

Workgroup 1-4
Virginia Housing Center
August 23, 2017
Summary Notes

Cindy Davis opened the meeting and had attendees introduce themselves.

C102.3 (2) Sub-workgroup for utility cable/wireless equipment (communications / permit exemptions)

Consensus for Approval

Jennifer McClellan, Verizon - this change is clarifying in nature the original proposed treated wireless and broadband providers differently in violation of state law. We think this is clear and satisfies the requirements for state law.

Ron Clements said he needs to withdraw his proposal.

C-105.2.1 Qualification of technical assistants

Non-Consensus

Debra McMahon gave an overview of the proposal of the Permit Tech Committee.

Rick Witt stated not going back through history. The original proposal caused some angst amongst building officials. This has gathered the support for a win for permit technicians. Does not affect those that function in a department as strictly administrative. This is an alternative to be approved.

Debra McMahon and Permit Technicians Committee submitted a proposal and Rick Witt's submission was public comments. Mr. Witt provides language that leaves the determination whether or not the permit tech "performs duties other than clerical". The supplement was sent out to the permit technicians, however, they wanted to go with the original. Their concern was 105.2.1 qualifications would require experience in those fields. They would like the qualification to remain.

Kris Bridges asked if Rick means to take this out. It adds nothing to the definition. The heart of the matter do we recognize permit techs mean different thing to different localities. This was a compromise and a middle ground proposal. We don't want to hamstring the locality with the original proposal. It has cost implications as well as could cause staffing problems. The one offered has been vetted by a lot of people that favored the original and those that were against the original. They've all come together to say we can live with the middle one.

Sean Farrell if you 105.2.1 if you remove the underlined language what you are left with is in order to be a technical assistant you have to have building, fire, housing inspection, plumbing, or an electrical trade, fire protection, elevator, mechanical or other property maintenance experience. If you add permit techs into the definition of a technical assistant, you have a disconnect between entry level permit tech qualifications and the definition of a technical assistant. Though Mr. Witt's suggestion garnered unanimous support, it doesn't bridge the gap between a technical assistant and the qualifications of a technical assistant. We need to bridge the gap. It will get us half way there and maybe it can be fixed in the next session. If we leave it the way it is, this hamstring the localities ability to bring in entry level permit techs.

Kris Bridges wants to know is the main point conceptual?

Greg Revels says he has a problem with 105.2.1 maybe it can be worked out in upcoming cycles. You can't eliminate the entry level people coming in these positions that lack the experience simply because their title might be permit technician. They were hired in clerical. This will restrict me. Rick Witt's change helps me. I still feel the qualifications restricts me. This is a local issue. There is a whole array of organization setups that can meet each jurisdictions needs.

Mike Toalson feels more and more depts. are accelerating. We have confidence in the building offices.

David Beahm on behalf of VBCOA the vote was unanimous in agreeance with Sean's comments. As it stands now we are in objection to the admission of the second piece to this.

Sean Farrell - Rick if we added in your language that gives local officials the ability to determine who is and who isn't a permit tech, into Debby's proposal would this help?

Rick Witt said he didn't think so. We have created a laundry list of items. The old section needs to be done. This code cycle can be left alone, let it go through and work on next cycle.

C-108.1(1) When applications are required.

Non Consensus

On behalf of a letter written by VA Senator Bill DeSteph. Vernon Hodge gave an overview of this proposal.

Chris Snidow is there a distinction between permit or temporary.

Vernon Hodge only supplementary under construction.

Sean Farrell no comment for or against. Wouldn't it be better added to fit under #1 instead of giving it its own section?

Supplementary floor systems require permits in some jurisdictions and not in others. They need to be uniform and consistent across the board.

Mike Toalson - What is a supplementary floor system?

Vernon Hodge - Mid space on floor systems so the floors won't be so bouncy.

Chris Snidow - Does the home owner need a permit for his own house?

Companies have regulations that they are required to follow.

Andrew Milliken - get away from any definition for supplementary floors

Cindy Davis permit or no permit?

Robby Dawson - Would this be better to go to TRB for an interpretation?

Greg Revels - What is the outcome if the installation isn't implemented?

Making sure there are no code violations. Vernon stated that the the senator didn't have any concerns about installation.

Haywood Kines - With a permit you are if it is structural. Just to brace a floor don't understand this.

Senator would be fine without a permit.

Chuck Bajnai - What about saggy floors. If it passed the first time and if it warps. If they jack without permit it is ok.

Don Surrena - if the homeowner wasn't happy with construction, they are just doing in their own home no permit.

Casey Littlefield - I purchased a house that had a gun safe and the home owner added supports. We took them out. We have approved as constructed.

Allison Cook - maybe it was before code and need supports for structural Need permits.

Sean Farrell if he has a plan are you going to review the whole system. Will they check for bearing and problem fastening for all?

Brian McGraw -Need a definition for supplementary floors.

Ron Clements how about an exception to a permit – supplemental floor systems installed to exceed code requirements to improve in R5 structures. Are not something that needs to be recoded, but needs an exemption.

Robby Dawson -What happens if you put in R2?

Vernon Hodge - you do need permit for R5?

Kenney Payne - based on what Vernon said takes out of IRC and puts in IBC. If you are going to add something that affects either one, you have to make it specific to R5.

Senator had concerns for single family homes.

Chris Snidow - states we have to have a definition.

Ron Clements - we don't need it. If it exceeds code requirement.

Kenney Payne Do we need the name system?

Jennifer McClellan - Do you need supplemental?

Chris Snidow - What about roof support systems? Structural systems shouldn't be limited to floors, cover all structures.

Don Surrena - New language to consider - existing floor system modifications

Sean Farrell - No, the word supplemental still needs to be there. It is important.

Brian McGraw - reinforcement of existing floor systems instead of supplemental? Or reinforcement of existing approved code compliant floor systems?

Vernon Hodge - use what's already in the code to determine if you do need a permit or don't need a permit... This will tell you how the code will be applied. Permits for installation shall be obtained; so it already requires permits for things covered by this section.

Cindy Davis - the challenge is this could encompass a wide variety of installations and applications that there can be a factor on existing structural systems that don't require a permit or it could be simple installation if you do require a permit. This is very hard to give the discretion to the locality.

Sean Farrell - agreed. Moving exemptions because you have over designed or go over code is a very slippery slope cause then it can be applied to trades and I don't think it's the right direction.

Kenney Payne - can someone talk to the legislator and explain the difficulty to find out why it's going the way that it is?

Ron Clements - If we don't fix it here he's going to submit a bill. It will go to the GA. He's trying to level the playing field for businesses. So he's not going to let that go.

Cindy Davis - So do we air on the side of caution and require a permit? As opposed to not when there are so many structural issues that could be involved.

Don Surrena - I would make it simple now, let that run through the cycle, tweak it later in another cycle. Get something into the code now to make easy sense, then work from there to make it more precise.

Cindy Davis – Is Ron's suggestion the simplest way to go?

Allison Cook – I don't think making this exempt from requirements is a good idea. Stated the board has the discretion to decide permit or no permit.

Cindy Davis - Senator DeSteph is asking for uniformity.

Robby Dawson - if there is a structural issue, by putting something in it that was not under the applicable building code?

Cindy Davis – the issue is personal preference

David Beahm – agrees with Robby. if there is a structural problem and a supplementary floor system is put in, it is still supplemental. Cause it didn't need to be there during original construction. Would rather see it require a permit and exempt it than to see it exempted with disregard and see a problem later on.

Chuck Bajnai - If we go to structural support if there is a cracked footing, that's a structural support...it's not a floor system now. Would that come under the exempt definition?

Chris Snidow - service ability problem for bouncing

Kenney Payne - some scenarios will cause for a permit.

Cindy – if it affects the structural integrity it will require a permit. If it does not, it's exempt.

Dan Willheim I would think to err on the side of caution and still require a permit. You think you are approving above code and you are not.

Ben Goss - I will have to ask if I need a permit to the board.

Alison Cook - I would lean to requiring a permit.

Don Surrena - Are you going to require a drawing. If you are going to require a permit, you have to provide plans. Which will make you get in deeper than what you wanted to.

Kenney Payne - if you fall on requiring a permit, add it to list under number 1.

Robby Dawson - This problem is not going away; this doesn't fix the problem.

Cindy Davis - support for adding modification to any structures to require a permit in #1.

Ron Clements - ask people to do something.

Robby Dawson - don't narrow to just R5.

Cindy Davis took poll more for permits. More voted to require than to exempt a permit.

Modifications to structural systems in Group R occupancies.

Sean Farrell - In the 14.11 it does grant the building official to have permit or not.

Chuck Bajnai - could there be a neutral ground, according to the building official, per local jurisdiction...just write it in to show differences across the state.

Sean Farrell - require the permit and the building official has the authority to not require it.

Cindy – Move the requirement to number one and let board decide.

Non-consensus

C-108.2(2) Permit Exemptions.

Ben Goss gave an overview of his proposal. Asking for permit requirement for roofing on all R group structures. Finding a lot of damage that wouldn't be there if someone had just followed the building code. Modification of 14.6?

Sean Farrell - Just because they are not required to get a permit doesn't mean they don't have to be code compliant. If we do determine deficiencies, we have the authority to cite. If the work on a home isn't code compliant, they could have a report issued by a building authority stating so.

14.5 is actually 14.11 and 14.11 is 14.5 it already covers siding. Somehow they were switched.

Shaun Pharr - I object to multiple family properties

Rick Witt – For siding just requiring a permit does not solve the problems of installation.

Chuck - re-roofing now requires a permit.

Non-consensus

C-109.7 As-built Drawings

Non-consensus

Brian McGraw

Representing State Fire Marshal's Office.

Brian gave an overview of his proposal and companion proposal, F-511.

Allison - I think this is reasonable now.

Chris Fornoy – are we talking construction drawings or shop drawings as well?

Everything. Homeowner have to keep construction drawings.

Ron Clements - does this need to be in building code or would it just be aa fire code issue?

Rick Witt - arguing against it. Wide open requiring the construction documents acceptable to the fire code. I don't think it's appropriate.

Brian - Design professionals start in the building code that's why it should be put there. The set of documents aren't being approved, it's where they are being stored.

Haywood Kines - we are inspecting to the set of drawings on site. Are you asking for set of plans to be retained on site for permanent record? Should this be in the building code or the fire code.

Shaun Pharr - opposed to this proposal.

Kenney Payne - Our intent whatever set was used for construction is the set we would be talking about in the first part. The owner gets a permanent set of drawings. We don't have concern for the second part. Only the set used by construction that was approved.

Linda Hale - it starts in the building code and then is transferred to the fire code. Exempting R5 is fine.

Non-consensus for this and proposal F-511

C-113.7.1(2) Third-party inspectors

Michael Redifer

Mr. Redifer not present

Mike Toalson - Objects to this proposal. There is a cost. Building permit fees are paid in example for inspections. The responsibility of transferring this cost back on the homeowner is inappropriate. Agree that the building officials having the authority to require use of a third party, feel that the current language satisfies that. Don't like the building officials to require the use of a third party official, don't like all those costs have to be added on. Would prefer if all costs required that are associated with third party officials shall be a credit towards your building permit fees, that might be acceptable.

Cindy Davis - The general discussion with the AG's office was questionable statutory authority cause by law the building office is responsible for these inspections. Legally would not be able to restrict it to just one. Whatever criteria is set, would have to be available to anyone who meets that criteria.

Chris Snidow – Maybe we should pull part five out?

Vernon Hodge – Criteria is already set for third party / special inspection in the code. This would be for things other than special inspections, which is already addressed.

Cindy Davis – The question is can you require this? You can request it, but you don't have statutory authority to require it.

Shaun Pharr is in opposition to this proposal. Mike makes a valid point...can I expect for my fees to go down since the locality is no longer responsible for performing these inspections? I doubt it.

Alison Cook - stated if we added language that indicates if the locality decided to go third party they don't have to pay permit fees. If they chose to go that route they can't charge fees for typical inspection services.

Administrative fees are still charged.

Cindy Davis - Bottom line is you have to sign off on this if it moves forward.

Consensus for disapproval

C-116.4 Issuance of certificate for pre-USBC structures

Andrew Milliken gave an overview of this proposal.

The word building official used to require a certificate of occupancy and now the requirement is for the fire official can request a certificate of occupancy.

Vernon Hodge - Building official was removed as a way of saying "or as determined by the building official". It was a VBCOA proposal a couple of cycles ago.

Kenney Payne - A pre USB building, or existing building...does the code use and/or?

Charlie Gerber – had concerns about “other existing building”.

Prior to ‘73 this language has always been here. There are numerous of situations that have post ‘73 buildings that have no records. This solution is to prove to the building officials that the certificate of occupancy information is approved.

Sean Farrell – How many building officials have a pre ‘73 certificate of occupancy in your building? They simply don’t exist. I think this fixes this. Reluctant to leaving the fire official in the language. Who is going to pay for this extra work? This cites the owner in the middle of this in getting certificate of occupancy. There is an administrative cost and an inspection cost to determine there are no violations with the existing structure. If the fire official is requesting that the building official go out to determine this, there is no way to recoup that money.

Robby Dawson – Not going to require the owner to do this. This eliminates putting the owner in the middle. The fire official can now ask for this.

Rick Witt – We do charge for this service. This is a property owner’s problem. They need to comply. It says building official “shall be”. It doesn’t say “may”.

Don Surrena – Will have to correct current violations. To what year? What violations?

Allison Cook - If the property owner has not been involved how can we inspect this. The owner has to be involved. We can’t just skip by the property owner and go into the property when we want.

David Beahm - stated the VBCOA would be against this proposal as it stands right now. Will also be opposed to changing the language from “shall” to “may”. If the owner comes in and request a certificate of occupancy for an existing building, we need to do this. It is a function of our department.

Non-consensus

CB-903.2.4 Upholstered furniture

Cindy – a related proposal to one that was made during the last code cycle. For the square footage of mercantile which was taken from 2500 to 12000 the 2500 was left for the F1 and S1. The proposal is to match the original code cycle to take the 2500 square feet for furniture in certain use groups back to the 12000 square feet which it was in the prior code cycles.

Allison Cook – It fixes an inconsistency between the IBC and the IEBC. As the IEBC stands now it would be more restrictive. This does add consistency. Strike the M group remove #2

Robby Dawson - Does not support this. You are classifying the fuel load as a different group. I have a problem with eliminating fire protection systems group.

Chris Born - Does not support this. This is an enormous fire hazard. The fuel load from upholstery furniture and mattresses is a solidified gasoline and deserve special consideration in the model code development. There was a test run on reducing sprinkler requirements for a configuration of mattresses. The results did not support where they were hoping to go. They almost burned the test facility to the ground. This is a bad fire protection move to eliminate sprinkler protections from this hazard.

Robby Dawson – the proposal was modified to provide a reasonable threshold that would not modify

Linda Hale - does not support this. Agree with Robby,

Kenney Payne - speaking on the IEBC be consistent with state amendment strike #2.

Andrew Milliken – is there consensus if we change square footage to fire area.

Ron Clements -there is still some confusion regarding this proposal. Existing building code says, if I build it new, I don't sprinkle it until 12000 if it's an existing building and do some alterations to it, I sprinkle it at 5000.

Brian McGraw - clarification from Kenney Payne

Kenney Payne – 12,000 already exists...#1 stays. #3 stays. #2 be struck. VA took that part out. We are just asking for consistency.

Non-consensus

Robby Dawson does anyone agree with IBC changes

Rick Witt agrees this is non consensus

CB-905.2 Standpipe installation standard

Mr. Born gave an overview of his proposal. Not an attempt to change the intent of VA standpipe requirements. It is an attempt to clarify. The way the exception reads, it only exempts pressure. Option 1 Strike the exception, move the language into 905.3.1... you can have a manual wet standpipe, you can go up to 150 ft with that manual wet stand pipe...

Option 2 – is the proponent’s preferred option. Imposes a requirement on the design professional to coordinate with the local fire official as to what their tactics and equipment are so that the standpipe equipment is designed to accommodate their needs and operational procedures. Standpipe equipment is usually the one piece of equipment solely installed for use of the fire department. The way it is currently written, we never ask the fire department if there is a maximum pressure that you want to pump? What pressure do you require at your nozzle? What hose configurations are you using?

Robby Dawson fine with option 1 – but if there is a locality without a local fire department, rather strike the exception

Ron Clements does not support option 2.

Consensus for approval for Option 1

CB-915.1.1(2) Installation of radiating cable

Allison Cook gave an overview of this proposal. Radiating cable/ existing communication... Proposing that it’s no longer the locality’s responsibility but the building owner should be responsible for installing and maintaining the additional emergency communications systems.

Shaun Pharr speaks in opposition.

Mike Toalson speaks in opposition. This code change violates the spirit of the compromise.

Brian McGraw fire official dilemma. A firefighter safety issue. Portable radios don’t respond well due to the construction of the building. Radio technology for fire service is not necessarily there. If a builder wants to build a building, all of the other requirements are there. If repeater systems are installed, will waive the requirement for the hand sets. In support of the owner providing these systems. Some editorial needs to be included to the fire code version.

Cindy Davis – There is not another workgroup meeting so there cannot be any significant changes made to the proposals that are submitted. Staff will be happy to insert specific editorial changes as long as they correlate back to statements made at this meeting. Otherwise you cannot go back and make changes to submit the board without those changes coming before this group.

Kenney Payne - we hoped this would go through the ad hock committee, but the we are opposed to this as written, because this is an after fact. Whenever something happens after the fact the finger is always pointed to the design professional for not designing it originally to meet the code.

Robby Dawson - The challenge is to redesign a radio system locally to give us X amount of coverage across X amount of the community. Let's address this with the statewide communications.

Kenney Payne – today we design a system that meets the code, but then other buildings go up and trees grow and all of a sudden they are not getting the signals that they need. Does that fall back on the owner?

Rick Witt doesn't think this proposal is the answer. Radiating cables may not be the technology you want to use anyway. Cellular providers are looking at alternate ways with new technology.

Andrew Milliken -We have this problem in Stafford in the stairwells. When the building was originally constructed, we had the coverage. But a few years down the line and we have modified buildings, communications have changed.

Non-consensus

CB-3307.2 Protection of adjacent occupied areas

Andrew Milliken gave an overview of this proposal. Protection of adjacent occupied areas. What wording needs to be changed...deleting the word "completely" separated to just separated...don't want to be unreasonable. Trying to simplify what is typically done in most projects with affect to the occupants. Code officials cannot go out and require additional levels of construction, sections in fire code that word deleted and removed regarding mall separations will ensure that when renovating one section or one tenant area, that the occupied area has some sort of separation from the construction.

Cindy Davis – large square footage stores...divide their work area from occupants of the store with plastic, this will not permit that?

No, this is why we want to take out completely separated.

Kenney Payne - consistent with the existing type of construction, is it rated construction? Even if it's temporary. Noncombustible vs combustible. Does completely means even above the ceiling?

Cindy Davis - The intent is to delete the word completely. Vacant space or areas under construction or demolition shall be separated and secured for the remainder of the occupied building with construction consistent with the existing type of construction for the building unless otherwise approved.

If you separate the construction area from the occupant area with drywall, the wall has to be type 1?

Are we talking about walls or systems as well? Separated and secured... whatever that looks like.

David Beahm said VBCOA would oppose this. Don't believe you can determine what's secure can be based on what's been said.

Haywood Kines - Not properly worded, but a good recommendation for a code change.

Kris Bridges said they have current constructions currently going on...sprayed fire resistant on the temporary walls.

Non-consensus

CR-R303.5.1 Intake Openings

Dan Wilhiem – I can see the language that's provided being interpreted differently from one area to another. I think this will be problematic. Would like to get a feel of what the building officials think of the language.

Tom Clark confused about the installation. Worried that they will be installed in another way.

Mike Toalson what would VBCOA think if we put a period after the word percent?

Chris Snidow stated he believed this was proprietary.

Consensus for disapproval

CR-R404.1.9.2 Masonry piers supporting floor girders

Charles Bajnai gave an overview of his proposal. Dealt with the requirement that said you had to have pier blocks 12 x 12 x 12. Blocks don't typically come that way. The suggestion is to scratch the whole section. Then you can use any dimension of blocks for a crawl space that you want.

Consensus for Approval

CR-R803.2.4 Structural fascia or perimeter blocking

Mr. Goss gave an overview of his proposal. Strengthen the perimeter of a roof diaphragm to give it a more direct path. The way roofs are built, they have a non-structural fascial. No sheeting or decking from as much as 3 to 6 inches. Makes it weak on the edge. Can cause wind/water damage. Want to make it safer.

Mike Toalson objects to this. We think it's a new and unnecessary expense. Unaware of roofs blowing off of houses in VA. In Florida, maybe during hurricane season.

Kris Bridges - Those standards 803.2.3 is referenced multiple times. State of VA has the worse roof construction ever seen. The fact that I can't attach a drip edge to the edge of the roof is morally reprehensible. The state is at risk for significant more damage, just because it hasn't happened, don't mean it won't. Homeowners are at risk. The quality of construction is significantly poorer. Home owners already incurring thousands of dollars in deferred maintenance cost.

The way it's currently being built, it's impossible to meet the manufactures installation instructions, load issues aside. It's designed in the code...you are not designed to meet this in the code. Since it's not designed to meet this in the code...they are not. Roofs are brand new but can be failed. Not using drip edge don't have the standard manufactures over hang, almost all of the roofs here are hanging 3 – 4 inches over the edge.

Non consensus

CR-R905.2.8.5 Drip Edge

Mr. Goss gave an overview of his proposal. Reject the deletion that requires this...It's in the code already...in order to get a proper edge on a shingle roof you need to have a drip edge so you can have something to attach your starter strip and shingles to so you won't have water intrusion.

Mike Toalson objects to this. If the drip edges aren't installed properly it causes more problems. Unnecessary cost. Shouldn't be mandated by the code. Every builder have the option to use a drip edge,

Non consensus

CR-R908.7 Roof system repairs

Ben Goss gave an overview of his proposal. Trying to get a definition of what a roof system is in comparison to a repair of the roof system. It didn't edit properly. Want to define what a roof repair is vs a roof replacement and what's required.

Kenney Payne stated there are definitions in the IEBC and the IBC. If this moves forward can they be the same or do they need to be different?

The IEBC standard is 50%.

Under that definition for roof replacement doesn't require me to replace it compared to salvaging it and that could be dangerous.

Mike Toalson objects to this. It includes some of the features we've already opposed to in previous code changes.

Non Consensus

CTM-401.4 Intake openings.

Consensus for disapproval

CTS-305.2.9 Clear zone.

Consensus for approval

F-107.2 (2) Mobile food preparation vehicles

Robby Dawson gave an overview of his proposal.

Strike 609.2 from this change. Change sections 319.4 and 904.2.2 to replace “Section 609” with “NFPA 96-17 Annex B.

Christine w/health dept. asking clarification for specific sections

Robby Dawson made changes.

Vernon Hodge stated Justin Bell had questions on this.

Brian McGraw you can do this as a local amendment.

Consensus for approval with revisions.

F-107.11 State Fire Marshal’s office permit fees

Mr. McGraw gave an overview of his approval.

Non-consensus (for board to decide)

F-319 (2) Commercial cooking

No changes made to it since the last meeting in June.

Consensus for disapproval

F-403.12.3.1 Number of crowd managers

You don’t need crowd managers at 999 but if you got to 1,000 you needed 4.

Robby Dawson said we need crowd managers. 1000 people you need 1 crowd manager for every 250 people in the venue.

Shaun Pharr believes this needs clarity.

Consensus for disapproval (will be addressed and discussed at the next code cycle)

F-609.1 Commercial kitchen hoods

Withdrawn

F-609.3 Operations and maintenance

Language needed to be added that cooking appliances needed to be approved by building code officials.

Rick Witt stated it is redundant and unnecessary.

Dan Surrena said make it a pointer.

Non-consensus

F-5706.1.1 Mobile fueling operations

Robby Dawson gave an overview of his proposal.

David Beahm proposed to revise language to say vehicles used for farm operations and machinery. This is replacing #3.

Robby Dawson would like an interpretation from the AG's office.

Linda Hale there is a difference if you have a farm use only tag.

They have a company in Loudoun County that fuels vehicles anywhere. (WeFuel)

They have gone around all the safety measures that is required for a gas station.

Michael O'Connor Fill and Purple in CA is in discussions with the fire dept.

CA has allowed it in designated areas.

Consensus with talking to AG's office

M-103.2.1 Responsibility

Greg Revels gave an overview of this proposal.

Shaun Pharr - has anyone talked with the AG's office on this one. It is very problematic.

Greg Revels has had instances where the owners are not responding to the tenants.

Problem with owners not taking care of problems with their properties.

John Walsh suggested there are provisions for repeat offenders.

There are no consequences for any terrible conditions until they get a violation notice, then they fix it. No consequences.

Sean Farrell with regards to 3 or more the legal counsel needs to have substantial evidence. You have a checks and balances.

Shaun Pharr doesn't dispute the problems that exist with owners. Would be willing to craft language with VBCOA.

Non-Consensus

M-202(2) Applicable building code

Rick Witt gave an overview of this proposal.

Maintained: To keep unimpaired in an appropriate condition, operation, and continuance as installed in accordance with the applicable building code, or as previously approved, and in accordance with the applicable operational and maintenance provisions of this code.

Modify the proposal with the inclusion of this definition.

Consensus for approval

M-505.4 Water heating facilities

Earl Weaver gave an overview of this proposal

Water heating facilities shall be properly maintained at a minimum temperature of 110 F (43 C)

Non consensus

M-505.5 Nonpotable water reuse systems

Revise #1 to add public comment suggestion by Susan Douglas from Virginia Department of Health to read, "Proper cross-connection control and backflow prevention measures shall comply with the applicable building code."

Add where required in front of #2

Consensus for approval with modifications

M-602.2 (1) Heat supply

John Walsh gave an overview of this proposal.

Mr. Joseph Ciszek gave the Legal Aid Justice Centers overview.

Shaun Pharr gave an overview of the decision the TRB came up with.

Kenney Payne gave alternative language.

Sean Farrell we would have talked about maintaining the heat source.

Public comment to be submitted by John Walsh, Shaun Pharr and Vernon Hodge.

Non-consensus

M-606.1(2) Third party elevator inspections

AG's office said there is a conflict.

Consensus for disapproval