

IEBC Drafting Committee Meeting
Draft Minutes
July 13 : 2 to 7 PM
July 14 : 7:30 AM to 2:30 PM
Baltimore, Maryland
Comfort Inn BWI Airport

Members Present: C. Danny Cargill, David Chang, David Collins, Susan Gentry, Mel Green, Gary Higbee, Edward Kocman, William Koffel, Carl Simmons, John Terry, Ronald Thomas and Ronald Wetmore,

Members Absent : None

Staff Present: Ken Schoonover, Terrell Stripling, Paul Coats and Hamid Naderi.

Guests Present: Todd Andersen, Jeff Feid, Dave Frable, Dottie Harris, David Hattis, Jon Heintz, Johns Hopkins, Chris Jones, Tom McLane, Marilyn Kaplan, Carlos Martin, Wayne Meyer, Kanti Patel, Larry Perry, Ronald Piester, Rebecca Quinn, Sarah Rice, Jim Rossberg,

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:20 PM on 7 -13 and 7:35 AM on 7 -14, 2000 with the above present during all or part of the meeting.

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND GENERAL COMMENTS

The committee members, staff and guests briefly introduced themselves. Chairman, John Terry, clarified that the role of this drafting committee is to provide direction and guidance for the philosophy and the general concepts and that staff will draft the language for the committee review and approval.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by J. Terry seconded by D. Collins to amend the agenda to bring item 5 before item 4 passed unanimously. M. Green suggested an item be added to talk about the committee make up and membership. This item was placed after item 4. Motion by B. Koffel seconded by S. Gentry to approve the amended agenda passed unanimously.

3. Approval of the April 26 and April 27, 2000 Kansas City Meeting Minutes

K. Schoonover asked for clarification as to why the minutes under item 6, mission statement, reflected "Code or Guide". D. Collins explained that it was because multiple documents were being looked at and a guide would have included a framework of many guides. G. Higbee explained that it additionally might address financial incentives and therefore would be a guide. Motion by D. Collins seconded by G. Higbee to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

4. REPORT OF THE STAFF ON DEFINITIONS (originally item 5)

Staff read the definitions that had been taken from existing codes and each definition was discussed :

Retrofit : The following points were discussed

the definition is too narrow and does not cover other issues

retrofit is mandatory and brings the structure up to a certain level

Retrofit might be a narrow “alteration”, when you retrofit sprinklers or structural elements for seismic, it does not bring in other requirements even though the work area is the entire building.

Retrofit is possibly a slang term for rehabilitation

It is possibly repair after damage

It is a mandatory improvement of an existing building

Should not have a definition with a negative connotation

There is also voluntary retrofit of structural systems

At some point it has to be addressed if voluntary retrofit would result in bringing the structure up to a certain minimum

Motion made by C. Simmons seconded by G. Higbee to not have a definition for the term retrofit and only address in the body of the code as an application passed unanimously

Repair : The following points were discussed

Definition is too narrow, should be used with renovation

Definition #3 is too broad

Definitions and code requirements go together, so do not worry too much about how narrow or wide the definition is now

The NJ subcode breaks it down and makes it very easy for design, application and enforcement

The definitions in NJ and NARRP were tightened because the code definitions were too broad and left a lot of room for variation and judgement

We must begin with the current I-Codes definitions and change or add later if there is a need

NJ looked at the same thing and took the approach we are

Motion by G. Higbee was seconded by D. Collins to use definition #3. Motion by S. Gentry seconded by J. Terry to amend definition #3 by removing the word “Reconstruction”. G. Higbee accepted the amendment. The amended definition #3 was put to a vote. For : 6 , against : 4, motion passed.

The definition for repair as passed reads : The renewal of any part of an existing structure for the purpose of its maintenance.

Alteration :

Motion by C. Simmons seconded by D. Collins to take definition #4 with an editorial addition of the word “in” after construction , motion passed with 1 voting against.

The definition as passed reads : Any construction in or renovation to an existing structure other than repair or addition.

Additions :

Motion by D. Collins seconded by C. Simmons to use definition #1

For : 7, against : 3, motion passed.

This definition would read : An extension or increase in floor area or height of a building or structure.

Relocated or Moved :

Why is there a need to define this?

By the definition as provided, moving a structure up vertically and placing it down would be considered “moved”

It was agreed this term will not be defined. (staff notes are not clear here. Apparently a motion was made to accept the definition provided by staff and was put to vote and was defeated with one voting against. Staff has no notes as to who might have made the motion and who seconded. Either way, the end result is that this term will not be defined)

Maintenance :

Motion by D. Collins seconded by R. Wetmore to use definition 2 with modification, passed unanimously. Modifications included removing the words “buildings” and “etc.”

The definition reads : The work of keeping structures in proper condition; Upkeep.

Change of Occupancy :

Motion by D. Collins seconded by C. Simmons to use the NBC definition and not use any of the definitions provided by staff. It was discussed that maybe the IBC Chapter 34 criteria as related to occupancy groups and divisions should be used without defining the term. The original motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously.

This definition reads : A change in the purpose or level of activity within a structure that involves a change in application of the requirements of this code.

5. REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES (originally item 4)

It was decided that item 4.3 be discussed first, since B. Koffell was not able to be at the meeting on the 14th.

4.3 NFPA 101A/IBC 3409

D. Collins provided a brief presentation of the report of this subcommittee. A discussion followed

Existing buildings stock have been built under many different codes that have to be considered. 3409 provides that alternative.

3409 is also an alternative to what’s in Ch. 34 other than 3409 and not just alternate to the new construction as the subcommittee report indicates.

If we do not include 101A as acceptable, we have to develop the I-Occupancy criteria for 3409

If the committee decides to include 3409 then staff would have to look into its correlation with the IBC

Motion by G. Higbee seconded by S. Gentry to include IBC 3409 as a compliance alternative and let staff evaluate it for correlation with the IBC passed unanimously.

Motion by B. Koffel seconded by J. Terry to recognize NFPA 101A as an alternate to the means of egress requirements of the IEBC within the same scope of 101A. Motion by M. Green to amend to allow this alternate only for buildings built under NFPA 101 seconded by G. Higbee. After some discussion the motion to amend was withdrawn and the original motion was put to a vote : Passed with 1 voting against.

4.1 Historic

M. Green presented the historic subcommittee report.

M. Kaplan indicated she would like to submit the “Historic Fire Risk Index System” to staff for consideration as part of IBC 3409.

M. Kaplan suggested the committee consider the issue of “house museums” in drafting of the historic provisions.

Motion by G. Higbee seconded by D. Collins for the Historic Subcommittee to review NFPA 914, Code for Fire Protection in Historic Structures (draft), and submit their findings to the IEBC Committee passed unanimously.

Motion by D. Collins seconded by R. Wetmore to approve recommendation #1 of the Historic Subcommittee passed unanimously.

Recommendation #1 : The Historic Buildings chapter should not be a complete freestanding document. It should reference the other sections of the IEBC as appropriate. We should not reprint every code provision in this chapter.

Motion by D. Collins seconded by M. Green to approve recommendation #3 of this subcommittee passed unanimously.

Recommendation #3 : If an exception is suggested for a historic structure, the special provision should be reviewed for applicability to other chapters.

Motion by D. Collins seconded by R. Thomas to approve recommendation #4 of this subcommittee passed unanimously.

Recommendation #4 : House museums, buildings normally used as a single family dwelling (R-3), but opened to the public several times per year for tours (maybe as many as 20 days per year), special consideration is needed for this use.

Motion by D. Collins seconded by C. Simmons to approve recommendation #5 of this subcommittee passed unanimously.

Recommendation #5 : The proposed life safety provisions under the National Parks Service/APT Project would be difficult to enforce. They are excellent guidance. Perhaps they may be included as an alternate method or as a guideline.

Motion by D. Collins (second not shown) to review the 1980 or otherwise the most current HUD Rehab guidelines for consideration of inclusion in the IEBC passed unanimously.

(It was agreed that M. Kaplan will provide a summary and applicable parts of the HUD Guidelines for Rehabilitation to the secretariat for distribution to the committee members.)

Motion by D. Collins seconded by C. Simmons to determine if there is a need for special structural provisions for historic buildings passed unanimously.

(C. Simmons to provide related information to the secretariat for distribution)

4.2 Structural

David Chang presented the report of the structural subcommittee.

It was questioned as to where the 75% level came from and how the Guidelines for Seismic Retrofit of Buildings (GSREB) and FEMA documents relate?

FEMA 356 contains simplified rehab provisions

It was commented that 75% level is the old way of doing things and that there are more appropriate methods available now.

D. Chang indicated that the 75% level originally comes from FEMA 178 and FEMA 310 and that California Universities also use this.

Suggestion was made that structural provisions similar to IBC be independently provided in IEBC as well

Wind provisions will be included in the IEBC

M. Green made a short presentation with a flow chart showing the relationship between the GSREB and FEMA documents.

Motion by G. Higbee seconded by D. Collins that IEBC include retroactive requirements including thresholds and triggers regardless of permit application passed unanimously. Staff was directed to put some wording together for the retroactive(retrofit) structural provisions.

M. Green suggestion that items 2 through 7 of the structural subcommittee report be kept as resource and guide for the triggers at this time and the final decision on them postponed until we have more of the provisions drafted, was agreed upon unanimously.

4.4 NJ/NARRP/UCBC

Report of the subcommittee was presented by Larry Perry.

The purpose of the code is to encourage use and reuse of existing buildings as well as providing a minimum level of safety for occupants in existing buildings.

Voluntary improvements vs. base level safety must be established for all buildings.

There is no one code that could be a plug in or used as the base, provisions should be drawn from all of these codes.

Item #2 of the subcommittee report : what should the goal of the IEBC be?

Motion by M. Green seconded by R. Thomas that the goal of IEBC is “ To encourage use and reuse of existing buildings”. Votes : For : 5, against : 4, abstain: 1, motion passed.

It was clarified this motion was not intended to prohibit the committee from requiring reasonable upgrades.

Item #3 of the subcommittee report :

Motion by G. Higbee seconded by R. Wetmore that any work as a result of retroactive requirements of IEBC will not trigger additional requirements passed unanimously.

Item #4 of the subcommittee report :

Motion by M. Green seconded by G. Higbee to consider IEBC based on the same concepts embodied in NJ/NARRP/UCBC (proportionality/stepped approach) passed with 2 voting against. It was clarified that the intent of the committee was that the NJ/NARRP/UCBC approach would replace the IBC Chapter 34 approach.

Motion by M. Green seconded by G. Higbee that IEBC adopt the concept of risk/hazard rating for the Change Of Occupancy from the NJ/NARRP/UCBC passed with 2 voting against.

4.6 Relocated and Moved Structures(heard before 4.5/presenter for 4.5 was out of the room)

J. Terry presented the report of the subcommittee.

Motion by J. Terry seconded by D. Collins to accept the proposed concept within the subcommittee report. A discussion followed :

It is intended that a moved structure must comply with IFC/IPMC to determine that it is safe for occupancy.

New work must comply with new construction requirements
Inspection and testing of systems to determine possible damage in transit might need to be considered
Certain requirements for new construction would apply such as utility hook ups, location on the lot and structural integrity.
Some communities may not want some of these “inferior” buildings to come to their neighborhood where all other buildings comply.
The original motion was amended to include some exceptions such as utility hook ups, location on the lot and structural integrity and passed unanimously.

4.5 Maintenance/Retrofit(other than seismic)

S. Rice presented the report of the subcommittee.
It was agreed that the identified retroactive requirements in the Current I-Codes should be considered for applicability in the IEBC. It was also suggested that a similar search for retroactive provisions in the IBC be made to include in this list.

4.7 Additions

S. Gentry presented the report of the subcommittee.
All of the requirements for additions are to be in one location under one section or chapter.
Motion by R. Wetmore seconded by E. Kochman that additions comply with the requirements for new construction passed unanimously.

5.5 Make up and membership of the IEBC Committee (added to the agenda at the meeting)

M. Green indicated that in a meeting where he was making a presentations, he was asked why there are no fire officials on the IEBC Committee. C. Simmons indicated that he is also the fire official for his jurisdiction. It was mentioned that the committee members are appointed by the ICC Board of Directors and any individual or group interested to be on the committee should write to the ICC Board of Directors and its Chairman.

6. Plan of Action and Tentative Time Line, Future Meeting Dates and Locations

It is our goal to produce a 2003 edition of the IEBC. The next meeting of the IEBC Committee will be held November 6 and November 7, 2000. Location to be determined by staff.

7. Other : None

8. SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS AND ASSIGNMENTS

The Historic Subcommittee will review NFPA 914 and submit its report to the secretariat for distribution to the committee

Staff will develop language for the topics discussed based on direction given from the committee. Such texts are sent to the IEBC committee and subcommittees. The subcommittees must focus on these reports for their area of responsibility.

All of the reports must be in the hands of the committee 30 days prior to the next meeting. As the reports of different topics are completed, they may be sent to the committee and do not need to wait for the completion of all topics.

- 9. NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION** : Covered under agenda item 6
- 10.** There being no other subjects for discussion, Motion by J. Terry seconded by M. Green to adjourn was passed unanimously.