

**Residential Code Review Committee
2008 Oregon Residential Specialty Code
Regular committee meeting minutes
- DRAFT -**

July 12, 2007

Members present: Patrick Bridges
John Caul
Chuck Day
David DeHarpport
Gary Lampella
Raymond Miller
Alan Seymour

Member absent: none

Staff present: Mike Ewert, code specialist
Chris Stewart, facilities engineer
Heidi Shamberger, structural para-technical specialist
Marianne Manning, rules coordinator

Guest present: Steve Strawn, Jeld-Wen

- 1. Approval of June 28, 2007 Residential Code Review Committee minutes**
Motion by Raymond Miller to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2007 Residential Code Review Committee meeting as submitted.
Motion passed unanimously.
- 2. Code amendment proposals and deferred items**

Chapter 3

Various sections and tables referring to seismic category D₀, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 6](#)) and Figure R301.2(2), new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 7](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA), discussed his organization's proposal to delete references to seismic category D₀ in various tables and codes sections throughout the 2008 Oregon Residential Specialty Code (ORSC). This proposal was developed at the national level. In the future the code will probably be revised to allow less restrictive standards in the D₀ category, but the 2006 edition only has one provision dealing with exterior veneer. Oregon has consistently used county lines for seismic zone delineations to keep code consistent within jurisdictions. Because the zones proposed by International Code Council (ICC) splits some cities and counties into separate seismic zones OBOA recommends that the D₀ designation be deleted to avoid confusion.

Patrick Bridges, Oregon Home Builders Association, distributed and discussed [suggested alternatives to the code change proposal](#) that would combine D₀ and D₁ into one seismic zone. Chuck Day expressed concern about the number of changes that would be required to delete or change the seismic categories in the multiple places it is referenced in code. Chairman Bridges distributed and discussed maps illustrating [proposed and existing seismic category boundaries](#).

The committee discussed the impact of the recommended changes, the possibility that future seismic code requirements could be less or more restrictive, other possible future code changes, various seismic category boundaries, calculations used to assign seismic categories, building design and the charge to keep Oregon amendments to a minimum.

Motion by Alan Seymour to approve Proposal 6 as a new Oregon amendment because it reduces confusion in code interpretation.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Raymond Miller not to approve Proposal 7 based on previous action.

Motion passed unanimously.

Figure R301.2(2), new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 8](#))

Raymond Miller, Structural Engineers of Oregon, requested that Proposal 8 be withdrawn because the recommended map was already retained in previous action.

Chairman Bridges ruled the request to withdraw Proposal 8 approved.

Figure R301.2(4), new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 9](#))

Patrick Bridges, Oregon Home Builders Association, discussed his organization's proposal to align the wind speeds with the Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC).

Motion by Alan Seymour to adopt Proposal 9 to provide code consistency.

Motion passed unanimously.

R301.2.1.3, model code and existing Oregon amendment (deferred)

In the current code, the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) can be used as an alternative.

Model code would raise the wind speed requirements above the basis of the 1997 UBC.

Motion by Raymond Miller to retain the existing Oregon amendment to create code consistency.

Motion passed unanimously.

R301.2.2.1.1, Table R301.2.2.1.2, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 10](#))

Raymond Miller, Structural Engineers of Oregon, requested that Proposal 10 be withdrawn based on previous action.

Chairman Bridges ruled the request to withdraw Proposal 10 approved.

Table R302.1, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 11](#))

Patrick Bridges, Oregon Home Builders Association, discussed his organization's proposal to retain a change to the 2006 International Residential Code (IRC) that would place the exterior wall fire separation requirements into a new table while retaining the long standing minimum 3 foot separation in the IRC and its legacy code. He distributed and discussed [an additional change](#)

that would delete “25% Maximum Wall Area” from the Exterior Wall Element column. This amendment would have a significant impact on Oregon’s high density land use.

Mr. Ewert indicated that he had contacted Mark Nard, with ICC, at the committee’s request, to check on errata that may have been filed on this section. Mr. Nard reported that there is an errata to this change in the third line: “four feet” should have been “two feet.” Chuck Day reported that Washington State Building Code Council passed an emergency rule staying implementation of this new section and instead keeping the 2003 IRC language.

Motion by David DeHarpport to adopt Proposal 11 with the additional amendment as a new Oregon amendment to be consistent with longstanding Oregon practices.

Motion passed unanimously.

Table R302.1, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 12](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association, requested that Proposal 12 be withdrawn in favor of Proposal 11.

Vice-chairman Miller ruled the request to withdraw Proposal 12 approved.

R311.4.3, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 16](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Builders Association, discussed his organization’s proposal to amend the requirement from “two” to “three” risers because two risers is too restrictive.

Motion by Raymond Miller to approve Proposal 16 as a new Oregon amendment for code consistency.

Motion passed unanimously.

R313.1, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 17](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Builders Association, discussed his organization’s proposal which would allow smoke alarms to be installed in accordance with the provisions of this code **or** the provision of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 72.

Motion by John Caul to approve Proposal 17 as a new Oregon amendment to clarify code language.

Motion passed unanimously.

R319.1, Item 2, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 18](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Builders Association, discussed his organization’s proposal to require that wood in contact with foundations be resistant to decay.

Motion by Raymond Miller to approve Proposal 18 as a new Oregon amendment for consistency with Oregon’s specific climatic conditions.

Motion passed unanimously.

R319.3, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 19](#))

Gary Lampella spoke for proponent Erik Sweeney, City of Eugene, whose proposal would require that washers, as well as fasteners, for pressure-preservative and fire-retardant-treated wood be galvanized. The chemicals being used for pressure-treated woods are dissolving steel in contact with it. Mr. Day discussed the use of other types of decay prevention treatments.

Motion by Raymond Miller to approve Proposal 19 as a new Oregon amendment to make code-required materials compatible with the marketplace.

Ayes – Bridges, Caul, DeHarpport, Lampella, Miller, Seymour

Nay – Day

Motion passes.

Committee members and staff reviewed deferred items in Chapter 3. Staff will change and correct all roadmaps.

R310.1, model code changes to emergency escape (deferred)

Mr. Lampella reported on information he received from ICC about administrative problems with this section. Corrections are being made at a national level that will delete the first sentence.

Motion by Gary Lampella to delete the first sentence to resolve a code conflict.

Motion passed unanimously.

The committee took a short break.

Chapter 4

R404.1, Tables R404.1(1), R404.1(2), and R404.1(3), retain existing Oregon amendment ([Proposal 20](#))

Patrick Bridges, discussed his organization's proposal to retain the current code for foundation walls. Foundation walls constructed in accordance with the current provisions performed successfully both in Oregon and nationally with no evidence of defects. Mr. Day reported on the emergency action taken in Washington consistent with this proposal recognizing the need for the amendment.

Motion by David DeHarpport to approve Proposal 20 to retain the Oregon amendment to be consistent with action taken at model code level.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chapter 5

R506.2.4, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 21](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association, discussed his organization's proposal to provide an exception for welded wire fabric.

Motion by Raymond Miller to approve Proposal 21 as a new Oregon amendment to clarify model code language.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chapter 6

R602.11.1, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 34](#))

Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association, requested that Proposal 34 be withdrawn based on previous action.

Chairman Bridges ruled the request to withdraw Proposal 34 approved.

R613.2, new Oregon amendment ([Proposal 35](#))

Steve Strawn, Jeld-Wen, offered his organization's support of Proposal 35, disapproving model code language in this section. Model code would limit the size of the emergency escape and rescue opening. For many single or double-hung openings, a 60 inch tall window will just meet model code provisions and in some cases the window is difficult to install. Mr. Strawn said he is concerned about enforceability of the requirement and the lack of scientific method used to arrive at the measurements.

Committee members discussed window height from the floor and an inspector's inability to determine final floor elevation at inspection.

Motion by Raymond Miller to approve Proposal 35 due to concern about enforcement and compliance.

Motion passed unanimously.

613.4, existing Oregon amendment

Chairman Bridges relayed comments he received from two door manufacturers, both small businesses, who are very concerned about the application of the side-hinge testing requirement. For custom work there are approximately two thousand different door applications that can be applied. It was their understanding that each and every assembly must be tested.

Steve Strawn, Jeld-Wen, reported that his organization's intent was not to endanger small businesses. They had worked closely with both American Architectural Manufacturers Association and WDMA to allow testing to ASD 3-30 as in the code today.

Chairman Bridges indicated that this section would be addressed after Appendix O action is taken.

Appendix S, ([Proposal 54](#))

Raymond Miller, Structural Engineers of Oregon, discussed his organization's proposal to delete Appendix S as it is no longer required for the IRC, conflicts with the International Building Code (IBC) and creates a third design criteria.

Chairman Bridges indicated that Appendix S was inserted to be consistent with the seismic map that is in the IRC. The seismic map for the IRC was developed using a different basis than the IBC, with soil as the main difference. Appendix S was designed with a conservative SDS default value for each seismic design category. The purpose of the appendix was to allow those design/build firms that have their own engineering staff to have a single code. The use of Appendix S is not required.

Mr. Lampella discussed an Attorney General's opinion that the low-rise code could be more than one code. Mr. Miller indicated that seismic requirements would not be a controlling factor for designs in Redmond. Designers are using parts of one code and different parts of another code in one design, when only one code should be used. Chairman Bridges pointed out that Appendix S is used for design requirements for loads that are consistent with IBC. He also noted that codes are mixed and matched particularly for wind requirements.

Motion by Gary Lampella to approve Proposal 54.

Ayes – Caul, Day, DeHarpport, Lampella, Seymour

Nay – Bridges

Abstain – Miller

3. Other information

Committee members John Caul and Gary Lampella will not be in attendance at the July 19 meeting. Mr. Lampella will provide written comments or a representative. The agendas for both the July 19 and August 2 meetings will be very full, Mr. Ewert urged the committee to study the issues on the tentative agendas prior to the meetings.

Mr. Seymour reminded the committee Mac Sheldon had been told that R806.4 would be heard as the first agenda item on July 19. Mr. Sheldon is bringing an expert that will be flying in from the east coast. Chapter 11 will also be heard on July 19.

Mr. Ewert urged the committee to be prepared to make decision about the Construction Claims Task Force issues at the July 19 meeting.

The committee adjourned at 11:24 a.m.