



EXISTING BUILDING SAFETY – A GUIDELINE FOR INSPECTION GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 23rd, 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		Phil Line	x
John Catlett		Steve Orłowski	
Dwayne Garriss	x	Don Scott	
Mark Graham	x	Gus Sirakis	x
Jennifer Goupil	x	Steve Szoke	x
Bryan Holland		Kenneth Wagner	x
Ryan Kersting	x		
A quorum requires 7 in attendance.			

b. ICC Staff:

i. Kevin McOsker

2. Meeting Conduct discussed as follows:

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

3. Previous Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

The meeting agenda referenced the review and approval of the January 9th meeting in error. The error was noted, the meeting minutes to be considered is the January 16th meeting. A motion was made to approve the meeting minutes dated January 16th and voted unanimously to be approved.

4. New Assessment Table (discipline specific) timeframes.

The Structural Working Group met regarding the assessment frequency Table 4.1, as noted in the previous meeting. Ryan Kersting shared a revised, simplified, Table 4.1 that appears closer to the original table proposed at a previous meeting that received support by the group. This new Table 4.1 removes the term Milestone Assessment in favor of the term Periodical Assessment. The frequency proposed is 15 years for general conditions and 10 years where environmental factors may apply as the initial recommended frequency. Ultimately, the intervals in the guideline are recommendations, with the intent that the jurisdictions that will adopt these provisions need to make the final decision on the frequency. A consideration might be that the frequency of assessment with environmental factors may be a function of material type (i.e. concrete in salt-laden environments, or wood construction in an area with pest infestation). The structural group's proposal is to consolidate the periodic and milestone inspections, as two separate assessments may cause some confusion to the end user of the guideline and the purpose is similar in their intent. Mark Graham mentioned that the Building Elements group proposed 30 years for the assessment for the building owner's consideration. He also mentioned the need to clarify the charging language in the body of the document. Steve Szoke mentioned that the scope of a Milestone Assessment is greater than the visual assessment this document is proposing. Some additional language may be needed to clarify that a traditional milestone program is not within the scope of this document. Steve provided a recommendation for language for milestone inspection. The asterisk was questioned, Kevin found the noted from 12/12 meeting with scope of the maintenance inspection to include a supplement assessment if something questionable is discovered. The language in the guideline may need to include a discussion on the scope of the services (building height, occupant load, risk category, number of buildings to be assessed, or other factors) that will need to be determined by the jurisdiction.

The Chair requested the committee members present in the meeting to indicate, by a show of hands, the approval of the simplified table as proposed by the Structural Working Group. There was no objection to the new table.

5. Introduction (re: Structural Evaluation, Damage and Condition Assessment).

A few additional comments were provided regarding the update new "scope" section that was introduced at the previous meeting. Julie Furr provided an overview since she was the primary author of this section. Michael Fillon commented that service-life and design applications do not include "earthquake" and we should consider striking this load, noting section 1.3.1 of the ASCE 7. The slight concern is that the new sections might be focused on the structural systems (for example service-life might mean something different for other disciplines. A concern from Gus that many buildings in New York date back to 1898, and the service-life comments may be inconsistent with the building stock in older cities. The code and standards were more prescriptive than modern codes. Julie mentioned that she would work with those comments to adjust the language.

The term “salt latent” environment was suggested to be updated to “corrosive” by Steve Szoke.

The term Certificate of Occupancy was considered too specific, with additional language for other authorizations that may exist.

The new language discussed will be updated in the next document draft.

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

Comments that were provided after the last meeting on this proposed new language was discussed. It was noted by the group that site specific elements, such as foundation excavation and dewatering isn't technically an environmental factor, a new subject section with site specific conditions needs to be considered. Some reorganization of the section was updated in the meeting. Steve Szoke will provide some additional language for consideration with respect to the Milestone Inspection program.

No objections to including this new language in the next guideline draft.

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

Flowcharts (included w/ agenda): Steve Orłowski updated the flow chart with a note as discussed in the previous meeting. The concern is that the flow chart represents the language in the document, the chart should match the actual language. It is felt that the document needs to articulate that the report needs to include notification to the AHJ. A dotted from the diamond “conduct an evaluation...” is warranted as one conclusion from the evaluation may be that a dangerous condition exists. Notification of the dangerous condition needs to occur quicker than preparing and delivering the full report. Chair Garriss asked Kevin to get with Steve to update the flowchart.

Julie Furr's comments (not included w/ agenda): Additional language in section 1.1 to clarify why this is happening. In addition, Julie updated section 1.2 Purpose (retitled 1.3 Methodology) was updated to clarify language that was repetitive, unclear, and deleting laundry list language in favor of a generic statement.

Micheal Fillon's comments (not included w/ agenda): These comments represent planning preparation, documentation, and interview to help the initial stages of a visual assessment; noting a visual assessment has certain limitations. Greater planning and documentation can lead to a better focus for certain elements, such as repairs or alterations. The interview with the owner and/or maintenance staff may provide additional insight into areas of focus for the assessment. This is similar to the ACI and Canadian assessment guidelines (noted previously). It was noted that Chapter 5 has some information about this process and this needs to be coordinated. Michael noted that some review and adjustment of terms and language might be necessary and welcomed any input. Further review of this language is needed by the group. This language will be sent out independently with the updated guideline document, due to time constraints.

Heather Aneeta's comments (not included w/ agenda): Heather provided some addition to the scope of work for the document. However, due to time limitations, a full review and consideration was not possible. This will be provided as a standalone document for consideration by the group.

Chair Garriss asked for an updated draft guideline document. Comments and items already agreed upon, should be accepted in the document. Information not considered by the group can be left in "track changes" mode. A clean copy is also requested.

8. Schedule of Upcoming Meetings: With some scheduling conflicts, the group decided to reschedule the January 30th meeting to February 13th.

~~January 9, 2024 – Tuesday~~
~~January 16, 2024 – Tuesday~~
~~January 23, 2024 – Tuesday~~
~~January 30, 2024 – Tuesday~~
February 13, 2024 – Tuesday

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

9. New Business - None
10. Good of the Order - None
11. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 3:34 pm ET.