

SUMMARY
WORKGROUP 2
MEETING
2018 Code Change Cycle

June 30, 2020 at 9:30 a.m.

Remote Meeting Link

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

- John Ainslie
- William Aceto
- Laura Baker (RECA)
- David Beahm (self/Warren County)
- Jeffrey Brown (DHCD)
- Greg Cade
- John Catlett (Catlett Code Consulting)
- Andrew Clark (HBAV)
- Allison Cook (Arlington County)
- Robby Dawson (NFPA)
- Cindy Davis (DHCD)
- Joshua Davis
- Garrett Dyer
- Ellen Eggerton (City of Alexandria)
- Rajan Engh (DHCD)
- Sarah A. Foote (DHCD)
- Chris Fox (VanMetre)
- Richard Grace (Fairfax County)
- Eric Goplerud (FACS)
- Randy Grumbine
- Linda Hale (Loudoun County Fire)
- Jay Hall (VA Department of Corrections)
- Dennis Hart (VBCOA/VPMIA)
- Brian Hilderbrand (DHCD)
- Bryan Holland (NEMA)
- Haywood Kines (Prince William County)
- Thomas King (DHCD)

- Eric Lacey (RECA)
- Curt Linderman (DEQ)
- Ernie Little (VFSB)
- Travis Luter (DHCD)
- Jeff Mang
- Jimmy Moss (VBCOA)
- Andrew Milliken (Stafford County Fire)
- Paul Messplay IV (DHCD)
- Florin Moldovan (DHCD)
- Kenney Payne (AIA Virginia)
- William Penniman (Sierra Club)
- Shaun Pharr (AOBA/VAMA)
- Richard Potts (DHCD)
- Rebecca Quinn (FEMA)
- Michael Redifer (NNVA)
- Greg Revels
- Stephen Reynolds (DHCD)
- Travis Rickman (VDFFP)
- Ross Shearer
- Chris Snidow
- Rick Statzer
- Susan Stillman
- Craig Toalson
- Jennifer Tolley (DHCD)
- Charles Walker
- John Walser
- Nabeel Waseem
- Dan Willham (Fairfax County)
- Paul Wallace
- Tread Willis

BU101-18 - Tall Wood

Proponents: John Catlett (catlettcodeconsulting@gmail.com)

2015 Virginia Construction Code

Comments:

- Mr. Milliken wonders about the efficacy of this proposed change.
- Ms. Davis reminds the group that the appendix is not optional.
- Ms. Hale points out that Fire Code and Building Code differ significantly in terms of appendices.

- Mr. Catlett agrees that it could use a bit of clarifying.

Results: Carryover to August meeting

B202(3)-18 Permit Holder Definition

Proponents: Michael Redifer (redifermd@nnva.gov)

Comments:

- Ms. Davis clarifies with Mr. Redifer that the permit-holder is the applicant.
- Mr. Beahm asserts the proposal isn't as comprehensive as it could be, on the grounds of the permit language being unspecific.

Results: Carry over to August meeting

B202(4)-18 Correlates Definition of Building

Proponents: Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com); Ronald Clements Jr (clementsro@chesterfield.gov)

Comments: None

Results: Consensus for Approval

B307.1(1)-18 Deletes Permissible Fireworks Row

Proponents: Glenn Dean (gad.pompier@gmail.com)

Comments: Mr. Walker of TNT Fireworks respectfully disagrees on the basis of consumer fireworks framed as “allowable” fireworks. Proponent not present at meeting.

Results: Consensus for Disapproval

B310.3(1)-18 Residential Uses Provisions

Proponents: Daniel Willham (Daniel.Willham@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Comments:

- Mr. Brown (DHCD) provides context for this proposal.
- Mr. Beahm echoes Jeff.
- Withdrawn by proponent in favor of B310.1..

Results: Withdrawn

B310.3(2)-18 Addresses Dwelling Units in R-1

Proponents: Daniel Willham (Daniel.Willham@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Comments: Withdrawn by proponent in favor of B310.1.

Results: Withdrawn

B310.8.2-18 Accessory Dwelling Units

Proponents: Residential Use Subworkgroup

Comments: Subworkgroup submitting alternative ADU proposal for Workgroup 3.

Results: Withdrawn

B404.5-18 Smoke Control Exception

Proponents: Christopher Campbell (christopher.campbell@arup.com); Raymond Grill (ray.grill@arup.com)

Comments:

- Proponent not present at meeting.
- Mr. Milliken asserts that the Fire Services Board does not support; concerns about smoke removal ability.
- Mr. Pharr wanted to voice support so that the proposal's proponent would have a bit more time to refine the language of the proposal.
- Nabeel Waseem is not in support.
- Mr. Davis wishes to clarify whether the proposal would be carried over or just voted down for consensus disapproval.

Results: Consensus for disapproval

B713.8-18 Penetrations in Shaft Enclosures

Proponents: Dennis Hart, VPMIA/VBCOA (dennis.hart@fairfaxcounty.gov); Richard Grace (richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Comments:

- Mr. Beahm brings up that the IBC Committee may not have been presented with this proposal prior to bringing it to Workgroup 2.
- Mr. Grace clarifies that he is not sure whether this particular proposal was sent over to the committee.
- Mr. Beahm is not necessarily opposed to the proposal; he was just unaware of it and agrees that it be presented to the committee as well as WG2.
- Mr. Hart agrees to carry it over to run it through the IBC Committee.

Results: Carryover to August

B713.11-18 Enclosure at the Bottom of Shaft Enclosures

Proponents: Richard Grace, VPMIA/VBCOA (richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Comments: None

Results: Carryover to August

B903.2.6-18 Group I-3 Automatic Sprinkler Systems for Exercise Yards

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

Comments:

- Mr. Milliken of Fire Services is not in support of this.
- Mr. Hall wishes to identify “a number that the Fire Services Board would be happy with.”
- Mr. Milliken says he does not have a number in mind specifically.

Results: Carryover to August; Mr. Hall will collaborate with the Fire Services

B903.4.2-18 Alarm Exception

Proponents: Casey Littlefield (caseylittlefieldmcp@gmail.com)

Comments:

- Ms. Davis of DHCD provides context for proposal in lieu of Mr. Littlefield (absent).
- Mr. Milliken is opposed; Fire Services Board has not yet reviewed this proposal.
- Representing himself, Mr. Milliken argues this proposal will “muddy the waters.”

Results: Consensus for disapproval

B905.5.3-18 Subject to the Approval of the Building Code Official

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

Comments:

- Mr. Beahm wishes to clarify who else would have to approve -- the building official? The code official?
- Mr. Payne and Mr. Beahm engage in a discussion regarding who would be able to enforce that this code is followed -- what is the allowable interpretation, and who else would need to approve the code itself?
- Mr. Milliken (representing the Fire Services Board) does not support this proposal.
- Mr. Little also does not support.
- Mr. Payne clarifies that this, in response to Mr. Milliken’s assertion that this allows “choices,” it’s not about what you like and what you don’t like.
- Mr. Pharr says that AOBA/VAMA support this proposal.

Results: Non-consensus

B907.3.2-18 Corrects Section Reference

Proponents: SBCO Staff

Comments:

- Ms. Hale speaks in opposition as the proposal was not able to be viewed in cdpVA prior to the meeting
- Mr. Brown clarifies this is just a clarification to the existing language, suggests a carryover to allow time for review
- Mr. Milliken supports carryover.

Results: Carryover to August

B916-18 Emergency Responder Communication

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

--Public Comments for: B916-18

Discussion by Kenney Payne Apr 17, 2020 17:03 UTC -

Comments:

- Mr. Payne expounds on this in verbal discussion regarding repeated attempts to change the code language over multiple cycles. He opposes this change on behalf of AIA Virginia.
- Mr. Pharr and Mr. Milliken provide discussion with a move for non-consensus.

Results: Non-consensus

B1004.3-18 Adds Mercantile to Posting of Occupant Load Requirement

Proponents: Andrew Milliken (amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

Comments:

- Ms. Davis clarifies whether this is a national Fire Code piece. (It is not.)
- Mr. Catlett and Ms. Cook support this proposal “in concept” but in practice have some concerns regarding the workload in terms of building loads/mercantile per locality.
- Mr. Payne and Mr. Milliken seek clarification from DHCD regarding retro-fit requirements that would bear an impact on this proposal.
- Ms. Cook clarifies that the workload wouldn’t be able to give “all systems go” on an immediate basis.
- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia and Mr. Engh of DHCD clarify that VEBC requirements would “only be triggered by work under the VEBC - alteration, addition, repair, change of occupancy.”
- Mr. Dawson agrees. Therefore, this proposal would only come into play when they hit on one of those actions.
- Mr. Milliken clarifies that this proposal only was put forward to lend consistency to the other pieces of the VEBC.
- Ms. Cook suggests we move this piece to Chapter 6, 7, and 8 of the existing building code, or Chapter 3.
- Ms. Davis asserts that she is “99 percent sure” we went through all the retro-fit requirements.
- Mr. Catlett recalls how in Alexandria, they used to issue printed notices.
- Mr. Revels is opposed to B1004.3-18 “on the basis that it should be submitted through ICC and not BHCD. This is an issue that should be consistent on a national level and Virginia should not be an outlier. Also, agree that it should not be retrofit as past code editions for M uses have different sq. ft. thresholds for calculating occupant loads.”
- Mr. Payne recommends moving this piece to Chapter 302.4 - not specific to repairs, COO, etc.; “once you’re in the code, you’ve got to comply with Chapter 3.”
- Ms. Cook voices support for the relocation to chapter 3 of the EBC.

- Mr. Redifer mentions that even in Chapter 3 it's a retrofit which is specifically prohibited by 103.4 VEBC. Mr. Catlett agrees.
- Mr. Revels does not lend support due to the fact that this is not reflected at the national level and we should be outfitting the Virginia code to fit the national.
- Mr. Milliken responds that this is not sufficient as a reason to move toward non-consensus but that in the interest of moving forward he'll acquiesce.
- Ms. Davis grants context behind Mr. Revels' dissent.
- Discussion on retrofit vs. new construction and when renovations/alterations are done.

Results: Carry over to August - likely to still be non-consensus but the hope is to get closer to consensus.

B1010.1.9.6-18 Removes Deletion Section

Proponents: John Mather (john@matherarchitects.com)

Public Comments for: B1010.1.9.6-18

Comments: DHCD staff has some concerns regarding replication of some of the pieces that we have previously moved to Chapter 4. DHCD staff worries this may cause some confusion and lack of clarity. Mr. Brown of DHCD staff speaks on behalf of this proposal in lieu of Mr. Mather (absent).

Results: Consensus for Disapproval

B1612.4-18 Flood Hazard Documentation

Proponents: City of Hampton; Hampton Roads Planning District Commission; City of Norfolk; Virginia DCR; FEMA Region II; Terrazia; City of Newport News

Public Comments: Discussion by Kenney Payne Jun 19, 2020 20:36 UTC

Comments: Mr. Brown of DHCD lends context for this proposal on behalf of the Resiliency SWG.

- Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) voices concern for lack of specificity and problematic language.
- Ms. Quinn with FEMA (Charles City County region) asserts that floodproofing shield maintenance is dependent on the efficacy of floodproofing design and that this proposal is insufficient to provide proper design planning.
- Mr. Payne rebuts that "just because this planning has been around since 1998, doesn't mean we have been responsible for implementation or plan creation" - just design - for that amount of time.
- Mr. Beahm clarifies that regardless of what the plan is, they review every 3 years.
- Mr. Brown of DHCD clarifies that he does have some concerns regarding AHJ in terms of building officials, that they may not have the authority to properly review.

Results: Non-consensus

B1612.2.1-18 Elevation Requirement

Proponents: City of Hampton; Hampton Roads Planning District Commission; City of Norfolk; Virginia DCR; FEMA Region II; Terrazia; City of Newport News; AIA Virginia

Comments: Discussion among Ms. Quinn of FEMA, Ms. Cook of Arlington County, Mr. Payne and others revolves around this being a potentially cost-prohibitive action.

Results: Non-consensus

B1703.1.3-18 Concrete Testing Personnel Credentials

Proponents: Kerry Sutton, American Concrete Institute (kerry.sutton@concrete.org) Concrete Testing Personnel Credentials

Comments:

- Proponent not present to provide context
- Mr. Beahm (self) dissents on the basis of verbiage.

Results: Consensus for disapproval

B1709.5.2-18 Garage Door Testing Standards

Proponents: Resiliency Subworkgroup

Comments: Mr. Beahm is concerned with some of the verbiage.

Results: Consensus for approval

B1804.8-18 Highest Adjacent Grade Definition

Proponents: City of Hampton; Hampton Roads Planning District Commission; City of Norfolk; Virginia DCR; FEMA Region II; Terrazia; AIA Virginia

Comments:

- Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia lends context to this proposal.
- Mr. Wallace labels the language as “extremely arbitrary” - could render a lot of properties “un-buildable”. Brings up issues with grades, with age-in-place facilities, ADA-accessible structures, and how these would be affected.
- Ms. Quinn clarifies the levels of planes that would be required to remain in compliance.
- Homebuilders are opposed.

Results: Non-consensus

B2902.3.2-18 IBC and PC Correlation

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

Comments: None

Results: Consensus for Approval

E402.4.2-18 Skylights

Proponents: Haywood Kines, Energy Subworkgroup

Comments: None

Results: Consensus approval

E404.5-18 deletes Supply Piping Sections

Proponents: Kenney Payne of AIA Virginia, Energy Subworkgroup

Comments: None

Results: Consensus Approval

E501.1 Moved to tomorrow.

E502 Moved to tomorrow.

E503 Moved to tomorrow.

E504.1 Moved to tomorrow.

E1301.1.1.1-18 Removes All Energy Code State Amendments

Proponent: Andrew Grigsby.

Comments:

- Mr. Fox dissents on the grounds that Virginia is actually less rigorous than it needs to be with energy efficiency, especially when compared to other states including Nevada and Maryland.
- Ms. Stillman (representing herself as a private citizen) supports the full proposal.
- Mr. Penniman (Sierra Club) strongly supports full adoption of this full code update.
- Mr. Clark (Virginia Homebuilders' Association) supports this proposal, but not in its entirety, due to affordability of building residential structures.
- Mr. Shearer supports this full proposal.
- Mr. Payne raises the concern of whether this proposal would supersede an earlier deletion.
- Ms. Davis clarifies that it would have to go to the Board to achieve final consensus.
- Mr. Penniman questions whether this includes language about piping, among other pieces.
- Mr. Beahm strongly objects to the proposed change.
- Mr. Pharr of AOBA/VAMA: AOBA/VAMA opposes E1301.1.1.1
- Mr. Goplerud mentions that "multi-unit dwellings are covered by commercial codes that are already at 2018 standards. It's the free standing affordable housing that the home

builders association is concerned about. There can't be a lot of single family affordable housing being built.”

Results: Non-consensus

RE402.1.2(4)-18 Ceiling R-Value Increase

Proponents: Laura Baker, Eric Lacey (RECA)

Comments:

- Mr. Fox of Van Metre Homes lends clarity to the proposal.
- Ms. Eggerton and Mr. Payne clarify that this is only a ceiling proposal, not wall installation.
- Mr. Lacey underscores his desire for Virginia to “catch up” with national standards.
- Ms. Eggerton clarifies that some of the areas of the building already can comply with this.
- Mr. Goplerud reminds us that Maryland already has adopted a much higher standard than Virginia’s and goes above and beyond the national standards for building these elements into their structures.
- Mr. Lacey agrees to continue to table it for the time being, moves to carry it over to the August meeting.
- Mr. Wilham speaks in support of moving to August as well.

Results: Carry over to August meeting

RE402.1.2(5)-18 Wall R-Value Increase

Proponents: Eric Lacey, RECA

Comments:

- Mr. Clark wishes to seek a “resolution that will work for everybody” on this proposal.
- Mr. Mang believes this amendment is “way overdue” and is cost-effective.
- Mr. Penniman (Sierra Club) strongly endorses this proposal and echoes Mr. Lacey’s introductory comments to this proposal.
- Ms. Eggerton is in support and maintains that this would make more homes affordable for the long-term due to reduced utility costs.
- Mr. Shearer mentions that the continued weakening of the ICC model as the homebuilder's desire leads to an inventory of houses in Virginia that becomes obsolete prematurely.
- Mr. Beahm of the Homebuilder’s Association of Virginia does not support and voices the fact that there is other opposition out there to this proposal as well.
- Mr. Payne wishes to clarify the thickness of the insulation.
- Mr. Lacey agrees to table this proposal til August.

Results: Carry over to August meeting

RE503.1.1.1 Replacement Fenestration

Proponents: Eric Lacey, RECA

Comments: Request to move this proposal review to tomorrow's agenda.

Results: Moved to tomorrow (7/1)