UNIFORM CONSTRUCTION CODE ADVISORY BOARD
Minutes of Meeting, April 17, 2009

Location
101 South Broad Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Attendance
Board Members
  William J. Lynn, Chair
  John Scialla, Vice Chair
  William Connolly
  John DelColle
  Arthur Doran
  George Hrin
  Robert McCullough
  Michael Mills
  Gregory Moten
  Beth Pochtar
  Leonard Sendelsky
  James Sinclair
  Joseph Surowiec
  Alexander Tucciarone
  Valerie Waricka

DCA Staff
  Cynthia A. Wilk, Director, Division of Codes and Standards
  Emily Templeton, Code Development Unit
  John Terry, Code Assistance Unit
  Michael Baier, Bureau of Code Services
  Louis Mraw, Office of Regulatory Affairs
  David Uhaze, Bureau of Construction Project Review
  Robert Austin, Code Assistance Unit
  Suzanne Borek, Code Assistance Unit
  Paulina Caploon, Elevator Safety Unit, Bureau of Code Services
  Marcel Iglesias, Code Assistance Unit
  Darren Port, Code Assistance Unit
  Drake Rizzo, Division of Codes and Standards
  Michael Whalen, Code Assistance Unit

Guests
  Nancy Dureya, Department of Children and Families
  Stephen Jones, Building Officials Association of New Jersey
  David Kurasz, New Jersey Fire Safety Advisory Board
  Joseph LaBruzza, Marlboro Township
  Bob LaCosta, Scotch Plains
  Ray Lonabaugh, National Fire Sprinkler Association
Mr. William J. Lynn, Chair of the Uniform Construction Code Advisory Board (CAB), called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

A. Approval of Minutes of the Code Advisory Board Meeting of February 6, 2009

  Mr. Leonard Sendelsky made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to approve the minutes with one amendment: that the list of Board members in attendance be amended to include Mr. Sendelsky. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Subcode Committee Reports

  Barrier Free Subcode Committee

  Mr. John DelColle, Chair, reported on a Barrier Free Subcode Committee that was held on April 3, 2009. At its last Committee meeting, December 8, 2008, the Committee had briefly discussed the Notice of Proposed Rule Making published by the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) concerning the scoping of the revisions to the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) that were published on July 24, 2004. In this meeting, the Committee was asked to review the Federal regulations and to bring to the Committee Chair's and the Department's attention any discrepancies between the Barrier Free Subcode and the revised Federal regulations. Tasks were assigned to Committee members.

  In the continuing discussion of accessible slot machines in casinos, Mr. DelColle reported to the Board that fixed seating at slot machines is not required in Puerto Rico.

  Building Subcode Committee

  Mr. John Scialla, Chair, reported on two Building Subcode Committee meetings that were held on March 20 and March 27; all items discussed were agenda items.

  Electrical Subcode Committee

  Mr. Bob McCullough, Chair, reported on an Electrical Subcode Committee meeting that was held on March 19, 2009. In addition to agenda items, the Committee continued its discussion of a change to the adopted ASHRAE 90.1 standard regarding voltage drop. The adopted edition of ASHRAE 90.1 requires a design analysis for voltage drop. The Committee recommended that this section should be left to the design professional/building owner and not to the discretion of the electrical subcode official. The committee recommends that Chapter 8 should remain optional.

  Elevator Safety Subcode Committee

  Mr. George Hrin, Chair, reported on an Elevator Subcode Committee meeting that was held on March 30, 2009 in which agenda items were discussed.
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Fire Protection Subcode Committee
Mr. William Lynn, Chair, reported on two Fire Protection Subcode Committee meetings in which agenda items were discussed. In addition, the Fire Protection Subcode Committee continued its discussion of the sidewall sprinkler requirement for the protection of decks and balconies and the relationship of technical standards, listings of equipment, and code requirements.

Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee
Mr. Arthur Doran, Chair, reported on a Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee on March 24, 2009 in which agenda items were discussed.

Plumbing Subcode Committee
Mr. Alex Tucciarone, Chair, reported on a Plumbing Subcode Committee meeting held on March 20, 2009 in which agenda items were discussed.

C. Old Business
1. Update of Model Codes/2009

   a. Plumbing Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.15)
   Mr. Alexander Tucciarone, Chair of the Plumbing Subcode Committee, reported that the Plumbing Subcode Committee identified three editorial amendments that should be made to the draft proposal to adopt the National Standard Plumbing Code (NSPC)/2009. These editorial changes are delineated in the Plumbing Subcode Committee's minutes. Mr. Alexander Tucciarone made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to approve the draft proposal for publication with the amendments in the Plumbing Subcode Committee's minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

   b. Mechanical Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.20)
   Mr. Arthur Doran, Chair of the Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee, identified a problem with International Mechanical Code (IMC)/2009, Section 504.8, Common exhaust systems for clothes dryers located in multistory structures. This section requires a continuously run exhaust fan to be linked to a standby power system; the Committee recommended that the continuously run fan be required to be linked to a standby power system only when the building is being provided with one.

   The Board held a brief discussion about the potential consequences of the code language, which could be interpreted as requiring standby power systems. One Board member pointed out that high rise buildings are required to have standby power systems; but this code provision would apply to multistory buildings, so its impact is broader. Another Board member added that, although a high rise building is required to have a standby power system, the clothes dryer exhaust system with a continually running fan has not previously been required to be linked to it. There was additional discussion that perhaps the code section intended to address concerns with the duct in the shaft because there is no damper where the dryer connects. The continuously running fan would then create a positive draft. One Board member stated that the vertical shaft has a positive draft anyway. One Board member cautioned about using the correct terminology for these systems because emergency systems have requirements from other subcodes; standby power and emergency power can be confused.
Mr. Arthur Doran made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to approve the draft proposal for publication with the provision that the continuously run fan be required to be linked to a standby power system only when the building is being provided with one. The motion carried unanimously.

c. Fuel Gas Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.22)
Mr. Arthur Doran, Chair, Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee, commented that the same issue with common exhaust systems for clothes dryers located in multistory structures that caused a problem in the mechanical subcode exists in the International Fuel Gas Code (IFGC)/2009.

Mr. Arthur Doran made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to approve the draft proposal for publication with the provision that the continuously run fan be required to be linked to a standby power system only when the building is being provided with one. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Arthur Doran made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to approve the draft proposal for publication without amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

e. Energy Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.18)
Mr. Arthur Doran, Chair, Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee reported on the Mechanical/Energy Subcodes Committee meeting in which several amendments to the draft proposal to adopt the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)/2009 were discussed.

In the IECC/2009, Section 403.2.2, Sealing, requires that sealed ductwork outside the thermal envelope be tested for tightness. The Committee thought that the test is justified for large buildings because problems do occur in this area, improper duct installation. Currently, a licensed professional engineer or certified air balancer conducts the test in commercial buildings. However, the Committee expressed concern that this code requirement applies to all buildings, the test would be required of residential, as well as non-residential, buildings. There is no certification for residential, or for Class III, buildings, so tests in Class III buildings are conducted by the contractor. The Board was informed of the new Federal requirement that a State receiving stimulus funds certify that within eight years it will adopt the IECC/2009 for residential buildings and ASHRAE 90.1-2007 standard for commercial buildings. A discussion regarding the effective date followed. One Board member observed that a Board that will license heating, ventilation, Air-conditioning (HVAC) contractors should be appointed in response to the Heating, Ventilation, Air-conditioning, and Refrigeration Contractors Licensing Act (PL 2007, c. 211). One Board member recommended that the testing requirement be delayed until January 1, 2013 to give ample opportunity for the HVACR Board to be appointed, rules adopted, and a licensing program to be established.

One Board member asked whether ASHRAE, Chapter 8, Power, would remain optional and was told that it will. This Board member also asked whether the provision in ASHRAE 90.1, at section 9.4.1.4(c) requiring that all guest lighting and receptacles in hotels and motels be controlled by a single switch means that bathrooms and other rooms in a suite must all be controlled by a single switch is included in the rule proposal. Staff informed the Board member
that when the ASHRAE 90.1-04 was adopted, the same language presented the same problem. It was fixed then and the fix remains in the current code adoption.

Mr. Robert McCullough made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Michael Mills, to approve the draft proposal for publication with an effective date of January 1, 2013 for the testing required in IECC/2009, Section 403.2.2, Sealing. The motion carried unanimously.

Before the discussion of the building subcode began, Mr. William Lynn, Chair of the Board, commended the staff for its tremendous work in a short time.

Mr. John Scialla, Chair, Building Subcode Committee, and Mr. William Lynn, Chair, Fire Protection Subcode Committee, reported on amendments from the Building Subcode Committee to the draft proposal for the building subcode. The numbers in the references refer to the numbers on the cover memo distributed with the rule proposal.

- Item B14: The Building Subcode Committee recommended adding “or less” to follow “to an exit in three minutes” in the text at N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.14(b)3xi.
- Item B27: The Building Subcode Committee wanted to be sure that the enforcement responsibility for Section 406.1.5, Automatic garage door openers, will be assigned to the electrical subcode official.
- Item B32: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the new code requirements for Live/Work Units in Section 419 and recommended adoption.
- Item B34: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the new code requirements for Ambulatory Health Care Facilities in Section 422 and recommended adoption. The Board held a brief discussion concerning ambulatory health care facilities and how to determine the number of non-ambulatory patients. These facilities are same-day surgery centers, so, due to anesthesia, the patients are not able to self-egress. The Board agreed that it was reasonable to conclude that the number of patient rooms (surgical areas) is the same as the number of patients.
- Item B44: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the rewritten provisions in Section 508, Mixed Use and Occupancy and recommended adoption. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that the provisions of the IBC/2006, which are the current building subcode requirements, be retained. The Board held a brief discussion. It was explained that the IBC/2006 and earlier code editions had required that storage uses over 100 square feet be separated or sprinklered. The IBC/2009 requires that storage areas be treated as any other mixed use—it would be treated as an accessory use when it is less than 10% of the occupancy. Thus, the impact occurs when the storage area exceeds 10% of the occupancy. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee expressed concern that this code provision is a reduction in safety.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Gregory Moten, to propose the IBC/2009 text unamended. The motion carried; all were in favor with the exception of Mr. William Lynn who was in opposition.

- Item B53: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the provisions of Section 704, Fire Resistance Rating of Structural Members, and recommended adoption. The Board held a brief discussion concerning the language in the model code regarding the definition of structural members. In reading the language, it was unclear whether lintels were to be considered secondary structural members. One Board member observed that,
although lintels have a structural purpose, they are not secondary structural members. It was recommended that the Department contact the ICC to confirm that the language was not intended to categorize lintels as secondary structural members.

- Item B55: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the new provisions is Section 705.5, Fire resistance Rating (of exterior walls), that require exterior walls with a fire separation distance of 10 feet or less to be protected from exposure from both sides. FS16-07/08, the code change proposal that caused this change, was studied. The concerns of the proponent were discussed and after a lengthy debate, the committee determined there was a lack of technical justification for the code change. Therefore, the committee recommended retaining the requirements of the IBC/2006 code and amending the “10 feet” to “5 feet”. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended adopting the 10-foot provision of the IBC/2009. The Board held a brief discussion concerning the measurements to the centerline.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to retain the current requirements of the building subcode (5 feet). The motion carried; all were in favor with the exception of Mr. William Lynn who was in opposition.

- Item B76: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that the text of the IBC/2009, Section 903.2.11.1, which limits the need for protection of windowless spaces to areas in excess of 1500 square feet, be amended and the current provisions of the building subcode be retained. By doing so, the level of protection afforded in the BOCA National Building Code/1996 would be retained, and all windowless spaces would be required to be protected.

Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. John Scialla, to approve the recommended change. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B89: The Building Subcode Committee recommended changing “building subcode official” to “fire protection subcode official” in Section 909.20.6.3, Acceptance and testing.

- Item B91: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the deletion of Table 1005.1, Egress width per occupant. By deleting the Table, the egress width per occupant would be based on requirements of IBC/2006 for a non-sprinklered building. E19-07/08, the code change proposal for this change, was studied. The Building Subcode Committee had held a lengthy debate regarding this issue. One Building Subcode Committee member thought that this code change would have a huge impact on large assembly buildings. Another Building Subcode Committee member asked if there was any history of problems with the table as it was published in the IBC/2006. He commented that the concept has been in the building code since 1987 and there was no technical justification for the code change. Therefore, the Building Subcode Committee recommended that the text of the IBC/2006 be retained and Table 1005.1 reinserted. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee had also discussed this code provision and recommended that the new text requiring the egress width to be calculated as a non-sprinklered building be adopted. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee observed that there are emergencies other than fire that require the prompt evacuation of buildings and the additional width would be helpful in those situations.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Gregory Moten, to retain the requirements of the current building subcode, the IBC/2006. The motion failed.
The Board continued its discussion. In response to a question regarding the impact of this code provision, one staff member provided a brief analysis. The minimum stairway width is 44 inches; the minimum door width is 32 inches clear; two means of egress are required. With two stairs and two egress doors, a maximum of 320 occupants per floor when the building has no sprinkler; when there is a sprinkler, the maximum occupancy per floor is 426. The number of required means of egress is increased when the occupancy is 12,000 per floor. At that point, the number of required doors jumps from 43 to 68. This would impact very large buildings, including arenas.

Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to adopt the IBC/2009 language. The motion passed with six in favor and three opposed.

- Item B93: The Building Subcode Committee discussed the Area of Refuge exemptions in Sections 1007.3 and 1007.4 based on the installation of an automatic sprinkler system. The Building Subcode Committee agreed with the Department's proposed amendment to retain the IBC/2006 requirement, which did not exempt sprinklered buildings from having an area of refuge. One Board member observed that there are circumstances when a building is evacuated in other than a fire condition. The stair tower is used as the area of refuge for non-ambulatory people with disabilities. When an area of refuge is constructed, there is a designated place for people with disabilities to await rescue. When there is no area of refuge, people with disabilities wait in the stairways; this can obstruct evacuation and delay rescue assistance.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to retain the requirement for an area of refuge in sprinklered buildings. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B94: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the amendment to Exception #9 of 1008.1.2, Door Swing, which would allow a sliding door for spaces with 10 or fewer occupants. The Building Subcode Committee recommended adoption. This section would allow the use of a sliding door for interior spaces, such as conference rooms. Concern was expressed regarding accessibility. Staff found that there are sliding door products that are fully accessible. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that these doors not be allowed. One Board member observed that a sliding door is currently allowed to be used as part of a means of egress in very limited circumstances.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Robert McCullough, to adopt the language of the IBC/2009. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B98: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that new section 1008.1.9.8 be deleted. Adopting this new section as written, would no longer require that electromagnetically locked egress doors automatically unlock when the fire alarm activates and would no longer require the main entrance door to be open from the egress side when the building is open to the general public in Group A, B, E or M occupancies.

Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Michael Mills, to delete this section and retain the current requirements of the building subcode. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B99: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that new text that requires “at least one of the following” for Group I-3 be adopted. The alarm would still be required to be activated manually by the guard service. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee did not think that it is necessary to require that all three conditions be present to activate the alarm system.
Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to adopt the language in the IBC/2009. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B105: The Board held a brief discussion about the provisions for ship's ladders, which are commonly used in industrial buildings. The IBC/2009 limits its section to alternating tread stairs. Following a brief discussion regarding the similarity between alternating tread stairs and ship's ladders, one Board member recommended that both options be permitted and held to the same standard. Another Board member recommended that handrail provisions be captured; the Board agreed.

Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to propose that alternating tread stairs and ship's ladders be scoped to have the same requirements. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B107: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the amendments to Section 1012.3, Handrail Graspability, and recommended adoption.
- Item B113: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the amendments to Section 1014.2, Egress through Adjoining Space, and recommended adoption.
- Item B115: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that existing IBC/2006 text that requires a second exit at 10 occupants in buildings of Group R-2 be retained. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee members thought that expanding the requirement for a second means of egress to 20 occupants is excessive for Group R-2. The Board held a brief discussion about at what point the change in text would have an impact. In the IBC/2006, the requirement that a second means of egress be provided for 10 occupants means that the second means of egress would be triggered for a 2,000 square foot dwelling unit; the IBC/2009 threshold of 20 occupants would trigger the second means of egress in a 4,000 square foot dwelling unit.

Mr. William Lynn made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to retain the current requirements of the building subcode. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item B119: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that the new text in Section 1021.1.1, Exits maintained, be retained as written. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee regards this provision not as a maintenance issue, but, rather, as a clear explanation that requires the path to continue to the exit.
- Item B126: In the draft proposal, the reference to the bleacher standard, ICC 300, was proposed to be deleted. In further review, the Department found that, in fact, this standard contains provisions for bleachers that are not otherwise included in the IBC/2009 and that are necessary to ensure the construction of safe bleachers. Therefore, the Department would like to propose the adoption of ICC 300. The Department would then request that the Building Subcode Committee and Fire Protection Subcode Committee review ICC 300 concurrent with the public comment period for the rule proposal.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to propose ICC 300 for adoption. The motion carried unanimously.

- Egress Window: The Fire Protection Subcode Committee expressed concern that in the proposal existing text regarding egress windows would be amended to delete the words “Basement and” and delete some exceptions. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee strongly believes that providing an egress window on every story, including basements, regardless of the existence of a sleeping room, is a firefighter and an occupant safety
issue for emergency escape. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommends that the new text be adopted as written and that the exceptions be retained. The Board held a brief discussion regarding the added expense for ensuring that basements have an egress window, which is openable and is five square feet. There was general agreement that this would be a costly requirement without a demonstrated benefit. The building subcode has never required an egress window in a basement without a sleeping room and there has been no known problem associated with that provision.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Dr. James Sinclair, to adopt the draft language as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. George Hrin, Chair of the Elevator Subcode Committee, recommended that the draft proposal for the elevator safety standards in the IBC/2009 be proposed for adoption without change. There were several changes to the draft proposal for N.J.A.C. 5:23-12.2, Referenced standards. There are several additional sections of ASME A17.1 that should be deleted because they deal with issues that are more appropriately addressed through the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA). Those sections are specified in the minutes of the Elevator Subcode Committee.

Mr. George Hrin made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to approve the adoption of the IBC/2009 with regard to elevator requirements and to approve the amendments to N.J.A.C. 5:23-12.2, as modified by the Elevator Subcode Committee. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. William Connolly made a motion, which was seconded by Dr. James Sinclair, to propose the adoption of the IBC/2009 as modified by Board discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

g. One- and Two-Family Dwelling Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-3.21)
Prior to an item-by-item discussion of the International Residential Code, the Building Subcode Committee discussed the possible deletion of Section R300, New Jersey’s amendment retaining the BOCA National Building Code/1996 height and area limitations in the IRC. The Building Subcode Committee recommended that the height and area limitations in the IBC/2009, Section R300, be adopted with one amendment—that, in addition to a 13 or 13R fire sprinkler system, a 13D fire sprinkler system be allowed to qualify for a height or area increase. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Robert McCullough, to adopt Section R300 and to allow the height and area trade-offs to be triggered by a 13D fire sprinkler system. The motion carried unanimously.

• Item R3: The Building Subcode Committee recommends taking the definition of “Attic, habitable” as it exists in Section R300 and insert the definition into Section R202. Following a brief discussion, the Board recommended that the definition be left where it is without change.

• Item R7: The Building Subcode Committee discussed the amendments to Table R301.5, Minimum Uniformly Distributed Live Loads. One Building Subcode Committee member expressed concern over the reduction of the minimum live load for balconies (from 60 lbs/sf to 40 lbs/sf). His concern was rooted in the fact that balconies only have one means of failure. If the structural support of a balcony were to fail, there is catastrophic failure, unlike a deck, where failure of a structural support would cause a redistribution of
the load. The Building Subcode Committee recommended reverting to the requirements of the IRC/2006 and retaining the minimum live load for a balcony of 60 lbs/sf. 

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Robert McCullough, to retain the 60 lbs./sf live load requirement for balconies. The motion carried unanimously.

- Item R-11: Egress windows. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee recommended that egress windows be required on every story, including basements. The Board discussion was brief and followed the same points raised during the discussion of the same issue in the IBC/2009, above.

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to adopt the language in draft proposal, without amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

- Items R17, R18 and R19: The Building Subcode Committee discussed the new requirements in Section R313, Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems. The Building Subcode Committee held a broad discussion on the need for fire sprinklers in one-and two-family dwellings and attached single family townhouses, the impact of this new code section in light of the current economic downturn, the impact on the affordability of the residential building stock in New Jersey, and, finally, problems that could arise in areas without public water supplies. In light of these complicating factors, with emphasis on adding costs in this difficult economy, the Building Subcode Committee recommended not adopting the requirement for sprinklers in one- and two-family dwellings. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee strongly supported requiring sprinklers in one- and two-family dwellings. The life safety implications are too strong to ignore any longer. The IRC/2009 allows sprinkler heads to be added to the basic plumbing system, which will control costs. The Fire Protection Subcode Committee also supported the delay in the effective date for the sprinkler requirement for one- and two-family dwellings other than townhouses because the delay would ensure that there is adequate time to provide training for contractors and code enforcement officials.

Board discussion followed. One Board member expressed agreement with the concerns of the Building Subcode Committee. This Board member believed that the cost would present an extra burden on the homeowner. This Board member recommended that New Jersey delay action for one code change cycle (until after the publication of the next edition of the model codes in 2012). Delay would be prudent because it would enable any problems with the new requirements to be identified and corrected and it would give the economy time to recover from its current slump. New Jersey has the highest housing costs in the country; adding code requirements would make housing even more costly. There was brief discussion about the delayed effective date of 2011 for one- and two family dwellings other than townhouses. Several Board members thought the delay was reasonable, but others thought it would not be sufficient and that an additional year, through the next code change cycle, would be required.

One Board member observed that sprinklers save property, not people. Another Board member countered that observation with a statement that the data are persuasive that sprinklers actually save lives and do not specifically save property. A larger discussion ensued concerning fire safety statistics. One Board member stated that statistics demonstrate that most fire deaths occur in houses and also show that new houses are no longer safer than old houses. Because of the increase in lightweight construction, the time for a house to be fully engaged in fire has decreased dramatically—a traditional house required 24 minutes from ignition to collapse; a new home requires 8 minutes.
The Board turned to a discussion of changing construction practices. The use of trusses has increased. One Board member observed that truss construction is cheaper; its use saves time, not necessarily materials. Another Board member pointed out that people want bigger spans for increased light and bigger rooms. But, one Board member pointed out that not every type of truss construction uses wood trusses; steel joists are also commonly used.

In the discussion of cost, one Board member pointed out that the additional cost for a P2904 (plumbing/sprinkler system) is modest. One Board member stated that homeowners would appreciate the increased life safety at the modest increase in cost. In response to a question about estimates of the cost, staff informed the Board that at an estimate of $1.66/square foot, the system would cost approximately $5,000 for a 3,000 square foot home and approximately $3,000 for a 2,000 square foot home. It was pointed out that there are estimates that are lower, particularly for the P2904 system, which is part of the plumbing system. This estimate is an average cost of a standard sprinkler system, NFPA 13R; it represents approximately 1% - 2% increase.

One Board member asked about water issues. Staff commented that because the required system operates off the plumbing system, water issues are not significant. In fact, there have been observations that a well is actually better for the contractor because the pressure coming into the house is known. Another Board member observed that the amount of water for the plumbing-based sprinkler system is small. In a house where two people can shower at the same time, there is enough water for the sprinkler.

Board discussion then focused on implementation. To clarify, one Board member summarized the draft proposal as follows: The draft proposal includes the IRC/2009 sprinkler requirements, which requires sprinklers in townhouses immediately and requires sprinklers in other one- and two-family dwellings in 2011.

One Board member suggested that the effective date could be adjusted. Given the current economic slump, an effective date three years in the future could be established. That would add a year to the effective date in the IRC/2009 and it could be applied to all one- and two-family dwellings, including townhouses. One Board member pointed out that, in that case, the entire provision could be held until the next code adoption. In response, it was pointed out that, where there is an effective date, people get ready for the implementation. Training is developed and held and builders, contractors, and code enforcement officials alike prepare to provide and enforce the new requirement. In contrast, where the code change is implemented without a definite effective date in the future, people do not get ready for implementation and enforcement. Then the code requirement is adopted and the construction industry is not prepared. Providing an effective date ensures smoother, more predictable, and more uniform enforcement. A date of January 2012 was then proposed. Following a brief discussion, one Board member observed that there appeared to be a consensus that there would be an effective date of January 1, 2012 for the sprinkler requirement for townhouses and one- and two-family dwellings. In response to a question, it was noted that the six-month grace period that applies to the adoption of model codes would also apply. Finally, it was noted that if the economy does not rebound, the effective date could be discussed again.

Mr. Robert McCullough made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to propose the IRC/2009 sprinkler requirements with an effective date of January 1, 2012 for townhouses and one- and two-family dwellings. The motion carried unanimously.
Item R21: The Building Subcode Committee reviewed the new code requirement in Section R315, Carbon Monoxide Alarms and recommended the deletion of Section R315.2, Where required in existing dwellings, because this is covered by the New Jersey Rehabilitation Subcode (N.J.A.C. 5:23-6).

Mr. John Scialla made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Michael Mills, to propose the draft language without change. The motion carried unanimously.

Item R24: The Building Subcode Committee discussed the new code requirement in Section R322.2.1, Elevation requirements. After a lengthy debate, the Building Subcode Committee voted 8-3 to recommend proposing the text of the 2009 IRC as published.

Item R26: The Building Subcode Committee discussed the changes to Section R402.3.1, Precast concrete foundations and recommend adoption. The Building Subcode Committee recommended that “Precast” be deleted from the title of Table R403.1, Minimum Width of Concrete, Precast or Masonry Footings, because the foundation is not precast, the foundation wall is precast, and the Building Subcode Committee thought that the title could cause confusion.

Mr. William Connolly made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to propose the adoption of the IRC/2009 as modified by Board discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. New Business

1. Removal on Non-required Fire Suppression Systems (NJAC 5:23-6.4 through 6.7, 6.31)

This rule proposal would amend the Rehabilitation Subcode to match the requirements of the Uniform Fire Code (UFC). The rule would allow the removal of existing partial or redundant protection systems with the written approval of the fire official and fire protection subcode official as long as the system is not required by the current edition of the Uniform Construction Code (UCC) and the special hazard that existed when the system was installed no longer exists. When both officials approve the removal of the system, all system components must be removed.

One Board member asked whether this approval can be appealed and was told that appeal is part of the UCC process, so, yes, the decision can be appeals. The Board member asked that the rule include that information. Another Board member suggested that the rule be amended to state, "subject to appeal."

Mr. Robert McCullough made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. William Connolly, to approve the draft rule, as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Form 380–Fire Sprinkler Hydraulic Plate

Standard Form 380, Fire Sprinkler Hydraulic Plate, was updated to reflect the current technical requirements dealing with hydraulic data.

Mr. Robert McCullough made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Leonard Sendelsky, to approve the form as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Form 100 – Construction Permit

Two items on Standard Form 100, Construction permit, were revised. Item 7 was revised to include "standpipes." Item 12 added for "fire alarms."
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Mr. Leonard Sendelsky made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. John Scialla, to approve the form as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Information
   1. CAB Log: The updated log was included in the meeting packets.

F. Pending Legislation
   1. A list of pending legislation on issues that impact construction was included in the meeting packets.
      One Board member commented that the list provided includes all legislation that references construction even where the bill has nothing to do with the UCC. That Board member recommended that a list be provided that presents only the bills that impact the UCC. The Department agreed to review the request.

G. Public Comments
There were no comments from the public.

H. Adjourn
   Mr. William Lynn, Chair, declared the meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.