

Tri-Chapter Uniform Code Committee (TUCC)

Meeting Minutes for April 3, 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:

*Sheila Lee, City of Santa Clara	Susan O'Brien, WC3
**David Basinger, Shums Coda Associates	Giyan Senaratne, WC3
+Ray Kansara, RK Associates	Dennis Corbett, City of American Canyon
Stephen Lau, City of San Mateo	Tomas Le, City and Co. of San Francisco
Troy Monier, Simpson Strong-Tie	Michael Richards, Foster City
Robert Woods, Walnut Creek	Homer Maiel, City of San Jose
Mark Crain, City of San Jose	Keyvan Irannejad, City of Milpitas
Bob Adler, City of San Jose	Fred Cullum, Interwest Group
Kerwin Lee, Rolf Jensen and Associates	Kerwin Lee, Rolf Jensen and Associates
Anthony Ghiossi, Town of Los Gatos	Gale Bate, Code Resource
Mac Saberi, City of Palo Alto	Diana Rapposelli, Union City
Mike Baird, Kutzman and Associates	Brooks MacNeil, City of Burlingame
Jennifer Hutchinson, Santa Cruz County	Kathryn Sedwick, City of San Jose
Gary Layman, City of Dublin	
* Chairperson	
** Secretary	
+ Additional/Back-up Secretary	

2. Minutes Approval:

The previous minutes were reviewed and approved.

Call to Order/Discussion of Related Topics:

3. R-3 buildings/5 ft. property line and openings requirement (final version)

Although none of the sub-committee members were able to attend the meeting this month, the group decided to review the final draft version (all variations on the theme). Steve had made three proposals, based on the feedback/clarifications provided at last month's meeting (e.g., definition of what is included in the opening area calculations). There was a brief discussion on how to apply this proposed interpretation document.

Action Taken: Group votes to approve this item with the suggested modifications to the language as indicated. Sheila asks for this to be TUCC approved interpretation item #2 (all R-3 opening conditions).

Next portion of the sub-committee's interpretation dealt with enlarging openings in a residential (R-3 occupancy's) existing wall. Again, there was a brief discussion on how to apply this recommendation to actual conditions.

Action Taken: This (TUCC approved interpretation item #3) was also approved, without change.

Final item of discussion from the sub-committee was how to deal with additions, less than 5-ft. from the property line.

Gale lead discussions that focused on the document's language related to the distance to the property line differing from the code language (i.e., less than 5-ft., 3-ft. or less, or between 3 to 5 ft. etc.). Sheila indicates that the document needs to use the wording found in CBC Table 704.8 to be consistent with the code requirements.

Action Taken: Sub-committee asked to make the necessary changes in the language. This third portion of the sub-committee's work was not approved, will be reviewed for final approval at the next meeting.

4. Plumbing fixtures (final version) – Kathryn Sedwick

Kathryn made last months suggested modifications to the previous submitted interpretations chart (kept the Labor Code language, etc.).

Action Taken: A vote was taken to approve this document as TUCC approved interpretation item #4 – motion passed unanimous.

This marked the end of discussions related to items previously discussed by the TUCC group. Sheila discussed the disclaimer language that each of these recommendations from the TUCC should include, so that the interpretation/guidelines are not confused with code minimums. We will add this language to all of the approved interpretations. Robert suggested that it should be California Building Construction Codes, instead of just California Building Standards Code. All final versions of approved documents shall be emailed to the Chapter Secretaries and committee members.

5. Control Area in existing building – Gale Bate and Sheila Lee

Gale provided three handouts to the group, and explained some of the changes to control areas in the 2007 CBC. Sheila and Gale's sub-committee focused on how to allow some existing control areas to remain (without restrictive modifications required by 2007 CBC), with typical tenant improvements, new tenants, or second floor control areas that now exceed maximum quantities (that have been revised). In particular, the sub-committee worked on providing an interpretation that would not require the new two-hour separation requirements for these second floor areas, and the associated two-hour upgrades to supporting walls, beams, columns, etc. As supporting documentation to allowing interpretation of this code requirement, Gale presented information from the group L occupancy committee, as well as a document from the SFM regarding approach suggested for dealing with these new requirements. In conclusion, Sheila and Gale proposed that in tenant improvements with a maximum of four control areas, the requirements to provide a two-hour horizontal separation could be waived.

Discussion from the group dealt with the fact that new code does not allow for single control area on multiple floors (each floor level and materials on that level establish the

defined control areas), and the lack of code definition for control areas that are open between floor levels. Sheila pointed out the problem lies with the floor separation (two-hour fire rated construction) being retro-fitted into existing, and often occupied buildings. Mac suggested that he felt that there was no problem asking for the code requirements in these types of projects, while Keyvan suggested that this is not a pervasive issue in most jurisdictions, so he felt there was no need to provide interpretation on this issue. Ray pointed out that because the 2007 CBC has already increased the quantities allowed, so perhaps this already is a less restrictive condition than previous codes.

Action Taken: Gale suggests that perhaps we review and discuss (particularly with Fire Officials) prior to next meeting, to ensure that enforcement is consistent throughout each jurisdiction.

6. Smoke alarm in Existing building – Susan O’ Brien and Mark Crain

Susan presented this (item #6) which dealt with interpretations of the interconnection of the smoke alarms in existing/remodeled homes. Current code requires the interconnection of smoke alarms in new construction, and when two or more smoke alarms are required. Concern is how to handle single-bedroom addition/remodels, where this requirement doesn’t apply or is ambiguous.

Suggested interpretation is to not require interconnection of smoke alarms, where there are no new or altered sleeping rooms. Additionally, to allow required smoke alarms (when not directly adjacent to the area of work – but not in a bedroom) can remain battery operated. Would still require the interconnection of alarms when scope of work includes two or more remodeled, or new bedrooms.

Action taken: Unanimous vote in favor of approving the proposed language as TUCC approved interpretation item #5.

7. Seismic/structural compliance in existing buildings – 10% alteration (CBC 3403.2.3.2)

Sheila asked for input from the group on how this is being enforced by member jurisdictions, as this will be a key item of discussion at the panel discussion at the end of the month. The hosts of the event came up with a few questions for the panel – and asked for clarification on when the structure be required to be upgraded seismically. The code requires at additions/alterations that are not structurally independent from the existing building, and increase forces on existing structural elements by more than 5% (CBC 3403.2.3.1.2) or 10% (3403.2 and/or 3403.2.3.2), will require the entire structural system to be upgraded to ASCE 7-5 requirements. Further, the 2007 CBC has a higher importance factor placed on the structural system in assembly occupancies, so rooms with over 300 people would need to include a higher importance factor with the addition/alteration project. Further, Fire Departments may also require modifications to trigger upgrades to the sprinkler systems.

San Jose representatives indicate that their jurisdiction has superceded with 3406 from the IEBC requirements on this item. Mac indicates that the code section was adopted and revised in the 2009 IBC hearings. Many other jurisdictions felt that the 10% factor was too restrictive.

Topics for discussion at next meeting:

- Atrium (Kerwin)
- Guards in existing stairways, and minimum width of stairways (Kathryn/Susan)
- Soils report (Homer/Steven)
- Accessible means of egress (Giyán/Kerwin/Anthony)
- Simplified wind design (DSA document – Giyan)
- Standardized solar panel plans (Sheila/Keyvan's staff)
- Structural upgrade requirements (Mac)
- Special inspections per 1705.1 (Robert) - Homer suggests that the special inspection group to discuss first.
- Protection at overhangs and projections (Kathryn/Sheila)
- 704.6 structural stability of fire walls (Homer/Fred)
- Strongwall/hardy frame uniform interpretations – sample of San Jose requirements (Homer).
- Emergency egress for podium type structures (Giyán/Gary).

Giyán asks that if the Contra Costa County/SFM document discussion could be held at the next meeting. Ray suggests people working on the code items be sent out a blank copy of the form for the sub-committees.

Next meeting scheduled for May 1st.

Adjourned 3:22 p.m.