

SUMMARY  
COMBINED WORKGROUPS 1, 2, 3 & 4 MEETING  
2018 Code Change Cycle

September 1, 2020 at 9:30 a.m.

Remote Meeting Link

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

**Participants**

Scott Andrews

Laura Baker (RECA)

David Beahm (representing himself)

Jeff Brown (DHCD)

Greg Cade (NFPA)

Andy Caldwell

John Catlett (Catlett Code Consulting)

Andrew Clark (Home Builder's Association of Virginia)

Allison Cook (Arlington County)

Cindy Davis (DHCD)

Robby Dawson (VFPA)

Rajan Engh (DHCD)

Million Fiseha

Sarah A. Foote (DHCD)

Sean Farrell (VBCOA)

Russell Furr (VFPA)

Richard Grace (VPMIA)

Randy Grumbine (Virginia Manufactured and Modular Home Association)

Judy Hackler (VALA)

Linda Hale (Loudoun County Fire)

Brian Hilderbrand (DHCD)

Bryan Holland (NEMA)

Todd House

Pat Hughes (City of Chesapeake)

Matt Hunter (AWC)

Christina Jackson (City of Norfolk/VBCOA)

Thomas King (DHCD)

Eric Lacey (RECA)

Ernie Little (VFPA)

Jeff Mang (Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association)

Scott McGeary

Paul Messplay IV (DHCD)  
Andrew Milliken (Stafford County Fire)  
Florin Moldovan (DHCD)  
Jimmy Moss (VBCOA)  
Kenney Payne (AIA Virginia)  
Shaun Pharr (AOBA/VAMA)  
Alexandria Phillips (Washington Gas)  
Richard Potts (DHCD)  
Travis Rickman (VDFFP)  
Jonathan Sargeant (OmegaFlex)  
Jeff Shapiro (International Code Consultants)  
David Sharp (Fairfax County)  
Matt Smolsky  
Jennifer Tolley (DHCD)  
Brent Werlein  
Dan Willham (Fairfax County)  
Rick Witt (VBCOA Fire Code Committee)

## **B101 Tall Wood Supplemental Info**

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

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal brings forward changes approved for the 2021 IBC and IFC for construction of Tall Wood (mass timber) buildings.

### **Background Information:**

- This proposal and its companion FP101 were carried over from the proposed phase, as well as the August 11, 2020 Combined Workgroup Meeting to iron out details related to implementation.
- In Workgroup 1&2, concerns were voiced regarding the construction requirements as an appendix and the need to ensure that it was not optional. Mr. Witt had suggested to get the 2021 language that was approved and insert that into the main body of the code.

### **Comments:**

- Mr. Brown (DHCD) explained that he assisted the proponent in updating the proposal by incorporating the 2021 tall wood provisions by reference in Chapter 6 instead of adding the provisions in an appendix as previously proposed. The new format provides an alternative compliance path at the option of the permit applicant. It allows a building to be constructed in accordance with the 2021 IBC and IFC provisions specific to mass timber and types IV-A, IV-B or IV-C construction while also complying with all other provisions of the 2018 IBC/VCC. The amendments to the IFC in this proposal are made to the IFC as it is referenced by the VCC, not the SFPC.
- Mr. Brown also indicated that the proposal would be changed from “BU101” to “B101” going forward because it is no longer slated to be an appendix.

- The referenced/incorporated 2021 IBC tall wood provisions will be included as supplemental info in the back of the printed 2021 VCC books so it won't be necessary to purchase the 2021 IBC in order to use the new compliance path.
- Mr. Payne wishes to know if the 2021 IBC reference is intended to include Virginia amendments to the referenced sections. Ms. Davis responds that since the 2021 sections are only specific to Tall Wood, they did not exist in the 2018 Codes. Therefore amendments are not an issue. Mr. Payne wants to make sure it is straightforward and that this change wouldn't require multiple books when building.
- Mr. Beahm suggests this should indicate that the proposal should state specifically which 2021 provisions and which 2018 provisions are applicable. Mr. Brown (DHCD) clarifies that the current proposal includes all 2021 provisions specific to mass timber or Types IV-A, IV-B or IV-C construction, but otherwise all 2018 VCC provisions would be applicable.
- Mr. Beahm and Mr. Payne are concerned that for "laymen" it may be confusing to say all other requirements of "this code". It would be better to say the 2018 VCC.
- There was agreement to change the last sentence to read "...as well as all other applicable provisions of the 2018 VCC, including provisions for buildings of type IV construction."

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **FP101 Tall Wood Supplemental Information**

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

**Summation of Proposal:** This is a companion proposal to B101 that brings forward changes approved for the 2021 IFC related to maintenance and operation aspects of mass timber construction, to the SFPC.

#### **Background Information:**

- Along with B101, this proposed change was carried over from the proposed phase, as well as the August 11, 2020 Combined Workgroup Meeting. See background information for proposal B101.

#### **Comments:**

- Mr. Farrell claims the SFPC is not applicable to buildings under construction so he isn't sure how the proposed Section 3308.9 could even be enforced by the fire official.
- Mr. Pharr agrees with Mr. Farrell and indicates that state law says that the SFPC is not enforced until after CO.
- Mr. Catlett disagrees.
- Mr. Farrell says the VCC and IFC Chapter 33 covers these requirements already, but the requirements are enforced by the building official. Adding requirements in Chapter 33 of the SFPC may be problematic
- Mr. Catlett made a point that Chapter 33 in the SFPC has not been amended out of the code so he doesn't see how this is any different since this is just adding to it.
- Mr. Milliken says having Section 3308.9 in the SFPC is an important provision for the cooperation of the Fire Official and the Building Official; he is in support. He cites a large number of wooden frame fire accidents recently.

- Mr. Dawson says he does think the Fire Code applies to buildings under construction and thinks those who are opposed might be taking a broad view of the law.
- Ms. Hale echoes Mr. Catlett.
- Kenney Payne - AIA Virginia asks if amending the VCC 3302.3 would be the path to get to SFPC Chapter 33.
- Ms. Davis asks which authority would enforce if requirements were in both the VCC and SFPC.
- Mr. Beahm asks if it would mean we would need both Fire and Building approvals before construction.
- Mr. Farrell says that adding the language of this proposal into the SFPC may be problematic for enforceability.
- Mr. Milliken says that he will remove his support of proposal B101 if this one moves forward as NC, and allow both tall wood proposals to move forward as NC. Ms. Hale agrees.
- Mr. Farrell just wants to make sure this could be enforceable. He has no issues with the code in itself.
- Mr. Catlett has no issues with this proposal being flagged for attorney general office input prior to the Board Meeting.
- Mr. Witt suggests it should be Non-Consensus.
- Mr. Dyer supports the idea of Consensus.
- Mr. Farrell agrees on Consensus for Approval pending legal review of Section 3308.9 items 3 and 4.
- Everyone agreed to move the proposal forward as CA, pending review by AG to verify if Section 3308.9 would be enforceable under the SFPC prior to a CO being issued.
- Mr. Beahm suggested changing “fire code official and the fire chief” to “AHJ”. Mr. Catlett agreed.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified -Changing item 2 to “authority having jurisdiction”. Result pending legal review with the A.G. of items 3 and 4 of Section 3308.9-  
*Review whether the SFPC only applies after CO.*

### **EB307 Roof covering**

**Proponent(s):** Kenney Payne, AIA Virginia (kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com); Ronald Clements Jr ([clementsro@chesterfield.gov](mailto:clementsro@chesterfield.gov))

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

#### **Background Information:**

- This proposal was Consensus for Approval at the July Workgroup 2 meeting. Subsequently, DHCD suggested language to clarify the definition for “roof covering” in response to a workgroup participants’ questioning, and the proponent agreed.
- Mr. Payne never heard from whomever had comments or concerns at the July meeting.
- Mr. Moldovan (DHCD) worked with the proponents to work out language to expand the definition because not all roof panels require the same type of supports. Now, this definition will be more inclusive of all roof coverings, not just metal ones. All that has changed between this past workgroup meeting and this one, is the wording of the definition.

#### **Comments:**

- Mr. Pharr says AOBA/VAMA support EB307-18.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **E502 Relocates VECC C/R 502 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 requirements of VECC Sections C502 and R502 to Chapter 8 of the VEBC. This proposal also provides a pointer in the VECC to the VEBC to assist code officials who may be used to looking at the VECC rather than the VEBC for existing building energy conservation requirements.

**Background Information:** The proponent requested a carryover at the Combined Workgroup Meeting on August 11, 2020.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Pharr was previously opposed, but he has removed his opposition.
- Mr. Payne pointed out to staff that they will want to review the references in Section 805 to 811.3 to verify that they are accurate.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **E504.1 Relocates VECC C/R 504 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 requirements of Sections C504 and R504 of the VECC to Chapter 5 of the VEBC and clarifies that repairs cannot be done in a way to reduce energy efficiency. This proposal aligns with other proposals to move the energy conservation requirements for existing buildings from the VECC to the VEBC. This proposal leaves a pointer in the VECC to the VEBC to assist code officials who may be used to looking at the VECC rather than the VEBC for energy requirements for existing buildings.

**Background Information:** At the August 11, 2020 Combined Workgroup Meeting, the proponents requested that this proposal be carried to the final Combined Workgroup Meeting.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Payne cites VECC compliance and exceptions; more things falling under repairs, greater flexibility. He is in support.
- Mr. Pharr withdraws opposition.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **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.

**Background Information:**

- Some workgroup participants (such as AOBA/VAMA) had issues with this proposal on the basis of cost. They believe the costs outlined within the proposed changes would be

prohibitive to many builders and that the proposed changes place undue cost burdens on the builders.

- Other workgroup participants were heavily in favor of these proposed changes, claiming that they would help better outline and underscore the importance of energy efficiency standards statewide.
- The proponents wish to be clear that it is only Section B of the proposal that they are actually proposing; they ask that the participants and stakeholders ignore the options proposed in Section A.
- After a robust discussion during the first Combined Workgroup meeting on August 11, Ms. Harnish of VAEEC and Ms. Baker (proponent) of RECA agreed that getting the weigh-in of several key stakeholders would be worthwhile, and believed it best to carry the proposal over to the final combined workgroup meeting.
- Key stakeholders whose views are sought on this proposal and were not in attendance at the previous combined workgroup meeting include Kenney Payne (AIA Virginia) and Allison Cook (Arlington County).

**Comments:**

- Mr. Payne would oppose Option A, but would not oppose B. They have some concerns, but they would ultimately support Option B. Ms. Baker reiterates that Option B is the one that the proponents are actively advocating for, not Option A.
- Mr. Pharr has cost concerns; he is unprepared to withdraw his initial opposition because of this.
- Ms. Cook believes there was a lot of effort made to minimize the potential costs to small businesses; tries to reassure Mr. Pharr.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **RB325.1 Habitable Attics**

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

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

**Background Information:** Proponent had some issues with cdpVA submitting the proposal and its associated amendments. At the first combined workgroup meeting, the proponent and other workgroup participants agreed this proposal should be carried over to the 9/1 combined workgroup meeting with Mr. Shapiro's commitment to meet with other stakeholders prior to the meeting - Andrew Clark, David Beahm, Dan Willham, Jason Laws, Ron Clements, and the VBCOA IRC Committee Chairman, Mr. Richard Moore. The aforementioned group met on August 18 and provided Mr. Shapiro with feedback.

**Comments:**

- Mr. Shapiro provides context for this proposal.
- The proponent provided an alternate proposal for the meeting via Word document. This version addresses feedback he received regarding heights of escape windows. This is the version he prefers to move forward, even if non-consensus.
- Mr. Catlett wants to allow fire retardant treated wood for rooftop structures. Mr. Shapiro agrees. **Will modify to add that part of it.**
- Mr. Clark (HBAV) suggests Non-Consensus but will continue to work with proponent.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

## **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.

**Background Information:** This one has changes from the previous meeting; changed the name to “cooking operations” and worked with Rick Witt on consensus language.

### **Comments:**

- Mr. Witt said that we been discussing for some time now and is ready to move it forward.
- Mr. Payne noted some issues with the wording.
- Ms. Hale clarified that the intent is the ventilation has to be turned on and has to be in operation.
- Mr. Grace (VPMIA) suggests some language to clarify “such ventilation as required”.
- Mr. Witt has no issues with the proposal if all that’s left to do is wordsmith.
- Mr. Milliken and Ms. Hale both agree that further clarifying the word “ventilation” instead of just saying “it”.
- Mr. Farrell suggests removing “where” and “is” and the “it” before “shall” – ***“Ventilation at or above the applicable building code... shall be operated and maintained”***.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

## **FP3107.12.5 Cooking tents**

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

### **Background Information:**

- One of several proposals that initially posited additional regulations for cooking tents during this code cycle.
- The Farm Bureau initially had concerns.

**Comments:** Mr. Smith of the Farm Bureau has removed his opposition after meeting with Ms. Hale to review the proposed changes prior to today’s meeting.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

## **FP103.2.1 SFPC Edits Part 4**

**Summation:** This proposal includes sections that were reviewed by the SFPC edit workgroup during the July 30th SFPC Edit Workgroup meeting and recommended as CA by Workgroup 1 on August 11th. Additional items reviewed by the SFPC Edit WG at the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting have been added to this proposal for consideration by Workgroup 1 today.

**Comments:** None

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

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

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

**Summation of Proposal:** This proposal includes all remaining SFPC sections submitted by the VFSB that were not able to be reviewed by the SFPC Edit workgroup.

**Background Information:**

- Although the edits to SFPC Chapters 1-10 were completed during the 2015 code update cycle, the VFSB submitted additional changes to Chapters 1-10 of the SFPC in June 2020. Additional SFPC Edit Workgroup meetings were scheduled in an attempt to review these additional changes prior to the August 11<sup>th</sup> Combined Workgroup meeting. At the time of the August 11<sup>th</sup> Combined Workgroup meeting, all items that had been reviewed by the SFPC Edit WG were approved by Workgroup 1 (See proposal “FP103.2.1 SFPC Edits Part 4” above). The group agreed to carry over any remaining items to the 9/1 meeting and one more additional SFPC Edit Workgroup meeting was held on August 20, 2020. All items reviewed by the SFPC Edit WG at the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting were added to proposal “FP103.2.1 SFPC Edits Part 4” and recommended CA by Workgroup 1 today.

**Comments:**

- The group utilized the remainder of the meeting to review all remaining SFPC Edit items (approximately 53 individual code sections) and make recommendations on each.
- Mr. Brown clarified that all items that receive recommendations today will be added to consensus proposal FP103.2.1 SFPC Edits Part 4. If there are any individual sections that are missed or do not receive a recommendation today they will remain with this proposal “FP103.2.1 SFPC Edit Chapters 1-10”.
- Due to a document mix up, a couple of sections that had previously been reviewed and had recommendation may have been re-reviewed today. Mr. Brown clarified that if staff finds that is the case, the final review and recommendation from today will go forward. Note: During post meeting reviews, staff only found two instances of re-reviewed sections, and neither included non-consensus items.

**Result:** Non-Consensus (This recommendation is only applicable to any items remaining as part of this proposal as they did not receive a Workgroup 1 review and recommendation today.)

## **1030.1 General**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

## **1030.2 Minimum size**

- Restores technical language, connects it back to the applicable building code. Makes sure operation of window is maintained, as well as the height to the floor.
- Mr. Witt, Mr. Farrell have concerns about enforceability.
- Mr. Sharp mentions how in previous codes, it may have been based on sill height.
- Ms. Hale says that operations matter; being able to open and operate the window properly.
- Mr. Willham agrees that it used to be based on sill height.
- Mr. Shapiro is in support of the text as it is.
- Mr. Witt opposes the idea of the “normal operations” language, claims it is too subjective to be enforced correctly.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **1030.3 Maximum Height from Floor**

- Mr. Farrell wants to make sure we are not forcing retroactive revisions to the code for current building owners.
- Mr. Moss suggests the following language: Emergency escape and rescue opening height shall be maintained in accordance with the applicable building code.
- Mr. Beahm states that he agrees with Mr. Moss' language.
- Mr. Payne suggests that Mr. Moss' recommendation would need to specify height.
- Mr. Willham mentions that up until 2012, things were still measured to the sill.
- Mr. Brown (DHCD) enters some modified language.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval As Modified

### **1030.4 Window Wells**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **1030.5 Bars, grilles, covers and screens**

- Mr. Payne asks if the language could say “maintained and operated” in accordance with the applicable building code. He is not opposed to what is there already.
- Mr. Milliken agrees.
- Ms. Hale adds that sometimes, there is no applicable building code that applies, but that this regulation would help cut down on the confusion.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **1031.4 Exit Signs (Revises a Reference to Ch. 12)**

- Mr. Witt wants to have the word “installed” fixed to “maintained.”
- Mr. Milliken acknowledges this oversight and agrees to that change.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval As Modified

### **1031.9 Floor Identification Signs**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **1031.11 Emergency Supplemental Hardware**

- Mr. Payne wishes to know if the word “maintenance” includes storage, since the second sentence of the proposal indicates how the materials are to be stored. He worries the second sentence may be used to circumvent the first sentence.
- Mr. Witt has concerns about this being maintained in the applicable building code. He disagrees with Mr. Milliken.
- Mr. Payne backs Mr. Witt's assessment. He is opposed if this proposal expands upon what was already agreed upon; AIA Virginia is in support if the proposal is intended to be carried out as was previously discussed.
- Mr. Farrell comments that building officials have the authority to revoke or suspend COO according to the VCC, so he is not sure this is the proper way to explain this.

- Mr. Milliken claims that these items were found to be inappropriately used by Fire Officials more often than Building Officials; he just wants whatever is approved in the SFPC to be approved here.
- Mr. Payne suggests the following language: 10.1.1 Consultation and notification. Prior to approval of emergency supplemental hardware, the building code official shall consult with the local fire code official or state fire code official if no local fire code official exists, and head of the local law enforcement agency. The local fire code official, the state fire code official, and the local fire, EMS and law enforcement first responders shall be notified of such approval, after approval of such emergency supplemental hardware by the building code official.
- Mr. Willham brings up the “locks and latches” clause as supporting textual evidence: section 1010.1.9.3.
- Mr. Milliken, Ms. Hale, and Mr. Witt discuss who has the ability to revoke a previously-approved code. Mr. Witt claims that there is no authority for a fire official to revoke anything.
- Mr. Milliken suggests we duplicate the previously-approved language.
- Mr. Payne says that Ch. 1 grants administrative authority, and a state amendment overrides that such as in this case. Mr. Witt disagrees, saying it is the opposite – that fire officials’ authority consists of maintenance-only and that is codified in law.
- Ms. Hale maintains that fire officials perform both operations and maintenance.
- Mr. Witt is in opposition if the last proposed sentence is included.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **1031.12 Area of Refuge**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **1031.13 Door Opening Force**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

**Add new section 1032.1** – Adding a new section for the Virginia SFPC for Ch. 10;

Attempting to bring in occupancy load language guidelines

- The other way to accomplish this would be by putting some administrative language in Ch. 1; proposal 110.4.1, “Unsafe Occupancy”.
- Mr. Payne wishes to add the word “Section” so it will read “Section 110.4” if that proposal were approved.
- Mr. Witt wishes for the word “note” to be removed; as well as clarifying language added that serves the purpose of letting officials know this is temporary, until a building code official can step in and determine and enforce new (permanent) occupancy load signage.
- Mr. Pharr clarifies with Mr. Milliken that either one or the other of the proposals will be moved forward, whereas the other will be withdrawn.
- Mr. Payne wants to understand if this is for assembly spaces. He wants to know whether there is already existing language to indicate temporary signage.
- Mr. Farrell thinks this has potential but that it still needs to be workshopped.
- Mr. Payne, Mr. Farrell and Mr. Witt all believe this should be carried to the next code cycle; neither 110.4.1 nor 1032.1 is as fully-fleshed out as they would like to see.

- Mr. Payne suggests some other options: referencing the table in the VCC might be a workaround. Mr. Farrell seconds this idea.
- Mr. Willham says that the table is only a reference for maximum safe occupancy loads during initial design, as opposed to being a maximum safe occupancy load from that point forward. He would be hesitant to rely solely or even mainly on the table contained in the VCC for ongoing direction for the code officials regarding occupancy load signage.
- Mr. Milliken mentions overcrowding issues are not always going to be in A-use buildings; that in fact they'll often be in conflict with B-use buildings. Mr. Milliken wants to know whether the language would apply to continuous use (which is more variable) than a fixed number of people providing an occupancy load issue. Mr. Payne discusses with him; Mr. Payne offers to workshop some language and embed it in the chat box during the meeting.
- The participants discuss withdrawing this proposal in favor of trying to reach consensus on 110.4 instead to accomplish the same goals. Mr. Payne workshops specifying language for 110.4.1. (See 110.4.1)

**Result:** Withdrawn

**3804.1.1.6 (revisited)** – modified the language so that it sounds like the emergency or standby power shall be maintained in the context of high school laboratories, as opposed to the code officials maintaining the laboratories themselves.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **304.1.2 Vegetation**

- Mr. Witt doesn't believe we need some of this language and would prefer that the last sentence be removed from the proposal.
- Mr. Milliken maintains that the Wild Land Urban Interface Code is a referenced standard but does not apply to each state, including Virginia.
- Ms. Hale mentions that it does not have anything to do with building codes; that it refers strictly to vegetation.
- Mr. Farrell mentions that it may be helpful to pull out specific sections from the national code and adopt all of it and add it to the SFPC, as opposed to selectively enforcing based on what is required in Virginia. He suggests we move the pieces that are relevant to Virginia and add them to the SFPC.
- Mr. Witt is concerned that certain vegetation – like pine trees, certain bushes, and so on – will not be allowed to remain next to one's buildings. He thinks this may be an overreach, and encourages Mr. Milliken to push this toward the next code cycle so they can collectively examine the potential ramifications of this proposed change.
- Ms. Davis mentions how the Wild Land Urban Interface Code references only lots that have been designated by the locality as being within a Wild Land Urban Interface area as being required to submit a vegetation plan. She further indicated that this code had been considered for adoption by the BHCD previously and that proposal was disapproved. Mr. Milliken maintains that things have changed and that the Wildfire Risk would be the key element for consideration for this code cycle.

- Mr. Milliken cites 304.1.2 Vegetation: Weeds, grass, vines, or other growth that is capable of being ignited and endangering property shall be cut down and removed by the owner or occupant of the premises. Vegetation clearance requirements in wildfire risk areas shall be in accordance with section 603.1 through 607.2 and Appendix C of the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **603.3.1 Fuel Oil Storage**

- Mr. Milliken provided background.
- Ms. Davis Asked when the 660 gallon was established. Do we need verify the quantities have not changed since the early USBC adoption? Mr. Milliken stated they either weren't addressed early on or changed slightly.
- Mr. Brown pointed out that the 2015 and proposed regulations list the 660 gallons so regardless, that will be in there.
- Mr. Milliken clarified that the only change is to remove "comply" so the section would read "be maintained".

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **603.3.2.1 Quantity Limits**

- Mr. Witt clarifies that if this proposal does not conflict with existing regulations, then he is on board with this proposed change. Mr. Milliken stated he'll look into this.
- Mr. Little states that the 660 gallon limit is in the 1984 Boca FPC.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

## **110.4 Unsafe Occupancy**

- There are broad concerns with signage from several stakeholders.
- Mr. Witt explains how there could be more than one occupant load and different occupant loads within sections of a building. He doesn't like the note. He thinks the proposal requires too much work and should be carried over.
- Mr. Milliken feels they need something to address overcrowding since the chapter 10 provisions were deleted.
- Mr. Payne cites 110.7 Overcrowding. Where the fire code official believes that overcrowding may exist, the fire code official shall be permitted to utilize the egress component sizing requirements of Section 1005 of the VCC and occupant load allowances under Section 1004 of the VCC to determine if overcrowding exists. Where such determination is made, the fire code official shall be permitted to require an approved temporary sign posting of the maximum allowable occupant load and such sign shall be maintained until the building official can determine the allowable occupant load at which time a permanent sign shall be posted or the temporary sign may be removed.
- Mr. Farrell explains how the fire official should be determining if a space is overcrowded, how it should be based on the occupant load and how that's determined.
- Mr. Little suggests adding overcrowding "may" exist. Mr. Payne agrees and says he originally used the word "may".

- Mr. Payne and Mr. Farrell have a short back and forth regarding the last sentence. Mr. Payne explained how he understands his concern but that it doesn't affect it the way he thinks it does for determining overcrowding.
- Mr. Farrell thinks this gets us where we need to be. Firm on the building official determining max occupant load. He suggests removing references to sections.
- Mr. Payne, Mr. Witt, and Mr. Farrell work on refining last sentence. Mr. Payne brings up italicizing defined terms.
- Mr. Farrell recommended moving to Chapter 10 and Mr. Milliken agreed. Added the provisions as a subsection - 1001.3.1 Temporary occupant load determination.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

## **110.7 Overcrowding**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified (see 110.4)

### **1001.3.1 Temporary Occupant Load Determination**

- Mr. Dyer and Mr. Witt are both in support of the changes made.
- Ms. Hale wants to make sure this is enforceable.
- Amended language by Mr. Brown of DHCD (as well as weigh-in from Ms. Hale, Mr. Farrell, Mr. Milliken, and Mr. Payne) works for all.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **1032.2 Emergency Occupant Load Identification**

**Result:** Withdrawn

### **3801.1 Scope**

- Milliken and Mr. Payne explain the changes made at the national level for Higher-ed labs.
- Mr. Beahm grants additional context; these changes were discussed 2-3 years ago.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **3801.2 Application**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **603.3.2.2 Restricted Use and Connection**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **603.3.2.7 Tanks in Basements**

- Mr. Farrell has some concerns with this one and will not revoke his opposition.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **605.8.1 Refrigerants Other Than Ammonia**

- Mr. Farrell asks when this was entered into the code. Mr. Milliken says there have been changes and modifications to the code over the years.
- Mr. Witt disagrees with this language and thinks it's a retrofit. He asks if the "approved location" requirement has been the case since this was added to the code. Mr. Milliken answers that it has.
- Ms. Davis recommends applicable building code language. Mr. Farrell supports scoping it that way.
- Mr. Payne questions the language "approved location".
- Mr. Milliken, Mr. Witt, and Mr. Farrell debate the language for a while and delete a lot of it to change it to fit what is already approved in the building code.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **605.9.1 Refrigeration System Emergency Shutoff**

- Mr. Farrell suggests language. Revised to be in line with previous language.
- Mr. Brown (DHCD) adds, at the proponents' request, language that had been debated earlier and decided upon for previous proposal 605.8.1 and several subsequent proposed edits.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **605.10.1 Automatic Crossover Valves**

**Result:** Withdrawn

### **605.13 Mechanical Ventilation Exhaust**

- Mr. Brown revises to be in line with previous language

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **605.17.1 Refrigerant Detection Systems Operations**

- Makes the language more inclusive for both modern and older technologies

**Result:** Withdrawn

### **607.2 Where Required. Cooking Operations with Grease-Laden Vapors**

- No discussion

**Result:** Withdrawn

### **701.7 Unsafe Conditions**

- Editorial change, no discussion

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **704.2 Opening Protectives**

- Relates to 705. 2

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **901.5.1 Occupancy**

- Mr. Witt suggests this one be considered Non-Consensus.
- Mr. Farrell questions why. Mr. Witt argues that because the authority regarding occupancy is a building officials' responsibility, and that it does not fall to a fire official.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **905.5.3 Class II System**

- Previous workgroup discussions included terminology, including “fire hose for use by trained personnel”. This proposal attempts to add the language in order to clarify who can utilize the fire hoses in which context.
- Mr. Farrell argues that Class II specifically regards occupants. Mr. Milliken states that the exact proposed language already exists in the current NFPA.

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **905.9 Valve Supervision**

- Relates to 903.4 for supervision of valves; does not add construction language.
- Mr. King (DHCD) points to the section referenced: 903.4 Sprinkler system supervision and alarms. All valves controlling the water supply for automatic sprinkler systems, pumps, tanks, water levels and temperatures, critical air pressures, water-flow switches and alarms on all sprinkler systems shall remain in service in the normal position and properly sealed, locked, or electrically supervised in accordance with the applicable building code.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **905.11 Locking Standpipe Outlet Caps**

- No need for a Virginia amendment; keep IFC language.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **907.3.2 Special Locking Systems**

- No discussion

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **907.3.3 Elevator Emergency Operation**

- No discussion

**Result:** Consensus for Approval, scoping language

### **907.4.2 Manual Fire Alarm Boxes**

- No discussion

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

### **907.4.2.3 Color**

- Mr. Pharr and Mr. Farrell voice concerns (Mr. Farrell has had issues with the “unless the applicable building code” language for several code cycles). Mr. Farrell is concerned this is headed for a “slippery slope” that recent code cycles have leaned on the language of “unless required by the applicable building code”.
- Mr. Pharr brings up the idea of the wall being red – would it apply then?
- Mr. Witt and Mr. Pharr both echo Mr. Farrell’s concerns; believes this could be incorrectly applied as a retrofit requirement
- Mr. Payne posits: if his alarm box is green, and the code language here outlines that the box should be red, would he be out of compliance?

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **Delete section 907.4.3 and 907.4.3.1**

**Result:** Withdrawn

## **907.5 Occupant Notification Systems**

- Mr. Witt advocates that this be non-consensus.
- Mr. Farrell claims that “technical prescriptive language” plus “the applicable building code” makes this much harder to enforce. It may lead to a conflict of requirements – two codes that are in direct opposition of each other.
- Mr. Milliken suggests the following language: Where required or provided in accordance with the applicable building code, a fire alarm system shall annunciate at the fire alarm control unit and shall initiate occupant notification upon activation in accordance with the applicable building code.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **907.5.2 Audible Alarms**

- Mr. Milliken and Mr. Witt discuss to seek amended language.
- There is some concern regarding the language beyond the first sentence.
- Mr. Brown and Mr. Pharr provides some suggested language; Mr. Farrell agrees.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

### **Delete Sections 907.5.2.2.1 and 907.5.2.2.2**

**Result:** Withdrawn

### **907.5.2.2.3 Alternative Uses for Emergency Voices/Alarm Communication Systems**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval (per August 20)

### **905.5.3 Class II System**

**Result:** Non-Consensus

### **907.6.3 Initiating Device Identification**

**Result:** Consensus for Approval

#### **910.4.4 Activation**

- Discussed smoke and heat vents regulations; only manual controls when the fire department says so.
- Amended language, approval

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

#### **910.4.7 Controls**

- Attempts to make sure manual controls are maintained.
- Mr. Payne, Mr. Milliken and Mr. Brown work on language, eliminating run-on sentences and directives.

**Result:** Consensus for Approval as Modified

#### **912.2 Location**

**Result:** Non-Consensus

##### **912.2.1 Visible Location**

**Result:** Non-Consensus