

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BUILDING CODES COMMITTEE

April 19, 2000
Maricopa Association of Governments Office
Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Leon Manuel, El Mirage, Chairman	* Tom Mattingly, Mesa
* Ken Sowers, Avondale	Armando Rivas, Paradise Valley
Bob Lee, Cave Creek	Jerry Loruss, Peoria
* Alex Banachowski, Chandler	Bob Goodhue, Phoenix
* Patrick Davis, Fountain Hills	Tim Wegner, Queen Creek
* Ralph Vasquez, Gila Bend	Dave Potter, Scottsdale
JoRene DeVeau, Gila River Indian Community	* John Guenther, Surprise
Ray Patten, Gilbert	Roger Vermillion for Michael Williams, Tempe
Bill Griffiths for Deborah Mazoyer, Glendale	Mario Rochin, Tolleson
Steve Burger, Goodyear	* Skip Blunt, Wickenburg
Chuck Ransom, Litchfield Park	Red Miller, Youngtown
Tom Ewers, Maricopa County	* Rus Brock, Home Builders Association

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Harry Wolfe, MAG

Alan Olson, Phoenix

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. by Chairman Leon Manuel.

2. Approval of March 15, 2000 Meeting Minutes

Leon Manuel asked if there were any comments on the meeting minutes. Bill Griffiths commented that some names of speakers at the Permit Technicians meeting were misspelled and that some names had been omitted. He said he would forward those corrections to Harry Wolfe for inclusion in the minutes. (The correct spellings of the people cited in the minutes should have been John Mall from the Registrar of Contractors and Barbara Morris from the Department of Revenue. In addition the Fire Marshal from Fountain Hills was Scott LaGreca, and the female contractor was Lesa Mahoney from South-West Architectural Builders.) It was moved by Ray Patten, seconded by Jerry Loruss and unanimously recommended to approve the minutes as amended.

3. Call to the Public

Steve Burger mentioned that one ICBO Board of Directors, Ms. Becky Baker, will be at the next Permit Technicians Forum meeting on May 10, 2000. The site of the meeting in Tempe has not yet been selected.

4 R3/U-1 Semi One-Hour Occupancy Separation

Roger Vermillion, Chairman of the Building Inspectors/Plan Reviewer forum, explained that the R3/U-1 Semi One-Hour Occupancy Separation standard represented the consensus of the group.

Leon Manuel suggested making it a policy instead of a standard following, the format used by Phoenix for their interpretations/policies. Using interpretations/policies in lieu of a “standard” was approved for use by this Committee in the later part of 1998..

Bob Goodhue responded that Phoenix is revising its format to make it more attractive.

Leon Manuel suggested that in light of changes by Phoenix to the format, we should maintain current format as presented at this time.

Bob Goodhue asked what walls and columns was meant by the term “completely within” in item #1.

Roger Vermillion responded that it was completed within the confines of the garage. .

Bob Goodhue asked if that included a bearing wall?

Roger Vermillion responded that it was a bearing wall or a column within a garage and an exterior wall. He also said that there was protection on the garage side.

Bob Goodhue said that he was satisfied if there were protection on the garage side.

Bob Goodhue raised a question regarding the advisability of 26 gauge sheet metal as addressed in Item #4. He said he understood its use for duct work, but that it was not needed here.

Roger Vermillion stated that requirement came from one of the jurisdictions and he did not recall which one it was.

Leon Manuel asked who uses 26 gauge sheet metal. He suggested that we undertake a survey to see what jurisdictions used it.

Cruz Sagasta said that the County allows 26 gauge as long as it overlaps the seem of the trap door.

Bob Goodhue said the steel that comes into contact with the surface does not have the same dynamics as the duct work.

Bob Goodhue asked about item #10 and whether anyone considered bolted wheel stops as another alternative. Roger Vermillion responded that such an alternative was never raised.

Bob Lee said that this particular section of the Code is a remnant from the past and that in the 2000 IRC a lot of the requirements disappear. He asked whether such a standard was really necessary.

Leon Manuel said that in the IRC the only provision that is eliminated is the 5/8" Type X sheetrock.

Roger Vermillion said that things can change, but that we need to address the issue now.

Tom Mattingly said that the IRC eliminated the need for 5/8" sheet rock. Knowing that adoption of the 2000 Codes is coming up, it would seem we should be moving in that direction. He added that the provision seemed to be more stringent than where the Code is going.

Red Miller questioned the provision in item #9 which called for gas and electric furnaces to be 18" above the floor. He asked where the source of ignition would be.

Roger Vermillion said that if you examined the Mechanical Code it shows things raised off the floor. He said this appeared to be a gray area in the code.

Alan Olson noted that in the electrical code you don't put duplex outlets low within garages. Electric water heaters are no different.

Steve Burger asked whether specifications for bollards were developed. Roger Vermillion responded that they were not developed.

Leon Manuel stated that if we needed to add specifications for bollards that there are specifications in the Uniform Fire Code.

Alan Olson said item #1 seems to require a ceiling in a garage. He said you need to be careful that a ceiling is required if the garage is open to the attic. He added that we know that the International Code will have less restrictive separation requirements, so it would not be desirable to make this standard more restrictive than the UBC. It was also mentioned that since all the jurisdictions current use the UBC it makes sense to come up with a common standard for how to do ceiling separations when they are used.

Steve Burger said that the Building Codes Committee could demonstrate, by accepting this standard, that we are moving toward uniformity. He recommended either accepting or rejecting it.

Alan Olson moved to approve the concept with a clarification in item #1; and that item #4 be revised to delete 26 gauge sheet metal. The motion was seconded by Steve Burger.

Cruz Sagasta said he was confused about item #1. He asked if you eliminated the 5/8" on the garage side if it was a single story unit. Bob Goodhue responded yes and the key is common attic space.

Bill Griffiths said the wording is okay if you add the option to extend the separation wall to the underside of the wall.

Roger Vermillion said that the common practice is to drywall the ceiling and walls within the garage. He added that no builder is using the option of continuing the separation wall through the attic space to the under side of the roof deck.

Dave Potter said that he was referring to using one layer of type x gyp bd, which does not necessarily constitute a listed one hour assembly.

Alan Olson said that the provision was written well for one option but that you need to have the other option available. He suggested rewording it to recognize the vertical separation wall in the underside of the deck.

Steve Burger said that the matter was explained in the ICBO Interpretation manual

The motion to delete 26 gauge was passed unanimously.

Tom Mattingly asked for clarification on provision #10. He asked about the bollards. Leon Manuel responded that the minimum specifications was contained in the Fire Code.

Tom Mattingly asked about the logic of having an electrical water heater raised off the ground.

Steve Burger said that the interpretations manual provides an explanation.

Bob Lee said that ICBOs idea was that a gas dryer was a portable piece of equipment.

Tim Wegner expressed concern about the use of a normal path.

The question was raised whether furnaces and water heaters should be out of the path of motor vehicles where they are not. Protection should be afforded by a ballard 3" in diameter installed a minimum 18 inches below and 44 inches above finished floor.

Cruz Sagasta said that you add \$5,000 to the cost of a home to make such a change.

It was moved by Tom Mattingly, seconded by Dave Potter and unanimously recommended to approve the rewording of item #10.

Bill Griffith suggested an alternative wording for provision number 1. Roger Vermillion suggested another wording for number one as follows: Option: the modified separation wall may continue through the common attic space to the underside of the roof deck in lieu of the above requirement. It was moved by Bill Griffith, seconded by Mario Rochin and unanimously recommended to accept this wording.

Dave Potter expressed concern with item #12. He said that the wording should be revised to say: "Jurisdictions that require fire sprinkler systems throughout an R-3/U occupancy need not comply

with fire resistive requirements of items 1 through 8.”

It was moved by Tom Mattingly seconded by Steve Burger and unanimously approved to accept the revised wording.

5. Marking of Trusses

It was moved by Bob Lee, seconded by Bob Goodhue and unanimously recommended to approve the standard for the marking of trusses developed by the MAG Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer Group.

6. Minimum Size of Opening of a Flue Damper in Solid Fuel Burning Fire Place Coating a Gas Log

It was moved by Bob Lee, seconded by Bob Goodhue and unanimously recommended to approve the standard for the marking of trusses developed by the MAG Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer Group.

7. Adoption of the 2000 Codes

Leon Manuel reported that the adoption of the 2000 International Building Codes and uniform set of amendments needed to be addressed during the coming months. He discussed the approach used in the Los Angeles area for adopting uniform codes and amendments.

Mr. Manuel said that this region might look at doing something similar to Los Angeles.

Bob Lee said that it would be best to all adopt the same codes. By doing so, we could all learn about the problems in the code and make it better.

Dave Potter said that we need to agree to form a committee and get started on adoption. Leon Manuel stated that as is last understood Tucson/Pima County, Marana and Oro Valley would be adopting the code as soon as it became available possibly without any amendments.

Alan Olson urged anyone who had questions on I Codes versus U Codes to go to the Prescott AZBO Educational Institute..

Alan Olson summarize two ways to proceed; one was to form a committee to come up with a consistent set of amendments; the other was to adopt the Code as published without any amendments.

Leon Manuel was noted that this was a national code that had a lot of input and that we should consider its adoption and only reluctantly accept amendments. He said that approach for addressing the 2000 Codes would be discussed again at the next meeting with action considered.

8. Questionnaire on Use of Technology in Permitting Process

Harry Wolfe noted that he had not had the time to develop the questionnaire on the use of technology in the permitting process. He did state, however, that the task had been placed in next year's work program, to begin July 1, 2000.

9. Status Report on Other Items

Leon Manuel reviewed the status of a number of items that had appeared on the MAG Building Codes Committee and had been deferred. These items included addressing a state energy codes standard, child day care and shade structures standards, inspections resolutions with Contractor's representatives, the One Coat Stucco Program, disability accessibility to single family residential model homes and an inspection survey. Mr. Manuel asked committee members who were responsible for following-up on these items to pursue them and that a report would be provided at the next meeting.

10. Review of Mission of MAG Building Codes Committee

This item was deferred because the representative who requested its consideration was not in attendance.

11. MAG Building Codes Committee Work Program for the Coming Year

This item was deferred because the representative who requested its consideration was not in attendance.

12. Topics for Future Agendas

Mr. Manuel noted possible topics for future agendas included the NEC resolution, legislative update, state plumbing code commission, adoption of 2000 Codes, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.