



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 26, 2009

***Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee
Wednesday, June 10, 2009
Meeting Summary***

****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 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)
George McCart, Oregon Disabilities Commission
Jim Riemenschneider, Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO)

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

Guests Present: Robert Rice, Josephine County
Gene Durnin, Northwest Automatic Fire Alarm Association (NWAFAA)
James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness

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

Chair Dieter called the meeting to order at 9:13 a.m.

Jim Hanson, policy analyst, explained that a quorum is not required for an advisory committee such as this that reports to a board, meaning the committee may proceed without a quorum and continue reviewing the code and providing recommendations.

Continue review of editorial and non-substantive model code changes beginning with Chapter 10

The committee agreed it was helpful to review the changes on a chapter-by-chapter basis, and elected to continue reviewing the code in that manner.

CHAPTER 10, MEANS OF EGRESS

Motion to approve Chapter 10.

Discussion on the motion:

George McCart clarified that the division will be removing all of Section 1007, *Accessible Means of Egress*.

Shane Sumption, fire and life safety code specialist, confirmed that Section 1007 is an existing Oregon amendment that will be carried forward, so the model code will not be used.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 11, ACCESSIBILITY

Mr. Sumption explained that until a new standard is adopted at the federal level, the existing Oregon amendments from the previous code cycle will be brought forward and model code Chapter 11 will be replaced in its entirety.

(The committee's motion on Chapter 11 can be found on page 16.)

CHAPTER 12, INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT

SECTION 1202, DEFINITIONS

Sunroom- Mr. Sumption noted the addition of a definition for a sunroom.

SECTION 1203, VENTILATION

1203.2 Attic spaces

Mr. Sumption noted the ventilation rate changed from $\frac{1}{150}$ to $\frac{1}{300}$. The $\frac{1}{300}$ ventilation rate was previously an exception when openings were split between the eave and the upper portion of the roof, but is now required by the code.

SECTION 1207, SOUND TRANSMISSION

1207.2.1 Masonry

Mr. Sumption noted this section was added to include a sound transmission class for masonry construction.

SECTION 1210, SURROUNDING MATERIALS

1210.1 Floors and wall base finish materials

Mr. Sumption noted the upward extension of the base molding was reduced from 6 inches to 4 inches.

Motion to approve Chapter 12.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 13, ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. Sumption explained the [Oregon Commercial Energy Conservation Advisory Committee](#) (OCEC) is reviewing this chapter of the structural code and will be providing a recommendation to the board.

(The committee's motion on Chapter 13 can be found on page 16.)

CHAPTER 14, EXTERIOR WALLS

SECTION 1405, INSTALLATION OF WALL COVERINGS

Mr. Sumption reminded the committee this section contained substantial changes that were discussed at the [May 26, 2009](#) committee meeting.

1405.14 Vinyl siding

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this section to the model code.

The committee talked about the specific ASTM standard referenced in this section.

1405.16.1 Panel siding and 1405.16.2 Lap siding

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of Sections 1405.16.1 and 1405.16.2, which contain specific ASTM standards requirements. The ASTM standard added is one that industry is already accustomed to using: ASTM C 1186, Type A.

SECTION 1406, COMBUSTIBLE MATERIALS ON THE EXTERIOR SIDE OF EXTERIOR WALLS

1406.2.2 Type I, II, III and IV construction

Mr. Sumption noted this section was reorganized into subsections, but contains no new information and the code requirements were not changed.

SECTION 1408, EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS)

Mr. Sumption noted this section is new and was added to the model code with definitions for EIFS, both with and without drainage. He explained the model code does not conflict with existing Oregon requirements on EIFS, but rather it better aligns the requirements between model code and Oregon's limited EIFS plan.

Motion to approve Chapter 14.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 15, ROOF ASSEMBLIES AND ROOFTOP STRUCTURES

SECTION 1502, DEFINITIONS

Ballast- Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the definition of a "ballast."

Roof assembly- Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the definition of a "roof assembly."

SECTION 1503, WEATHER PROTECTION

1503.4.1 Secondary drainage required and 1503.4.2 Scuppers

Mr. Sumption noted Sections 1503.4.1 and 1503.4.2 were added to the model code. He explained these provisions will be deleted if the existing Oregon amendment is brought forward to this code cycle.

Vice-chair Lampella noted the Oregon Plumbing Specialty Code (OPSC) has the exact language that covers this area, so even with an Oregon amendment the requirements are covered in Oregon code.

1503.6 Crickets and saddles

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this section to the model code.

SECTION 1505, FIRE CLASSIFICATION

Table 1505.1 Minimum Roof Covering Classification for Types of Construction

Mr. McCart asked if this table contains the same requirements as the existing wild fire code or if this is something new to model code.

Mr. Sumption noted Oregon deleted the references to the footnote covering the wild fire code by adding a line in the code during the last code cycle.

Richard Rogers, structural program chief, explained there are special maps that must be adopted under the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code, so this code section is really a tool for local jurisdictions.

SECTION 1507, REQUIREMENT FOR ROOF COVERINGS

Table 1507.2.7.1(1) Classification of Asphalt Roof Shingles per ASTM D 7158

Mr. Sumption noted this is a new table included in the model code.

Table 1507.2.7.1(2) Classification of Asphalt Shingles per ASTM D 3161

Mr. Sumption noted this is a new table included in the model code.

1507.2.9.2 Valleys

Mr. Sumption noted a change to valley linings in item #1 where the requirement changed from 16 inches to wide to 24 inches wide.

1507.5 Metal roof shingles

Mr. Sumption noted the ice barrier requirements were added to this section.

1507.6 Mineral-surfaced roll roofing

Mr. Sumption noted the ice barrier requirements were added to this section.

1507.7 Slate shingles

Mr. Sumption noted the ice barrier requirements were added to this section.

1507.8 Wood shingles

Mr. Sumption noted the ice barrier requirements were added to this section.

1507.9 Wood shakes

Mr. Sumption noted the ice barrier requirements were added to this section.

1507.16 Roof gardens and landscaped roofs

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of this section that deals with roof gardens and landscape roofs. He explained it refers back to Chapter 16 for determining load requirements.

SECTION 1509, ROOFTOP STRUCTURES

1509.2 Penthouses

Mr. Sumption noted this section was reorganized and broken down into subsections, but the content and its requirements did not change.

1509.2.4 Type of construction

Mr. Sumption noted the new language was added under the type of construction heading and includes exceptions 4 and 5. Both of the new exceptions deal with Type I construction and allow unprotected construction with a minimum separation of 20 feet.

1509.5.1 Noncombustible construction required

Mr. Sumption noted a minor change to the language in this section, where the height allowance provision used to read “more than 50 feet in height” now reads “more than 50 feet in *building* height.”

Motion to approve Chapter 15.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 16, STRUCTURAL DESIGN

Mr. Sumption asked committee member Jim Riemenschneider from SEAO to review the next few chapters and highlight the changes for the committee. He noted some of the provisions in model code may be changed or may not apply in Oregon if the committee decides to bring forward the provisions from existing Oregon amendments.

SECTION 1604, GENERAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

1604.8 Anchorage

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the section now defines minimal spacing for real engineering in masonry and concrete walls.

1604.10 Wind and seismic detailing

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this section deals with lateral force resisting systems controlled by wind and requires structural system details in line with model code and ASCE 7, noting that will be a change for many projects.

SECTION 1607, LIVE LOADS

Table 1607.1 Minimum Uniformly Distributed Live Loads L_0 , and Minimum Concentrated Live Loads

Mr. Riemenschneider noted an interesting change to item 29 in the table, which was changed to reflect the common practice of using a 300 lb. concentrated load requirement for a minimum point load on truss members.

SECTION 1609, WIND LOADS

1609.6 Alternate all-heights method

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the alternate wind design provisions of this section are pretty comprehensive, are all-inclusive, and are simplifications of the ASCE 7 Method 2 Analytical Procedure. He explained the current OSSC has references to the 1998 OSSC for simplified wind load designed by the UBC standard, noting he is unsure how that will carry over to this code cycle. He explained these new requirements are a simplified method.

Mr. Sumption noted that one of the code amendment proposals submitted for consideration by the committee suggests deleting the existing Oregon amendment. He explained a few code amendment proposals will also be coming from the division.

James Bela, president and founder of Oregon Earthquake Awareness, testified that statute says the state will adopt current standards, noting that since the 1998 standard is not readily available, he encourages the committee to adopt modern methods and modern codes.

SECTION 1614, STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this is a new section for high-rises in seismic occupancy category 3 or 4, which sets stabilizing minimums based on existing design philosophies.

SECTION 1612, FLOOD LOADS

1612.3 Establishment of flood hazard

Mr. McCart asked if the model code's change to using the new FIRM study in this section requires all local jurisdictions to adopt it rather than continuing to use the old FEMA study. He explained that requiring local jurisdictions to adopt the new study would mean the jurisdiction would also have to purchase the study and make it available to the public, which is a heavy cost requirement on the jurisdiction.

Mr. Sumption explained the division will add an Oregon amendment to the code that allows the jurisdiction to decide whether or not to adopt the new study.

Mr. Riemenschneider stated he was unsure of the desired direction for adopting wind design and snow load requirements, noting current code typically refers to the 1971 data.

Mr. Sumption noted a code amendment proposal was submitted that suggests updating the snow load requirements based on the new maps.

Mr. Bela stated he is always uncomfortable with decreasing the minimum snow load requirements, noting he would like to see the 25 pound per square foot load requirement reinstated. He argued that it

is not always clear in code that the snow load requirements pertain to the actual physical conditions of the snow and with climate change, the annual snow loads are changing. Mr. Bela also noted that he does not believe any money is being saved by reducing the snow load requirement.

Mr. Riemenschneider indicated his agreement with the 25 pound per square foot requirement, noting that SEAO submitted two code amendment proposals ([OSSC 10-14](#) and [OSSC 10-16](#)) for Chapter 16 that would require a minimum of 20 pounds per square foot load requirements for snow.

Chair Dieter clarified the committee will have an opportunity at a future meeting to discuss such changes, however a motion is needed to approve the non-substantive and editorial changes currently under consideration.

Motion to approve Chapter 16.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 17, STRUCTURAL TESTS AND SPECIAL INSPECTION

SECTION 1704, SPECIAL INSPECTIONS

1704.4 Concrete construction

Vice-chair Lampella asked whether exception 2 was new or existing, noting this provision highlights an ambiguity that exists in practicing engineering or architecture in this state.

Mr. Sumption explained exception 2 is existing language and was not changed in this code cycle.

Table 1704.4 Required Verification and Inspection of Concrete Construction

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this chapter has a lot of updates and maintenance; however this table was a hot topic during the national code development process. He explained the table now lumps inspections together and requires them to be performed on a periodic basis.

1704.5 Masonry construction

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this section was changed in its entirety.

1704.12 Sprayed fire-resistant materials

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this section is new and has some extensive changes.

The committee agreed it would be helpful to table the chapter to allow for further review.

Mr. McCart provided some background on the changes to this section, explaining the requirements came from the California resistance system and is being incorporated into the ICC code with the inclusion of special inspections.

Motion to TABLE Chapter 17.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 18, SOILS AND FOUNDATIONS

Motion to approve Chapter 18.

Discussion on the motion...

Mr. Sumption explained this chapter does not have black marks indicating specific changes because it was revised in its entirety and reorganized. He suggested tabling the chapter to allow for more review.

Mr. Bela commented that the committee should make sure isolated footings were not overlooked.

Chair Dieter asked if there was a previous problem with the use of Chapter 18 for them to make such a drastic change and reorganization.

Mr. McCart explained that such drastic changes are typically done for usability, to make the code more user-friendly.

Motion to approve Chapter 18 **withdrawn**.

Motion to TABLE Chapter 18.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 19, CONCRETE

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the changes in this chapter were done to align with the ACI 318 standard and as a result, a lot of terms were changed to make them similar among the national standards.

Motion to approve Chapter 19.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 20, ALUMINUM

Motion to approve Chapter 20.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 21, MASONRY

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the primary change to this chapter was updating it to the ACI standard.

SECTION 2109, EMPIRICAL DESIGN OF MASONRY

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this is a new section or was rewritten in its entirety, but the language is modernized to reflect current practices in industry. He also noted that a few code amendment proposals were submitted for the committee's consideration relating to this chapter.

Motion to approve Chapter 21.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 22, STEEL

Mr. Riemenschneider noted this chapter has been modernized to reflect current industry practices and updates provisions to the AISC standard.

Motion to approve Chapter 22.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 23, WOOD

SECTION 2308, CONVENTIONAL LIGHT-FRAME CONSTRUCTION

2308.6 Foundation plates or sills

Mr. Riemenschneider noted that although this is an ever-changing issue, the changes to this section were minor.

SECTION 2306, ALLOWABLE STRESS DESIGN

Table 2306.2.1, Allowable Shear (pounds per foot) for Wood Structural Panel Diaphragms with Framing of Douglas Fir-larch, or Southern Pine for Wind or Seismic Loading

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the table now includes a graphic, depicting nailing, which is very helpful. He explained this section primarily contains a lot of updates.

SECTION 2304, GENERAL CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Riemenschneider pointed out this section relates to braced walls, noting the changes made parallel those being made to the residential code.

Motion to approve Chapter 23.

Discussion on the motion...

Mr. Bela recommended the foundation seal anchorage requirements included in ACI 318 appendix D, should get included in the code.

Motion carried unanimously.

Break.

CHAPTER 24, GLASS AND GLAZING

SECTION 2406, SAFETY GLAZING

2406.3.1 Multi-pane assemblies

Mr. Sumption noted additional pane identification standards were included in this code section, allowing the use of the CPSC 16 CFR 1201 or ANSI Z 97.1 standards.

SECTION 2409, GLASS IN ELEVATOR HOISTWAYS AND ELEVATOR CARS

Mr. Sumption noted this is a new section and there are no conflicts with Oregon codes.

Motion to approve Chapter 24.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 25, GYPSUM BOARD AND PLASTER

SECTION 2506, GYPSUM BOARD MATERIALS

Table 2506 Gypsum Board Materials and Accessories

Mr. Sumption noted the standard ASTM C 920 was added to this table as an option.

SECTION 2509, GYPSUM BOARD IN SHOWERS AND WATER CLOSETS

2509.2 Base for tile

Mr. Sumption noted the standard ASTM C 1325 was added as an option.

Motion to approve Chapter 25.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 26, PLASTIC

SECTION 2602, DEFINITIONS

Fiber reinforced polymer- Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the definition of a “fiber reinforced polymer,” which had not been addressed in previous codes.

Fiberglass reinforced polymer- Mr. Sumption noted the addition of the definition of a “fiberglass reinforced polymer,” which had not been addressed in previous codes.

Motion to approve Chapter 26.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 27, ELECTRICAL

Mr. Sumption noted an Oregon amendment is needed for this section to change the reference from NFPA 70 to the OESC.

Motion to approve Chapter 27.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 28, MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

Motion to approve Chapter 28.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 29, PLUMBING SYSTEMS

Vice-chair Lampella asked about the existing Oregon amendment for this section.

Mr. Sumption explained there is an existing Oregon amendment for this section that replaces it in its entirety that can be brought forward to this code cycle.

Motion to TABLE Chapter 29.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 30, ELEVATORS AND CONVEYING SYSTEMS

Mr. McCart asked if the elevator section at BCD had an opportunity to review these provisions for consistency.

Mr. Sumption stated the elevator section had reviewed this chapter.

Motion to approve Chapter 30.

Motion carried unanimously.

(The committee heard testimony from the proponent of code amendment proposal OSSC 10-44. See discussion below.)

Review public code change proposals

[Code Amendment Proposal- #OSSC 10-44](#)

Robert Rice, representing Josephine County Building Safety and Southern Oregon Chapter International Code Council, provided public comment on code proposal #OSSC 10-44. He explained a similar proposal was adopted in the OSSC as an Oregon amendment last cycle. This proposal is an approved concept that is similar to the provisions adopted as part of the 2009 IRC and does not add requirements to the code, just merely clarifies existing requirements. He noted some changes have been made to the proposal since it was submitted to the division for the committee's consideration, explaining the intent is to come back with a modified proposal for the committee to review.

The committee asked about the process for a modified code amendment proposal.

Mr. Sumption explained since the code proposal has already been submitted, the committee can take into consideration the proponent's suggested changes to their proposal, and, if the committee agrees, can make a motion to approve the proposal as modified.

Mr. McCart asked Mr. Rice if the proposal included a requirement for nailing going into a bearing block.

Mr. Rice explained that with this proposal the trusses are trapped in between the rafters.

Mr. Riemenschneider noted his concern is with the cantilevers and the wind speed force without a direct diaphragm. He explained that the IBC and IRC were not in agreement on the braced wall requirements, asking how this fits into those differences between the code organizations.

Mr. Rice noted the seismic category and wind criteria provisions were split into two sections in the last code cycle and this proposal should not be in conflict with those requirements.

The committee continued to discuss the specifics of the code proposal.

Chair Dieter asked Mr. Rice to return to BCD between now and the committee's next meeting with a slightly modified amendment, working to align it with ICC. The committee will re-review this proposal at its next meeting.

Mr. Bela noted that because of the presence of damaging earthquakes in seismic category C, he opposes the exception in OSSC 10-44, explaining he would like to see it attached to the wall lining, not just the load resisting elements and that he would also like to see the cost data associated with this proposal.

Other code amendment proposals

The committee agreed to defer reviewing the remaining code amendment proposals to allow the proponents to attend future meetings and speak on behalf of their proposals.

(The committee returned to discussing the editorial and non-substantive model code changes, resuming with Chapter 31. See discussion below)

Continue review of editorial and non-substantive model code changes beginning with Chapter 10 – *continued*

CHAPTER 31, SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION

SECTION 3105, AWNINGS AND CANOPIES

3105.4 Canopy materials

Mr. Sumption noted the addition of standard UL 723 as an optional standard for testing canopy materials and products.

SECTION 3109, SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES AND SAFETY DEVICES

Mr. Sumption noted the provisions in this section are covered under the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), so this section will be deleted from the structural code.

SECTION 3110, AUTOMATIC VEHICULAR GATES

Mr. Sumption noted this is a new section that also includes some new national standards.

Motion to approve Chapter 31.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 32, ENCROACHMENTS INTO THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mr. McCart asked if approving this chapter will remove the 1991 Oregon interpretive rulings relating to public right-of-way.

Chief Rogers explained these are not interpretive rulings but rather, authorized local amendments that will remain available to the jurisdictions that have them and approving this chapter will not impact those local amendments.

Motion to approve Chapter 32.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 33, SAFEGUARDS DURING CONSTRUCTION

Motion to approve Chapter 33.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 34, EXISTING STRUCTURES

Mr. McCart noted the maintenance requirements need to be removed from this chapter if the committee approves it for inclusion in the code.

Chief Rogers explained a lot of the requirements in this section are trumped by Oregon statute. He noted the committee will have an opportunity to review the changes to this chapter more thoroughly when the committee begins the review of existing Oregon amendments. Chief Rogers stated the division's recommendation will likely be to continue to maintain the provisions in Chapter 34 and keep the International Existing Building Code (IEBC) as an alternate method, with Oregon amendments. No one on the west coast has adopted the IEBC without amending the seismic provisions because the existing IEBC requirements do not work for these high seismic areas. He explained that when the committee reviews the existing alternate method, they will have an opportunity to look at appropriate amendments for both the alternate method and Chapter 34.

SECTION 3404, ALTERATIONS

Chief Rogers noted this section will likely be modified.

Motion to approve Chapter 34.

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 35, REFERENCED STANDARDS

Motion to approve Chapter 35.

Discussion on the motion...

Mr. Sumption noted a problem in this section, explaining NFPA 110 was updated to the 2005 standard in model code. He explained the 2002 version of the NFPA 110 standard had some additional language that allowed discretion when applying the 96 hour backup fuel supply for onsite emergency generators, language that was eliminated in the new standard. This is problematic because it requires a facility to have a large amount of backup fuel supply on hand in all cases. For example, a mixed-use building that does not warrant that much reserve would be required to have nearly 950 gallons of fuel on site for their generator as a backup supply. The concern is that such a requirement may drive people away from a better alternative for back-up power. Mr. Sumption stated this requirement needs to be fixed and noted he is working with the State Fire Marshal's office (OSFM).

AMENDED Motion to approve Chapter 35 with the exception of NFPA 110-05.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX A, EMPLOYEE QUALIFICATIONS and APPENDIX B, BOARD OF APPEALS

Mr. McCart noted that Oregon statute covers the requirements contained in Appendix A and Appendix B, so it trumps the code.

Motion to disapprove Appendix A and Appendix B.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX C, GROUP U – AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS

Mr. McCart asked if this appendix is moot because Oregon has statutes that relate to agricultural buildings and provides exemptions.

Chief Rogers explained Appendix C regulates agricultural buildings that do not qualify for an “exemption” under ORS 455.315. He noted both ORS 455.315 and Appendix C are necessary.

Motion to approve Appendix C.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX D, FIRE DISTRICTS

APPENDIX E, SUPPLEMENTARY ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

and APPENDIX F, RODENT PROOFING

Mr. Sumption explained Appendices D, E, and F are not adopted by the state of Oregon.

Motion to disapprove Appendices D, E, and F.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX G, FLOOD-RESISTANT CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Sumption explained Appendix G is not adopted statewide, but local jurisdictions may adopt it. He noted that although it is not adopted statewide, the Appendix has remained in the code in previous cycles.

Motion to approve Appendix G with an explanation describing how it is used in the state of Oregon.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX H, SIGNS

Mr. McCart asked if this provision needs to be in the code, since local jurisdictions in Oregon adopt their own sign ordinances.

Mr. Sumption explained Appendix H is similar to Appendix G, in that although it is not adopted statewide, the appendix has remained in the code in previous cycles, adopted as an Oregon amendment with a note describing how it is applied in Oregon.

Motion to approve Appendix H, including an explanation noting how it is used in the state.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chief Rogers noted that the committee disapproved Appendices A and B because Oregon has a different practice; however, with Appendices G and H the committee approved them for inclusion in the code with anticipated Oregon amendments. He explained the actions taken on these sections need to be consistent, either all four appendices should be approved or all four should be disapproved.

Motion to **reconsider** actions on Appendix G and Appendix H.

Motion carried unanimously.

Reconsideration:

Motion to disapprove Appendices G and H, and add language indicating that local jurisdictions can adopt the provisions.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX I, PATIO COVERS

Motion to approve Appendix I.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPENDIX J, GRADING

Mr. Sumption noted this appendix is normally adopted as an optional choice for local jurisdictions.

Motion to disapprove Appendix J and add language indicating that local jurisdictions can optionally adopt the provisions.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bela argued that if this appendix is being adopted across the state by local jurisdictions then it should be included in the statewide code. He asked if there was a list available that indicates the jurisdictions that have adopted this appendix.

Chief Rogers explained the use of specific optional code provisions by local jurisdictions should be adopted by ordinance in each jurisdiction. He further explained that the state does not adopt this appendix statewide because the provisions included in it are outside the division's regulatory statutory authority.

APPENDIX K, ICC ELECTRICAL CODE

Mr. Sumption noted this appendix is not adopted by the state.

Motion to disapprove Appendix K

Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 11, ACCESSIBILITY and CHAPTER 13, ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. Sumption noted that the committee discussed Chapters 11 and 13 earlier in the meeting, but no action was taken on them. He explained that although these chapters will likely be replaced with an Oregon amendment, the committee needs to make a motion on these chapters.

(See page 2 for the committee's discussion on Chapters 11 and page 3 for the discussion on Chapter 13.)

Motion to disapprove Chapters 11 and 13 for gut and stuff by Oregon amendment.

Motion carried unanimously.

Lunch Break.

Review Existing Oregon amendments, beginning with Chapter 2

Mr. Sumption suggested reviewing the existing amendments and compare the new model code to see how they line up.

Existing Oregon Amendment #EA07-02

CHAPTER 2, DEFINITIONS

Mr. Sumption reviewed the added and deleted definitions included in the existing Oregon amendment EA 07-02 for Chapter 2, noting that some definitions were changed to better align with statutory requirements and to clarify model code.

SECTION 201, GENERAL

201.4 Terms not defined

Mr. Sumption explained Oregon adds a sentence to this section that addresses terms that are not defined in code. He noted this addition was a recommendation from policy staff during the last code cycle because of the code's reference to an out of print publication that is no longer available.

Chief Rogers noted that because Section 408 was tabled for further review at the last meeting, he recommended the committee not address any of the definitions that refer to Section 408 at this time. The committee will review these items when Section 408 is addressed and up for consideration.

Companion crypt- Mr. McCart noted the term “companion crypt” refers to a code section that has been renumbered and should be updated to Section 424 in order to better align with the new code. He then noted that DHS will be concerned with any changes to SR occupancy references. Mr. McCart also indicated wharves are not captured in Chapter 4 as noted in the existing Oregon amendment, so that reference also needs to be updated to align with the new model code.

Chief Rogers explained numbering updates are editorial items that will be captured by BCD staff upon approval of the existing Oregon amendment for inclusion in the new code.

Motion to approve the existing Oregon amendment #EA07-02 for Chapter 2, with the exception of those definitions that relate to Section 408, which was previously tabled.

Motion carried unanimously.

Existing Oregon Amendment #EA07-03

CHAPTER 3, USE AND OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION

Mr. Sumption explained the additional color handout explains significant changes that model code will have on the existing Oregon amendment.

SECTION 302, CLASSIFICATION

302.1 General

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment incorporates the SR occupancies into this section and is still needed because model code does not cover this change.

SECTION 303, ASSEMBLY GROUP A

303.1 Assembly Group A

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment for this section is now captured in model code, which means this provision can be deleted from the existing Oregon amendment.

SECTION 304, BUSINESS GROUP B

304.1.1 Definitions

Clinic outpatient- Mr. Sumption noted the new model code added a definition for “clinic outpatient,” which was an existing Oregon amendment. He explained, however, that the model code definition is

different and does not permit even one person incapable of self-preservation to be covered under this definition. The existing Oregon amendment on the other hand allows not more than five individuals who may be incapable of self-preservation to be covered under the definition of “clinic outpatient.” Mr. Sumption also noted the change in occupancy from an I to a B occupancy. Even with the change in occupancy, the same safeguards are in place with regards to sprinkler and alarm requirements in the facilities.

Mr. McCart clarified this requirement is for only for new buildings, noting that to apply it retroactively would be expensive.

Chair Dieter noted the Oregon amendment on this code section needs to coordinate and be consistent with the fire code provisions and requirements.

Mr. Sumption explained the existing amendment is a term that was “stolen” from the fire code in order to incorporate it and capture it in the building code. He noted the division can double check and follow up with the State Fire Marshal’s office.

The committee determined the existing Oregon amendment was sufficiently captured in model code, allowing this provision to be deleted from the Oregon amendment.

SECTION 304, BUSINESS GROUP B

304.2 Lockup facilities

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment captures requirements specific to Oregon, so the committee will likely want to carry the provision forward to the current code cycle and approve the existing Oregon amendment for this section.

SECTION 306, FACTORY GROUP F

306.2 Factory Industrial F-1 Moderate-Hazard Occupancy

Mr. Sumption noted the model code now captures the requirement included in the existing Oregon amendment, which means the Oregon amendment for this section can be deleted.

306.3 Factory Industrial F-2 Low-Hazard Occupancy

Mr. Sumption noted the model code now captures the alcohol content requirement included in the existing Oregon amendment, which means the Oregon amendment for that provision can be deleted. However, the wood barrel and the bottled wine aging facilities requirements included in the existing Oregon amendment are still unique to Oregon, which means that portion of the Oregon amendment needs to remain.

SECTION 307, HIGH-HAZARD GROUP H

307.1.2 Storage of Class 1.4G (Class C Common) fireworks

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment captures requirements specific to Oregon, so the committee will likely want to carry the provision forward to the current code cycle and approve the existing Oregon amendment for this section.

SECTION 308, INSTITUTIONAL GROUP I

308.1 Institutional Group I

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment was not captured by model code and is therefore still needed.

308.2 Group I-1

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment was not captured by model code and is therefore still needed.

308.2.1 Residential facility

Mr. Sumption noted model code did not capture the existing Oregon amendment that specifically ties in Appendix SR, which means the existing Oregon amendment is still needed.

308.3 Group I-2

Mr. Sumption explained model code has captured some of the changes included in the existing Oregon amendment, meaning those provisions can be deleted, these include: deleting the language pertaining to care on a 24 hour basis; deleting the note following “nursing homes”; and deleting the facility note at the end of the list. He further explained that model code did not capture two changes included in the existing Oregon amendment that are important to keep, these include: the addition the word “health,” and adding “ambulatory health care facilities” to this list in this section. He explained the word “health” is important and should be brought forward to this code cycle, but the reference to the ambulatory health care facilities can be deleted because it is addressed elsewhere in the model code.

308.3.2 Definitions

Mr. Sumption noted that many of the definitions captured in the Oregon amendment are now captured in model code in new Section 308.3.1. He explained now that the definitions in the existing Oregon amendment are included in model code; the Oregon amendment can be deleted.

308.3.3 Residential facility

Mr. McCart asked if the reference to the SR occupancy in this section is still needed since it is covered in another section of code.

Mr. Sumption noted that including the reference to SR occupancies is helpful for jurisdictions, and because of that, the existing Oregon amendment is still needed.

308.5 Group I-4, day care facilities

Mr. Sumption explained the existing Oregon amendment for this section aligns the code with Oregon rules and statutes, which means the amendment is still needed.

SECTION 310, RESIDENTIAL GROUP R

310.1 Residential Group R

Mr. Sumption noted the existing Oregon amendment for this section aligns the code with Oregon rule and statute requirements clarifying facility occupancies that accommodate six or fewer persons, so the amendment is still needed.

SECTION 311, STORAGE GROUP S

311.2 Moderate-hazard storage, Group S-1

Mr. Sumption noted the model code changes to the aircraft hangar requirements will have an impact on the existing Oregon amendment, but the Oregon amendment is still needed.

311.3 Low-hazard storage, Group S-2

Mr. Sumption noted the alcohol content requirement was captured in model code; however, the wood barrel provision was not, so the existing Oregon amendment is needed for that provision.

311.4 Mausoleums and columbariums

Mr. Sumption noted this requirement is specific to Oregon, meaning the existing Oregon amendment is still needed in order to capture these requirements.

Mr. McCart noted that at some point the state needs to delete this amendment since it has been around and remained unchanged since 1976.

Motion to approve the existing Oregon amendment #EA07-03 for Chapter 3 where model code has not addressed and captured the changes.

Motion carried unanimously.

Break.

Existing Oregon Amendment #EA07-04

CHAPTER 4, SPECIAL DETAILED REQUIREMENTS BASED ON USE AND OCCUPANCY

SECTION 406, MOTOR-VEHICLE-RELATED OCCUPANCIES

406.2.2 Clear height

Mr. Sumption explained the existing Oregon amendment for this section adds a reference to Oregon's Section 1104.4, which contains accessible parking requirements. The amendment also deletes a model code reference to Section 1106.5 because Oregon replaces Chapter 11 in its entirety. Because of this, the existing Oregon amendment is still needed.

SECTION 407, GROUP I-2

407.8 Emergency and standby power

Mr. Sumption noted this existing Oregon amendment adds a section to the model code that requires emergency power to be installed in all health care facilities. Because it is a new section that adds requirements, the Oregon amendment is still needed in order to include these provisions in the code.

Mr. McCart pointed out the new code now has a Section 407.8 which does not relate to the Oregon amendment, so the amendment location needs to be placed in a more appropriate place in code.

Mr. Sumption explained this requirement was previously added to the end of the section, so based on the model code numbering the new section number will be 407.10.

SECTION 408, GROUP I-3

Mr. McCart noted the committee should keep all provisions relating to Section 408 tabled for consistency.

The committee agreed to keep Section 408 tabled and address those topics covered under that section at a later date.

SECTION 412, AIRCRAFT-RELATED OCCUPANCIES

412.2.3 Floor surface

Mr. Sumption noted this section was amended during the last code cycle with an Oregon amendment and further amended during the mid-cycle process. He explained the original amendment in the last code cycle deleted half of the section and added requirements to the end. Then, during the mid-cycle, the section was further amended to delete the section in its entirety. Because of the significant Oregon

changes to this model code section, it is important to bring forward the existing Oregon amendment to this code cycle.

Mr. McCart noted the model code renumbered parts of this section, so the new number in model code is Section 412.4.3, which is the section that would be deleted in its entirety by the Oregon amendment.

412.2.6 Fire suppression

Mr. Sumption explained Oregon had some amendments relating to fire suppression in aircraft hangars that was significantly changed in the new model code. The most significant of the changes is found in exception 2 which deals with foam suppression requirements. He explained the proponent of the Oregon amendment, Jim Schwager, explained that the intent of the amendment is to safely mitigate the hazards of fire without putting all aircrafts in a hangar at risk. Model code did not capture the foam suppression exception included in the exiting Oregon amendment, so the amendment is still needed.

Mr. Sumption further explained that there will be a bit of overlap with the new model code provisions, which added the language “based upon...,” so the Oregon amendment was renumbered to reflect the model code exception. Model code numbering has changed this from Section 412.2.6 to Section 412.4.6.

SECTION 421, PIERS AND WHARVES

Mr. Sumption noted this section was added to the end of model code Chapter 4 in previous code cycles by Oregon amendment. The model code added some sections to this chapter, so Section 421 will be updated to Section 424 in the Oregon amendment to reflect this change. He explained the provisions in the Oregon amendment are still needed, so it should be brought forward to this code cycle.

Vice-chair Lampella asked if this is a specific section in Chapter 9 that deals with piers and wharves, and if so, whether that should be specifically referenced in this section.

Mr. Sumption noted piers and wharves are also covered in Section 903.2.10.4.

SECTION 422, MAUSOLEUMS AND COLUMBARIUMS

Mr. Sumption noted this section was added to the end of model code Chapter 4 in previous code cycles by Oregon amendment. The model code added some sections to this chapter, so Section 422 will be updated to Section 425 in the Oregon amendment to reflect this change. He explained the provisions in the Oregon amendment are still needed, so it should be brought forward to this code cycle.

Motion to approve the existing Oregon amendment #EA07-04 for Chapter 4 where model code has not addressed and captured the changes, with the exception of Section 408 which shall remain tabled.

Motion carried unanimously.

[Existing Oregon Amendment #EA07-05](#)

CHAPTER 5, GENERAL BUILDING HEIGHTS AND AREAS

SECTION 508, MIXED USE AND OCCUPANCY

508.1 General

Mr. Sumption noted some requirements in this section were changed in the new model code.

508.2 Incidental uses

Mr. Sumption noted this section had a lot of reorganization in the new model code. The intent of the Oregon amendment is to clarify that there is a choice to either mitigate an incidental use area by using a choice provided in the table or consider the incidental use area as a different occupancy. Model code does not provide this option, so the existing Oregon amendment is still needed and should be brought forward to this code cycle.

Vice-chair Lampella asked whether these options were covered in the new changes to model code captured in Section 508.1.

Chief Rogers indicated the model code does not clearly articulate and allow for the options provided in the existing Oregon amendment, so in order to keep the options, the Oregon amendment would need to be brought forward to this code cycle.

Motion to TABLE existing amendments to Chapter 5 to allow staff to review the code changes.
Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to adjourn.
Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Dieter adjourned the meeting at 2:49 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:

ACI	American Concrete Institute	IEBC	International Existing Building Code
AISC	American Institute of Steel Construction	IRC	International Residential Code
ANSI	American National Standards Institute	NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers	OBOA	Oregon Building Officials Association
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials	OESC	Oregon Electrical Specialty Code
BCD	Building Codes Division	OPSC	Oregon Plumbing Specialty Code
CFR	Code of Federal Regulation	OR-OSHA	Oregon Occupational Safety and Health Division
CPSC	Consumer Product Safety Commission	OSFM	Oregon Office of the State Fire Marshal
DHS	Oregon Department of Human Services	OSSC	Oregon Structural Specialty Code
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	SEAO	Structural Engineers Association of Oregon
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map	UBC	Uniform Building Code
IBC	International Building Code	UL	Underwriters Laboratories
ICC	International Code Council		