OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES BOARD/UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION
CONFERENCE ROOM
2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 2F
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107
OCTOBER 20 2015 – 10:00 A.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Amber Armstrong (Arrived 11:01 a.m.), Ross Barrick (Arrived at 10:24 a.m.), Jim George, David Hall, Chris Henderson, Larry Herzel, Curtis McCarty, Joe McKenzie, and Cary Williamson

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Danny Hancock and David Timberlake

OTHERS PRESENT:
Billy Pope (OUBCC Staff), Kathy Hehnly (OUBCC Staff), Shawnta Mitchell (OUBCC Staff), Sandra Balzer (Attorney General's Office), Chris Swonger (Smith Group), Mark Harris (Titeflex Corp.), John Harrod (Chair – Residential Fuel Gas, Mechanical, and Plumbing Technical Committee), Rhonda Harding-Hill (Oklahoma Department of Commerce), Robert Doke (State Fire Marshal), Todd Booze (Vice-Chair – Residential Building Technical Committee/Ideal Homes), Billy Swindell (State Auditor and Inspectors Office), Greg Clark (City of Norman), Joe Robertson (City of Jenks), Kelly Parker (GWS)

CALL TO ORDER:
Mr. Larry Herzel called the regular meeting of the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission to order at 10:02 a.m. in the Construction Industries Board/Uniform Building Code Commission Board Room at Shepherd Mall, 2401 NW 23rd St., Suite 2F, Oklahoma City, OK 73107.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE:
The following statement was read into the record:
"This regular meeting of the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission scheduled to begin at 10:00 a.m. on this 20th day of October, 2015, has been convened in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, Title 25 Sections 301 through 314.

Further, this meeting was preceded by an advance public notice that was sent to the Secretary of State electronically specifying the date, time, and place of the meeting here convened.

Notice of this meeting was given at least twenty-four (24) hours prior hereto. To date, eighty (80) people have filed a written request for notice of meetings of this public body.

Mr. Herzel introduced himself to the audience as the Commission's Vice-Chairman, and noted the Chairman; Mr. Timberlake was not in attendance. He stated he would be conducting the meeting.

REPORTS

CEO Report:

Mr. Pope stated Ms. Shawnta Mitchell had resigned giving a month's notice. He added her last day would be Tuesday, October 27, 2015. He noted she was headed to a position out-of-state. He stated he wished her all the best. He noted he had hired Ms. Terri Bennett to take her place, adding there would be a few days of overlap so that Ms. Mitchell would be able to provide some training before she left. Mr. Herzel noted there was other information available to the Commissioners behind tab "A" for review. Mr. Pope stated funds were stable which was a good indication construction was staying strong. Mr. Herzel added the Commission would miss Ms. Mitchell and appreciated her work.

Financial Report:

Mr. Herzel noted there was not anyone available from the Office of Management and Enterprise Services to give the financial report due to the change in meeting time. He noted the reports were available for review behind tab "B." He added unless there were any specific questions to be addressed, the Commission would skip the report.

Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee Update:

Mr. Williamson stated the Alternative Fuels Committee had met on September 21, 2015. He noted it was one of the more productive meetings. He added they had moved through some public comment forms. He stated the committee was reviewing several codes to be meshed together. He noted the upcoming meeting would be looking at NFPA 59A with the 2014 NEC® and the 2015 editions of the IFC® and IFGC®. He added the committee still had a lot of work to go.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the September 15, 2015 regular meeting minutes

Mr. Herzel noted the minutes were behind tab "D" in the books. He added he had a few typos to be corrected that did not change the context or meaning.

MR. CHRIS HENDERSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. JOE MCKENZIE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS MODIFIED

VOTING AYE:	Amber Armstrong Jim George David Hall Chris Henderson Larry Herzel Curtis McCarty Joe McKenzie Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Ross Barrick Danny Hancock David Timberlake

Presentation and discussion on the FY13 and FY14 Audits

Mr. Billy Swindell with the State Auditor and Inspector's Office greeted the Commission. He stated he would be going over the audits for both the 2013 and 2014 fiscal years (FY13 and FY14) as they were both just completed. He added they were getting ready to start the 2015 fiscal year audit (FY15). He reviewed how the reports were put together and how the process worked. He reviewed the significant findings and compliance issue that were found for FY13. He noted the first item found was that funds were not transferred out of the Commission's clearing account monthly. He added it was both a significant finding and compliance issue. Mr. McCarty asked if that was something that OMES did for the Commission. Ms. Hehnly responded in FY13 the process of depositing funds directly into the Commission's account was stopped and funds were then deposited to a clearing account. She noted there was some time before a process was established to meet the requirement and it was not an issue in FY14. Mr. Swindell noted it was not a material finding in FY14. There was further discussion on the process for the deposit transfers. Mr. Swindell noted the second finding for FY13 related to both revenue and expenditures and dealt with the process for agency reconciliation on an "in-total" comparison for financial statement purposes. There was further discussion on the changes that had been made as a result of the findings. Mr. Swindell noted for FY14 the only significant finding and it was the same issue for reconciling the "in-total" comparisons for the financial statement purposes. There was discussion on the timing issue and the requirement in the Commission's statues for an annual audit verses being part of the statewide cash-basis audit. Mr. Herzel thanked Mr. Swindell for his time.

Presentation by the Residential Fuel Gas, Mechanical, and Plumbing Technical Committee (FGMP) on the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code®

Mr. Herzel stated the next item was the Fuel Gas, Mechanical and Plumbing presentation given by Mr. John Harrod. He added the 2015 IRC® books were available for everyone, but only for use at the meeting and couldn't be taken home. He noted for housekeeping, what he wanted to do was go chapter by chapter and if there were no changes to the chapter, there was no need for discussion. He asked Mr. Harrod to stop at the end of each Chapter to answer any questions, make any modifications to the presentation and then vote on the presentation in its entirety at the end with the modifications, if any were made.

Mr. John Harrod, Chairman of the Fuel Gas, Mechanical, and Plumbing Committee greeted the Commission. He noted he appreciated the opportunity to make the presentation and the efforts of all the committee members involved. He offered special thanks to Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Hehnly for the work they did.

Mr. McCarty stated there were some slides in the FGMP presentation that should have been sent to the Building Technical Committee for Chapters Three and Eleven. He noted so the Commission didn't get hung up on discussing them, could they be discussed with the Building Technical Committee presentation, on those chapters so they could be compared at the same time. Mr. Harrod noted the FGMP committee felt some of the slides in question should have been under their purview of their committee and not the Building Technical Committee. There was further discussion on the issue with the consensus to discuss them along with the Building Technical Committee presentation.

Mr. Harrod stated the direction the FGMP committee was given was to review all chapters within the Residential code that applied to the expertise within the committee. He reviewed the basic information the committee reviewed as far as the number of public comment forms and the carry-overs from the 2009 rule modifications. He noted Chapters One and Two were reviewed with one modification, which

was to modify the definition of a building drain to align it with the 2015 commercial code change. Mr. Herzel asked if there were any discussion on Chapters One and Two. Mr. Barrick noted he agreed with the proposed change to the definition as it helped with the required cleanouts on the drains. Mr. Harrod skipped the modifications for Chapters Three and Eleven. He noted Chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen were approved as written. There was no discussion on those chapters.

Mr. Harrod reviewed all the 2009 modifications, public comment forms (PFC's), on Sections M1502.3, M1502.4.2, M1503.4.1, Table M1506.2, and Sections M1507.1 through M1507.3.3 and Tables M1507.3.3(1) and M1503.7.3.3(2). He went over the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for Chapter Fifteen and asked if there were any questions. Mr. McCarty noted he had a comment on Section 1502.4.2, Duct installation. He stated dryer ducts were an issue for homeowners and wanted to know how an inspector would know if the screw only protruded an eighth of an inch without taking it apart to check. He added it was a potential fire hazard and he proposed the Commission approve the proposed change that was suggested but was denied by the committee. There was further discussion on the issue that covered if the requirements were new in the 2015 code; the responsibility of the installer to follow the code and be accountable for their work; and other ways to mechanically fasten the duct work.

MR. CURTIS MCCARTY MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CARY WILLIAMSON TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT FORM FGMP-13 ON SECTION 1502.4.2 DUCT INSTALLATION THAT STRIKES THE 2015 CODE LANGUAGE AND REPLACE IT WITH THE 2009 LANGUAGE

VOTING AYE:	Jim George Chris Henderson Curtis McCarty Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	Ross Barrick David Hall Larry Herzel Joe McKenzie
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Amber Armstrong Danny Hancock David Timberlake

Mr. Herzel noted since there was a tie, to assume the motion passed and the Commission would accept the public comment form.

Mr. Harrod presented the PCF's on Chapter 16 for Table M1601.1.1 and Section M1601.4.1. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommendation for each change and asked if there were any questions. Mr. McCarty noted before Chapter Sixteen could be closed out, Chapter Eleven would need to be discussed. There was further discussion on the issue with the consensus to vote on the Chapter with the discussion of Chapter Eleven during the Building Technical Committee presentation.

Mr. Harrod noted Chapters Seventeen and Eighteen were approved as written. There was no discussion so he moved on to the change proposed for Chapter Nineteen. He noted FGMP-20 dealt with adding a new section for electrical requirements for fuel cells. He noted this was one of the times where the electrical technical committee did as instructed and looked through all of the sections of the IRC® and determined there was an issue within their field. He noted the committee agreed with the proposed change and approved the comment form. He asked if there were any discussion.

Mr. Harrod then noted Chapters Twenty, Twenty-one, Twenty-two, and Twenty-three were all approved as written. There were no comments on any of the chapters. He added the committee did review each chapter, only that the committee felt there were no changes needed. Mr. Harrod presented the 2009 rule modifications and PCF's on Chapter Twenty-four for section G2406.3, Tables G2413.4(3) and G2413.4(4), Section G2414.4.2, G2414.4.3, G2415.12, and G2417.7. He reviewed the committee discussions and votes on each item and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. McCarty said he wanted to discuss Section G2414.5.3 regarding the corrugated stainless steel tubing. He noted there had been issues with the CSST and lightning strikes causing fires. He asked if the proposed change that was denied would require the CSST to meet a higher standard. Mr. Harrod agreed that was correct. He noted the standard was eight times more stringent than what the current code allowed. He added the committee's concern was that there was only one vendor that could meet the requirement. Mr. McCarty noted there was still black steel pipe and then there were two options. He noted he was aware of several houses in the area that had burned to the ground from lighting strikes and discussed once it was hit, the whole system had to be replaced. He asked if he could have some further understanding of what the particular public comment form was about. He asked if it was the appropriate time to discuss it. Mr. Herzel replied the Commission could and noted the submitter of the form was in the audience. There was further discussion on the issue that covered the responsibilities of the Commission to review higher standards for safety issues; CSST lightning house fire statistics; and if the black steel pipe would meet the higher standard proposed.

Mr. Mark Harris with Titeflex Corporation addressed the Commission. He was asked if the black steel piping would meet the proposed higher standard. Mr. Harris noted he believed it would, but was not aware of any testing for the requirements. Mr. Harrod noted black steel piping would be bonded all the way through so it should be in compliance. Mr. Harris went over his company history and the general history of CSST. He went over the product they produced that met the higher standard he proposed and passed out a sample for the Commission to see. There was further discussion between the Commission and Mr. Harris that covered the cost difference; a presentation given to the technical committee; the monopoly issue; industry or regulatory demand; amending when the requirement would go into effect; if other states had adopted the proposal; the code adopted by the Commission was always the minimum; if the change had been admitted to ICC; the bonding source and fittings; if special tools were required; who wrote the test standard for ICC-ES PMG LC1027; basis of the test requirements; and if there was a patent on the product. Mr. Herzel thanked Mr. Harris for his input. He asked Mr. Harrod to confirm the reason it was denied was because there was only one company making the product even though black steel would comply as well. Mr. Harrod replied the PCF (FGMP-9) only dealt with the CSST and there was a requirement for bonding the CSST material and it was the integrity of the entire system to be resistant to a lightning strike. Mr. Barrick noted the CSST gave a good path to allow the lightning to reach ground. There was further discussion on the issue regarding the increasing standards; issues with fires; cost to repair after a fire; and fire statistics.

Mr. Robert Doke, the State Fire Marshal, addressed the Commission. He noted his agency was made aware of issues with lightning strikes and CSST. He noted approximately three years ago, Fire Chief Kurt Trickle in Alva had two residential fires due to lightning strikes in one month. He stated in both cases the cause was the CSST that went to the kitchen stove. He noted the State Fire Marshal Commission will not endorse a particular business or product, but would endorse technology and manufacturing as a whole. He stated his Commission dealt mostly with commercial structures, but will deal with some residential, especially apartment homes. Mr. Doke noted there were at least two documented cases in Oklahoma and he was sure there were probably more. He noted the issue in Oklahoma was that they were not being grounded. He asked Mr. Means to offer his opinion. Mr. Mike Means, Executive Director of the State Home Builders Association addressed the Commission. He stated his Association had met with the Titeflex Corporation and it was his suggestion the group use the OUBCC committee process to get the item approved. He noted the Board looked at it with the possibility of doing some kind of commendation or resolution in favor of it, but came across the same obstacles the committee had, which was that it looked like the association was endorsing a manufacturer. He noted the board declined to take action, although they liked the adoption of a higher standard. He noted he liked the idea heard a bit ago of allowing a window for other companies to produce a product before the change became a requirement.

Mr. Hall noted the Commission was talking about going above and beyond the standard in the code because of the higher lightning danger that may or may not exist. His asked if those statistics had been collected. He noted a change could be made based on the numbers, but needed to be documented. Mr. McCarty agreed and noted it was the reason he had brought it up was due to the higher risk in Oklahoma. Mr. Harris noted the information could be found by Googling "NLSI" or "Lightning Density by State." He added there was a listing of density of strikes by state. There was further discussion on the issue.

MR. CARY WILLIAMSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CURTIS MCCARTY TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT FORM FGMP-9 AND INCLUDE THE CHANGE IN THE 2015 CODE LANGUAGE

Ms. Armstrong stated she wasn't sure she had enough information to vote for the change. She added if there was other information or a presentation they could look at if the vote was going to the Commission as opposed to the technical committee, it should be done first. Mr. Herzel noted he understood but there was already a motion and second on the floor. Mr. George noted the national level was very careful about putting proprietary items in the code and he would not be able to vote for it. Mr. Barrick noted he felt the same without more information. Mr. George pointed out the change they were proposing was a listing, not an actual standard. Mr. Herzel asked for a roll call on the open motion.

VOTING AYE:	David Hall
	Chris Henderson
	Curtis McCarty
	Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	Amber Armstrong
	Ross Barrick
	Jim George
	Larry Herzel

Joe McKenzie

ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Ms. Hehnly noted the motion did not pass.

Mr. Harrod presented the 2009 rule modifications and PCF's for Chapter Twenty-five on Sections P2503.4, P2503.6, and P2503.7. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes and recommendation for each modification and asked if there were any questions. There were no questions or discussions on Chapter Twenty-five.

Mr. Harrod presented the two PCF's for Chapter Twenty-six on Sections P2603.4 and P2603.6.1. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for each modification and asked if there was any discussion. There was no discussion on Chapter Twenty-six.

Mr. Harrod presented the 2009 rule modifications and PCF's for Chapter Twenty-seven on Sections P2704.1, P2706.1, P2709.2, and P2715.1. He described the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for each modification and asked if there were and questions. There were no questions or discussion on Chapter Twenty-seven.

Mr. Harrod presented the review of the 2009 rule modifications for Chapter Twenty-eight on Sections P2801.5 and P2803.1. He reviewed the committee discussion and votes and asked for any questions. There were no questions.

Mr. Harrod presented the review of the 2009 rule modifications and PCF's for Chapter Twenty-nine on sections P2902.5.3, P2903.8.6, P2903.9.1, P2903.10, P2904.1 and Sections P2904.1.1 through P2904.8.2 and Tables P29004.6.1 through P29004.6.2(9), sections P2905.1, P2905.2, P2905.4 and P2906.4. He described the committee discussions, votes and recommendations on each section. Ms. Armstrong asked about section P2904.1, noting that the section dealt with how to install the system when it was installed. She noted in the past the Commission had not required fire sprinkler systems for one- and two-family houses but they were required in townhouses. Mr. Harrod agreed, noting that was addressed in Chapter Three that would be discussed later. He asked if there were any other questions on Chapter Twenty-nine. There were no questions.

Mr. Harrod presented the review of the 2009 rule modifications and PCF's for Chapter Thirty, on sections P3003.2, P3003.9.2 and P3008.1. He went over the committee discussions, votes and recommendations for each section and asked for any questions. There were no questions.

Mr. Harrod presented the one change to Chapter Thirty-one on Section P3103.4. He reviewed the committee discussion, vote, and recommendation and asked if there were any questions on the chapter. There were no questions.

Mr. Harrod noted Chapters Thirty-two and Thirty-three were approved unanimously and asked for any questions. He noted that concluded his presentation. He thanked staff and the Commission for the opportunity. Mr. Herzel thanked Mr. Harrod and his committee for all their hard work. Mr. Harrod said he really appreciated his committee member's hard work. He noted at one point they thought they were

done, but then had to come back for a few more meetings. Mr. McCarty asked about Section P3008.1, Sewage backflow. He noted it looked like the committee had both a public comment form and the 2009 rule modifications. He asked if the committee brought forward the 2009 language because the action taken only addressed the comment form. Mr. Harrod noted the committee left the 2009 language. There was further discussion on the section.

Discussion and possible action on the presentation by the FGMP Committee on the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code®

MR. JOE MCKENZIE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CURTIS MCCARTY TO ACCEPT THE PRESENTATION AS GIVEN, EXCEPT FOR CHAPTERS THREE, ELEVEN, AND SIXTEEN AND THE MODIFICATION MADE TO CHAPTER FIFTEEN WHICH CHANGED THE SECTION REGARDING DRYER VENTS BE APPROVED

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong
Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall
Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie
Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Mr. Herzel declared at 12:25 p.m. a lunch recess for forty-five minutes.

The commission reconvened at 1:20 p.m. and a roll call was taken to confirm a quorum.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Amber Armstrong, Ross Barrick, Jim George, David Hall, Chris Henderson (arrived at 1:35 p.m.), Larry Herzel, Curtis McCarty, Joe McKenzie, and Cary Williamson.

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Danny Hancock and David Timberlake

Presentation by the Residential Building Technical Committee (BTC) on the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code®
Mr. Herzel noted the next item was the Residential Building Technical Committee presentation and Mr. Todd Booze would be making it. Mr. Booze stated the committee chairman was abroad and he was giving the presentation. He thanked the Commission staff for their help with the process. He noted he would summarize the PCF's, but could stop to answer specifics when necessary. Mr. Herzel agreed and

noted he would still like to stop after every chapter and determine if there were any specific changes to vote on.

Mr. Booze noted there was quite a bit of activity throughout the process with comment forms and amendments made. He stated the committee voted unanimously to approve Chapter One as written. Mr. Booze presented the changes from the PCF's for Chapter Two, sections dealing with the definitions of a storm shelter and the definitions modified through the modifications proposed to Chapter Eleven. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes and recommendations. Mr. Booze and Mr. Barrick discussed the need for the LED verbiage to be included in the definition for the high-efficacy lamps as part of the Chapter Eleven modifications. There was no further discussion or modifications to Chapter Two.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Three on Table R302(1), Section R302.5.1, R303.1, R303.4, R311.1, R311.7.5.1, R312.2, R312.2.1, R314.2.2, R314.3, R315.1, R315.2.2, R323.1, R326.1 and the additions of Sections R323.2, R326.2, R326.3, and R326.4. He reviewed the committee discussion, votes and recommendations.

Table R302(1), with Ms. Armstrong asked about Table R302(1) and the proposed modifications to the rows for "Walls", the first item was the fire-resistance rate for 1-hour with exposure from both sides at zero feet and the non-fire resistance rate for zero hours at greater than three feet. She wanted to know what happened between the zero and three feet. Mr. Booze noted it would have to be fire resistant. Ms. Armstrong replied the table in the book said less than three feet, but the new table said zero. She stated there was a difference between less than three feet and zero and she felt there was a gap not addressed. There was further discussion on the table, with the consensus to modify the table by changing the minimum fire separation measurements for each row as follows: Walls (fire-resistance rated) with one-hour exposure from both sides as less than three feet and to include the testing standards listed in the 2015 code not included on the public comment form; Walls (Non fire-resistance rated) with zero hours as greater than or equal three feet; Projections (fire-resistance rated) with one-hour on the underside as less than three feet; Projections (non fire-resistance rated) with zero hours as greater than or equal to three feet; Openings would not be allowed at less than three feet; Openings 25% maximum of wall area line should be stricken.

The Commission, Mr. Booze and Mr. Harrod discussed Section 312.2.1, Design and installation. Mr. Booze noted the change had to do with one- and two-family dwelling fire sprinkler systems. The committee voted to make the same modification as in 2009 and approve the comment form to move the section in to an appendix. He noted they did leave the sprinkler requirement for townhomes. He noted he thought that was the same modification as made by the FGMP committee. Mr. Harrod addressed the commission and noted the FGMP committee made the same change and referenced to Section 2904 so that where it was required, they were still directed to the proper section. Mr. Herzel asked if the FGMP committee could live with the modifications made by the building committee. Mr. Harrod reviewed the changes made by his committee. Mr. Booze, Mr. Harrod and the Commission discussed the different suggestions for handling the section with the consensus to utilize the Building Technical Committee's format for the change.

Mr. Booze, Mr. Herzel and Mr. Harrod discussed the different proposals from the two committees on Sections R314.2.2 and R315.2.2. Mr. Barrick noted he would still like to see the word "minor" inserted before the word "additions," for both sections. Mr. Booze and the Commission discussed Section R314.3 Locations with regards to the smoke alarms. Mr. Booze noted the committee approved the

comment form which deleted the forth location requirement. The Commission and Mr. Booze discussed if there were any errata done to correct the issue; Commentary language; manufacturer's installation requirements, and the intent of change. The consensus was to keep the 2015 code language.

Mr. Booze and the Commission discussed the modifications to Section 326 for swimming pools. Mr. Booze noted the 2015 language brought in a code that was not reviewed and no one knew enough about. He noted the language added replaced that and made requirements much more responsive. There was some discussion on the modification that covered, the changes made, exception number two; intent of fencing for pools; where the language proposed came from; reasoning behind the requirement exception for the two acres; modifying the proposed language; and regulation in municipalities. Mr. Booze noted that completed the changes for Chapter Three.

Mr. Herzel noted the Commission did need to come to a decision on Table R302.1(1) Exterior walls. The Commission discussed the revised table Mr. Clark created during the earlier discussion that has been passed out. The consensus was to bring the test standards for the one-hour fire-resistance rated walls row back into the language with the three-foot measurement for all rows in the column headed "minimum fire separation distance," with the understanding for the rows where the greater than sign is that it should be greater than or equal to. Mr. Herzel noted the other item still to confirm was leaving in Item 4 from tile 21 on Section R314.3, which would deny the public comment form B11.

MR. CURTIS MCCARTY MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. ROSS BARRICK TO ACCEPT CHAPTER THREE WITH THE MODIFICATIONS TO THE TABLE R302.1(1) EXTERIOR WALLS AND DENIAL OF PUBLIC COMMENT FORM B11

VOTING AYE:	Amber Armstrong Ross Barrick Jim George David Hall Chris Henderson Larry Herzel Curtis McCarty Joe McKenzie Carry Williamson
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Danny Hancock David Timberlake

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Four on Section R402.2, Tables R403.1(1) , R403.1.(2), and R403.1(3), Figure R403.1(1), Sections R403.1.6, R403.1.7.3, R403.1.9.1, and R406.2. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Barrick asked where the 2300 pounds of tensile strength came in the proposed change to R403.1.6. Mr. Booze replied it came from a structural engineer on the committee and exceeded all the requirements. Ms. Armstrong asked if anyone had reviewed section R403.1.7.3 in relationship to flood management and what FEMA and cities required.

Mr. Booze noted FEMA did not have any requirements on if the pad elevation was above or below the street. He added cities would have flood management requirements that would normally be contained in the right-of-ways. He added there would still need to be grading around the house.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs to Chapter Five on Sections R506.2.1, and R506.2.3. He went over the committee discussions, votes and the proposed modifications to each section. Ms. Armstrong asked why the language proposed in R506.2.1 for fill depths that exceeded 48 inches was stricken. Mr. Booze replied because it was inherent in the code and if it exceeded 48 inches it would need to be an engineered design.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Six on Tables R602.3(1), R602.3(3), Section R602.4, R602.7.5, R602.10.5, R602.10.8, R602.12, and R602.12.2. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommended changes. Mr. Barrick asked on the change for Table R602.3(1), if the change was only for end nailing and not toe nailing. Mr. Booze replied it was for end nailing.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Seven on Section R703.4, Figures R703.8, R703.8.2.1, and R703.8.2.2 and Section R703.8.3.1. He went over the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for each change. Mr. Barrick asked about the limited lengths in Section R703.8.3.1 and if anything over it required going back to the ¼ inch iron. Mr. Booze agreed. He noted that completed the changes on Chapter Seven.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Eight on Sections R801.3, R802.3, R802.3.1, R802.5, R802.5.1, and R802.7.1.2. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes and recommendations for each section. There were no questions on the proposed recommendations for Chapter Eight.

Mr. Booze presented the changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs for Chapter Nine on Sections R905.2.1, R905.2.8.5, and R908.3.1.1. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for each change. Mr. Barrick asked if the 1x8 rough sawn for re-decking were still good. Mr. Booze replied so long as they were tight fitting. He added some of the shingle manufacturer's did not allow for it with their products.

Mr. Booze presented the only change to Chapter Ten Section R1005.7. He reviewed the committee discussion, vote and recommendation and asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Mr. Booze discussed the PCFs that dealt with Chapter Eleven in total. He noted the initial direction the committee wanted to go after reviewing the 2015 language was to bring forward the 2009 language. He noted the first change to Chapter Eleven was public comment form B35 which requested the entire chapter be moved to an appendix. Mr. Booze noted the committee voted unanimously to deny the request. He noted the next two public comment forms were B42 and B43 each which modified the entire chapter. He stated comment form B42 seemed to be a combination of both the 2012 and 2015 codes. He added form B43 was to delete the language in Chapter 11 and bring forward the 2009 language. He noted the committee used B43 as the starting point for where the State of Oklahoma would be for energy efficiency. He noted when the committee got into reviewing the different items in the 2009, there were a couple of different groups and several people who came to the meetings and voiced comments and concerns about some things. He stated the committee met with a local energy rater and gentleman from the SPEER group and the biggest concern was there was some things

stricken from the 2009 language and if those changes came forward, the code would not meet the 2009 level. He noted those groups model all the energy codes across the country to see where every state was at. He noted the committee worked with him to figure out minor prescriptive tweaks that could be made to bump up over the 2009. He noted one of the issues that came up was a requirement for duct testing and blower door testing. He noted traditionally the code has been visual and prescriptive and there was no performance base anywhere in the code. He added envelopes could be addressed if they were inspected as long as the air barrier was inspected and could be seen to be caulked and insulation put in properly, then envelope tightness would not be a problem. He added for duct tightness there were some proposals that could be discussed with the FGMP committee chair, Mr. Harrod. He noted those proposals would be that ducts were installed in a specific manner that would address the biggest issues with duct leakage, the difference between using liquid applied sealers and using duct tapes. He noted those were the highlights of the process the committee went through. Mr. Booze stated the next change was public comment form B53 requested the committee retain all the 2015 language and review each section individually. He noted that was what the committee did and in rules the sections would be matched to the corresponding sections in the 2015 code.

Mr. Booze presented the remaining changes from the 2009 rule modifications and PCFs on Chapter Eleven for Section N1101.6, Tables N1102.1.2 and N1102.4.1.1, Sections N1102.4.1, N1103.3.2,

Mr. Barrick asked on the change for Table N1102.1.2, if the inch and a half was the minimum bearing. Mr. Booze noted it didn't necessarily have to do with the minimum bearing of the concrete slab; that was joists. He added what the committee was doing was a slab ledge that was integrated to those designs. Mr. Booze, Mr. Harrod and the committee discussed Section N1103.3.2 Sealing. There was further discussion on some clean up language proposed in the FGMP presentation; why the FGMP committee denied public comment form FGMP-19 regarding the mastic only sealing; modifying the language between the two committees; and the ability in option three for an approved agency to do the inspection.

MR. ROSS BARRICK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. DAVID HALL TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT FORM B50; ADDING "OR EQUIVALENT METHOD" BEHIND THE WORDING "(MASTIC OR SIMILAR)"; ADDING VISUAL INSPECTION AS OPTION NUMBER THREE AS SHOWN IN THE FGMP PRESENTATION; REMOVING THE EXCEPTION ON ITEM NUMBER TWO AND LISTING IT UNDER ALL THREE OPTIONS; AND STRIKING THE WORD "EITHER" AND ADDING THE WORDING "ONE" IN ITS PLACE

Ms. Armstrong asked if it was up to the building official to determine if the material is an equivalent to the liquid applied that met the 181 BM. Mr. Harrod agreed. There was further discussion on what standard 181 BM was and it was determined that 181 BM should be listed as "UL 181 BM." The Commission then discussed the revised version handed out by Mr. Clark.

MR. ROSS BARRICK AMENDED HIS MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. DAVID HALL TO INCLUDE THE WORDING "UL" BEFORE THE WORDING "181 BM"

There was further discussion on the wording for the third item regarding the "approved agency" with the final consensus to read how the FGMP committee proposed as: "Visual verification by the Authority Having Jurisdiction or an approved agency."

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong

Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall
Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie
Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Mr. Harrod stated he wanted to address something that was not an item addressed by the Building Committee, towards the beginning of the chapter. Mr. Harrod presented the proposed change to Section N1101.14 Certificate, reviewing the committee discussion, vote and recommendation. Mr. Booze noted his committee left that section struck out of the 2009 code when it was brought forward and explained the reasoning behind their decision. Ms. Hehnly asked for clarification, in the 2009 code the committee moved the requirement into an appendix, and did the Building Committee delete it completely or did they intend to leave it in the appendix. Mr. Booze noted they intended to leave it in the appendix. He noted if a city wanted to enforce it, they could. There was further discussion on the requirement with the consensus to leave the certificate requirement as proposed by the building technical committee, in the appendix.

Mr. Booze presented the change for Section N1103.5. He reviewed the committee discussion, vote and recommended change to the section. There was discussion on adding the word "potable" to the section; the FGMP recommendations for the section, to include Section N1103.5.3 and changing the piping in that section from three quarters inch to one inch (3/4" to 1"). There was further discussion on the section.

MR. ROSS BARRICK MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT FORM B54 AS MODIFIED BY UNDERLINING "CIRCULATION SERVICE POTABLE" IN THE SECOND LINE OF N1103.5 AND ADD IN SECTION N1103.5.3 WITH CHANGE FROM A ¾ NOMINAL TO 1 INCH NOMINAL PIPE WHERE WE BEGIN THE INSULATION

Mr. Greg Clark noted for consideration, in the currently approved public comment form B43, he recommended deleting Section N1103.4 out of the comment form as it was redundant to everything just decided. Mr. Clark clarified you had to look at the paperwork he provided for the amendments to Chapter Eleven to see there was a section labeled N1103.4 in the 2009 code that contradicted everything the committee just discussed. Mr. Harrod noted that was a housekeeping item with the numbering differences between the two editions of Chapter Eleven. Mr. Clark noted there was a conflict between the requirements in 2009 and the 2015 language brought back into the code; he noted it had to do with R3 versus R2. There was further discussion on the discrepancy

MR. BARRICK AMENDED HIS MOTION TO MODIFY PUBLIC COMMENT FORM B43 TO REQUIRE A R3 VALUE INSTEAD OF R2 IN SECTION N1103.4 IN GREG GLARKS VERSION OF B43

MR. CURTIS MCCARTY SECONDED THE MOTION

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong
Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall
Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie
Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Mr. Booze presented the remainder of the changes for Chapter Eleven on Sections N1103.1, N1104.1, N1108.1.1.4, and N1109.1.1.4. He reviewed the committee discussions, votes, and recommendations for those changes. Mr. Booze noted that completed Chapter Eleven and asked if there were any other questions. Ms. Armstrong noted there were two packets pushed into the back of the commissioner books and wanted to know what they were. Ms. Hehnly noted the first was a marked up version of the rules submitted by Mr. Clark on Chapter Eleven bringing forward the 2009 language. The second was Ms. Hehnly's version showing the same language marked up with the correct numbering for the 2015 code.

MR. CURTIS MCCARTY MADE A MOTION WITH SECOND BY MR. CHRIS HENDERSON TO APPROVE CHAPTER ELEVEN WITH THE TWO MODIFICATIONS TO THE PRESENTATION REGARDING SEALING AND CIRCULATION WATER SYSTEMS

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong
Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall
Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie
Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Mr. Booze noted the last two items were the appendices added for swimming pools and the residential tornado provisions. He noted the second was for high-wind construction and contained methods for cities to use if they wanted to push the wind speeds to 135 mph. Ms. Armstrong asked if Appendix W was what the City of Moore had in place. Mr. Booze agreed it was.

Discussion and possible action on the presentation by the BTC on the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code®

MR. DAVID HALL MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CHRIS HENDERSON TO ACCEPT THE BUILDING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AS PRESENTED EXCEPT FOR THE SPECIFIC MODIFICATIONS MADE BY THE COMMISSION

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong
Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall
Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie
Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

NEW BUSINESS:
There was no new business.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
Mr. John Harrod suggested in light of all the conflict and conversation regarding Chapter Eleven on Energy Conservation, that a separate technical committee be formed when the next code cycle was adopted to address the issues that could be affected by the different disciplines affected.

ADJOURNMENT: (5:05 P.M.)

MS. AMBER ARMSTRONG MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. DAVID HALL TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE: Amber Armstrong
Ross Barrick
Jim George
David Hall

Chris Henderson
Larry Herzel
Curtis McCarty
Joe McKenzie

Carry Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Danny Hancock
David Timberlake

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 17th day of November, 2015

DAVID TIMBERLAKE
David Timberlake, Chairman

PREPARED BY: KATHY HEHNLY
Kathy Hehnly, Executive Assistant
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission

OFFICIAL COPY - *Original with signatures in office file*