



**CHARLES D. BAKER**  
GOVERNOR

**KARYN E. POLITO**  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

**MIKE KENNEALY**  
SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
**Division of Professional Licensure**  
**Office of Public Safety and Inspections**  
1000 Washington Street, Suite 710  
Boston, Massachusetts 02118

**EDWARD A. PALLESCHI**  
UNDERSECRETARY OF CONSUMER  
AFFAIRS AND BUSINESS  
REGULATION

**LAYLA D'EMILIA**  
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF  
PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

**Existing Building Code Committee (Ch. 34)**

Chairman DiMascio took roll call:

*Layla D'Emilia, or designee	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
**Peter Ostroskey, or designee	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Fred Lonardo	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Mike Grover	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Dana Haagensen	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Kevin Hastings	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Vernon Woodworth	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent

Mike DiMascio, Chair	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Doug Anderson	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Lee Cleveland	<input type="checkbox"/> present	✓ absent
Michael Shearer	<input type="checkbox"/> present	✓ absent
Erik Eklund	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Barry Gehrom	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent
Dave Horton	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent

*\*Office of Public Safety Assistant Chief of Inspections–Building and Engineering Dan Walsh participated as the designee for DPL Commissioner, Lyla D'Emilia.*

*\*\* Jen Hoyt participated as the designee for State Fire Marshal Peter Ostroskey.*

June 29, 2020 Meeting Minutes

**General notes on format of these minutes**

- *These minutes represent general points of discussion by members and audience participants during the regular meeting session. The minutes are not intended to be a verbatim account of discussions.*
- *Votes are noted as **MOTION** by, seconded by, and whether it was a unanimous or split vote.*
- *Agenda topics as numbered may be in the same order as they appear on the meeting agenda.*
- *The meeting agenda is listed as **EXHIBIT A**; others are listed sequentially as addresses during the meeting.*

**Regular Meeting Portion**

1. **Roll Call.** Chairman DiMascio opened the meeting about 10:00 am. He took roll call by asking board members to respond when their called. Jen Hoyt, Fred Lonardo, Mike Grover, Dana Haagensen, Kevin Hastings, Vernon Woodworth, Mike DiMascio, Doug Anderson, Erik Eklund, Barry Gehrom, Dave Horton, and Dan Walsh all responded to their in attendance.
2. **Review\Vote** technical review of questions and answers, intended to be added to Official Interpretation 2014-01. Chairman DiMascio had Dan Wash explain the BBRS sent two questions, identified in the red font as questions 10 and 11 on the DRAFT Interpretation 2014-01 (**EXHIBIT B**). Also explained was the BBRS gave the Existing Building Code Committee a specific charge, to perform



a technical review of the two questions. Chairman DiMascio introduced Mike Guigli, the author of the questions and answers to explain and provide background.

Mike Guigli explained that question 10 based on *work area* defined in the existing building code. He talked about the work area definition includes an intended area of work, and excludes portions of the building not initially/intended to undergo work becomes necessary as a result of a code provision requires some additional work not initially planned. The group discussed this issue and several agreed that work performed outside the intended work area could be considered something other than the work area.

Mike Grover talked about how industry has been applying the work area and thinks work area methodologies need to be better understood. The IEBC does not define reconfigured space and he spoke about treating reconfigured space, as incidental work would help question 10.

Doug Anderson thinks question number 5 in the DRAFT Interpretation 2014-01 clarifies reconfigured space when applying work area at the project design phase (i.e., changing the manner in which occupants egress from the space; travel or distance to exit). Moving walls that do not change the egress do not influence “work area”.

Vernon Woodworth spoke about question 10 and 11 are examples of incidental work. He also thinks the egress distance has to change for the work to count towards work area. Mike DiMascio agreed but he thinks the example, which removes the chimney, does change the scope of work. Mike Grover thinks examples “a” and “c” is considered incidental work, and examples “b” and “d” qualify as work area.

Dana Haagensen expressed concern that each answer to question 10 ends with “work area” = 0 and this might confuse folks to the extent that this conclusion would apply to the entire project. He also expressed concern that the answer to d in question 10 might affect insurance loss policies which only allow for replacement to the as is condition.

Chairman DiMascio suggested the group consider a vote to change reconfigured space in question 10 to incidental work.

Jen Hoyt spoke about issues with considering work triggered by another incidental matter. She does not consider reconstructing stairs incidental work and expressed concern about applying the code in this way has the effect of circumventing the thresholds in the code. Doug Anderson spoke about the prescriptive code language includes an exception for stair reconstruction and about how additional work triggered by a code requirement not considered work area.

At this point in the discussion, Jen Hoyt spoke about the questions do not mesh with the answers and suggested that Mike Guigli rework. Mike Guigli talked about his willingness to reworking the questions.

On a **MOTION** by Dana Haagensen seconded by Jen Hoyt it was a unanimous vote to ask Mike Guigli to revise the questions as this group feels the issue is an important. Jen Hoyt, Fred Lonardo, Mike Grover, Dana Haagensen, Erik Eklund, Barry Gehrom, Dave Horton, Mike DiMascio, Kevin Hastings, Vernon Woodworth, and Doug Anderson all responded in the affirmative. Dan Walsh abstained.

The group then provided Mike Guigli with guidance related to question 10, which included incorporating the code reference in the answer to “b”, and he should consider that Chapter 8 in the IEBC already includes an AAB exception. Not everyone in the group agreed that answer “a” is considered reconfigured space. Some suggested either consider expanding answer “d” or remove it.

As to question 11, the group suggestions included, the code allows no work area considerations in situations, which include moving walls that do not change the existing egress. Some think this application can result in situations whereby a three family use would not need to include fire sprinklers as part of compliance. Some spoke about property owners nowadays choose to remove the second egress and install fire sprinklers as a code compliance path.

Mike Guigli spoke about his appreciation for the feedback today and is thinking about removing the term “reconfigured space”. He expressed interest with reworking the questions and answers.

On a **MOTION** by Doug Anderson seconded by Jen Hoyt it was a unanimous vote to ask Mike Guigli to revise the question because the question describes reconfiguring space and has an inclusion of no reconfigured space and the group supports this effort. Jen Hoyt, Fred Lonardo, Mike Grover, Dana Haagensen, Erik Eklund, Barry Gehrom, Dave Horton, Mike DiMascio, Kevin Hastings, Vernon Woodworth, Dan Walsh, and Doug Anderson all responded in the affirmative.

#### **EXHIBITS:**

---

- A. Meeting Agenda June 29, 2020.
- B. 2014\_01 Official Interpretation Existing Buildings DRAFT 6-29-2020.