



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services

Building Codes Division

1535 Edgewater Street NW

PO Box 14470

Salem, OR 97309-0404

(503) 378-4133

FAX (503) 378-2322

bcd.oregon.gov

May 22, 2009

## *Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee*

*Tuesday, May 12, 2009*

### **Minutes**

**\*\*NOTE:** *The following minutes are a summary of the committee's discussion.  
To review the meeting in its entirety, the archived video of the meeting is available  
on the committee's Web page at the following link: <http://www.bcd.oregon.gov/committees/10ossc.html>*

**Members Present:** (Chair) Terrence Dieter, Intel  
(Vice-chair) Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA)  
Andy Dykeman, Lease Crutcher Lewis  
George McCart, Oregon Disabilities Commission  
Eric McMullen, Fire Marshal  
Jim Riemenschneider, Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO)

**Members Absent:** Susan Steward, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)  
John Rakowitz, Associated General Contractors (AGC)

**Guests Present:** Peter Strauhal, American Institute of Architects (AIA)

**Staff Present:** Richard Rogers, Structural Program Chief  
Shane Sumption, Fire and Life Safety Code Specialist  
Jim Hanson, Policy Analyst  
Shauna Parker, Rules Coordinator  
Dana Fischer, Building Code Para-Technical

### **Introductions**

Staff and committee members introduced themselves.

### **Overview of process**

Richard Rogers, structural program chief, welcomed everyone and thanked the committee members for volunteering their time to participate in the code adoption process.

Jim Hanson, policy analyst, briefly explained the *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, Fourth Edition*, which is the public meeting guideline the committee will follow during its meetings. He noted that the committee will nominate and approve a committee chair and all actions should go through him or her, including motions and recognizing individual speakers who wish to participate in the discussion.

Chief Rogers went on to discuss the “Goals and Outcomes” document, explaining that the division is trying to limit the number of Oregon amendments to the code in an attempt to follow model code whenever possible but that necessary amendments will also be considered as part of the process.

Shane Sumption, fire and life safety code specialist, provided background on the sections of code that relate to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), noting that the new national changes are still under review by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and have not yet been officially adopted, which means that at this point, the code will need to reference the 1993 version. He noted that if the new ADA provisions are approved while the committee is reviewing the code, then the new provision will be incorporated into the Oregon code.

Chief Rogers discussed the International Existing Building Code (IEBC), recently adopted in Oregon as an alternate method, noting that if the committee wanted to recommend adoption of the IEBC as part of the Oregon code, they would need to adopt all three sections. He explained the [Oregon Commercial Energy Advisory Committee](#) (OCEC) is reviewing the energy chapters in an effort to ramp up the energy code, with a goal of increasing the energy efficiency across all commercial buildings in the state.

Chief Rogers went on to review the “Life of the Code” document and provided an overview of the code adoption process, explaining the committee’s primary role is to vet the code, decide how to move forward, and provide a recommendation to the board. He noted the anticipated effective date of the code is April 1, 2010. He also noted the submission deadline for code amendment proposals is May 21, 2009. Chief Rogers reviewed the committee meeting dates, explaining that dates may change depending on the committee’s review of each section of the code. He noted that through this process there will be three opportunities for public comment including the code committee process, at the board, and at the rulemaking hearing. He reminded the committee that adoption of the code requires both an affirmative vote from the board *and* the administrator of BCD.

Mr. Sumption explained the layout of the binder and the materials included. He explained the [matrix](#) is a guiding document that is updated throughout the committee process and includes the committee’s actions related to the various sections of the code. He explained that code amendment proposals would continue to filter in.

Chief Rogers noted that the criteria for code change proposals is captured in rule and all proposals must meet those criteria to move forward or be returned to the applicant with an explanation why the proposal was denied. He explained that in order to move forward, the committee will need to make a motion on each item brought to the committee, including existing code, code changes, alternate methods, statewide interpretations, code amendment proposals, and division proposals. He also explained that although the Building Codes Structures Board (BCSB) has purview over both the building code and the new construction provisions of the fire code. The fire code sections are under review by the Office of State Fire Marshal (OSFM) in order to make sure the codes align.

Eric McMullen explained that he serves as chair for some of the OSFM subcommittees that are reviewing chapters 9 and 10. He noted that any significant changes will come to this committee. He further noted that there is a lot of cross over between OSFM and BCD with the fire code sections, and the two agencies work closely to cover everything.

Chief Rogers explained chapter 1 is not included yet, because the division is working to coordinate and align the administrative chapters and their definitions as much as possible between each Oregon code. He then noted the next step is electing a chair and vice-chair of the committee.

**Motion** to nominate Terry Dieter for chair of the 2010 Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee. Mr. Dieter accepted the nomination.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### ***Break***

**Motion** to nominate Gary Lampella for vice-chair of the 2010 Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee.

Mr. Lampella accepted the nomination.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **Review significant model code changes to 2009 IBC**

### **SECTION 311- STORAGE GROUP S**

#### **311.2- Moderate-hazard storage, Group S-1**

Mr. Sumption explained the first significant change, noting that this is one of the areas in the code where there is an existing code change and Oregon amendments.

Chief Rogers explained that approving this change would mean deleting the existing Oregon amendment.

Mr. McMullen provided some background on this code change at the national level, explaining the S-2 aircraft hangars were consistently used outside the scope of the code including their construction and the intended meaning of the terms “maintenance and overhaul.” He noted that he submitted the existing Oregon amendment during a previous code cycle by using language from NFPA 409.

Peter Strauhaul, American Institute of Architects (AIA), explained his concern with losing the ability to classify a building that is only storing aircraft as an S-2 because the new classification of S-1 is more restrictive.

**Motion** to approve 311.2.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **SECTION 403- HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS**

### **403.2.3- Structural integrity of exit enclosures and elevator hoistway enclosures**

**Motion** to approve 403.2.3.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **403.3.2- Water supply to required fire pumps**

The committee briefly discussed the requirements laid out in this section, including the 420 foot high-rise requirement, noting that some of the requirements are a bit restrictive.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to **TABLE** this item to allow staff to follow up with ICC and report back.*

### **403.4.6- Smoke removal** *(discussed with 403.6.1, see below)*

#### **403.6.1-Fire service elevator**

Chief Rogers suggested the committee may want to table items 403.4.6 and 403.6.1 to allow staff to do more research on the section since there is a significant difference and impact between existing code requirements and the new requirements pertaining to 420 foot, 75 foot, and 120 foot buildings.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to **TABLE** both 403.4.6 and 403.6.1 to allow staff to follow up with ICC and report back.*

## **SECTION 412- AIRCRAFT-RELATED OCCUPANCIES**

### **412.4.6.1 Hazardous operations**

The committee discussed item 412.4.6.1, noting some questions and concerns they have with this new code section. They discussed whether the language was good clean up, or whether it was limiting in scope.

*The committee agreed to briefly table action on this section until after the committee break to check what is covered in NFPA 409.*

## **SECTION 419- LIVE/WORK UNITS**

The committee discussed the enforceability of this code section, noting that it does provide a sense of consistency throughout the state. The committee also discussed designated storage areas in live/work units and the multiuse function of these structures.

Mr. McMullen noted a couple of fire service issues that create difficulty, such as the requirement that no more than five related individuals can occupy the structure. He explained the fire service has a responsibility to count heads, and determining who is or is not a related resident is tricky. He also noted that although sprinklers are required, the type of sprinklers allowed is still not addressed.

Mr. Strauhail asked about providing an exception for a more sustainable approach to B occupancy structures and their sprinkling requirements.

Vice-chair Lampella discussed the differences in B and R occupancies, noting that most of the fires are in R occupancies not B occupancies, a subject that was part of the national discussion.

George McCart discussed the accessibility and conformance issue raised by this section. If additional changes are needed for this section, Chief Rogers noted that the division would allow limited “approved as modified” motions or, as an alternative, submission of a code amendment

proposal by the May 21st deadline. He also explained that the number of employees threshold in this section is not unlike that pertaining to agricultural exempt buildings.

**Motion** to approve Section 419.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Chief Rogers noted that when reviewing the accessibility provisions in chapter 11, the committee will also need to re-address this section.

### **SECTION 422- AMBULATORY HEALTH CARE FACILITIES**

The committee reviewed and discussed the background of this code section, reviewing the definition of “ambulatory health care facilities.”

**Motion** to adopt Section 422.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **SECTION 423- STORM SHELTERS**

The committee discussed the provisions of storm shelter requirements, discussing ICC 500 and FEMA requirements. They agreed that if someone wants to build a storm shelter in Oregon, there should be standards for them to meet.

**Motion** to approve Section 423.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **TABLE 503- Allowable Building Heights and Areas**

The committee reviewed the changes and differences in the table.

**Motion** to approve Table 503.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **SECTION 703- FIRE-RESISTANCE RATINGS AND FIRE TESTS**

#### **703.6- Marking and Identification**

The committee discussed fire rated assemblies and the fire code, noting that this applies to new construction only.

**Motion** to approve 703.6.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **SECTION 705- EXTERIOR WALLS**

#### **705.5- Fire-resistance Ratings**

**Motion** to approve 705.5.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **SECTION 903- AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS**

### **903.2.2- Group B ambulance health care facilities**

**Motion** to approve 903.2.2.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **903.2.3- Group E**

**Motion** to approve 903.2.3

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **903.2.7- Group M**

The committee briefly discussed this code section, noting that a sprinkler system will be required for all Group M occupancies used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture. The committee voiced their concern that there was no lower threshold requirement and the difficulty of enforcing and applying the requirements as a result.

**Motion** to TABLE 903.2.7.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **903.2.9.1- Repair garages, #4**

The committee discussed past Oregon practice with regard to this section, noting that if it is not approved there would be a gap in the code.

**Motion** to approve 903.29.1.

Vote: 5-1; No- McCart

*Motion carried.*

## **SECTION 907- FIRE ALARM AND DETECTION SYSTEMS**

### **907.2.2.1- Group B ambulatory health care facilities**

**Motion** to approve 907.2.2.1.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### *Lunch break*

## **SECTION 915- EMERGENCY RESPONDER RADIO COVERAGE**

Mr. McMullen explained the fire service's position on this requirement, stating that this is something they have been advocating for and there are some exceptions.

The committee discussed their questions and concerns regarding this new requirement, including the cost impact on small business, the applicability to all new buildings, the retroactive provisions, changes to the radio systems, how the radio systems work, and statewide oversight.

Mr. Strauhaul, AIA, noted some concerns relating to cost analysis, asking if a building fails or some component of the building fails and the transponder is somehow a part of the building, will it continue to operate after a failure. He also asked whether the code would require some kind of transponder or device that needs upgrading.

Mr. McMullen explained that the number one reason for firefighter deaths in buildings is the lack of communication available once they enter a building. He noted that the device is based on a radio bandwidth emergency services frequency that is set by the FCC and should not become obsolete.

Chair Dieter proposed deferring a decision on this requirement until after the fire service has made a decision.

Chief Rogers stated that if the committee tables this section, some numbers should be compiled to provide an overview of the costs involved with compliance.

**Motion** to TABLE Section 915.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **SECTION 412- AIRCRAFT-RELATED OCCUPANCIES**

### **412.4.6.1 Hazardous operations**

Mr. McMullen read the language in NFPA 409, explaining that regardless of size the fire sprinkler threshold is zero, and that the fire code provides limitations to cover those items outside that threshold.

**Motion** to approve 412.4.6.1.

*Motion carried unanimously*

## **SECTION 1024- LUMINOUS EGRESS PATH MARKINGS**

Mr. McCart asked if there is a requirement in this section to tactile egress paths, noting that lighted pathways do not help blind individuals. He noted that section 1024.2.3 addresses handrails and the requirement to have a line on them. He explained there are three or four textures for marking different locations and directions, noting that the movement of people in an emergency situation becomes very important, but if the pathway is not textured for accessibility then it may cause a problem. Mr. McCart asked if anyone talked to the federation for the blind about this code requirement.

Vice-chair Lampella indicated that he did not remember any discussion regarding accessibility for these exit enclosures.

The committee discussed cost ramifications associated with this section, as well as how accessibility and a means of egress are addressed in Oregon code.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to TABLE Section 1024 to allow staff to check with the U.S. Access Board to see if the use of tactile warning was considered when adopting this section of code.*

*Committee returned to discussion on 412.4.6.1 (see above)*

## **SECTION 1405- INSTALLATION OF WALL COVERINGS**

Mr. Sumption explained this is a new code section with new requirements.

**Motion** to approve Section 1405.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **SECTION 1609- WIND LOADS**

**1609.6- Alternate all-heights method-** *(see discussion below on chapter 16)*

## **SECTION 1614- STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY**

Chief Rogers indicated that chapter 16 is in need of more review and recommended that the committee may want to table all of chapter 16, including item 1609.6 and section 1614 at this time to allow for further review.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to **TABLE** Chapter 16 (including both 1609.6 and Section 1614) for more review to allow SEAO to provide a recommendation on these new provisions.*

## **SECTION 3007- FIRE SERVICE ACCESS ELEVATORS**

The committee briefly discussed this code provision, asking if BCD's elevator section had an opportunity to review these requirements.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to **TABLE** Section 3007 to allow staff to return and provide a technical update on this section.*

## **SECTION 3008- OCCUPANT EVACUATION ELEVATORS**

The committee noted that this is a significant change to the code. They discussed the emergency recall and self evacuation mode requirements on elevators. They reviewed the reasoning behind the code change at the national level. The committee also discussed existing code requirements related to high rise structures.

Mr. Stauhaul requested the committee table this section until further clarification can be provided regarding the possibility of an overloaded elevator in an emergency situation.

*Without objection, the committee agreed to **TABLE** Section 3008 to allow staff to return and provide a technical update on how the elevator would work.*

## **Review Existing Oregon amendments, beginning with Chapter 2**

The committee agreed that because of the volume of material to review in Chapter 2 and with the limited amount of time scheduled for today's meeting, that this section would wait until the next committee meeting.

Chair Dieter adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.