

**Indiana Building Code Committee Meeting Minutes**  
October 16, 2012  
**Sterrett Center – Lawrence, IN**

**Participants**

Denise Fitzpatrick, Legal & Code Services	<a href="mailto:dfitzpatrick@dhs.in.gov">dfitzpatrick@dhs.in.gov</a>
Tim Moehl, P.E., Moehl Engineering	<a href="mailto:tmoehl@moehleng.com">tmoehl@moehleng.com</a>
T.J. Burns, IFD	<a href="mailto:tj.burns@indy.gov">tj.burns@indy.gov</a>
Ed Rensink, RTM Consultants	<a href="mailto:rensink@rtmconsultants.com">rensink@rtmconsultants.com</a>
Bobby LaRue, Monroe Co. Code Enf.	<a href="mailto:blarue@co.monroe.in.us">blarue@co.monroe.in.us</a>
Craig VonDeylen, IBA	<a href="mailto:craig@deylen.com">craig@deylen.com</a>
Michael Arany, White River Twp F.D.	<a href="mailto:marany@wrtfd.org">marany@wrtfd.org</a>
Kyle Gottschammer, Lawrence Code Enf.	<a href="mailto:kgottschammer@cityoflawrence.org">kgottschammer@cityoflawrence.org</a>
Dan Gagen, PDMI	<a href="mailto:dan.gagen@pdm-i.com">dan.gagen@pdm-i.com</a>
Daniel Sheposh, Noblesville Code Enf.	<a href="mailto:dsheposh@noblesville.in.us">dsheposh@noblesville.in.us</a>
Jeff Dean, City of Indianapolis	<a href="mailto:jeff.dean@indy.gov">jeff.dean@indy.gov</a>
Michael Gentile	<a href="mailto:Michael.gentile@philipchun.us">Michael.gentile@philipchun.us</a>
John Hawkins, Commission	<a href="mailto:john.hawkins@koverthawkins.com">john.hawkins@koverthawkins.com</a>
Dave Zellner, JTL	<a href="mailto:d.zellner@jtleng.com">d.zellner@jtleng.com</a>
Rex King, JC Hart	<a href="mailto:rex@homeisjchart.com">rex@homeisjchart.com</a>
Steve Bartrom, City of Indianapolis	<a href="mailto:sbartrom@indy.gov">sbartrom@indy.gov</a>
Jim Markle, South Bend Code Enf.	<a href="mailto:jmarkle@southbend.in.gov">jmarkle@southbend.in.gov</a>
Dan Overbey, AIA	<a href="mailto:doverbey@bdmd.com">doverbey@bdmd.com</a>
Ralph Gerdes, Ralph Gerdes Consultants	<a href="mailto:rgerdesconsultants@ameritech.net">rgerdesconsultants@ameritech.net</a>
Michael Koppes, Purdue University	<a href="mailto:mjkoppes@purdue.edu">mjkoppes@purdue.edu</a>

**Summary**

1. Denise Fitzpatrick, Chairperson, opened the meeting and issued a sign-in sheet. Quorum established initially with 13 voting members. Additional members arrived after the meeting began. The number of voting members varied throughout the day but never dropped below 11 voting members.
2. Motion to approve minutes from last meeting by Dan Gagen, seconded by Dan Sheposh. Motion carried.
3. Discussed Tabled Amendments
  - a. PC\_4-06 To make stair upgrades for risk category IV instead of III. TJ noted that few buildings over 420 feet have ever been built in Indiana. Ed and Ralph noted that risk category III would affect buildings of 100' and over. Ed moved to approve. Mike K. seconded. Motion carried with one nay and one abstention.
  - b. PC\_4-07 to amend that dual water supply only applies to buildings over 420'. Ralph noted that there is no evidence of a water supply problem for smaller high rise buildings, and this was originally developed to address concerns about earthquake damage in high risk seismic areas. Mike Gentile agreed that lower height multi-story buildings were not an issue but felt that 30 stories or more was a concern during construction. Mike K. moved to approve, seconded by Ed.

Motion carried 7-6-1.

c. PC\_4-08 strikes requirement for emergency responder radios. Jeff and TJ pointed out that a fire code amendment was passed to address emergency responder radios by local ordinance. Motion by Kyle, seconded by Bobby that this section be amended to mirror the approved fire code amendment. Ralph asked about the scenario of fiscal impact rejecting the new fire code. The consensus was that if this scenario happens, then all fire code references in the building code would need to be reviewed for revisions. Motion carried.

d. Bobby noted that no fiscal impact was given for recent proposed changes. Ed pointed out that changes that avoid a new fiscal impact have an impact of zero. John H. pointed out that he was working on costs avoided in the fiscal impact statement. Discussed difference between filed projects and number of projects. John noted his spreadsheet had a separate column of the prediction of the actual number of projects affected.

e. PC\_4-09 dedicated fire service elevators. Proposal to change requirement for two dedicated fire service elevators to one fire service elevator for high rises. Current code has no requirement for a dedicated fire service elevator. Ralph noted that the model code requirement for two was a compromise from a proposal to require three elevators. TJ noted that fire fighters are trained to use elevators and they will use them if they are available. Ralph noted that standby power requirements only apply to one elevator, so even if two were provided, only one would be tied to the emergency generator. TJ noted that a requirement for two dedicated elevators in all buildings over 120' high would be a huge fiscal impact. Ed moved to approve. Mike A seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.

f. PC\_5-07 Table 503 height requirements. Proposal is to restore current code allowable heights for B, M and S occupancies. Ralph noted that a previous proposal removed the one-hour trade off. He stated that the fiscal impact is probably at least \$250,000 per office building, because many Indiana developers are now building 5-story buildings. Bobby asked how insurance rates were affected if Indiana's code was less restrictive than model codes. Some noted that insurance companies perform separate underwriting for large buildings such as factories, and will often impose requirements stricter than the code. Ed moved to approve. Mike K. seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.

g. Some members departed and 13 voting members were now present.

h. PC\_09-06 and PC\_09-07: Withdrawn.

i. PC\_16-06 and PC 16-07 carry over of current seismic requirements: Mike K. had consulted with colleagues at Purdue and moved to approve both. Seconded by Ralph. Motion carried with two abstentions.

#### 4. New proposals:

a. PC\_A-04: to retain definitions in the model code. Mike noted that current language deletes these definitions. Proposal is to restore them. Ed noted that Rule 6-2 of the GAR applies to site improvements that connect to a Class 1 structure. Bobby noted that local building officials spend an inordinate amount of time on accessibility compliance. He is concerned that the more Indiana regulates accessibility, the less time the code officials have to spend enforcing life safety

requirements. Jeff felt that local code officials have become the de-facto enforcers of the ADA. Bobby L. moved to approve. Mike K. seconded. Motion carried with one nay.

b. PC\_A-05: proposal to delete Indiana amendment to scoping. Mike K. moved to disapprove. Ed seconded. Motion carried.

c. PC\_A-06: proposal to change Indiana amendment language reading that the Indiana rule is to aid in compliance, instead of ensure compliance. Some felt this was language to protect enforcement officials. Kyle moved to disapprove. Ed seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.

d. PC\_A-07: Proposal to restore ANSI A117.1 exclusions for existing elevators. Ed commented that the presence of the exception implies a requirement, but the lack of an exception does not create a requirement. Ed felt that the GAR exempted existing buildings where work was not being performed. Ralph felt that the amendment helped clarify when accessibility requirements applied, as elevator requirements were often not widely known. Motion to approve by Ralph. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with 4 abstentions.

e. PC\_A-08: remove an amendment and restore model code language regarding exceptions for dimensions of LULA elevators. (the language in the PC should be strike-through text. Motion to approve by Ralph. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with 3 abstentions.

f. PC\_A-09: proposal to delete Indiana amendment prohibiting floor mounted urinals. Dan G. noted that these were not allowed by plumbing code. TJ pointed out that this amendment originated around 1987 because these urinals were used as floor drains and became easily clogged. Jeff said the plumbers on the plumbing code committee were opposed to this type urinal due to maintenance difficulty. Several were concerned about conflict with the plumbing code. Mike K. moved to deny. Ralph seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.

g. PC\_A-10: proposal to restore model code requirement of 606.5, to require toilet accessories mounted for little people access in restrooms with more than six lavatories. Mike G. noted no fiscal impact because it was strictly mounting height for one set of accessories. The requirement is not in the text of the ADA but are in the advisory comments of the ADA. Motion by Bobby to approve. Second by Ralph. Motion carried 7-4-2, but Mike G. to fix section reference and resend.

h. PC\_29-08: Carry Indiana amendment for drinking fountains over to new Chapter 29. Motion to approve by Ed, second by Mike A. Motion carried.

i. PC\_29-09: Carries Indiana amendment for separate employee restroom threshold over to new Chapter 29. Motion by Ed, second by Craig to approve. Motion carried.

j. PC 29-10: Restore Indiana amendment threshold for unisex restrooms in restaurants by carrying over to new Chapter 29. Current code threshold of 150 has been a requirement for many years. Motion to approve by Ed. Seconded by Craig. Motion carried.

k. PC\_29-11: Proposal to extend warehouse (factory and industrial) maximum travel distance to 1,000 feet. Ed noted a number of variances had been granted for this. Jim Markle moved to approve. Seconded by Ralph. Motion carried.

l. PC\_29-12: Proposal to amend current Indiana Table 29, which was

deleted by previous amendment. Also, the amendment appears to intend to say “not required” instead of “required.” Ed noted that by going to model code Chapter 29 the need for this amendment was eliminated. Moved by Kyle to disapprove. Second by Craig. Motion carried.

m. PC\_GAR-07: Proposal to add a section to the GAR regarding repairs to buildings damaged by natural disaster. Currently state plan review sporadically enforces an unwritten 50 percent rule to determine whether current building codes apply to repairs. Dave Z. noted that this may stem from a FEMA requirement regarding 50 percent of the market value as the threshold where FEMA will consider a building a complete loss. Tim noted that it is unclear if smoke and water damage is included in the 50 percent calculation. Proposal is to add a section to the GAR that states if the building was built prior to May 2003 the repairs would have to meet the Indiana code based on the 1997 UBC. If built after May 2003, and before June 2008 then the repairs would need to meet the Indiana code based on the 2000 IBC. If built after June 2008, then the repairs would need to meet the Indiana code based on the 2006 IBC. Jeff asked how he would define a repair under the proposal. He said in actual practice, it becomes difficult to determine. He felt the proposal was stricter than the current unwritten interpretation. Ed agreed. Kyle said he conducts a pre-fire inspection and he discusses with the insurance company and the owner what they want to be repaired. He noted often that the insurance company has motivations that compete with code compliance. Bobby said the unwritten 50 percent rule is unenforceable. He questioned that the amendment would be out of date as new codes are adopted. Dan Overbey noted that over time it would be very difficult to access older codes. Ed noted that GAR 4-12 (i) allows repairs to be made in compliance with the code of record. This proposal would conflict with 4-12(i). Ed noted that Code Services maintains a library of all codes. It was unclear if a design professional or local code official would have knowledge of this library. Discussed the proposal for expedited review for fire damage. Current statute allows \$5,000 for expedited review of new construction. Ralph moved to disapprove. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried 11-2-1.

n. PC\_4-10: delete requirements for luminous markings. Noted that these projects already require an emergency generator. Moved by Mike K. for approval. Seconded by Dan Sheposh. Motion carried with 3 abstentions.

o. PC\_4-11: proposal to delete requirement for sprinkler system in ambulatory care, because these facilities are already governed by NFPA 101, which does not have a requirement for sprinklers. Mike A. moved to disapprove. Seconded by Kyle. John H. noted that PC 9-15 was approved to require sprinklers where ambulatory care was on other than the level of exit discharge. Mike A. stated that he felt PC\_9-15 was a good compromise, and this proposal went a step too far for both life safety of occupants and rescue personnel. Motion failed 6-7-1. Ed moved for approval, seconded by Ralph. Motion carried 7-6-1.

p. PC\_4-12: proposal to dovetail with proposal 9-3 regarding fire alarm at ambulatory care. Mike K. moved to approve, seconded by Ed. Motion carried with one abstention.

q. PC\_9-22: Proposal to completely remove the sprinkler requirements for ambulatory care. Ralph moved to approve. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with 3 abstentions.

r. PC\_10-12: Proposal to dovetail with PC 4-10. Motion by Mike K. to approve, seconded by Ed. Motion carried with one abstention.

s. PC\_10-13: Motion to clarify the requirements for exit discharge for an interior stair through the first floor. Ralph noted that if you start at the stair, but are not in it, you don't have to visually see the exterior door. Commission recently ruled no variance required on a case involving a similar situation where the door was not immediately visible but was visible within just a few steps of the stair. Bobby noted that his jurisdiction enforces this because upper floor occupants may not be familiar with the first floor, and the path must be immediately visible, in his opinion. Mike K. noted that previous codes have always allowed discharge through first floor lobbies, whether the exit was visible or not. Dave Z. felt the Commission committed an error in granting the variance and may not have been given accurate information, or certain members may have been confused or mistaken about the facts. Craig said "readily visible" is a vague standard, as daylight will not always be streaming through a full glass door to make the exit visible. He noted that at night readily visible will always mean that lighted exit signs are readily visible. Bobby moved for disapproval. Seconded by Kyle. Motion carried 8-5-1.

t. PC\_05-08: deletes footnote d in table 601, which was previously deleted. Moved for approval by Bobby, seconded by Mike K. Motion carried.

u. PC\_05-09: Carries forward Indiana amendment regarding ducted penetrations of incidental use. Dave Z notes that mechanical code allows fully ducted systems. After discussion, this is already carried forward in the LSA. Withdrawn.

v. PC\_07-13: Proposal to maintain current code language of rating walls for exposure on both sides if separation is less than 10 feet. New code changes this to 5 feet. Motion by Craig to approve, seconded by Ed. Motion carried with three abstentions.

w. PC\_07-14: Maintain current code language regarding smoke barriers. Ed moved to approve. Craig seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.

x. PC\_07-15: Leakage rate of smoke barriers. Ralph said NFPA committees have thus far rejected this requirement. Smoke barriers in hospitals have worked adequately for 40 years. Motion to approve conditioned on deleting the text after the words, "UL 1479." Motion by Ed, seconded by Jim M. Motion carried.

y. PC\_07-16: Curtainwall. Withdrawn.

z. PC\_07-17: Deletes requirement for smoke dampers at horizontal exit fire walls. Not required by current code or NFPA 101. Motion to approve by Ed, second by Mike K. Motion carried with one abstention.

aa. PC\_07-18: : Deletes requirement for smoke dampers at horizontal exit fire barrier walls. Not required by current code or NFPA 101. Motion to approve by Ed, second by Mike K. Motion carried with one abstention.

- bb. PC\_10-14: Exception for deleting area of refuge in jails and prisons. These occupancies will be sprinklered. Mike A. moved to approve. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with one abstention.
- cc. PC\_14-04: Deletes requirement for full scale test in a fully sprinklered building. Mike A moved to approve. Mike K. seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.
- dd. PC\_14-05: similar issue. Mike A. moved, Mike K. seconded to approve. Motion carried.
- ee. PC\_14-06: similar issue: Mike A. moved, Mike K. seconded to approve. Motion carried.
- ff. PC\_15-3: Allows primary and overflow drains to use the same drain pipe. Dovetails with new plumbing code. Dan G. moved, Ed seconded to approve. Motion carried.
- gg. PC\_15-14: similar issue regarding NFPA 285. Mike A. moved to approve, Mike K. seconded. Motion carried.
- hh. PC\_26-01: similar issue regarding NFPA 285. Ed moved to approve. Mike K. seconded. Motion carried with one nay.
- ii. PC\_29-13: Clerical clean up. Ed moved to approve. Second by Mike A. Motion carried.
- jj. PC\_29-14: Restores Indiana urinal substitution rules and mirrors new plumbing code. Ed moved to approve. Second by Ralph. Motion carried.
- kk. PC\_29-15: Restores Indiana ratio for A-5 occupancies. Bobby noted 1520 was not divisible by 15. Ralph moved to accept with amendment that "1520" be changed "1500" in the table, so as to be divisible by the proposed 50 factor. Second by Mike K. Motion carried with one abstention.
- ll. PC\_29-16: Similar proposal for I-1 occupancies. Motion to approve by Ed. Seconded by Ralph. Motion carried 10-2-1.
- mm. PC\_29-17: Dovetails with plumbing code requirements. Motion by Mike K. to approve, seconded by Ed. Motion carried.
- nn. PC\_29-18: Restores current Indiana amendment for remote buildings on religious property. Motion by Ralph to approve with the footnote number to be "j" and strike the word religious (two instances). Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with two nays and two absentions.
- oo. PC\_29-19: Withdrawn.
- pp. PC\_29-20: Definition of unisex restrooms. Ed motioned to approve. Second by Craig. Motion carried with two absentions.
- qq. PC\_29-21: Restores plumbing fixture dimensions from the Plumbing Code, as they were deleted by amendment in the Plumbing Code. Moved by Mike K. for approval. Second by Craig. Motion carried.
- rr. PC\_09-23: tweaks wording regarding consultation for fire department connections. Motion to approve by Jim M. Second by Dan S. Motion carried with one nay.
- ss. PC\_09-24: tweaks wording regarding consultation for exterior fire alarm devices: Mike K. noted the Indiana exception has been in place for several years. Mike A. noted that the alarm is needed to help firemen find the building, as often the address is sometimes not enough to quickly locate the building. Motion to

approve by Bobby. Seconded by Jim M. Motion failed to carry 6-6-1. Motion to approve by Jim M., with the exception in the Indiana Amendment to remain. Second by Dan S. Motion carried with one nay and one abstention.

tt. PC\_34-18: deletes ability to convert class 2 structures into group A or E. Would still allow small restaurants (less than 50) to be converted. Motion to approve by Jim. M. second by Mike A. Motion carried with one nay.

uu. PC 34-19: requires A and E occupancies to have swinging doors. Moved by Kyle to approve. Seconded by Mike A. Motion carried.

vv. PC\_34-20: limits exceptions to stair tread and riser dimensions. Motion to approve. Jim M. moved to approve. Seconded by Dan G. Motion carried.

ww. PC 34-21: withdrawn.

xx. PC\_12-5 : Attic access exceptions. Discussed that the proposal would apply to unvented attics, dovetailing with PC\_12-04. Some felt that the requirement for insulation above the roof should be revised to allow batt insulation under the roof deck. The author was unwilling to entertain an amendment, stating that he wished to limit it to unventilated attics. Kyle motioned to approve. Craig seconded. Motion carried.

yy. PC\_23-1 Span tables. Dave Z noted that the current AWA amendments do not apply to all sizes of lumber and the more amendments will be forthcoming from AWA. It was felt that at the time more amendments are issued, an updated proposal could be submitted. Mike K moved to approve. Ed seconded. Motion carried.

zz. PC\_31-1 withdrawn

aaa. PC\_10-15: Panic hardware trigger for E to be 100. Motion by Ralph to approve. Seconded by Ed. Motion carried with three nays and one abstention. This replaces PC\_10-11.

bbb. PC 29-22: Fixture calculations. Carries over current Indiana amendment to avoid fiscal impact of additional fixtures. Motion to approve 29-22 and disapprove 29-06 by Ed. Seconded by Ralph. Motion carried with 3 nays and one abstention.

ccc. PC\_29-07: withdrawn.

ddd. PC 18-02. Geotechnical investigations. Revision to clarify that liability for the investigation is borne by design professional, not code official. Bobby asked if he could still require an investigation if the design professional did not obtain one. John noted that the design professional would need to produce information on investigations from adjacent property in order to qualify for the waiver. Mike K. moved to approve. Ed seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

##### 5. Discussed draft LSA:

a. Discussed carry over amendment regarding occupancy classification divides U occupancy into two separate divisions of U-1 and U-2. John H. felt this was archaic as neither the 2012 model code nor the Indiana amendments provides any other language regarding the separate divisions. The unanimous consensus was to allow staff to modify this section to bring it in line with the new model code.

b. The Indiana amendment to the definition of dwelling unit limits congregate residents to 10, while the amendment to Section 1018.1 limits

congregate residents to 16. The current code limit is 16. The unanimous consensus was that the current limit of 16 should be carried over.

c. The model code language states that I-1 and I-2 occupancies with five or fewer persons provides an option of complying with the Residential Code, provided an automatic sprinkler system was provided. The unanimous consensus was that the language referring to the Residential Code should be stricken, and these occupancies are to be regulated by the Indiana Building Code.

d. Section 1029 of the new model code removes the exception for sprinklered R-2 occupancies. This creates a significant conflict with the current Indiana carry over amendment to 1029 regarding ladder access. The unanimous consensus was that the exception in the current Indiana Code for sprinklered R-2 occupancies should be carried forward with the current Indiana amendment regarding ladder access requirements.

e. Discussed the errata to ASCE 7-10, and noted that it had not yet been officially published by ASCE. The unanimous consensus was to incorporate the proposed errata, provided that the changes were not substantive.

6. John and Denise will work on the final draft LSA and John will work on finalizing the fiscal impact statement. These will be distributed via email, and a time period will be provided for members to respond with comments via email. John stated that the goal was to present the committee's work at the December Commission meeting.

7. John and Denise thanked all members for their work.

Prepared by,  
John A. Hawkins, AIA