

Workgroup 1 Meeting  
Henrico Training Center, Henrico, VA  
March 23, 2016

**C103.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 3)**  
[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

William Andrews Smoke detectors in single family homes

**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.

**Comments:**

David Beahm - It does require a greater level of safety.

Johnna Grizzard - VBCOA will have a code change for this. A change of use request will be addressed. This has not been submitted yet, however, it will address Mr. Andrews request.

Cindy Davis – Mr. Andrews, do you want to carry this over to the next work group and then if you are ok with the new code change that comes in, you can withdraw this one?

Mr. Andrews – the changes she is referring to is only within a use group and it will not be adequate.

Mr. Kenney Payne – Would you be alright to collaborate with the group and see what comes out. I know we have a workgroup meeting next Wednesday and maybe we can place this on the agenda for a code change discussion.

Mr. Andrews – Once something is submitted what is the process for adding collaborative language?

Cindy Davis – I think once you have submitted, I am not sure you can go back and collaborate at that point, the collaboration feature is built into the front in so that you can collaborate while you are creating it. But that doesn't mean that you can't collaborate off line, you just can't do it through the system. Again every single code change has an email address for the proponent and can be contacted by anyone who has a question or concern.

Vernon Hodge – If the proposal is going to be a joint proposal then even after it is submitted staff can add or just get an email saying I have been approved to be a co-proponent on this proposal so we can add that too. This way it shows that this has multiple proponents.

Mr. Farrell – If we are moving from a more restrictive to a lesser restrictive then the building code does not require you to do anything. What are we asking people to do other than spend more money.

John Walsh - We can go ahead and collaborate and add to the VBCOA code change.

Richard Bartell – I'm trying to understand this proposal and where the code allows a change of use without doing anything, I just don't think the code allows this. A house has specific requirements.

Henry Rosenbaum - We do run into this problem on the fire side when we go into a business or any facility and there has been a change. We would like to see a change of use or occupancy issued. I would like to see if any future proposals come about that you also look at the fire code 102.1.1 and try to mirror that as much as possible the same thing that you do on the building side. The text should be the same as we move forward. The example of the location that uses the building permits to trigger something and that is great, this is a statewide code and not all localities have the luxury to have those departments interact with other departments so we need to set a base document that the fire officials can use and the building officials use absence of business license or other agencies.

Vernon Hodge – Mr. Andrews has 3 separate proposals with the same language not just this one.

Cindy Davis – So it sounds like to me like you are all going to work together and we are not going to do anything with this now we will just **carry this forward until the other one comes forward and see where it goes.**

**C-108.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Chip Dicks (Page 4)**  
[chipdicks@futurelaw.net](mailto:chipdicks@futurelaw.net)

108.2 Exemptions from application for permit

**Reason:** This proposal is being submitted by Chip Dicks on behalf of Lamar Advertising Company as an added exemption for OSHA requirements on billboards.

**Comments:**

Cindy Davis – I understand the proponent is not here but I understand that someone will be talking on his behalf.

Mr. Clements - I have VBCOA working with him on this. Allows them to work on these without permits. Provide catwalks and ladders.

Greg Revels - just stipulating the work itself. Why do I care if OSHA issue. That is confining.

Dean – 108.1.5.3306.9 is this part of his change. This is part of a link.

Vernon Hodge – Differentiate colored underline

Cindy Davis – So I'm hearing general agreement on this with a recommendation that the limiting language of only OSHA required regulations be removed.

Shaun Pharr - absence of this, you may have to get permit. Chip may want to way in on this. Thousands of these things may be needed if this is not passed.

Cindy Davis – So we will move this forward with striking OSHA language.

**C-113.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent Bill Einloth (Page 8)**  
[Einloth\\_engle@hotmail.com](mailto:Einloth_engle@hotmail.com)

**Reason:** Skip Harper – He had sent in a bunch of pictures of the crawl space and the condition of the crawl space with a manufactured home on it. It has basically got a ton of water underneath of it. This individual felt that the crawlspace hadn't been inspected so he wanted to create a code requirement requiring that crawlspaces be inspected. Being that this is a manufactured home, I contacted them this morning and they have sent in a complaint for the manufactured home and the problems are deeper than a code change requirement.

**Comments:** Cindy Davis – For the purposes of this group here today the individual wanted a minimum inspection listed as a requirement for every single home in Virginia because he wanted to protect any other consumer from having this same problem. This is how I understand it.

Skip Harper – That is correct.

Sean Farrell - VBCOA adhoc doesn't believe this is necessary issue, we believe the crawlspace is enough and don't feel like adding another issue.

Cindy Davis – So I'm hearing No support for this one.

**CB-901.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 14)**  
[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** Mr. Andrews is adding the sentence The building official shall notify the local fire official when approving, installing, disabling or removing a fire protection system.

**Comments:** Richard Bartell - to begin with, the building official is not going to be approving the installing or disabling, he may approve the installation of but he is not going to be approving the installing or disabling any system. It is a poorly written sentence and I don't think it accomplishes what the submitter hopes.

Robby Dawson – Bill I sent you an email last night to maybe get access so I could maybe lend some support for maybe some modification. I think it does have a great deal of merit. My first consideration was to add 901.3.1 particularly when it is talking about removing because I think the building official does have the ability to remove the permit process the removal of a non-required under the building code fire protection system. That removal should require the approval by a fire code official because if the fire code modification permitted in the modification in lieu of the fire apparatus act. The fire official should be the one to approve the removal of that system. We have this happen all the time in townhouses they can't meet the access provision that is a fire code requirement. What we would like is to your request to modify for fire code aerial ladder apparatus access. If you put an alarm system, an offsite alarm system, consistent with section that is consistent with the USBC.

Richard Bartell – I think what this code change is saying and I think we are saying the same, we both need to know what each side is saying. This would be a coordinated effort between the fire code official and the building code official by notifying where you have placed a required system.

Robby Dawson – You want the building official to authorize the fire code modification?

Shaun Pharr – As I read this proposal, it is not attempting on its face to shift authority, it is original language, you cannot modify or remove without a building official. I think there is merit of notice to the fire code official. I am just concerned about the delay and would put a suggestion out there specifying in that sentence, if it could stay to specify something about timing. At the time the permit application is submitted or within 10 days or something similar. So notification doesn't come at the tail end by the building code official to its fire code counterpart. Notice should be given as soon as possible.

Robby Dawson will help Mr. Andrews with suggestions.

Glenn Dean – I find the disabling part problematic.

Michael Redifer – Because this happens in Newport News as well. The development plan will be signed off on the fire code officials based on the proffer protection to the building. What I suggest is that the fire official when making modifications to fire code requirements on the site, not even look at modifications to the building as meeting their standard for that modification. In other words stick to the site, modify the site rather than accepting a change to the building, which is a building code modification.

Robby Dawson – What can I do in that building on site that will alleviate my operation in not having a fire lane access to that building?

Michael Redifer - We have to say no sometime and there is an appeal process when you do say no.

Mike Armstrong - We cannot deny a church, we can't tell them no because they have no water. That is just not being realistic. We have to think about the statewide issue versus a municipality.

Sean Farrell - doesn't 103.8 and 103.8.1 become applicable?

Cindy Davis – So really what you are talking about is the communication issue. This part is happening without anyone being told it is happening?

George Hollingsworth – this in its simplicity is saying that make sure that everyone knows and is aware and that the building owner doesn't get caught in the middle. So if the system is removed and the fire code official was in the building last year and then they call the fire code official and say the system was removed we would hate for the citizen to go through a lot of things we don't want them to have to go through.

Ron Clements – I think the simple solution is to strike non required. Don't call it required. If the fire code official says, I want a sprinkler system in that building because of fire code, that is not a building code modification and I cannot enforce it. What happens is they pull the system out of the building, I have no way to stop them and I let my fire code official know and the fire code official will have to site them under the fire code ordinance they are violating. This is not technically a building code required system so I wouldn't call it a required.

Rick Witt – to me this is a communication issue, it is an administrative provision. Go to Administrative Chapter 1 says all administrative matters are put into Chapter 1. This does not just talking about non-required systems this talks about any system. You can't regulate communication and we need to think about this. Maybe it is just simple as when a system is installed, you notify the fire code official. You need to be careful how you write this.

Kenney Payne – 901.3 is modification during construction, right? If for an existing building a whole new rehab code that addresses issues where you are going in a year later and discover something as part as the work being done. That code addresses issues like that, so if this is intended to apply to existing building codes I think there is going to be a disconnect here because they are going to say things like in an existing code you are not allowed to decrease existing conditions. You may have a sprinkler system that is not required but the rehab code is not going to allow you to remove it, at all or disable it.

Cindy Davis – So it looks like we have a lot of coordinating efforts here. We will hold this over and it will come back after folks have worked on this and they give us feedback.

**CB-905.2 cdpVa-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 15)**  
[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** Pressure reducing valve settings shall be as approved by the local fire official.

**Comments:** Mr. Andrews – NFPA 14 requires pressure reducing valves where discharge pressure over 175 psi (typically on lower levels in high rise building). We would like 150 psi instead of 175 psi.

Cindy Davis – Couldn't this be dealt with as a modification?

Mr. Andrews – then you would have to deal with each individual building and fire official

Glenn Dean – I would submit that this be more appropriate as a local ordinance rather than in the SFPC. It is not going to affect a building now under construction or materials used. As it is worded, particularly with the SFMO being the local fire official for the majority of the land areas, it is a challenge. Things are going to differ across the local areas.

William Andrews – It is a problem

Glenn Dean - As the AHJ for state enforced areas, I don't know this has been a problem.

Shaun Pharr – the authority issue is looming again. Standpipes are part of the fire protection system and the authority of them is the building code and the building official so that last sentence as approved by raises the implication. This is a practical matter that could be addressed by Mr. Andrews' earlier change as it is getting tweaked. At least this provides dialogue between the building official and the fire code official.

Richard Bartell – Why do we want to differ from the national standards?

Rodgers – William and Glenn really hit the bullet on this one. In Arlington where we have lots of probably over 200 high rise buildings. This is in the wrong section.

Cindy Davis – In summarizing this, I am not hearing any support for this being done as part of the code on a statewide basis in a mandatory fashion,

**CR-R302.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ronald Clements representing Chesterfield County (Page 16)**

[clementsro@chesterfield.gov](mailto:clementsro@chesterfield.gov)

**Reason:** Adding an exception for exterior walls.

**Comments:** Ron Clements – VBCOA hasn't signed off on this.

Greg Revels – in agreement.

Rick Witt – in agreement

Richard Bartell – in agreement

**F102.1.1.-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 17)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** For 2015 code, change to 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 get appropriate Certificate of Occupancy from building official when use changes.

**Comments:** Cindy Davis – Can we lump them in with the others?

William Andrews: Yes

Johnna Grizzard - we didn't include but we will look into it.

David Beahm – We would also need to look at the allowance of a final inspection survey and certificate.

**F-403.5 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 18)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** Group E occupancies, The fire official may regulate where more than five occupants under the age of 2 ½ years old may occupy in parts of building not protected by an approved automatic sprinkler system.

**Comments:** William Andrews – A couple of years ago, our office became aware that there are infants in some of our high schools. High school students were bringing their infants to class. Older school buildings with infants in them now. Where can these infants be located?

Greg Revels – I understand the intent of what you are trying to do, however, I think the language extends further than I think the fire code official would like it to extend.

Robbie Dawson – If you have 10 or 15 18 mo. Old children doesn't that change the use. I-4 is under 2 ½ years old. They are not doing this as a day care.

Johnna Grizzard - it would be different if it was a day care. In a high school it is a one to one ratio. There is no hazard there.

Emory Rodgers – 106.3.1 inspections.

Ed Rose – Is this during school hours?

Cindy Davis – generally speaking, I hear no support for this issue.

**F-505.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 19)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** Using different addresses confuses records and in an emergency can have serious consequences. Only an officially approved address shall be used to identify that site. Exception: Mailing address may be to a post office box, and to another approved address.

**Comments:** Glenn Dean – Not a code locality problem. Needs to be addressed somewhere else.

Kenney Payne – Now let me see if I’m correct, this will move forward, with no support? Will we see this checked box.

Cindy Davis – Yes, all proposals go to the board for a final decision whether they have full support, partial support or no support.

**F-703.4 cdpVa-15 Proponent Justin Biller (Page 20)**

[jbbiller@carilionclinic.org](mailto:jbbiller@carilionclinic.org)

**Comments:** Mr. Biller not present

Vernon Hodge - he still wants this in even though already in code

Robby Dawson - I agree with NFPA 80 testing which it is in already.

Kenney Payne - FireCode workgroup there have been discussions about when you reference things like this says inspections under which the building was constructed.

Glenn Dean - under old and new, I don’t agree.

Cindy Davis – Discussion is that NFPA 80 should remain, the visual has already been the standard, there has been comments that this may change relating to the Fire code edit. So we will move this forward and see what happens.

Robby Dawson – If it goes forward in accordance with NFPA 80, that will be fine. I will reach out to Justin Biller.

David Beahm - it is already part of the inspection  
Adding additional language, ok with NFPA 80

Rick Witt - don't want to set up in language since it was changed in 2004. There is a cost factor to have inspection. You need to be careful on a re-write.

Henry Rosenbaum - maintenance does reference NFPA 80, redundant language.

Michael Redifer - testing for emergency egress lighting added to IFC.

Kenney Payne – I think if we delete the vertical sliding and rolling doors.

Cindy Davis - No agreement, we will revisit again.

**F-901.6.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 21)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** Standards, Standpipe pressure reducing valves with adjustable setting shall be at pressure approved by fire official, as part of five year flow test.

**Comments:** Cindy Davis – Rather than opening this again, can we put this to the same general agreement that it will be addressed on a local basis.

**F-1030 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 22)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** The Virginia fire code cannot require more than the building code, thus wordage which requires physical features in addition to such is void within Virginia's Fire Prevention Code. Beyond use group R-2 and R-3, fire officials need authority to require good maintenance of windows originally installed able to open, and designate existing windows as an emergency escape, or access fresh air where escape unsafe.

**Comments:** William Andrews cited Section 1031.7 addressing windows as emergency escape and rescue. An exterior window is to be maintained as an emergency escape and rescue window.

Kenney Payne - How do we regulate and enforce this?

William Andrews - We have guidelines for window size

Richard Bartell - How can we support this since this is already in code? Why can't you use the language already in the code?

William Andrews – The fire official has no documentation as to what is the escape window.

Richard Bartell – We don't ask them to designate the escape window on the plans only that any window that meets the specifications can be deemed an escape window.

Sean Farrell – To me this has retrofit written all over this. I don't believe VBCOA can support this.

Cindy Davis – So I'm not hearing support for this one? No support

### **M101.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent VMC Rewrite Committee (Page 24) 2012 Virginia Maintenance Code**

**Reason:** As requested by the Board of Housing and Community Development, DHCD staff undertook a review of the Virginia Maintenance Code (VMC) to remove unenforceable construction provisions printed within the code. Current codes work from having to rely upon administrative provisions in Chapter 1 to supersede provisions in the International Codes, which are incorporated into the state regulations, but different than, or outside of the scope of, or in conflict with provisions of Chapter 1. DHCD established a committee of stakeholders involved in and affected by the VMC to collaborate on and review the draft rewrites. This VMC rewrite represents consensus among those involved. The changes are essentially editorial as they are just removing the unenforceable provisions from the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) and rewording administrative provisions in the IPMC to be consistent with the Chapter 1 language. It was noted that if client groups wanted to make substantive changes to the VMC, those would be submitted separately through Virginia's code change process.

**Comments:** Cindy Davis – In your packet you will see the 2012 Virginia Maintenance Code that the VMC Rewrite Committee has worked on in several sessions. Last year we ended up with the current document which we attempted to go through the VMC and remove unenforceable provisions. This attempt was made to remove the language to help anyone who pulled this up on-line, building owner or tenant and anyone who has questions about what is and is not enforceable under the maintenance code locally. If the locality chooses to enforce the maintenance code this is the limit to what can be enforced. Johnna Grizzard, is one of the members of the VMC Rewrite Committee. I understand that there are a number of code changes being prepared to put some things back in in a different manner, not requiring retrofits but making it clear how it has to be maintained. This exercise was simply taking out what cannot be enforced in its current form.

Robby Dawson – Put things back in? Put things back into what? Things have not been removed it is just a proposal to remove things.

Cindy Davis – This is up to the Virginia Maintenance Committee.

John Walsh - We may have to put things back in if things have been taken out. If BHCD says no, this is not what we intended we will go back next cycle and start over. Have to anticipate that this will get accepted. This is kind of a dual process. This will need to be voted on before adding the code changes.

Cindy Davis – The process used to do this was done over a long period of time with a lot of folks at the table that enforce it and have to live with it. At the end, there was no disagreement but yes, some of these things we don't like but we understand the way the law is written that this cannot be retro actively enforced against existing buildings in Virginia. With this understanding, the sections were removed. If this goes to the board as proposed regulations, then the code changes that would address any issues related to these sections you see in front of you would be put forth as separate code changes.

Robby Dawson – This is the VMC package that is in the pdf format.

Cindy Davis – If there is general support for this then staff will incorporate into a document for the proposed regulation to the board. At any time, revisions or changes can be made. The purpose of getting this ready was to ensure that everyone had a chance to talk about it ahead of time, knew what was being done, why it was being done, understood the process. Now it comes before the whole workgroup for vetting.

Vernon Hodge - If we receive enough change requests, we may have to get the original group back together and have them look at what other people want to do, because, the original group may have to come together again.

David Beahm – We are open to collaboration at this time.

Richard Bartlett – Suppose the committee doesn't support, will we still have an opportunity to send to the board?

Vernon Hodge – Suppose this is editorial, because the International Property Maintenance Code has stuff in it that you cannot use because of Chapter 1. All we are doing is to go into the book and taking it out so there is no misconception about whether you can use it or not. Some wanted to make substantive changes to the language of the IMC, we didn't want to do that because this rewrite is just editorial. Substantives changes should be done on a separate form and we will give to the board with this rewrite.

Shaun Pharr - Editorial revisions, number of changes that was deleted. Sections that are tenant responsibility that was deleted. Lots of details that were deleted because they were redundant, tenants and owners aren't going to be able to find in other areas. I have some concerns.

Cindy Davis – We came up with generic language to be used throughout so that we don't lose sections where you still need to look at things even when it appears to be stricken there has been general agreement acknowledging that this will be replaced with generic language "in accordance with the code in which it was originally constructed."

Sean Farrell – I would make a recommendation in order to facilitate to put this at the end of the agenda. Then folks interested could stay and we proceed by line and state what we did.

Emory Rodgers - Shaun and others who might have amendments to place things back in between now and your next Workgroup 1 Meeting on July 7. There are some wordsmithing that needs to be made.

Robby Dawson - Section 101. What needs to be tweaked or modified. Not a 26 page impact as this looks like an elephant, I have a problem with working on this when other things may be added,

Kenney Payne – in Fire Code Workgroup pulled deleted items go in appendix.

**M103.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent William Andrews (Page 54)**

[William.andrews@richmondgov.com](mailto:William.andrews@richmondgov.com)

**Reason:** 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).

**Comments:**

**M104.5.3 cdpVa-15 Proponent Sean Farrell, VBCOA (Page 55)**

[sfarrell@pwcgov.org](mailto:sfarrell@pwcgov.org)

**Reason:** Where no permission has been granted to inspect a building or structure, or to access the premises, the inspection may only involve what is in plain view.

**Comments:** Sean Farrell - Stay away from illegal searches. Help clarify language.

Richard Bartell – I understand why this is put here, I don't think it adds anything to the code. I think we are all bound by the laws of the commonwealth when it comes to trespass on an individual property

Robby Dawson – I agree.

Rick Witt – I agree with my colleagues from Hanover and Charlottesville.

Support for Disagreement

**M-202 cdpVA-15 Proponent John Walsh (Page 56)**

[John.walsh@richmondgov.com](mailto:John.walsh@richmondgov.com)

**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. All structures shall have an approved primary heat source capable of maintaining a level of comfort heat sufficient to maintain the plumbing and sanitation systems free from damage or freezing. Additionally, every owner and operator of a Group R-2 apartment building or other residential dwelling who rents, leases or lets one or more dwelling unit, rooming unit, dormitory or guestroom on terms, either expressed or implied, to furnish heat to the occupants, thereof shall supply heat during the period from October 15 to may 1 to maintain a temperature of not less than 65 degrees F (18 degrees C) in all habitable rooms, bathrooms, and toilet rooms.

**Comments:** John Walsh - Manufactured Homes parks were owned by owner and homes were owned individually. Heating systems were taken out or never fixed them. We required some kind of heating. 602.2 relates to leasing. There is a vagueness in the code that we need to clarify.

Richard Bartell – Owner occupied dwelling does not have to have heat.

Shawn Pharr - I was on winning side. Board was persuaded by language in 1990. This was deleted in R-2 if you are taking money for rent. If you are owner, we are not going to reach the long arm of the law to your dwelling, however, if you take money you have to provide.

John Walsh - Any structure that was not owner occupied was exempted. Apples and oranges. Don't use VMC, we muddied the water in Richmond.

Shawn Pharr - the practical impact of that application would be surrendered totally meaningless what the legislative board did in regard who has to provide heating,

Robby Dawson - we were leaning on unfit structure. This needs to be fixed.

Greg Revels - tweaking of this?

Johnna Grizzard – This is why we have VMC to protect individuals.

Glenn Dean - modification can be done.

John Walsh - I can modify.

Sean Farrell – Rarely do you see an owner complain on themselves.

Emory Rodgers - Rewrite this language.

Work on this and bring back.

**R102.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ron Clements Virginia Rehabilitation Code  
(Page 58)**

[clementsro@chesterfield.gov](mailto:clementsro@chesterfield.gov)

**Reason:** Change of occupancy from R-5 to a commercial use is not specifically addressed in the VRC. Conversion of group R-5 single family dwellings to various commercial uses is a common change of occupancy.

**Comments:** VBCOA Rehab Code is working on this and it will address the issue.

Kenney Payne - I will support the revisions and changes to the table.

**OTHER DISCUSSION ISSUES:**

--Eric Mays (Prince William) has a FedEx project that the conveyor system is being made and installed on-site. Is a conveyor system installed in a warehouse considered a “processing machine” ? Clarification

Sean Farrell VBCOA language to include conveyor process equipment.

General Agreement that this is exempt.

--Asbestos nothing proposed, just discussions

Sean VBCOA ad-hoc committee discussed statutory language and nothing we can change in code.

--Historic building definition.

Sean Farrell – VBCOA Administrative Ad-hoc Committee, conclusion was that the statutory language was identified and it is what it is. We need to have one definition for all three codes.

John Walsh no state definition only a statute.

Ron Clements - so many definitions so tried to have one definition in one place.

--Any Exemptions for appliances and equipment

--Tiny Houses

Thom Stanton representing the American Tiny Houses Association

Gave an overview on tiny houses. Multigenerational thing. What is the typical tiny house, wheels, etc. Manufactured home, stand alone residence or a recreational vehicle.

Richard Bartell – built a tiny house and had no problem complying with building codes. We can't deal with them when they are on a chassis.

Kenney Payne draft a code change for tiny houses.

--Any other issues for discussion

--Sean Farrell - Permit technicians in whether or not whether they are technical assistants to the building official. Permit Technicians Committee putting together a proposal to address this interpretation issue.

Vernon Hodge – I think it is a training and certification office issue. It was implemented as a volunteer certification.

Emory Rodgers - They are the first line before the building official. I believe it depends on if the building official has designated duties for the permit technician.

Michael Redifer – The building official can't have the permit technician issue a permit unless they are a technical assistant.

Vernon Hodge – The board of housing says they have a volunteer certification.

Johnna Grizzard – I believe we all agree, according to the definition, yes they are technical assistants.

Rick Witt - They are technical assistant's, volunteer certification.

George Hollingsworth – maybe we should look at the requirements.

Richard Bartell - We don't do business the same, who is the technical assistant? I believe it should be the building official who makes the call, BHCD doesn't staff

my office. Flexibility for each locality. Optional certification, I should decide to take it. Don't mandate because some localities don't have funds for training.

Greg Revels – Don't impose this on all jurisdictions.

105.2 and 105.2.2 Certification of technical assistant have BCAAC and VBCOA Ad-hoc look into this for further action,.

Kenney Payne - Agenda items in one or more workgroups. Both outcomes are taken to the board.

--Virginia Maintenance Code

Glenn Dean - It has been entered into cdpVA in a pdf format.

Richard Bartell - change to maintenance code for the pdf version.

John Walsh – We prepared the base document and we may make code changes and add some language back in.

Robby Dawson - I have a problem with this. It is duly noted.

Shaun Pharr - Some of this is clear, however, some characteristics of unsafe condition I don't understand.

Sean Farrell - vet your code change through VBCOA.

Chapter 1 Administration

Replaced 2012 with 2015 and took out retrofit language

Chapter 2 Definitions deleted definitions that weren't used anymore

Chapter 3 General Requirements

Chapter 4 Light, Ventilation and Occupancy Limitations

Chapter 5 Plumbing Facilities and Fixture Requirements

Chapter 6 Mechanical and Electrical Requirements

Bryan Holland with NEMA suggested changing to 1,000 volts in 604.3.1.1

Chapter 7 Fire Safety Requirements

Reference to SFPC.

Can place this in a code change.

Adjourned 2:55 p.m.