

STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD

Minutes

May 2, 2002 Meeting

Attendance: Ron Bergeson, HCD; Ingrid Icasiano, SFM; Gloria Scott, DOT; Fred Herman, SSC; Alan Dreyfuss, CPF; Dan Chudy, CalBo; Stephan Castellanos, DSA; Richard Hastings, CLC; Bob Mackensen, CSA; Steve Farneth, AIA; Mike Paravagna, DOR, Loring Wyllie, SEAOC.
Staff: Tom Winter, Executive Director; Barbara Bell, Counsel, OLS/DGS.

Item 1.

Dan Chudy, Chair. Call to order at 1:30 PM: There is some confusion over the start time between the CPF Schedule and the SHBSB notice of meeting. One had 1:00 PM and the other 2:00 PM. Nominations of board officers was suggested at the September meeting and scheduled for the December meeting. Not sure if it is appropriate to bring this up if not on agenda.

Exec. Director. Reports on what has been done. Joe Hall was appointed as the Nominating Committee. Joe Hall informed staff of the nominations by fax letter. Nominations were announced and ballots were sent out by mail to each member with the meeting notice of December 6th, 2001. Ballots were returned to the Exec. Director, a quorum of ballots were recorded and votes were tallied. The official results of the election were informally announced at the March 18th meeting but not recorded in the meeting "minutes".

Chudy. Those results should be published in these minutes for official notification.

Results of Elections for Officers 2002

Dan Chudy, Chair

Alan Dreyfuss, Vice-Chair

Stephen Farneth, Secretary

Item 2.

Staff Report, Executive Director, Tom Winter

Past Minutes

Approval of the September 25th, 2001 minutes. Revised by direction of board at Sept meeting. Needs motion for approval. Motion to Approve: Richard Hastings; Second: Steade Craigo.
Unanimous.

The other meeting minutes of December 6, 2001 and March 18, 2002 in the board packet are not for approval, are provided for information. Actions taken in committee are sent on for approval by the board.

Historic Schools Program

Update on the programs related to the SHBC. Application of the SHBC to historic schools. Received a 90% submittal on a contracted Bibliography of Research and Testing for Archaic Materials and Methods of Construction. The intent of this bibliography is to gather all of the numbers and back-up data for analysis and consideration by the DSA for use in applying the structural chapters of the SHBC. This first step is almost completed and a second step of analyzing the materials for applicability will be contracted. From the analysis, a final step of a committee of DSA, the SHBSB and others to be determined will recommend to the State Architect the values assigned to the various materials and methods and have the reports from the bibliography for back-up. These materials will be available to the DSA reviewers as well as designer professionals.

Fred Herman. Will the values be different from what is currently in the SHBC?

TW. The SHBC refers to 1994 UCBC, those are the kinds of values to be used. Potentially the DSA values could be used in the SHBC. That has not been discussed with the board or committees. The implication is that schools as opposed to other buildings probably would have different values. There are

STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD

other issues to be worked out as to issues of what is different between schools and other buildings. Ultimately a presentation of the differences could be very useful.

(?) Will this be a more prescriptive part to the code rather than performance?

TW. No, other provisions in the code allow alternative numbers to be brought forth for consideration, however they will be subject to the requirements of the Field Act. SHBC (as well as the Field Act) doesn't preclude other design methodologies from that prescribed for the design of school buildings. We're trying to look down the road for our staff and get around any concerns over potential need for the "product approval" process on any building material or method.

Item 3.

SHBSB Board Policy: There is a document in your package, an offshoot of the Executive Committee work. Staff wanted some kind of policy for setting meeting dates in order for staff and the board to have a consistent calendar. Staff to explain the issues involved.

TW. The meeting schedule has been set meeting to meeting lead to issues of staff time to prepare board packages. Seemed better to set meetings on a schedule, or "typical" basis for each month, with regular meetings on a quarterly basis. A day of the week and a week of the month as standard for any monthly meeting. The recommendation is for the third Thursday of a month. Except for the CPF Conference month. For any appeal or action requested of the Board, we have a set date to look for. Recommendation for quarterly meetings is for February, May, September and November. That works around Christmas, Thanksgiving and other holidays. Full meetings will be held a minimum of once a year. Workload indicates that quarterly meetings would be committees for the most part.

DC. Concern is with Policy recommendation Item #7. One meeting per year in southern California. Problem is logistics, easier to fly than get to Los Angeles or other southern Cal locations.

(?) Didn't we change that language?

TW. I changed the language from "shall" to "should". A goal statement not a mandate.

(?) If we follow CPF that would happen every other year anyway.

DC. Suggest that we eliminate Item 7.

RH. Wouldn't want to eliminate that Item. It is should, we don't really "have to". A good policy because of the ability of the public to attend.

SC. Supports Dick on that issue, its important for our outreach to have meetings in Southern Cal because it's a large part of the state and the public can find out what we are doing. Compromise, say "may"?

BM. May is OK

DC. No problem with should or may.

SC. Can someone explain the difference between a meeting and a general meeting?

DC. Meetings can be standing committee meetings.

TW. That's Item #5 of the proposed motion.

DC. The majority would like to leave Item 7 as is?

Multiple. Affirmative

DC. Do we have a motion then?

RH. I would move that we adopt the recommended policy for Meetings for the SHBSB

SC. Seconded.

DC. There has been a motion and second.

In favor of the motion?

Unanimously approved.

Item 4.

Info in packet.

DC. Just four items there. If you've had a chance to review them. The matrix shows the current wording, the proposed wording and give an analysis of each one. Does this require additional discussion, it looks

STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD

like mostly its clearing up the intent. The only one that might have some discussion is the last item on roof covering, Section 8-408. Could staff bring us up to date on why this is suggested.

TW. This is from personal experience working on buildings where the intent of the roof covering is not to be moisture proof. But to be generally waterproof, but not leak proof. That was a designed part of their historic construction. Examples would be pan and barrel tile roofs without moisture proof membranes, and straight board and bat roofs. Discussion was originally that the whole section might not be needed, original roofs should be allowed without further comment.

DC. Is Item 2 to become Item 1, the requirement of Class C is the only requirement that's been there.

Ingrid Icasiano. There are now areas of "high fire hazard", would that have any consequences?

AD. It might have been clearer if in the "before" both Items 1 and 2 had been included. There's no change being proposed to the paragraph on wood roofs. It's the same. Seemed confusing.

TW. Subsequent to the wood roof requirement, a bill by Dutra (AB 625) from last year has changed the requirements for roofing in California. At the bottom of that bill there was the proviso that stated "for qualified historical properties" to look at the SHBC. That bill refers to CHBC section we are discussing. That means that this is still the operable section.

Ingrid. Didn't that bill require a roof to be to be resistive ?? as a fire assembly?

TW. The legislation included an item to refer to the SHBC, so I would assume that for qualified historical buildings and structures the CHBC is the language not other sections of the Dutra legislation.

(?) suppose you took the phrase taking out the "and exclude dampness". Leave the rest alone. I'm concerned about it not having anything....for example if it's a residence and they want to occupy it and restore it I think the roof should be watertight.

(?) I would like to have some control over it, not just put a blue tarp over it and say its fixed.

AD. It's a funny section in that its prescriptive but has little or nothing to do with treatment of historic buildings. I could see it say a roof system may be detailed, and it becomes a standard which is also not acceptable for the CHBC. I would guess that someone was concerned that it was not substantial.

Loring Wyllie. Analysis suggests that one and two are exceptions. They aren't really exceptions. And a friendly barb to my Architect friends, a statement that says that modifying the details to keep them from leaking is good wording. I'm more for taking out the word "dampness".

SC. What about taking out shall and put in may?

AD. Then it's a standard, like a secretaries standard. Shall means it has to be done as a code item.

SC. If we leave it in, some of the historic work that we do will lead to problems because we will need to modify the detailing to make them damp proof.

(?) What's the definition of a roof?

SC. Some roofs leak.

RH. They all don't provide shelter either, sheds, barns, ramadas

RM. Suggests alternate language for Item 1 of the Section 8-408 of the CHBC.

RM. Move, and Fred Herman seconded (?)

DC. Motion and second to omit the words that were read into the record, "to the building occupants", and "to exclude dampness", from Item 1 as include in the current code.

No further discussion

Passed.

Item will be retained as modified by Bob's motion and retain item 2 with no change.

Any more discussion on the other items in this Item? Is there a motion

Moved Richard Hastings. Seconded Fred Herman.

SC. Do we have some sort of definition some parameters of what is meant by "reasonably good condition" or is that decided in a special context?

DC. I would assume that that would be done on a case by case basis by the design professionals.

Unanimous, approved.

Note: Passing the items moves the changes on to official "rulemaking".

STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD

End of items on Agenda.

New Business

A) Fred Herman has been working on a handbook for the use of the SHBC. He is looking for guidance and some cases for each of the sections in the code. This is for use by building departments so they can see examples of what has been done before. Send to Tom and he will circulate it for board review.

B) Another item, Fred has noted that Loring Wyllie, of the American Society of Civil Engineers, has received an honorary membership for all of the good things he has done, and he is to be recognized for it. Applause.

C) Recognition of Bill Batts for his 23 (or 24) years on the SHBSB. Chair request the staff to make a recognition doc. for Bill for his hard work. Staff will get something together for Bill using a photo take at the 25th anniversary of the code. Applause.

D) Gloria Scott, member of the SHBSB representing Caltrans DOT has an issue over the use of the SHBC to historic bridges and roads, and how it applies to such structures. We have 119 historic bridges in Caltrans and another 160 under local jurisdiction. The engineers are very uncomfortable using the SHBC, it doesn't tell them precisely what to do and it seems to be in conflict with other codes that they use such as the ASHTO and others. District 7 DOT has requested through Diane Kane (who is here) two requests. Is it possible to write something to Caltrans something in writing that say unequivocal that SHBC applies to bridges roads and other structures. We get questions from local governments about whether it applies to their road structures. An the other is to look into guidelines or regulation on how the SHBC can be used to reach equivalent levels of safety that are required on roads and bridges. Caltrans within its system has several sections of roadway that are designated as historic, sections of Route 1 the redwood Hwy. Proposed sections in Monterey County that are eligible, portions of route 66 and 101 and the Feather River Highway, Cabrillio Freeway in San Diego, the Cahuenga Freeway in Los Angeles, the most important the Arroyo Seco Parkway in Los Angeles.

All sections of road that Caltrans Environment is dealing with for historic issues and need help in keeping the spirit of the highway and safety code.

DC. Would it be possible to get the questions in written form. Directed to the Exec. Director and present these items to the Board if necessary.

TW. My preference that we bring it to the exec comm. and the code update comm..

Mel G. Colorado Street bridge, the reviewed the law and the city attorney found very specifically that Public works projects are exempt from building code. And we chose then to not bring the issues to the SHBSB.

DC. That's why I think its necessary to get it in writing, have the staff research the issues and consult with legal staff as required and bring it to the board to be studied and discussed.

SC. Though there was some state law that forced state agencies to enforce the SHBC. A part of the statute.

AD. The Definition of qualified historical building in the code makes it very clear that not only structures like bridges area included, but landscapes, sites, groupings of trees, and even the configuration of a roadway should be considered to be historic.

Gloria. When they look at the code they see buildings, and when the refer to it is says buildings and not to linear resources. Its hard for them to interpret it. They are looking for the piece of paper from the board that says it does apply to bridges and roadways, second a handbook idea, how does it apply.

TW. One of the things we are doing this afternoon is the legal and statutory workshop with staff counsel. We discussed the idea briefly that the regulation we have written is patterned after a building code, but it appears we have authority to write other regulations. At the next Code Committee we will agenda an item on this discussion and invite all members to attend.

RH. Next meeting is in September. Will this be timely? Could we write and circulate a letter? Isn't the Tower Bridge railings an issue?

AD. There is a letter from the board in your packet on the Tower Project.

STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD

Gloria. That project has been put on hold due to comments from review agencies and the consultants to the city are going back to consider alternatives that were recommended in the SHBSB comment letter.

AD. To address Richards concerns, it seems like there are two questions. Does the SHBC apply to structures? The answer is YES. The answer to the second question may take a little longer to generate. The code committee has some work to do. And also something to explain how it works.

TW. The direction is to prepare a letter for signature by the Chair to someone in DOT to be determined by Gloria.

Gloria. The other update was for Arroyo Seco Parkway in Pasadena. Diane Kane, Caltrans District 7 staff historian will give the update.

Diane. Architectural Historian for Caltrans Dist 7, LA that has been working on this Parkway for 10 years. She believes that the Parkway will be nominated as a National Federal Highway Scenic Byway in June. This will be the second high speed limited access highway to receive this designation in the country. What we are trying to do is to build on the historic character of the roadway to rehabilitate the neighborhoods that are adjacent to the road. Major historic neighborhoods. The other option is for the district to widen, straighten and flatten the road. Which we cannot do because of physical and environmental constraints as well. We are stuck with the road as is. The road has a high accident rate. There are 4 spots for concern. When working with highway engineers, they have a separate set of code books issued by Federal Highway Administration, AASHTO, or Institute of Transportation Engineers that are the design manuals. If the road or bridge is not to these standards, the department gets litigated on the deficiencies, and there is no basis to defend the problems. What we are finding is that the bridges and roads aren't inherently unsafe, but it's what the drivers are doing on them that they weren't designed to do. There are other options that may be employed to preserve the historic character of the features and help public safety and also help public costs. There is a lot of work being done on "things" "functionally obsolete", which means they don't meet the most current codes, but really there is nothing wrong with the structure. The city of LA generating numbers using various formulas from the Feds to widen their historic bridges. The costs are very high. There are apparent ways to deal with these in an alternative manner. It would be helpful if we could use the SHBC to make alternatives that would lessen the changes and liability.

E) Joe Hall. Wishes to thank the people that worked on the Case Studies Books recently received. Especially Deborah Denne' as well as Ruth Todd, Steade Craigo and others. This book makes the SHBC look like it may become more institutionalized.

DC. Reserve our official thanks to another meeting when Deborah is in attendance.

Joe Hall. Make it an agenda item.

DC. The meeting is on schedule. Would like to recognize the large audience. Are there any items from the audience?

Loring. Please make schedule for the start of the meeting in the agenda and the notices match.

Bob Mackensen. Insert the statutes in the code? Mail out the statutes?

TW. I forgot to bring them today. Suggest using the Web, they are available on the CA Homepage.

Mel Green. Looking to the future across the US. Many states are looking to "smart codes". There is a bill still in the legislature won't replace the SHBC, but across the country etc. even the new I codes have new methods to getting to preservation through alternative "rehab codes".

DC. in my jurisdiction I get questions from the political side about things that are going on in the eastern portion of the US in relation to smart codes. I tell them that there is a big difference between the west coast and the east coast in regards to building codes.

Dan Visnich. In regards to the SHBC becoming more institutionalized, just looking at the Caltrans issues, the SHBC and SHBSB are just breaking new ground. In terms of the changes in building codes and building technologies this board will face a lot of new challenges in the future, and near future.

Adjournment 2:30 p.m.