CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Roxanna Recinos-Serna called the meeting to order at 12:05 PM

IN ATTENDANCE / INTRODUCTIONS:

*Roxanna Recinos-Serna, Dublin
Homer Maiel, 4 Leaf Inc
Mike Stone, NEMA
Raymond Cheng, City of Fremont
Evon Ballash, City of Palo Alto
Chris Bradt, Frontier Energy/BayREN
Dennis Lau, City of San Ramon
Jonathan Clark, SDC Architects
* Chairperson
** Secretary

**Fred Cullum, 4Leaf
John Taecker, UL LLC
Jennifer Mastro, SDG Architects, Inc
Clarice Shephard, TRB Plus
Bill Tott, City of Milpitas
Akitayo Akiwumi, City of San Ramon
Todd Bailey, TRB Plus

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes for the January 10, 2019 meeting were approved with minor editorial changes.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- A link to the June Tri-Chapter Annual Business Meeting will be added to the East Bay Chapter website.
- Roxanna said that she wishes to step down as Chair and asked the members to consider stepping into the position. She will continue to attend but has served her time well. Fred will remain as Secretary and Co-Chair. John Taecker asked how much time is required. Roxanna: the format is in place and seems to be working well; generally, a couple of hours per month. She wants the TUCC to continue as it provides a valuable service for code clarity and consistency among the member jurisdictions and said that the meeting rooms are reserved for this year, and that the lunches simply need to be ordered and coordinated.
- Roxanna asked whether the attendees felt the current format is working, with occasional speakers and most of the time set aside for announcements and code questions. John T responded that he felt the code questions were valuable, and that occasional speakers
on specific items of current interest. Jonathan said that, as an architect, he appreciates the concept of working toward uniformity. Homer said the format is good; need more code questions and code discussion. Roxanna thanked all for the input and will present the same question at the March meeting in Dublin. Roxanna also noted that the March meeting will be moved up to March 7th, as the room is committed for support of the famous Dublin Saint Patrick’s Day celebration. John T asked who was informed on the policies. Roxanna said that Fred makes a monthly report to the chapters, and many people check on the TUC link through the East Bay Chapter: http://www.eastbayicc.org/index.php/tucc. Fred will reach out to other chapters to gauge which jurisdictions accept the policies.

- Chris announced the next BayREN forum on March 7th on the reach codes (2919 codes) already adopted by several Bay Area jurisdictions: https://www.bayrencodes.org/events/
- Mike Stone mentioned the demand charge controller response policy 17 and offered to update it to the 2017 NEC. This is a system that allows load shedding from EV charging stations when load exceeds panel capacity; it is an automatic load management. He pointed out that this is not a new concept in the electrical code, but in the past, it was primarily for commercial and industrial uses. The California Building Standards Commission has adopted NEC Article 625.41 from the 2017 NEC. Akitayo pointed out that that article is shown with strikethroughs from the CEC code book. Mike was unaware of that and will contact the CBSC to get it corrected. Even with the load shedding aspect, load calculations will need to be provided for new EV charging stations, but with automatic load sharing in place, it is as if no load is being added to the service. This aspect of load shedding in residential use is limited to EV charging only. John Taecker pointed out that the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research references TUC Policy 17, so a quick update is needed. Mike said that it is important to verify that the load shedding equipment is listed and pointed out that some of the manufacturer’s diagrams are incorrect in that they show the CTs (charge controllers) located in the utility section of the panel, a use not permitted by the utility providers.
- Bill Tott said that Tesla chargers have a DIP switch that is accessible, with removal of four screws, by anyone. The DIP switch allows the charge amperage to be set from 60 Amps to 100 Amps. Milpitas requires that a warning label be attached pointing out that alteration of the set amperage violates the approval of the installation. Others confirmed that they are requiring the label, and some require that it be installed over the screws. http://www.ci.milpitas.ca.gov/_pdfs/bld_permit_electric_vehicle_charging_system.pdf

PRESENTATION:

Brief discussion of new Policy 24 relating to approval of electrical equipment and installation was approved unanimously.

CODE QUESTIONS:

Q1. An applicant is proposing the installation of a new residential ballasted solar photovoltaic (PV) racking system. The racks are not attached to the roof, but rely on weight and friction to remain in place, they did present some wind tunnel testing and static calculations, but insist that all the plans and information are proprietary and cannot be released publicly. The testing was done on various roof shapes with roof slopes greater than 1:12. Does this system appear acceptable and, can the information be held in confidence?

A1. No, the submittal is inadequate for approval, even as an alternate method and material, as it was very limited, and documentation disallowed location on pitched roofs; the document also
referenced clay tile roofs only. Additional testing including shake-table testing and a listing would be required. Further, the PV panels were held by straps across the roof ridge which could present a tripping hazard at the roof pathways (ultimate call is by Fire personnel). As to confidentiality; permit records, once the permit is issued, are public record and cannot be sequestered, the sole exception to this in California, is for bank vault design and installation.

Q2. Can intumescent paint be used for fire-resistive rating for exposed structural wood column member? Paint is applied to a modified primary structural member in lieu of a previously approved fire-resistive assembly protected by fire-resistive gypsum board. Manufacturer claims this is acceptable as the product is ‘listed’.

A2. John Taecker contacted Underwriters Lab in Northbrook Illinois and spoke with the fireproofing expert. Definitive answer was that intumescent coating is limited to steel members only as originally tested; testing was not done using wood members. The product must be listed and tested. The manufacturer’s statement was not a fact. John also pointed out that a new UL option for all, called “Product Spec” is available on the UL website: https://www.ul.com/code-authorities/ul-product-spec/ AHJ’s have greater access to filters, such as beams, wood, etc. John Taecker has spent much of his career making UL resources more accessible to the design and code enforcement communities; thank you John!

Q3. Three story mixed-use building over below-grade parking garage. Is this appropriately called a podium building?

A3. No. The concept of the podium with a three-hour separation between the parking garage and the uses above is intended to allow additional stories above grade for a mixed-use structure. As this proposal does not need this exception, the construction types, fire separations and areas can simply use the standard design restraints; the garage, therefore, does not need to be Type I construction. Refer to CBC Section 510, Specific Provisions, for code design regulations on building separation, building height and area.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM
Next meeting will be March 7 at Dublin City Hall; FREE lunch at Noon. Meeting from 12:00 to 3 PM

Respectfully submitted, Fred Cullum, Secretary