As of March 1st of 2005, the 2002 Ohio Building Code (OBC), 2002 Ohio Mechanical Code (OMC), and 2002 Ohio Plumbing Code (OPC) will be replaced with the 2005 OBC, OMC, and OPC. All construction documents submitted to certified building departments for construction document review, approval, and inspection must comply with the 2005 codes starting on March 1st of 2005. Because the publishers of the updated codes have not met their publishing deadlines, making the updated codes difficult to obtain before the effective date of the new codes, the Board of Building Standards has authorized the use of the current codes (the 2002 OBC, OMC, and OPC and their respective referenced standards) as an alternative compliance method.

Drawings identified by the applicant as designed to the 2002 Ohio codes can continue to be submitted to certified building departments for construction document review using the 2002 set of codes until September 1st of 2005 as an alternate compliance method. There is no option to mix the provisions from the two sets of codes or their respective referenced standards. Each set of submitted documents must be clearly marked with the set of codes intended to be used for construction document review; either the 2005 or the 2002 set of codes. By identifying one set of codes, the respective referenced standards will also apply. Again, there is no option to mix or choose various standards from the two sets of codes. Any orders written by a building department should also indicate which code set was used to review the construction documents and upon which the order is being written.

(Continued on page 4)
In the past, an applicant applying for Board approved certifications had to meet only two requirements. The first was to meet the minimum experience requirements and the second was to pass the required examinations. Effective January 1, 2005, a third requirement has been added that requires all applicants applying for any new certifications to attend the Ohio Building Code Academy (OBCA). If you currently hold a valid certification approved by the Board prior to January 1, 2005, you are not required to attend the OBCA.

Upon receipt, applications will be forwarded to the Personnel Committee for review at its next scheduled meeting. The Committee will evaluate the qualifications of each applicant to determine that the applicant meets the minimum experience requirements and make recommendations to the Board.

Upon approval of qualifications pursuant to rule 4101:1-1-03 of the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) and pursuant to section 103.3.4 (1) & (2), an applicant is granted a two-year interim certification from the date of approval to allow the applicant to complete the Ohio Building Code Academy, and the examination requirements. Pursuant to section 103.3.4 (1) & (2) of rule 4101:1-1-03 of the OAC, an applicant must complete the “Ohio Building Code Academy” requirements during the first year of the two-year interim certification granted by the Board. If during the evaluation phase of the “Ohio Building Code Academy”, it is determined that the applicant must complete additional coursework, the additional coursework must be completed during the two-year interim certification period. If the additional coursework is not completed during the two-year interim certification period and the applicant provides evidence of complying with the examination requirements of Section 103.3.4 (2), the Board may grant a one-time, one year extension to allow completion of the additional coursework.

During the interim certification period, the applicant is permitted to perform the job function for which application is made. When the interim certification expires and no extension has been granted by the Board, the applicant is no longer permitted to perform the job function for which application is made. The concepts behind the Ohio Code Academy have been evolving over the past two decades. During this time span, Ohio has taken several steps to establish progressive methods of educating certified personnel.

Three major initiatives that created milestones in the development process are:

- The development of a structured curriculum covering all aspects of code enforcement was created with the help of Ohio State University. This document known as “DACUM” is still referred to extensively in discussions of educational development.
- “Train the Trainer” made it clear that adult education needs are best filled when they are taught to specific learning objectives, delivered in brief conclusive segments, and the learning experience is verified and validated by some means of measurement.
- The Education Coalition meetings that were held in the late 90’s were the most effective activities, melding together all of the aspects of our previous sessions and highlighting the aspects of our plan that were incomplete.

Each of the initiatives tackled along that 20-year journey are necessary pieces of the fully developed concept as presented in this document. The Education Ad Hoc committee has completed the remaining work and developed a progressive plan that will professionally educate and evaluate those individuals seeking certification in the State of Ohio as a certified code official. The first OBCA will be held in the last quarter of 2005 and every six months thereafter.

The OBCA will consist of forty hours of training and evaluation. The cost of the OBCA will be covered by the three percent assessment fund. Students will be required to cover the cost of their travel, food, and lodging expenses while attending the OBCA and students must also cover the cost of any required post academy coursework.

The instructors for the OBCA will have proven track records that are adequately versed in the specific discipline they will be instructing. Each instructor will utilize clear and complete course outlines and each instructor will be required to teach to the structured lesson plan so that the evaluation of each student will be consistent, fair and equal.

The following list of topics established for the OBCA. Considering the fact that not every aspect of every topic applies to all certifications, each segment of the outline will be written as a stand-alone course. This way the pieces of each class can be selected from the outline and inserted into a complete
Kitchen hood requirements for pizza ovens—This article is dedicated to a frequent question: “What type of hood, if any, should be provided above a pizza oven?”

Previously, when designers and code enforcement personnel would call to ask me this question, I would always refer them to section 507.2.1 of the 2002 Ohio Mechanical Code (OMC) and more specifically to the corresponding section of the International Code Council’s International Mechanical Code Commentary (2000 edition). The commentary gives typical examples of which type of applications would require a Type I hood versus which type of applications would require a Type II hood. The commentary text clearly states that Type II hoods are appropriate for cooking appliances that produce little, if any grease-laden vapors. The commentary text also specifically mentions that completely enclosed ovens such as convection or conveyor-type pizza ovens would typically only require a Type II hood. If one had a copy of the commentary, the answer to the pizza oven question seemed pretty straightforward. With the recent adoption of the 2005 OMC based upon the 2003 IMC, there was a code change, ICC Code Change Proposal M47-02, that slightly modified section 507.2.1. This modification split the previous paragraph 507.2.1 on Type I and Type II hoods and made it reference only Type I hoods. A new section 507.2.2 was added for Type II hoods. The new code text also added examples of typical appliances that require Type I and Type II hoods. In theory, I think that listing examples of appliances is a good idea. However, unfortunately, when listing items in code text, it is impossible to list all types of items that may exist. The list of typical appliances requiring a Type I hood includes griddles, fryers, broilers, ovens, ranges and wok ranges. Note that the word “ovens” was, unfortunately, included in the list. Again, I say unfortunately, because the list doesn’t distinguish between the many different types of ovens such as bakery ovens, pastry ovens, meat roasting ovens, rotisserie ovens, deck style convection pizza ovens, deck style forced air pizza ovens, electric and gas conveyor pizza ovens, wood fired pizza ovens, standard convection ovens, retherm ovens, and even microwave ovens. You get the idea—the list could go on forever. A literal reading of the code would give the impression that a Type I hood (with the associated hood fire suppression system) would be required above all ovens including microwave ovens. Is a microwave oven or a completely enclosed deck style convection pizza oven in the same risk category as griddles, fryers, broilers, ranges, and wok ranges? In my opinion…the answer is NO!

As expected, the 2003 IMC Commentary was also modified to reflect the code text change. The commentary to section 507.2.2 seems to suggest that the type of hood required might be based upon the classification of the type of appliance. The commentary states that convection or deck-style pizza ovens that are considered light-duty cooking appliances (by definition) only need a Type II hood. This might imply that all light duty appliances would require a Type II hood and that all medium duty appliances, such as conveyor pizza ovens, or heavy duty appliances, such as broilers, would require a Type I hood. In a conversation with ICC staff responsible for the commentary language, I learned that this conclusion was drawn both by making a comparison of the listing of appliances shown in the new code text of 507.2.1 and 507.2.2 and the definitions in Chapter 2 and from talking with kitchen ventilation equipment industry representatives. He mentioned that the industry is recommending that all pizza ovens be provided with the more expensive Type I hood. Of course they are…they sell kitchen hoods!

I disagree with the assumption in the commentary that the Type of hood should be based upon the duty classification of the appliance. First, the reasoning submitted with the code change proposal (M22-00) that put the light duty, medium duty, and heavy duty definitions in Chapter 2 states that the definitions do not prescribe when a hood is required; rather they are used in conjunction with section 507.13 to determine exhaust flow rates. Furthermore, the code text in 507.2.1 (Type I hoods) lists appliances that are all considered medium or heavy duty by definition, with the exception of “ovens”. All ovens, except conveyor pizza ovens, are defined as light duty appliances. Similarly, the code text in 507.2.2 (Type II hoods) lists appliances that are all considered light duty by definition, with the exception of “pasta cooks”. A pasta cooker, by definition, is a medium duty cooking appliance. Therefore, if the intent was truly to require all medium or heavy duty appliances to have Type I hoods, then a pasta cooker and a conveyor type pizza oven should have a Type I
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In 1982 the Ohio General Assembly passed a bill that required the Board of Building Standards to certify automatic sprinkler system designers and to assure that their sprinkler construction documents, when received by certified building departments, were given the same treatment as those submitted by a registered design professional, an architect or professional engineer. Initially, the applicants were grandfathered under the legislation and new applicants were required to pass an examination.

The original grandfathered applicants were only permitted to design fire protection systems that used water and they were not permitted to design high hazard or fire alarm systems.

After the “seal law” was passed in 1995, fire protection system designers were concerned that they could no longer submit plans for non-water fire protection and fire alarm systems because they were not registered architects or professional engineers. The fire protection system designers successfully lobbied the General Assembly to change this. On September 26, 1996, Section 3781.105, R. C., was modified to require the Board of Building Standards to certify fire protection systems designers for all types of automatic fire suppression systems and for all fire alarm systems. The Board was not given jurisdiction over security alarm systems. Additionally, the Board was specifically instructed to determine that the applicant for certification had directly engaged in designing and preparing drawings for the category of the type of fire protection system for which the applicant seeks certification. The Board was also instructed to certify an qualified applicant who submitted proof of passing an examination by the National Institute for Certification in Engineering Technologies (NICET) for the type of fire protection system for which they are certified. There was no grandfathering of any person who had not already been certified. Those individuals certified prior to September 26, 1996 are only authorized to do wet systems. If individuals certified prior to September 26, 1996, they must meet the NICET requirements and pass its examination. The Board no longer administers its own examination.

For individuals who design other than wet systems, high hazard systems, or fire alarm systems, they must hold NICET level III or IV certification. Individuals having a certification with a G as the prefix cannot design the systems mentioned in the previous sentence without having additional NICET certifications.

Over the years, the Board of Building Standards has received two reoccurring complaints about fire protection system designers. First, some fire protection system designers have attempted to develop their own seals to affix to plans. Section 3791.041, R. C., is very specific that the fire protection system designer should place his signature and Board assigned fire protection system designer number on the plans. No statutory authority is given the fire protection system designer authorization to develop and use a seal. In fact the Architects & Landscape Examiners Board is very protective of its right and that of the registration board for professional engineers to have the exclusive authority to have a seal for its professional. The Board receives several complaints on this issue quarterly. The second complaint is that some building departments attempt to deny professional engineers and architects the right to submit fire protection plans under their seal. Section 3791.041 (B) (1), R. C., clearly provides that persons certified under Chapters 4733 and 4703, R. C., have a right to submit fire protection systems plans as long as they hold Ohio certification in either discipline.

05 Codes Update and Using Previous Codes

(Continued from page 1)

After September 1st of 2005 the option to use the 2002 codes will end and documents identified as designed to comply with the 2002 codes will no longer be valid for submission to the local certified building departments. All construction documents submitted to certified building departments for construction document review, approval, and inspection after September 1st of this year will be reviewed and approved for compliance with the 2005 Ohio Building Code, 2005 Ohio Mechanical Code, and 2005 Ohio Plumbing Code.
What are “life safety” inspections? We hear a lot about them. Many building departments say they are conducting “life safety” inspections. But where are the provisions for them in the building code? How did they get started and do we really know what they are?

It appears that “life safety” inspections began some time ago with the witnessing of acceptance tests for fire protection systems in accordance with OBC section 901.5. It also appears that these inspections have evolved far beyond their original purpose. Instead of an individual inspector, “life safety” inspections usually involve a “team” of individuals from both the building and fire departments. In many cases, they are performed toward the end of a project just prior to occupancy.

Naturally, something this large requires a lot of coordination, not only between the fire service and the building department, but also among the designers, contractors, subcontractors and the owner. When more people are involved, the more time increases. Inevitably, projects get delayed because owners, designers and contractors have to change their schedules and cease much of their work in order to accommodate the building/fire teams.

In some building departments, “life safety” inspections have become so routine, they are conducted on nearly every project, even those without fire protection systems. Furthermore, other building departments offer “life safety” inspections “after hours” for which owners are expected to pay additional fees designed to cover overtime costs. This practice amounts to a type of extortion because the building department knows that owners cannot lose precious time waiting for normal inspections.

We’ve received calls from concerned individuals who’ve gone through these inspections. Some have likened it to an invasion of their entire project that leaves nothing unturned. Many of the “deficiencies” found by these building/fire teams often bear little resemblance to the original plan review or previous inspections. Suddenly, owners are faced with a whole new array of problems. Problems they had every right to expect had been solved during the plan review and inspection processes. Why didn’t the building departments catch these things before? What went wrong?

Some building/fire teams have been described as taking on a sort of “pack mentality.” Usually, “alpha males” in the group take psychological command and set in motion a series of events that call for the team to find even the smallest detail. Members of the team, we are told, tend to compete with each other in order to show a kind of prowess not normally present during individual inspections. In an atmosphere of changing allegiances, those who don’t want to “rock the boat” tend to recede into the background because they don’t want to undermine a unified front. Some of the more aggressive inspectors have actually ordered contractors to uncover work that ordinarily should have been inspected a long time ago. This is likely a violation of OBC section 109.1 which provides for a strict time limit on inspections. Others reportedly have taken a more direct approach such as opening control boxes and disconnecting wires to see if they can trigger trouble signals. Since personnel employing these practices can incur liability for the building department these actions should stop immediately.

Since all fire protection installers are required to be certified by the State Fire Marshal (see Ohio Revised Code section 3737.65), such tinkering is inconsistent with the law and the contractor’s responsibility for conducting acceptance tests (see NFPA 13, section 10-1 and NFPA 72, section 7-1). Testing should be left to the certified installer and the building department should strictly confine itself to observation. Those who believe “life safety” inspections are necessary because they think some certified contractors aren’t properly conducting tests should instead take their concerns to the State Fire Marshal.

While not prohibited, combined inspections should only be conducted in accordance with the law and the building department’s duties under the building code. The owner’s rights must be preserved at all times. When inspections are done properly, fire prevention issues are kept separate from building code requirements. Obviously, issues that directly affect fire fighting operations such as fire lane turning radii, locations of fire department connections, fire command centers and communications need to be coordinated with the fire department, but the building depart-
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...mment is ultimately and legally responsible for the approval of all construction on the site. Some jurisdictions view “life safety” inspections as essential to their responsibility to enforce the building codes. But are they really? If these inspections are so essential, then why doesn’t the building code require them? OBC sections 104.2, 104.4 and 109 establish the requirements for building department inspections. OBC section 109.3, in particular, lists the required types of inspections. Some inspections are included for special circumstances, but these should not be viewed as requiring “life safety” inspections.

Inspections are purposely set up in a manner that follows the normal sequence of construction. As each phase of construction closes, so do the inspections. Any action by the building department that requires the dismantling or destruction of an area that was previously inspected and subsequently covered up is strictly prohibited even if the department failed in its responsibility to perform the original inspection. Unless the work does not comply with the approved plans or the building official is willing to declare a serious hazard, the work cannot be revisited (see OBC section 105.4). The inspections listed in the building code, properly conducted, should not require a “life safety” or any other kind of inspection to be performed after the fact.

California Building Standards Commission Withdraws 2003 Code Recommendations

Decision by Commission Clears Way for State Agencies to Proceed with International Building, Fire, and Residential Codes

Sacramento, CA — The California Building Standards Commission voted 8-2 on Wednesday, March 16, to rescind its code recommendations of July 2003. The Commission’s action will allow state agencies to move forward with the adoption of building codes that are the best fit for California, including the International Building Code (IBC), the International Fire Code (IFC) and the International Residential Code (IRC), in updating the State’s building codes. The state agencies will bring proposed code amendments back to the Building Standards Commission for approval—a process that is estimated to take about two years. This approach is consistent with how California has adopted building codes in the past.

The Building Standards Commission’s action followed a unanimous 7-0 recommendation issued on March 8 by the Commission’s Coordinating Council, made up of the State’s code-writing agencies, in support of the IBC, IFC and IRC. Public testimony in support of the IBC, IRC and IFC before both the Coordinating Council and the Building Standards Commission registered overwhelmingly in favor of using the I-Codes in California. More than 500 private and non-profit entities, as well as individuals, support the I-Codes in California.

2005 Denison Award
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the mid-west and the east coast. He has been an instructor for training programs offered to building department personnel and tradesmen at the University of Wisconsin and in various states including New Jersey, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio. He has also served on the Board of Education for the Clermont Northeastern School District.

Ray began working for Clermont County in 1982 as a mechanical inspector and plans examiner. In 1992, he was promoted to Clermont County’s Chief Building Official position.

In 1996, he was instrumental in creating Clermont County’s one stop shop for permits and inspections, which was aided by a grant from the State of Ohio. This process was created to simplify and facilitate all permitting activities in Clermont County. That same year Ray received the Ohio Building Official Association award as Building Official of the Year.

In 2001, he received the Floodplain Administrator of the Year award from the Association of State Floodplain Managers.

In 2004, he was promoted to Building Director for Clermont County. In this position he manages both the Community, Planning and Development Department and the Building Inspection/Permit Central Departments. In addition to the building department activities in both Clermont and Brown Counties, he is quickly incorporating the planning department into Clermont County’s one stop shop for permits and inspections, and is updating subdivision regulations and processes to streamline approvals.

Ray is married, has two children, and now has two grandchildren. Congratulations to Ray Sebastian, and thank you for your service to Ohio and its citizens.
I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Ohio Building Officials Association (OBOA) membership for their vote of confidence in electing me as President for 2005 at the OBOA/SWOBOA joint conference in West Chester. I look forward to the challenges and opportunities that the position holds for me in the following year. This should prove to be another exciting year in our profession with the new Ohio Building Code taking effect this year, the Code Academy officially in place, and a State wide residential code finally being established in Ohio.

For all those who attended the Joint Conference in West Chester, thank you for making this year’s conference a great success and to Southwestern Ohio Building Officials Association (SWOBOA) the host this year for raising the bar once again for how well a conference can be run. I hope that any of you that were unable to attend this year will be able to join us in Canton for the 2006 Joint conference hosted by Five County Building Officials Association (FBOA).

I would like to encourage all members to take an active role in our organization by getting involved in a committee, by participating in Building Safety Week, or some other activity in your local chapter. OBOA continues to be one of the strong leadership chapters of the International Code Council (ICC) and the success of our Chapter lies in the hands of each of you. OBOA does not just consist of the Board of Directors, it is all the members from across the state working together to promote the protection of the public through consistent and uniform enforcement of the building codes throughout Ohio.

If you would like to be involved in an OBOA committee please contact myself or any board member so we can get you in contact with the chairperson. The committees available to be involved with can be found on the website at OBOA.org.

Again thank you and I look forward to serving as your President throughout 2005.

Sincerely,
Stephen Moore
OBOA President

OBOA Officers:
Rick Helsing
City of Fairfield
Phone: (513) 867-5318
Fax: (513) 867-5310
E-Mail: rick1@one.net

Bill McErlane
City of Springdale
Phone: (513) 346-5730
Fax: (513) 346-5747
E-Mail: wmceralane@springdale.org

Bruce Wholf
City of Maumee
Phone: (419) 897-7075
Fax: (419) 897-7182
E-Mail: wholfb@maumee.org

OBOA Directors:
Philip Seyboldt
City of Bedford
Phone: (440) 232-1600
Fax: (440) 232-1558
E-Mail: pseynoldt@sbcglobal.net

Maurice Wyckoff
Montgomery Co. Building Regulations
Phone: (937) 225-4586
Fax: (937) 225-6327
E-Mail: wyckoffm@mcohoio.org

Gerald Stoker
City of Loveland
Phone: (513) 683-0150
Fax: (513) 583-3040
E-Mail: gzstok@lovelandoh.com

William Desvari
City of Lorain
Phone: (440) 204-2045
Fax: (440) 244-6920
E-Mail: Willliam_desvari@cityoflorain.org

Tim Monea
City of Wooster
Phone: (330) 263-5258
Fax: (330) 263-5247
E-Mail: tmonea@woosteroh.com

Michael Rudey
City of Oregon
Phone: (419) 698-7071
Fax: (419) 698-7150
E-Mail: mrudey@ci.oregon.oh.us

OBOA Treasurer’s Report

Bank Accounts as of March 11, 2005:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD#91</td>
<td>$5726.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD#68</td>
<td>$6128.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD#97</td>
<td>$11,755.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>$14,414.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed 2005 Budget

Projected Inflows $46,363.00
Projected Outflows $31,435.00

Bruce Wholf, Treasurer
FBOA

General Meetings are the first Wednesday of the month 6:30pm with a CE program at Tangier Restaurant, 532 W. Market St., Akron.

Seminars are being presented on April 12, 2005 and again on April 13, 2005 in Cuyahoga Falls: Ohio Residential Code, Managing Moisture & Water Intrusion Problems, and Engineered Lumber Products.

Past Pres. Dan Gargas and Sec. Terry Conner were project officers for production of a 30 sec. TV commercial. FBOA, NCOBOA, BOCONEO, and OBOA are funding air time on WJW TV-8 Cleveland (Fox) during building safety week. This commercial is available to other OBOA chapters.

Join us at OBOA’s 16th Annual Conference, Feb. 5-7, 2006, in Canton.

MVBOC

In January Billy Phillips presented info. on the new Ohio Code Academy and ICC Region V. In February Jeff Tyler (DIC) gave an informative and entertaining presentation: “Building Code Jeopardy”. In May Bob Reynolds will be presenting a seminar on Exiting.

Two $1,000 scholarships will be awarded this year.

MVBOC is working with Miami Valley Communications Council to create a promotional video. The video will be used by our members during BSW and a possible local spot as a PSA.

MVBOC endorsed Dana Boogher, CBO/Director of Clark County as our candidate for the Residential Code Advisory Committee created by H.B. 175.

SWOBOA

The following are the continuing education courses being presented and activities that have been scheduled in Southwest Ohio:

- April 21—1:00 to 4:00 pm, “2005 OBC Overview”
- May 8-14—Building Safety Week
- June 16—11:00am to 4:00 pm, RCO Review with Lunch
- July 15—10th Annual Scholarship Golf Outing

For additional information concerning future courses, please visit our web site at: www.swoboa.org or contact:

Charles Crawford at: 513-352-4787 
or Mike Spry at: 513-352-2492

COCOA

We would like to have your opinion as to what activities COCOA would like to have offered:

- Zoo and Wyandotte Lake
- Ohio Historical Society
- White Water Rafting
- Slate Run
- Tecumseh
- Canoe Trip
- Columbus Destroyers
- Blue Jackets
- Longaberger Baskets
- Tour Perkins Observatory
- Ohio Balloon Festival
- Holiday Tour of Homes
- Ohio Railway Museum
- Suggestions from the members

Contact: Jim Stocksdale
JESStocksdale@Columbus.gov

Upcoming Events
4/20/2005 - Code Consistency Meeting
4/21/2005 - Board Meeting
4/21/2005 - Education
5/18/2005 - Code Consistency Meeting

BOCONEO

The Energy Code seminar at the March meeting was well attended.

Debbie Ohler, BBS staff member, presented an overview of changes in the 2005 adoption of the codes. Attendance is nearly at capacity at the Lodge. We are encouraged by the great membership turnout at our monthly meetings. Your participation/suggestions to improve BOCONEO are vital to provide and maintain a strong organization.

You can find various Code Committees’ recommendations at www.iccsafe.org. Challenges to the committee recommendations and voting by ICC membership for proposed code changes will be considered at the fall conference Sept. 25-Oct. 2 in Detroit, MI.

If you are an ICC member you are eligible to vote on committee recommendations at these hearings. If you haven’t experienced the code change process this is perhaps a “once in a lifetime” opportunity to really get involved – and you will make a difference.
OBOA Information Update

Make sure you E-mail address and contact information is up-to-date. Visit the OBOA web site and look for “Update Your E-mail and Phone Information”. You can provide the information on-line or by mailing your information to:

OBOA
1245 Sunbury Road, Suite 100
Westerville, Ohio 43081-9444
Phone/Fax 614-890-8639

OBOA 2005 Committee Assignments are now posted on the OBOA web site. The chairmen, co-chairmen, and members are listed along with their contact information.

ODPCA
The Ohio Design Professionals and Code Analysts, Inc. is offering a continuing education course providing a comprehensive 10-week course covering the entire 2005 OBC, including references to the 2003 IBC.

WHEN: Wednesday evenings, 6–9 p.m., March 16—May 18, 2005
WHERE: City of Columbus Building Services, Lower Level Training Room, 757 Carolyn Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43224
MATERIALS: Participants should bring their own copy of the 2005 OBC. The 2003 International Building Code Commentary will be used as a reference. Sandwiches, chips and a beverage will be provided.

This is an in-depth study of each chapter of the OBC for Building Officials, Plans Examiners, Building Inspectors, Architects, Engineers, and other design professionals.

For information contact Dale Shumaker at: Phone – (614) 645-7827 (please fax or email questions if possible)
Fax – (614) 645-7912

SWOFSC
The Ohio Fire Code was pulled from it's hearing before the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR). The State Fire Marshal's Office and interested parties are meeting to resolve issues. Marshal Woltz hopes to have resolution in April per his comment at the recent Winter Symposium for the Ohio Fire Chief's Association.

Members of our organization attended the SWOBOA/OBOA joint conference in West Chester. SWOFSC President Craig Best was presented with OBOA's Fire Official Award. We had great representation at the ICC Code Hearings in Cincinnati. Members from the Ohio Fire Officials Association and staff from the Ohio Fire Marshal's Office were also in attendance.

NCOBOA
Membership meetings are the 3rd Thursday of each month, 6:00 PM at DeLuca's In The Park, in Lorain, Ohio. On 3/9/05 Steve Regoli from the BBS presented an excellent seminar for City Officials on the behalf of NCOBOA. In July 2005 NCOBOA will host it's annual golf outing.

Upcoming seminars:

April 17—Managing Moisture & Solving Water Intrusion Problems: BO/PE/BI 2 hrs
May 11—Simpson School 6 hrs
May 19—ODNR (Tentative)
Sept 15—Fire & Smoke Damper Radiation BO PE BI 1.5 hrs; Damper Installation HVAC Systems MI SI ESI
Oct 20—Superior Walls (Tentative)
Nov 17—Allied Fireplace (Tentative)

Check our www.ncoboa.org for further information and updates.
OBOA Info. Update

OBOA/SWBOA Joint Conference—Rick Helsinger:
The OBOA/SWBOA Joint Conference is closed and determined to have been a huge success. With over four hundred people in attendance, fifty-one educational classes offered and some of the best food, fun and fellowship in the state, the bar has been set for future conferences.

I would like to thank COCOA for all their help, advise, and for allowing us to sit in on all of their previous planning sessions. My thanks also go out to the staff at the Marriott in West Chester. Their eagerness to help and serve all of us at the conference was noticeable and appreciated. As always Billy Phillips and all the staff at the OBBS were invaluable to the success of the conference, Thanks! A special thanks goes out to the SWBOA conference planning committee directed by Jim McFarland. Jim’s leadership, hard work and commitment to the conference were one of the main contributors to this year’s conference success. To FBOA and future conference planners, we’re here to help; call us.

Members received a five hour BBS accredited seminar on energy code compliance from ICC instructor Frank Morris and a hot lunch at the February monthly meeting. The all day event was well attended by more than 70 members. Mr. Morris presented an excellent program that generated quite a few questions from attendees. A free copy of REScheck software for residential energy code compliance is available on-line at www.energycodes.gov. Check it out.

Desvari regarding a recent legal news blip in the Cleveland Plain Dealer regarding allegations and charges brought against him by the City of Lorain police chief. BOCONEO fully supports Bill and his defense against the charges.

A membership check will be forthcoming to OBOA in April from the organization for 240+ members. We are encouraged by the great response from our membership to the programs BOCONEO offers. Any suggestions for the good of the organization and the code enforcement community in general are welcome.

Congratulations to FBOA on the new website! I’ve had the pleasure of using it and received quick response to my request for a job posting…speaking of job postings:

City of Beachwood, City of Brunswick, City of Willoughby
Seeking certified inspectors with plumbing and building inspection certifications.

The organization ended the month of February 2004 with total assets of $42,672.89.

Thanks to OBOA president Rick Schriewer for his message to the membership which was posted in BOCONEO March 04 newsletter.

The annual golf outing for the BOCONEO scholarship fund will be held Friday, July 16, 2004 at Rolling Green Golf Course, Huntsburg, Ohio. Details are developing.

BY-LAW CHANGES

At the OBOA General Business Meeting held on January 31, 2005, the membership approved three by-law changes. They are:

• To permit Associate Members to vote on floor motions in the OBOA Residential Code change process,
• To change the make-up of the Executive Committee to: President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer, and
• To allow Retired Active Members to vote on the business of the organization.

A complete updated copy of the OBOA Code of Ethics, Constitution, and By-laws are available on the OBOA web site.

OBOA would like to strongly encourage participation in the development of the ICC Codes. Participation allows your voice to be heard and makes you better educated on the codes. If you ever wondered how text gets in the codes and why, the hearings are the best way to find out.

OBOA’s Code Change Committee reviews code change proposals, provides comment, and takes positions on proposals. If you wish to participate please contact your chapter president or:

Bill McErlane, Chairman, Code Change Committee, City of Springdale, 11700 Springfield Pike, Springdale, Ohio 45246 (513) 346-5730 E-mail: wmcerlane@springdale.org

OBOA has historically provided a grant in the form of reimbursement for those who wish to actively participate. The OBOA Board has approved up to $300 per member to reimburse up to 10 members who wish to participate in the hearings in Detroit, Michigan, Sept. 25 – 28, 2005. If you wish to take advantage of this opportunity, please submit a request no later than August 26, 2005 to the OBOA Code Change Committee Chairman. Approved attendees will be required to provide documentation of expenses for reimbursement.
2005 OBOA—SWOBOA Joint Conference Photos
Making it Understandable - Jan Sokolnicki

I’ve been on staff here at the board for over 12 years now. Together, we’ve faced and resolved many challenges, created some great opportunities, experimented with different education and funding systems, and all changed a lot during this time. We’ve made & lost some great friends, seen many of our reliable, trusted colleagues retire or pass on, and learned a lot over these years. As I look back (over almost 30 years in this code business), I feel I’ve been blessed in ways I haven’t deserved with the experiences I’ve had and mentoring I’ve received. Over the past few years, my job seems easier, the code change cycle has become tedious rather than complicated and challenging. I guess I had been settling into the “older guy” version of professional life. Yeah, life was good here.

(Nota advised—other shoe about to drop): This past 18 months or so has done its best to shake me back into the “good old days of stress and difficulty”. After years of working on and establishing reliable, open, relationships with the fire prevention side of our enforcement profession, I might have become a bit complacent (old guy disease) and let contact lapse with OFOA, the Ohio Fire Chiefs Assn. and the OFM’s office. I started noticing little things: a editorial written here and there about the BBS working against fire services objectives, fewer requests for our opinion on coordination issues between the two codes, rumors about how we’ve taken “hard line” positions about the fire code or how we’re “teamed up” with the industry against the fire service. Since this kind of stuff occurred every once in a while over the years before, I thought maybe this was just another one of those times. I was really wrong. Last August, for the first time at a board public hearing, we watched and heard testimony of fire official after fire official. They all were objecting to provisions of the proposed 2005 OBC. We had never had that kind of focused objection before. The folks that were testifying were those with whom we thought we had good working relationships. As days went on, we met with each testifier to find out how to resolve the issues they raised and we were able to reduce the concerns by explaining the provisions in more detail. After these individual meetings we were left with several proposed administrative sections that needed more than an explanation. One of the things we realized during the discussions was that we didn’t know the extent of difficulty some local fire prevention bureau personnel were having in getting local building departments to cooperate with them. They gave us hard evidence that some building departments not only made some mistakes in coordination of issues of joint interest, like inspections of fire protection systems, but in some cases the building official refused to accept input on issues related to OBC non-compliance even though the OBC has had a provision for years indicating that the building department is supposed to cooperate.

To resolve this issue:
1. The Board removed some proposed text in OBC Chapter 1 that could be misinterpreted to suggest limiting fire officials from their fire prevention responsibilities of the OBC.
2. Working with representatives of the fire officials, staff developed, proposed, and the Board adopted new text for OBC §106.1.2(5). This new text makes it clear that the building department must work cooperatively when the community has a fire official interested in being involved. (see text of provision below)
3. Our Chairman Holland, after hearing the testimony, determined that we cannot continue to allow the communication/cooperation condition to continue. He indicated that he will be establishing an Ad Hoc group specifically intended to maintain an effective and constant relationship with our fire code enforcement partners.

I’m glad we’re taking an action that should get us back to where we should have always been.

In Ohio, there are examples of great working relationships between fire & building departments in many jurisdictions. In other localities, we hear some pretty pathetic excuses why folks don’t work together. One thing I do know, (old age creeping in or not) the folks in our communities, including our families, businesses and neighbors deserve the best service our profession is capable of providing….that means accessing as much expertise as we can collect and coordinating the proper application of the code(s) through fair and uniform code enforcement. We need to work together…I can’t take another year like the last one.

**************

106.1.2 Special provisions. The following are special provisions:

1. When construction includes the use of industrialized units or alternative materials, designs and methods of construction or equipment approved by the board, documentation shall be provided to the building official describing how they are to be used. Before these items are installed or used, the following shall be submitted:
   1.1 A copy of the construction documents approved by the board; and

(Continued on page 13)
Learning module that is tailored to the needs of the audience without duplicating our efforts and rewriting each class.

1. Communications & People Skills
2. Personnel & Supervisory Skills
3. General Business & Ethics
4. Administrations and Law
5. Personal Recognition of Job Site Safety
6. General Bldg Code Occupancy
7. Building Limitations & Construction Types
8. Building Safety
   - Fire-resistant Materials and Const.
   - Fire Protection Systems and Fire Alarms
   - Means of Egress
9. General Structure
10. Accessibility
11. Existing Building
13. Ohio Plumbing Code
14. Ohio Mechanical Code

The curriculum and recommended time allocation for each certification are as follows:

**Building Official Certification:**
1. 16 hrs. Administrative Code
2. 2 hrs. Personnel and Supervisory Skills
3. 4 hrs. Communication and People Skills
   - Oral & written communications
   - Dealing with problem people & situations
4. 14 hrs. Code related courses taken from course topics list, items 5 through 14, directly related to supervising and staffing a building department.

**Inspection Certifications:**
1. 8 hrs. Administrative Code
2. 6 hrs. Communication & People Skills
   - Enforcement Basics
   - Oral & written communications
   - Dealing with problem people & situations
3. 2 hrs Gen. Business & Ethics
4. 24 hrs. Code related courses taken from course topics list, items 5 through 14, which are directly related to the inspection certification being pursued. In addition there will be a level of cross training with other classifications to insure they are aware of how their particular discipline fits into the overall inspection process.

**Plans Examiner Certifications:**
1. 8 hrs. Administrative Code
2. 6 hrs. Communication and People Skills
   - Oral & written communications
   - Dealing with problem people & situations
3. 2 hrs. Gen. Business & Ethics
4. 24 hrs. Code related courses taken from course topics list, items 5 through 14, which are directly related to the Plan Examination certification being pursued. In addition there will be a level of cross training with other classifications to insure they are aware of how their particular discipline fits into the overall permitting process.

Each applicant who has been approved for an interim certification will be put on a list and automatically scheduled for the next OBCA. You will receive a letter from the Board advising you of the date, time and location of the next OBCA.

Contact Billy Phillips for addition information about the OBCA.
Ohio Board of Building Standards Calendar

**APRIL 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3—Daylight Saving Time Begins
17—Martin Luther King Day
22—Board of Building Standards Public Hearing and Conference Meeting
24—First Day of Passover

**MAY 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1—Orthodox Easter
8—Mother’s Day
21—Armed Forces Day
30—Memorial Day (Observed)

**JUNE 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3—Board of Building Standards Conference Meeting.
14—Flag Day
19—Father’s Day
21—First Day of Summer

---

**ICC Calendar**

2—Publication Date for "Report of the Public Hearings"

6—Workshop for Fair Housing Act Accessibility; Holiday Inn Presidential Conference Center; Little Rock, AR

24-30—National Window Safety Week

25-29—AZBO 2005 Spring Institute; Prescott, AZ

8-11—Solutions to Coastal Disasters Conference 2005; Charleston, SC

8-14—Building Safety Week

10—California Dept. of Conservation Strong Motion Instrumentation Program Seminar for Utilization of Strong Motion Data; Los Angeles, CA

10-12—Window & Door Manufacturers Assn. Technical Conference; Schaumburg, IL

19-20—2005 Property Maintenance and Housing Institute; Chicago, IL

1-3—ICC-ES Committee Meeting; Chicago, IL

6-10—South Carolina Fire Marshals Association Spring Conference; Four Points Sheraton; Myrtle Beach, SC

6-7—10th Intntl. Fire Protection Symposium, “Methods of Fire Safety Engineering”, Presented by German Fire Protection Assn. & Braunschweig University of Tech.; Hannover, Germany

13-15—4th Intntl. Conference on Advances in Steel Structures; Shanghai, China

17—Deadline for Receipt of Public Comments

25-29—ASHRAE Annual Meeting; Denver, CO
Getting Mechanical

(Continued from page 3)

hood and all ovens, other than a conveyor type pizza oven, should have a Type II hood. This is inconsistent with the actual code text proposed by M47-02. In my opinion, the intent of listing appliances in 507.2.1 and 507.2.2 was simply to give some examples of when a Type I or Type II hood might be required. The list is not absolute.

I’d like to take this time to expand the commentary text a bit. There are several issues to think about when determining the type of hood to provide above a given appliance. The most important issue, in my opinion, is to determine whether grease laden vapors and/or smoke are present in large enough quantities to constitute a fire hazard if grease were to build up on the walls, ceilings, or exhaust ducts. If so, a Type I hood is probably warranted. NFPA 96 lists some typical appliances that produce grease-laden vapors. The list includes, but is not limited to, deep-fat fryers, ranges, griddles, broilers, woks, tilting skillets, and braising pans. In contrast, if the primary concern is to remove excess heat and steam from the kitchen, the most appropriate type of hood is most likely a Type II. Another thing to consider is that Type I hoods require a fire suppression system. How would the fire suppression system protect a fully enclosed oven, for example?

To my knowledge, pre-engineered wet chemical suppression systems are not even listed for use with enclosed appliances. I have heard stories that code officials are requiring the suppression system contractor to drill through the oven in order to place the piping and nozzles inside to protect the appliance. Please DO NOT ever require a contractor to drill through the oven as this would violate the listing of the oven and subject you to liability.

Getting back to pizza ovens, practically speaking, most people would agree, based upon experience that grease build-up is not of prime concern, heat build-up is. However, you don’t have to rely only on your instinct or practical experience. There is technical justification for this conclusion too. A 1999 ASHRAE research report 745-RP titled “Identification and Characterization of Effluents from Various Cooking Processes” concluded that gas/electric ovens (cooking sausage pizza) produced significantly less grease emissions than gas/electric griddles (cooking hamburger), gas/electric fryers (cooking potatoes), gas/electric broilers (cooking hamburger or chicken), and gas/electric ranges (cooking spaghetti, sausage, and sauce). This could lead to the conclusion that a Type II hood might be sufficient for a pizza oven. Unfortunately, this data has not been developed for all types of ovens and the report did not identify whether the oven was enclosed or whether it was an open ended conveyor type. I personally, don’t think that the results would be considerably different. I would guess that a meat roasting oven or a rotisserie type oven might produce more grease laden vapor than a pizza oven. However, more research similar to the ASHRAE research needs to be done to determine what the real story is. A test protocol should be developed to evaluate the emissions from all types of food cooking processes…using all types of appliances.

In the meantime, the building official should evaluate the risk of the operation; not simply the name of the appliance. The building official should consider the frequency and duration of operation, the type and quantity of grease-laden vapors typically produced by the cooking operation, and the proposed maintenance practices of the owner. In all cases, when assessing the type of hood that is required, there is some judgment that needs to be made by the building official. In my opinion, a building official should not simply read the code text literally. The building official should always liberally interpret the code with consideration for intent and practicality.

Code users are slowly realizing the problem with the model code language. You should know that in the 2004 IMC Supplement, which Ohio has not adopted yet, code change proposal M49-03/04 added an exception to section 507.2.2 which states “a single light-duty electric convection, bread, retherm, or microwave oven”. This further supports my opinion that all ovens do not require Type I or Type II hoods.

Additionally, in the current code development cycle, code change proposal M62-04/05 has made it half way through the process by being approved by the IMC Development Committee. This proposal adds an additional exception to section 507.2.2 that reads as follows: “A Type II hood is not required for the following electrically heated appliances: toasters, steam tables, popcorn poppers, hot dog cookers, coffee makers, rice cookers, egg cookers, holding/warming ovens. The additional heat and moisture loads generated by such appliances, shall be accounted for in the design of the HVAC system.”

As always, if you should have questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.