

**General Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting
First Meeting Summary**

Date: July 29, 2025

Location: Virginia Housing Center

Time: 9:00 AM

Attendees:

VA Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) Staff:

- **Jeff Brown** - Deputy Director, Division of Building and Fire Regulation
- **Florin Moldovan** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Travis Luter** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Paul Messplay** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Chris Scott** – Code and Regulation Specialist, State Building Codes Office
- **Rajan Engh** – Training and Development Specialist, Virginia Building Code Academy

Stakeholders:

- **Andrew Clark** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Andrew Milliken** – Stafford County
- **Corian Carney** – Independent Alliance of the Electrical Industry (IAEI), VA Chapter
- **David Beahm** – Warren County
- **David Sharp** – Fairfax County
- **DeAnthony “DA” Pierce** – Virginia Building and Code Officials Association (VBCOA)
- **Dennis Hart** – Fairfax County
- **Gerry O’Connor** – Eaton
- **Jason Vandever** – North American Insulation Manufacturers Association (NAIMA)
- **Joseph “Tread” Willis** – IAEI VA Chapter, Prince William County
- **Kyle Kratzer** – Fairfax County, VBCOA
- **Matt Mertz** – Fairfax County
- **Mark Price** – City of Martinsville
- **Michelle Dickson** – City of Richmond
- **Mike O’Connor** – Virginia Petroleum and Convenience Marketers Association (VPCMA), Virginia Propane Gas Association (VAPGA)
- **Nicholas Bowles** – Nottoway County
- **Paul Keller** – Turnkey Porch Enclosures
- **Perry Weller** – City of Staunton
- **Peter Broadbent** – Broadband Association of Virginia (VCTA)
- **Richard Gordon** – Hanover County
- **Ron Clements** – Chesterfield County

- **Russel Furr** – City of Alexandria
- **Sandra Escorcia** – City of Richmond
- **Sean Farrell** – Prince William County
- **Steve Shapiro** – Apartment & Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA), Virginia Apartment and Management Association (VAMA)
- **Susan Harold** – City of Richmond

Administrative Proposals (USBC & SFPC)

1. B105.1-24 – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of proposal.
 - i. Sean F – No objection to proposal. Did staff research when and how this language arrived in the code?
 - 1. Florin M – The proposal stands on its own merits and doesn't have any conflicts.
 - ii. David B – Has opposition. Building Official (BO) can be removed for cause, which was put in place to ensure there was a way to remove the BO if there is any issue. You can have an appointment for a 1-year time frame, and then that could be continuous. Right now, the code makes it clear that when you appoint the building official, the "Permanent" nature is so that they are removed from political actions and desires.
 - iii. Andrew M – VFSB supports this.
 - iv. Ron C – VBCOA Admin committee supports.
 - v. David B – Clarifies he was speaking on behalf of himself.
 - vi. Non-consensus.

2. B108.2-24 – Dennis Hart

- a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Richard G – In support of change. Localities with a large R-5 housing stock will need to prepare for an increase in permit volume. Hanover will go from 800 to about 3,000 permits per year.
 - 1. Kyle K – Permit increase is temporary, right? Switching over from non-flammable to flammable, there wouldn't be a refrigerant classification change, and therefore, it would still be exempt. Is that correct?
 - a. Dennis H – It would, yes.
 - b. Kyle K – So it's just that initial changeover that will have the increase.
 - ii. Consensus for approval.

3. B115.2-24 – Ron C (Note: This proposal was heard later in the agenda)

- a. David S – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Ron - By adding “responsible party” to the first sentence, you no longer need all the stricken language.
 - 1. Sean F – No position. Notes that moving toward permissive language does allow for subjective enforcement of the code. One locality may choose to do something while another locality decides to act differently. The first sentence says, “responsible party or permit holder,” – can I do both?
 - a. Ron C – Yes. And we could accept that as a friendly amendment.
 - ii. Jeff B – Based on history, when that question has come up specifically with the Virginia regulations, when we’ve asked the Virginia Code Commission, they would say if it says “or” that also means “and” when there are just two options and not a long list.
- b. Florin M – Asks for clarification on the language to be used - “to the responsible party, or permit holder, or both...”
 - i. Sean F – Yes.
- c. David S – Wants to get to the person responsible for code compliance.
- d. David B – In support.
- e. Andrew C – Not opposed. “Responsible party”... you could rope in any number of people involved in that project. Is there a way to narrow it down to somebody?
 - i. David S – That’s a reference back to 112.1, which states that any person performing work covered by the code has the responsibility to secure the results intended by the code.
 - ii. Andrew C – In that case, someone working on behalf of a bankrupt or out-of-business contractor, or just anybody working on that job, could be considered the responsible party.
 - iii. David S – The intent is not to go after an employee working for a contractor or company. When you have a legal entity, that entity has the status of personhood in the eyes of the law in most instances. It’s not to get at the individual laborer who is hired and working for that contractor.
- f. Jeff B – Asks for any further comments.
- g. Consensus for Approval as Modified.

4. **B115.2(2)-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Steve S – How do you prove receipt on the other end of it?
 - 1. Ron C – It’s already in the SFPC and is already allowed by the Maintenance code.
 - 2. Steve – No objection to it.
 - ii. David B – Representing self. Agrees with the change. Electronic is the way things are going. If it’s an option, it’s an option.

- iii. Sean F – Representing self. Is there a reason we repeated, “the intended recipient”? Recommends a friendly Amendment: In the added text, delete “To the permit holder or responsible party,” so that it just reads, “...by electronic service.”

- 1. Ron C – Supports the floor amendment.

- b. Consensus for Approval as Modified

5. **B118.4-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron – Provides overview of the proposal.

- b. Consensus for approval.

6. **B119.5-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.

- i. David B – Supports.

- ii. Steve S – Does this have application to the SFPC?

- 1. Ron C – I initially did not put the proposal in for the SFPC because I saw the homeowner as the main issue. Andrew M reached out to me about it.

- 2. Andrew M. – Yes, interested in including this in the SFPC. If there is consensus, we suggest moving forward with that consensus, and we will submit a separate code change for the SFPC.

- a. Ron C – Unless that would be considered a friendly amendment, which I would accept.

- b. Andrew M – If there’s consensus for that, too, there’s no objection to that.

- c. Jeff B – This might be something we would want to bring to the SFPC sub-workgroup, so it might be best to do that as a separate proposal and run it through the SFPC sub-workgroup and then bring it back to the next General Stakeholder Work Group.

- b. Consensus for Approval – Companion proposal to SFPC may be forthcoming.

7. **PM105.2-24** – Matt Mertz

- a. Matt M – Provides overview of the proposal.

- i. Tread W – Recommends mirroring Ron’s language from proposal B115.2(2)

- ii. Matt M – This language in the proposal is from the SFPC.

- b. Jeff B – Any objections to this proposal?

- i. Michelle D – Asks if we can make all three consistent by modifying the first one?

- ii. Jeff B – That might be something that could be decided today and then developed later.
 - iii. David B – Ron’s language would probably be better.
 - iv. Ron C – The term “electronic service” is the proper legal technology. I don’t know how to validate a mailbox. Fine with consistency between VPMC and SFPC since they are maintenance codes. Wants to leave the building code alone—no objection correlating with the SFPC.
- c. Jeff B – Asks if Matt wants to move forward as-is?
 - i. Matt M – As far as the electronic mailbox being changed to electronic service, that’s fine.
 - ii. Sean F – This language was predicated initially on serving as it pertains to state law - In person to the responsible party, another at the premise, or post at the premise. Is your language consistent with the state law that enables this?
 - iii. Matt M – Probably not taking too big a leap here since it already aligns with the SFPC and, with Ron’s language, would align even more.
- d. Florin M – Asks for clarification on the change.
 - i. Matt M – Where it starts by saying, “Transmitting to a valid electronic mailbox,” that would be shortened to, “...or by electronic service.”
- e. Steve S – Agrees with Ron. Leaving building code as it is and allowing this to mirror the SFPC.
- f. Sean F – The additional sentence there: “Such procedure shall be deemed the equivalent of personal notice.” Is that redundant?
 - i. Matt M – If we take that out, if we’re trying to align codes, that would be some additional work for the fire code.
- g. Sean F – Opposition.
 - i. Florin M – Asks if Sean will work with the proponent in the interest of consensus.
 - ii. Sean F – Yes.
- h. David B – Asks if fire services should look at it also to ensure consistency.
- i. Sean F – Did we run this change through the VBCOA Property Maintenance Committee?
 - i. Matt M – When the VPMC met, this was not available.
 - ii. Perry W – This particular language being proposed has been in the SFPC since at least the 2012 edition of the code.
- j. Carried Over. The proponent will work with those who have comments.

SFPC Proposals

1. **FP202-24** – Gerry Maiatico

- a. Proponent is absent. Jeff B asks if anyone from VFPA can present.

- i. Andrew M – Provides overview.
 - ii. David B – Supports
- b. Consensus for Approval

2. **FP601.2-24** – Gerry Maiatico

- a. Andrew M – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Jeff B – All of these SFPC proposals have been to the SFPC sub-workgroup, so they have been discussed.
 - 1. Steve S – I was at the SFPC sub-workgroup meeting, and I don't have anything to add.
 - ii. Mike O' – Representing the Propane Association. What's the practical application of the first underlined portion? When, in a fire code official's opinion, there is actual or potential danger, what action is this authorizing them to take?
 - 1. Andrew M – If there's an imminent risk of a fire occurring from a piece of equipment, or the power supply, or an electrical component that wouldn't otherwise be able to be controlled. This can now be controlled through the utilities being provided to the structure.
 - 2. Mike O' – Could the building appliances, equipment, or utilities include the propane tank?
 - 3. Andrew M – My guess would be yes.
 - 4. Mike O' – I don't recall this being brought up in the earlier committee meeting. I would need to populate this before proceeding, and I would like to defer if possible.
 - 5. Jeff B – The proponent is not here; however, if there is opposition, I would encourage meeting with the proponent to talk through that.
 - 6. Mike O' – I didn't say, "Opposition." I need to populate this because of the statement that it would impact a propane tank.
 - 7. Jeff B – If we must come up with a decision today and we have people who aren't ready to support it, I would be hesitant to call it a consensus.
 - iii. Dennis H – Not in favor of, "...when in the fire code official's opinion." It is not great code language, and it leaves a lot up to the determination of that fire official. When would this take effect?
 - 1. David B – That could be solved by taking it back to the first sentence of the original language, "Deemed unsafe or hazardous." As opposed to, "in the opinion [of the Fire Official]."
 - iv. Jeff B – Sounds like an opportunity for a cleanup to get us closer to consensus,
 - v. Peter B – Representing the VCTA. The VCTA shares the propane industry's concern regarding internet, cable, or alarm system components. Would like to be a part of any subsequent discussion.

- vi. Jeff B – We will make sure the proponent is briefed, and we will consider this proposal carried over.

b. Carried Over

3. **FP3101.1-24 and B3102.1-24** – Ron Clements (Heard together at the end of the agenda)

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposals. Andrew M brought this to the fire services board, and they have provided their comments. I have not had the opportunity to go through them yet. Asks for comments or concerns from the group? We are on the path to table this so I can address all of Andrew's comments.
- b. Jeff B – Opens the floor for discussion. Appreciates Ron taking on the effort to address this issue.
- c. Ron C – For the building code, you're going to the IFC, not the SFPC. It's the building code that regulates the construction of the tent. The fire prevention code is for operations and maintenance. Chapter 1 of the SFPC says that anything that is construction-related is invalid, but in the SFPC, there are numerous construction provisions. A large part of this exercise was to go through and delete all of the invalid construction provisions, which the fire official can't enforce under the SFPC. Nothing prohibits the building official and fire official from working out an arrangement where the building official wants the fire official, who is getting operations and maintenance permits, also to handle the building code side.
- d. Jeff B – Any other discussion, questions, or comments? We will mark those as carried over if that's okay with you.
- e. Ron – I guess what I'm hearing is that if Andrew and I work out his comments, then everyone else is good.
- f. Carried Over

4. **FP4106.1.3-24** – Gerry Maiatico

- a. Andrew M – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. Jeff B – Some of these mobile vehicles become permanent, and the proponent is attempting to draw the line of when it becomes permanent.
 - i. Florin M – For clarity, there is an exception in the last portion of the sentence, but there is a cdpVA formatting issue.
 - 1. Mike O' – Representing the Propane Association. What is the need for the exception?
 - a. Florin M – The intent is to exclude those facilities connected to a utility, but that are done so in accordance with the building code. These mobile food preparation vehicles are not covered by the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC), but the SFPC covers them. The question arises, "What happens if I do connect this structure that is not regulated by the USBC but is connected to a building that the USBC

regulates?” The USBC would require a building permit application, inspections, and approvals for that portion of the work. The primary concern was always that there was no clarity on who regulates what. The portion of the connection between the unit and any utilities or building service would be regulated under the USBC. Everything preceding the exception would not apply because it has already been permitted, inspected, and approved.

- ii. Sean F – Representing himself. Andrew M, did discussions with the VFPA include conversations about whether they are regulated by VDOT? Don’t they have to carry a proper registration?
 - 1. Andrew M – No, not necessarily.
 - 2. Sean F – It’s not a vehicle?
 - 3. Andrew M – There’s nothing in the SFPC that says you have to have a state inspection or registration or anything like that.
 - 4. Sean F – The USBC or the SFPC won’t require that, but for it to be a mobile truck, it would need to be regulated by VDOT.
 - 5. Perry W – Once it’s parked, DOT does not care. They don’t look at the components inside.
 - 6. Sean F – Suggests the following language: “Food Trucks must be registered by the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles.” Otherwise, they become inoperable vehicles handled by your inoperable vehicle ordinance. Or they become permanent fixtures, and now we’re looking at something almost like an industrialized building. Or something akin to that. So instead of trying to address the mobility, maybe we should think about the overarching state authority.
 - 7. Andrew M – I can’t speak for Gerry on that, specifically. I wouldn’t necessarily agree. This question has come up before in our jurisdiction about whether the definition of a mobile food truck vehicle includes registration as a vehicle. Perhaps making the exception more exclusive to not only connecting to utilities, but also that the building the structure is connected to is also regulated by the applicable building code. We can table this and bring it back.
 - 8. Sean F – We have an example of this in Prince William County. We have data center complexes with a whole city of trailers. Google wanted to bring in a food trailer, so we pushed them down to the Industrialized Building Regulations with DHCD, and Brian Hilderbrand took a look at it and determined that it was a vehicle and wasn’t regulated under the IBSR. Our Building Official said that if it is not regulated as an industrialized building, then it needs to be regulated as a motor vehicle. We won’t apply the building code if it has a vehicle tag on it and it is on wheels.
 - 9. Andrew M – Asks Sean F to share that with Gerry.

- iii. Mike O' – Does this change impact those traditional mobile food trucks that use generators or propane for their equipment?
 - 1. Andrew M – Asks for clarification on Mike O's question.
 - 2. Mike O' – Does this impact mobile, DMV-licensed traditional food trucks that use propane or generators?
 - 3. Andrew M – It applies to them, but doesn't change anything with how they are being handled. This is to address the permanency concept.
 - 4. Perry W – Say you parked your truck at a site for over 180 days, and you decide that you don't want to use your 100-gallon propane cylinder and want to get a 500-gallon tank and set it out there, and then some other regulations may kick in.
 - 5. Mike O' – Where does it say that?
 - 6. Perry W – That's what we are trying to address.
 - 7. Mike O' – How?
 - 8. Kyle K – Because it would become permanent. You would now need to disconnect and do more permanent things to detach the unit and move it away, as opposed to a generator that is usually attached to the chassis, where you could just shut everything down and drive away. That's the whole point of this change: it's saying that if you become a more permanent structure, you can't just up and go; it's not really a mobile operation anymore.
- iv. Sean F – Going back to the Prince William County example, this particular food trailer had HVAC on the ground, an external propane tank, connected to electric service, but was still a vehicle registered with the DMV and not regulated by the building code. We permitted the disconnects and all of the equipment associated with the vehicle, but the permits were unrelated to the vehicle itself. I'll reach out to Gerry, but how do you define "excessive effort?" What does that mean in terms of enforceability? What's the threshold there that triggers a notice of violation? We are struggling with defining what "permanent" means. In the context of my example, Google was there for four years building a complex of data centers. [The food trucks] weren't permanent, such that they will be there forever or until they are obsolete, but they will be permanent for the time that they are there. Therefore, the DMV applicability is paramount.
- v. Jeff B – We will carry this over and have those with comments work with Gerry on the proposal.

5. **FP3303.1-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal along with a floor modification supported by the fire services.
- b. Consensus for Approval as Modified

VPMC Proposals

1. PM202-24 – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. David B – Representing self. Unsure how #3 affects #4 or vice versa.
 - 1. Ron C – These are all independent items. This proposal is just putting back words that were inadvertently removed during the previous cycle.
 - 2. David B – Not opposed to it. Disagrees with it but not opposed to it.
 - ii. Jeff B – Asks for further comments in support or opposition.
- b. Consensus for Approval

2. PM302.5-24 – Matt Mertz

- a. Matt M – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. Steve S – Speaking for self. Supports. Good catch, particularly with grammar.
- c. Dennis H – Representing self. This would apply to structures on the exterior?
 - i. Matt M – I thought about that, too. In the end, I decided to go with a simple change rather than questioning whether this provision should exist where it exists.
- d. Consensus for Approval

3. PM303.2-24 – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Sean F – Wouldn't the applicable building code define these for you? You struck out "Applicable building code" and then put in specific sections.
 - ii. Ron C – The proposal moves "Applicable building code" down into the new sections.
 - iii. Sean F – Thank you.
- b. David B – Supports.
- c. Consensus for Approval

4. PM309.1-24 – Matt Mertz

- a. Matt M – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. Steve S – Representing himself, supports.
- c. Consensus for Approval

5. PM602.2-24 – Honore Tchou (Absent)

- a. Jeff B – Provides an overview of the proposal along with background information on the Heating and Cooling study group. The study group started developing a draft proposal that will be discussed once it is finalized, to hopefully capture all of the concerns of the proponent. Staff have followed up with the proponent after the first study group meeting.
- b. Steve S – On behalf of AOBA. Against this proposal.
- c. Andrew C – Was there consensus in that study group? If someone is invested in it, instead of tabling it, is it possible to send it back to the study group?
 - i. Florin – We’ve reached out to the proponent and have not heard whether he wants this tabled. The study group or its participants will develop their own proposal separate from this one. The group today can make a recommendation on the proposal as it is presented. Study group members are working on a consensus proposal.
- d. Jeff B – It’s okay for the group to decide on this, and we will update the proponent.
- e. David B – Opposed to proposal.
- f. Dennis H – VPMIA. Not feasible with a two-pipe system in R-2s. Not in favor.
- g. Andrew C – Just as a suggestion. A lot of these proposals have come up during session from constituents and legislators want to be responsive to their constituents and make sure they get a fair hearing. For the sake of not excluding a stakeholder, maybe carry this over.
- h. Jeff B – That’s fair. Is everyone good with that approach since he is a citizen working on his own?
- i. Steve S – There was also discussion in the SG meeting about consistency among codes. Issues with what the VMC, VCC, and VPMC may require. I hope the proposal that comes back addresses those.
- j. Carried Over

VCC Proposals

1. **B434-24** – Michael McCabe (absent)

- a. Florin M – We worked with the proponent to some extent to help him put this within the context of the code. Staff are not speaking to the merits or technical aspects of the proposal. Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Steve S – Behalf of AOBA. Opposed. This should go through the ICC process.
 - ii. Kyle K – Behalf of self. The number one thing that this proposal could use to make it more palatable is to reduce the amount of code language in the definition. At the very least, it would need some code sections instead of putting so much of that in the definition. This will require considerable effort to clarify the intent.
 - iii. David B – VBCOA building code committee is in opposition. This should go through a full vetting process.

- iv. Ron C – Unsure what this applies to. Would this apply to every building ever built? There's no code language or mandatory language here.
- b. Non-consensus.

2. **B903.2.1.2-24** and **B907.2.1.1-24** – Richard Gordon

- a. Richard G – Asks to discuss B903.2.1.2-24 and B907.2.1.1-24 together as they are companion proposals. Provides overviews of the proposals.
 - i. Dennis H – Question for B907.2.1.1-24: How does the code official determine the average ambient noise when determining compliance?
 - 1. Richard G – Great question. NFPA 72 has a test method, but it doesn't provide much usability here.
 - ii. Steve S – Speaking for self, referencing B903.2.1.2-24. This is a big leap where restaurants that wouldn't previously need sprinklers now need to be sprinklered. Agrees the definition of night club needs work. Opposes this proposal. AOBA has no position.
 - iii. David B – Representing VBCOA's building code committee. A change of use where a restaurant would go from a smaller restaurant to a larger one could be detrimental, and the cost impact would be astronomical. Unsure if there is any justification for this. VBCOA's building code committee is opposed to both.
 - iv. Sean F – Opposed to both. Asks the proponent to come up with data to support the change.
 - v. Jeff B – Do you want to move forward with getting a vote on this?
 - vi. Richard G – If I want to submit something that's totally different version just to address the night club clarification, I can do that separately.
- b. Non-consensus

3. **B1006.3.4-24** – Lyle Solla-Yates

- a. Carried over at the request of the proponent.

4. **B3005.4-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. David B – VBCOA building code committee is in support of the change.
- c. Consensus for Approval.

5. **B3102.1-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. Consensus for Approval.

6. **B3301.1-24** – Ron Clements

- a. Ron C – Provides overview of the proposal.
- b. Andrew M – VFSB supports
- c. David B – VBCOA building code committee supports.
- d. Consensus for Approval as Modified

VEBC Proposals

7. **EB504.1.6-24** – Corian Carney

- a. Corian – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Ron C – Not speaking in opposition. Probably need to do a companion proposal in Chapter 1 that gets you out of the existing building code for residential work that says you can do like-for-like replacements.
 - ii. David B – Not opposition. Typically, when we deal with residential, we stay in residential. The existing building code is there for the commercial side but doesn't typically deal with R-5. Doesn't think the section should be removed from the VRC.
 - iii. Corian – Comfortable with keeping it in the residential code.
- b. Kyle K – Would it be better to have a pointer in the residential code to say, "Refer to section 504.1.6 of the Existing Building Code" instead of having the exact requirement in two different texts.
 - i. Ron C – 102.2.2 probably overrides what's in the residential code. You can leave this language in Chapter 5 for the other R-occupancies, but something should be added to 102.2.2 to give you the path to the VRC.
 - ii. David B – Does not disagree with Ron.
- c. Steve S – AOBA is not in support. The proposal says there is no cost impact, but there would be a cost impact, right?
 - i. Corian C – Maybe there would be a cost impact. Most panel boards are built with them installed on the panel board already, so you may not have a choice anyway.
 - ii. Steve S - Opposed to adding this to the Existing Building Code.
- d. Andrew C – HBAV is not in support. Significant cost impact.
- e. Jeff B – Chapter 5 is the repairs chapter and staff's position is that a panel replacement would be an alteration. Should this be in chapter 6 instead of chapter 5?
 - i. Corian C – It really should be in both.
 - ii. Jeff B – Asks Corian if he wants to carry this proposal over to the next meeting or move forward with a vote.
 - iii. Corian C – Carry Over.

- f. Carry Over.

Energy Proposals

1. **REC-R402.1.2(1)-24** – Eric Lacey
 - a. Carried over at the request of the proponent.
2. **REC-R402.1.2(2)-24** – Eric Lacey
 - a. Carried over at the request of the proponent.
3. **REC-R402.1.2(3)-24** – Jason Vandever
 - a. Jason V – Provides an overview of the proposal.
 - b. Jeff B – This was discussed at the Energy Sub-Workgroup meeting, and there was no opposition from those in attendance. Opens the floor for discussion.
 - c. Consensus for Approval
4. **REC-R402.4.1.2-24** – Eric Lacey
 - a. Carried over at the request of the proponent.
5. **REC-R405.2-24** – Eric Lacey
 - a. Carried over at the request of the proponent.
6. **REC-R408.2.9-24** – Eric Lacey
 - a. Carried over at the request of the proponent
7. **EC-C402.5.2-24** – D.A. Pierce
 - a. D.A. Pierce – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Steve S – Speaking for himself. Aren't there potentially other buildings that could benefit from this that should be included? Perhaps a warehouse space?
 1. D.A. Pierce – Yes, that was discussed, but I plan on submitting this just for data centers at this time for expedience and because Virginia is the data center capital of the nation.
 - b. David B – The way the second part is written, if there is an office space in this warehouse that is not housing server cabinets, would that space require skylights?

- ii. D.A. Pierce – Yes. A data center can be a use within a mixed-use occupancy. And this would only apply to the data center portion.
- c. Consensus for Approval

VRC Proposals

1. **RB301.2.1-24** – Chase McCarthur

- a. Paul Keller – Owner of Turnkey Porch Enclosures. Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Steve S – Speaking for himself. Are there other manufacturers who make this product?
 - ii. Paul K – There are.
 - iii. Steve S – So this isn't unique to your product?
 - iv. Paul K – Correct. There are similar products.
 - v. Steve S – Not sure everybody is going to follow the instructions on a label. We are going to have windborne debris all over the place.
 - vi. Paul K – The way we looked at this is that hurricane preparedness is universal. When there's high wind, people are moving things from their pool, securing things, and boarding up windows. This is about a 30-second way to prepare for hurricanes.
- b. D.A. Pierce – Representing self. How is this not different from a sunroom?
 - i. Paul K – A sunroom is a glass structure. These enclosed porch areas have panels that can move and have less fixed glass than a sunroom.
 - ii. D.A. Pierce – There are five categories of sunrooms, and this appears to fit into Category 1. All sunrooms can be built on a deck-style foundation. If it's a raised floor system, the code states that the system needs to be engineered. Would this be more appropriate in the sunroom provisions of the code, particularly under the Category 1 section? As far as engineering is concerned, you don't necessarily need a foundation; however, if you have a Category 4 or 5 sunroom, which requires insulation, there's a minimum requirement of an air barrier underneath the space if you don't have a foundation.
 - iii. Paul K – In practically every application we are doing this, there is not a sealed or closed foundation system underneath.
- c. Kyle K – Not opposed to a change specifically on this subject because I know this is highly debated. Did the 75-mph number strictly come from the other states, or do you have some testing that shows it fails at 75mph?
 - i. Paul K – No. This is the verbiage that NC put in. I don't know who created that mile per hour rating.
 - ii. Steve S – Cat 1 hurricanes start at 76mph, so this falls below this.
 - iii. Paul K – We're trying to differentiate between a random storm and a hurricane.

- iv. Kyle K – Spoke with another manufacturer whose product fails at 60 mph. Is there any testing that talks about where that failure rate is?
- v. Paul K – I don't believe there is, but I think that is the whole reason for the labeling. Instead of being able to say definitively what this product will do, the solution is to take the sashes down once we get above these high winds.
- vi. Kyle K – We're already making an exception that it doesn't meet code. However, we also don't have data that states that it can meet the number we're putting on there (the 75mph figure). Not sure of anywhere else in the code where it puts the responsibility on the owner to prepare for that type of weather. This needs to be addressed; I don't know if this is the solution.
- d. Andrew C – Putting the burden on the homeowner is something they may not be able to control. Would this preclude or put your company or product at a competitive advantage over others in the marketplace? Would your competitors say that they are comfortable with this?
 - i. Paul K – It's not that you'll have a single manufacturer, I'm saying this type of product in this industry is for people who are looking for additional protection on their porch.
- e. D.A. Pierce – A Category 1 sunroom doesn't require fenestration, just for clarification.
- f. Richard G – One other consideration that we've heard is to accept this as a guard. Now we have a structural requirement it has to meet, but we're hearing it's going to blow out at 40mph or 50mph. There are more applicability situations that we need to look at, too.
- g. David B – Opposed as it's written, particularly because of the decal language.
- h. Jeff B – If we go forward with the proposal right now, it would be labeled as non-consensus. You also have the option to carry this proposal over to the next meeting to work on it and bring it back to the next workgroup meeting.
 - i. Paul K – Is the opposition primarily if the label is permanent?
 - 1. D.A. Pierce – My opposition is that this is in the wrong section of the code. This should be in the Category 1 sunroom section.
 - ii. David B – This applies to an item and an action you have to do to that item after the fact. This seems more like a maintenance piece versus a construction piece.
 - iii. Kyle K – My opposition is that only in the event of hurricane-force winds is there cause for doing something about it, when some of these products will fail before then. I'm looking for some testing.
 - 1. Paul K – We have a product that works well and serves a need. We're just trying to find a way to work with everybody to make this product work.
- i. Jeff B – We can mark this as non-consensus, and it will still go to the Board for consideration with a summary of the discussion, or, if you want to get with stakeholders to work on it, we will need to table it now.
 - i. Paul K – Fine going forward as non-consensus.

- j. Non-consensus
 - 2. **RB322.3.6-24** – Corian Carney
 - a. Corian C – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Steve S – Representing self. Support.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
-

Trades Proposals

- 1. **M403.3.1.1-24** – Dennis Hart
 - a. Dennis – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Richard G – Hanover County supports.
 - c. Steve S – Self supports.
 - d. Consensus for Approval
- 2. **M504.4-24** – Dennis Hart
 - a. Dennis – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
- 3. **M506.3.2.5-24** – Dennis Hart
 - a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Steve S – In support.
 - c. Consensus for Approval
- 4. **M508.2-24** – Dennis Hart
 - a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
- 5. **M607.6.2.2-24** – Dennis Hart
 - a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
- 6. **M1109.2.5-24** – Greg Johnson (absent)
 - a. Dennis H – Not part of Greg’s group but provides an overview of the proposal. VPMIA and VBCOA were developing similar proposals.

- i. Steve S – First line of reason statement says this is on the consent agenda for 2027. If we want to adopt something in the 2027 code, this will be the language.
 - ii. Florin M – This proposal fixes an oversight during the development of the 2021 International Mechanical Code. The proposal that this was included in was a very extensive proposal, and the proponent never intended to add this criterion for Group A1 refrigerant. Since then, he has issued a white paper clarifying his intent.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
7. **M-FG404.7-24** – Withdrawn by proponent
8. **M-FG407.2-24** – Dennis Hart
- a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
9. **RM-FG2415.7-24** – Dennis Hart
- a. Dennis H – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. David B – Supports.
 - b. Consensus for Approval
10. **RE3601.8-24** – Corian Carney, Charles Styles, Joseph Willis
- a. Corian C – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Andrew C – Is this truly a cleanup, or am I missing something? HBAV members are unclear.
 - ii. Tread W – This isn't really a change; it's an alignment. Current disconnecting means provisions are muddled and confusing, and people don't know how to address them. The 2026 NEC proposal says, "You shall install the service disconnect means outside." This will happen in the 2026 National Electrical Code, and then we will be a code cycle ahead of it. We treat this as a service disconnect, not a servicing disconnect, or emergency disconnect, or meter disconnect, where the location of the grounding electrode system may change, or the location of the main overcurrent device may change. This gives it some consistency across the board, no matter where you are in the Commonwealth. The service disconnect, which has your overcurrent protection and your grounding electrode system established there, is outside for first responders. And there is no confusion about where it is and where it is not.
 - b. Jeff B – To clarify, this is a change from what's in the code now, where you don't have to place your service disconnect on the exterior.

- i. Tread W – That’s correct. You have the servicing disconnect that says, “This shall be the service disconnect.”
 - ii. Corian C – The way it’s written now, you have to have a disconnect outside. It doesn’t have to be a service disconnect, but that’s what everyone is suggesting. So it is a change.
- c. Andrew C – Asks proponents to get together with HBAV members to explain the proposal better.
 - i. Corian C – Agrees to carry over the proposal and work with HBAV.
- d. Carried Over

11. **RE3901.4.2-24** – Tread Willis

- a. Tread W – Provides overview of the proposal.
 - i. Dennis H – Representing self. As I understand it, it’s not required to have an outlet in an island or peninsula. This would still put the use of extension cords at risk of getting pulled over the countertop because they could choose not to install the receptacle in that island or that peninsula.
 - ii. Tread W – Asks for floor amendment. Get rid of the comma and the “if.”
 - iii. Sean F – It still doesn’t make it mandatory.
 - iv. David B – No, it doesn’t.
- b. Kyle K – Is it your intention to keep the current provisions of 9 square ft and every 18 square ft after that? Or are we back to 1 outlet can work for the entire island?
 - i. Tread W – One outlet can work for the entire island. But it must be installed.
- c. Ron C – As the building official of my locality, I’m going to say this is still optional, the way it’s written. This won’t be enforced uniformly across the state.
- d. Jeff B – This is a substantive change based on statements made; there appear to still be questions as to what is required in the 2024 IRC. We do have time for a couple more meetings.
- e. David B – Verification of the other requirement is going to be critical. Because if not, you are just saying that no island needs an outlet.
- f. Corian C – I’m neutral on this one.
- g. Dennis H – People don’t want the pop-up receptacles. I don’t think you’ll get a consensus if we require the pop-ups altogether.
 - i. Tread W – Pop-ups aren’t the only option. That is an option to achieve compliance, but it’s not the only option.
- h. Jeff B – Do you agree with carrying this one over?
 - i. Tread W – We’ll table and re-work.
- i. Carried Over

12. **RE3902.20-24** – Corian Carney

- a. Corian C – Provides overview of the proposal.

- i. Andrew C – The cost impact is minimal. To get our members comfortable, they want to see if there's a demonstrated need that this would address in Virginia.
 - ii. Gerry O' – Representing Eaton. Based on national fire fighter association or FEMA data on fires dating back to 2002, which is when AFCI requirements were introduced to bedrooms (and has over time expanded to every space except attics, bathrooms, and garages), if there is a GFCI already on the circuit, this is a \$5-7 add-on to protect the entire circuit.
 - iii. Andrew C – We could find cost data all over the place.
- b. Gerry O' – From a fire perspective, home fires have roughly stayed steady. They might have declined 1-2%. If you base it on the number of homes built in 2000 compared to today, we've almost doubled the number of homes we build in a year.
 - i. Andrew C – In Virginia, that trend is the opposite. Our permit data has gone down significantly. A substantially smaller number of homes are being built each year.
 - ii. Gerry O' – I'm basing it on the number of fires. It's hard to place a true stat number on electrical fires based on electrical wiring versus electrical cooking on a countertop that started a fire.
 - iii. Andrew C – The fire services folks are beginning to amp up how they collect data, specifically for this purpose. We can then really hone in and say, "Are we addressing a perceived problem or do we have data that shows there is an issue?"
 - iv. Gerry O' – I can tell you that after doing studies, I receive a lot of calls and reports from NEMA on unwanted tripping or nuisance tripping. Is it really a nuisance if it's doing its job? It could be an unwanted trip that causes discomfort to reset the breaker. From our perspective, we have an excellent AFCI algorithm programmed into our devices. I want to say 80% of the items that we send a tech out to inspect are due to circuit overload. And any breaker would do it, whether it's AFCI or GFCI. If you overload a 20-amp circuit, it will trip.
- c. Jeff B – Andrew, are you in opposition at this point?
 - i. Andrew C – At this point.
 - ii. Corian C – I'm not sure if there is a world in which we all agree, so we will move forward with it as non-consensus.
- d. Non-consensus