

**Construction Codes Advisory Board
Minutes of May 21, 2015**

Board Members present:

Bryan Boeholt
Eric VanderMey
Greg Gilda

Jim Safranek
Lily Iftner
Loren Brandford

Board Members absent:

Joe Malaspino
Allan Wakeling
Sam Park
Steve Simpson

Len Whalen
Rob Lane

Guests:

Tom Kinsman

City Staff:

Maureen Traxler
Julie A. Hines

Jon Siu

Meeting began at 12:00 p.m.

Minutes of April 16, 2015

The minutes of the April 16th CCAB meetings were approved as presented.

MailChimp and Trumba

Julie Hines presented the features of CCAB's new calendar system, Trumba, which allows board members to download meeting materials from the meeting announcement itself. She also stated that DPD has migrated to MailChimp email service for regular CCAB meetings and announcements.

Review of 2015 Seattle Building Code

Chapter 10

The Board began its discussion of Chapter 10 with Maureen Traxler's presentation about how IBC has clarified the terms, "width" and "capacity" throughout Chapter 10. Formerly these terms were used inconsistently and often interchangeably. In the 2015 IBC, "width" is now used to mean the minimum width, in inches, of any means of egress component required by other Chapter 10 prescriptive minimum requirements. "Capacity" means the dimension, in inches, necessary to accommodate the design occupant load at a given point along the path of egress travel.

The Board next discussed changes to Section 1005.6. Section 1005.6 addresses how to determine the sizing of a "means of egress" component when occupants of two stories reach the door at the level of exit discharge simultaneously thereby creating the need for sizing appropriate to manage a larger combined occupant load. Jim Safranek

asked whether Seattle combined the occupant load at three levels, i.e., at the level of exit discharge and the two adjacent levels. Jon Siu responded that Seattle's code only used the adjacent floors in determining the sizing – thus, only two levels -- and did not factor in the exit discharge level. Eric VanderMey and Jim Safranek pointed that the IBC 2012 Code Commentary calculated the sizing differently and other jurisdictions were more consistent with how the Commentary interpreted this section. The Board decided to table this discussion for now.

Maureen Traxler explained that 2012 IBC Section 1015 on exit and exit access doorways has been combined with Section 1021 (number of exits and exit configurations) into one section, Section 1006, for the 2015 IBC.

The Board then discussed Section 1006.3, Egress from stories or occupied roofs (in the 2012 IBC this was Section 1021.2, Exits from stories.) Maureen pointed out that DPD proposed amending this section to specify that a horizontal exit would not count as an exit for the purposes of meeting the required number of exits from the story or roof. Tom Kinsman asked whether horizontal exits would have any use. Jon Siu responded that they could be used for travel distance, but he would have to think about other uses.

Maureen Traxler reported that Section 1008.3 addresses emergency power and power supply for illumination. The threshold for emergency power is now a space that requires two or more exits.

Section 1008.3.3 is a new provision that requires emergency power in the listed areas regardless of the number of exits. Bryan Boeholt asked if Section 1008.3.3 applied only to high rise buildings. Maureen Traxler said that this section was meant to govern more than just high rises.

The Board next discussed Section 1009, Accessible Means of Egress. Maureen Traxler said that exception 1 to Section 1009.1, specifying when an accessible means of egress is required, had been changed by the removal of the word "alterations". After this amendment, Exception 1 now reads: "Accessible means of egress are not required to be provided in existing buildings". Maureen Traxler asked the Board their opinion as to whether, as a result of removing "alterations" from the exception accessible means of egress would be required for "additions" to existing buildings. Jon Siu responded that an addition to an existing building would be considered new construction. Jim Safranek asked if a lateral addition would be treated the same way as a top story addition. Jon Siu said that both would require an accessible means of egress but that the top story addition would result in alterations to the adjacent floor. This in turn would mean the 20% rule would apply.

With regards to Section 1009.2.1, Elevators required, Jim Safranek asked whether DPD excludes the level of exit discharge as a story when determining four or more stories above the level of exit discharge. Jon Siu responded that the level of exit discharge is not counted. Jim Safranek said that, according to an ICC written interpretation and his conversations with the ICC office, the ICC includes the level of exit discharge in

determining whether there are four or more stories, necessitating an accessible means of egress elevator. Jon Siu explained that the 2006 IBC defined “level of exit discharge” as a horizontal plane, so, at that time, the ground floor at the level of exit discharge was counted towards the four or more stories. That changed when the 2009 IBC defined “level of exit discharge” as a story at the point at which an exit terminates and an exit discharge begins. Maureen Traxler remarked that the language of Section 1009.2.1 is clear that the level of exit discharge is excluded.

The Board moved on to Section 1009.4, Elevators, which includes an existing Seattle amendment, requiring standby power and lighting for elevator cars, control rooms, and machine rooms. Maureen Traxler pointed out that Section 1009.6 had been reworked by the ICC to be split into subsections and now addressed the width and capacity issue. Bryan Boeholt asked whether there was anything in the code to prevent a builder from making all elevators accessible means of egress. Jon Siu said that the code did not limit the *number* of extra accessible means of egress elevators, but all the accessible means of egress elevators would have to comply with the emergency operation and signaling device requirements of Section 2.27 of ASME A17.1, according to Section 1009.4.

Maureen Traxler reminded the Board that the next meeting would be June 4th and the discussion will begin with Section 1010, Doors, Gates, and Turnstiles.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.