



February 25, 2008

John La Torra
Committee Chairman
Task Force on Hearings
City of Redwood City
PO Box 391
Redwood City, CA 94064

PRESIDENT

JOE KIRKPATRICK, S.E., C.B.O.
Deputy Building Official
City of Irvine

VICE PRESIDENT

HADI TABATABAEE, P.E., C.B.O.
Chief Building Official
City of Fullerton

SECRETARY

DAVID KHORRAM, P.E., C.B.O.
Building Official
City of Fullerton

TREASURER

ANTHONY WEIMHOLT, C.B.O.
Building and Safety Manager
City of Norwalk

PAST PRESIDENT

GERALD CARAIG, P.E., C.B.O.
Permit and Plan Check Manager
City of Huntington Beach

COMMITTEES:

EDUCATION CHAIR

GABRIEL LINARES, P.E.
Building and Safety Manager
City of Brea

**CODE INTERPRETATION
CHAIR**

FAISAL JURDI, P.E., C.B.O.
Deputy Building Official
City of Newport Beach

**PUBLIC RELATIONS AND
MEMBERSHIP CHAIR**

KHANH NGUYEN, P.E., C.B.O.
Building Official
City of Costa Mesa

Subject: Qualified Endorsement of Proposed Four-Year Code Development Cycle

Dear Mr. La Torra:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Orange Empire Chapter of the International Code Council in regard to the effort underway to improve the Code Development Cycle. First, let me thank you and your fellow task force members for undertaking this endeavor and for all the hard work that has occurred to date.

Of the proposals being offered at this time, the Four-Year Cycle options is most appealing. The reasons for our endorsement explain the core features which we appreciate in Option 4 regardless of the cycle being 4 years. We offer a *qualified* endorsement until the following points are considered and addressed.

The following summarizes our position and concerns:

Final Action Hearings to be held at Annual Business Meetings. This element is considered crucial to the integrity and effectiveness of the process. Only under this scenario can there occur a high rate of participation from the voting membership. The premise that the voting membership can consistently attend *separate* ABMs and final Action Hearings, typically in remote locations, within a 12 month period, is simply not reasonable. And a process that does not achieve a high degree of participation of the voting membership at the *final action* can not be deemed effective.

Four-Year Code Development Cycle. This element is appealing because it reduces the frequency of code adoptions along with the associated administrative duties of the local building official. This would allow code officials greater opportunity to thoroughly learn and adjust to code editions, with

the added benefit of more informed and knowledgeable members participating in code development. This would also afford the building official (the voting member) greater opportunity to participate in ICC business in general. This element does, however, create the following concerns:

1. Can all reference standards cycles be adjusted to be compatible with a four-year cycle?
2. Can state law be amended to eliminate the statutory mandate to adopt state codes on a three year cycle?

Conclusion. The Orange Empire Chapter would fully support the proposal if these two concerns are satisfactorily addressed. If they can not, however, a third option should be developed in which *all* Final Action Hearing occur at ABMs.

We appreciate this chance to provide input for the Task Force's consideration.

Please contact me at (949) 724-6320 should you wish to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,


Joe Kirkpatrick
President