

From: bellockeng@aol.com <bellockeng@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 11:34 AM

To: Member Input <memberinput@iccsafe.org>

Subject: Proposed code changes

There should be a cost benefit analysis for any changes made and that the code start to reflect a realistic minimum building standard.

As it stands now whether if you make \$10,000,000 a year of \$15/hour you are obligated to follow each and every requirement of the building code(s).

With the average household income in the US is now \$60,000 (if you can believe the press) and with the average price per s.f. for a house nationwide ranging from \$186 Raleigh - \$386 San Francisco (per Cumming) the lower income the gap increasingly widens.

Essentially, without a realistic cost benefit analysis, every change ends up increasing housing cost and placing the lower income more and more out of the possibility of owning/constructing a dwelling and any hope of improving their and their children's lifestyle.

Every code change, no matter how small, increases the cost of housing. I have never seen one code change that I can remember that reduces the overall initial cost.

As an engineer I cannot argue the changes have not made the buildings safer, i.e. GFI, arc faults, R-21 wall, R-39 ceiling, sprinklers, insulated basement, etc. - but have we accomplished anything by essentially obligating lower income families and children to be forced to live in an existing cardboard box or ghetto house. Dwellings may be safer but at what cost.

Philosophically, looking at the extreme, is it better to live in a house with R-11 wall and R19 ceiling than to live in that ghetto house or cardboard box. With the codes as written we have forgotten and continue to forget at least 1/3 of our population.