

**Workgroup 1 Meeting
Henrico Training Center
July 7, 2016**

Richard Potts welcomed everyone and had attendees introduce themselves. Also reviewed the definitions of consensus, non-consensus, approval, disapproval and pending.

Vernon Hodge reviewed the new public comment feature on cdpVA.

A-40 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Amusement Device Technical Advisory Committee

Vernon.hodge@dhcd.virginia.gov

Reason: The Amusement Device Technical Advisory Committee is a Board of Housing and Community Development-appointed committee to advise the Board on the standards for amusement devices. The ASTM F-24 standards for amusement devices were reviewed and this proposal is to update the regulations to the latest available ASTM standards. A number of standards have been discontinued and their provisions incorporated into the updated standards, so the proposal is necessary to prevent the reference to outdated standards.

Comments: Vernon Hodge – We use the ASTM that is currently available. The committee has made this proposal from the committee and this is what is in this proposal.

Emory Rodgers – Are there any changes to the VADR in this cycle?

Vernon Hodge – We will review any proposals from the public, however, we have not received any to date. The committee will have more meetings and may generate more proposals. There were some discussions on a few issues.

Rick Witt asked if all of the standards proposed have been finalized.

Vernon Hodge confirmed that all standards proposed have been updated and finalized.

Richard Potts – Not hearing any objections, we will **move this forward as consensus for approval.**

C-101.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2012 Virginia Construction Code
101.5 Use of terminology and notes.

Reason: The added language clarifies that any reference to the IBC in the VCC includes the Virginia amendments to the model IBC, as well as, all of the other iCodes or standards. Otherwise, such references would be to the IBC (or other iCodes or standards) without including the Virginia amendments. The proposed change also revises the format (without changing the technical aspects or text) so that it is easier to read and understand. It also follows the same formatting being proposed for the VEBC.

Comments:

Kenney Payne stated that even though this was for the VA Construction Code, it actually had its origin in the Rehab Code. He was one of the volunteers working to develop the training content for the code academy training for the VRC and volunteered to take on the proposed code changes. He thought if we change in the Rehab Code then we should change in the VA Construction Code. We tried to make it easier to understand which code (VEBC or VCC) applies to which occupancies. It just reformats what is already there.

Vernon Hodge didn't get a chance to discuss this with Kenney before the meeting. He believes this proposal is a conflict. There are no inconsistencies in the way the IBC is used under the VCC.

Kenney Payne mentioned when they were going through the VRC, they were really going through the IEBC. He asked where the vehicle was that referenced VA changes. He wanted clarification whether to follow the IEBC or VRC?

Vernon-Hodge stated it is a VRC issue not a VCC issue and that he was not opposed to a proposal to change in VRC instead of IBC.

Kenney Payne asked if it could be revised to include the VA amendments? He didn't want to create a conflict and asked for any objections to formatting and striking #5?

Vernon Hodge stated he didn't think we were losing anything?

Emory Rodgers made a comment that state amendments are published in the blue book, and that the IBC sections were published in the VA IBC? He asked if we needed to fix this?

Vernon Hodge stated he believed he was trying to be consistent with his proposal for the Rehab Code which uses the IEBC as the model code with references to the IBC. There is a legitimate problem in the VRC that makes references to the IBC because it doesn't pick up the VA amendments.

Richard Potts asked how to make the changes in this proposal.

Vernon Hodge stated that if we delete #5 and keep the format changes, if the group is ok with that then we can mark this amended proposal as consensus for approval. If there are no objections, this would skip us from bringing it back to the workgroup.

Richard Potts stated **this amended proposal will move forward as consensus for approval.**

Emory Rodgers also mentioned that #4 may need revisions also.

C-102.3 (1) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Ron Clements representing VBCOA Administrative committee
clementsro@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Construction Code
102.3 Exemptions.

Reason: The current electrical utility and telecommunications code exemption detailed in exception #1 of Section 102.3 has been a source of confusion because of the length of the single exception and the amount of qualifiers listed in the two sentences that make up the exception. This code change is intended to clarify the intent of the exception and is predominately editorial.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Emory Rodgers stated that the VBCOA administrative committee is supporting this code change and is trying to clarify the language.

Rick Witt mentioned that Ron Clements asked him to bring back any comments to this proposal.

Richard Potts stated that he didn't hear any objections so this proposal will **Move forward as consensus for approval.**

5

C-102.3(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Michael Redifer representing VBCOA Administrative Committee
mredifer@nvva.gov

2012 Virginia Construction Code
102.3 Exemptions

Reason: A need to further clarify additional components associated with manufacturing and processing machines as well as the intent to apply the exemption to machinery and equipment involving the handling of products or packages has been identified. It is not uncommon for such installations to

incorporate material/product conveying systems which should also be exempted to the extent that they serve the exempt machinery exclusively. Foundation and structural support systems as well as any portions intended for use by service and/or maintenance personnel would not be exempt.

Richard Potts gave an overview of this proposal.

Comments:

Emory Rodgers stated the VBCOA Administrative Committee supports this proposal.

Richard Potts mentioned with no further comments, this will **Move forward as consensus for approval.**

C-102.3(3) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Michael Dellinger representing VBCOA Region III

mdellinger@shenandoahcountyva.us

2012 Virginia Construction Code
102.3 Exemptions

Reason: The current VCC does not address demolition in place of manufactured homes. Manufactured homes are typically moved, not demolished. Because they are subject to federal regulation, they are generally left in one piece so that they can be used again, or they go to the manufactured home graveyard. Suggestion- Maybe your VBCOA region would be willing to submit a proposal. Such as: Industrialized buildings subject to the Virginia Industrialized Building Safety Regulations (13VAC5-91) and manufactured homes subject to the Virginia Manufactured Home Safety Regulations (13VAC5-95); except as provided for in Section 425 and in the case of demolition of such industrialized buildings or manufactured homes.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Vernon Hodge stated that this proposal from VBCOA Region III was for clarification since they had experienced some situations with industrialized buildings and manufactured homes.

Tyler Craddock asked if a site built home needed a permit for demolition? After receiving a yes answer, he mentioned he thought they did.

Richard Potts stated that since there were no objections, we would **Move forward as consensus for approval.**

C-103.3(1) cdpVA-15 Proponent: William Andrews
William.andrews@richmondgov.com

2012 Virginia Construction Code
103.3 change of occupancy.

Reason: Seek change for 2015 USBC, to wording from IBC, to require new Certificate of Occupancy from building official when occupancy use changes, instead of only requiring permit or new Certificate of Occupancy when needs greater safety feature. Changing use should have record of building official approval.

Richard Potts mentioned this was a carryover proposal.

Comments:

William Andrews stated he is working with VBCOA on this change of occupancy.

Johnna Grizzard stated that VBCOA Administrative Adhoc Committee is working on this and have narrowed it down. Changing from restaurant to single family home requires a great degree of standards. They are working to clean up the language.

Rick Witt stated he had concerns about how it is written.

Robby Dawson mentioned he had questions for Johnna regarding a single family dwelling.

Robert Adkins stated he didn't agree with this.

Glenn Dean stated he disagreed with the technical change, when it goes from a B to an M. His concern was the interchange of building terms, a change of tenancy within a use group. The occupancy use term is going to be problematic.

Emory Rodgers mentioned the code change didn't work the way it was written and because of the laundry list, it is non-consensus as he saw it. He stated there would be a re-write. When there is an occupancy change without alteration, you need a permit, should we mandate?

Richard Potts stated this proposal will **Move forward as non-consensus.**

C-103.3(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2012 Virginia Construction Code
103.3 Change of occupancy.

Reason: The proposed new title “Virginia Existing Building Code” (VEBC) follows the model code “International Existing Building Code (IEBC) for which it is named. Although not “officially” recognized as such, the “International Residential Code” (with state amendments) is most often referred to and known as the “Virginia Residential Code” or VRC. The proposed code change would eliminate the possible confusion.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal and stated this was vetted through the VBCOA VRC committee.

Comments:

Johnna Grizzard stated as a volunteer of the VBCOA Rehab administrative adhoc committee we heard arguments that it might sound like a retrofit. VBCOA supports this proposal.

Richard Potts asked for any further comments, we will **Move forward as consensus for approval – Kenney will un-strike his 103.4.**

Kenney Payne stated this was more about renaming. You may see VEBC if not approved it will go back to VRC.

C-103.7 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Ronald Clements representing VBCOA Administrative Code Committee
clementsro@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Construction Code
103.7 Retrofit requirements.

Reason: There are retrofit provisions regarding accessibility; therefore, it is not accurate or necessary to provide the commentary in the second part of the first sentence that is specific to fire protection and safety equipment. The retrofit requirements of VRC Chapter 17 do not reference the retroactive provision of Chapter 11 in the IFC; furthermore, Chapter 11 of the IFC is deleted from the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention code. Therefore, the second sentence is proposed for deletion.

Richard Potts gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Richard Potts hearing no comments, the proposal will **Move forward as consensus for approval.**

C-105.2.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Debra McMahon
Debra.mcmahon@fairfaxcounty.gov

2012 Virginia Construction Code
105.2.1.1 Qualifications of permit technicians

Reason: The purpose of this proposed code addition is to get permit technicians recognized for their technical expertise on a state level. Permit technicians are responsible for reviewing, processing and issuing build/trade permits per the provisions of the Virginia Construction Code. They are responsible for ensuring that minimum submission requirements are met based on each individual jurisdiction requirements. Often times, permit technicians are required to do cursory reviews of architectural and trade plan requiring skills equal to technical assistants.

Debra McMahon gave an overview of her proposal and the qualification of permit technicians and how it gives some latitude for them.

Comments:

Emory Rodgers mentioned that this was not mandatory just small alterations.

Greg Revels stated he had a problem with the qualifications statement? He stated this doesn't work for him and that he would delete the first sentence and tighten the definition. Smaller localities must have difficulty in hiring these permit techs.

Rick Witt also stated he had concerns. I don't hire them on their construction knowledge. He suggested knocking out one year experience. He would help work on this proposal.

Matthew Hunter mentioned that ICC has a certification course for this. Because of wanting recognition for these administrative professionals, is it possible the language is ok, maybe call them permit clerks?

Shaun Pharr stated that recognition was a great thing but not sure if this is the right way.

Vernon Hodge stated we have to be very careful because we already have a definition for technical assistants. The enforcement word needs to be changed. Permit technician is other than a technical assistant.

Johnna Grizzard stated they already meet the criteria of a technical assistant.

Rick Witt stated again that if we move forward as consensus of pending, he will work with Debra on this.

Emory Rodgers suggested that we not mess up the standards.

Richard Potts stated we will **move this forward as pending**.

C-108.2(2) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Walter Lucas representing the City of Danville

lucaswa@danvilleva.gov

2012 Virginia Construction Code
108.2 Exemptions from application for permit.

Reason: It doesn't make sense to require an electrical permit to replace a switch or a fixture in other use groups when Section 108.14.2 doesn't require a plumbing permit to replace fixtures of well pumps in all use groups.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Bob Adkins stated not appropriate for light fixtures to be replaced without a permit.

Richard Potts stated we would **Move forward as non-consensus**.

C-108.2(3) cdpVA-15 Proponent: Michael Dellinger representing VBCOA Region III

mdellinger@shenandoahcountyva.us

2012 Virginia Construction Code
108.2 Exemptions from application for permit.

Reason: As indicated in Section 102.3, certain structures are required to comply with the code when they are located in hazardous places, i.e. floodplain, mudslide areas to assure additional safety due to water or mud forces. By adding the same language as in Section 102.3, this unifies the code for all structures located in these types of areas and assures that the proper engineering as required by the code is met through the permit process.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Kenney Payne asked if we had a map that shows mudslide prone areas in Virginia?

Vernon Hodge stated the language has its basis in state law and you still have to comply with floodplain and mudslide requirements. This is a permit exemption section, even though you don't have a permit, you still have to comply with codes.

Rick Witt stated we don't want an exemption from the exemption.

Richard Potts stated we will **move forward as consensus for disapproval.**

C-113.4.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Campbell Gilmour
Campbell.Gilmour@comcast.net

2012 Virginia Construction Code
113.4.1 Testing of Radon Systems.

Reason: Intent: To ensure mandatory radon mitigation systems are tested for effectiveness to certify the safety of the public.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Bob Adkins said he didn't know what system he should be testing?

Skip Harper has reached out to some VBCOA folks and they are trying to come up with a fix. This was brought before previous workgroup sessions. One incident was fixed by placing an exhaust fan on their radon system, and covering the passage into the house.

Richard Potts stated with no other comments, we will **move forward as consensus for disapproval.**

C-117.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Ron Clements, representing VBCOA VRC Committee and Kenney Payne, representing AIA-VA.
clementsro@chesterfield.gov and kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2012 Virginia Construction Code
117.2 Moved buildings and structures.

Reason: VRC Chapter 13 addresses moved buildings and structures. The existing requirements of 117.2 are still basically the same as they were prior to the adoption of the VRC Chapter 13 specifically for moved buildings.

Comments:

Kenney Payne stated that once we made the VRC mandatory, he didn't see a need for duplicating in the VCC. Chapter 1 should deal with administrative things and let the technical chapters deal with the technical issues. Ron Clements proposed to delete the new definition regarding moving buildings and structures.

Vernon Hodge stated that the concern on relocated buildings was not to have a conflict in VA on industrialized buildings, such as school classrooms. Moved

buildings moving to VRC would be a substantiated change. Moving this language to VRC may be appropriate.

Kenney Payne stated that this is comparable and see if there is disagreement.

Tyler Craddock asked if we needed language clarifying that we are not talking about Industrialized Building Safety Regulations and Manufactured Housing?

Vernon Hodge stated that we have an exemption in the IBSR and MH and that they are not regulated by this code. VRC and IRC carries over.

Kenney Payne suggested talking with Ron Clements and if the group is ok with this, we can move forward as consensus and we will submit another proposal to deal with the change.

Emory Rodgers stated there probably wasn't another workgroup meeting before the proposed regulations have to be approved.

Richard Potts stated to **move forward as consensus for approval with submitting another proposal to deal with the change.**

CB-901.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: William Andrews
William.andrews@richmondgov.com

2015 International Building Code
901.3 Modifications.

Reason: Fire officials are responsible for applying the fire code on maintenance and periodic testing of the fire protection systems, plus local fire officials coordinate emergency responses to site (including state). Local fire officials need to learn when a building official approves installing, disabling or removing fire alarms, sprinkler system, and other fire protection systems (including for renovation or demolition). The building official is the best source for properly authorizing substantial changes to fire protection systems, thus to notify local fire official.

William Andrews gave an overview of his proposal.

Rick Witt stated his opposition to this and mentioned that you can't fix a local problem that you can't legislate. This is not a positive step.
Not a positive step.

Robby Dawson stated the fire official have to be aware of this to put on their inspection schedule.

Mike Maenner asked if a permit would be required for this? If so, everyone would be notified.

Linda Hale stated it would require a permit.

Johnna Grizzard indicated she usually didn't get a response and that she agreed with Rick.

Emory Rodgers stated that you can't disable a fire system without notifying a fire official.

Glenn Dean specified that you couldn't disable a fire system without notifying the owner or a third party who takes care of the system.

William Lloyd stated that if you remove the system, just notify someone.

Kenney Payne asked if VCC 103.8.1 overrides 901.3 if you are removing a section?

Richard Potts stated that we would **Move forward as non-consensus.**

F-102.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: William Andrews

William.andrews@richmondgov.com

2012 Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code
102.1.1 Changes

Reason: For 2015 code, change the wording from IBC, so use per Certificate of Occupancy issued by building official. Current code limits fire official from citing violation when use changes unless only within same use group (this section) or declare building unsafe due to changed use (section 110.4). Change enables fire official to require customer to get appropriate Certificate of Occupancy from building official when use changes.

Comments:

William Andrews gave an overview of the proposal by saying that fire officials need to be notified.

Rick Witt suggested the need to go through the VBCOA Rehab committee to come up with a better language?

Johnna Grizzard said the only concern she had with that, we could duplicate the language, and then have dual agencies dealing with this.

Glenn Dean declared that the language is problematic and the change of tenant doesn't cause a new certificate of occupancy to be issued. This is going to create confusion.

Richard Potts stated to **Move forward as consensus for disapproval.**

F-703.4 cdpVA-15 – Proponent: Justin Biller

2012 Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code
703.4 Testing.

Reason: In particular, Health Care Facilities in Virginia are facing enforcement of this requirement as part of ongoing licensure/funding through State enforcement of NFPA 101, Life Safety Code, so it is also important that these requirements are consistent with local fire prevention code enforcement as well throughout the Commonwealth. The revised language in Section 703.4 clarifies that the intent of 703.2 was for all fire doors (including swinging doors with fire door or builders hardware as designated by NFPA 80) to be inspected/tested in accordance with the provisions of NFPA 80.

Richard Potts gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Robby Dawson said he reached out to the proponent and did not receive a response. Robby said he could go in and make modification to the 2nd sentence.

Vernon Hodge stated there wasn't support of this proposal unless some changes were made. We could put it as non-consensus, disapproval or pending.

Bob Adkins mentioned he didn't know who was to be doing this testing.

Rick Witt asked about the previous time frame for inspections?

Robby Dawson stated it was annually by anyone the owner wanted.

Emory Rodgers said this proposal needed clarification and we needed to talk with the proponent.

Bob Adkins said this related to horizontal and vertical sliding door in 703.4.

Vernon Hodge stated that pending did not mean it will not go to the board for post regulations, even if it goes to Workgroup 2 they will make a determination. The reason we assigned to both was because it was both an administrative function in the proposal and a technical function. WorkGroup 1 looks at the administrative function and WorkGroup 2 looks at the technical function. If we don't have a determination from WorkGroup 1 we will have to hold it over until after the

proposed regulations. Vernon suggested it should go as non-consensus. Non-consensus just means there was some opposition.

Glenn Dean stated it was a matter of placement; it needs to go in 703.2.

Shaun Pharr stated that visual inspection has inconsistencies, however, had not. I heard about this being a problem.

Skip Harper said the proposal that is up there is not out of the fire code and its not out of the 2012 or 2015. He believes the proponent is trying to make the whole section new. He should have struck 703.4. The 2012 and 2015 are the same.

Richard Potts asked if everyone was clear? We will **Move forward as pending.**

F-3103.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Andrew Milliken, representing Stafford County Fire Marshal's Office
amilliken@staffordcountyva.gov

2015 International Fire Code
3103.2 Approval required.

Reason: The intent of this proposal is to eliminate conflicting language regarding when a permit is required. Section 107.2 of the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code indicates the criteria for when permits are required to be obtained from the fire official, including for temporary tents and membrane structures. In fact, Section 3103.4 highlights and guides the user of the code to this information already. Section 3103.2 comes from the model code and, although similar, conflicts with the criteria located in Chapter 1.

Comments:

Glenn Dean stated that another code change is being drafted just hasn't been submitted yet.

Richard Potts said after no other comments, we would **Move forward as non-consensus**

I-160 cdpVA-15 Proponent: DHCD SBCO staff

2012 Virginia Building and Fire Code Related Regulations
2012 VA IBSR

Reason: DHCD staff reviewed the Virginia Industrialized Building Safety Regulations and proposes clarifications to the regulations.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of the proposal and went through each one.

Comments:

Robby Dawson asked how you determine when the building entered the assembly line?

Vernon Hodge stated the CAA is required to keep records of when buildings start and go on the production line.

Skip Harper gave an overview of when you walk into a plant, the first station is floor framing, which starts the production line. It could be up to 15 stops possible before finishing,

13VAC5-91-160. Use of model codes and standards.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes– The change to Section 160(A) is to clarify that the one year grace period for the use of the earlier codes only applies to industrialized buildings which are being constructed in the plant during the one year period, and not to buildings just being designed which have not begun being constructed.

13VAC5-91-180. Compliance assurance agencies.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes – The change to Section 180(B and C) deletes criteria for re-approval of compliance assurance agencies implemented in the last code change cycle. The requirements have been determined to be unnecessary and an undue burden on compliance assurance agencies and DHCD staff.

13VAC5-91-200 Information required by the administrator.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes – The change to Section 200 makes it clear that the criteria for approval of compliance assurance agencies applies to both initial approval and to reapproval. An additional change to Section 200 deletes a requirement that compliance assurance agencies must be accepted by other jurisdictions in addition to be accepted by an independent accrediting organization as that requirement is not necessary.

13VAC5-91-240 Control of compliance assurance agency certification label.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes – The change to Section 240 permits the compliance assurance agency to authorize the manufacturer to apply the compliance assurance agency’s certification label. This is already permitted for registration seals.

13VAC5-91-260 Registration seal for industrialized buildings.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes – The change to Section 260 (E) provides the statutory language for refunds of seals rather than just a reference to the provision in state law.

13VAC5-91-270 Manufacturer’s installation instructions and responsibilities of installers.

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of proposed changes – The change to the note in Section 270 is to provide the contact information for the Board for Contractors.

Emory Rodgers asked if the time frame now for re-approval of CAA's was every 2 years?

Vernon Hodge said this would not be changing.

M-103.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: William Andrews
William.andrews@richmondgov.com

2012 Virginia Maintenance Code
103.3 Continued approval.

Reason: Change for 2015 Code. Short of declaring building or part unsafe due to changed use, maintenance code official needs ability to cite change use to require customer to get Certificate of Occupancy for change of use. Maintenance code intended to see structure maintained as was approved by building official, thus change in use needs record of building official's approval (Certificate of Occupancy).

William Andrews gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Kenney Payne stated we are trying to define language. We understand concept but we cannot approve at this point.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments, said we would **Move forward as disapproval.**

M-202 cdpVA-15 Proponent: John Walsh, representing VBCOA VMC Committee
John.walsh@richmondgov.com

2012 Virginia Maintenance Code.

Reason: Due to a recent ruling by the TRB that exempted owner occupied structures from the provisions of the unfit definition related to a heating source it is necessary to clarify the language and also to clarify the intent of the Board of Housing. It was argued that the Board in their 1990 original revision to the definition and to the section of code found in 602.2 purposefully excluded owner occupied structures from the requirement for any heat source. Even in light of the fact that the definition of a "nuisance" structure (precursor to the current Unsafe/Unfit definitions) in 1990 stated "any" structure that lacked heat was a nuisance structure.

John Walsh gave an overview of his proposal. We would like this moved forward to the board to have an open discussion with them. We had an appeal hearing at the TRB regarding providing heat. We lost on a close vote. We forwarded a code change because there was some general disagreement on what the code sections actually said and what was intended, even amongst the board members. Whether we were limiting the requirement for heat or limiting the requirement for performance standard for rentals as opposed to owner occupied. There was a lot of testimony that talked about the direction of the board in 1990 at that time in the decisions they made. We think it is time to ask if this is still their intent.

Comments:

Phil Storey stated his opposition and sent in his counter proposal yesterday. Essentially there are two provisions within the proposal, we are asking for a definition for what the original intent of the board was. The other provision in our proposal is to add additional language to the actual heating requirements in Section 606.2 requiring all structures to have a heat source.

John Walsh stated he wanted the board to reevaluate or reaffirm their decision.

Emory Rodgers said both proposals will go through as non-consensus. Without heat you are not going to keep plumbing and sprinkler systems from freezing. The board will have to decide. Heat seems to be critical to have.

Phil Storey stated there are other codes that relate to this other than requiring to prescribe a heating system. Everyone wants safe and efficient comfort heat they just disagree with the descriptive nature of this proposal.

Shaun Pharr mentioned the board decided as a matter of law in 1990 to create an exception to owner occupied dwellings and buildings.

Rick Witt asked if you include all structures is that in direct conflict with state law?

Emory Rodgers stated that you can't say all structures.

John Walsh mentioned he was open to any language; we just want to know the board's intent.

Rick Witt stated all structures that had a heating requirement must be maintained to the code in which it was built.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments stated this will **Move forward as non-consensus.**

Emory Rodgers wanted to make clear to everyone that non-consensus goes to board, pending is different.

M-507.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Charles Wilson
Cwilson2@arlingtonva.us

2012 Virginia Maintenance Code
507.1 General

Reason: To include erosion prevention and insert the consistent use of the phrase storm water runoff as widely used in the environmental area. And to address the threshold limit that is not addressed by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

Vernon Hodge gave an overview of the proposal.

Comments:

Emory Rodgers stated the VBCOA Administrative Committee unanimously opposes this proposal. He noted the current language was sufficient.

Shaun Pharr stated that he agreed with Emory.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments stated this will **Move forward as consensus for disapproval.**

M-604.3.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bryan Holland, NEMA
Bryan.Holland@NEMA.org

2012 Virginia Maintenance Code
604.3.1.1 Electrical equipment.

Reason: This proposal adds “a third party field evaluation body” to the list of entities that may provide an inspection report to the AHJ indicating equipment exposed to water has not sustained damage and does not require replacement. Third party field evaluation bodies are recognized under the NFPA 790 Standard for Competency for Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies. This proposal also seeks to remove the voltage rating limitation imposed for the equipment listed in Items 1-5. All of the equipment and wiring in Items 1-18 have standardized voltage ratings in compliance with their applicable product standards.

Bryan Holland gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

John Walsh asked how he would know if a third party is licensed? We need some type of certification.

Glenn Dean stated it was just a different title to an approved national testing laboratory.

Greg Revels asked about adding a clarification language to this proposal?

Bryan Holland stated he could.

Richard Potts stated we would **Move forward as pending. If we can add the definition before the Work Group 2 meeting, we can move forward as consensus.**

Emory Rodgers asked if the third parties were certified?

R-101.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne, representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2012 Virginia Rehabilitation Code
101.5 Use of terminology and notes.

Reason: The entire paragraph has been converted to a list format, which is much easier to read and understand. Other than the new #7 and “Note” the text remains unchanged (except for “VEBC” in lieu of “VRC”). The added language under #7 clarifies that any VRC reference to the IBC means the VCC, which includes the VA amendments to the model IBC, as well as, any VRC references to the other iCodes or standards means those including VA amendments. Otherwise, such references would be to the IBC (or other iCodes or standards) without the VA amendments. The “Note” follows the same concept as that found in VCC 101.2, Note 1 to remind everyone of the “International Codes” referenced in the VEBC that might otherwise be amended in the USBC.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal. The only change in 1-6 is taking the IEBC to the VEBC. The only real change is #7 and the Note.

Comments:

Vernon Hodge said he was not sure if this was the best language.

Emory Rodgers stated it needed tweaking but it needs to be there, he thinks it should be moved forward.

Kenney Payne said he will propose a different language in #7.

Vernon Hodge will add rest of stricken language.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments stated this will - **Move forward as consensus of approval with changes.**

R-102.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Kenney Payne, representing AIA-VA
kpayne@moseleyarchitects.com

2012 Virginia Rehabilitation Code
102.2 Scope.

Reason: The reformatting of VRC 102.2 should make it easier to understand which code (VEBC or VCC) applies to which occupancies. Also the original exception is misleading, since you can have a change of occupancy involving a Group 1-2 and/or 1-3. For example, one can go from a Group 1-2 to a Group B, or go from a Group 1-3 to a Group R; however, one cannot go from a particular Group to a Group 1-2 or 1-3. If Group 1-2 and/or Group 1-3 are allowed to use the VRC/VEBC, even if changing to such Groups, then this code change would need to be revised accordingly.

Kenney Payne gave an overview of his proposal.

Comments:

Johnna Grizzard stated that VBCOA supports this proposal.

Vernon Hodge asked if there was a companion proposal that makes changes to the VCC that correlates with this?

Kenney Payne stated there was and it is going through a few people now. We at least wanted to get this one in the Workgroup meeting.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments stated this will **Move forward as consensus for approval with pending changes.**

Emory Rodgers stated he would prefer move forward with consensus, instead of pending.

Johnna Grizzard asked if there was anything substantially incorrect about this format?

Vernon Hodge stated no.

Next meeting Work Group 2, July 20.

Emory Rodgers asked if the staff was going to place the new state laws in the codes?

Vernon Hodge stated that we are concentrating on the proposed regulations right now. Proposals that come in a week before the agenda goes out for Work Group 3&4 which is August 17, this will be the last workgroup meeting we will do before we start preparing the package for the board of housing. Nothing will go

into the proposed regulations that haven't been looked at in the workgroup meetings. After the proposed regulations are published, we are allowing a 6-month period next year to do this all over again.

Kenney Payne stated his apologies to the group, he would like to reconsider the last proposal status. Kenney went over his proposed changes and asked if he made changes, can we move this forward as consensus.

Richard Potts after hearing no further comments stated this will **move forward with consensus.**