Minutes

FIRE TAC PRESENT:

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman
Joe Belcher
Chris Atheri for Joe Holland
Jim Schock

Tony Apfelbeck
Charlie Frank
Brad Schiffer
Peter Schwab

FIRE TAC NOT PRESENT:

Jeff Gross

Robert Hamberger

STAFF PRESENT:

Mo Madani
Justin Vogel
Chip Sellers
Jim Hammers

Thomas Campbell
Chris Howell
Robert Benbow
Marlita Peters
Welcome:

Time: 10:01.m.

Ms. Peters welcomed everyone to the concurrent teleconference call of the Fire TAC and Plumbing TAC.

Roll Call:

Ms. Peters performed roll call for the Fire TAC. A quorum was determined with 8 of 10 members present at roll call.

Agenda Approval:

Mr. Apfelbeck entered a motion to approve the agenda for today’s meeting as posted. Mr. Belcher seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 8 to 0.

Review and Approval of March 21, 2017 meeting minutes:

Mr. Schiffer entered a motion to approve the minutes from the March 21, 2017 meeting as posted. Mr. Apfelbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 8 to 0.

To review and accept final draft report for research project titled “Evaluation of the Cost Impact of Florida’s Specific Changes to 2015 I-Code Changes (Prescriptive Code Changes)”:

Mr. Madani provided a brief background of this project and stated this was limited to prescriptive provisions. He then asked Dr. Issa to provide the information on the final draft report.

Dr. Issa provided the detail of this project to include the cost impact with a power point presentation.

Mr. Apfelbeck entered a motion to accept the report. Mr. Frank seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 8 to 0.

Recommend and discuss potential research topics for consideration by the Building Commission:

Mr. Madani provided a summary of the requirements for new projects to be considered. He then asked if there were any proposed research topics.
Recommend and discuss potential research topics for consideration by the Building Commission (cont.):

Mr. Schock stated he would like to have the cost analysis for the project just presented include how the exact costs are offset by benefit. He said he understands that a cost benefit analysis is very complicated however; at the very minimum he would like to see bringing in the information that was presented through the I-Code and the Florida Code process. Mr. Schock said the reasoning why so that at least the TAC members and the Commission members look at this they could at least give weight to cost verses benefit. Mr. Schock stated he did not know if this would be considered an extension of this research project or if it can work into the project.

Mr. Madani stated the Commission would need to decide if this project should continue. He said if the intent is to continue, this would be an expansion of that project and this would be kept in mind.

Mr. Apfelbeck stated he would like to see a project on impact of code issues on property insurance rates. He said he did not feel anyone had a grasp of the impact of the code decisions on the property insurance rates. Mr. Apfelbeck further stated that issues such as going to the building department if you go from a Class 5 to a Class 7 what that would mean in term of the rate changes of the property insurance. He said for instance if there is a change in the wind speed line what kind of impact would that have. Mr. Apfelbeck stated he would like to have a study completed on this issue using some typical properties and get some feedback with respect to what happens with insurance rates and impacts. He said this would help them make better decisions.

Mr. Atheri said that it might be helpful to have a speaker join us on a call on a one time basis. He said Factory Mutual participates in the ICC National Code changes would be good and he feels they should participate as they have some understanding of how a code change can affect their ability to get insurance on their structures and they might be able to address a few of our questions and provide more information.

Mr. Belcher stated he would like to see a study on justification for the fire separation. He said there does not seem to be any justification referencing any kind of fire problems. Mr. Belcher also said there had been some discussion that they should look at those types of questions from the Fire Code in the residential setting. He stated they need to see if the three foot separation verses a five foot separation is resulting in any large amount of fires. Mr. Belcher said he would like to see research on the impact or the fire record on residential fire spread between buildings in a fire scenario.
Recommend and discuss potential research topics for consideration by the Building Commission (cont.):

Mr. Schock entered a motion to rate the projects as follows:
1. As proposed by Mr. Apfelbeck for evaluation of code changes to include impact on insurance rates.
2. As proposed by Mr. Schock for cost benefit analysis addition to the current project produced by Dr. Issa.
3. As proposed by Mr. Belcher regarding fire rating.
Mr. Apfelbeck seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 8 to 0.

Mr. Madani asked that all three presenters provide a clear definition and scope of work for the research project by the end of June for presentation at the August meeting.

To consider and discuss DS 2017-019 by Robert Shumake of Shumake Architecture, PA.:

Mr. Madani presented the declaratory statement as submitted by Robert Shumake.

There was no one present representing the petitioner on the call.

Mr. Madani presented the question and staff analysis as follows:

**Question:** Does FBC 1029.1 require an emergency escape and rescue opening from sleeping units located on the second and third floors of an R-2 occupancy configured with two remotely located fire rated stairs, and otherwise complying with FBC?

**Answer:** No, as per Section 1029.1 of the 5th Edition (2014) FBC, Building, an R-2 building that is equipped with an automatic sprinkler system and provided with a minimum of two independent exits per story is not required to provide for an emergency escape and rescue openings. Therefore, an emergency escape and rescue openings are not required for the sleeping units in question.

Mr. Belcher entered a motion to accept the staff analysis. Mr. Apfelbeck seconded the motion.

Mr. Schiffer asked for an amendment to remove the word independent and add with a minimum of two exits.

Mr. Belcher stated this is a very confusing section of the code. He suggested that “add two exit accesses” be added to the answer. Mr. Belcher accepted the amended answer.
To consider and discuss DS 2017-019 by Robert Shumake of Shumake Architecture, PA.

(continuation):

The final answer with amendment is as follows:

Amended Staff Answer: No, as per Section 1029.1 of the 5th Edition (2014) FBC, Building, an R-2 building that is equipped with an automatic sprinkler system and provided with a minimum of two independent exits per story or two exit access to the stairway is not required to provide for an emergency escape and rescue openings. Therefore, an emergency escape and rescue openings are not required for the sleeping units in question.

The amended motion to accept staff analysis with changes passed unanimously with a vote of 8 to 0.

Final Roll Call:

Ms. Peters performed the final roll call. All original 8 members were remaining on the line.

Public or TAC Comments: None

The meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.