

## **Tri-Chapter Uniform Code Committee (TUCC)**

Meeting Minutes for March 6, 2008  
Milpitas City Hall  
455 E. Calaveras Rd.

### **Call to Order:**

Meeting called to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. by committee co-chairperson Sheila Lee, City of Santa Clara.

### **1. In Attendance:**

\*Stephan Kiefer, City of Livermore  
\*Sheila Lee, City of Santa Clara  
\*\*David Basinger, Shums Coda Associates  
James Russell, Building Codes Consultant  
Susan O'Brien, WC3  
Giyen Senaratne, WC3  
Kathy Bucciarelli, WC3  
David Chung, Gilroy  
Dennis Corbett, City of American Canyon  
Tomas Le, City and Co. of San Francisco  
Richard Betti, City of San Jose  
Michael Richards, Foster City  
Homer Maiel, City of San Jose

Keyvan Irannejad, City of Milpitas  
Rafael Adame, City of Watsonville  
Fred Cullum, Interwest Group  
Daniel Wells, Simpson Strong-tie  
Gary Lepori, City of San Bruno  
Kerwin Lee, Rolf Jensen and Associates  
+Ray Kansara, RK Associates  
Gale Bate, Code Resource  
Tom Shih, CSG  
Diana Rapposelli, Union City  
Brooks MacNeil, City of Burlingame  
Kathryn Sedwick, City of San Jose

\* Chairperson  
\*\* Secretary  
+ Additional/Back-up Secretary

### **2. Minutes Approval:**

Sheila asked that a clarification be made to last month's minutes. There were several references to the "special inspection committee", but Sheila noted that previous Tri-Chapter Special Inspection Committee was dissolved. Therefore the special inspection committee referenced in last month's minutes should be clearly noted as not affiliated with the TUCC or any of the Tri-Chapters, but rather an impromptu group that meets and occasionally makes recommendations to the Tri-Chapters. This group does not represent any of the Tri-Chapters at this point.

With the clarification, the previous minutes were reviewed and approved.

### **Call to Order/Discussion of Related Topics:**

Last month's committee approved the recommendations for party-wall requirements. As a point of order, Sheila asked that this be marked as item #001, and approved for distribution to the three Chapters website. Steven asked these should be clearly indicated interpretations.

BOMA, SVEDA, IFMA groups have invited a few of us from the TUCC committee to sit on a panel to discuss policy, implementation issues and interpretations related to 2007

model codes. This discussion will take place on April 23, 2008, in San Jose. Everyone is invited to attend, and to be available for additional input from the group, in addition to the four Building Officials that will be on the panel (flyer distributed at the meeting – see attached scanned document).

Discussion of Sub-Committee Reports:

1. Corridors and common path of egress travel – Jim Russell, Michael Richards and Gary Layman

Jim indicated that they have combined the sections on corridors (CBC 1017) and common path of egress travel (CBC 1014.3) in an attempt to interpret implementation of these concepts in existing buildings. Of particular interest to the sub-committee was how the 75-ft. (100-ft. in fire-sprinkler buildings) will affect existing exit access and exiting elements in the building. Examples given are related to existing open stairways in a two-story structure, and whether or not they need to be included in the exit travel/common path of egress measurement.

Jim indicated that the common path of egress is the real problem (not the overall exit travel distance), so how do you define where this begins in the examples? The committee then had a brief discussion related to exit access and exit elements, as well as whether or not corridors needed to be enclosed.

Jim indicated that after the discussion, he feels that the once in the corridor he has two means of egress, so the subcommittee will modify the proposed interpretation and return to the committee for final discussion and acceptance.

2. Modifications to Corridors in Existing Buildings – Jim Russell, Michael Richards and Gary Layman

Sub-committee's second item dealt with the remodel of an existing fire-rated corridor, and/or with the modification that adds a rated corridor into an existing tenant space. The 2007 CBC will now allow the corridor to be non-rated and in some instances remove rated doors or combo FSD's – should there be some limits on when and how the rated corridor is downgraded, and continuity of the corridor construction?

Keyvan commented on the proposed guideline suggesting the rated corridor as similar to an "exit", even though defined only as "exit access", which should be revised. Sheila suggests that the interpretation should relate only to the remodeled areas, and the egress access path from the remodeled area to the exit discharge – apply the codes only to these areas. Homer indicates that the partial non-rated corridor is allowed, so they can keep the existing corridor construction without modification (just no longer rated). Gale indicates that if still an assembly occupancy, a corridor would still be required, but Kerwin suggests that is only applicable to a corridor from an assembly use over 100 occupants.

Jim summarized the group discussions to ask the sub-committee to redefine the recommendations to the following: (1) an existing one-hour corridor that no longer needs to be maintained – if chosen by designer; and (2) when an assembly room has over 100 occupants, a corridor will be required; and (3) how tenant improvements for one location of the building must address possibility of downgrading a required rated corridor.

3. R-3 occupancies and allowable openings in property lines – Stephan Kiefer, Ryan Clarkson and Frank Ranonie

Steve presented the revisions to previous interpretations to the group and suggested that the final version will combine the three issues into one item. Ryan and Frank included a definition of what is an opening (language from the IRC as an interpretative guideline) – is everyone happy with this revision? Everyone seems to be satisfied with this clarification/reference in the interpretation document. The group suggests that the dryer vent openings, ventilation openings, etc., should still be considered to be an opening. Still wanted the document to be simplified (not a book), so the sub-committee did not include every specific type of opening. Sheila indicates that interpretations cover all general conditions, exceptions including hillside lots, will need to be handled based on local conditions.

Sheila and others suggested now that the definition of what an opening was including is resolved, could the original four types of conditions being included with the interpretation. Steve will have four final documents.

4. Minimum number of required plumbing fixtures - Kathryn Sedwick, Bob Adler, Keyvan Irannejad, Ray Kansara

Kathryn presented plumbing fixture count comparisons from San Jose to review, and showed conflicts with the CPC. The recommendation document proposes that when applying fixture counts to designs we make them as flexible as possible, because this is not a fire-life safety issues and it gives the Building Department some latitude with enforcement. Steve suggests that rather than an interpretation, this is more of a tool for use and reference by each local jurisdiction.

Sheila suggests that language on the document needs to revise the “use the least amount” statement, so as to not suggest design intentions. Further, Sheila indicate that local jurisdictions have the authority to make final determinations on fixture counts. Kathryn commented on how footnote #19 in Table 4 -1 of the CPC inspired the interpretation to do this as well.

Sheila again commented on the note at the top of the Chapter 29 errata that indicates not adopted by the State, came from a complaint from **Plumbers Union**. This still needs to be fixed, and should not be any different from the previous codes (i.e., **Local jurisdictions have the authority to use provisions in chapter 29**). Steve suggested changes to the general language of the document to be for reference only, with latitude from local jurisdiction. Sheila asks that the sub-committee comes back with revisions to the document the next meeting – and provide maximum flexibility for designer and local jurisdictions.

Gale indicates that State Labor code recommendations note should also be eliminated from the document – which cannot be violated. Steve suggested adding this to item #3 as an alternative.

5. Simpson Strongwall/Hardy Frame Testing Criteria and the use of these shear elements with the new code – Dan Wells, Simpson Strong-tie

Dan recently visited San Jose to discuss the new test criteria found in the 2006 IBC for pre-manufactured wood and steel shear wall systems (and offered to provide similar seminar/information to other jurisdictions if interested). Simpson is currently testing and submitting new testing data for their products to ICC, but the responses are nearly a year from being completed (wood shear panels expected before November 2008, and steel frame shear panels perhaps next year). Kathryn asked to not go into great detail regarding the engineering and test data, but that until the test data is reviewed and considered adequate, there needed to be a policy established for the use of the walls in the interim.

Sheila asks had the San Jose Engineering Staff reviewed the test data, and what were their recommendations for accepted products? Kathryn will send this information forward for distribution to the group.

The committee discussed acceptance criteria related to engineered narrow wall panels and expansion anchors. The concern is that none of the products meet the newly developed acceptance criteria. The committee concluded that each jurisdiction needs to develop their own policy until the final reports and information is provided.

Keyvan asked Dan whether or not Simpson would provide a letter on acceptable load and criteria, until the test data has been approved - Dan indicated that they would provide this letter.

*New Discussion Items raised for Next Meeting:*

Sheila suggested that we discuss the revisions to items previously reviewed, as well as the H-5 recommendations at the next meeting. Once done with these – then suggestions for new topics could be provided for future meetings.

Possible future items to discuss were as follows:

Gale suggests discussions on what is defined as an atrium.

Kathryn suggested guards being retro-fitted at existing stairways.

Discussions of when soils reports should be required for residential construction.

Keyvan asked to discuss affects of accessible means of egress at future meeting.

Keyvan related that complications from new wind design are too much – wanted to discuss a recommendation to come up with a prescriptive policy based design criteria (i.e., just use 15 psf), particularly as seismic usually governs. Fred indicated this idea has support from the Napa/Solano Chapter that will continue to allow the old wind base shear design be used for many instances.

Time will be provided at next meeting to set-up additional assignments for sub-committees.

Next meeting scheduled for April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Adjourned 3:00