

**SUMMARY**  
**COMBINED WORKGROUP1, 2, 3 and 4 MEETING**  
**2018 Code Change Cycle**

August 11, 2020 at 9:30 a.m.

**Remote Meeting Link**

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

**Participants**

William Aceto

Bob Allen (Henrico County)

Scott Andrews

Laura Baker (RECA)

David Beahm (self/Warren County)

Russell Bikoff (Virginia Democracy Forward)

Jeffrey Brown (DHCD)

Lily Byer

John Catlett (American Wood Council, Catlett Code Consulting)

Andrew Clark (Home Builders Association of Virginia)

Kristin Clay

Paul Coats (American Wood Council)

Claudia Cotton

Cindy Davis (DHCD)

Dennis Dineen

Garrett Dyer (VDFP)

Ellen Eggerton (City of Alexandria)

Russ Ellison (DEQ)

Sarah A. Foote (DHCD)

Charles Gerena (Drive Electric RVA)

Robert Glass

Eric Goplerud (FAAC)

Richard Grace (VPMIA/VBCOA)

Randy Grumbine (Virginia Manufactured and Modular Home Association)

Linda Hale (Loudoun County Fire)

Karen Haley-Wingate

Chelsea Harnish (VAEEC)

Dennis Hart (VPMIA/VBCOA)

Brian Hilderbrand (DHCD)

Kathie Hoekstra (350 Alexandria)

Bryan Holland (NEMA)  
Renee Hooper (DEQ)  
Patrick Hughes (City of Chesapeake)  
Maggie Kelley - Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA)  
Jane Kim (VBCOA)  
Thomas King (DHCD)  
Haywood Kines (Prince William County)  
Dr. Frederick Krimgold (Virginia Tech)  
Eric Lacey (RECA)  
Annette Lang (representing herself)  
Jason Laws (VBCOA)  
Joy Loving (CAAV)  
Travis Luter (DHCD)  
Ivy Main (representing herself)  
Paul Messplay IV (DHCD)  
Andrew Milliken (Stafford County Fire/Fire Services Board)  
Florin Moldovan (DHCD)  
Jimmy Moss (VBCOA)  
Jay Murdoch  
Nancy Najarian (Virginia Democracy Forward)  
Kathleen Nawaz (representing herself)  
Keith Oberg (representing himself)  
Mike O'Connor (VPCMA)  
Andrea Papageorge (Southern Company Gas)  
William Penniman (Sierra Club)  
Shaun Pharr (AOBA/VAMA)  
Alexandria Phillips (Washington Gas)  
Richard Potts (DHCD)  
Rebecca Quinn (FEMA)  
Michael Redifer (representing himself)  
Travis Rickman (VDFFP)  
Jonathan Sargeant (OmegaFlex)  
Jeff Shapiro (International Code Consultants)  
David Sharp (Fairfax County)  
Ross Shearer (representing himself)  
Sharon Shutler (The Virginia Grassroots Coalition)  
David Smith  
Andrew Smith (Farm Bureau of Virginia)  
Chris Snidow (Henrico County)  
Susan Stillman (Sierra Club)  
Kerry Sutton (American Concrete Institute)

Jennifer Tolley (DHCD)  
Morgan Whayland (Natural Gas)  
Dan Willham (VBCOA)  
Rick Witt (VBCOA Fire Code Committee)  
Petrina Jones Wrobling  
Chad Zaynow (Columbia Gas)

## **BU101 Tall Wood Appendix**

**Proponent(s):** John Catlett ([catlettcodeconsulting@gmail.com](mailto:catlettcodeconsulting@gmail.com)), Catlett Code Consulting

**Summation of Proposal:** These proposals (FP101) bring in changes approved by the 2021 ICC code update process for construction of Tall Wood (mass timber) buildings.

### **Other Pertinent Information:**

- This proposal and its companion piece, FP101 Tall Wood Appendix, originated in the proposed phase. They were carried over for issues arising from implementation.
- Concerns were voiced regarding the construction requirements as an appendix and the need to ensure that it was not optional. Mr. Witt suggested to get the 2021 language that was approved and insert that into the main body of the code.

### **Comments:**

- Ms. Davis (DHCD) provides context for this proposal, Mr. Catlett (AWC) discusses issues with cdpVA and how he has encountered difficulty on his side with updating information to this proposal as he needed to.
- He has attempted to “clean up” the text and appendix, and he also submitted a verification
- Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board Codes and Standards Committee) is opposed due to this proposal being part of an appendix; he wishes for it to be included in the body of the text.
- Mr. Milliken doesn't see an issue with this proposal being included as part of the body of the code, but is resistant to it being an appendix in the fire code.
- Ms. Davis agrees - she suggests wordsmithing it.
- Mr. Catlett has no issue including this language in Chapter 3 as opposed to an appendix, claims this is based on 2018 code language - he suggests carrying this over to the September meeting to give time to wordsmith it to satisfy both the Fire Services Board concerns and the American Wood Council
- Mr. Coats of the American Wood Council is happy to work with Mr. Catlett on this as well as Mr. Milliken.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1

## **FP101 Tall Wood Appendix**

**Proponent(s):** John Catlett - Catlett Code Consulting (representing American Wood Council)

**Summation of Proposal:** This is a companion proposal to BU101 and reflects changes approved for mass timber construction by the 2021 ICC code process.

**Other Pertinent Information:** Along with BU101, this proposed change was carried over from the 2019 Workgroup 1&2 meeting.

**Comments:** See Companion Proposal BU101.

**Results:** Carryover to 9/1

### **B202(3) Permit Holder Definition**

**Proponent(s):** Michael Redifer

**Summation of Proposal:** Adds a definition for permit holders.

**Other Pertinent Information:** This proposed change was carried over from the June 2020 Workgroup 2 meeting to revise language based on feedback.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Redifer (representing himself) - this has been pared down to the reason statement
- Mr. Willham of VBCOA Building Codes Committee supports this change.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **B713.8 Penetrations in Shaft Enclosures**

**Proponent(s):** Dennis Hart, VPMIA/VBCOA ([dennis.hart@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:dennis.hart@fairfaxcounty.gov)); Richard Grace VPMIA/VBCOA ([richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This change coordinates the penetration's requirements with the current language for shaft construction.

**Other Pertinent Information:** This proposed change was carried over from the June 2020 Workgroup 2 meeting to give the VBCOA IBC Committee an opportunity to review.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Grace provides context, gives history to what providing shafts means according to previous codes (2006 and 2009), and how it relates to the current code.
- Mr. Willham representing the VBCOA Building Code Committee opposes this change on the basis that the current language is sufficient as-is.
- Mr. Snidow suggests leaving out "vertical" and "horizontal" language, and just refer to them as penetrations.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **B713.11 Enclosures at the Bottom**

**Proponent(s):** Richard Grace, VPMIA/VBCOA ([richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov))

—

**Summation of Proposal:** This companion change to B713.8 will align the two code sections and still permit a duct contained within a shaft to terminate in a room having a use related to the purpose of the shaft without requiring the installation of a fire damper

**Comments:**

- This is a companion piece to B713.8; Mr. Grace provides background information on the proposal.
- Dan Willham of VBCOA building code committee opposes; the committee believes the current code language suffices.
- Mr. Beahm (IBC Committee) asserts that the construction code should stay with the construction code. They are opposed to this proposal, arguing that it takes options away instead of providing additional measures for construction. He believes this is a philosophical difference between the two committees involved.
- Mr. Grace maintains they aren't taking away a viable option - the option remains in Chapter 7.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **B903.2.6 Exception for automatic sprinklers in exercise yards**

**Proponent(s):** William Hall, Virginia Dept of Corrections ([william.hall@vadoc.virginia.gov](mailto:william.hall@vadoc.virginia.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This reflects a compromise proposal between VADOC and Andrew Milliken but it is not a full compromise at this time. This proposal seeks to except certain exercise yards from automatic sprinklers.

**Other Pertinent Information:** Carried over from the June 2020 Workgroup 2 meeting to address feedback.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Davis solicits opposition/support stances.
- Mr. Willham of VBCOA IBC is in opposition.
- Mr. Milliken - opposition. They have tried to work out additional language, but they still have overarching concerns.

**Results:** Consensus for Disapproval

### **B907.3.2 Special locking systems**

**Proponent(s):** DHCD Staff ([sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov](mailto:sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal correlates section numbers that had been previously changed.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Willham - in support of this change

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **B918.1 Emergency Responder radio coverage**

**Proponent(s):** Linda Hale, Loudoun County Fire Marshal's Office ([Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov](mailto:Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)); Andrew Milliken, Stafford County Fire Marshal's Office ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summary:** This proposal defines how emergency radio coverage should be installed in certain buildings. It mandates the use of specific technology.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Hale provides reasoning - it shouldn't be on taxpayers to pay for radio coverage
- Mr. Pharr of AOBA and VAMA opposes - they say it is entirely appropriate to use tax revenue to fund local essential safety measures. Further, we shouldn't saddle building owners with these costs. Nobody is arguing that these safety measures aren't critical to safety.
- Mr. Witt (VBCOA Fire Code Committee) opposes; he suggests we carry to the next code cycle, acknowledges the need for an update but believes the stakeholders all need to come together to make some decisions that are mutually acceptable.
- Mr. Willham (VBCOA Committee) also opposes for the reasons stated above.
- Mr. Milliken (Fire Services Board) is in support. He believes that due to the technologies that have come out since this code was originally penned, an update is warranted, but he wants to at least get the discussion going.
- Mr. Dyer (SFMO) is in support for the reasons already stated.
- Public comment by Mr. Payne of AIA Virginia cites that he is concerned about functionality and longevity of this proposal's suggested changes due to "line-of-sight" language (just in case another building is constructed later).

- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) points out that the current language makes suggestions as opposed to outlining requirements. There is most likely “latitude that has not been explored” to enact some of these infrastructure ideas. He would not be opposed to a committee that explores how to update these ideas and the language to describe them; he is however vehemently opposed to using this proposal to “turn existing code on its head.”
- Ms. Hale maintains it is a small dollar amount that would make the difference between the model code and the code with these changes in place and that she was not attempting to recreate anything through this proposal; she is not sure a workgroup would allow any sort of consensus.
- Mr. Pharr disagrees, and clarifies that what he meant was that there may be equivalent, different approaches to the problems laid out by this proposal, other than those that have been suggested. He wishes to note that AOBA/VAMA also submitted a comment on cdpVA.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **B1004.3 Posting of occupant load for mercantile use**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (self), ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal attempts to add a posting of occupancy loads for mercantile uses.

**Other Pertinent Information:** Carried over from the June 2020 Workgroup 2 meeting to revise and get closer to consensus based on feedback.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Milliken explains that this first proposal is one that was submitted before, but that B1004.3 and B1004.3(2) are companion proposals with similar ideas, they only plan to try and get one of the two to consensus.
- Mr. Willham (VBCOA Building Code Committee) opposes.
- Mr. Beahm (IBC Committee) does not believe this is a change that is drastically needed. He is opposed.
- Ms. Hale (Virginia Fire Prevention Association) disagrees; she believes that this list should be “proactive” rather than “reactive,” and this change is something that is necessary. She is in support.
- Mr. Snidow claims they can reference the C.O.
- Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) thinks that posting the occupancy load will help with COVID, which limits the occupant loads in retail. But she also acknowledges that there is a cost to getting the signs up.
- Mr. Milliken suggests moving companion proposal B1004.3(2) to non-consensus.

**Results:** Withdrawn

### **B1004.3(2) Posting occupant load for mercantile use**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (representing himself), ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** Similar to proposal 329 - B1004.3-18 but adds correction to VMC 702.1

**Comments:**

- See comments from B1004.3.
- Mr. Willham (VBCOA Building Code Committee) opposes.

**Results:** Non-Consensus

## **EB103.2 Short-term rentals**

**Proponent(s):** Greg Revels, Henrico County ([greg.revels@henrico.us](mailto:greg.revels@henrico.us))

**Summation of Proposal:** Provides clarification and exceptions for change of occupancy for R-5 units used as short term rentals.

### **Other Pertinent Information:**

- Short-term rental has been a long-standing issue that's been discussed at the Residential Use Group meetings, including meetings on: May 31 2019, July 10 2019, August 9th and the final ADU meeting (split as a separate proposal) in June 2020. There has been disagreement within the building code community for use-group classification of beach rental homes with multiple sleeping units, and it has also been a sticking point for some of the ADU discussion where people are converting basements into rental units. This can create a fire hazard and life safety hazard since both these groups of structures are not designed for multiple occupancies, but effectively they're being converted into such.
- At the May 31, 2019 meeting, suggested added language regarding ADUs was brought forth; nothing was decided upon because the group believed it would be helpful to have Mr. Revels (not in attendance that day) to walk the group through the proposed changes. The discussion at that meeting yielded the following results: The workgroup felt there was no additional concerns from a code perspective regarding Air BnB and similar short-term rentals of dwelling units. There are no greater hazards associated with the use than found in time shares or lodging houses. However, current provisions do not allow the uses for anything other than the purposes of "complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation" which are called out in the definition of a dwelling unit. Uses for wedding venues or other similar uses would not be considered complying with the requirements and would need to be addressed within the requirements of the IBC. Local zoning and/or homeowner associations may be better geared to regulate the number of and requirements for parking, licensing, etc. than attempting to regulate them through the building code.

### **Comments:**

- Proponent is not present.
- Ms. Davis (DHCD) gives background to this proposal in Mr. Revels' stead.
- Ms. Hale is concerned that it isn't inclusive enough - doesn't include fire code.
- Mr. Allen (Henrico County) speaks on behalf of Mr. Revels.
- Mr. Beahm (representing self) is opposed to the change, claiming this proposal would implement a solution for a locality's issue as opposed to a statewide issue.
- Mr. Milliken is also opposed, for the reasons outlined by Mr. Beahm. The Fire Services Board are concerned with it remaining an R-5. He questions how or whether this affects the residential subworkgroup.
- Mr. Brown of DHCD clarifies that this did not affect the subworkgroup, and that Mr. Revels did intend for it to be inclusive statewide, not merely just bound to help one locality.
- Mr. Allen is in support.

**Results:** Non-consensus

## **EB307 Roof covering**

**Proponent(s):** Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com); Ronald Clements Jr ([clementsro@chesterfield.gov](mailto:clementsro@chesterfield.gov)) - not on the call

**Summation of Proposal:** Clarifies roof repairs and roof coverings in the context of the existing building code.

**Comments:**

- This proposal was Consensus for Approval at the July Workgroup 2 meeting. Subsequently, DHCD suggested language to clarify the definition for “roof covering” and the proponent agreed. Since there was a change, the proposal brought before the workgroup again.
- Mr. Witt supports.
- Mr. Pharr supports.
- Mr. Penniman has questions for Mr. Payne and wishes for it to be carried over to the final workgroup meeting.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1 meeting

### **EB701.4 Move VECC C505 to Ch. 7 of VEBC**

**Proponent(s):** Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey ([eric@reca-codes.com](mailto:eric@reca-codes.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal moves portions of the VECC to the VEBC for improved energy efficiency.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Baker (RECA) provides background for the three energy proposals that go together.
- Mr. Witt questions whether the committee has indicated consensus, and that the language included in this proposal is consensus language. Ms. Baker indicates that is her understanding.
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) is opposed based on cost, claiming that there is a “statutory obstacle” to the Board adopting new code changes that would increase the cost on existing buildings, and that this proposed change goes against that.
- Ms. Eggerton of Alexandria mentions that these requirements are already in the VECC.
- Mr. Penniman (Sierra Club) claims that retrofits are far more expensive than building energy-efficient buildings upfront. He is concerned that energy requirements aren’t being considered fully, but he is in support.
- Ms. Baker maintains that these are the best ways to implement these energy-efficient measures in ways that are not cost-burdensome for stakeholders - builders and owners.
- Mr. O’Connor questions whether this includes residential buildings or whether it would apply to state buildings. Ms. Davis answers that this would not include fuel-switching and maintains that this would be up to DGS (as both the builder and the owner of state government buildings) to either take these requirements as minimum code, or require stricter codes (LEED requirement, 100 percent Net Zero Energy, etc.).
- Mr. Lacey provides clarity on the compromises between the VEBC standards and minimal energy efficient updates being made.
- Chelsea Harnish (VAEEC) supports this proposal
- Mr. Beahm (self) opposes. He says that options are great, but that this would be too opinion-based of a change.
- Mr. Pharr wishes to double-down on the language of “the least possible cost”. He repeats that he can’t support due to the cost considerations that would be prohibitive for so many builders and owners.

- Ms. Eggerton clarifies that this would not apply to historic buildings and would be a cost-saving measure to all others.
- Ms. Baker clarifies that this proposal only covers Proposal Section B, and to ignore Section A.
- Mr. Witt wants to clarify about whether this enforces a standard that is not applied to other building structures of having to bring all buildings up to all most modern standards when they change occupancy.
- Mr. Beahm mentions that if the proposal were only limited to Option B, he may have a different answer or opinion, but at the moment he is still opposed.
- Mr. Penniman (Sierra Club) reiterates the importance of energy efficiency, he is still in support.
- Mr. Lacey mentions that the 2015 Virginia Residential Code already includes the residential language in section N1111.2, almost verbatim. This proposal just puts it into the Existing Building Code.
- Ms. Harnish and Ms. Baker suggest carrying all three proposals over to the September meeting to let Kenney Payne and Allison Cook air their insights, too.
- Ms. Davis agrees.

**Results:** Carryover to 9/1 meeting

### **EB1101.18(2) Address identification**

**Proponent(s):** Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia ([kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com](mailto:kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** Moves the address identification requirement to indicate that it is required to be present.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Milliken (representing himself) speaks on behalf of Mr. Payne, who is not in attendance.
- Mr. Penniman questions whether this is a misprint - does it extend to existing or future buildings? Mr. Beahm has the same question.
- Mr. Milliken and Ms. Davis lend context that it is for both existing and future buildings.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **FP103.2.1 Supplemental info**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (SFPC) - [amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

**Summation of Proposal:** Helpful for users to identify which applicable building code applies.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Davis notes that this supplemental information is not a proposal, per se, but it is not something that goes through a regulatory process.
- Mr. Milliken wishes for this to be consistently incorporated into building code discussions.
- Ms. Davis agrees to discuss this further.

**Results:** This is not a proposal

### **FP103.2.1 VFSB SFPC Edit Part 4**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (SFPC) [amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal includes VFSB recommended changes to Chapters 1-9 and 38 of the SFPC that have been reviewed and recommended by the SFPC Edit Workgroup

**Comments:**

- Ms. Davis mentions that this proposal is intended to remove construction language and clarify maintenance language regarding how the fire service does inspections.
- Mr. Milliken is very appreciative of the fact that there was an additional Fire Code Edit to help workshop this further.
- Mr. Witt wishes to carry this to the 9/1 meeting, so that the committee has a chance to review the parts of the chapters 1-9 within FP103.2.1 that they haven't addressed yet.
- Ms. Davis and Mr. Brown (DHCD) clarifies that the ones we have consensus on, out of the SFPC edits, will move forward – but not the ones that have not been reviewed yet -- in response to Mr. Witt's concerns.
- Mr. Moss speaks in support.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

**FP103.2.1 VFSB SFPC Edit Chapters 1-10**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (SFPC) - [amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal includes VFSB recommended changes to Chapters 1-10 and 38 of the SF

**Comments:**

- Those concerned with these edits haven't gotten to Ch. 9 yet, so making a decision for Chapters 1-10 would be premature at this time.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1 Meeting

**FP107.2(2) Commercial cooking operational permit**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken (Stafford County Fire), [amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov)

**Summation of Proposal:** This adds an operation permit for commercial cooking operations outside the situations where it already applies.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Beahm previously had concerns, but is fine with the proposal as it stands currently.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

**FP112.5 Application for appeal**

**Proponent(s):** Linda Hale, Loudoun County Fire ([Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov](mailto:Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)); Andrew Milliken, Stafford County Fire ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal seeks to clarify who can file appeals for decisions made by the Fire Official.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Hale provides context for this proposal.
- Mr. Pharr supports the intent, but he is concerned about the statutory authority and thinks it needs further clarification.
- Ms. Davis gives voice to a conversation she had recently with the assistant AG who says there is no statutory issue, but that he is concerned that this may be more of a zoning issue, and may be hard to enforce.
- Mr. Witt has issues with the language. He believes it is too broad and is seeking more specific definitions for pieces like “economic impact” and “adverse effects.”
- Mr. Dyer (SFMO) is in support.

**Results:** Non-Consensus

### **FP319.2.1 Permits for food trucks**

**Proponent(s):** Linda Hale, Loudoun County Fire ([Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov](mailto:Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov)); Andrew Milliken, Stafford County Fire ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** Adds permit requirements for food trucks.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Hale provides context for this proposal.
- Mr. Smith (Farm Bureau of Virginia) has no comment on it, but that he sent it to the Food Truck Association and heard nothing back from them.
- Mr. Witt is concerned that this sets up a conflict between the local government and the state fire office.
- Ms. Hale clarifies that this is not a divergence from what is already in the code.
- Ms. Hale and Ms. Davis engage in conversation regarding which jurisdictions would be the ones to have permits issued per food truck.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **FP609.2 Ventilation for cooking operations**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken, Stafford County Fire ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal indicates how a fire official can interface with the building official for cooking operations occurring without adequate ventilation.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Witt has issues with this proposal. He wants to parse out parts of the proposal, and he wonders about the necessity of specifying grease-laden vapors, as opposed to anytime a cooking operation is being performed.
- Ms. Hale is in support; she disagrees with Mr. Witt and claims that the specificity is very necessary.
- Mr. Moss (Fire Code Subcommittee) is in support.
- Mr. Grace (VPMIA/VBCOA) also wishes to discuss with Mr. Milliken and Mr. Witt.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1

### **FP3104.15.5 Cooking tents**

**Proponent(s):** Andrew Milliken, Stafford County Fire ([amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov](mailto:amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** Correction by the VFSB Codes and Standards Committee to avoid conflicting terms due to the new definition of "cooking tent"

**Comments:** None

**Results:** Withdrawn

### **FP3107.12.5 Cooking tents**

**Proponent(s):** Linda Hale, Loudoun County Fire ([Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov](mailto:Linda.Hale@Loudoun.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal adds additional safety precautions and clarifies that cooking tents, regardless of whether they have sides, are included in this provision.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Hale (Loudoun County Fire) provides context for this proposal.
- Mr. Smith (Farm Bureau of Virginia) is opposed.

- Mr. Milliken (Fire Code Standards Committee) acknowledges that whether there are drops on the side of the tent does not actually matter, and that Mr. Smith's fears that this would affect a farmers' market are thus moot.
- Ms. Hale maintains that this is designed to make the existing code clearer, it doesn't actually change anything.
- Mr. Smith suggests carrying over and talking with Linda Hale.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1

### **FP5003.1.1(1) Footnote for max refrigerant**

**Proponent(s):** Julius Ballanco ([JBENGINEER@aol.com](mailto:JBENGINEER@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This adds a footnote for Group A2L refrigerants to the MAQ table in Chapter 50.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Glass (Goodman Manufacturing) represents Mr. Ballanco, who is unable to make this meeting.
- Mr. Milliken clarifies that the Fire Code Edits removed these tables. He also mentions that it is important to measure against the SFPC to make sure the footnote makes sense.
- Mr. Shapiro (International Code Consultants) claims it's being discussed for 2024. Nothing for 2021 related to refrigerant storage.
- Ms. Hale mentions that she doesn't think it is necessary - there is no data to support this since it hasn't been discussed yet by the ICC.
- Mr. Milliken mentions that because it's in the wrong book entirely, it should be voted as consensus for disapproval.

**Results:** Consensus for Disapproval

### **FP5003.1.1(2) Footnote for max refrigerant**

**Proponent(s):** Julius Ballanco ([JBENGINEER@aol.com](mailto:JBENGINEER@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This adds a footnote for Group A2L refrigerants to the MAQ table in Chapter 50.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Glass wishes to clarify whether the table is removed for the Virginia fire code; Ms. Davis clarifies that this is only in regard to the IFC, but the reference still remains.

**Results:** Consensus for Disapproval

### **FP5704.2.13.1.1 Exceptions for SWCB tanks**

**Proponent(s):** Resiliency Subworkgroup

**Summation of Proposal:** Makes reference to the SWCB regulation section since there are some specific requirements that are different from the requirements in this section.

**Comments:** Mr. Brown of DHCD gives context.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval.

### **E404.2 Solar readiness**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman (Sierra Club), [wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com)

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal specifies a requirement for rooftops to be overbuilt in preparation for installation of solar panels, but does not mandate the installation of solar panels. The proposal has exceptions for when solar panels would be ineffective and therefore does not require overbuilding of the roof.

### **Comments:**

- Mr. Penniman provides context for all the energy proposals, including this one.
- Ms. Nawaz is in support - she discusses how she hopes homeowners of all means will be able to install solar, and if not, figure out why.
- Ms. Loving (CAAV) is in support. She mentions the urgency for Virginia to adopt these energy-efficient measures.
- Ms. Hoekstra is in support - that it is great to have a backup energy source.
- Ms. Stillman (Sierra Club) is in support; she claims it will indeed be a cost-saving measure.
- Mr. Clark (Virginia Homebuilders' Association) is opposed; he acknowledges that solar would be good for the environment, but the upfront costs provide issues.
- Mr. Beahm (self) is opposed to the change. He believes this should be up to the homeowner, not something that is forced upon them through regulation.
- Bryan Holland (NEMA) fully endorses and supports Proposal E404.2-18 as a means to further improve the effective use and conservation of energy on dwellings.
- Ms. Main (self) is in support.
- Ms. Najarian (Virginia Democracy Forward) is in support. She mentions that there is real consumer demand for residential solar energy, especially among younger homeowners/homebuyers.
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) mentions that whatever expenditures there are could also be irrelevant if the solar isn't being used.
- Mr. Witt suggests making this a non-mandatory appendix.
- Mr. Goplerud mentions that this is focused on residential structures only, not commercial.
- Ms. Namaz mentions that nobody is discussing the cost-savings measures that occur over the lifetime of solar panels. She suggests postponing this proposal for later consideration so that we can take a closer look at the numeric breakdown.
- Mr. Pharr describes how the construction code outlines "5 stories or less". He mentions how some localities use incentives as opposed to mandates to increase the chances that consumers will adopt solar.
- Mr. Beahm claims that oftentimes consumers are literally saving every dollar, so even if a \$100 figure may be objectively low for some, it could still be cost-prohibitive for others, especially those who are trying to buy their first homes.
- Ms. Nawaz maintains that there is documentation to suggest that the costs are not slated to be prohibitive.
- Mr. Witt questions who is going to verify the solar readiness: how would this be enforced?
- Mr. O'Connor represents Virginia-based businesses in the propane and heating oil industries. Any equipment they install in a residence is self funded not the result of a state subsidy or mandate. He opposes this process as it puts the governments' foot on the scale for one supplier of home energy while discriminating against others.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **E405.10 Electric vehicle readiness**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman (Sierra Club), [wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com)

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal is anticipated to be in the 2021 IECC and includes provisions for additional installations of EV-charging stations and EV-Ready structures.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Penniman provides background, including cost-savings benefits for implementation.
- Ms. Hoekstra is in support due to the fact that climate change is doing irreversible harm to the environment.
- Ms. Loving (CAAV) is in support.
- Ms. Nawaz underscores the differences between electric vehicles and gasoline-powered vehicles, and the benefits of EV. She is in support.
- Bryan Holland (NEMA) fully supports Proposal E405.10 adding EV Capable and EV Ready requirements into the VECC.
- Ms. Stillman speaks to the benefits of installing EV charging stations upfront so that we don't have to retrofit later.
- Mr. Gerena (Drive Electric RVA) is in support and discusses how Virginia is already behind neighboring states and that we need to adopt more stringent carbon regulations.
- Maggie Kelley (SEEA) supports Proposal E405.10 - adding EV Capable and EV Ready requirements into the VECC, on the basis that this assists in creating a more energy-efficient Virginia.
- Mr. O'Connor brings up that this proposal means that consumers will have one choice of EV charging supplier- all of which are regulated monopolies with a guaranteed rate of return. He brings up how today, there are 4,236 stations selling gasoline in VA, and that consumers need more options, not fewer. He also mentions how, on July 1, Virginia increased its gasoline tax to 28. cents per gallon. Electric vehicles pay less than a tenth of that amount annualized but drive the same roads.
- Mr. Pharr - AOBA/VAMA are opposed due to the fact that there are no data to support the cost savings.
- Mr. Clark (HBAV - also representing Phil Abraham with the Virginia Association of Real Estate) still has concerns about this proposal, and is not in support, but that educating stakeholders and consumers to empower them to make these greener choices independently would be great instead of mandating the changes.
- Sharon Shutler (The Virginia Grassroots Coalition) supports this proposal.
- Annette Lang mentions that as a homeowner in an HOA, she has no options...
- Eric Goplerud (Faith Alliance for Climate Solutions) supports this proposal.
- Ivy Main (self) supports the EV proposal. Putting a plug in the parking area is cheap and easy when done during construction. There is no good reason not to do it.
- Charles Gerena (Drive Electric RVA) brings up, in response to comments on using incentives to encourage actions that benefit the environment rather than mandates, such incentives are far less effective if the built space prevents those actions from taking place. For example, a homeowner may want to install an EV charger, but she may be unable to do so because the panel box is one side of the house and the driveway is on the other side.
- Mr. Oberg compares the costs of retro-fitting versus folding in EV-readiness into a 30-year mortgage and strongly supports.
- Ms. Lang (representing herself) said that building in an EV charging station would be a huge incentive to buy an electric vehicle.
- Mr. Penniman supports.

**Results:** Non-consensus

**E502 Relocates VECC Sections C/R502 to VEBC**

**Proponent(s):** Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey ([eric@reca-codes.com](mailto:eric@reca-codes.com)) - RECA

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal moves the commercial and residential provisions of Section 502 from the VECC to the VEBC.

**Comments:** Proponent requested to carry over.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1

### **E504.1 Relocates VECC Sections C/R504 to VEBC**

**Proponent(s):** Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey ([eric@reca-codes.com](mailto:eric@reca-codes.com)) - RECA

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal moves the commercial and residential provisions of Section 504 from the VECC to the VEBC.

**Comments:** Proponent requested to carry over.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1

### **RE402.1.2(5) Insulation provisions**

**Proponent(s):** Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey ([eric@reca-codes.com](mailto:eric@reca-codes.com)) - RECA

**Reason Statement:** The purpose of this proposal is to improve energy savings and increase

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal brings in the wall insulation requirements of the 2018 IECC.

#### **Other pertinent information:**

- At the April 24th, 2019 Energy Subworkgroup meeting, this proposal was voted Non-consensus. HBAV opposed this proposal due to the cost increase to single-family homes. They believe these measures should be optional. Supporters of this proposal argued that savings in utility costs more than offset the initial increase in construction costs.
- At the August 2019 Energy Subworkgroup meeting, this proposal was voted Non-consensus. The proponent gave overview of their proposal and addressed the public comment submitted in cdpVA. A. Clark/HBAV was still in the process of evaluating the cost estimates and still did not have consensus among his members.

**Comments:** Proponents reached a compromise with HBAV, which includes withdrawing this proposal with agreement to move RE402.1.2(4) forward as consensus for approval.

**Results:** Withdrawn by the proponents

### **RE402.1.2(4) Insulation provisions**

**Proponent(s):** Laura Baker (laura@reca-codes.com); Eric Lacey ([eric@reca-codes.com](mailto:eric@reca-codes.com)) - RECA

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal brings in the ceiling insulation requirements of the 2018 IECC.

#### **Comments:**

- Mr. Lacey provides context.
- Ms. Hoekstra is in support.
- Mr. Goplerud (Faith Action Alliance Council) is in support.
- Mr. Clark is greatly appreciative of all who put work into this proposal and their work on this compromise. HBAV supports.
- Ms. Harnish (VAEEC) is in full support.

- Maggie Kelley ( SEEA) supports this proposal

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **RE402.1.2(6) 2018 IECC Insulation tables**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal brings in the full 2018 IECC insulation tables

**Comments:**

- Mr. Clark (HBAV) opposes on the basis of cost as well as some serious design flaws.
- Mr. Shearer (self) supports this proposal; he believes it is indicative of Virginia going in the “right direction.”
- Kathie Hoekstra (350 Alexandria and self) supports this proposal.
- Mr. Goplerud (FAAC) supports based on cost savings as a result of increased energy efficiency.
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) is opposed.
- Ms. Nawaz supports this proposal.
- Ms. Main (self) supports this proposal, citing that it will reduce utility bills for owners and tenants over the life of the home. These bills are unaffordable for low-income residents, so this is a very important part of making housing affordable.
- Ms. Stillman (self) supports the improvement in insulation for walls and ceilings, citing that it is easier and cheaper to do in construction than later.
- Sharon Shutler (Virginia Grassroots Coalition) supports this proposal.
- Ms. Lang underscores the need to bring Virginia’s code up to “modern standards.”
- Dr. Frederick Krimgold (VT) speaks in support of the proposal, citing the greenhouse gases’ increase in recent years and how climate change is so detrimental to our environment, our safety, and our homes in the long-term.
- Mr. Clark (HBAV) wishes to clarify whether support for this proposal also indicates support for the previous proposal...
- Mr. Penniman (Sierra Club) is not opposed to compromise.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **RE402.4.1.2(2) Air leakage testing**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** The purpose of this proposal is to bring the Virginia code up to date with the 2018/2012 IECC as it relates to blower door testing and 3 air changes per hour..

**Comments:**

- Ms. Najarian (Virginia Democracy Forward) is in support.
- Regarding air leakage testing, Mr. Lacey (RECA) stands by the compromise agreed to with HBAV, which includes mandatory blower door testing of all new homes at 5 ACH50, and the elimination of the visual inspection option.
- Ms. Harnish (VAEEC) agrees with Mr. Lacey’s comment.
- Ms. Eggerton also supports the compromise that was worked out in the subcommittee.
- Mr. Clark with HBAV echoes Mr. Lacey’s comment.
- Mr. Goplerud (FAAC) is in support of this proposal.
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) is in opposition, mentioning the “due regard” language contained within the proposal.

- Mr. Beahm (representing himself) agrees with the above HBAV and energy subworkgroup agreements.
- Mr. Witt disagrees with the idea that there should be a note included in the proposed code change. He asserts that the substance of the note included should be its own proposed code change.
- Mr. Penniman disagrees with the idea of a cheaper option being a better option if it does not protect the residents as well.
- Ms. Stillman (self) supports this proposal for less air infiltration. One gets more vermin in homes that are leaky. This is harmful to people's health.
- Dr. Krimgold (VT) is in support of this proposal.

**Results:** Non-consensus

### **RE403.1.2 Electric resistance heat**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal restricts the use of electric resistance heat as a primary home heating method.

**Comments:**

- Ms. Lang (self) supports this proposal with regard for Mr. Penniman's explanation of benefits.
- Ms. Stillman supports, citing personal experience with both electric resistance heat and pump heat.
- Mr. Clark (HBAV) opposes.
- Mr. Beahm (representing self) does not support.
- Ms. Shutler (The Virginia Grassroots Coalition) supports this proposal
- Ms. Nawaz supports this proposal, mentioning that electric heat pumps are much more efficient than gas/fossil fuel sources.
- Ms. Eggerton (speaking for herself) supports this proposal.

**Results:** Non-Consensus

### **RE403.1.4 Primary Space Heating Systems**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal prohibits the use of gas furnaces for primary heat sources.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Clark (HBAV) opposes.
- Mr. Beahm (self) stands by his comments from the last change (RE403.1.2) and opposes this proposal, RE403.1.4, as well.
- Ms. Lang (self) supports this proposal.
- Ms. Stillman (self) supports.
- Ms. Eggerton (Alexandria) says it is cheaper as a first cost to install a heat pump only over an air conditioner with a gas furnace. Modern heat pumps can perform down to 7 degrees so that no back up heat is needed.
- Ms. Nawaz supports this proposal.
- Ms. Najarian (Virginia Democracy Forward) supports this proposal.
- Ms. Shutler (Virginia Grassroots Coalition) supports this proposal
- Mr. Pharr (AOBA/VAMA) opposes RE403.1.4

- Ms. Whayland (Natural Gas) opposes.
- Ms. Main (self) supports.
- Mike O'Connor opposes.
- Alexandria Phillips (self and Washington Gas) opposes this proposal RE403.1.4
- Mr. Zaynow (Columbia Gas) opposes.
- Ms. Papageorge (Southern Company Gas) strongly opposes this proposal.
- Mr. Shearer (self): The code pertains to new construction, which should be moving towards zero carbon. He is in support.
- Ms. Main (self) supports, citing that a new law makes it the policy of the Commonwealth to achieve a net-zero economy by 2045, which will necessitate all buildings going electric. There is no reason to install gas heat in buildings today, that will have to be converted later.

**Results:** Non-consensus

## **RE404.2 Electric readiness**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal requires additional electric wiring with the goal of allowing home owners to more easily switch to more energy efficient technology in the future.

### **Comments:**

- Mr. Penniman provides background for this proposal.
- Ms. Clark mentions that if this proposal is the same as it was during the last workgroup meeting, HBAV is opposed. Phil Abraham on behalf of the Virginia Association of Commercial Real Estate asked Mr. Clark to pass along his opposition as well.
- Mr. O'Connor is opposed.
- Ms. Eggerton (The City of Alexandria) supports this as they have a goal of moving to electrification in the future as an action of the adopted Environmental Action Plan 2040. This proposal supports the goals to reduce carbon emissions by 50% by 2030 and 80-100% by 2050.
- Mr. Beahm (self) claims this change would create issues with different manufacturers' requirements, so he is opposed.
- Ms. Stillman (self) supports electric readiness.
- Ms. Papageorge (Southern Company Gas) is in opposition to this proposal. The proponent states that the proposal is based on language that will probably be in the 2021 IECC". It may not, as this provision from the 2021 edition of the IECC is currently being appealed to the Board of Directors of the International Code Council (ICC).
- Mr. Sargeant (OmegaFlex) says that unless this can be amended to require gas be piped to all electric appliances, they strongly oppose this proposal. This proposal seeks to force electrification.
- Ms. Stillman argues that this proposal just says you give customers choices by making the home electric ready. More choices.
- Alexandria Phillips, speaking on behalf of herself and Washington Gas, opposes this proposal RE404.2
- Bryan Holland (NEMA) strongly supports Proposal RE404.2. They worked with the proponent to address the comments made during the WG#3 meeting and feel the revised language is very workable and will enhance the effective use of energy in a dwelling.
- Jimmy Moss (self) opposes this proposal

- Ms. Najarian supports this proposal, claiming that it is apparent that Virginia, the country, and the world will convert to using electricity to combat climate change. Virginia is poised to finally be a frontrunner in the transition to use of renewable energy. The time to do this is when you are building. In addition, a very important aspect of environmental justice, is to make costs of utilities reduce. That includes cost of running energy efficient appliances. Let's do it at the front end.
- Ms. Main (self) is in support; let's not wait to convert to electric energy.
- Ms. Lang (self) supports.
- Ms. Shutler says The Virginia Grassroots Coalition supports this electric readiness proposal.
- Ms. Byer (self) supports this proposal.
- Ms. Eggerton (The City of Alexandria) supports this as we have a goal of moving to electrification in the future as an action of the adopted Environmental Action Plan 2040 and this proposal supports the goals to reduce carbon emissions by 50% by 2030 and 80-100% by 2050
- Mr. Clark (HBAV) is opposed, as is Phil Abraham on behalf of Virginia Association for Commercial Real-Estate.
- Ms. Main supports the electric readiness proposal. Again, it's Virginia policy to get off fossil fuels in the next 25 years, and we should not make it more expensive for homeowners to switch from gas to electric.
- Mr. Zaynow of Columbia Gas is opposed.

**Results:** Non-Consensus

### **RE407.1.1 ERI Options**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal gives additional options for trade-offs to accomplish the required energy rating.

**Comments:**

- Keith Oberg (self) supports.
- Ms. Shutler supports.
- Ms. Najarian (Virginia Democracy Forward) supports this measure as it gives builders and owners a choice, and also supports increased energy efficiency. This is significant because energy efficiency is a win win. No one loses, and giving people choices empowers them and helps with the buy in.
- Ms. Nawaz supports this proposal.
- Mr. Witt (speaking for himself) opposes this change as it requires additional requirements to other requirements of the code. The residential code is a prescriptive code and any requirement should stand alone
- Mr. Clark opposes based on substance but also on the proposal's structure itself.
- Mr. Lacey (RECA) is in support.
- Ms. Harnish (VAEEC): VA Energy Efficiency Council supports this proposal
- Mr. Beahm (representing himself) opposes RE407.1.1
- Ms. Eggerton (City of Alexandria) supports this as options for improved efficiency that aligns with the adopted Environmental Action Plan 2040
- Mr. Shearer (self) is in support.

**Results:** Non-Consensus

## **ERB101 Net Zero Energy Appendix**

**Proponent(s):** William Penniman - Sierra Club ([wpenniman@aol.com](mailto:wpenniman@aol.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This provides an appendix to encourage builders to construct “Zero Energy” dwellings by establishing basic standards.

### **Comments:**

- Mr. Bikoff (VA Democracy Forward) supports.
- Mr. Willham (Fairfax County) supports RE407.1.1-18
- Susan Stillman is in support of the zero net energy proposal. This is for consumer protection.
- Ms. Najarian supports this on behalf of VA Democracy Forward and as an individual. Standardizing terminology puts transparency into the process for owners. Always critical in the buying and selling process.
- Ms. Lang supports on behalf of myself.
- Ms. Eggerton (City of Alexandria) supports this definition and criteria net zero proposal and assures consistent metrics according to the standards as improved efficiency options that align with adopted Environmental Action Plan 2040
- Ms. Shutler is in support. This does not require builders to construct buildings with these requirements, but they can choose to implement if they wish.
- Mr. Shearer is in support. He mentions that this proposal is crucial to consumer protection.
- Mr. Witt opposes ERB101-18, because code officials are not in the business of verifying marketing terms as it is not a code regulatory issue
- Mr. Clark (Home Builders Association of VA) is opposed to this measure - is there a Virginia-specific issue? Are there reports of builders using this marketing term?
- Ms. Nawaz supports this proposal. Clarifying the language of what is meant by "zero energy" or "net zero energy". The definition has evolved over time (NREL has publications on this) and clarity allows all parties involved in a home transaction to be clear on expectations. Standardization doesn't raise costs, just helps participants.
- Mr. Beahm agrees with Mr. Witt.

**Results:** Non-consensus

## **RB200 Substantial Damage definition**

**Proponent(s):** Resiliency Subworkgroup

**Summation of Proposal:** This is an approved proposal from the resiliency SWG to duplicate a definition in VRC.

**Other Pertinent Information:** RB200 comes from the Resiliency SWG, where the discussion was specifically held as part of the December 2019 and March 2020 meetings.

- At the December 2019 meeting, Mr. Payne (AIA Virginia) discussed a draft proposal that brought forward many IBC changes recommended to increase flood resistance in Chapter 5 of FEMA’s “Reducing Flood Losses Through the International Codes”. He explained that most of the changes were to the IBC Appendix G “Flood-Resistant Construction”. Additional discussions focused on the benefits of utilizing either Appendix G or a local floodplain ordinance.

- At that same meeting, Mr. Payne suggested that one way to add additional strength/resiliency for structures in certain high risk areas, without making significant changes to the IBC, would be requiring all buildings in specific/identified high risk areas to be designed/built as Risk Category IV, in accordance with the IBC. This would make the requirements clear, versus utilizing terms like “stronger”, as the specific requirements are already laid out in the IBC. Additional discussion included adding a new Risk Category and requiring compliance with all requirements of Risk Category IV, with exceptions for any that were identified as non-applicable.
- At the March 10, 2020 meeting the Subworkgroup discussed and approved RB200. It was approved as amended. Mr. Brown summarized that this was from Kristen Owens’ (DCR) office, and would add the identical definition for “substantial damage” that exists in the VEBC and VCC and duplicate it in the IRC/VRC. Mrs. Quinn (FEMA) asked about the “substantial improvement” definition from the VEBC. The group agreed to duplicate both improvement and damage definition in the IRC.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Brown (DHCD) lends context to this proposal.
- Mr. Clark (Home Builders Association of VA) supports.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

**RB302.2 Townhouses reference pointers**

**Proponent(s):** Jeff Shapiro ([jeff.shapiro@intlcodeconsultants.com](mailto:jeff.shapiro@intlcodeconsultants.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal fixes additional section references for townhouse separations.

**Comments:**

- Andrew Clark - Home Builders Association of VA: HBAV supports 302.2 as well

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

**RB302.13 NFPA 13 Options**

**Proponent(s):** DHCD Staff ([sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov](mailto:sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** Change is to correlate these sections with proposals RB302.3(1) and RB302.2.6 that were approved by Workgroup 3 where there was the addition of NFPA 13 and 13R references.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

**RB325.1 Habitable Attics**

**Proponent(s):** Jeff Shapiro ([jeff.shapiro@intlcodeconsultants.com](mailto:jeff.shapiro@intlcodeconsultants.com))

**Summation of Proposal:** Deletes the state amendment and brings in the 2018 language for habitable attics.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Clark (HBAV) asserts that he would be glad to have a conversation with Mr. Shapiro offline to iron out this proposal.
- Mr. Witt suggests reaching out to some of the other stakeholders who could help workshop this proposal further, such as Mr. Clements (Chesterfield County).
- Ms. Davis mentions that DHCD staff is concerned about the language that is contained within the proposal; Mr. Shapiro agrees to work with these groups.

**Results:** Carry over to 9/1 meeting with the agreement to meet with DHCD staff and other stakeholders prior to the meeting - Andrew Clark, David Beahm, Dan Willham, Jason Laws, Ron Clements, Andrew Milliken.

### **RTP608.15 Location of backflow preventers**

**Proponent(s):** Richard Grace - VPMIA/VBCOA ([richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** This provides a requirement for access for backflow preventers.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Beahm (self) agrees with Mr. Grace; this is a good change.

**Results:** Consensus for Approval

### **MH20(2) Editorial**

**Proponent(s):** DHCD staff ([sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov](mailto:sbco@dhcd.virginia.gov))

**Summation of Proposal:** Editorial correlation only

**Comments:** None

**Results:** Consensus for Approval