

## General Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting

### Second Meeting Summary

**Date: October 3, 2025**

**Location:** 4224 Cox Rd, Glen Allen, VA 23060 - **Virginia Housing Center**

**Time: 9:00 AM**

#### **Attendees:**

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

- **Jeff Brown** – Deputy Director of Building and Fire Regulation
- **Florin Moldovan** – State Building Codes Office Director
- **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
- **Amy Fottrell** – Policy Analyst, Policy and Legislative Services

#### **Stakeholders:**

- **Andrew Clark** – Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
- **Andrew Grigsby** – Viridian
- **Andrew Milliken** – Stafford County Fire Marshal’s Office, Virginia Fire Services Board (VFSB) Codes and Standards Committee
- **Angela Gue** – Warren County
- **Bob Shippee** – Private Citizen
- **Bryan Holland** – National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)
- **Chelsea Harnish** – Virginia Energy Efficiency Council (VAECC)
- **Chris Barfield** – University of Virginia, Building Official’s Office
- **Corian Carney** – York County, Independent Alliance of the Electrical Industry (IAEI) - Virginia Chapter
- **Dan Willham** – Fairfax County, Virginia Building and Code Officials Association (VBCOA)
- **David Beahm** – Warren County, VBCOA
- **David Compton** – City of Virginia Beach
- **Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker** – Virginia House of Delegates 2025, 5th District
- **Dennis Hart** – Virginia Plumbing and Mechanical Inspectors Association (VPMIA), VBCOA PMG Code Committee
- **Doug Banks** – Henrico County
- **Eric Lacey** – Responsible Energy Codes Alliance (RECA)
- **Eric Mays** – Prince William County

- **Gregory Black** – George Mason University
- **Jason Laws** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA
- **Jonathan Sargeant** – Omega Flex
- **Joseph “Tread” Willis** – Prince William County, IAEI - Virginia Chapter
- **Joshua Davis** – State Fire Marshal’s Office
- **Joshua Jones** – Henrico County
- **Kevin Perry** – Warren County
- **Kyle Kratzer** – Fairfax County, VBCOA
- **Lee Stoermer** - Loudoun County Fire Marshals Office
- **Lyle Solla-Yates** – Charlottesville Planning Commission
- **Mark Graver** – City of Waynesboro, Builder, VBCOA Region III
- **Mark Price** – City of Martinsville
- **Mason Trimble** – Virginia Department of Energy (VDEG)
- **Matt Mertz** – Fairfax County
- **Matthew Byers** – Warren County
- **Matthew Robinson** - Spotsylvania County, VFSB
- **Michael Dellinger** – Albemarle County, VBCOA Region IV
- **Michaela Phillips** – Warren County
- **Mike O’Connor** – Virginia Petroleum and Convenience Marketers Association (VPCMA), Virginia Propane Gas Association (VAPGA)
- **Nicholas Bowles** – Halifax County
- **Peter Broadbent** – Virginia Cable Telecommunications Association (VCTA)
- **Richard Gordon** – Hanover County
- **Robby Dawson** – National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- **Ron Clements** – Chesterfield County, VBCOA Admin and Existing Building Code Committees
- **Rory Stolzenberg** - Charlottesville Planning Commission
- **Russell Furr** – City of Alexandria Fire Marshal’s Office
- **Ryan Celestino** – City of Newport News, IAEI - Virginia Chapter
- **Samuel Rokowski** - National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- **Sarah Thomas** – Virginia Association for Commercial Real Estate (VACRE)
- **Sean Farrell** – Prince William County
- **Shahriar Amiri** – Arlington County
- **Steve Shapiro** – Apartment & Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington (AOBA), Virginia Apartment and Management Association (VAMA)
- **Susan Stillman** – Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter
- **William Abrahamson** – American Institute of Architects, Virginia Chapter
- **William Penniman** – Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS

### **B101.2-24 (Withdrawn)**

#### **B101.2 (1)-24 – Joseph Wages (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Brian Holland** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Bill P** expressed support for the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. **Steve S** stated that the ICC board correctly kept these provisions in the appendices.
  - b. **Andrew C** noted that this creates a patchwork of enforcement across localities. ICC board deemed it outside of scope.
  - c. **Ron C** stated that the cost impact statement is inadequate. Further, this proposal makes requirements mandatory throughout Virginia and not optional for individual localities. Lastly, addressing a statement made by Brian H in his opening remarks, that this proposal, according to an ICC Appeals Board ruling, meets the scope and intent of the 2021 and 2024 IECC. He notes that only the ICC Board of Directors can make determinations on scope and intent, not the ICC Appeals Board.
  - d. **Shahriar A** expressed technical issues, noting the code doesn't specify how to install an Energy Storage System (ESS), only that one needs to be provided.

### **B103.5-24 (Carry Over)**

#### **B105.2.1-24 – Kyle Kratzer (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Kyle K** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Ron C, Corian C, and Dennis H** expressed support based on the proponent's reason statement.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. **Mark G** stated that qualifications are crucial for credibility and good stewardship.
    - i. **Eric M**, responding to **Mark G**, cited examples of hires in Prince William County that would violate the current strict provisions but was in support.
    - ii. **Kyle K** explained that the proposed change arose because of a misunderstanding about the intent of the existing section concerning technical assistant qualifications. He further noted that recent high school technical training programs influenced changes to the provision's language and that under the current system, the "three years of experience" requirement was still being imposed even on individuals with a two-year degree, which created a barrier for qualified candidates. **Kyle K** emphasized that the intent here is to allow hiring of candidates who have an equivalent

level of experience or education, not necessarily three years of direct experience. Lastly, he shared that Fairfax County has piloted an internship program where localities help interns gain the necessary “equivalent experience,” and uses a tiered system to develop interns up to “qualified individual” status.

#### IV. Discussion

- a. **David B** suggested a friendly amendment to remove "at least three years of..."
- b. **Andrew C** asked if the intent was to address staffing; **Kyle K** confirmed.
- c. **Ron C** noted that Chesterfield County relies on "any combination of education and experience," and would have vacancies if the existing provisions were strictly enforced.
- d. **Sean F** expressed a need for correlation between the other regulations.
  - i. **Kyle K** noted that his intent is for correlation to occur and asked to discuss a compromise with opponents during the break.
    1. Note: This proposal moved forward as non-consensus due to **Mark G's** opposition.

#### **B107.1-24 (Carry Over)**

#### **B109.1-24 – David Beahm (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **David B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Ron C** and **Mark G** expressed support, calling the current requirement an unnecessary burden.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.
- IV. **Sean F** noted that reversed plans might not account for different setbacks between lots.
- V. **Eric M** expressed concern for complex sites with topography issues that may affect whether a basement would be considered a story above grade but removed opposition after proponent's clarification that this proposal still requires the approval of the building official.

#### **B109.2-24 (Carry Over)**

#### **B109.4-24 (Carry Over)**

#### **B110.6-24 – David Beahm (Consensus for Approval as Modified)**

- I. **David B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Ron C** and **Corian C** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**

- a. **Shahriar A** expressed “mild” opposition and concerns that this proposal allows for unilateral permit extensions and suggested language to require a request be made to the building official for extensions.
- b. **Mike D** opposed the change, citing complications with expired VDH permits.

IV. **Discussion** led to a **floor modification** to strike “written” but keep “upon request,” which gained consensus.

- a. **Andrew C** suggested that justification is required in the preceding sentence of the stricken language in the proposal.
  - i. **Corian C** agrees with Andrew’s statement.
- b. **David B** expressed support for, “upon request,” with, “written,” being stricken.
  - i. **Shahriar A** expressed support for this modification.

#### **PM105.2-24 – Matt Mertz (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Matt M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Sean F** noted that he worked with the proponent to reach this consensus language.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### **FP112.5-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **David B, Ron C, and Joshua D** expressed support for the proposal.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

### **VIRGINIA CONSTRUCTION CODE (VCC) PROPOSALS**

#### **B406.2.7-24 (Carry Over) & FP1208-24 (Consensus for Approval as Modified) – Ernest Little**

- I. **Andrew M** provided overviews of the proposals on behalf of the proponent and **Jeff B** provided background on the floor modifications presented by the proponent.
  - a. **Sam R** noted that the proposed markings change in the 2026 National Electrical Code (NEC). Recommended the group look at those changes for correlation with this text.
- II. **Support (B406.2.7)**
  - a. **Russel F** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition (B406.2.7)**
  - a. **Mike O'** questioned the necessity of the proposal, asking for incident data and noting it singles out the private sector.

- b. **Andrew M** cited a significant fire in Colorado and the difficulty of extinguishing EV fires.
- c. **Dan W** opposed, feeling NFPA language shouldn't be duplicated in the USBC.
- d. **Brian H** opposed, citing flaws in the proposal and lack of incident data where a disconnect was available. Offered to work on a new modification.
- e. **William A** raised concerns about nuisance hazards and staffing for shutoffs in large developments.

#### IV. Discussion (FP1208)

- a. **Shahriar A** suggested changing "maintained" to "maintained in accordance with the applicable building code."
  - i. **Jeff B** asked if there is any opposition to **Shahriar A's** proposed modification.
  - ii. **Brian H** suggested pointing to NFPA 70B for maintenance standards.
    - 1. **Jeff B** noted that the definition of "Maintained" refers back to the building code that was applicable when the installation took place and would include the applicable standards at the time of construction.
- b. **Florin M** asked for clarification on the language being suggested for a modification by **Shahriar A**.
  - i. **Shahriar A** responded with, "Electrical vehicle charging systems, where provided, shall be maintained in accordance with the applicable building code," for 1208.1 and, in 1208.2, "Where provided, emergency shutoffs shall be maintained in accordance with the applicable building code."
  - c. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### B509.1-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Dan W** stated the proposal provides a good pointer that may otherwise be missed.
  - b. **Russel F** expressed support.
- III. **Discussion**
  - a. **Bill P** asked if the proposal would apply to Tesla wall-mount batteries in homes.
  - b. **Andrew M** stated it does not.
  - c. **Andrew C** asked if this would apply to multifamily developments.
  - d. **Andrew M** stated that it would, but that it would require a lot of battery storage to meet the threshold.
- IV. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### B906.1-24 (Non-Consensus) and FP906.1-24 (Non-Consensus) – Morgan Hurley

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification shared on the

screen.

II. **Support**

- a. **Andrew M** expressed support.

III. **Opposition**

- a. **Steve S** reiterated comments from the 2<sup>nd</sup> SFPC SWG meeting.
  - i. *Comments from 2<sup>nd</sup> SFPC SWG meeting: Steve S noted that striking A, B, and E occupancies has been proposed to be stricken for the past 5 code cycles and that the Board of Housing has rejected it every time. AOBA will be speaking again in opposition at the Board of Housing and Community Development meeting.*
- b. **Dan W** noted that the VBCOA building code committee opposes this proposal.
- c. **Shahriar A** stated that this proposal only increases costs without solving a problem.

**B917.1-24 – Gregg Black (Non-Consensus)**

I. **Gregg B** provided an overview of the proposal.

- a. **Sean F** asked if there is an Emergency Management Coordinator (EMC) at every facility?
  - i. **Gregg B** replied that there is an EMC at every facility as required by Executive Order 41.
- b. **Eric M** asked what happens if the building official disagrees with the EMC, who is the final decision maker?
  - i. **Gregg B** stated the risk analysis would have to be approved by the EMC.
  - ii. **Eric M** further inquired as to who has to approve the risk analysis under the current code?
  - iii. **Gregg B** noted that the current code is silent on who approves it.
  - iv. **Eric M** stated that since the code is silent, this would be under the purview of the building official.
  - v. **Gregg B** replied in the affirmative.
  - vi. **Eric M** asked if the proponent is intentionally usurping the power of the building official and giving it to someone else.
  - vii. **Gregg B** replied in the affirmative, further noting that the building official would have a say about what gets installed, to make sure that it's compliant with NFPA standards, but the risk analysis regarding how the system would be used and what the hazards and threats are to the building, would be within the purview of the EMC. The risk assessment addresses the hazards that the campus would face and how communication happens between campus administration and the occupants of the buildings.

II. **Opposition**

- a. **Dan W** opposed because it increases requirements for the building official, weakens their authority, and places an extra burden on them by having to coordinate with an extra agency.

III. **Support**

- a. **Chris B** expressed support, noting that UVA already coordinates with emergency management personnel for determining where monitors and notification devices should be placed.

#### **B1006.2.1-24 (Withdrawn) and B1006.2.1(1) (Consensus for Approval) – Daniel Willham**

- I. **Dan W** provided an overview of the proposal.
  - a. **Support**
    - i. **Andrew M** expressed support for B1006.2.1(1).
  - b. **Opposition**
    - i. **Andrew M** expressed opposition for B1006.2.1.
- II. **Dan W** – withdrew B1006.2.1.

#### **B1006.3.4-24 – Lyle Solla-Yates (Consensus for Approval as Modified)**

- I. **Lyle S** provided an overview of the proposal and presented a floor modification for consideration adding Item 7 to Section 1006.3.4.2, to read:

"7. The emergency power illumination requirements in section 1008.3 shall be provided regardless of there being only one means of egress under this section."
- II. **Sean F** asked if this proposal is the product of all of the stakeholders of the Single Exit Stair Study Group and, if so, why they are not listed as a proponent.
  - a. **Jeff B** explained that a consensus proposal did not come out of the Study Group. However, the original proposal was discussed by the Study Group and feedback was provided to the proponent who then revised the proposal to address concerns raised by the study group participants.
- III. **Support**
  - a. **Andrew C**, speaking on behalf of HBAV and the City of Harrisonburg, supported, noting that this proposal encourages redevelopment.
  - b. **Dan W** expressed support.
  - c. **Andrew M** stated support, noting that the reason for support is predicated on the fact that this proposal rejects the single-exit stair design for 5 or more stories, of which the VFSB is strongly opposed. Further, this proposal mandates additional fire protection features beyond what is required for a single-exit three-story design. He further noted that this proposal is consistent with what is required by NFPA 101 Life Safety Code for single-exit stair designs and the proposed provisions in the 2027 edition of the International Building Code. Lastly, this proposal supports utilizing the code development process instead of the legislative process and is intended to encourage redevelopment.
- IV. **Discussion**
  - a. **Mike D** expressed concern about the exemption permitted in the code for those buildings on sites where there is inadequate water pressure for a sprinkler system,

noting his reservations if this exemption applies to these four-story single-exit stair buildings.

- i. **Robby D** asked if the exemption mentioned by **Mike D** is applicable to these buildings, since these buildings exist in a separate section of the code.
- ii. **Andrew M** provided additional detail, noting that the exemption only applies to two-story buildings and this proposal deals with four-story buildings, so the exemption would not be applicable.

- b. **Mark G** asked about adding a story to an existing non-sprinklered building.
  - i. A general discussion occurred among stakeholders about the applicability of the Virginia Existing Building Code (VEBC), noting that one cannot create or expand a non-conforming condition for an existing building.

#### V. Opposition

- a. No formal opposition was stated by the stakeholders present at the meeting.

### **B1110.20-24 – Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker (Carry Over)**

- I. **Delegate Bennett-Parker** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Steve S, Bill P, Eric L, Andrew C, Ron C, and Sean F** all expressed strong support.
- III. **Opposition/Clarification**
  - a. **Dan W** noted that VBCOA Building Code Committee wanted further data as to the necessity for this change and further stated that there are no specifications as to what constitutes a “baby changing station” versus an “adult changing station.”
  - b. **Shahriar A** suggested using the term “diaper changing station” from A117.1 for clarity.
  - c. **David B** noted that there is no clear language as to whether you would be required to install a baby changing station if an adult changing station already exists.
- IV. **Delegate Bennett-Parker** agrees to carry over the proposal to work with stakeholders on consensus language.

### **B3002.4-24 – Lyle Solla-Yates (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Lyle S** provided an overview of the proposal and the associated floor modification, explaining that the language from the original proposal is being changed with the floor modification from “with the following” to “with all of the following” for clarity and to ensure all listed requirements must be met.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Andrew C** expressed support for the proposal but suggested that the proponent should meet with other stakeholders to address any outstanding concerns and possibly improve the proposal further.
  - b. **William A** indicated support for the proposal.
  - c. **Rory S** explained that the proposal targets buildings that typically do not have elevators

due to their high cost. He argued that adopting this proposal could encourage the installation of additional elevators, which would improve both evacuation during emergencies and firefighter access.

**III. Opposition**

- a. **Andrew M** strongly opposed the intent of the proposal.
- b. **Lee S** (speaking on behalf of himself) opposed the proposal, describing the practical difficulties of evacuating patients on backboards down multiple flights of stairs, a process that requires 5-6 people. Lee argued that elevators would allow just 2 people to transport someone, highlighting the safety and efficiency benefits of elevator access in emergencies.

**B3102.1-24 (Withdrawn)**

**B3500-24 - Mark Dreyer (Non-Consensus)**

**I. Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.

**II. Support**

- a. No support from stakeholder participants was expressed.

**III. Opposition**

- a. **Steve S** noted that this proposal goes beyond what ICC did with regard to ASCE supplement 2, further stating that the cost is enormous, especially considering those buildings constructed in flood hazard areas.
- b. **Dan W and Andrew C** opposed for the same reasons noted by **Steve S**.

**VIRGINIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE (VEBC) PROPOSALS**

**EB202-24 – Eric Mays (Consensus for Approval as Modified)**

**I. Eric M** provided an overview of the proposal, including the floor modification shared on the screen, which narrows the scope to only include special occupancies as described in NFPA 70.

**II. Support**

- a. **Corian C, Ron C, Shahriar A, Brian H, and Mike D** all supported the modified proposal.

**III. Opposition**

- a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

**EB601.5-24 – Dennis Hart (Carry Over)**

**I. Dennis H** provided an overview of the proposal and expressed his intent to carry over the proposal but was interested in receiving feedback from the stakeholders.

**II. Support**

- a. **Mike D, Jonathan S, and Andrew M** expressed support.

### III. Opposition

- a. **Ron C** expressed opposition, noting that these provisions cannot be enforced uniformly across the state. The purpose of the VEBC is not to be a retrofit code.

## **EB601.6-24 – Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker (Carry Over)**

- I. **Delegate Bennett-Parker** provided an overview of the proposal.

### II. Discussion

- a. **Dan W** asked if this would need to be provided for all level 1 alterations as a trigger but only level 2 alterations in bathrooms as a trigger?
  - i. **Delegate Bennett-Parker** stated the intent is for both a level 1 or level 2 alteration to a restroom.
- b. **Florin M** asked if that should be considered a floor modification to read, “for a level 1 or level 2 alteration that includes renovations or alterations to a restroom, a baby and toddler diaper changing station...”
- c. **Shahriar A** recommended deleting level 1 or level 2 as there is no longer a level 3 alteration. **Jeff B** restated the modification to read, “for alterations that include renovations or alterations to a restroom, ....”
- d. **Shahriar A** supported this change.

### III. Support

- a. **Eric L, Bill P, and Tread W**, all representing themselves, expressed support.

### IV. Opposition

- a. **Ron C** stated that VBCOA’s VEBC committee opposes this proposal because level 1 alterations could include small repair work, such as replacing a light fixture or a floor tile, and these types of alterations would now have to meet this new requirement.

## **VIRGINIA PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE (VPMC) PROPOSALS**

## **PM602.2(1)-24 – Honore Tchou (Non-Consensus)**

*Note: The original proposal designation number for this proposal was PM602.2-24*

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal on behalf of the proponent.

### II. Support

- a. No support was expressed by stakeholders present at the meeting.

### III. Opposition

- a. **Shahriar A, Steve S, Andrew C, and Dennis H** expressed opposition to this proposal in favor of proposal PM602.2(2)-24.

## **PM602.2(2)-24 – Gregg Fields, Earl Weaver, Delegate Elizabeth Bennett-Parker (Consensus for Approval as Modified)**

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal on behalf of the proponents.

II. **Support**

- a. **Dennis H, Andrew C, Steve S** expressed support for this proposal over the alternative proposal - PM602.2(1)-24.

III. **Discussion:**

- a. **Florin M** provided additional background, noting the proposal stemmed from the Study Group formed to address legislative concerns.
- b. **Eric M** recommended using permissive language "may also enforce" rather than mandatory "shall".
- c. **Jeff B** reiterated that there were not going to be any more study group meetings and the proponents were not in attendance, so he does not have the authority to speak on their behalf and make an amendment. If there is opposition, then it will go down as non-consensus and it will be noted that VBCOA Region III is against it.
- d. **Mark G** speaking on behalf of VBCOA Region III, was initially opposed but removed opposition after further discussion.
- e. **Dan W** suggested language changes and referencing specific section numbers in Section 104.1.
- f. **Florin M** clarified that staff helped draft the proposal and did not include reference sections for ease of correlation with future code cycles.
- g. **Bill P** not speaking in opposition or support, argued heating and cooling are health and safety issues and that there are people who die if they don't have access to air conditioning or heating.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

### **STATEWIDE FIRE PREVENTION CODE (SFPC) PROPOSALS**

**FP405.5-24 – Delegate Elizabeth Bennett- Parker (Consensus for Approval as Modified)**

I. **Delegate Bennett-Parker** provided an overview of the proposal.

II. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the floor modification.

III. **Support**

- a. **Russel F** expressed support.
- b. **Andrew M** noted that the Virginia Fire Services Board (VFSB) did not support the original proposal and had not yet formally reviewed the amendment, but he worked with Delegate Bennett-Parker to develop the modified language, and he supports its adoption.
- c. **Steve S** asked about the notification timeline in NFPA 72.
  - i. **Andrew M** responded that only notification before and after is required.
  - ii. **Steve S**, upon clarification, indicated support for the proposal.

IV. **Opposition**

- a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

### **FP601.2-24 – Gerry Maiatico (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Florin M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Andrew M** brought up that there had been a prior discussion about updating the definition of “Utilities” within the proposal to address ambiguities or concerns, but no new language had been incorporated yet.
  - a. **Florin M** noted that no floor modifications or updates had been received from the proponent since the last discussion.
- III. **Support**
  - a. No support was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.
- IV. **Opposition**
  - a. **Steve S** opposed. Initially supported with the carve out for telecommunication devices.
  - b. **Peter Broadbent** expressed strong opposition, describing the proposal as the “biggest public safety hazard.” He further emphasized deep frustration that, despite repeated requests, no answers or collaboration from the proponents had been provided over the past two months. Lastly, stakeholders from the telecommunications sector have safety and operational concerns that remain unaddressed.
  - c. **Bill P** asked for clarification as to which occupancy groups this proposal would apply.
    - i. **Jeff B** responded, clarifying that the proposal does not limit its application to any specific occupancy group.

### **FP807.2-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Russell F** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

### **FP901.6.3-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Russel F** and **Steve S** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

### **FP3101.1-24 (Withdrawn)**

### **FP4101.9-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Russell F** and **Lee S** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### **FP4106.1.3-24 – Gerry Maiatico (Carry Over)**

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Lee S** expressed support.
- III. **Shahriar A** asked whether the proposal would result in the entire food truck being exempt from utility requirements.
  - a. **Andrew M** responded that the intent is not a blanket exemption, but rather to ensure that any utility connection (e.g., electrical, gas) for a mobile food truck is made in accordance with the applicable building code.
  - b. **Florin M** clarified further that based on discussions at previous SFPC Sub-Workgroup meetings, it appears that the proposal is specifically aimed at addressing mobile food vehicles that are not currently in compliance with the applicable building code.
  - c. **Shahriar A** expressed skepticism about exempting food trucks from utility requirements, stating that such an exemption “does not make sense.”
  - d. **Andrew M** noted that the proponent is open to changing the proposal’s language to address these concerns and provide greater clarity.
- IV. **Opposition**
  - a. **Mike D** opposed the proposal in its current form, arguing that it could create conflicts between the building official and the fire official regarding enforcement and compliance.
  - b. **Andrew M** suggested that including clarifying language such as, “has been modified to be a structure,” could help resolve some of these conflicts.
  - c. **Mike D** agreed that such language would be helpful.
- V. **David B**, speaking on behalf of the proponent, asked for the proposal to Carry Over.

#### **FP5001.7-24 – Andrew Milliken (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Andrew M** provided an overview of the proposal noting that the VFSB codes and standards committee supports the proposal.
- II. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### **FP6112-24 – Lee Stoermer (Carry Over)**

- I. **Lee S** provided an overview of the proposal that included a floor modification of the original proposal.

- a. **Steve S** asked for clarification on what “IROL” stands for in Section 6112.4 of the floor modification and what its function is.
- b. **Lee S** responded that IROL is a third-party online system for recording compliance and inspection data.
- c. **Steve S** asked if the use of such a system is a mandate under the proposal.
- d. **Lee S** replied that it is not a mandate, just an option that other jurisdictions are already using.

II. **Shahriar A** pointed out that although the section title references “vendor,” many of the detailed requirements seem to be placed on the customer, leading to potential confusion over responsibility.

- a. **Lee S** responded that the proposal is geared toward notification to the vendors.

III. **Ron C** raised the concern that IROL is a private, proprietary company and questioned the appropriateness of referencing a specific company or product within the state code.

- a. **Lee S** indicated willingness to remove the reference to IROL if necessary.

IV. **Jeff B** asked for clarification if the proponent is still working on potential changes with the gas association and the intent was to carry over this proposal but would like to get some additional feedback. The proponent verified that that is the intent.

V. **Mike O’** speaking on behalf of the VAPGA, read a response from the national organization. “The proposal sounds reasonable based upon the circumstance, none of these items would be considered out of OSHA, NFPA, IFC or insurance provider norms. The items in conflict with the other regulations are as follows: 6112.6 and 6112.6.1. The use of atmospheric monitoring, and potential leak conditions regulated by 29 CFR (Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations) and NFPA 470 are areas outside of the scope and capabilities of propane marketers and something the propane industry relies on the fire department to supply. The recommendation is that the requirements focus on early notification and engagement with emergency responders as opposed to an obligation of air quality monitoring that is outside the capabilities of non-emergency personnel.”

VI. **Shahriar A** asked whether the requirements in the proposal apply to portable LP gas tanks.

- a. **Lee S** clarified that the proposal applies only to underground and above-ground storage tanks, not portable LP tanks.

VII. **Shahriar A** questioned who is going to notify the customers of these requirements in Sections 6112.1 and 6112.3.

- a. **Andrew M** responded that the requirements are for the vendor’s documents of the customer not a requirement of the customer.
- b. **Eric M** clarified that the title of the section limits requirements to the vendor.

VIII. **Jeff B** again asked for clarification from the proponent if they would like to carry over the proposal and the proponent indicated that was the plan.

## ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE PROPOSALS

### EC-C402.1.6-24 – Bill Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bill P** provided an overview of this proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Eric L** pointed out that the provisions in question are 2006 IECC provisions, allowing roof and wall insulation levels to be reduced by half in certain occupancies and that skylights lose 2.6 times more heat than walls or roofs, making reduced insulation problematic. He further noted that the appendix would reintroduce distinctions between metal-framed and non-metal-framed windows, distinctions that are not present elsewhere in the current code. These added distinctions would create confusion and enforcement problems for code officials. Lastly, he recommended approving the proposal as written to avoid these complications and maintain clarity and consistency in the code.
  - b. **Chelsea H** expressed support based on **Eric L's** comments.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. **Brian H** stated that NEMA prefers the national consensus process and argued that this should be handled at the national level where subject matter experts from across the country can provide insight.
  - b. **Steve S** opposed, noting that the General Assembly directive referenced by the proponent was to "consider" comparable standards, not necessarily adopt them verbatim.
  - c. **Mark G** warned that if these provisions are removed, it could lead to excessive insulation requirements being applied to buildings that were never intended to be properly heated (such as utility or storage buildings). He further emphasized the importance of including specific carve-outs or exemptions for certain building types, like utilities, to avoid imposing unnecessary or impractical insulation standards on them.
  - d. **David B** stated opposition based on **Steve S'** comments.

#### **EC-C403.7.4.1-24 – Tread Willis (Carry Over)**

#### **EC-C405.17-24 (Non-Consensus) and REC-R404.5(1)-24 (Non-Consensus) – Joseph Wages**

- I. **Brian H** provided an overview of the proposal on behalf of the proponent.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Bill P** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. **Steve S** opposed, stating it goes beyond the "minimum code" and should be in appendices.
  - b. **Ron C** opposed, questioning if it's within the state code's scope and citing an inadequate cost impact statement.
  - c. **Andrew C** strongly opposed, citing unstudied impacts on utilities, land planning, and development costs.
  - d. **Mike O'** opposed, noting federal EV tax incentives have been repealed.

- e. **Andrew M** opposed, raising safety concerns for parking garages, particularly with regard to ventilation and adequate sprinkler systems.
- f. **Shahriar A** opposed, noting safety concerns about EV fires and fumes.

IV. **Brian H** responded to opposition by stating that other states have successfully implemented similar requirements and that guidance exists to avoid the raised concerns. **Brian** further moved to have companion proposal REC-R404.5(1)-24 go forward as non-consensus, as it deals with the same topics but on the residential side.

#### **EC-C405.17(1)-24 - Bill Penniman (Carry Over)**

##### **EC-1301-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.1.2-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.1.2(1)-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.1.2(2)-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.1.2(4)-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.4.1.2-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R402.4.1.2(1)-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R403.14-24 (Carry Over)**

##### **REC-R404.5-24 (Carry Over)**

#### **REC-R404.6-24 – Bill Penniman (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Bill P** provided an overview of the proposal.
  - a. **Andrew C** asked for clarification about Section 404.6.5, specifically what is meant by a "permanently affixed object on site."
    - i. **Bill P** responded that the intent is for the reserved area to be free from obstructions like chimneys or anything that would shade the area where solar panels are to be installed.
  - b. **Andrew C** asked if the provision would require developers to cut down trees that shade the roof or otherwise "obstruct" solar readiness.
    - i. **Bill P** clarified that the proposal would not require trees to be cut down and expressed willingness to further modify the language to clarify intent.
  - c. **Andrew C** voiced opposition: As written, the proposal could impose additional upfront costs on homeowners for a feature they may never use, while future owners could easily add solar readiness features during resale if desired. He does not see the benefit in mandating this for every home and believes it should be left to the homeowner's discretion.
    - i. **Bill P** responded that if no roof area is reserved for solar panels at construction, the option for future homeowners to install solar is lost, emphasizing the importance of thinking ahead for future needs.
- II. **Support**

- a. **Brian H** strongly supported the proposal, arguing that over the next decade, three systems - onsite renewable energy, energy storage, and electrified transportation - will become as fundamental in homes as circuits and branch feeders. Urged the group to be forward-looking and anticipate future trends in code development.

### III. Opposition

- a. **Tread W** felt the provisions should remain in the appendix as an option rather than being mandatory.
- b. **Mark G** representing himself, believes solar readiness is best left to the free market. Noted some owners may simply not want roof-mounted systems due to concerns (e.g., fear of roof leaks).
- c. **Matthew R** representing himself, opposed, arguing that the proposal would create more requirements at plan review and inspection, possibly incurring costs that may not provide real benefit in the long run.
- d. **David B** opposed for the reasons already mentioned by other opponents.

## REC-R404.7-24 – Bill Penniman (Non-Consensus)

### I. Support

- a. **Shahriar A** stated that the proposal is unenforceable in its current form. Appreciated the intent but emphasized that the language “needs work” to be practically implemented.
- b. **Mark G** expressed uncertainty about how to determine the correct electrical service size for a building when accounting for all the proposed provisions.
  - 1. **Brian H** responded that all the relevant components have minimum ampacity ratings specified. Building services can be sized according to these published requirements.

### II. Support

- a. **Brian H** expressed support for the proposal. Cited the need to mitigate the risk of house fires caused by improperly installed or unpermitted electrical equipment, suggesting that forward-thinking code requirements can improve safety.

### III. Opposition

- a. **Steve S** opposed, stating that the proposal goes beyond the minimum requirements of the code and should remain as an optional provision in the appendices.
- b. **Tread W** opposed, echoing the reasons given by other opponents.
- c. **Andrew C** and **David B** expressed opposition.
- d. **Matthew R** representing himself, opposed, arguing that the proposal would impose greater burdens on plan reviewers and inspectors, increasing complexity and possibly cost for stakeholders.

## REC-R405.2-24 Carry Over

## REC-R405.2(1)-24 – Bill Penniman (Non-Consensus)

- I. **Bill P** provides an overview of the proposal.
  - a. **Dan W** asked what difference it makes if you use BTUs (energy units) or dollars (cost) to calculate this ratio.
    - i. **Bill P** explained that if you base the calculation on dollars, you are subject to the volatility of changing energy prices.
    - ii. **Dan W** countered that in practice, you would use the same cost rates for both your actual design and the code's reference design, so the calculation should remain correlated.
    - iii. **Bill P** reiterated that using BTUs means the analysis is based on energy consumption alone, avoiding the complications of fluctuating prices. Using dollars introduces a multiplier—the energy price—that can swing widely and unpredictably.
  - b. **Shahriar A** asked for clarification: “What is the standard reference design?”
    - i. **Bill P** answered that the standard reference design is the minimum requirements of the code.
- II. **Support**
  - a. No support was expressed by the stakeholders at the meeting.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. **Mike O'** asked for justification of the cost impact statement, noting that the proponent's reason statement addresses the future re-enforcement of RGGI (Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative), which, anecdotally, has increased the cost of utilities.
    - i. **Bill P** replied that costs are coming down because the energy mix is shifting toward solar, wind, and nuclear, which are becoming cheaper over time. RGGI will influence the supply of these alternate forms of energy.
- IV. **Andrew C** asked for clarification on whether it is the builder's choice to follow the simulated performance path for compliance, or if it is being mandated.
  - a. **Bill P** responded that it is the builder's choice.

#### **REC-R408.2.9-24 (Carry Over)**

### **TRADES PROPOSALS**

#### **M1103.1-24 – Dennis Hart (Consensus)**

- I. **Dennis H** provided an overview of the proposal.
  - a. **Support**
    - i. **Mark G** expressed support.
  - b. **Opposition**
    - i. No opposition was expressed by the stakeholders who were present at the meeting.

#### **M-FG310.2-24 (Consensus for Approval) and RM-FG2411.2 (Consensus for Approval) – Dennis Hart**

- I. **Dennis H** provided an overview of M-FG310.2-24 and companion residential proposal RM-FG2411.2-24.
  - a. **Support**
    - i. **Tread W** expressed support for both proposals.
    - ii. **Jonathan S** noted his favor of sunsetting the non-arc resistant CSST and supported both proposals.
    - iii. **Andrew M** supported both proposals noting that in Maryland this product is not even able to be sold.
    - iv. **Jonathan S** and **Mike D** stated support for both proposals.
  - b. **Mark G** asked why this product would still be manufactured.
    - i. **Jonathan S** noted that if CSST is bonded correctly, it is safe. He further noted that his company sells this product in Canada where it's required to be bonded.
      1. **Mark G** asked if Jonathan S foresees manufacturing this product, and if so, how long this product will be in production.
  - c. **Jonathan S** noted that in competitive markets where this product is allowed, it will be sold since it is cheaper to manufacture.
  - d. **Opposition**
    - i. No opposition was expressed by stakeholders present at the meeting.

#### **RE3601.8-24 – Corian Carney (Carry Over)**

- I. **Tread W** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Brian H** expressed support.
- III. **Andrew C** asked the proponent if he could table the proposal to give Andrew time to review the proposal with HBAV membership.
  - a. **Tread W** agreed.

#### **RE3705.6-24 – Tread Willis (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Tread W** provided an overview of the proposal.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Brian H** expressed support.
- III. **Opposition**
  - a. No opposition was expressed by stakeholders present at the meeting.

#### **RE3901.4.2-24 – Tread Willis, Eric Mays (Non-Consensus)**

- I. **Eric M** provided an overview of the proposal, including historical background with regard to how the provisions regarding island and peninsular countertop receptacles became code.
  - a. **Andrew C** asked if, based on the background narrative presented by the proponent, there is another proposal coming forward for consideration that aims to address the

concerns with appliances falling off of the counter and causing injury.

- i. **Eric M** stated that an alternate proposal would be reverting back to the 2018 language, which worked for 85 million people.
- ii. **Andrew C** asked if carry over is possible to discuss with HBAV membership.
- iii. **Eric M** expressed interest in having this proposal be non-consensus so that he can work with **Andrew C** and HBAV on a separate proposal.

- b. **Kyle K** representing himself, pointed out that this change doesn't solve the problems and dangers associated with receptacles installed at the end of the island, noting that you can still install the receptacle at the end of the island, on top of the countertop, and the cord could still be hanging over.
  - i. **Tread W** reaffirmed that this proposal seeks to mitigate the problem, not solve the problem.
- c. **Dennis H** noted that the feedback he received is that this proposal essentially requires a pop-up receptacle installed in the countertop, which creates a situation where spills and debris can get into the assembly.
- d. **Brian H** stated that every solution that has been developed at the national level has created an unintended worse consequence and that he does not believe there is a good answer to this problem. He suggested going with the design that worked for 30 years.

### **Industrialized Building Safety Regulations Proposal**

#### **IB260-24 – DHCD Staff (Consensus for Approval)**

- I. **Jeff B** provided an overview of the proposal.
  - a. **Steve S** recommended changing the cost impact to “decrease cost”.
  - b. **Jeff B** noted that staff will make that change.
- II. **Support**
  - a. **Dan W** and **Steve S** (representing himself) expressed support.