

Tri-Chapter Uniform Code Committee (TUCC)

Meeting Minutes for September 10, 2009
Milpitas City Hall
455 E. Calaveras Rd.

Call to Order:

Meeting called to order at 1:17 p.m. by committee co-chairperson Homer Maiel, City of San Jose.

1. In Attendance/Self Introductions:

++Homer Maiel, City of San Jose
+Ray Kansara, RK Associates
**David Basinger, Shums Coda Associates
Giyana Senaratne, WC3
Gene Tague, City of San Jose
Richard Betti, City of San Jose
Mac Saberi, City of Palo Alto
Carol Lau, City of Sunnyvale

Mike Wayne, Redwood City
Betty Chan, City of Milpitas
Oliver Chan, City of Milpitas
Robert Woods, City of Walnut Creek
Kathryn Sedwick, City of San Jose
Ana Akin, Bureau Veritas
Akitayo Akiloumi, City of San Ramon

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

2. Minutes Approval:

The previous minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously.

3A. Inspection of 20A 3M Double Layer Grease Duct Enclosure (Richard Betti):

Richard asked for how other jurisdictions were handling these with regards to inspections - were they doing the required inspections themselves, or using certified inspectors. Further, 3M has provided engineering options for certain applications, making the installation easier, but difficult for the inspector to determine if acceptable. Richard proposed that jurisdictions allow their inspectors to do all of the inspections (i.e., grease duct, first and second layers), as 3M's certification process is rather expensive, and Certified Thermal Ceramics does not have a special inspection program (which is leading to their product sometimes being turned down).

Those in attendance gave varying answers as to how these were being inspected - some required certified or special inspection, while others did the all inspections themselves. Homer suggested that a mass email question be sent to the members to survey all responses.

3B. Grey Water Systems Permits and Inspections (Richard Betti):

Richard also asked about the grey water systems and whether or not others had been issuing these permits, as well as following recently passed HCD policies on not issuing permits for simple systems. Ray commented that this was discussed at last month's

meeting, and only Morgan Hill had special requirements prohibiting their installations due to ground water conditions. Although not many had issued permits for these systems, most felt that requirements were covered in the 2007 CPC. Richard noted that with the HCD expressed terms the jurisdictions must specifically indicate that they are issuing permits for the systems that HCD has decided not to pursue. He also suggested that anyone interested in these systems review the greywatergorrillas of Berkeley website, as there are varying conditions of installation.

4. Parking Garage Clearance in Multi-Family Structures (Kathryn Sedwick):

Kathryn noted that the current code had language variations in Chapter 11A that required for multi-family parking garages to maintain the 8' - 2" for the structure. However, when contacted HCD indicated that the intent was only to provide the clearances along the accessible paths of travel for vehicles. The new express terms will provide a change in the 11A language to be aligned with the requirement/language of Chapter 11B parking structures.

A code question was raised at this point as to whether or not jurisdictions were also aware of California Energy Commission (CEC) code language changes for exterior wall finish materials to have sealed joints to eliminate air infiltration. This would in theory require drywall, Densglass, and other jointed products to be caulked - which would add significant costs to larger projects. Group was unaware of the language changes, but Robert suggested a call to the CEC for an interpretation in writing on the intent, that in turn could be shared with and used by many local jurisdictions.

5. Indoor Water Efficiency Ordinance (David Basinger):

David presented information that he had sent out earlier (through the Chapter secretaries) regarding a Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Association (BAWSCA) attempt at creating both indoor and outdoor water efficiency Ordinances. Of concern was the fact that the group's efforts were focused on exceeding many of the new Green Building Code requirements, and that Building Departments (the groups that would be responsible for enforcement) were not currently being represented in the meeting. Further, there was pending State legislation that was attempting to required upgrades of building fixtures at the point of sales, which would be even more problematic with regards to enforcement. After a brief group discussion, Dave again requested that all that could attend the September 30 BAWSCA working group meeting in Foster City be available to provide some needed Building Department perspective on the matter.

Other code items to discussions:

Homer had a few items for the group discussions (2009 IBC and future 2012 IBC code changes). In particular, he focused on a couple of requested changes that were deemed to be in need of immediate changes (i.e., going directly into the 2012 code language, without hearings, as they were so obviously needed changes). Homer felt that two items could affect us directly, and wanted to bring the attention of the group the following:

First, the language of the nonseparated occupancies (Section 508.3.2.1) was changed to clarify that when referencing the "most restrictive" requirements, the high-rise building provisions did not apply to all nonseparated occupancy groups.

Second, IBC Table 508.3.3 is changed in the 2012 so the H-5 occupancy is separated (in the table), so that sprinklers must be installed throughout the buildings containing the H-5 occupancy group. Buildings with H-3 or H-4 occupancy groups could only be sprinklered (if the jurisdiction allows for partial sprinkler systems) at the H-3/H-4 areas. The revised Section modifies the second column to eliminate footnote A from being applied.

Mac asked about the change of occupancy language from the new code - such as a B occupancy changes to an E occupancy; are jurisdictions asking for the upgrade (seismically) of the building? Homer/Kathryn indicated that the San Jose Ordinance does greater than 10%. Homer further indicated that San Jose could trigger more from the adopted IEBC language. Kathryn indicates that structural analysis can also be provided to indicate that upgrades not required - which was also accepted.

Giyan had a series of questions for the group, which evolved into the following discussions:

Question as to how the group was responding to the Sierra Club's survey of jurisdictional commercial solar fees? Kathryn indicates that the group had discussed this earlier and noted that there are always different fees from different jurisdictions. Robert indicated that Walnut Creek was looking into a flat fees for future changes in the future, or more of a scale for reasonable work completed (i.e., based on size of the panels).

Question as to whether anyone was having problems with the reduction in require separation between assembly uses and S-2 parking garage/storage areas? Everyone acknowledged the reductions, and Robert indicated that sprinklers should not eliminate the separation issue.

Question as to how jurisdictions are handling permits and fees for City owned building projects? The group indicated that typically permits were being issued, but fees not always collected. However, all felt that it was important to hold the City projects to the same standards as the privately developed projects. Homer suggested that in the past sometimes the Building Department would do a cursory review, but never see the final working drawings, as the Public Works Director was given the title of Building Official for City owned projects.

Question as to whether or not jurisdictions were allowing for calculations to be stamped by an engineer, with another professional stamping and signing the plans. All agreed that this is acceptable per State Licensing Laws.

Question as to whether or not the group was applying 2007 CBC 419 or 705 as it relates to party walls in R-2 townhomes? Robert indicated that 419 is the specific requirement, while the 705 Section is up to the designer whether or not to use these requirements. Homer indicated that more than two units in the 2007 CBC, with a property line between units is considered a townhome (new definition), and while in the 2001 CBC these had a common foundation/roof system, the new code allowed for a single two-hour fire-resistive wall on the property line.

Ray followed-up on item #4 from the last months meeting (discussion of CBC 716.6) - penetrations connecting two floors, or duct connecting four floors. ICC has indicated that

this is not what was suppose to be meant with the current language in the code - should not connect four floors. ICC has been asked for a formal opinion on this item, but still waiting to hear back from ICC.

Ray also indicated that previous meeting item #3 (2009 code changes and State amendments) was not resolved. Kathryn suggested that by August, 2010, there would be a better understanding of the final code amendments, and at that point have committees review specific sections and looking for discrepancies. Homer felt that we had until the final expressed terms of the new codes were available, and could table this for later discussions.

Next meeting scheduled for October 8, at 1:15 p.m. (canceled due to conflict with CALBO Education Week), with Keyvan scheduled to chair the meeting. The following meeting in November (right before the holiday - November 19), would like to suggest this cover the December meeting as well - something for future discussions.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.