Meeting Minutes for January 10, 2019
Dublin City Hall
100 Civic Plaza, Dublin

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Roxanna Recinos-Serna called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM.

IN ATTENDANCE / INTRODUCTIONS:

* Roxanna Recinos-Serna, Dublin
** Fred Cullum, 4Leaf
Brett Wickham, Contra Costa County
John Taecker, UL LLC
Shilpa Chandrashekar, 4Leaf
Kerwin Lee, Architect
Omar Noorzaei, City of Hayward
Bill Vaughan, TRB Plus
Alan Tam, Alameda County
Abed Choudhry, Contra Costa County
Ocean Kwon, City of Dublin
Akitayo Akiwumi, City of San Ramon
Dennis Lau, City of San Ramon
Frank Kong, City of Walnut Creek
Jonathan Clark, SDG Architects
Keyvan Irannejad, WC3
Giyon Senaratne, WC3
* Chairperson
** Secretary

Roxanna thanked all for coming, particularly the new attendees and architects.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes for the December 13, 2018 meeting were approved.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- John Taecker announced that the Tri-Chapter ABM committee met and have set the agenda for the June 7, 2019 meeting at the Dream Inn in Santa Cruz. The agenda has been condensed to end at 3:30 PM. A 30-minute slot is set for a presentation for the Tri-Chapter Uniform Code Committee. He asked all to attend, as it’s an opportunity to listen to many professionals and meet with representatives of the state agencies.
- Keyvan said that the City of Milpitas has an excellent program for “temporary” building inspectors. The position is for a twelve-month, renewable period and the employee receives full City benefits during the period of employment. This was intended to bring in new inspectors and let them learn on the job. Certification is not required for application. There is also an open opportunity for Permit Tech.
• Roxanna said that Dublin has prepared a handout for new business owners in Dublin in response to AB 3002, which was signed into law by the Governor. http://ca-dublin2.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/19834/AB3002-Notice AND https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB3002

• Roxanna said that Mike Stone will be at the February meeting to discuss tentative TUCC Policy 24 regarding means of approval for electrical installations. He can also address demand-response service sizing and suggest revisions to existing Policy 17 on Electric Vehicle Service Equipment in Single Family Residences.

• Roxanna asked all for suggestions on guest speakers for upcoming TUCC meetings.

• Abed is involved with a new essential services building (fire station); MEP equipment must meet the safety standards for seismic restraints as needed for essential facilities. The tested equipment must be approved by Cal OSHA. A final letter must be submitted by an "independent" engineer (this is done after testing is complete) indicating all is acceptable. However, if the final letter states that some items need to be fixed then do not accept it; the MEP issues must be fully complete and acceptable to the AHJ.

PRESENTATION:

John Taeciker, Senior Regulatory Engineer at Underwriters Laboratories presented a revised version of proposed procedures for approving installation and use of electrical equipment. These were initially developed by an IAEI Task Group. The revision will be considered at next month’s meeting. Mike Stone, NEMA West Coast Field Representative, will answer any inquiries about the policy and procedure. Keyvan suggested that TUCC organize a task force to further develop the policy. John responded that that would seem to be unnecessary, as the work has already been done, and the policy is intended simply as a tool for the AHJ, not a directive. He also mentioned that IASonline.org has a listing of accredited field evaluation services, for example: https://www.iasonline.org/?post_type=ias_certificate&orderby=org&order=ASC&s=&global=1&service=13567&keyword=electrical&number=&org=&city=&state=&country=&zip=

CODE QUESTIONS:

Q1. Are ventless clothes dryers acceptable in existing buildings, for example when they are converted from apartments to condominiums? Are they acceptable in new buildings?

A1. Yes, in existing buildings where ducting is not practical; some, however require that the dryers be maintained by the building management, as they do require more attention than conventional domestic dryers. Santa Cruz has accepted them for historic buildings. Milpitas will accept them in apartments, where maintenance is provided, but not condominiums. It was suggested that AHJs consider looking at other codes to consider approval of ductless units as alternate methods and materials. See https://www.theproper.com/how-ventless-dryers-work-2145837 for information on types and maintenance. The CEC does list them for energy conservation.

Q2: There had been a discussion at a prior meeting about counter receptacles in multifamily residential kitchens not meeting reach requirements due to the depth of standard slip-in ranges. The question was whether it is acceptable to permit the managers to keep a stock of alternate
(and more expensive) ranges to be installed when a unit is rented to a person with special needs.

A2. Consensus was that this would be acceptable in that it would meet the intent of the code for adaptability.

Q3. Are electric heat pump water heaters acceptable in the reach codes?

A3. Yes, they are acceptable as an alternate with Title 24 calculations and can be installed prescriptively without energy calculations. [https://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2016standards/documents/2016_water_heater_efficiency_guide.pdf](https://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2016standards/documents/2016_water_heater_efficiency_guide.pdf)

Q4. A proposed new addition wants to retain one existing unreinforced masonry wall as a face (for aesthetic purposes) adjacent to it. There will be a space between the new wall and the URM wall. Applicant wants to use the URM reduced design criteria. Would this be acceptable?

A4. Consensus was no; this is a new building with a masonry veneer and the current standards for new buildings for anchored veneer must be met.

Q5. Can CBC Appendix G (Flood-Resistant Construction) be applied to an accessory structure, Group-U Occupancy of less than 120 square feet in a flood zone?

A5. 1) FEMA is more restrictive than Appendix G

2) U Occupancies less than 120 SF are exempt from permits.

No consensus.

Q6. Can an architect procure a permit for a project he designed on a property that he does not own, and has no authorization from the property owner to act as the owner’s representative?

A6. No. No law permits this practice. However, if the owner completes the permit application as owner-builder and properly authorizes the architect to be an agent to act on property owner’s behalf – and executes proper authorization in writing – this is acceptable.

Q7. Can permit fees be waived for veterans performing access work on their house?

A7. Yes, but it would require authorization from the City Council or Board of Supervisors.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 3 PM.
Next meeting will be January 10 at Milpitas City Hall; FREE lunch at 11:30 AM. Meeting from 12:00 to 2 PM

Respectfully submitted, Fred Cullum, Secretary