

Indiana Building Code Committee Meeting Minutes

June 26, 2012

Sterrett Center – Lawrence, IN

Participants

Denise Fitzpatrick, Legal & Code Services	dfitzpatrick@dhs.in.gov
Lonnie Lagle, DHS	llagle@dhs.in.gov
Tim Moehl, P.E., Moehl Engineering	tmoehl@moehleng.com
T.J. Burns, IFD	tj.burns@indy.gov
Daniel Overbey, AIA, BDMD Architects	doverbey@bdmd.com
Ed Rensink, RTM Consultants	rensink@rtmconsultants.com
Dr. David Kish, Purdue University	djkish@purdue.edu
Michael Koppes, Purdue University	mjkoppes@purdue.edu
Bobby LaRue, Monroe Co. Code Enf.	blarue@co.monroe.in.us
Jim Gerstbauer, Monroe Co. Code Enf.	jgerstbauer@co.monroe.in.us
Ralph Gerdes, Ralph Gerdes Consultants	rgerdesconsultants@ameritech.net
Tim Callas, J & T Consulting	tcallas@jtconsult.us
Jim Markle, South Bend Code Enf.	jmarkle@southbend.in.gov
Craig VonDeylen, IBA	craig@deylen.com
Michael Arany, Greenwood F.D.	marany@wrtfd.org
Rex King, JC Hart/I.A.A.	rex@homeisjchart.com
Kyle Gottschammer, Lawrence Code Enf.	kgottschammer@cityoflawrence.org
Dan Gagen, PDMI	dan.gagen@pdm-i.com
Daniel Sheposh, Noblesville Code Enf.	dsheposh@noblesville.in.us
Steve Bartrom	SBartrom@indy.gov
Scott Perez	scott@arxtheon.com
Jeff Dean, City of Indianapolis	jeff.dean@indy.gov
Adam Holman, City of Zionsville	aholman@zionsville.in.gov
Matthew Brown	mattb-energydiagnostics@hotmail.com
Robert Harmeyer	rjh@msktd.com
Tim Puls, Eli Lilly	puls_timothy_a@lilly.com
John Hawkins, Commission	john.hawkins@koverthawkins.com

Summary

1. Denise Fitzpatrick, Chairperson, opened the meeting and issued a sign-in sheet. Quorum established
2. Minutes from May 22, 2012 were approved. (Motion by Mike Koppes, second by Jim Markle).
3. Townhouse Definition discussion. Mara Snyder had noted in a previous email that a property line is the distinguishing factor that defines a Townhouse. Bobby LaRue noted that there are big differences between townhouses and apartments. He noted that townhouses are separated by 2-hour fire walls. Jim G. said zoning in

Bloomington will not allow small lots. He noted that sprinkler protection was not the only reason that some developers choose to build a townhouse. Jeff Dean noted that the current definition first appeared in the 1998 Indiana Building Code. He pointed out that under the model code, sprinklers would be required. Craig noted that some other jurisdictions will allow PUD zoning with property lines to create single family residences, and he felt that was an important marketing option. The big differences between Class I Apartments and Class 2 Townhomes are sprinkler, accessibility, and electrical code requirements.

4. Discussed carry over amendments in the Draft LSA document prepared by Denise.

a. Discussed amendment to 717.5.2 (section 716.5.2 of current code), which allows duct penetrations of fire barrier walls to have flexible drops at the air outlets. Mike Koppes felt that the intent was exceeded by the current wording, and noted that a strict interpretation would apparently prohibit rectangular ductwork. Ed Rensink said that Rodney McCulloch had based it loosely on NFPA 101. Mike K. volunteered to re-write.

b. Discussed Appeals and Interpretations section, and possibility of expanding. The question was raised as to why a dispute is required for an official interpretation. It was noted that official interpretations currently take several months to obtain. If expanded, it could make current situation worse. John asked if a system where the most expedient method of receiving an official ruling was to pay additional fee and request a variance that may or may not be required was dysfunctional, and if this section exacerbated the dysfunction. Jim. Gerstbauer was concerned that if expanded and eased the interpretation could become an automatic avenue of appeal from local rulings, rendering local rulings meaningless and completely bogging down the interpretation process. Jeff noted that the wording might be based on statute and beyond the ability of the committee to address.

c. Discussed carry over amendment 717.5.3. 2012 IBC changes language significantly from current code, and these amendments may not be desirable. Dr. Kish will propose amendments to exceptions 3, 4, and 5.

d. Mike also noted that 707.5.1 may need to be revised. He will propose an amendment.

e. Need proposal to Chapter 2 to add IECC to list of cross-referenced codes.

f. It appears 507.3 needs to be revised based on 2012 IBC model code language. Ed volunteered to write the proposal.

5. Tabled code proposals.

a. PC_2-2: Platform definition to allow fixed or horizontal sliding curtains not greater than 20 feet, revised for grammar corrections: Motion by Bobby L., second by Craig. Motion carried.

b. A discussion regarding fiscal impact ensued. Many code officials requested the flexibility to submit proposals for discussion without complete fiscal information, since accurate information requires significant research or knowledge of pricing. Some statement of impact must be included, and those on the committee with knowledge of construction agreed to provide input to enhance accuracy. Denise noted that John was to maintain a spreadsheet summarizing the impact from code change proposals added to the draft LSA.

c. PC 3-1: Motion to table for another month by Bobby L., second by Mike Arany. Motion carried.

d. PC 4-3: Incidental Parking. Revised to expand to F and M occupancies, and revised fiscal impact statement based on strict interpretation. Ralph Gerdes moved to approve, Tim Callas. seconded. Motion carried.

e. PC 4-4: Live-Work Units. Revised to reconcile with GAR. Discussion took place about R occupancies triggering sprinkler systems for the entire building. Ralph and Jeff noted that the current code does trigger the sprinkler system in this case and we should not step backwards. Tim C. commented that one apartment can trigger the sprinkler system for a 50,000 factory, as in the case of his recent winery variance. It was noted that the live/work unit definition does not cover projects like the winery due to the 3,000 s.f. limit. Based on Dr. Kish's reading the consensus interpretation was that the entire live/work unit could have a 13R system, based on the R occupancy. This creates a possible problem for the sprinkler designer, but it appears that this issue is beyond the scope of the building code committee. Motion to disapprove by Mike K, second by Tim C. Motion carried.

f. PC 5-3: Building signage. Revised language submitted. T.J. Burns moved to table to next month's meeting with Fire Code Committee. Lonnie seconded. Motion carried.

g. PC 5-4: Chapter 5 table for frontage increase, based on proposed 2015 model code revisions. Ralph moved to deny. Tim C. seconded. Motioned carried with two nays.

h. PC 5-5: Open parking garages beneath A, I, B, M & R occupancies. Dr. Kish noted that open parking garages are limited to types I, II, and IV construction. Intent of proposal is to allow limited size buildings to have mixed construction types without podium construction and incorporate an open parking garage. The code change would allow small A, I, B, M & R occupancies to have an adjacent open parking garage separated by a fire barrier. Concern was expressed that the original concept of 510.7 for podium construction may be made obscure by the code change. Ed suggested re-writing the proposal as an exception. Bobby moved to table for revisions, seconded by Tim C. Motion carried.

6. New code change proposals.

a. PC 2-4: Townhouse definition: Bobby noted that the Indiana Residential Code limits townhouses to 3 stories and must have 2-hour construction. His opinion was that the property line does not serve a building safety purpose. Jim G. reiterated the problem in Bloomington of zoning prohibition against small lots. Bobby noted that only 12 townhouse projects were released in 2011. A lengthy discussion took place regarding Class 1 and Class 2 structures. Tim C. noted that buildings with three or more units without a property line become Class 1 structures. After reading definition of Class 2 structures in IC 22-12-1-5, a motion was made by Bobby to modify the proposal by striking "as a Class 1 structure." Seconded by Craig. Motion carried. Kyle moved to approve as modified. Tim C. seconded. Craig asked for an opportunity to review the new language with his sponsoring organization. Kyle withdrew his motion and Tim C. withdrew his second. Bobby moved to table as modified. Tim C. seconded. Motion carried with one nay.

b. PC 3-2: Freestanding Picnic Shelters and Freestanding Canopies with 3 open sides to be considered A-3 occupancies. Noted that 2012 definition of Fire Area includes areas under roofs and floors, even if there are no enclosing walls. Some were in favor of the proposal but felt there should be a size limit. Others noted that the A-3 classification in the proposed amendment would trigger the sprinkler requirement at either 2,100 s.f. or 4,500 s.f. based upon occupant load. Mike K. moved to table to give Tim C. time to offer an amendment to the definition of Fire Area, which could render this proposal moot if it is approved. Second by Tim C. Motion carried with 4 nays.

c. PC 4-5: Requires storm shelters in all Group E occupancies with an aggregate occupancy of 50 or more. Discussed that fiscal impact of around \$80M may be understated. John noted that AIA Indiana is working with Indiana Department of Education to draft guidelines for schools to use in establishing safe zones within the schools. Mike A. moved to disapprove. Tim M. seconded. Motion carried with 4 nays and 2 abstentions.

d. PC 6-1: Delete footnote d in Table 601 (footnote d allows a trade off of sprinkler system for 1-hour construction in certain limited situations): Bobby noted this is an outdated requirement that rarely applies, so it should be deleted. Discussion followed with Ed and Ralph commenting that this is a carry-over from the older UBC codes, but since the adoption of the International Building Code as the model code, it cannot be used to offset any other provision of the code, and is rarely used. They noted that allowable height and area increases more than offset the need to trade 1-hour construction for a sprinkler. Bobby noted that the 2015 model code proposes to delete it. Tim C. moved to approve, Bobby seconded. Motion carried with one nay.

- e. PC 7-1: Clean up references to Chapter 1 in section 703.4 by deleting them: Motion to approve by Mike K., second by Mike A. Motion carried with 5 nays.
- f. PC 7-2: Delete required labeling of fire/smoke/barriers/walls above ceilings. Dr. Kish felt it was useful to have markings. Several noted that illegal penetrations are a big issue and markings help provide notice. Ralph felt that the fiscal impact would be much larger than estimated. Robert Harmeyer noted that JCAHO currently requires this for accreditation of hospitals, and it is not a large cost. Mike A. felt it would be a tremendous benefit and did not think it was a hardship. Tim Moehl asked if load-bearing walls weren't a greater safety issue than fire barriers, and wondered why load bearing walls were not included. Ed noted that walls in hospitals change frequently and their inspectors have learned that markings cannot be trusted. Ralph moved to approve, second by Tim C. Motion carried with 7 nays.
- g. PC 7-3: Column protection: proposal to add back the exception in the current code for columns supporting two floors, or one floor and a roof. Discussion noted that the proposed exception is clear as written. Dan stated he intended to still require protection for the column, but allow membrane protection for these columns, not individual protection on all 4 sides. Motion to disapprove by Mike K., with second by Kyle. Motion carried. *(Ed. note: the fiscal impact of the new requirement for protection on all 4 sides will need to be added into the fiscal analysis)*
- h. PC 7-4: Delete joint treatment requirements for non-rated floor assemblies. Dan stated that the current code does not require this. Ed felt that this has always been required, and the model code just makes it more clear. Mike K. moved to disapprove, Ed seconded. Motion carried.
- i. PC 7-5: Structural independence of fire walls. A discussion took place regarding Indiana's interpretation of structural independence, Factory Mutual MFL wall construction, and the nature of fire wall construction in Indiana prior to the adoption of the International Codes. Mike K. moved to amend by re-phrasing "Buildings on each side equipped throughout. . ." Bobby L. seconded. Motion to approve as amended by Mike A., Kyle seconded. Motion carried with 2 nays.

17. PC 7-6: Withdrawn.

Next meeting : July 17, 2012. Joint meeting of Fire Code and Building Code Committees at Sterrett Center. Need proposals for Chapters 9 and 10 submitted to Denise by July 11.

Prepared by,
John A. Hawkins, AIA