



**INTERNATIONAL
CODE
COUNCIL®**

**EXISTING BUILDING SAFETY – A GUIDELINE FOR INSPECTION
GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, January 16th, 2024
2:00 – 3:30 pm Eastern

MS TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting ID: 246 315 698 745

Passcode: LVvn4M

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

MEETING MINUTES

1. Roll Call:

a. Committee:

Sergio Ascunce	x	Phil Line	x
John Catlett		Steve Orłowski	x
Dwayne Garriss	x	Don Scott	x
Mark Graham	x	Gus Sirakis	
Jennifer Goupil	x	Steve Szoke	x
Bryan Holland		Kenneth Wagner	x
Ryan Kersting	x		
A quorum requires 7 in attendance.			

b. ICC Staff:

- i. Dorothy Mazzarella
- ii. Kevin McOsker

2. Meeting Conduct discussed as follows:

- a. Identification of Representation:
- b. Ethical Conduct:
- c. Antitrust Compliance Guideline:

Note: Agenda items were taken in an alternate order than the posted agenda, minutes reflect order of that discussion.

3. Review and discuss the consolidated draft committee draft guideline.

The meeting started with Julie Furr's draft document clarifying the intent of the guideline with respect to Structural Evaluation, Damage Assessment, and Condition Assessments. The document was not shared before the meeting. Julie provided an overview of the new proposed language. Damage is a defined finite event (earthquake, hurricanes, fire, vehicle strikes the building) that occurs that requires an assessment. Condition assessment is to evaluate buildings based on long-term aging process under normal conditions. The group considered that the best place to locate this information is in the beginning of the document, such as an introduction. This information sets the stage for the document's intent. Kevin will work with Julie and Ryan on this element of the document for the next meeting.

Michael Fillon provided a recommendation a part of the assessment process in this guideline to include an interview of the building owner. This captured in an Ontario, Canada assessment guideline (section 8.2). Michael has sent his thoughts and the Canadian guideline to everyone prior to the meeting. Julie suggested that possibly adding "interview notes" to the checklist(s) in the appendix of the draft guideline.

4. Previous Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

A quorum was obtained after the roll call, allowing the minutes to be considered.

Motion was made and unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the January 9th meeting.

5. New Assessment Table (discipline specific) timeframes.

Sergio Ascunce provided the Building Elements Group's recommendation for the assessment intervals for the new Table that was collaboratively agreed upon at the last meeting. BEM's recommendation was to reintroduce the risk category, occupant load, and height in stories for Structural and Envelope assessments. The structural group was concerned about the removal of the periodic assessment that was established 15 years in a previous meeting. Maybe a solution might be to consolidate the periodic inspection and the milestone columns. A consideration to separate structural and envelope as weather might impact the elements differently and might warrant earlier evaluation. The Structural Working Group will convene to address the table with the alternative language. The qualification of the Risk/Size of the building might be best to address building scope in Section 4 of the document, possibly as an additional table. The group will look at alternatives to the update table for the next meeting. Chair Garriss suggested that the groups work on this item and resolve the assessment frequency at the next meeting.

6. Alternative to Table 4.1 footnotes c. and e.

Kevin provided an overview of the draft document that would remove footnotes c. and e. from Table 4.1 and relocate the language and concepts to the body of the document in new sections 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.5.1. In addition, it was an opportunity to address the supplemental building component inspection/assessments (balconies, façades, etc...)

within the document in lieu of the current footnote f. Some modified language was updated during the meeting for clarity. The issue of “structural systems” was also modified to “known structural vulnerabilities”. With known structural vulnerabilities, there was a consideration to include a benchmark of codes to identify significant shifts in design application. This can be found in ASCE 41.

Michael Fillon provided comments regarding the decay of structural elements from other sources such as fungi and insect attacks.

Steve Szoke provided commentary regarding the notes he provided:

- The first item was an additional item to the flow charts with respect to AHJ getting a receipt of the requirement for corrective action. Steve and Heather are going to include this information on the flow chart.
- Additional language with respect to assessments for structural elements exposed to the exterior when designed to be an interior element. Possibly, including the note for any building element that might be exposed where not intended to be would need to be considered.
- Steve brought forward language concerning the time a building was constructed based on specific eras of construction/enforcement. This is tied to the “known structural vulnerabilities”, which might need to be a definition where this language could be helpful.

Sergio provided a process to deal with a transition of existing buildings that would exceed the milestone inspection date at the time for an assessment program would be implemented.

7. Schedule of Upcoming Meetings:

~~January 9, 2024 – Tuesday~~
January 16, 2024 – Tuesday
January 23, 2024 – Tuesday
January 30, 2024 – Tuesday

*All meetings scheduled for 2:00 pm ET, unless otherwise noted.

8. New Business - None

9. Good of the Order - None

10. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:28 pm ET.