

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
Mechanical Technical Advisory Committee
Orlando, Florida
October 13, 2003

REPORT

Voting Members Present:

Bob Andrews, Steve Bassett, Jim Cummings, Al Fraga, Mike McCombs, Peggy Patterson, Pete Quintela, Phillip Simmons.

Others present: Yilmaz Taskin, Kathy Reid, Hamid Bahadori, Jack Glenn, Truly Burton, Robert Volin, Oriol Haage, Wayne Dean, Robert Fine, Ann Stanton.

Meeting Objective:

Review requests for declaratory statements DCA03-DEC-247 and DCA03-DEC-261 and provide recommendations to the Commission.

Actions Taken:

DCA Counsel Jim Richmond advised the TAC that since both DEC requests referenced the same buildings, they should be combined into one response. Bob Andrews, a voting member of the TAC, declared a potential conflict of interest; he is the proponent in DCA03-DEC-261.

The following buildings are referenced:

Wheeler Residence	Villas of Rolling Hills
5081 Hancock Road	Rolling Hills Circle, Bldgs 1 - 14
Southwest Ranches, FL	Davie, FL
Broward County	Broward County

Quintela stated that the TAC had already addressed this issue in DCA02-DEC-255. He referenced an ICC statement that private garages are occupiable, not habitable. DCA02-DEC-255 is consistent with staff opinion on DCA03-DEC-261 and DCA03-DEC-247. BOAF has agreed with DCA02-DEC-255 on four occasions.

1. To the question, "Based on the definitions of Habitable Space and Occupiable Room mentioned above, it is my opinion tat the above-mentioned garages are not considered a habitable or occupied space. Is this opinion correct?", the answer is: NO, the opinion that the garages are not considered occupied space is not correct. The opinion that garages are not considered to be habitable space is not relevant to this section.

2. To the question, "If the above mentioned garage is not considered an occupied space then sec. 401.2 of the FMC requiring naturally ventilated occupied spaces to comply with 402 of the FMC would not be a requirement of the code. Is this correct?", the answer is

YES, it is correct that if the space is not considered “occupied space”, the ventilation requirements of Chapter 4 (including options in either section 402 or 403) do not apply at all because of sec. 401.1.

3. To the question, “The above mentioned garages are required to comply with sec. 403.3, which requires 100 cubic feet per minute (CFM) of outside air, per car. Is this correct?”, the answer is NO, the garages described are not required to comply with section 403.3 if the natural ventilation option in 402 is chosen for compliance.

4. To the question, “The 100 CFM requirement for outside air could be satisfied by natural or mechanical ventilation in the above mentioned garages. Is this correct?”, the answer is NO, the garages may not comply with section 403 by natural ventilation because section 401.2 specifies that section 402 is to be used for natural ventilation and section 403 is to be used for mechanical ventilation.

5. To the question, “The above mentioned garages are going to use natural ventilation to comply with Table 403.3 (100 CFM/car). I believe this requirement can be satisfied by natural ventilation with openings smaller than the 4 percent of the floor area rule stated in Sec. 402.2 of the FMC if proper documentation is submitted to the building department justifying openings are sized and located in such a manner to provide the 100 CFM per car. Is this correct?”, the answer is NO. If natural ventilation is going to be utilized to comply with Section 401.1, the code states it shall meet the criteria of section 402.

6. To the question, “In the above mentioned garages I believe the requirement for 100 CFM per car is to prevent contaminants from entering the occupiable interior of the Group R3 Occupancy. Is this correct?”, the answer is “If mechanical ventilation is used, the 100 CFM/car is intended to both provide ventilation and prevent migration of contaminants into the adjoining occupiable space.”

The TAC was of the opinion that the intent of this section could not be determined. Glenn stated that the TAC was responsible for including these provisions in the code and should take a stand on code intent. Fraga stated that it could be researched but would cost money. Andrews noted that the TAC had asked that ASHRAE be contacted for a response on this matter in the past.

7. To the question, “Table 403.3 of the FMC for certain areas, such as bathrooms, allows for intermittent ventilation rates. It does not show intermittent ventilation rates for garages. In the above mentioned garages the 100 CFM per car requirement can be intermittent. Is this correct?”, the answer is NO, the code does not specify intermittent ventilation; ventilation shall be provided during the periods when the garage is occupied.

8. To the question, “If ventilation required for the above mentioned garages is to be continuous, then a garage door, which is normally closed, would not be acceptable to provide the 100 CFM per car requirement. Is this correct?”, the answer is that ventilation by 100 CFM per car is by mechanical means while opening the garage door meets the natural ventilation requirement as long as the door meets the 4% requirement of sec. 402.

9. To the question, “The above mentioned building is a Group R3 Occupancy which is covered in Chapter 12 (Interior Environment) of the FBC. Is this correct?”, the answer is YES, the Group R-3 building mentioned is covered by Chapter 12 of the FBC.

10. To the question, “Sec. 1205.5.1.1 of the FBC refers to buildings where food is prepared or stored.

A. This section does not exempt residential single family houses. Is this correct?” and

B. Food is stored and prepared in the above mentioned townhouses. Is this correct?”, the answers are:

A. YES, section 1205.1.1 does not exempt single family residential, and

B. YES, food is expected to be stored, prepared and processed in the townhouses; but NO, food is not expected to be stored, prepared and processed in the garages.

11. To the question, “Sec. 1205.1.2.6 and Sec. 1205.1.2.7 of the FBC require protection of openings for the purpose of light or ventilation. Such protection of openings is required by this section to prevent rodents from entering buildings from unprotected openings. This section would require the ventilation openings to be protected to prevent rodents from entering the above mentioned garages attached to the townhouses. Is this correct?”, the answer is NO , section 1205.1.2.6 would not require the openable ventilation openings to be protected to prevent rodents from entering the above mentioned garages attached to the residence; however, fixed ventilation openings would require rodent protection.

12. To the question, “If #8 is not correct, then in the above mentioned garages there is no requirement to screen or otherwise protect the garage door opening. Is this correct?”, the answer is YES, it is correct that there is no requirement to screen or otherwise protect a garage door opening when it is used by the designer to provide natural ventilation.

13. To the question, “Have we met all code requirements for the ventilation of this garage?”, the answer is YES, the garages described by Petitioner meet code requirements for ventilation.

14. To the question, “Does the garage door have to be screened based on Section 1205.1.2.6?”, the answer is NO, the garage door does not have to be screened based on Section 1205.1.2.6.

15. To the question, “Does this apply to all Group R3 occupancy?”, the answer is that this body does not have general binding interpretation authority as it is not case specific.

16. To the question, “If we have satisfied Section 402, do we also have to satisfy Section 403?”, the answer is NO. Section 401.2 requires compliance by either section 402 or 403, not both.

17. To the question, “Does the Florida Building Code require these garages to have

permanent openings to the outside of 60 sq. in. per car as the old South Florida Building Code required?”, the answer is NO.

Other Business:

Quintela stated that there is no apparent mandating authority in the code to inspect conveyors per ASME B 20.1. It should be included in the Chapter 15 references. This was not noticed before the mod proposal and comment periods were over.

The TAC would like clarification from the Commission as to if a job is turned down by a local building department, whether it should be appealed first before being brought to the Commission. Glenn mentioned that it is the right of any impacted party to request a DEC statement under the provisions of Chapter 120, F.S.

Commissioner Bassett stated that as he had forecast, building departments are enforcing the prescriptive alternative to section 601.4: “I told you so.”

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.