a locality that has developed local private street construction standards to also include design and construction standards for fire apparatus access roads when such standards are utilized.
When a locality chooses to develop private street and road standards, they should also be permitted to include the design of fire apparatus access roads as part of that standard. The current Section 503 allows a locality to make an exception for requiring access roads initially through a local written policy, but does not appear to permit a locality to also develop the design standards. This would give the locality that ability in order to address specific local conditions.

This change would not increase and has the potential to decrease construction costs.

Submittal Information

Date Submitted: 02/20/2013

The proposal may be submitted by email as an attachment, by fax, by mail, or by hand delivery.

Please submit the proposal to:

DHCD DBFR SBCO (State Building Codes Office)
600 East Main Street Email Address: Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov

____ As Submitted _____ As Amended _____ Disapproved _____ Carry over _____ Other (specify)

STATEWIDE FIRE PREVENTION CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

December 20, 2012
Glen Allen, Virginia

Members Present	Members Absent
Mr. John Ainslie	Mr. Ron Boothe
Mr. Rick Witt	
Ms. Elaine Gall	
Mr. Bill Kyger	
Mr. Edwin Smith	

Call to Order

Mr. John Ainslie, Chairman of the Statewide Fire Prevention Code Development Committee, called the meeting of the Committee to order.

Opening Comments

Mr. Emory Rodgers, Deputy Director of the Division of Building and Fire Regulations of the Department of Housing and Community Development, provided introductory comments and an overview of the Statewide Fire Prevention Code base document included in the Committee meeting notebook. Mr. Rodgers also summarized consensus issues to be considered during this meeting.

Inspection Fees

The Committee reviewed the compliance inspection fee proposal of the State Fire Marshal's Office. The State Fire Marshal stated that the proposal was not final, so the Committee agreed to table the issue until the final proposal could be considered.

Other Consensus Issues

Other consensus proposals considered by the Committee were:

1. Revocation of permit
2. Explosives, blasting agents, theatrical flame effects and firework permit fees
3. Duration of operational permits
4. Electronic signature
5. Notice of right to appeal
6. Placard removal.

All of these proposals were approved by the Committee to be sent to the Board of Housing and Community Development's Codes and Standards Committee.

Non-Consensus Issues

Mr. Rodgers reviewed eleven non-consensus issues that will be under consideration during this Statewide Fire Prevention Code regulatory cycle. Mr. Rodgers reported that other issues are being

considered by the Fire Services Board Code Committee at their January 16, 2013 meeting.

Adjournment

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned.

VA DHCD- STATE BUILDING CODE & FIRE REGULATIONS
CODES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Workgroups 2 & 4 Meeting Notes Summary

Meeting held: Thursday, February 28, 2013
Location: Virginia Housing Center
Time: 9:30am

1. **VCC 408.9 Windowless Buildings**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - One of the intents for this proposed change is to better clarify how this section should be interpreted; currently, there are various interpretations of this section
   - Working with Department of Corrections on this code change
   - "Tenable environment" is not defined in current code; need to look at NFPA 130 and its use of the term 'tenable'
   - Brooks Ballard gave an overview of her reasons for support for the proposed changes; she will make discussed changes and send to Emory to be included along with summary hand-outs

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus to approve as amended in the substitute proposal.

2. **VCC 427 I-3 Lock-up Areas**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - Creates new definition in 202 and a new section 427 called "Lockup areas".
   - Proposal language changes "Lockup areas" to "Temporary Holding Areas" (temporary - not intended for overnight accommodations)
   - Suggestion to eliminate "temporary" and replace with "short-term", due to other BOC standards that must be adhered to

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus to approve as amended in the substitute proposal.

3. **VCC 508.2.3 Allowable Building Area and Height**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - Clarifies how to treat accessory occupancies as approved for the 2015 IBC
   - The term 'storage' was taken out because it would pose difficulties at B level use

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus as submitted

4. **VCC 509 Incidental Uses**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - This proposal is not the vehicle for doing what the bill intends
   - Language appears to be broken, cannot put 2006 language into 2012 amendment

   Action: Withdrawal by proponent

5. **VCC 703.7 Marking of Fire-Rated Assemblies**
Proposed by: Kenney Payne
Comments/Concerns
   - This was approved in Portland for the 2015 cycle

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus to approve, with amendment to remove the word "accessible"

6. **VCC 806.1.2 Combustible Decorative Materials**
Proposed by: Kenney Payne
Comments/Concerns
   - Scope needs to be re-defined by some other mechanism, to clearly show the purpose/intent of this proposal.
   - Remove the term "partition"
   - Proponent will amend per comments from attendees to include in new exception 2, to put a distance such as 12 inches and not use the term "partition.

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve with amendments

7. **VCC 903.2.7 M Occupancy Sprinklers**
Proposed by: Frank Castelvecchi
Comments/Concerns
   - This proposal eliminates the Virginia amendment leaving 12,000 sq. ft. threshold for upholstered furniture, in order to correlate with the language in the 2012 IFC for upholstered furniture and mattresses in retail settings
   - Amend supporting statement to say requirements only applicable when the upholstery furniture or mattresses actually covers the entire 5,000 s. f.
   - Emory suggests those who would be impacted by this change to take a close look at language, as they will be directly affected. There are enforcement issues and Virginia fire data is extremely good

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus to approve, with staff comments

8. **VCC 908.7 E Occupancies Carbon Monoxide Detectors**
Proposed by: Workgroups 2 & 4 meeting attendees
Comments/Concerns
   - Proposal is on behalf of a delegate who wants to require CO detectors in K-12 public schools
   - HB 2201 was tabled to allow the USBC regulatory process to review mandating CO alarms in K-12 public schools only.
   - Per Emory, if someone wants to put in a change to require CO detectors for all E groups, it would be considered in a separate bill
   - Much back and forth discussion on details
     - 2015 IBC has code change that outlines the technical provisions for CO alarms in all E occupancies, which includes public and private schools, E occupancies on college campuses
     - CO alarms should be tied into a notification system
     - Summary will have the 2015 E CO code change

- Staff will amend draft code change to provide technical provisions and be the vehicle to move forward
- Most of the discussion wasn't in opposition, but the need to provide adequate technical requirements for approval

Action: Based on legislation and no proposal submitted at this time, deferring to next workgroup meeting this summer to refine a code change.

9. **VCC 1009.1 Stairways**
Proposed by: Kenney Payne
Comments/Concerns
   - Adds an exception for stairways that do not serve as an exit or provide access

Action: Withdrawal by proponent

10. **VCC 1022.5 Penetrations**
Proposed by: Kenney Payne
Comments/Concerns
   - Attendees oppose new exception 2; egress interior stairs have to be protected thus should not allow through-penetrations
   - See no problems for designer to comply with current IBC

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

11. **VCC 1106.1 Accessible Parking Table**
Proposed by: Ken Fredgren
Back-up proposed by: John Catlett
Comments/Concerns
   - Discussions on differences between change and alternate proposed change
     - 1st Proposed Change reduces the increased accessible parking spaces
       - Change accessible parking from 3 to 2.5% for parking lots over 500
       - Change 30 to 25 at the 1001 threshold shown on the table
       - Proponents provided demographic statistics on the aging and increases in issuance of accessible parking stickers
     - 2nd Proposed Change further reduces the increased accessible parking spaces
       - Change accessible parking from 3 to 2.33% for parking lots over 500
       - Change 30 to 23 at the 1001 threshold shown on the table
       - Would better enforcement make increases unnecessary
       - Proponent will remove footnote to decrease accessible parking spaces for S, F, H and U

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 as consensus to approve with amendments; back-up amendment also consensus to approve and move forward

12. **VCC 1106.3 Outpatient Clinics Accessible Parking**
Proposed by: 2011HJR 648 Workgroup
Comments/Concerns
   - IBC's Outpatient clinics definition currently includes doctors' and dentists' offices
   - This proposal adds outpatient clinics to the 10% category

- With the increases proposed and if approved for T1106.2, why wouldn't these additional accessible parking spaces are ok for doctors and dentists offices? Should IBC definition be changed to not include doctors and dentists offices?
- It would take code changes to move any of the questions posed into the 2012 regulatory process

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve, with comments

13. VCC 1403.5 Exterior Wall Flame Test

Proposed by: Kenney Payne
2nd Proposal by: Keith Nelson
Comments/Concerns

- Proposed to delete section in its entirety, so that it can comply with the IECC requirement for water-resistive barriers
- Currently no data to suggests that this is a problem
- Change at national level was based on test data of a large wall that already had a large fuel load and then added the barrier
- Discussion that engineering judgment would be problematic
- Exceptions will cause even more confusion
- Proposal by Keith Nelson was withdrawn in support of proposal by Kenney Payne

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

14. VCC 2308.3.2.2 Light-frame Construction

Proposed by: Chris Snidow
Comments/Concerns

- Submitted to correlate with the IRC
- American Wood Council and building officials did not agree with the proposal.

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to deny

15. VCC 2603.5.5 Exterior Wall Assembly Fire Test

Proposed by: Kenney Payne
Comments/Concerns

- Exterior wall assembly adds new exception where sprinkled can be substituted for use of materials complying with UL285 for vertical and lateral propagation
- New NFPA 285 includes a diagram that would incorporate a typical brick constructed wall, which would require all walls to be tested and would be very costly
- This proposal allows a sprinkler system to be used as an exception to requiring the test

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

16. VCC 2701.1.3 Generators in Assisted Living Facilities

Proposed by:

Comments/Concerns

- This is no code change, but the subject was brought forth at the 2013 General Assembly
- ALF need to work with DSS to see if code change to 2701.1.3 is necessary including what is to be on emergency power for these R and I-1 occupancies.
- USBC requires generators and allows them to be optional standby systems that can be brought on site by a vendor.
- Currently ALFs have to have an installed connection
- Item to be discussed at DHCD workgroup meeting August and/or October 2013.
- The VDH study group is required to have a report to the General Assembly by October 2013
- HB1511 was tabled to allow for the 2012 USBC regulatory process to review this matter

Action: VDH will chair a study group to include the VBCOA, VIAEI and DHCD

17. VCC 3006.4 Elevator Control Room Ratings

Proposed by: Michael Redifer

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal aligns USBC with the ASME A17.1 standard terminology and making the 2009 USBC technical amendments no longer necessary
- Staff comment: This change will now require a fire-resistance rating that previously was not required in buildings four stories or less
- Building official agree with proposal
- Emory did question why we are deleting exception 2 that allows no rating under 4 stories?

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve with possible opposing comments forth coming from building owners

18. VCC 3006.7 Machine-room-less Elevator Work

Proposed by: Michael Redifer

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal eliminates the use of collapsible guard rails
  - Elevator inspectors feel the collapsible designs are unsafe for mechanics and inspectors
  - Some manufacturers have collapsible designs that they ask building officials to approve
- Proposal disallows use of folding work platforms
- Permanent platforms in new buildings can account for the clearances, but in existing buildings installations this could be a problem; building official would have to grant modifications
- VMFA has developed a removal platform to use in place of collapsible guard rail
- In the 2009 USBC the current text on guard rails complies with the IBC guard rail requirement
- The ASME A17.1 contains more flexible guard rail requirements
- Staff comment: This proposal may need further review for the 2nd half of the 2012 USBC regulatory cycle

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus, with comments

19. VCC IPC 405.3.2 Lavatory Location in Schools

Proposed by: Kenney Payne

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal adds an exception that is needed but wasn't successful at the national level

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

20. VCC IECC C402.1.1 Vertical Fenestration

Proposed by: Stephen Turchen

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal eliminates reference to ASHRAE 90.1 and requires the compliance path to be in conformance with the IECC
- Proponent believes there are conflicts and would direct designers and builders to the IECC 407 total building performance.
- Designers and building officials not supportive of the change as proposed.
- Instead of the fear of mixing-matching for the less stringent provisions, there may be a clearer way than deleting the A90.1 reference
- No representative from Energy Committee was present to expound on the subject-matter

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

21. VCC IECC C402.4.8 Recessed Lighting

Proposed by: Matt Westheimer

Comments/Concerns

- Some discussion on proposal being redundant, but not necessarily wrong
- Clarification only on when a thermal envelope is required for recessed luminaries

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

22. VCC 912.4.1 Stairways

Proposed by: Kenney Payne

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal adds language to the existing exception for stairways not otherwise address in §912.7.2

Action: Withdrawal by proponent

23. VCC 606.1 Semi-Annual Elevator Inspections

Proposed by: Michael Redifer

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal would mandate 2 annual inspections
- Standard recommends 2, some localities require 2 while others don't
- State law requires an annual inspection
- Elevator inspectors and building officials concerned over the need and cost associated with making this a statewide mandate

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

24. SFPC 308.1 Use of Open flames for Cooking

Proposed by: Workgroups 1 & 3 meeting attendees

Comments/Concerns

- No code change has been officially submitted, topic for discussion only based on DHCD draft
- Immediate issue resolved over fees charged in Alexandria
- One fire official issues no permits but performs inspections of the canisters during restaurant inspections
- One attendee suggested amendment be considered to state the size of the canister and delete the use of Sterno, as it is a trade name

Action: **Building owners, Bed & Breakfasts, Churches, along with groups such as VHTA, C&C, VRMA and NFIB can review; they have until 07/01/13 to submit an official code change**

25. SFPC 308.1.4 Grills on Decks

Proposed by: Andrea Pitts

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal would prohibit use of open flames for grilling within 10 feet of a combustible building for one and two family dwellings
- Fire Officials generally support this proposal. Most of the attendees opposed and supported leaving the exception as is
- Much discussion and numerous concerns over enforcement issues
  - Proposal has merit and would create a law that enables the fire service to issue summons and/or determine liability
  - Where is the fire data to support this as a statewide mandate? It is usually discarded ashes that start exterior fires.
  - A home can be 5 feet from the property line so why 10 feet
  - Concern that people would be in violation of a law that they have no idea about
  - Can be done now by local ordinances

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus**

26. SFPC 404.3.2 Fire Safety Plan

Proposed by: Zack Adams

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal deletes fire extinguisher from Fire Safety Plan

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to deny**

27. SFPC 506.1 Fire Service Keys

Proposed by: Michael Redifer

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal coordinates IBC and IFC
- Current code requires that key be different for each district/locality; need change in language to allow for using standardized key
- Enables lock boxes to be used for non-standardized keys

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC and the BHCD/FSB meeting 03/25/13 as consensus to approve**

28. SFPC 607.1 References to Existing Buildings

Proposed by: Robby Dawson

Comments/Concerns by staff

- §607.1
  - this would be a retro-fit provision for elevators standardized keys and conflict with previously approve code change in #27
  - does not need to reference Virginia Maintenance Code as it is stand-alone locally adopted regulation
- §704.1
  - If 1st sentence is struck, the 2nd one needs to be struck as well
  - Change "shall comply" to "shall be subject to"
- §907.1
  - Strike in its entirety
- §1029.4
  - Strike in its entirety

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus, to approve with staff comments for further amendments**

29. SFPC 703.1 Owner Inspection of Fire-resistance components

Proposed by: Workgroups 2 & 4 meeting attendees

Comments/Concerns

- No code change has been officially submitted, topic for discussion only by draft DHCD code change
- STRB has a pending decision that say the provision isn't enforceable upholding a decision by the fire official in Alexandria. Deleting the requirement in the IFC would then allow enforcement only by local fire prevention ordinances. Otherwise, if it remains would mandate enforcement statewide. In Workgroup 1&3 meeting, there is a code change that impacts this section
- Building owners will review for impact, cost and enforcement issues as it cover all existing buildings with any type of fire-resistance rating

Action: **Will have discussion at Workgroups 1 & 3 meeting. Staff will carry-over for summer workgroup meeting**

30. SFPC 5601.2.4.1 Blasting and Fireworks Insurance

Proposed by: Robby Dawson

Comments/Concerns by staff

- Proponent may want to indicate who was contacted for the supporting statement to document support by the industry and others who do blasting or firework displays

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve with staff comments**

31. SFPC 5607.16 Blast Records

Proposed by: Robby Dawson

Comments/Concerns by staff

- Proponent needs to make a clear distinction between using a table or prescribing a form
  - Make it a form and enforce its use
  - Or further enumerate requirements shown on the existing table
  - Generally, the Codes Commission wouldn't allow us to publish forms in regulations
  - Should have in supporting statement who in industry contacted

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve with staff comments

32. SFPC 5608.4.1 Comets and Mines

Proposed by: Robby Dawson

Comments/Concerns

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

SUB-WORKGROUP PROPOSALS

Tanker Truck Parking in Residential Areas

- Discussion on possible code changes forth coming based on TRB decision
- Meeting scheduled for April 10th.
- Staff will carry-over to summer workgroup meeting
- Propane vehicles already have different standard in the SFPC

Assisted Living Facilities

- Language already been approved at national level. Draft code changes revised to fit into the USBC regulatory scheme and correlate with DSS regulations
- Concerns over not yet knowing what changes may be forthcoming to the Fire Code that may be necessary to correlate with this change. Such IFC changes for fire drills and evacuation planning will be out March 11th and fire officials can submit any code changes up to July 1st.
- Much discussion on the differences between Virginia's Amendments and national changes
- Will discuss further in another sub-workgroup meeting March 13th. Can there be defined better what is limited or may require physical assistance will be the task of the sub-group meeting
- Building officials and operators support concept and moving forward to the BHCD's CSC March 25th meeting

Action: Will move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting either as consensus to approve or non-consensus

Exhausted Hoods for Domestic Appliances in Commercial Buildings

- Sub-workgroup meeting held, started with M76 and came up with this proposal

Action: Will move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

VA DHCD
Workgroup #1 and #3 Summary (03-12-13)

Meeting held: Tuesday, March 12th 2013
Location: Virginia Housing Center
Time: 9:30am

Emory Rodgers opened the meeting with an overview and explanation of the 2012 Code Change process and schedule, followed by introductions of those present. Review of proposed changes commenced.

1. **VRC 101.2 REFERENCED STANDARD**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - Discussion on the deletion of Chapter 34 makes this change unnecessary

   Action: Proposal withdrawn by proponent

2. **VCC 101.6 AND VRC 101.6 ORDER OF PRECEDENCE**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

3. **VCC 102.3 SHIPPING CONTAINERS**
   Proposed by: VBCOA Administrative Committee and STRB
   Comments/Concerns
   - Exceptions clarifies that shipping containers are exempted from these code requirements

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

4. **VCC 102.3.1 AND 202 AUTOMOTIVE LIFTS (3 PROPOSALS)**
   Proposed by: Lynn Underwood and DHCD Staff
   Comments/Concerns
   - If passed as written, would make automotive lifts subject to annual elevator inspections
   - Elevator representatives support this proposal
   - Automotive lifts pose no greater hazard than any other industrial processes equipment
   - must determine how to differentiate between processing equipments and any other equipment that requires structural support
   - 2 separate issues too look at in this proposal: initial installation and maintenance
   - Proponents can decide if they want to seek further interpretation from the Technical Review Board (TRB)

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

5. **VCC 103.4 ADDITIONS**
   Proposed by: Kenney Payne
   Comments/Concerns
   - Current code allows one the option of using the IBC OR IEBC

- Once changes are correlated, it will get rid of reference to §3403.3
- Replace "shall comply" with "shall be permitted to comply"
- Clarity on 5% cap vs. increase by 5% , to existing structures

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus as amended

6. **VCC 103.10 ALTERATIONS AND SCOPE, ENERGY CONSERVATION**
   Proposed by: Michael Redifer
   Comments/Concerns
   - Proposal is not intended to affect requirements of ASHRAE
   - Change allows the use of Low-E Building exemption
   - Proponent noted that historic and Low-E Buildings are exempt from the requirements of this proposal
   - Emory Rodgers suggested that proposal should be further scrutinized for conflicts, problems or concerns
   - Need to determine whether this language needs to be put in the IEBC or IECC

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus; Staff will recommend it be carried over to the 2nd half of the cycle

7. **VCC 108.1 RESTRIPING ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES**
   Proposed by: Ken Fredgren
   Comments/Concerns
   - Does the last sentence apply if there is not an accessible entrance; if so, would it then require the addition of an accessible entrance
   - Confusion over what the 20% includes and when and where does it come in
   - Suggested to eliminate the reference to accessible entrance from §3411.6
   - Staff would correlate language with IBC; probably in Chapter 3 (prescriptive)
   - Board may want clarification on whether or not this code change will trigger the requirement for a permit

   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus with amendment deleting the word "accessible" from the last sentence of 3411.6.

8. **VCC 108.2 DECK PERMIT EXEMPTION**
   Proposed by: Chuck Bajnai
   Comments/Concerns
   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

9. **VCC 113.6 ELECTRONIC NOTICE OF INSPECTION**
   Proposed by: STRB
   Comments/Concerns
   Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

10. **VCC 113.8 ENERGIZING ELECTRICAL SERVICE FOR FINAL INSPECTION**
    Proposed by: STRB

Comments/Concerns

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus to approve

11. VCC 202 DEFINITION OF NIGHT CLUB

Proposed by:

Comments/Concerns

- Main use can be taken out, but would make law more astringent
- No code change, proposal won't go anywhere, but wanted to put it on the table

Action: No Code Change (discussion item only)

12. VRC 202 DEFINITION OF EXISTING BUILDING

Proposed by: Kenney Payne

Comments/Concerns

- SFM recommends keeping "initial edition" language; each locality would have their own initial edition
- Some posed that using a specific date may create problems
- DHCD staff explained that the date is not "official", rather it should be used to establish a starting point
- Emory Rodgers would like to hear from building officials how this may have posed a problem in the past

Action: Proposal withdrawn by proponent

13. VCC IRC R202 DEFINITION OF HABITABLE ATTIC

Proposed by: VBCOA IRC Committee

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal not intended to change the compliance requirements of the IRC
- From industry standpoint, will not support
- HBAV does not support change
- SFMO finds proposal problematic from an enforcement viewpoint; what code section would be referenced
- This is the easiest way to state one cannot have a 4-story building; habitable attics may only be added to 1st and 2nd story buildings
- Remove the definition of habitable attic altogether

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

14. VCC IRC R302.5.1 GARAGE DOOR

Proposed by: Mike Toalson

Comments/Concerns

- VAMMHA supports proposal
- Building official believes this is a fairly minor cost that gains some protection to the inside of the house

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

15. VCC IRC R311.2.1 ACCESSIBLE INTERIOR DOORS

Proposed by: HBAV

Comments/Concerns

- Some voiced that proposal was poorly crafted
- Suggestion to add the word "nominal"
- DHCD staff to make technical corrections to proposal
- Emory Rodgers request VAMMHA to provide floor plan information

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus as amended

16. VCC IRC R502.5 PORCH HEADERS

Proposed by: Lynn Underwood, Brian Foley

Comments/Concerns

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus to approve

17. VCC IRC R507 DECKS (4 PROPOSALS)

Proposed by: Chuck Banjai

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal takes out non-consensus types of issue
- Language used taken out of DC-A6; lots of states are using it
- Lateral support requirement currently in IRC is broken, this document covers the requirements that are NOT in the IRC language.
- Perhaps if this language is too much, we can go with some similar to what NADRA has
- 80% of the Commonwealth welcomes some guidance on this issue
- Proposal initially sponsored by American Wood Council, who has no interest in maintaining it
- If this proposal goes through, 2 deck proposals will be withdrawn (Bryan Deem and John Trenary); must wait to see if initial proposal goes through.

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

18. VCC IRC R602.3.1 TALL WALLS

Proposed by: Chuck Bajnai

Comments/Concerns

- Proposal clarifies that 20-foot high walls cannot be stacked in threes

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

19. VCC IRC R602.7.4 KING STUDS

Proposed by: Chuck Bajnai

Comments/Concerns

- Will this proposal negate other acceptable methods?
- Language in proposal refers to NDS; in order for it to correlate with IRC, language must be added to the IRC
- Perhaps another code change is needed

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

20. VCC IRC R806 ROOF VENTILATION

Proposed by: Chuck Bajnai
Comments/Concerns

- Proposal takes out apparent contradiction; clarifies that one can have vented or un-vented attics
- Requires at least 50% of venting, if provided, comes from eaves

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

21. VCC IRC R807 ATTIC ACCESS
Proposed by: Chuck Bajnai
Comments/Concerns

- Proposal is less restrictive, building officials do not like it

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

22. VCC IRC R905.2.8.5 DRIP EDGE
Proposed by: Mike Toalson
Comments/Concerns

- Suggestion made to make an exception where drip edges interfere with gutters or leaf protections systems
- Emory Rodgers suggested to proponents that some tweaking could be done to this proposal

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

23. VCC IRC N1102.1.1 (TABLE WALL AND CEILING INSULATION (2 PROPOSALS)
Proposed by: HBAV
Comments/Concerns

- Proposal offers too much change, too quickly; please advance as non-consensus
- Proposal addresses 2x4 vs. 2x6 construction; many areas across the country are now going to 2x6 construction
- Increased costs of construction included in analyses
- Arlington County reps would support this proposal as written
  - good compromise
  - addresses energy efficiency
- SFM asked how this proposal would affect energy savings?
- SFM supports reducing the %

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

24. VCC IRC N1102.4 WHOLE HOUSE TESTING
Proposed by: Mike Toalson, Randy Melvin
Comments/Concerns

- In VA we currently have visual or mechanical testing

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

25. VCC IRC IECC R402.2.13 MECHANICAL ROOMS
Proposed by: Bryan Deem, Stephen Turchen, Guy Tomberlin
Comments/Concerns

- Discussions relating to when this would be applicable
  - Only applicable to the building thermal envelope, would not apply to a water heater in a shed
- Proposal only references appliances that are not direct vent.
- Suggested for proponent to clean up language

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

26. VCC IRC IECC R402.4.1.1 (TABLE AIR BARRIERS (4 PROPOSALS)

Proposed by: Stephen Turchen

Comments/Concerns

- Some officials believe that current requirement is being overlooked; language already in code
- Not adding anything that isn't already there, just want to emphasize it in bold narrative, rather than having to look at a table.

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

27. VCC IRC IECC R403.2.1 ATTIC SUPPLY DUCT INSULATION

Proposed by: Bryan Deem

Comments/Concerns

- This is a code change at national level

Action: Withdrawal by proponent

28. VCC IRC IECC R403.2.2 DUCT TESTING

Proposed by: Mike Toalson

Comments/Concerns

- Testing is not required/mandated in current code
- Some would like to see duct testing on every home, code at this point gives you an option
- Suggested to revisit this topic in next cycle

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

29. VCC IRC IECC R403.4.2 HOT WATER PIPE INSULATION

Proposed by: Mike Toalson

Comments/Concerns

- VBCOA Energy Committee does not support this proposal

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

30. VCC IRC IECC R403.6 AND M1401.3 EQUIPMENT SIZING (2 PROPOSALS)

Proposed by: Guy Tomberlin

Comments/Concerns

- New standard (Manual S update) will alleviate some of the over-sizing issues
- Emory Rodgers suggests that this proposal may be worth carrying over to second half pending outcome of Standards committee meeting

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

31. **VCC IRC IECC R405.5.2(1 (TABLE WINDOW GLAZING)**
Proposed by: Mike Toalson
Comments/Concerns
- Change would be a backwards step; Virginia currently enforces the way the 2012 code is written
- Proponent wants credit for less glazing as compared to the standard reference design
- This proposal revises only one piece of the performance method

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

32. **VCC IRC M1501.2 TRANSFER AIR**
Proposed by:
Comments/Concerns
- Issue is in balancing (design)
- These will be vetted at the next VPMIA committee meeting

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus (carry over 2nd half of cycle)

33. **VCC IRC M1503.4 MAKEUP AIR**
Proposed by: Mike Toalson, Randy Melvin
Comments/Concerns
- Current requirement is irrational 400 is okay but if you go to 401 then you have to make up all 401 not just the one; most downdrafts are in excess of this.
- Currently doing it in Maryland and it is causing a lot of problems.
- SS against, VPMIA would like to vet.

Action: **Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus (carry over 2nd half of cycle)**

34. **VCC IRC G2411.1 CSST ARC-RESISTANT JACKET**
Proposed by: Robert Torbin
Comments/Concerns
- At this time no national standard; process to continue

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

35. **SFPC 103.2 AMENDMENTS**
Proposed by: Robby Dawson
Comments/Concerns
- Discussion on deletion of scope of enforcement maybe problematic to allow scope of enforcement from model codes and reference standards to be enforceable without review for impact on the law and SFPC regulations sections 101.2, 102.4, 103 to 106.
- In §901.2 staff noted this was something the VCC and SFPC need to be coordinated as USBC 109 establishes details and sets o be submitted.

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

36. **SFPC 106.3 THIRD PARTY INSPECTIONS**
Proposed by: John Catlett
Comments/Concerns
- Discussion on conflicting language "may" vs. "shall"

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting with consensus as amended

37. **VADR § 20 DEFINITION OF AMUSEMENT DEVICE**
Proposed by: ADTAC
Comments/Concerns
Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

38. **VADR § 20 SMALL MECHANICAL RIDES AND INFLATABLES**
Proposed by: ADTAC
Comments/Concerns
- Discussion on why these should be inspected

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

39. **VADR § 30 DEVICES COVERED AND NOT COVERED**
Proposed by: ADTAC
Comments/Concerns
- Language adds zip lines and inflatables but removed mechanical bulls

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

40. **VADR § 75 FEES**
Proposed by: ADTAC
Comments/Concerns
Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus

41. **VADR/VCC 102.3 GENERATORS**
Proposed by: Kenneth Martin
Comments/Concerns
Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as non-consensus

42. **VCS – DHCD/BCAAC PROPOSED REVISIONS**
Proposed by: Michael Redifer
Comments/Concerns
Action: Proposal being carried over to second half of cycle

43. CODE ACADEMY STANDARDS – DHCD/BCAAC PROPOSED REVISIONS

Proposed by: DHCD, BCAAC

Comments/Concerns

- DHCD staff member reviewed proposed changes

Action: Move forward to BHCD's CSC 03/25/13 meeting as consensus