



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

June 16, 2009

Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee
Tuesday, May 26, 2009
Meeting Minutes

****NOTE:** *The following is 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 site at the following link: <http://www.bcd.oregon.gov/committees/10oss.html>

Members Present: Chair Terrence Dieter, Intel
Vice-chair Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA)
George McCart, Oregon Disabilities Commission
Eric McMullen, Fire Marshal (*arrived at 10:50 a.m.*)
Jim Riemenschneider, Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO)

Members Absent: Andy Dykeman, Lease Crutcher Lewis
John Rakowitz, Associated General Contractors (AGC)
Susan Steward, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)

Guests Present: Anthony Barsotti, Construction Advisory Committee to OR-OSHA (CAC)
Dave Kaiser, CAC
Peter Strauhaul, American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Robin Kerper, Architect
Roger Severson, RSA Consulting
Mike Wheeler, Smoke Guard
James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness
Mike Butler, Interior Technology

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

Chair Dieter called the meeting to order at 9:17 a.m.

Chair Dieter requested a roll call (**Present:** Chair Dieter, Vice-chair Lampella, McCart, Riemenschneider; **Absent:** Dykeman, McMullen, Steward, Rakowitz). After roll call, the chair determined a quorum was not present. The chair, with the agreement of the committee members, decided to proceed with review of code change proposals, but explained the committee will wait until a quorum is present to provide a formal recommendation on specific code sections or proposals.

Review public code change proposals

Code Change Proposal OSSC 10-04

Proponent: Anthony Barsotti for the Construction Advisory Committee to Or-OSHA

Anthony Barsotti, safety representative for Temp-Control Mechanical and member of the Construction Advisory Committee to OR-OSHA, provided [public comment](#) on code amendment proposal [OSSC 10-04](#) relating to reducing rooftop fall exposure.

George McCart asked if the truss manufacturers were consulted in the development of the code amendment proposal.

Mr. Barsotti stated that the truss manufacturers had not been consulted.

Vice-chair Lampella noted that the code typically describes when the code provision is required. He asked several questions including, what triggers the provision. He also asked if the provision applies to a minimum roof slope or if it only applies to flat roofs. Mr. Lampella went on to ask about details of the use of a special inspection and certification. He then explained his concern over using the word “example” in code language, noting that he felt an example does not provide a clear requirement and therefore does not promote strict adherence to the code requirement. He also noted his concern over the proposed 5,000 pound load requirement.

Mr. Barsotti answered Vice-chair Lampella’s questions and noted the proponents may need a bit of help in determining how this would work. He explained that it would definitely apply to new buildings and that the proponents believe that if there is a fall hazard, then it should be addressed regardless of the slope on the roof. He also explained the special inspection process and the use of an authorized inspector.

The committee went on to discuss the various requirements proposed in the code amendment.

Jim Riemenschneider noted that the only way the anchor proposal would work is to have a secondary system. He argued that the use of wood truss systems in particular might be prohibited under the proposed code provision.

Mr. McCart asked what kind of structural implications the proposal would that have on the existing building when performing a retrofit and the kind of cost requirements a builder will run into by applying the code section.

Chair Dieter then asked how the proponents decided to use the 5,000 pound load requirement.

Mr. Barsotti explained that the load requirement is used in the ANSI standard that addresses the design criteria for anchorages. He also noted that OSHA uses this criteria or a safety factor of 2 to 1.

Vice-chair Lampella stated he is concerned about how the provision is included in the code, as well as how building officials and their staff can implement the requirement. He argued that if the code provision is unclear, then it will allow for various interpretations among jurisdictions. He noted that a similar proposal was presented to ICC at the national level and asked Mr. Barsotti what the final recommendations for that proposal were.

Mr. Barsotti answered that the ICC committee's recommendation was that it might be better to work with jurisdictions to find a solution. He noted that the proposal submitted at the national level was not as comprehensive as this version submitted for consideration in Oregon. He further explained that they have a duty to protect the people who are working on a structure. Providing that protection is cheaper at the time of a facility's construction rather than by adding costs when performing a maintenance project.

The committee continued to discuss the specific requirements in the proposal, discussing examples of field experiences.

Mr. Barsotti noted that the practice of installing roof anchors is not an uncommon practice for new construction. He then provided background on past and current methods of fall prevention safety and the impact it has on the load requirements of a structure.

James Bela, president and founder of Oregon Earthquake Awareness, provided public comment noting that there is a chance of people being on roofs during earthquakes, so it would be useful to have some sort of protection. He also noted that the use of "if possible" language in the proposal is too permissive and not definitive enough, explaining someone has to determine if it is possible.

Vice-chair Lampella asked for clarification on the statistic in the proposal that states there have been 784 falls from roofs in the past decade. He asked whether those falls were in commercial buildings only or if they were also counting residential roof falls.

Mr. Barsotti explained that the numbers address commercial structures only and do not address single family dwellings. He also clarified that using permissible language in the proposal is intentional because some building rooftops may be more terraced than others, so some provisions may not be workable in those situations.

Richard Rogers, structural program chief, noted the wood truss issue is a significant issue, and the division tends to guard against implementing code that that will severely impact the construction industry. He noted that the implication on existing buildings is a significant issue that is something that needs to be worked on and brought back to the committee. He also agreed that code is not generally written with permissive language.

Chair Dieter suggested the code proponents work with BCD staff, the wood truss industry, and structural engineers to address these concerns, and then return to the committee with answers and perhaps changes to the proposal.

Health Care

Roger Severson, RSA Consulting, representing the Department of Health Services, provided public comment about health care issues in code. He discussed I occupancy for ambulatory healthcare, explaining that the most recent ICC changed these facilities to B occupancies. He noted that he applauds the national direction to change the occupancy of these facilities, explaining the change enhances the ability to provide 24 hour coverage something outside of a hospital. Mr. Severson also noted a technical change on alarms and sprinklers that would reduce the protection level by eliminating the requirement to install a fire alarm in a sprinkled building. He stated that a simple fix is to eliminate

the exception in that code section. He went on to discuss other areas of the code that address health care.

Chief Rogers noted that the committee could revisit the fire alarm issue raised by Mr. Severson when looking at the existing Oregon amendment.

Mr. Severson also noted a flaw in section 308.3.1, explaining that the language five or fewer under the nursing care heading is different in model code, and can be cleaned up when the committee reviews it.

Break.

Continue review of significant model code changes to the 2009 IBC

Chair Dieter asked staff to review the items tabled at the last meeting.

SECTION 403, HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS

403.3.2 Water supply to required fire pumps

403.4.6 Smoke removal

403.6.1 Fire service access elevator

Mr. Sumption provided updates on the consultation with ICC on code items 403.3.2, 403.4.6, and 403.6.1 relating to high rise structures. He explained that the requirements in these sections would apply to all high-rises 75 feet or greater unless the code section specifically addresses that it only applies to something different, such as a super high-rise.

Eric McMullen arrived at 10:50 a.m.

The committee discussed whether the requirements in section 403.6.1 meant that multiple elevators were needed in order to meet the requirement and to work with the logistics of a super high-rise structure.

Mike Wheeler, Smoke Guard Corporation, noted that he believed the intent of the section is strictly dedicated to the whole height of the building.

Chair Dieter recognized Eric McMullen's arrival and indicated that a quorum was present.

Motion to approve items 403.3.2, 403.4.6, and 403.6.1.

Motion carried unanimously.

Fire Service recommendations on tabled items

Mr. McMullen reviewed the code sections of concern to the fire service and the results of discussion at the fire code committee.

SECTION 419, LIVE/WORK UNITS

Mr. McMullen explained the fire code committee recommended leaving the language as proposed in Section 419. He noted that the remaining issue is the intent and interpretation of the scope of the NFPA standard.

SECTION 915, EMERGENCY RESPONDER RADIO COVERAGE

Mr. McMullen went on to explain that the fire code committee had some strong feelings that Section 915 is needed, but still needs some work. As a result, they developed a subcommittee to review the language to make it more suitable for Oregon. Mr. McMullen asked that the OSSC committee hold off on making a decision on this section to allow the fire code subcommittee to provide a recommendation at an upcoming meeting.

The committee discussed this code section and the process surrounding a recommendation from the fire code subcommittee.

Mr. Rogers noted that because the recommended change from the subcommittee is not in the form of a proposal and since the submission deadline has passed, accepting the change may be outside the code change process, so it may be more appropriate to submit as a mid-cycle code amendment.

Mr. McMullen stated since that is the case, he would suggest deleting this language and addressing it at mid-cycle, because as it stands the section is problematic. He also provided some background on the fire code adoption process.

Mr. Bela noted his concern with weakening the model code language on a fire and life safety issue.

The committee continued to discuss options to address this code section and make it less problematic for the fire service.

Chief Rogers suggested that the committee could keep the section tabled for now.

*The committee agreed to leave Section 915 **tabled** until the June 25th meeting, allowing the fire service to go through their committee process and provide a recommendation.*

SECTION 3008, OCCUPANT EVACUATION ELEVATORS

Mr. McMullen continued to discuss the recommendations from the fire code committee. He explained they had no recommendation for Section 3008.

SECTION 903, AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS

903.2.7, Group M (item #4)

Mr. McMullen stated that because of the ambiguities in the code language, the fire code committee voted unanimously to delete item #4 in Section 903.2.7 relating to Group M occupancies used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture. He went on to explain that the fire code committee had a thorough discussion and was unable to come up with a suitable solution other than deleting item #4. As a result, they established a fire code subcommittee to address the issue and prepare a mid-cycle code amendment for consideration.

Mr. McCart noted a code change proposal was submitted that deals with this section: [OSSC 10-07](#).

Mr. Lampella temporarily removed himself as vice-chair of the committee to provide public comment on this code change proposal, which was submitted by Mr. Lampella on behalf of Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA).

Code Amendment Proposal OSSC 10-07

Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association

Gary Lampella, Building Official with the City of Redmond, explained code amendment proposal [OSSC 10-07](#), which quantifies that a Group M occupancy with upholstered furniture would only be subject to the code requirement if the space exceeds 2,500 square feet. He explained that similar space limits are currently placed on woodworking areas and high piled storage facilities.

Mr. McMullen explained that even with the proposed changes, the proposal still raises the same issues that are of concern to the fire service.

Gary returned to his position as vice-chair.

Mr. McMullen argued that poorly written code causes problems and the fire service fears that this code section would cause more problems than it solves.

Peter Strauhaul, American Institute of Architects (AIA), provided public comment recommending code language for a mid-cycle amendment.

Motion to approve Sections 3007 and 3008 to correlate with the approval of 403.6.1.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to delete new model code language in 903.2.7 item #4.

Motion carried unanimously.

SECTION 419, LIVE/WORK UNITS

Mr. Sumption provided information on Chapter 11 relating to Section 419, explaining the language was taken out of the IBC and would be inserted into Section 1110.1 item #5 and Section 1106.1.10.1.

Chief Rogers expressed concerns that the model code language may conflict with the Fair Housing Act. He noted that this code section should be tabled to allow for more research.

*The committee agreed to **table** this section and address it at a future meeting, allowing staff to do some more research.*

SECTION 1024, LUMINOUS EGRESS PATH MARKING

Mr. McCart asked for a follow up on Section 1024, asking if staff had an opportunity to contact the Access Board to discover their involvement in the development of this new code section.

Mr. Sumption explained that he checked with the board and since the egress requirements were not increased, Braille was not specifically addressed because there are other existing requirements that provide for accessible egress. He noted that this section was intended to address lighted egress for sighted people.

Mr. McCart argued that Braille is not the issue, but that a lighted egress does not assist a blind individual and texture would be beneficial to assist the blind in a building evacuation.

Vice-chair Lampella clarified that the section's intent is to provide a lighted exit for sighted individuals when the lights go out.

Motion by Mr. McCart to approve Section 1024.

Motion carried unanimously.

SECTION 1609, WIND LOADS

1609.6 Alternate all-heights method and SECTION 1614, STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

The committee asked for an update on Sections 1609.6 and 1614.

Chief Rogers noted the division just received the additional information and it needs to be reviewed further before providing the committee with an update.

*The committee agreed to leave Sections 1609.6 and 1614 **tabled** to provide more time to review the technical information provided to the division by SEAO.*

*Gary Lampella **withdrew** code change proposal **OSSC 10-07**.*

Lunch break.

Review editorial and non-substantive model code changes

CHAPTER 1, ADMINISTRATION

Motion to TABLE Chapter 1 to allow BCD to coordinate the administrative chapter among the various specialty codes.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 2, DEFINITIONS

The committee and staff discussed the process for reviewing the editorial and non-substantive changes.

Motion to approve the editorial and non-substantive changes in Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10

Discussion on the motion-

The committee agreed to review the code on a chapter-by-chapter basis, rather than perform a sweeping motion to approve the chapters.

Mr. Sumption briefly reviewed Chapters 2 through 10 with the committee, noting the more significant of the editorial and non-substantive changes. He did not review the significant changes already discussed by the committee.

CHAPTER 3, USE AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Sumption reviewed the occupancy changes in model code.

CHAPTER 4, SPECIAL DETAILED REQUIREMENTS BASED ON USE AND OCCUPANCY

Mr. Sumption noted that a few definitions were added to this chapter. He explained that a lot of the black bars indicating changes are actually formatting changes, such as italicizing defined terms.

SECTION 406, MOTOR-VEHICLE-RELATED OCCUPANCIES

406.2.4 Vehicle barrier systems

Mr. Sumption noted the change in the height requirement from 2 feet to 2 feet 9 inches.

SECTION 408, GROUP I-3

Chief Rogers explained that Section 408 has been heavily amended by Oregon in past code cycles. Model code was amended, and now includes some changes typically made in Oregon. Because of the changes, the Department of Corrections (DOC) is currently reviewing this section. He explained that recommendations will be brought forward to the committee after the review, noting that the committee should wait to adopt this specific section until that time.

The committee agreed to wait to make a decision on this section until DOC provides a recommendation to the division.

SECTION 411, SPECIAL AMUSEMENT BUILDINGS

411.7.1 Photo luminescent exit signs

Mr. Sumption noted this is a new section.

SECTION 414, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

414.5.4 Standby or emergency power

Mr. Sumption noted exceptions 1 and 4 were added.

SECTION 422, AMBULATORY HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

and SECTION 423, STORM SHELTERS

Mr. Sumption noted that model code now aligns with some existing Oregon amendments, and as a result of the committee's recommendation for adopting these new model code provisions, some existing Oregon amendments in Chapter 4 can now be eliminated.

CHAPTER 5, GENERAL BUILDING HEIGHTS AND AREAS

SECTION 503, GENERAL BUILDING HEIGHT AND AREA LIMITATIONS

Table 503, Allowable Building Heights and Areas

Mr. Sumption noted the only change was a reduction in the allowable stories.

SECTION 506, BUILDING AREA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Sumption explained that although it looks like there were significant changes to this section, the section was reorganized and terms were italicized, noting that the fundamental provisions and requirements in this section have not changed.

SECTION 508, MIXED USE AND OCCUPANCY

Mr. Sumption noted section 508 has been entirely reorganized.

Table 508.2.5, Incidental Accessory Occupancies

Mr. McMullen noted that in previous code cycles this section conflicted with the fire code. He explained the Oregon fire code has a specific amendment for recycling facilities, whereas this table only denotes a waste area, which is different. He explained the conflict was discovered during the mid-

cycle process because different jurisdictions were applying the codes differently. He noted that he would check with the fire service because this may be better addressed in the fire code.

Mr. Sumption noted the last two items on this table relating to fire pumps in high-rise and non-high-rise buildings were added.

SECTION 509, SPECIAL PROVISIONS

509.5 Group R-1 and R-2 buildings of type IIIA construction

Mr. Sumption noted this provision existed in past code cycles, however it now includes R-1 occupancies where previously it was only R-2 occupancies that met the criteria.

509.9 Multiple buildings above group S-2 parking garages

Mr. Sumption noted this is new language, although past codes had similar requirements such as in 509.8.

Vice-chair Lampella clarified that 509.8 applies to one building whereas 509.9 applies to multiple building fire walls.

CHAPTER 6, TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION

SECTION 601, GENERAL

Table 601 Fire-Resistance Rating Requirements for Building Elements

Mr. Sumption noted the table now includes items that were footnotes in previous code cycles.

SECTION 603, COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL IN TYPE I AND II CONSTRUCTION

603.1 Allowable materials

Mr. Sumption noted a minor change in exception 25 relating to type I-A construction in this section.

CHAPTER 7, FIRE AND SMOKE PROTECTION FEATURES

Mr. Sumption noted there are a lot of black bars in Chapter 7 because they added a new testing standard, UL 263, in addition to ASTM E 119.

SECTION 705, EXTERIOR WALLS

705.2 Projections

Vice-chair Lampella explained this section is still flawed. He has been working with individuals to find a resolution to this code section at both the national and state levels. He explained that this section is an old UBC provision that was applied to an IBC provision, however, they are two different code philosophies. He noted that number 2 contains the fatal flaw.

SECTION 704, FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING OF STRUCTURAL MEMBERS

704.13 Sprayed fire resistant materials (SFRM)

Mr. Sumption noted there is some new language in this section, which is a good fix in the model code.

SECTION 706, FIRE WALLS

Table 706.4 Fire wall fire-resistance rating

Mr. Sumption noted model code clarified the table, which now denotes how to better apply the rating.

SECTION 708, SHAFT ENCLOSURES

708.2 Shaft enclosure required

Mr. Sumption noted exceptions 13, 14, and 15 are new and have been added to this code section.

708.14.2.6 Activation of pressurization system

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

708.14.2.7 Special inspection

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

708.14.2.8 Marking and identification

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

708.14.2.9 Control diagrams

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

708.14.2.10 Control panel

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

708.14.2.11 System response time

Mr. Sumption noted this language was relocated from Chapter 9 to this section.

SECTION 712, HORIZONTAL ASSEMBLIES

712.3.3 Unusable space

Mr. Sumption noted this was an existing requirement relating to ceiling panels. While no requirements changed, many of the section titles in this Chapter have changed.

SECTION 715, OPENING PROTECTIVES

Table 715.5 Fire Window Assembly Fire Protection Ratings

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of a value for fire partitions with a defined 20-minute fire window assembly. Previously, the provision did not define what needed to happen in the half hour assembly rating.

SECTION 716, DUCTS AND AIR TRANSFER OPENINGS

716.5.3 Shaft enclosures

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of exception 5.

SECTION 719, THERMAL- AND SOUND-INSULATING MATERIALS

719.1 General

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of exception 4.

CHAPTER 8, INTERIOR FINISHES

SECTION 803, WALL AND CEILING FINISHES

Mr. Sumption noted that a lot of this section was relocated and renumbered from previous editions.

SECTION 806, DECORATIVE MATERIALS AND TRIM

806.1.2 Combustible decorative materials

Mr. Sumption noted this section was clarified to specify the use of NFPA 701 to reach the 10 percent requirement of a specific wall or ceiling area.

CHAPTER 9, FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS

SECTION 902, DEFINITIONS

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the last sentence to the definition of fire area, which clarifies the intent.

SECTION 906, PORTABLE FIRE EXTINGUISHERS and SECTION 907, FIRE ALARM AND DETECTION SYSTEMS

Mr. Sumption noted these sections came over from the fire code.

Mr. McMullen clarified that the provisions have not changed during the transition from the fire code to its inclusion in the building code. He noted however that the maintenance requirements are included in these sections.

907.3.2 Delayed egress locks

Mr. Sumption noted this is new language and includes an option provided in Chapter 10.

906.2 General requirements

Chief Rogers pointed out this section includes maintenance requirements such as thirty day inspections and inspection logs. He explained general practice is to try to keep maintenance out of the code and BCD may want to take a closer look at Section 906.

Vice-chair Lampella explained the intent of OBOA when discussing this at the national level was to include these provisions in the building code while eliminating the maintenance provisions.

906.1 Where required

Mr. McMullen noted there is some clean up that is needed in this section to make it clear that the requirements only apply to new construction, such as changing “fire code official” to “building official.”

The committee agreed BCD staff should review this section and report back on how to clean up the code section and address these concerns.

Mr. Sumption explained that the division will work closely with the State Fire Marshal to address these issues and align the two codes as closely as possible.

SECTION 910, SMOKE AND HEAT VENTS

Table 910.3, Requirements for Draft Curtains and Smoke and Heat Vents

Mr. Sumption noted a minor modification to footnote A that changed the wording from “Chapter 23 of the fire code” to simply “Chapter 23”, which is the wood chapter in the building code.

Mr. McMullen noted this table came over from the fire code, so the reference to the fire code was not needed, however it should be noted in the building code.

SECTION 911, FIRE COMMAND CENTER

911.1.3 Size

Mr. Sumption noted a minor change to the size, which increased from 96 by 8 to 200 by 10.

SECTION 913, FIRE PUMPS

and SECTION 914, EMERGENCY RESPONDER SAFETY FEATURES

Mr. Sumption noted these sections are part of the fire code and are just reproduced here for reference.

CHAPTER 10, MEANS OF EGRESS

SECTION 1002, DEFINITIONS

Mr. Sumption noted the definition of bleachers was changed a bit and broken up into two sections: “bleachers” and “grandstands.”

SECTION 1005, EGRESS WIDTH

1005.2 Door encroachment

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the last sentence in this section relating to nonstructural projections.

1005.3 Door hardware encroachment

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this section which provides specific requirements for door hardware.

SECTION 1007, ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS

Mr. Sumption noted this section is deleted in Oregon and replaced by an Oregon amendment.

SECTION 1008, DOORS, GATES AND TURNSTILES

1008.1.4.4 Access-controlled egress doors

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of I-2 occupancies in this section.

1008.1.9.4 Bolt locks

Mr. Sumption noted exceptions 3, 4, and 5 have been added to this section.

1008.1.9.5.1 Closet and bathroom doors in Group R occupancies

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this new code requirement.

1008.1.9.8 Electromagnetically locked egress doors

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this code section.

Mr. McMullen noted the section was updated to reflect practice and does not require the installation of heat sensors on the doors.

1008.1.9.9 Locking arrangements in correctional facilities

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this code section and explained it may be amended pending the result of section 408 recommendations from the Department of Corrections.

1008.1.10.1 Installation

Mr. Sumption noted the changes in the listings in items 1 and 2 of this subsection.

Chair Dieter noted that there is a motion on the floor and the committee will be losing its quorum. He explained that reviewing the chapters has been helpful and would like to continue reviewing the code in that manner. He stated he will accept an amended motion.

AMENDED MOTION to approve Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 and table Sections 408, 508.2.5, 705.2, and 906.

Motion carried unanimously.

Eric McMullen left at 2:16 p.m.

The committee agreed to continue review of the editorial and non-substantive changes at the next committee meeting and adjourn the meeting for the day.

Review Existing Oregon amendments, beginning with Chapter 2

This agenda item was not heard.

Chair Dieter adjourned the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

Note: *The below list is provided for the reader's reference and contains frequently used acronyms found in the meeting summary.*

Frequently Used Acronyms:

ANSI American National Standards Institute
ASTM American Society for Testing and Materials
BCD Building Codes Division
IBC International Building Code
ICC International Code Council
NFPA National Fire Protection Association

OBOA Oregon Building Officials Association
OR-OSHA Oregon Occupational Safety and Health
Division
OSSC Oregon Structural Specialty Code
SEAO Structural Engineers Association of Oregon
UBC Uniform Building Code
UL Underwriters Laboratories