

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BUILDING CODES COMMITTEE

June 20, 2012

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 N. 1st Ave
Chaparral Room
Phoenix, AZ

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Michael Williams, Tempe, Chair
Randal Westacott, Avondale
*Phil Marcotte, Buckeye
*Mike Tibbett, Carefree
*Mike Baxley, Cave Creek
A-Martin Perez, Chandler
Mary Dickson, El Mirage
*Jason Field, Fountain Hills
A-Larry Taylor for Ray Patten, Gilbert
Tom Paradise, Glendale
Ed Kulik, Goodyear
*Chuck Ransom, Litchfield Park

Tom Ewers, Maricopa County
A-Steven Hether, Mesa
Bob Lee, Paradise Valley
*Dennis Marks, Peoria
*Julie Belyeu, Phoenix
*Dean Wise, Queen Creek
Dustin Schroff for Michael Clack, Scottsdale
Dale Crandell, Tolleson
*Rick DeStefano, Wickenburg
A-Jim Fox, Youngtown
*Jackson Moll, Home Builders Association
*Sharon Bonesteel, Salt River Project

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Scott Wilken, MAG
Steve Gross, MAG
Lisa Prichard, Arizona Masonry Guild
Dave Endres, Superlite Block
Mike Summers, Top Quality Masonry

Brian Juedes, Felten Group
Greg Felten, Felten Group
Ed Freyermuth, Arizona Masonry Guild
Tiffany Sprague, Sierra Club
A-Mike DeWys, Chandler

*Those members neither present nor
represented by proxy.

A-Those members participating via
audioconference

1. Call to Order

Michael Williams, Chair, called to order the June 20, 2012 meeting of the MAG Building Codes Committee (BCC) at 2:00 p.m.

2. Introductions

Voting members Martin Perez, Larry Taylor, Steven Hether and Jim Fox attended via telephone conference call. All members and guests introduced themselves.

3. May 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Bob Lee pointed out an error in the draft minutes, saying the top of page 4 should say “follow the NEC” instead of “follow then NEC” and made a motion to approve the amended minutes. Dale Crandell seconded the motion, and the amended minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Call to the Audience

Ken Kirschmann talked to the committee about recent issue Southwest Gas has had with water heater installation. He said that major contractor in the area has been installing water heaters by eliminating the Temperature Pressure Release (TPR) valve and installing another valve that shuts off the gas. He said that, in the event of a too high temperature being reached, this set-up would prevent additional pressure but not relieve the existing pressure. He asked if any of the members had seen this situation, or knew if there were changes to the code that would allow something like this. Tom Paradise asked if the gas valve is heat sensitive, and Ken Kirschmann said that it is. He said that he wanted to bring it to the group’s attention in case they hadn’t seen it in the field. He said that Southwest Gas policy is that they will leave the gas turned off for water heaters set up like this and place a hazardous conditions form on the water heater, and have the contractor make the required changes, usually installing the regular TPR valve. Michael Williams asked if the valve has a rating. Ken Kirschmann said that the valve appears to have a rating printed on it, but he’s never seen it and isn’t sure what the exact rating is.

5. Comments From the Committee

Tom Ewers asked how many jurisdictions require permits for construction storage trailers. He also asked how many require permits for construction offices, and, if so, they require them to be handicapped accessible. Jim Fox said that Youngtown requires permits for construction offices and they have to be handicapped accessible if they include a conference room. Steven Hether said that Mesa requires permits for construction offices, and if they’re only going to be used for the construction crews they do not have to be handicapped accessible, but it is required if they will be used for any meetings.

Bob Lee said that the AZBO Annual Business Meeting will take place July 17-19, in Payson at the Best Western. He said there will be a golf tournament the first day, with chapter meetings that evening. He said that the business meeting will be held the morning of the second day. He said that there will be professional development in the afternoon of the second day featuring Dr. Paul Melendez of the University of Arizona. He said the third day will include a roundtable discussion on the changing face of building inspections. He said that after lunch on the third day there will be a demonstration of a blower door test.

Scott Wilken said that staff is trying a new software called Adobe Connect at this meeting for the members attending via audioconference. He said that it allows the members on the phone to see what is being shown on the screen in the meeting room without having to download anything. He said that if it is successful, it will be made available at future meetings.

6. New 4” Interlocking Block Wall with Pilaster Details

Lisa Prichard from the Arizona Masonry Guild and the Arizona Masonry Contractors Association presented new interlocking block wall details. She said that in 2007, the masonry industry had worked with Felten Group to develop a standard detail for 4” masonry block walls that can be offered to residents as a resource when building a new fence. She said that that detail has been updated to reflect recent building code changes. She said that they were going to present the 9.5 course Exposure B and C details with a rating of 200 pounds per square foot (psf) and the 8.5 course Exposure B and C, which are primarily for southern Arizona.

Brian Juedes said that in 2007 the City of Phoenix required that engineering calculations be provided for block fences. He said that the discussions at that time resulted in pilaster spacings that were greatly reduced from the spacing historically used on block fences. He said that as part of the current update, they were able to use reduced wind load to increase the pilaster spacing to what they had been in the past. He said that 8.5 courses and 9.5 courses are the correct number of courses to achieve a 5’8” fence and 6’ fence, respectively. He said that the four designs can be used with a presumptive soil value or values from site-specific soils reports.

Tom Ewers said that Maricopa County requires a block on the bottom course to be turned on its side for drainage purposes. He asked if that would affect these designs. Brian Juedes said this procedure would provide the necessary strength and would not adversely affect the designs.

Bob Lee said that his understanding in the past of the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) was that it put the onus on the engineer to state what the acceptable safety factor is based on the material being used. He asked if that had changed recently. Brian Juedes said the LRFD does not eliminate factor safeties, but is a different approach to how factor safety is managed.

Tom Paradise said that, by code, Glendale would not require a permit for a fence like this. He asked if any jurisdictions would require a permit. Bob Lee said that Paradise Valley has amended their code to require a permit for any fence over 8” high. Tom Ewers said that Maricopa County would require a permit for a drainage review, but not a structural review. Jim Fox said that Youngtown requires a permit for all fences. Tom Paradise said that the 2012 building code has an exemption for fences under 7’, but jurisdictions can amend that if they want. He asked what happens to the design if someone builds a 6’ fence using this detail and later adds a course or course and a half, staying under 7’ and, therefore, not needing a permit. He asked if the designs are only valid for 8.5 course and 9.5 course fences. Greg Felten said that the I-codes dropped the 33% increase with wind loads for masonry, so that adds some safety factor, as well. He said that, as far as the safety calculations are concerned, an extra course or course and a half would not be a problem. Brian Juedes said that beyond 9.5 courses is not in the plans now and would have to be analyzed. He said that the fence is not over designed, and they are not designed for extra courses. Tom Paradise said that his guess is that wouldn’t work. Brian Juedes said that they said with older fence design that adding courses wouldn’t work.

Bob Lee said that the fence like this at his house has no mortar holding the blocks together. Mike Summers said that for each course the blocks are likely hanging from a horizontal piece of rebar. Brian Juedes said that this design does not cover the mortarless blocks, and that it relies on the bed joint for the vertical spanning. He said that the head joint in the top course is not structural, but is included as a serviceability issue in case anyone climbs over the fence. Tom Paradise pointed out that the top course is still tongue-and-groove, but with mortar. Brian Juedes said that is correct.

Brian Juedes said that there is an allowance in the design for unbalanced lots, in case one lot is higher than the neighboring lot. He said the calculations can accommodate up to 8” of unbalanced fill before being considered a retaining wall.

Bob Lee asked if any jurisdiction is allowed to use these designs even if it is not a guild member building the fence. Lisa Prichard said yes, and that the idea is that these designs are available for the general public. She said that jurisdictions can make copies for people who come into the counter or post the designs on their website.

Dustin Schroff asked if it is okay if these details come in on a set of civil plans. Brian Juedes said that they provide the details to the Masonry Guild, so that could result in the details being used on another registrant’s plans, but that they would like to be aware that the details are being used in that fashion. He said that jurisdictions would be in the right to ask for a letter of permission from Felten Group if someone else is using the details.

Jim Fox said that he has seen fences with the bottom course 8” tall rather than a half course, and asked how that changes these details. Brian Juedes said that they also have 8 and 9 course details, but they won’t be 6’ tall fences- the 9 course detail ends up with a wall that is 5’9” tall if the footing is buried as shown. He said that there is no 10 course standard detail. He also said that in these details the half course can be placed anywhere within the wall.

Michael Williams asked how critical the durawire placement at the top of the wall is, and if it is expected to go through the pilasters or just in the panels. Brian Juedes said that it goes just in the panels. He said that it is just a pressure connection in the panel, and the wire goes from pilaster to pilaster.

Michael Williams asked if the committee would be allowed to include these details in the Code Amendments and Standards book. Brian Juedes said that would be no problem.

7. MAG Building Code Amendments and Standards Book

Michael Williams said that at the previous meeting the committee had voted on the first 25 items on the list, and this meeting would discuss the rest of the list, followed by the items that had previously been tabled.

Michael Williams said that Item 26 dealt with post-tension slab construction. Tom Ewers said that the recommendations in this item haven’t changed. Randal Westacott said that a lot of work went into the post-tension roundtable committee that produced these recommendations. Tom Ewers made a motion to include Item 26 as written. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 27 dealt with dryer installation. Scott Wilken added that there is a tag included with this item that is to be placed on dryers at installation. Tom Paradise said that Glendale still uses it. Scott Wilken asked if this item were updated to reference the 2012 code, would that preclude any jurisdiction that hasn't adopted the 2012 codes from using it. Bob Lee pointed out that this would be case with a number of items. Randal Westacott suggested updating all the of the code year-specific items to the current code to show that this committee is encouraging the most up-to-date codes. Scott Wilken asked if it would be workable to keep the code year-specific items referencing the current code, but include a statement in the book's introduction that any jurisdiction using any of these standards should feel free to edit the document to reference which ever code year they are using. Bob Lee made a motion to update Item 27 to reference the 2012 codes. Dale Crandell seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Wilken said that Item 28 addressed a lot of different topics. Bob Lee said that these topics have been addressed since, and this document belongs in the historic column. He made a motion to include Item 28 as Historic. Randal Westacott seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Bob Lee said that Item 29 was similar to the previous item, in that the topics have since been addressed. He made a motion to include Item 29 as Historic. Mary Dickson seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 30 allows the temporary use of Port-A-Johns to meet the ADA requirements if a sales office or model home were sold. Tom Ewers said that he would still use this. Tom Ewers made a motion to include Item 30 as written. Randal Westacott seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 31 requires builders to provide a pad certification report for single family lots. Ed Kulik said that this item is still relevant. He made a motion to update Item 31 to reference the 2012 codes. Dale Crandell seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 32 allows the installation of a deco drain directly below the weep screed to allow excess moisture to escape the inside of the wall. Randal Westacott made a motion to update Item 32 to reference the 2012 code. Ed Kulik seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 33 was a set of amendments to the 2002 NEC that allows cable attachments outside of an SES. Bob Lee said that it's still being used, and that the text should be updated to reference the 2011 NEC and 2012 IRC. Bob Lee made a motion to update Item 33 to the current codes. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 34 established that storage space located under stairs not be considered as underfloor spaces requiring lighting. Bob Lee said that he doesn't think this has been addressed in the code, so it's something that should be updated. He made a motion to update Item 34 to the 2012 IRC and 2011 NEC. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 35 recognized the City of Phoenix Approved Structural Steel Fabricators program. Randal Westacott asked if Phoenix still uses this. Bob Lee said that they

do. Bob Lee made a motion to include Item 35 as written. Tom Ewers seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 36 recommended the AZBO proposed amendments to the 2006 ICC codes. Randal Westacott suggested that this item be included as Historic. He made a motion that Item 36 be included as Historic. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 37 accepted recommendations of the Arizona Residential Post-Tensioned Round Table to set standards for inspection, evaluation, and acceptance of the concrete pour for residential post-tensioned slabs on ground. Bob Lee asked how this item relates to Item 26. Scott Wilken said that Item 26 doesn't reference inspections. Tom Ewers made a motion to update Item 37 to the 2012 codes. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 38 supported the 2007 supplement to the IRC for story height and wall bracing requirements. Michael Williams said that this is probably still needed for the jurisdictions still using the 2006 IRC. Tom Ewers said that this supplement was incorporated into the 2009 IRC. Ed Kulik said that he suggests keeping this item as-is until a majority of jurisdictions have updated past the 2006 codes. He made a motion to include Item 38 as written. Dale Crandell seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Michael Williams said that Item 39 recommends that jurisdictions update to the 2009 family of codes. Mary Dickson made a motion to include Item 39 as Historic. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Wilken said that there were a few items from the May meeting that were updated by the committee members. He said that Sharon Bonesteel was working on Item 7, Item 19, and Item 20, but was not able to attend the June meeting. She will present her findings at the next meeting.

Scott Wilken said that Item 8 was standards for fireplaces. Tom Ewers said that he researched this item, and the standards have not changed. He made a motion to include Item 8 as written. Randal Westacott seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Wilken said that Item 9 and Item 11 were researched together. Dustin Schroff said that he conducted a survey to find out how widespread the use of composite tags is. He said that of the 10 respondents, 8 do not enforce the provisions of either Item 9 or Item 11, and the other two enforce one but not the other. He said that some prior codes have truss marking requirements, but the 2006 to 2012 codes do not. He made a motion that Item 9 and Item 11 be included as Historic. Randal Westacott seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Wilken said that Item 10 was researched by Mike Baxley, who was unable to attend this meeting. He said that Mike Baxley provided the updated strawbale construction standards from Pima County. He said that the provided document appeared to not discuss strawbale construction, and suggested postponing discussion on this item until the next meeting. Bob Lee made a motion to table Item 10 to the August 2012 meeting. Ed Kulik seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Wilken said that Item 24 was regarding foam products for fireblocking. Bob Lee said he researched this item. He made a motion to update the text of Item 24 to refer to Section 302.11 of the 2012 IRC, change “firestop” to “fireblock,” to make it clear that it refers to fireblocking material that is listed or tested in accordance with UL 1479, ASTM E814 or ASTM E136. Tom Ewers seconded the motion.

8. Updated MAG Building Codes Committee Membership

There were no updates.

9. Update Survey of Code Adoption

There were no updates.

10. Topics for Future Agendas

Michael Williams said that the July meeting will be canceled. He said that the next meeting will be held August 15, 2012. He said that the committee will review and vote on the block fence standard details at the August meeting.

11. Adjournment

Bob Lee made a motion to adjourn and Ed Kulik seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:46 PM.