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Happy consumer-driven and trivial interpretation of love day.
I am grateful for the past few months. This is my last newsletter article as the Utah Chapter President. It has been a pleasure and very rewarding getting to know many of you over the years and representing you with the Chapter. As I ride off in the sunset I was pondering as to what to write about. There has been so much going on in our profession lately that there are many subjects that I could write on. Legislative actions, implementation of codes, professionalism, plan reviews, etc...the list goes on.

With all this I wanted to talk about membership and what that means. We have had a few past members ask what value that gives as they consider paying dues and some have chosen not to and other continue in their loyalty. I have thought about this with some reflection of what it has meant to me and what I have gained out of a chapter membership. Many of our benefits we extend to all, such as the newsletter, training, our conference and even legislative representation. So, if this is the case why should I pay a membership if it is for free? This is the question I have been asking of myself. These are a couple of thoughts that followed:

Firstly, associations depend on membership to thrive. Without members no association would be possible. Today we would have to have 50 faithful members to start a chapter within the ICC model. We luckily exceed this amount and continue to have good representation across the State of Utah. With associations comes organization. We have a common purpose and that helps us to provide essential functions to our members. Without organization no one would have the means to make things happen that we otherwise take for granted. This comes in the forms of training during our monthly times as well as our annual conference. We have committees that work on uniformity and government affairs. This organization of members gives us representation in meetings and hearings. It provides a way for us to mobilize and sponsor individuals to code hearings and other meetings that otherwise would not be possible. We also have community voice through our membership.

Secondly, there is support that's given to members. This is shown in networking, mentoring and again training. This is again due to the organization of individuals to make this happen. We give support to the community that the chapter sponsors. We have donations of time and monies to local charities that we do every year. During the Annual Business meeting we will also be awarding individuals with scholarships or their immediate family members. We will recognize those that have worked tirelessly to represent our trade with various awards.

This is all possible due to memberships. Albeit through dues that are paid on an annual basis. I hope you see the values that are not tied to monetary compensation or a commodity that you receive but a comradery of persons and representation in various ways. I am proud of the Utah Chapter ICC and what it does in our industry and have been honored to represent you as your president. I look forward to my future participation with the chapter and what it can do for us as a whole.

Jason Van Ausdal
President - Utah Chapter
The code change hearings in Las Vegas was quite eventful and went well in my estimation. It was interesting that all the energy code provisions to increase the R values in the residential code which were disapproved by the committee in Albuquerque were also disapproved by the voting members at the hearings; the same was true for the commercial provisions where they were approved by the committee to increase the R values the voting members also approved to increase those values at the hearings. Many items were overturned. Of all the persons in the room there were very few people who voted, the numbers varied from 192 to 32 so, you can see that the outcome of what will be in the codes was determined by very few people. Except for the Colorado Chapter those who spoke were mostly outside interest like the Home Builders Association, the Multi-housing Association and corporations who have a monetary interest in the code. As inspectors, plans examiners and building officials we need to be in the forefront in speaking up.

This is not the end of the process; the online voting has already started and will continue till Black Friday. “Following the closing of the online ballot period, the votes received will be combined with the vote tally at the Public hearings to determine the final vote on the code change proposals”. Many of the items where the vote was close the online votes could easily change the final code. So look the items over before you vote.

I will be retiring on April 16th of 2020 but would still like to be involved in some way to improve the codes. It has been an honor to serve the Utah Chapter through the years starting in 1980 when I served on the board. The first code change proposal I was part of what in 1983 prior to starting with Salt Lake City. While in Centerville I figured out how to get a one-hour roof ceiling assembly on trusses and one TJI’s which were a new product at the time by going to three places in three documents. Because trusses were on 24” on center the provisions of 721 didn’t work so I called the gypsum association with an idea for consolidating the requirements into an assembly in the table which they liked and they submitted it which was approved in San Antonio and it became part of the U.B.C. Table ……… When I started with Salt Lake City in 1983 I was allowed to attend the ABM in St. George provided I taught a class which I did for several years without compensation until professional teachers came on board.

Some catch phrases are used in making a point such as “don’t throw the baby out with the bath water”. Years ago, taking a bath was quite an ordeal, in ancient times weddings were in June because that was when it got warm enough to take a bath in the stream, later when there was a way to heat water on a wood burning stove it was a little easier but took some planning. My grandparents had a wood burning cookstove which had pipes running through it, kind of like an ancient version of an instantaneous water heater which would heat up the water which would go into a ten-gallon tank which would still take some planning. Because it would take so long to heat several people had to use the same bath water. When it was my turn, I declined figuring that I would be dirtier after the bath than before. In not so olden times the man of the house had the first bath then the wife then all the kids in the same water and finally the baby so throwing the baby out with the bath water was something they could relate to. As another point of trivia in medical times the homes didn’t have wood floors but had dirt so to keep things somewhat clean they put straw which was called thresh, to keep the thresh from spilling out to the outside they placed a threshold at the door so that was how we got the phrase threshold.

At there was too much discussion on approving the referenced standards especially NFPA 285 that it is flawed when testing combustibility of exterior wall finishes over 40 feet high. This standard is used in approving products in the evaluation reports and so what would happen if we removed the reference in the code? I always thought that the standards where just automatically adopted since our group has no authority or input in changing any standards.
Was approved as submitted which is a BIG change to strike all the EXCEPTIONS for not having to make existing structures accessible when doing alterations to existing buildings.

Is another BIG CHANGE which was approved to delete the provisions for partial and complete change of occupancy provisions in existing buildings feeling that the 20% requirement for accessibility will cover all the issues. As a point of concern the UBCC failed to update the reference to their amendment from the 2015 I.E.B.C. to the 2018 I.E.B.C regarding this section which will be removed. The UBCC will need to review this change to see where to place their requirement for 20% of the dwellings to made accessible in a changed occupancy or just remove it altogether in favor of the 20% of the cost of the change.

I feel this is the best proposal presented to required two-way communication systems at elevator door openings on alterations exceeding 50% of the building area. A good modification is proposed to change “in accordance” to “required by”. This was passed with the public comment which was a good modification proposed to change “in accordance” to “required by”.

The committee’s approval of this was wrong. These are points well taken. WHY WOULD ANYONE WANT TO REMOVE ANY EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLING SYSTEM????? Another item not listed in the public comment is maybe the sprinkler system was put in in lieu of one-hour construction as the code once allowed. We have allowed fire sprinkler systems as a trade-off and the reasons are long forgotten. Thanks, Jeff, for bringing up your point, please DISAPPROVE!! Don stood and spoke to this and quoted Ted Itchon a Salt Lake City fire code plan reviewers’ comment “Without a clear history of the Existing buildings uses, change of occupancy, construction type, or an alternative means and methods application the removal of an automatic fire sprinkler system may prove to be catastrophic during a fire event”. This was disapproved on the floor.

Was approved. I have never thought of a rain gutter holding the edge of the roof on but just the opposite that the roof held the gutter on so when the roof edge is held on by the gutter this is very important. Structural engineers who do reviews need to take note of this item.

Has anyone ever seen a screen under a skylight to catch the broken glass and keeping it from cutting up anyone underneath? This change clears up this confusion calling them retention screens and was approved overturning the committee’s disapproval with the public comment.

Don spoke to this to overturn the committee’s action of disapproval to include provisions in the I.R.C. for INTERMODAL SHIPPING CONTAINERS. In Salt Lake City we have been approached several times to allow shipping containers for multistory buildings and if they are properly connected to the ground and to each other they should perform well in a hurricane or an earthquake. This was approved as amended.

Was overturned from disapproval to approval. An interesting conversation, the wind design temperature and in dry climate the latent temperature is zero as occurs in out dry climate. Manual J is incorporated into this proposal which should be of interest for those obsessed with manuals, J, D and S.

Separating the structural requirements for guard and handrails was approved in the I.R.C. The guard is to minimize the possibility of a fall. There was discussion of structurally designing a guard to resist forces from falling inward? The code should address what is probable and not possible. An elephant could come running through the double doors into the code hearings room which is possible but not probable but in Vegas it might be probable. Handrails are graspable, guards don’t need to be graspable. Years ago the term for guards in the code was guardrail which was changed to guards since there is no
requirement for a horizontal rail to be part of the design.

Exit discharge is not addressed in the I.R.C. in other words, once someone steps on to the exterior landing or onto a deck the stairs at that point are not regulated. This code change which was approved with the two public comments clarifies that stairs not within or serving a building porch or deck or non-habitable attics or crawl spaces are not regulated. Stairs from a porch or deck will be regulated for rise, run, width and handrails but stairs from one level of lawn area to another are not as clarified by this section.

Was approved with public comment 3 and 5 declaring that habitable attics are a story above grade plan. As the code is currently written an attic could be considered a fourth floor which would place the dwelling under the requirements of the I.B.C. and must be fire sprinklered and as illustrated in the comments of this proposal would outside the reach of any rescue ladder by the fire department. The public comments mandate fire sprinkling systems when the habitable attic is above the third story. How will that pan out in Utah where fire sprinklers are not required in the I.R.C.?

The disapproval was overturned with the addition of public comment 1 regulating energy storage systems in dwellings. With the increased use of photo voltaic systems there needs to be regulations of the locations and separations of areas where the batteries are located.

Although fire-retardant treated wood has a very limited application in the I.R.C. this provision which was approved clarifies that the treatment be impregnated and that paints, coatings and stain surface treatments are not approved.

This doesn't allow sampling of inspections but defines it but by defining it the concept for allowing it is introduced. Don spoke against this that owners paid in good faith for a permit and an energy inspection must be made of every dwelling unit. Permits and plan reviews cost a lot of money and the owner is entitled to an inspection of every dwelling even if all the units were alike and built by the same builders. The approval by the committee was overturned and this was disapproved. RE43 also addressed sampling which was also disapproved.

Public comment #2 was approved which keeps the term mandatory of the slab-on-grade insulation. There was a lot of discussion about the term mandatory as opposed to prescriptive on this and other items. The committee’s action for disapproval which was overturned by 66.67% 36/18 which is a baby step in the direction of emphasizing the important of slab-on-grade insulation.

The home builders like the concept of sampling of inspections and make a case for it. In real life do inspectors inspect each unit where they are all the same? This concept was disapproved, each unit in multifamily dwellings must be inspected for air leakage. See comment on RE10.

ucts should be buried in the insulation and need to be outside the unconditioned space!! The change from R6 to R8 isn't significant enough. The R8 insulation on the ducts in an unconditioned attic may work in San Diego or Hawaii but for the rest of the country it is insufficient.

This item is GIGANTIC in proportions in the general definition of WALLS, ABOVE-GRADE to include a whole bunch of stuff in what is considered walls. The new wording reads as follows “This includes, but is not limited to, between-floor spandrels, peripheral edges of floors, roof and basement knee walls, dormer walls, gable end walls, walls enclosing a mansard roof and skylight shafts. The biggest objection was to include the “peripheral edges of floors”. The concrete and masonry people
went berserk over that. The typical type of constructions for years is to ignore that fact that the concrete floor projects clear to curtain wall with zero insulation at that location. The proponent of the change pointed out that when he worked in an upper floor office in Chicago at the exterior wall his feet were always cold because there was no insulation at the floor. The rebuttal to that was he should have worn wool socks. After the discussion was completed there was a call for civility in our testimonies.

Through CE75 are proposals to increase R values of the building envelope which all passed. Low income tenants in apartments must decide on whether to pay their energy bills or eat. We subsidize energy inefficiency through government help to pay their energy bills, so we all pay for higher energy bills.

This change was submitted by the Utah Chapter 10 years ago and has weathered the test of time, so I am surprised to see it being challenged for disapproval. Don spoke to this and stated that the solution is to put in direct vent water heaters and furnaces. Gravity vent equipment needs to go the way of 3.6 per flush water closets and incandescent light bulbs and this provision should help that happen. The commentators reason states it is not an energy use issue, but it is a gaping hole in the exterior wall for combustion air is an energy use issue and this provision address that, to treat the room as an unconditioned space.

Address operable openings interlock which will open lose large openings at certain set points which was disapproved. Don spoke to Public comment #1 to change the set points from 70 and 80 degrees to 55 and 90 degrees which is what the openings at the operable roofs of the City Creek development are set at which should work and meet the committee’s concerns. The set point should be comparable to the range of temperatures found in San Diego and Hawaii. The disapproval was overturned, and the public comment approved.

Don spoke to this item to approve as amended by public comment which would strike the added sentence of requiring an occupancy sensor in a parking garage to ramp up the ventilation rate. The Utah chapter worked hard to strike those words years ago in favor or providing CO and nitrogen dioxide detectors and now it was reintroduced. The provisions for reducing the cfm area from 22,500 to 8,000 was so good that the reintroduction of the words had been overlooked but was caught by someone else. He explained that the triggering of the system should not be dependent on movement of people or electric cars but needed to be triggered by hazardous fumes. It became quite stressful when the proponent of public comment #2 spoke for disapproval of the whole code change since this is also addressed in the mechanical code in IM.C. Section 404.1 and may change in one code would necessitate a change in the other which was a valid point but the mechanical code does not capture the energy efficiency requirements of this section. In past hearings a phrase would be made “don’t throw the baby out with the bath water”, Don rebutted that stating that the reduction in area was too important to toss this all out and that he didn’t see any problems in the foreseeable future and that he looked forward to applying the energy savings provisions in garages since all the garages he had reviewed were too small to be made energy efficient. He prevailed and public comment #1 passed by a vote of 31/7. As you can see it is only 38 people voted on this item so the outcome on most of the code items were determined by a few people.

The new requirements for electrical vehicle parking spaces and equipment were approved in the commercial portion of the I.E.C.C. but disapproved in the residential portion. The discussion went on for a long time. Because there were 5 public comments the same persons could stand and repeat what they said because the clock started repeatedly. One argument for providing EV changing stations during construction is that it cost $6.50 to retrofit per stall. Salt Lake City was mentioned a few times as being in the forefront in requiring the stalls and equipment.
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Utah Chapter International Code Council
2019/2020 Membership

Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Jurisdiction / Company: ___________________________

Business or Home Address: ___________________________

City: ___________________________ State: _________ Zip Code: _________

Region: ___________________________

Phone Number: ___________________________ Email: ___________________________

****In order to receive the monthly news letter, we must have your email address****

New Member _____ Renewal _____ Please fill out one form for each membership!

Membership Type and Fees:

- Governmental Class A: Usually the Building Official working for a Governmental agency / jurisdiction $75.00
  (NOTE: One vote per “Class A” Membership. One “Class A” Membership Per Jurisdiction)

- Associate Member: An Employee of a current Governmental “Class A” Member $25.00

- Corporate / Industry Member: An association, company, corporation, manufacture, testing agency $95.00

- Professional Member: A design professional or contractor licensed by the state $75.00

- Educational Member: An employee of an educational institute, college, university or district $25.00

- Permit Technician: An employee of a current Governmental “Class A” Member $25.00

- Retired Member: A member retired from any of the above membership types $25.00

Membership Is Valid July 1st Through June 30th Of Each Year

Please make checks payable to:
Utah Chapter ICC
C/O Duchesne County, Karl Mott
P.O. Box 317
Duchesne, Utah 84021-0317

(Please include one application for each member with your check)

Or you can join or renew your membership online at our website: www.utahicc.org
(Members tab, online membership form)

*The Utah Chapter ICC is always looking for interested members to serve on various committees and on the chapter board. If you would like to participate please contact any of the Utah Chapter ICC board members. For a list of board members and committees go online at www.utahicc.org and click on members tab.*
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