



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

September 25, 2009

Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee

Thursday, August 6, 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 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)
Andy Dykeman, Lease Crutcher Lewis
George McCart, Oregon Disabilities Commission
Eric McMullen, Fire Marshal
Jim Rimenschneider, Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO)
Susan Steward, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)

Members Absent: John Rakowitz, Associated General Contractors (AGC)

Guests Present: Tony Barsotti, OR-OSHA Construction Advisory Committee
Johnathan Balkema, Oregon Home Builders Association
James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness

Staff Present: Chris Huntington, Policy and Technical Services Manager
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 9:10 a.m.

Chair Dieter provided an overview of the topics that remain for the committee to review and explained the procedures for this last committee meeting.

Request committee ratification of actions from 6/10/09 & 7/22/09 meeting

Chair Dieter reviewed the [matrix](#), listing the items that require ratification by the committee.

Motion to ratify the committee's actions from the June 10, 2009 and July 22, 2009 meetings.
Motion carried unanimously.

Review substantial model code changes

SECTION 1614 HIGH RISE STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS

Richard Rogers, structural program chief, provided background on this substantial model code change requirement, noting the division had asked SEAO for a recommendation on this item.

Jim Riemenschneider explained SEAO's recommendation for this section, noting that they agree with this section, but that a clarification for specific size buildings needs to be added.

Motion to approve the substantial model code changes to Section 1614.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review editorial and non substantive model code changes

CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATION

Chief Rogers provided an overview on Chapter 1. He explained that the underlined language is simply carried forward to this cycle and is not new language. He further explained that in Oregon, Chapter 1 is modified significantly from model code because of specific statutory requirements in the state. Chief Rogers noted that there are very few changes this cycle. He pointed out the fee table, whereby statute requires the use of the 1979 UBC fee table. He explained that the legislature authorized a 30% increase in fees and the table reflects that increase.

Motion to approve editorial and non-substantive model code changes to Chapter 1.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review existing Oregon amendments

EA07-01 Administrative

(See discussion on Chapter 1 provisions above for the discussion on the item)

Motion to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-01.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review editorial and non substantive model code changes

Chapter 7, Section 705.2 Projections

Chief Rogers reviewed the [handout](#) that explains the changes to Section 705.2.

Vice-chair Lampella described the code requirement and provided background on the section. He explained the national code had originally supported similar requirements, but instead adopted another version of the requirements. He stated the model code language is a code change submitted by him, but the language has some problems and needs to be changed. Currently, the code does not differentiate between an H-2 and S-2, and this provision provides clear requirements for projections. Vice-chair Lampella pointed out the existing flaw in the language that provides "the following three methods"; but in reviewing the methods, a contractor would never use method number two and would have to go back to the table which has different requirements for protected and non-protected openings.

Chair Dieter asked where this code proposal is in the process at the national level and how often this comes up as an issue. He noted his hesitation with getting ahead of the model code.

Vice-chair Lampella explained the code proposal has been at the national level and will be heard in Baltimore. He also explained that the projection requirements are a reoccurring question and problem that often come up.

Motion to approve Section 705.2 as modified.
Motion carried unanimously.

CHAPTER 18 SOILS AND FOUNDATIONS

Chief Rogers explained the division asked SEAO for a recommendation on this chapter. He reviewed the [SEAO handout](#) with their suggested changes, noting the recommendations primarily maintain most of the existing Oregon amendments.

Motion to accept SEAO's recommendations for Chapter 18.
Motion carried unanimously.

Review existing Oregon amendments

EA 07-23, 2308.3.2, Fig. 2308.3.2(1) &(2), 2308.12.6

Chief Rogers explained the handouts, submitted by [David Niles](#) and [Robert Rice](#). He started with item 2308.3.2 which deals with how to handle prescriptively built wood frame construction. He noted that SEAO had some concerns and were willing to delete some of the existing Oregon amendment in favor of code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-44. Chief Rogers clarified that the committee already approved the proposal, which was a national consensus document. He also explained that SEAO agreed to delete the Oregon amendment in section 2308.12.6, which deals with provisions for irregular structure design.

The committee discussed the process relating to the existing Oregon amendment and their approval of the code amendment proposal.

Chief Rogers clarified that while the provisions adopted in the code proposal are ahead of the national structural model code, the same provision is already included in the newest version of the national residential model code (IRC). He clarified that while the committee has already approved a new Oregon amendment for this chapter, the existing Oregon amendment still needs to be addressed and the committee needs to take action.

Motion to delete the portions of the existing Oregon amendment where the model code does not address the requirements, based on the committee's prior approval of proposal #OSSC 10-44 in favor of the model code's language in section 2308.12.6.
Motion carried unanimously.

EA 07-34 Existing Structures

Chief Rogers reviewed the [combined document](#) that shows the amendments to chapter 34. He noted that BOMA had raised some concerns and wanted to check with their membership to make sure there were no issues.

Susan Steward stated BOMA has no problems with this item.

Motion to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-34.
Motion carried unanimously.

Review following new amendments public code change proposal

Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-03

Chief Rogers reminded the committee that they tabled this item to allow the proponent to come back with an amended proposal to address the committee's concerns. He stated the proponent has not returned to the division or the committee with an amended proposal.

Ms. Steward also noted that representatives of Carlson Testing approached BOMA with their concerns that the proposal is far too restrictive.

Motion to disapprove code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-03.

Discussion on the motion:

James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness, countered that it is customary that a reason be given when a motion is made to disapprove, and asked the committee to state the reason for disapproval of the proposal.

Reason for disapproval motion: Eric McMullen stated that the reason for disapproval is because the square foot requirement is too high. Vice-chair Lampella further clarified other reasons for disapproval include the fact that no technical or scientific evidence was provided to the committee and the proponent did not respond to the committee's concerns surrounding the submitted proposal.

Motion carried unanimously.

Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-04

Anthony Barsotti, OR-OSHA CAC, reviewed a [handout](#) showing the suggested changes to the proposal. He explained the changes were reached by the consensus of a workgroup.

Vice-chair Lampella noted his questions and concerns with the proposal, asking about the 4,000 square foot provision. He stated he felt that the phrasing relating to the obstruction for the line of sight is really not clear. He also pointed out that the code proposal has impacts on the roof design and would drive other designs in the building, such as photovoltaic items on the roof. Vice-chair Lampella stated that while he is not against safety, there is a lot to take into consideration with this proposal and he is not sure the building code is the right place for this requirement noting it overlaps into other areas such as the mechanical code and energy provisions.

Andy Dykeman stated he feels this is a good proposal and that it is good to include in the building code. He explained that in large scale projects, elements get changed, and he does not see that modifying one or two anchors on a project as being a reason not to use anchors. Mr. Dykeman described buildings that have permanent fall protection anchor systems built in. He noted that he does see some concerns with the requirements, but there are a lot of capable designers out there are working around it.

Chair Dieter asked if Mr. Barsotti had an opportunity to talk to other authorities having jurisdiction, building officials, or OBOA.

Mr. Barsotti explained he had an informal conversation, but did not have an opportunity to run the new language clarifications by those groups.

Mr. Bela noted that there are two issues that he felt must be separated- the new code requirements and a code interpretation. He affirmed that the proposal should go to a public hearing.

Mr. Dykeman asked whether the code language was being worked on at the national level or, if other than OSHA requirements, there was an existing standard at the national level for fall protection systems.

Mr. Barsotti explained that at this time there is not currently a national model code standard.

Chair Dieter noted that vice-chair Lampella brought up some good points regarding the language, stating his agreement with the concerns that the language is still not clear enough. He stated that even though safety protection is important, he is still hesitant to approve this code proposal. He commended Mr. Barsotti and the group who worked on the proposal, noting there has been a lot of excellent work on the issue.

Motion to approve the amended language as proposed for code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-04.

VOTE: 1-6

Aye- Dykeman,
Nay-Dieter, Lampella, McCart, McMullen, Riemenschneider, Steward
Motion failed.

Motion to disapprove code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-04.

Reason for disapproval: George McCart explained the language is not clear enough to deal with field operations and the proposal needs more work to make it where it is a useable item in the field.

VOTE 6-1

Aye-Dieter, Lampella, McCart, McMullen, Riemenschneider, Steward
Nay- Dykeman
Motion carried.

Mr. Bela asked a question about how this proposal could make it to a public hearing.

Chief Rogers explained that the committee's action is just a recommendation to the Building Codes Structures Board, who will receive all the approval and disapproval recommendations made by the committee. He further explained that it is the board that provides the final recommendation as to what is forwarded to public hearing and any item is up for consideration at the board level, whether the item was approved or disapproved by the committee.

Mr. Barsotti asked if the board could look at revised language.

Chief Rogers stated the board has the authority to approve as modified, if the changes are limited, however writing language in front of the board is discouraged because the board will not tolerate it.

Chair Dieter noted that the next scheduled board meeting is September 30.

Mr. Barsotti stated his appreciation to the committee for their time on this issue. He then asked the committee to describe the main issue with the proposal.

The committee noted that the primary concerns were with obstructions, materials, hidden surfaces, impact loads, and the exceptions included in the proposal.

Chair Dieter thanked Mr. Barsotti for his efforts, noting that the intent is certainly supported.

Code Amendment Proposals #OSSC 10-30 through #OSSC 10-34 & #OSSC 10-42

Chief Rogers provided an overview of the proposals which address modifications to Chapter 34. He noted that the committee did not have any concerns with the proposals at the previous meeting, but BOMA had wanted to check with their membership to make sure there were no issues.

Ms. Steward stated BOMA has no problems with these items.

Motion to approve code amendment proposals #OSSC 10-30, #OSSC 10-31, #OSSC 10-32, #OSSC 10-33, #OSSC 10-34, and #OSSC 10-42.

Motion carried unanimously.

Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-35

Chief Rogers noted this proposal was tabled to allow the proponents to return with modifications to the proposal that addressed the committee's concerns. He provided an overview on the proposal submitted by the city of Portland who stated they were having problems with Type III construction.

The committee agreed that while there were good intentions and the proponents did point out a hole in the code, an interpretative ruling could provide a solution for this section.

Motion to disapprove code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-35.

Reason for disapproval: Vice-chair Lampella stated the reason for disapproval is based on the problems with the language that makes the code requirements more restrictive.

Motion carried unanimously.

Review Existing Statewide Alternate Methods

Alternate Method #08-05 Structural provisions

Chief Rogers provided background on the alternate method that allows another path for compliance by using the IEBC rather than Chapter 34 of the IBC. He briefly discussed the amendments submitted by SEAO, which primarily update the existing alternate method to the 2009 IEBC. He noted that some of the provisions submitted by SEAO are more restrictive than the IEBC model code simply because no one on the west coast has adopted it without amendment because it does not work in high seismic areas. He noted that BOMA had requested tabling the item in order to check with their membership.

Ms. Steward stated BOMA has no problems with these items.

Motion to approve existing alternate method #08-05 with the proposed amendments submitted by SEAO.

Motion carried unanimously.

Break.

Reconsideration of Existing Oregon Amendment #EA 07-09 for Chapter 9

Chair Dieter stated he and Mr. McMullen serve on the state's fire code committee and an issue arose at the last fire code committee meeting regarding a provision already approved by the committee.

Mr. McMullen explained that the fire code committee deals with maintenance and reviews IBC Chapters 9 and 10 to ensure there are not conflicting requirements between the building code and the fire code. He noted that a question arose regarding Section 905.5.1.1 and 905.5.1.2 the in existing Oregon amendment for Chapter 9. He stated these sections require the installation of certain elements that would nullify the effectiveness of a fire sprinkler system. The fire code committee suggested that this provision does not make sense to for the requirements to be in the building code, and would be more appropriate in a maintenance code or through an alternate method process.

The committee briefly discussed the fire code committee's proposal and the existing Oregon amendment.

Motion to reconsider previous action on existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-09.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to delete Sections 905.5.1.1 and 905.5.1.2 from existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-09.

Discussion on the motion...

Mr. McCart asked for clarification as to what would happen with the provisions, inquiring whether it would be included in the fire code or disappear altogether.

Mr. McMullen clarified that the requirements would disappear and be dealt with on a case by case basis.

Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion of possible fiscal impact

Chris Huntington, policy and technical services manager, thanked the committee for their hard work and reviewed the questions included on the [fiscal impact questionnaire](#).

The committee participated in the review and provided their input on the fiscal implications of adopting the new code, giving the following recommendations:

1. Impact on state agencies, units of local government, and members of the public?

Mr. McCart stated there will be some impact including not only a learning curve for building officials and inspectors, but also the local municipalities because there are a lot of new pieces that are going into effect such as new requirements for fire sprinkler systems. He noted there are also other underlying variables will need to be addressed.

2. Who else is likely to be economically effected?

Mr. Dykeman noted building owners, developers, contractors, and, on public projects, there may be impacts to the general public. He stated that the costs are not excessive, but there will be some minimal impact including minor cost increases.

Chair Dieter pointed out the specific example of super high-rise buildings. He stated they may be significantly impacted by the new code requirements for the means of egress and fire responder provisions.

Vice-chair Lampella stated that the radio responder requirement will have some impact on building owners, but it should not be significant.

Mr. Riemenschneider pointed out that by simply adopting model code requirements there is an added cost, specifically with the high-rise requirements in Chapters 14, 16, and 17. He noted special inspection requirements will have both more and less costs associated with them, which are mostly placed on building owners.

3. *Number of small businesses impacted and types of businesses and industries likely to be affected?*

Vice-chair Lampella identified the change in the aircraft hangar requirements would have a slight impact, specifically in the Redmond area.

Mr. McMullen pointed out that schools would be impacted by the change in the threshold requirement for fire sprinklers, noting that would affect all schools across the board.

4. *Expected reporting, recordkeeping, and administrative activities?*

The committee agreed that there are no changes to these requirements by adopting the new code.

5. *Professional services?*

Mr. Dykeman stated there will be some increase in these services, such as needing to hire an engineer or a designer for fire protection, high-rises, and including more detail in designs.

6. *Equipment, supplies and labor or increased administration?*

The committee agreed that there are no changes to these requirements by adopting the new code.

Manager Huntington reviewed the board process and noted that the board will also make a finding regarding the fiscal impact when they review the code.

Vice-chair Lampella noted that throughout the review process the committee did weigh the cost impact versus the life-safety concerns.

Chair Dieter thanked everyone for their participation.

Chief Rogers presented a certificate of appreciation to each member for their participation in this process.

Chair Dieter adjourned the meeting at 11:17 a.m.