



Board of Building Standards

RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

DATE: MAY 10, 2023
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: TRAINING RM 1, 6606 TUSSING RD, REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO 43068
[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Call to Order

Roll Call

Agenda – Changes or Additions

Consideration of Minutes

[MIN-1](#) March 22, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Old Business

OB-1 2023 NEC Review

[OB-2](#) 2019 RCO Proposed Amendments Stakeholder Comments

New Business

[NB-1](#) Petition 23-04 Section 311.7.1 (Handrails)

Reports from Chairperson

Reports from Executive Secretary

Public Comments

Comments from Committee Members

Future Meeting Schedule

August 9

October 18

December 20

*More as needed

Motion to Adjourn

MINUTES
RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 22, 2023

Call to Order

Mr. Phillips called the meeting to order at 9:00 am on March 22, 2023 at 6606 Tussing Rd, Reynoldsburg.

Roll Call

Committee members present: Don Phillips, Ric Johnson, Mike Boeckermann, Lindsay Bott, Andre Frasier, Bill Kaufholz, Roger Puzzitiello, and Dan Spada.

Staff members present: Jay Richards & Regina Hanshaw

Visitors present: No visitors present.

Agenda – Changes or Additions

Mr. Richards requested change to add IRC Chapters 21-23 for review. Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Spada seconded to amend the agenda to include the additional chapters for review. Motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of Minutes

MIN-1 January 18, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Johnson requested a correction changing Mr. Johnson moved instead of Mr. Phillips on IRC Chapter 16. Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Spada seconded to approve the corrected January 18, 2023 meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business

OB-1 2019 RCO Proposed Amendments Stakeholder Comments

Mr. Richards presented the stakeholder comments, including the comments requesting adoption of the 2023 edition of the NEC instead of the 2020 edition. Ms. Hanshaw stated that with the Board moving forward with adoption of the 2023 NEC in the building code there would be two editions of the electrical code being adopted at about the same time which would make it confusing from the enforcement perspective. Ms. Hanshaw stated that if the Committee was interested in considering the 2023 NEC as the base electrical code, the proposed amendments would be carried forward and would not be reconsidered. Mr. Phillips stated the he would support consideration of the 2023 edition for adoption. Mr. Boeckermann moved and Mr. Kaufholz seconded to review the 2023 edition. Motion passed unanimously with Mr. Johnson abstaining. Mr. Richards provided a brief summary of changes in the 2023 NEC affecting 1-, 2- & 3- family.

New Business

NB-1 2021 IRC Chapters 20-34

Mr. Richards presented the significant changes to the 2021 IRC Chapter 21 including the code change proposal, reasoning and the cost impact for the change noted by the code change proponent. After review of each change and discussion, Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Frazier seconded to approve the changes of 2021 IRC Chapter 21. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Mr. Richards presented the significant changes to the 2021 IRC Chapter 22 including the code change proposal, reasoning and the cost impact for the change noted by the code change proponent. After review of each change and discussion, Mr. Johnson moved and Ms. Kaufholz seconded to approve the changes of 2021 IRC Chapter 22. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Mr. Richards presented the significant changes to the 2021 IRC Chapter 24 including the code change proposal, reasoning and the cost impact for the change noted by the code change proponent. After review of each change and discussion, Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Spada seconded to approve the changes of 2021 IRC Chapter 24. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Under discussion of 2021 IRC Chapter 29, Mr. Johnson moved and Mr. Boeckermann seconded to carry forward Section 2904 provision. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Mr. Richards reported that there were no changes in 2021 IRC Chapters 20, 25, 34 requiring review. No action taken.

Reports from Chairperson

Mr. Phillips requested scheduling of review of newer energy codes editions later this year. Ms. Hanshaw stated she would schedule review beginning at the August meeting.

Reports from Executive Secretary

Ms. Hanshaw stated the Board's stakeholder meeting on the updates to the building, mechanical and plumbing codes was scheduled for later that day.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Comments from Committee Members

There were no comments from committee members.

Future Meeting Schedule

August 9

October 18

December 20

*More as needed

Motion to Adjourn

Ms. Bott moved and Mr. Kaufholz seconded to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.

Don Phillips, Chair
Residential Construction Advisory Committee

Regina Hanshaw, Executive Secretary
Board of Building Standards

Distribution:

File

Committee Members and Staff

From: [Michael Essary](#)
To: [Richards, Jay](#)
Subject: RE: [External]:Proposed changed to RCO (Electrical)
Date: Thursday, April 27, 2023 11:12:41 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Mr. Richards:

Thank you for the quick response. I am not sure if it is still open to discussion on whether to remove the surge protection requirement, but if it is, I would hope that my input can be taken into consideration.

I realize that it appears that surge protectors only protect property (which is part of the purpose of the Code) but in doing so they also indirectly protect life. Transient damage goes beyond just worrying about your TV and computer, which are actually fairly well equipped to handle these events, and begins to effect life safety devices such as smoke/carbon monoxide alarms, GFCI devices and breakers, AFCI devices and breakers and even portable medical equipment installed in many homes.

The utility grid is ever aging and transient events are only getting more and more common and so the state sending the message that surge protection isn't critical is less than desirable and can create an artificial point of contention when discussing the importance of whole home surge protection with homeowners.

Given the small impact of the cost of an SPD on a panel or service upgrade, I think that the requirement should not be deleted from the RCO. SPDs can be purchased for as little as \$75 and install in less than 30 minutes.

Thank you for your time, justification for the addition of 230.67 is below.

230.67 Justification:

Electronic life-saving equipment such as fire alarm systems, IDCI's, GFCI's, AFCI's and smoke alarms, may be damaged when a surge occurs due to lighting, internal local switching as well as external utility switching. Other equipment is also damaged when subjected to surge. In many cases, electronic devices and equipment can be damaged and rendered inoperable by a surge and yet this damage is undetected by the owner. It is practical to require a SPD to provide a general level of protection. In almost all new service installations, as well as service upgrades, no consideration is given to providing a general level of protection to the "whole structure" which would include those devices that cannot be afforded a cord connected Type 3 SPD protection. First level subdivision (D) is included to require that when a service is upgraded, an SPD is to be installed.

For example, in 2002, the product standard for GFCI's was revised due to documented failures of devices that were occurred when the devices were subjected to transients. The fact that the electrical industry redesigned GFCI technology to address well documented damage to these life saving devices

is reason enough to require whole house/structure SPD protection. The changes that were made do not prevent the GFCI from being damaged but rather provide a requirement for these devices to self-test and determine if they were damaged and are no longer functioning properly.

Studies by recognized authorities including NEMA, IEEE, and UL, all substantiate the fact that surges can and do cause significant damage. Nationwide Insurance organizations recognize the need for effective surge protection as well and have published recommendations that include point-of-use surge protectors and installation of surge protection at service equipment.

The NEC must mandate a minimum requirement for surge protection in all services. It is "practical" to provide this minimum and feasible level of protection for all electronic life saving devices already mandated within the NEC. See Section 90.1 of the NEC.

-
Michael Essary

From: Jay.Richards@com.ohio.gov <Jay.Richards@com.ohio.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 5:22 PM
To: Michael Essary <Michael.Essary@blindandsons.com>
Subject: [External]:Proposed changed to RCO (Electrical)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mr. Essary,

Thank you for your inquiry regarding proposed amendments to the 2019 Residential Code of Ohio (RCO) and the changes to Chapter 34 Electrical in particular. We have not posted any justifications; however, we can offer the following general summary of discussions by the members of the Residential Construction Advisory Committee (RCAC) in regard to their recommendation to the Board. For amendments to the RCO, the Board relies on recommendation from the RCAC.

During review of the 2020 NEC, the RCAC heard significant comment on the proposed amendments to the NEC, including the exemption for surge protection, but decided to keep the exemption based on discussion that it was more of a property protection, rather than, a life safety issue. The intent is not to prohibit the inclusion of surge suppression should an owner choose to have this protection for their equipment. In this use, surge suppression is more an economic choice than an occupant safety requirement.

In response to issues surrounding the difficulties in requiring the use of GFCI protection of branch circuit outlets for outdoor HVAC equipment, the Nation Fire Protection Association (NFPA) adopted an exception to 210.8(F) in the 2023 NFPA 70 (NEC) because of reported incompatibility of GFCIs with certain HVAC equipment. Exception #2 to NEC 210.8 (F) reads:

Exception No. 2: GFCI protection shall not be required for listed HVAC equipment. This exception shall expire September 1, 2026.

The Board proposed to adopt the NEC exception without the expiration date in the draft Ohio Building Code (OBC) rules that includes adopting the 2023 NEC. The Board did this so we can verify that the incompatibility issue has been resolved with products available before the exemption is removed. Based on the Board's action, the RCAC recommended similar language. Also, please be aware the current amendment package to the RCO includes the proposed adoption of the 2020 edition of the NEC; however, next month, the RCAC will consider moving forward with the 2023 edition rather than the 2020 edition of the NEC as the base electrical code to which the approved Ohio exemptions are applied.

Jay Richards

Assistant Construction Code Administrator

Ohio Board of Building Standards

6606 Tussing Road, PO Box 4009

Reynoldsburg, OH 43068-9009

P 614.644.2613

jay.richards@com.state.oh.us

com.ohio.gov/dico/bbs/



com.ohio.gov

This message and any response to it may constitute a public record and thus may be publicly available to anyone who requests it.

From: Michael Essary <Michael.Essary@blindandsons.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 12:51 PM

To: BBS, BBSOfficAsst3 <BBS@com.ohio.gov>

Subject: Proposed changed to RCO (Electrical)

To whom it may concern:

I am curious if the justifications for changes are posted anywhere with regards to the proposed adoptions to the 2019 RCO? There is one item specifically, 3401.1 – Item #4 - the deletion of 230.67, that I am very curious about.

Was there a justification for deletion of that requirement? The addition of 230.67 to the NEC passed with a 10-2 vote.

Given that the purpose of the code is to safeguard persons and property from the hazards of using electricity, removal of a device that is designed to safeguard equipment(property) seems like an odd decision to me.

Additionally, the requirement for GFCI protection of 50A and less outdoor outlets, should be maintained. If anything, maybe make an exception for mini split units but traditional A/C condensers should pose no issue when installed properly.

Thank you for your time,
Michael Essary

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

The information transmitted is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or taking action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Links contained in this email have been replaced. If you click on a link in the email above, the link will be analyzed for known threats. If a known threat is found, you will not be able to proceed to the destination. If suspicious content is detected, you will see a warning.

2019 Residential Code of Ohio Amendments Comments

Commenter	Email	Code Section	Comment	Staff Comments	RCAC Recommendation	Code Committee Action
Joe Bargdill	joe.bargdill@westerville.org	317.1, 328.1, 507.2.1	<p>Section 403.1.2. Wood Treatment for pressure treated lumber below grade shall have a label showing rating UC4B according to AWPA U1.</p> <p>Note: most pressure treated lumber on the market (other than 4 x 4 or heavier) are only rated for ground contact. When used as a wood foundation material or pole building lumber below grade, the lumber should reflect a direct burial rating.</p> <p>Sections 317.1, 328.1, and 507.2.1 should also note this change.</p>			
mark ichtist	1171cplichristmd@gmail.com	Chpts 34 & 44	<p>It is my belief that the 2023 NEC be adopted for both the commercial and residential codes.</p> <p>One reason is it can be confusing keeping track of all of them. By the time they are adopted, there will be buildings still being inspected under the 2017 NEC. Having to remember the changes for the 2020 and 2023 as well as the 2017 will be more time consuming, and contractors as well as inspectors may get confused.</p> <p>I also believe they that it is an additional burden both on contractors and building departments spend money on both books, when the most recent standard is already published.</p> <p>Finally I believe the code should be adopted in full. There is not a reason in my opinion to take things out, when the code is a minimum safety standard as written.</p>			

Stehlin, Michael	Michael.Stehlin@hamilton-co.org	403.1.4.1	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed changes to the 2019 RCO. Specifically, I wholly support reinsertion of the exceptions that allow freestanding accessory structures under 600 and 400 SF to have footings less than frost depth. It is common in our jurisdiction to have detached garages and sheds of 200-600SF built with monolithic slabs with a turn down edge of 18" in depth. It was totally unnecessary to remove these exceptions in the 2019 RCO, and I am extremely supportive of their reintroduction. Detached accessory structures have been built this way for decades without any problem.</p>			
Bill Toole	wrt@tooleinspectors.com	Chpts 34 & 44	<p>I would propose not accepting the 2020 NEC and go to the 2023 NEC for use in review and inspection for the residential sector to match the acceptance of the 2023 NEC proposed for the 2024 OBC. Uniformity in the review and inspections process, the use of one referenced standard, ease of use for the installing contractor to only have to use one referenced standard, elimination of confusion for owners, designers and contractors rapidly come to mind in utilizing the same referenced standard year for review and regulation.</p>			

From: [Joe Bargdill](#)
To: [BBS, BBSOfficAsst3](#)
Subject: New Revisions To The 2019 RCO
Date: Thursday, March 2, 2023 1:17:47 PM

Section 403.1.2. Wood Treatment for pressure treated lumber below grade shall have a label showing rating UC4B according to AWPA U1.

Note: most pressure treated lumber on the market (other than 4 x 4 or heavier) are only rated for ground contact. When used as a wood foundation material or pole building lumber below grade, the lumber should reflect a direct burial rating.

Sections 317.1, 328.1, and 507.2.1 should also note this change.

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

From: [mark.ichrist](#)
To: [BBS, BBSOfficeAsst3](#)
Subject: NEC changes for the residential and commercial codes of Ohio.
Date: Thursday, March 2, 2023 3:05:52 PM

It is my belief that the 2023 NEC be adopted for both the commercial and residential codes.

One reason is it can be confusing keeping track of all of them. By the time they are adopted, there will be buildings still being inspected under the 2017 NEC.

Having to remember the changes for the 2020 and 2023 as well as the 2017 will be more time consuming, and contractors as well as inspectors may get confused.

I also believe they that it is an additional burden both on contractors and building departments spend money on both books, when the most recent standard is already published.

Finally I believe the code should be adopted in full. There is not a reason in my opinion to take things out, when the code is a minimum safety standard as written.

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov <<mailto:csc@ohio.gov>> or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

From: [Bill Toole](#)
To: [BBS, BBSOfficAsst3](#)
Cc: [Foley, Megan](#); [Hanshaw, Regina](#)
Subject: Comments to proposed amendments to 2019 RCO
Date: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:05:57 PM

I would propose not accepting the 2020 NEC and go to the 2023 NEC for use in review and inspection for the residential sector to match the acceptance of the 2023 NEC proposed for the 2024 OBC. Uniformity in the review and inspections process, the use of one referenced standard, ease of use for the installing contractor to only have to use one referenced standard, elimination of confusion for owners, designers and contractors rapidly come to mind in utilizing the same referenced standard year for review and regulation.

Bill Toole

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

From: [Stehlin, Michael](#)
To: [BBS, BBSOfficeAsst3](#)
Subject: Comment on Proposed Rule Change RCO 403.1.4.1
Date: Thursday, March 2, 2023 1:54:42 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear OBBS;

I am writing in support of the proposed changes to the 2019 RCO. Specifically, I wholly support reinsertion of the exceptions that allow freestanding accessory structures under 600 and 400 SF to have footings less than frost depth. It is common in our jurisdiction to have detached garages and sheds of 200-600SF built with monolithic slabs with a turn down edge of 18" in depth. It was totally unnecessary to remove these exceptions in the 2019 RCO, and I am extremely supportive of their reintroduction. Detached accessory structures have been built this way for decades without any problem.

Sincerely,

Michael Stehlin



Michael Stehlin, AIA
Chief Building Official, Planning + Development
Todd B. Portune Center for County Government
138 E. Court Street, Rm 801, Cincinnati, OH 45202
(O)513.946.4519 | www.hamiltoncountyohio.gov

CAUTION: This is an external email and may not be safe. If the email looks suspicious, please do not click links or open attachments and forward the email to csc@ohio.gov or click the Phish Alert Button if available.

BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS

6606 Tussing Road, P.O. Box 4009

Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068-9009

(614) 644-2613

bbs@ohio.gov

www.com.state.oh.us/dico/bbs/default.aspx

APPLICATION

FOR RULE CHANGE



Pursuant to section 3781.12 of the Revised Code and rules adopted by the Board of Building Standards, application is herewith submitted to adopt, amend, or annul a rule adopted by the Board pursuant to section 3718.10 of the Revised Code.

For BBS use:	
Petition #:	23-04
Date Recv'd:	03/27/2023

Submitter: ROBERT KRAMER CITIZEN
(Contact Name) (Organization/Company)

Address: 5690 GENEVIEVE PLACE
(Include Room Number, Suite, etc.)

FAIRFIELD OHIO 45014
(City) (State) (Zip)

Telephone Number: 513-885-4600 Fax Number: _____

Date: MARCH 26, 2023 E-mail Address: KEYNOTEMAN@HOTMAIL.COM

Code Section: 101

General Explanation of Proposed Change (attach additional sheets if necessary):

311.7.1 Stairways shall not be less than 36 inches (914 mm) in clear width at all points above the permitted handrail height and below the required headroom height. Handrails must be installed on both sides of all stairways and shall not project more than 4.5 inches (114 mm) on either side of the stairway and the minimum clear width of the stairway at and below the handrail height, including treads and landings, shall not be less than 31½ inches (787 mm) where a handrail is installed on one side and 27 inches (698 mm) where handrails are provided on both sides

1. Around 24,760,843 patients were admitted to emergency departments due to staircase-related injury during a 23 year-long study by NEISS.
2. In an average year, 1,076,558 people in the US suffer from a staircase-related injury.
3. More than 12,000 people meet death from falling down stairs every year. This itself tells how fatal a fall could be. Simple tripping down stairs or falling off the stairs can rewrite one's destiny. Since the fall will be very fast, the speed of impacting your head or back will occur in a fraction of a second.

The cost should be no more than \$200.00 per home.

Explanation of Cost Impact of Proposed Code Change*: _____

* Attach additional cost information as necessary to justify any statement of cost increase or cost decrease.