

Tri-Chapter Uniform Code Committee (TUCC)

Meeting Minutes for January 10, 2008
Milpitas City Hall
455 E. Calaveras Rd.

Call to Order:

Meeting called to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. by committee co-chairperson Sheila Lee, City of Santa Clara.

1. In Attendance:

*Sheila Lee, City of Santa Clara
**David Basinger, Shums Coda Associates
Anthony Ghiossi, Town of Los Gatos
Laura Brinson, Santa Cruz County
Gary Layman, City of Dublin
Allen Lang, Alameda County
Steve Houlihan, City of San Jose
Richard Betti, City of San Jose
Suresh Achaya, City of Concord
Kevin Mulcahy, City of Concord
Richard Ames, City of Mountain View

Gale Bate, Code Resource
Bob Adler, City of San Jose
Rafael Adame, City of Watsonville
Fred Cullum, Interwest Group
Mike Baird, Kutzmann and Associates
David Chung, City of Gilroy
Stephen Lau, City of San Mateo
Bill Vaughn, SEAONC
Mark Gilligan, SEAONC
Brooks MacNeil, City of Burlingame
Kathryn Sedwick, City of San Jose

* Chairperson

** Secretary

+ Additional/Back-up Secretary

2. Minutes Approval:

Previous minutes reviewed and approved.

Call to Order/Discussion of Sub-Committee Reports:

Sheila briefly made a point of order that during these discussions of the sub-committee work, the group should feel free to make recommendations, and perhaps ask for additional changes to be made to the interpretations. These will in turn be brought forward to a future TUCC meeting. Voting on whether or not to recommend a common interpretation will take place only after all discussion/revisions have been made to a particular item.

3. Discussions of sub-committee's work:

Item #3 – How to Enforce New 5-ft. Separation to Property Line at R-3 Occupancies:
(See attached draft documents dated December 28, 2007, from Ryan Clarkson, Livermore, and Frank Rainone, Sunnyvale, for reference)

Steve Kiefer and his committee did not make it to the meeting, but there are four different submittals they provided to be discussed, which may be combined into a single item at a later date.

3A - Additions less than 5-ft from the property line

TUCC discussions focused on whether or not the under-floor and attic venting should be considered openings, and included in the 25% of unprotected openings allowed in the 3- to 5-ft. from the property line distances. Kathryn asked for clarification regarding where is the top and bottom of the wall being defined with regards to the opening protection requirements? Susan O'Brien suggested that the committee add a definition of openings to the recommendations, and then return for additional discussions.

We need a definition of the wall and opening as it relates to the requirements and recommendations.

3B - What is included in the 25% opening requirements?

The interpretation/proposed guideline references some ventilation – but it would appear that the sub-committee was addressing ventilation as it relates to natural light and ventilation requirements. Kathryn indicates that if the interaction equation from CBC 704.7 and/or 704.8 is used (i.e., Figure 704.7), in some instances you will not reach the 25% allowed per Table 704.8. Sheila noted that the sub-committee used the IRC as reference, and felt that it was helpful when needed for interpretations as the CBC sections are largely based on the IRC.

Again the inclusion of under-floor and attic ventilation is requested to be looked at further by the sub-committee.

3C - R-3 Occupancy - exterior window/door replacements where closer than 5-ft. to the property line

TUCC in agreement that window replacement (i.e., like-for-like), should be acceptable, without enforcement of the opening protection provisions.

3D – New or enlargements of existing openings in walls closer than 5ft. to the property line

The TUCC had some confusion (without the members of the sub-committee present), on what the recommendation really is trying to indicate.

Sheila requested the sub-committee to provide clarification of the 25% unprotected opening applicability with regards to new **and** existing walls. Mike suggested that we need consistency on the 25% (what is included – see recommendations of 3A and 3B), before we can move forward on this item. Kathryn also asked if the sub-committee could provide additional interpretations related to overhang/eaves?

4. Party Walls per 2007 CBC 705.1.1

(see attached, undated document #4 from Robert Woods, Walnut Creek, and Mike Baird, Kutzman Associates)

4A - Mike Baird indicates that he and Robert have created two separate interpretation policies related to the Party Wall. Robert (through Walnut Creek) has developed a policy and procedure to allow party wall construction through jurisdictional resolution and legal documents being recorded – option #1. Mike has proposed alternatively not allowing use

of any party walls whatsoever, based on the concept that the code defines a party wall, but does not indicate that each jurisdiction should be inclined allow them to be constructed – option #2.

Sheila prefers that the sub-committee have only one opinion provided for discussion and consideration by the larger group. Further, option #2 was dismissed as the jurisdictions would be required to allow the use of party walls, as they are part of the adopted code. Gale suggested getting some consensus on how these walls are identified during the plan check process. Kathryn asked whether or not maintaining structural stability been part of previous codes – because meeting this requirement will be extremely tricky and difficult.

4B - Party wall references in CBC 419, Robert and Mike felt that there was no interpretation recommendation required, as these are not the same party walls defined in CBC 705.

Kathryn noted that structural independence cited in CBC 419 is not the same as the requirements and definition of a party wall in CBC 705. San Jose is also concerned with townhome language in the 2007 CBC, as it differs from the architectural vernacular, and there still would be the issue related to utility locations.

Consensus is that CBC 419 has no need for interpretation.

5. Special inspections for wood-framed construction – New Section 1707.3
(see attached undated draft document #7, from Keyvan Irannejad, Milpitas, Mark Crain, San Jose and Gary Layman Sr., Dublin)

Gary indicated that there is not currently an ICC policy or certification process for qualifying structural wood frame special inspectors. The sub-committee operated under the assumption that in the near future an interim certification policy would have been developed (by ICC, ICC Chapters, etc.) to provide certification for these types of inspections. The committee also recommended that jurisdictions allow whoever is certified to perform these inspections to also be pre-qualified to review walls and shear transfer mechanism as well.

Mark Gilligan from SEAONC suggested that the group recommendations should include additional new inspection requirements, such as structural shear walls for seismic loading, and seismic resistance. SEAONC also wanted to note that the project engineer of record may not want to provide the role of special inspection, and the jurisdictions should not require them to provide these inspections. The obligation per code is that the owner hires the qualified special inspector, which may differ if the special inspections are provided by current jurisdictional staff.

Anthony is concerned that this may be a step backwards not relying on field inspectors to perform these inspections. Sheila is in agreement that the jurisdictional inspection staff has been providing these inspections to date. Keyvan agrees, but noted that when ICC (or other agency) develops a certification process for wood frame inspectors – how will this change the process? Sheila noted that because there is not currently a certified inspection program available for those inspections, we are not obligated to create a certification or program to meet this requirement-

Gary proposed that the group continue to make the inspections as we have in the past, and review this again when a certification process has been developed.

6. Bob Adler distributed IAPMO Standards Council Decision TIA UPC-21-06 (horizontal wet venting:)
(group moved discussions to a later meeting)

7. SEAONC developed special inspection statement forms:

Mark distributed working copies of a new inspection statement form that could be used as a guideline for construction projects that were required by code to provide special inspection. These forms are different than the old testing and inspection forms (which were not always clear). SEAONC has taken information from the ICC program on special inspection, East Coast groups and OSHPD to develop this new form. There has already been positive response to the new statement forms, as they have been adopted by the State University system.

The new form has an introduction section dedicated to the agreement between the owner and the special inspector, which provides a summary of inspections. The rest of the document is in a tabular format, with items in the text (not in the table) directly from Chapter 17 requirement language. Some items have not been indicated specifically, as they are somewhat redundant with other sections – so the requirement is only noted singularly – for example concrete and seismic. SEAONC is working under the assumption that they will be capable of being edited to eliminate/delete extra line/rows for smaller projects (similar to OSHPD policies). This will allow the form to be set-up and perceived as a separate document from the plans and specifications. Because it covers all of the special inspections, the prime designer needs to pull this together for use on the projects.

Keyvan will work with SEAONC to look into the special inspection issues with the special inspection group that meets every Tuesday of each month.

Additional items:

Rest of the items moved for discussion at the next meeting. Sheila reinforced that copies of sub-committee's recommendations are needed prior to the next meeting.

Next meeting scheduled for February 7th – Steve Kiefer will chair the meeting.

Adjourned 3:15