

# 2006 CODE AMENDMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

Meeting notes from May 8th, 2007:

## **1: Approve April 17th meeting notes.**

The meeting notes from the April 17th meeting were approved without any modifications.

## **2: Vote on amendments.**

- IBC-S1: *Passed. 8 For/2 Abstain.*
- IBC-S2: *Referred back to sub-committee to add language declaring a "C" wind exposure.*
- IBC-S3: *Passed. Vote was unanimous.*
- IBC-S4: *Vote was deferred until a sub committee member can explain the rockery wall requirements.*
- IBC-S5: *Passed. 8 For/1 against.*
- IBC-S6: *Passed. Vote was unanimous.*

**The following structural amendments were not recommended by the structural sub committee but were provided to show that existing local amendments were considered.**

- IBC-S7: This previous amendment was to stipulate a "C" wind exposure. See IBC-S2.
  - IBC-S8: Previous amendments required roof trusses to be tied down at points of bearing. This requirement is redundant. See IBC 2308.10.1.
  - IBC-S9: Previous amendments reduced ice dam/snow loading of eaves. No engineering justification could be found.
  - IBC-S10: The local amendment to allow patio covers on slabs without frost depth footings was not forwarded. The committee wanted the structural sub committee to reexamine excluding open shade structures from the requirement for frost depth footings. The spacing of horizontal members on a shade structure should be determined regarding the snow bridging effect.
  - IBC-S11: Previous amendments had a modified footing/stem wall table. There was also a footnote that had been in previous adoptions that allowed the under floor to be excavated to the bottom of the footing. This is at odds with local practice and was tabled for further discussion. This matter was also referred back to the sub committee for alternatives to dug in footings.
  - IBC-S12: This was a previous amendment that required a minimum of ½" nominal roof sheathing. Engineering analysis showed that ½" would not be required until a 34 lb. P sub g load was reached. Any engineered structure would have the roof sheathing analyzed and the appropriate thickness specified. Structures built under the prescriptive provisions would have increased thickness depending on ground snow load.
- 
- UPC-4rev: *Passed. 9 For/1 Against.*
  - UPC-5a: *Failed. 7 Against/3 Abstain.* The committee did not think the 2006 language was mandatory. The code language "shall have the authority" gives permission to

- approve and does not mandate the approval. The suggested language change did not mirror the UMC language as given in the supporting statement.
- UPC-6a: *Referred back to the sub committee* to delete section 411.2.5 or provide the AWWA document mandating the floor drain. There was a question as to whether a floor drain is mandatory or if there are other approved methods to drain the test water out of the structure.
- UPC-8: *Failed. 4 For/6 Against.* There was not any documentation submitted that plastic fittings fail at a higher rate than metal fittings. The committee did not want to be vulnerable to a lawsuit by banning a product that maintained the appropriate IAPMO certifications.
- UPC-9a: *Failed. 3 For/7 Against.* The only documentation provided was a manufacturer's installation guide that was not clear on how it related to the amendment. The statement that there are fire issues with plastics in non-combustible construction was unsupported and at odds with all building and plumbing codes since 2000. Water hammer issues were in direct conflict with UPC-21 submitted by the same sub committee. The supporting statement that jurisdictions currently do not allow plastic piping only applies to the City of Reno and not to any other Northern Nevada jurisdiction. Fire penetration issues were discussed and noted that there are numerous listed products to achieve fire stopping.
- UPC-10: *Failed. 3 For/7 Against.* The committee at previous meetings had indicated that the water purveyors should direct water conservation. The rationale was that conservation would happen when water right demands were addressed with the water purveyors. It was noted that there are many ways to obtain lower water usage and that the greatest savings could be achieved through controlling irrigation.
- UPC-19: *Referred back to the sub committee.* Washoe County will continue to issue manometer licenses for this code cycle. There are however, regional issues to deal with. Some gas suppliers perform manometer tests such as Southwest Gas. Propane suppliers who are licensed by the State LP Board also perform manometer tests prior to service. Will alternate licensed companies be required to obtain a Washoe County manometer license? Also the option to allow the witnessing of a manometer test was to be removed from the amendment.
- UPC-21 *Failed. Vote was unanimous.* Documentation from a PEX manufacturer indicated that some PEX systems might experience instantaneous pressure surges above 150 psi, especially systems utilizing 3/8" pipe. It was also pointed out that there are different PEX formulations and there is not a uniform swell ratio.
- UPC-25 *Referred back to sub committee.* The documentation submitted was for monthly rainfall amounts not hourly. The committee was willing to reexamine this if there was documentation provided.
- UPC-26 *Passed. Vote was unanimous.*

**Steering committee voting members present:** Arvil Singleton, City of Reno; Curt Weagel, City of Sparks; Kevin Gattis, Carson City; Randy Rudy, City of Fernley; Nick Malarchik, Lyon County; Charlene Parish, Washoe County; Sheena Beaver, BAWN; John Schroeder, BANN; Buzz Harris, AGC and Dale Lowery, ABC.

### **3: Set next steering committee meeting.**

The next steering committee meeting was set for May 16<sup>th</sup>.