



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



Building
Codes
Division

Department of Consumer
and Business Services

Building Codes Structures Board

Meeting agenda

Meeting date: February 4, 2026

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: This meeting will be open to the public. **This is a hybrid meeting.**

Virtual connection and online streaming: View the live meeting or access the connection information for the Zoom meeting at: Oregon.gov/bcd/Pages/bcd-video.aspx

I. Board business

- A. Call to order
- B. Roll call
- C. Approval of agenda and order of business
- D. Approval of the draft board meeting minutes of [November 5, 2025](#)
- E. Date of the next scheduled meeting: May 6, 2026

II. Public comment

The board will hear public testimony, including testimony from individuals who have signed up in advance. Public Comment will be heard by virtual attendance or written testimony only.

III. Reports and updates

- A. Structural Program update
- B. Energy and Mechanical Program update

IV. Communications

[Revitalizing Oregon's existing buildings through adaptive reuse](#)

V. Appeals

There are no appeals for this meeting.

VI. Unfinished business

There is no unfinished business at this time.



1535 Edgewater St. NW
P.O. Box 14470
Salem, OR 97304



503-378-4133



bcd.info@dcbs.oregon.gov



oregon.gov/bcd

VII. New business

[Board review and approval of the division's proposed interim amendments to the governing snow load provisions for certain repairs and alterations to existing buildings in the 2025 Oregon Structural Specialty Code.](#)

VIII. Announcements

The Board Chair or board members can make announcements during this time.

IX. Adjournment

Board meetings are generally adjourned by the Board Chair.

Interpreter services or auxiliary aids for persons with disabilities are available upon advanced request. For assistance, please contact [Kaydi Milton](#) at 503-428-4169.



State of Oregon
Building Codes Structures Board
Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2025

Agenda Item I.D.

Members Present: Eric Schmidt, chair, building official
Theresa San Agustin, disabilities commission representative
Brenda Hartzog, energy supplier
Marshall McGrady, building trade representative
Lora Ratcliff, representative of a fire protection agency
Gary Heikkinen, owner/ manager of commercial office building
Jean Root, architect

Members Absent: Andrew Dykeman, vice-chair, three-plus stories general contractor
Vacancy, heavy industry construction contractor

Staff Present: Todd Smith, manager, Policy and Technical Services (PTS)
Tony Rocco, structural program chief, manager, Housing and Building Safety Section (HABS)
Richard Donovan, senior policy advisor, PTS
Kelly Thomas, technical policy analyst, PTS
Andy Boulton, senior policy advisor, HABS
Mark Heizer, mechanical and energy code engineer, PTS
Eric McMullen, structural program assistant chief, HABS
Jeremy Williams, structural program engineer, HABS
Pierre Sabagh, policy analyst, PTS
Debi Barnes-Woods, boards coordinator, PTS
Kaydi Milton, policy development coordinator, PTS

Guests Present: Dr. Rebecca Lewis, University of Oregon
Elizabeth Torske, Self

I. Board business

- A. **Call to order:** Chair Eric Schimdt called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.
- B. **Roll call:** Seven board members were in attendance virtually. Vice Chair Andrew Dykeman was excused.
- C. **Approval of agenda and order of business:** The chair ruled the agenda and order of business approved.

D. **Approval of the draft board meeting minutes:** The chair ruled the May 7, 2025, minutes final.

E. **Date of the next scheduled meeting:** February 4, 2026.

F. **Welcome new member** Theresa San Agustin was confirmed by the Interim Committee on Rules and Executive Appointments to begin serving in an unexpired term representing Oregon Disabilities Commission for the Building Codes Structures Board. Her term began October 1, 2025, and ends June 30, 2028.

Theresa San Agustin stated thank you for the introduction and I'm from Tillamook County in a small coastal town. I lost my hearing at the age of four, I am hearing impaired so I will be reading the captions for this meeting. I am a retired physician of thirty-two years and I have gained my knowledge about universal design and accessibility. I was a program manager of spinal cord injury. I am very well aware of what it takes for people with disabilities if they're not accessible in a building or public building. I have a strong interest in accessibility, I built my home in Neskowin with intent of everything being accessible. I do have a question that I would like to raise is why is the county exempt from implementing guard rail and safety hand rail in the HOA community? I don't know what it would take to implement a standard for all the community to have a safeguard or hand rail.

Chair Eric Schmidt stated some of the questions you bring up are not on the agenda today for this board however the staff at Building Codes Division can follow up in terms of the proper channels to try and advance any of those kinds of conversations.

G. Board vote for one member for membership for CIEB

Policy Analyst Pierre Sabagh, introduced this item. He explained the process of voting for a member for the Construction Industry Energy Board (CIEB) and stated the board can either vote today or can table this item to the next board meeting. Some background on the Construction Industry Energy Board, it is comprised of two board members from other respective boards and a member from the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE). The primary goal of the board is to maintain the construction energy provisions of the state of Oregon. The CIEB is scheduled to meet three times a year. If the board chooses to go through the vote today, I would open the floor for nominations, each person or individual that's nominated for membership must first accept the nomination then can speak on any interests and qualifications. Board will then take a board vote or roll call and the majority vote will become the member.

Marshall expressed his interest in serving on the CIEB.

Motion by Member Gary Heikkinen to support Marshall McGrady's membership to the Construction Industry Energy Board.

Marshall accepted the nomination and stated he is a general supervising electrician here in the state of Oregon and is a training director for NIBW electrical training center here in Portland, Oregon. He has done a lot of extensive work with the department of energy

when he was the political director for Local 48.

Roll call vote taken.

Aye: Lora Ratcliff, Brenda Hartzog, Gary Heikkinen, Theresa San Agustin, Marshall McGrady, and Chair Eric Schmidt.

Nay: None

Motion carried.

II. Public comment- None

III. Reports and updates

A. Structural Program Update

Chief Rocco, structural program chief, Housing and Building Safety Section Manager, stated the 2025 OSSC was approved through the efforts of this board and became initially effective in the state on October 1st. The administrative provisions of chapter one became mandatorily applicable statewide also on October 1st in all municipalities, while the remainder of the code has that intentionally flexible phase-in period. The remainder of the code will become mandatory on April 1st 2026. It will still have the option of the use of the 2022 OSSC or the new 2025 iteration with the exception of those administrative chapter one provisions. Chapter one has been posted on the division's website since September and is now available to print, download and save. The division is also happy to announce that there are physical code books out with building officials and in their staff's possession.

Chief Rocco wanted to take a moment to show appreciation of all the hard work and effort for everyone involved in the publishing process. The division exceeded our goal for the publishing process and the division is currently repeating these steps right now in the review committee phase for the 2026 Oregon Residential Specialty Code (ORSC) under the purview of the Residential and Manufactured Structures Board. The division has been working hard on developing training for the 2025 iteration of the OSSC and it will be free to access with online video accessibility on our division's webpage. Lastly, the team remains engaged in our joint Housing Accountability and Production Office known as HAPO, which was created under our governor's housing initiatives in 2024, particularly Senate Bill 1537. The board will benefit from hearing about one of the study components being conducted through the HAPO team by the experts at the University of Oregon.

B. Energy Program Update

Chief Heizer, mechanical and energy engineer, stated the 2025 Oregon Mechanical Specialty Code (OMSC) has gone through the same process as the ORSC, including the code change training for mechanical officials. The division did a lot of work this code cycle to make sure that there was a good alignment between the mechanical and structural codes. The ORSC Chapter 11 code committee has wrapped up their work and that work will be going to the board next year for inclusion in the next residential code on the commercial side. The division is continuing to develop more materials to help with application of the 2025 Oregon Energy Efficiency Specialty Code, continuing to work on additional outreach to organizations such as lighting designers, architects, mechanical

engineers, and the industry. I would like to take a moment and say thank you to Marshall McGrady for joining the Construction Industry Energy Board, we look forward to working with you along with Gary Heikkinen.

C. Legislative Update

Policy Analyst Pierre Sabagh, stated in your board packet today there is a 2025 division legislative report. There is one specific bill that may be of interest to the board was House Bill 3505. This bill prohibits municipalities from increasing system development charges for the installation of larger water meter if the sole reason for that meter is the installation of a 13D residential fire sprinkler system. This bill had a targeted effort to increase affordability and remove a barrier to residential construction in infill lots and other sites that are difficult to develop. This bill was championed by the division, with the support of Governor Tina Kotek.

IV. Communications

University of Oregon presentation on the study of the impact of state programs, policies, and plans on housing production

Tony Rocco, structural program chief and Housing and Building Safety Section Manager, stated the Housing Accountability and Production Office (HAPO) is jointly operated with our colleagues and friends at the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and was created by Senate Bill 1537 in 2024. One primary mission and focus of HAPO is to facilitate housing development solutions and help customers navigate the complexities of local housing development processes. In addition to creating the joint office, Senate Bill 1537 also directed HAPO to report back on our government actions that impact housing production at both the state and local level. HAPO is working with the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy Research and Engagement on analysis of statewide programs, policies, plans and processes that impact housing production. Today, we are lucky to have Dr. Rebecca Lewis from University of Oregon to talk a bit more about the plan for that study and analysis and ways to engage.

Dr. Rebecca Lewis stated this project focuses on state level barriers to housing production. I'll list the agencies that we're looking at in the next couple slides but we're looking at programs that both hinder and help housing production across agencies and performing the research in conjunction with HAPO. There's a parallel study that ECONorthwest is the lead on that is looking predominantly at the local process and permitting barriers. We're also involved in that team but not playing the lead role, the kickoff for that project just happened yesterday, November 4th. There is a focus on identifying the barriers and setting priorities for how resources are used. Overall, we're first trying to wrap our arms around all the different ways that state agency programs affect housing production. We have been working to identify and analyze plans, policies, programs, and procedures and we have developed a questionnaire that has gone out to state agencies and is due today. A part of this process is assessing the effectiveness and reducing and eliminating these barriers so we are seeking to gather perspectives from a diverse range of stakeholders. Talking to government officials, at a local level predominantly, but representing not just planning but also building code officials, public works, and even looking at private and nonprofit sectors. We are working on the Senate

Bill 1537, section five reports, and ultimately developing actionable legislation in this report that will go to the legislature in September. We have started looking at other studies that have been conducted on state agency barriers in Oregon and in other states to see what's been said before. We're wrapping up this inventory of all the programs, policies, procedures that related to housing production from each agency. We are on the cusp of launching our multi-stakeholder survey which will be running in December and we'll be analyzing those results and feeding those into our focus groups which be happening in the winter. These focus groups are either focused on sector, topic, or region but getting broad perspectives from across the state with different city sizes. Which then will lead us to conducting some scoping interviews with agency officials to try to talk about how programs work and make sure we understand the context. We will be focusing on land supply, land readiness, state financing, infrastructure process, and permitting. The decision was made through HAPO and the governor's office to exclude materials, labor, and construction industry barriers.

After all of this we will be triangulating all this great information that we're getting from our research to do some program and policy analysis and provide some implications and recommendations in this legislative report. The final report that includes actionable recommendations for state agencies around reducing barriers to housing production and maximizing the use of state resources to enhance residential development. We are working on having a report early summer for lots of comments and review before the final report goes to the legislature in September.

Board member, Theresa San Agustin asked if HOA was included as part of the study for public housing?

Dr. Rebecca Lewis stated yes, it includes all types of residential housing development.

Chair Eric Schmidt asked if survey would be sent out to planning directors and public work directors?

Dr. Rebecca Lewis stated yes, we have an email list from League of Oregon Cities of all the public work directors and city administrators. We even have a list of all the planning directors and contract planners that are working with them. In the past when we've done these studies, we focused only on planners but we're excited to broaden out this reach to look at engineering and building officials and others, who are touching this process in different ways.

V. Appeals - None

VI. Unfinished business - None

VII. New business- None

VIII. Announcements - None

IX. Adjournment

Chair Eric Schmidt adjourned the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kaydi Milton, policy development coordinator.

Revitalizing Oregon's existing buildings through adaptive reuse

Oregon Building Codes Division (BCD) is providing this backgrounder to share regulatory information and describe technical services for the support of adaptive reuse of existing buildings across the state.

Adaptive reuse

Adaptive reuse, the sustainable practice of repurposing existing buildings, is occurring in communities across Oregon. Rather than demolishing and rebuilding, adaptive reuse extends the life of existing structures, often transforming underutilized or vacant, non-residential buildings (e.g., retail, office, hotel) into vibrant housing or mixed use developments. This approach not only supports urban regeneration but also contributes to strengthened communities, particularly as Oregon explores building more multifamily housing projects across the state to meet housing demand and provide more affordable options to all Oregonians.

BCD provides flexible tools within the state building code to facilitate safe and efficient conversions through policy guidance, technical support, and collaboration with local jurisdictions. BCD is committed to enabling adaptive reuse projects that enhance livability, preserve community character, and expand Oregon's housing supply.

Increasing housing through adaptive reuse of existing buildings

BCD's statutory authority, as well as established customer service programs, are in alignment with the implementation of adaptive reuse projects that support statewide housing goals.

Key milestones include:

- May 2022: BCD issued an initial *Adaptive Reuse of Existing Buildings Memorandum* outlining tools in the building code that support adaptive reuse.
- July 2024: In addition to existing roles and responsibilities of the BCD Structural Program, the Housing and Building Safety (HABS) section was formed. HABS is part of the joint office between the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and BCD called the Housing Accountability and Production Office (HAPO), which was created by Senate Bill 1537 (2024). HAPO became operational on July 1, 2025, with a primary focus of supporting increased housing development, the Governor's housing production initiatives, and to assist in the removal of related development process barriers.
- December 2024: A BCD report was submitted to the Legislature that recognized building reuse, including reuse of an existing building's primary structural frame and exterior wall envelope, as a code-supported strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase housing production.
- October 2025: With the adoption of the 2025 OSSC, BCD reaffirmed flexible code compliance and application options for the adaptive reuse of existing buildings.
- November 2025: HAPO kicked off the Local Residential Development Process Improvement Study, which is one part of the HAPO directed analysis of state and local programs, policies, and process that impact housing development required by Senate Bill 1537 (2024). The study focuses on local government processes that impact housing development, with a particular emphasis on land use, public works, local infrastructure, and construction permitting.

Regulatory provisions and options for the reuse of existing buildings

Statewide building code provisions include flexibility in regulating adaptive reuse. Moreover, BCD provides adaptive reuse support services that maintain robust safety standards while prioritizing plan reviews and permitting, especially in rural and underserved communities. For existing buildings, the Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC) recognizes the International Existing Building Code (IEBC), and facilitates greater compliance, increased safety, and reasonable safeguards while encouraging adaptive reuse. Existing building projects can be complicated and most often require the expertise of a registered design professional familiar with existing building code provisions. While building officials' roles do not include providing any type of design advice or pre-project development summaries listing all existing nonconforming elements of a given existing building slated for adaptive reuse, the building officials across our state, including those at the division, are great sources of general project facilitation and should be contacted early on in the existing building project process.

Regulatory applicability: Projects involving the reuse of existing buildings are governed by Chapter 34 of the OSSC, which is a modified version of the IEBC. Existing building regulatory provisions are applicable to alteration, addition, and potential changes of use, character, or occupancy for all building types.

Chapter 34 of the OSSC: The Oregon-integrated IEBC noted above outlines three compliance methods in Sections 3403.1.3.1, 3403.1.3.2, and 3403.1.3.3 for customers to consider; prescriptive, work area, and performance.

- The Prescriptive Compliance Method follows a more traditional code application hierarchy; consistent with historic compliance paths of Chapter 34 from earlier International Building Code iterations as well as the Uniform Building Code.
- The Work Area Compliance Method outlines varied levels of work scope based on the type of work proposed and the actual area of the existing building being impacted. This method focuses on compliance tiers proportionate to the designated levels of work and provides for more flexible design options, particularly where only a portion of the building is undergoing alterations or changes of use or occupancy.
- The Performance Compliance Method comprises elements from historic rehabilitation codes including the Uniform Code for Building Conservation. It uses a numerical scoring system and evaluation of existing building elements to determine necessary compliance. This method is popular for existing buildings constructed prior to Oregon's first statewide building code in 1974.

Changes to existing Risk Category: Regardless of the compliance method selected, any proposed increase to the existing Risk Category of the building may trigger additional seismic loading compliance considerations for a project.

A common misunderstanding of existing building regulation is regarding mandatory "seismic upgrades" for every change of use or adaptive reuse project. There are no such requirements under application of the state building code that automatically apply simply due to a building being existing. Local municipalities also have exclusive statutory authority to develop local seismic rehabilitation plans and programs entirely outside administration and enforcement of the state building code.

Under application of OSSC Chapter 34, demonstration of an existing building's ability to meet modern seismic design requirements is only relevant where a newly proposed use and occupancy of the existing building increases the assumed level of inherent risk to the occupants (i.e. increase in Risk Category such as changing a standard office building into a theater; transforming a commercial retail space into a school; and changing from a storage or utility occupancy to a residential or office space).

Major structural alterations also require structural design compliance as specified by OSSC Chapter 34. In these cases, current code requirements apply to all impacted areas of the existing building, as well as to the new work. Seismic design requirements and associated loading from current code are necessary performance considerations for these types of planned structural modifications and alterations.

Existing building accessible design: Conversions into covered multifamily dwellings.

OSSC Chapter 34 includes provisions in Section 3403 that apply to all three compliance methods. This includes accessibility compliance for all existing buildings in Section 3403.6. These requirements must be considered regardless of the compliance method selected for a given project.

There is common misapplication of accessibility compliance for projects where existing buildings or portions thereof are being converted to multifamily use. The accessible unit compliance paths of Chapter 34 align with the federal Fair Housing Act (FHA) and include the concept of “first occupancy.”

The FHA, and state building code, intentionally only apply accessible unit design requirements to covered multifamily dwellings currently built for “first occupancy,” meaning newly constructed. Conversions of any existing building, or portion thereof, into multifamily dwellings do not require any type of mandated accessible unit design compliance. “First occupancy” is defined as “a building that has never before been used for any purpose.”

Customers may always elect to voluntarily exceed minimum code requirements, and provide accessible unit design where an existing building is being converted to multifamily use. Any common use spaces or amenities and all areas of public accommodation (e.g. a leasing office) still require appropriate levels of accessible design compliance, dependent on the overall scope of work.

Existing building regulatory provisions and options for energy efficiency

Regulatory applicability: For adaptive reuse of existing building projects, the energy code requirements are in the Oregon Energy Efficiency Specialty Code (OEESC) as well as the OSSC. They both have general applications.

Additions, alterations, renovations, or repairs shall conform to energy provisions in the building codes. Unaltered areas of existing buildings may remain as-is. Maintenance of existing energy-related systems to return them to working order shall not be considered an alteration.

The OEESC, which is based on ASHRAE 90.1, has provisions that apply to new energy-related installations and alterations. The applicable sections include:

ASHRAE 90.1, Section 4.2.1.3. Alterations of existing building assemblies, systems, and equipment shall comply with the provisions of Section 4.2.2 through 4.2.5 and one of the following options:

- a. Section 5, “Building Envelope”; Section 6, “Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning”; Section 7, “Service Water Heating”; Section 8, “Power”; Section 9, “Lighting”; Section 10, “Other Equipment” and Section 11, “Additional Efficiency Requirements,” or*
- b. Section 12, “Energy Cost Budget Method,” or*
- c. Normative Appendix G, “Performance Rating Method”*

The OSSC has provisions that apply to new energy-related installations and alterations. The applicable sections include:

- OSSC Section 3409.7.1. Level 3 alterations to existing buildings or structures are permitted without requiring the entire building or structure to comply with the energy requirements of the energy code.
- OSSC Section 3403.2. Mechanical and electrical code compliance is addressed as additional codes in the reuse existing buildings.

Substantial alterations, defined as “where a major renovation of part or all of an existing building includes major replacement of at least two major building systems”, expand the energy code compliance scope beyond general application. The following sections are applicable to substantial alteration projects involving the reuse of existing buildings:

- All new lighting and all new HVAC systems shall comply with ASHRAE 90.1, Section 11.1.4.1.
- The total number of energy credits required for the project is determined in ASHRAE 11.5.1, part c. Projects that are not initial build-out construction shall achieve 50% of the total of credits required in Table 11.5.1-1 for the building use type in the substantial alteration portion of the building.

BCD technical services for adaptive reuse of existing buildings and related projects

BCD is available to address questions and provide informal interpretations to support local municipalities relative to the applicability of the building codes for adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Project teams are encouraged to consult with BCD staff for assistance with:

- On-site walkthroughs and consultations where appropriate
- Site-specific code solutions and related pathways
- Guidance on reasonable safeguards for site-specific challenges
- Consultations on optional compliance pathways
- Damage repair allowances without triggering unrelated upgrades
- Ensuring alterations do not reduce existing levels of code compliance
- Coordination with local building officials and local fire service representatives

Questions?

Visit the division website to [contact a building code specialist](#).

Agenda Item VII.

State of Oregon

Board memo

Building Codes Division

February 4, 2026

To: Building Code Structures Board

From: Ian Paik, Policy Analyst

Subject: 2025 OSSC Proposed Interim Amendments

Action requested:

Review and approve the division's proposed interim amendments to the governing snow load provisions for certain repairs and alterations to existing buildings in the 2025 Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC).

Background:

A significant change in snow load design has occurred between the 2022 and 2025 Oregon Structural Specialty Codes (OSSC). The 2025 OSSC, which is based on the 2024 International Building Code, now references the American Society of Engineer's ASCE 7-22 Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures.

ASCE 7-22 introduced new mapping techniques and design methodologies that resulted in substantial increases in design snow loads for certain Oregon regions. This update represents a national shift from a "uniform hazard" to a "uniform risk" snow design approach. By incorporating 40 years of the latest data and advanced reliability analysis, the new standards aim to provide consistent safety levels across all climates and topography.

This transition was vetted and recommended by both the Structural Engineers Association of Oregon and Building Codes Structures Board during the 2025 OSSC adoption process.

The proposed amendments align with the intent of OSSC Chapter 34, which provides a controlled departure from new construction requirements for specific scopes of work. These changes provide necessary flexibility for certain repairs and alterations, allowing continued use of existing buildings while maintaining reasonable safety standards without imposing the burden of new design snow loads unless certain conditions trigger their application.

At the request of the division, in 2025, the Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO) Board of Directors and Code Committee reviewed the proposed interim amendments to the following sections of the 2025 OSSC: 3404.5.2.1, 3404.5.2.1.2, 3404.5.2.4, 3405.3.3, 3407.6.2, and 3408.5.2. SEAO's letter of support is provided with the proposed amendments as testimony to the board.

Options:

- Approve the division's recommended interim amendments and forward to the Administrator for rulemaking and subsequent adoption, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the occupants or the public or necessary to conserve scarce resources.
- Amend and approve the division's recommended interim amendments and forward to the Administrator for rulemaking and subsequent adoption, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the occupants or the public or necessary to conserve scarce resources.
- Disapprove the divisions recommended interim amendments and maintain the current 2025 OSSC.

STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF OREGON

9220 SW Barbur Blvd, #119, PMB #336, Portland, OR 97219

503.753.3075

www.seao.org • E-mail: jane@seao.org



To: Tony Rocco, Structural Program Chief, Oregon Building Codes Division

From: Structural Engineers Association of Oregon Board & Code Committee

Subject: 2025 OSSC Code Adoption

Date: December 11, 2025

Dear Mr. Rocco,

At the request of the Oregon Building Codes Division, the Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO) Board of Directors and Code Committee has reviewed the proposed Statewide Code Interpretation 11-01 and the interim amendment for Chapter 34 including changes to 3404.5.2.1.2, 3404.5.2.4, 3405.3.3, 3407.6.2, and 3408.5.2. Based on our review of the Statewide Code Interpretation 11-01, the board and the committee support the proposed changes to the code interpretation. In addition, based on our review of the material provided for the changes to Chapter 34 including the revision received December 4, 2025, the board and the committee support the proposed changes.

In closing, SEAO is available to review, discuss or provide any additional information that these recommendations entail, including providing technical information as required. Please call or email if there are any concerns or questions based on the above recommendations.

Sincerely,

Kylean Gunhus, PE

On Behalf of the SEAO Board of Directors

Eric R. Watson, PE, SE

On Behalf of the SEAO Code Committee

2025 Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC)

Proposed interim amendments

Changes are denoted as follows:

Blue/underline: New code language
Red/strikethrough: Deleted code language

Sections 3404.5.2.1 through 3404.5.2.1.2

3404.5.2.1 (405.2.1) Repairs for less than substantial structural damage. Unless otherwise required by this section, for damage less than *substantial structural damage*, the damaged structural elements shall be permitted to be restored to their predamage condition. ~~Where either of the following conditions exist, repair of the damaged structural elements shall comply with the requirements of this code for new construction:~~

- ~~1. The damage is deemed *dangerous*.~~
- ~~2. The damaged structural elements, in their predamage condition, have a demand-capacity ratio greater than 1.5 for ASD load combinations or 1.3 for LRFD load combinations as determined by Section 1605, using dead loads and live loads determined in accordance with Sections 1606 and 1607.~~

3404.5.2.1.1 (405.2.1.1) Snow damage. Structural components whose damage was caused by or related to snow load effects shall be repaired, replaced or altered to satisfy the requirements of Section 1608.

3404.5.2.1.2 Critical damage. Where either of the following conditions exist, repair of the damaged structural elements shall comply with the requirements of this code for new construction:

1. The damage is deemed *dangerous*.
2. The damaged structural elements, in their predamage condition, have a demand-capacity ratio greater than 1.5 for ASD load combinations or 1.3 for LRFD load combinations as determined by Section 1605, using dead loads and live loads determined in accordance with Sections 1606 and 1607.

Exception: Where this damage was not caused by or related to snow load effects, it shall be permitted to use the applicable design snow load provisions of the building code in effect at the time the existing, valid certificate of occupancy was issued.

Section 3404.5.2.4

3404.5.2.4 (405.2.4) Substantial structural damage to gravity load-carrying components. Gravity load-carrying components that have sustained *substantial structural damage* shall be retrofitted to comply with the applicable gravity load provisions for new construction in this code. Undamaged gravity load-carrying components, including undamaged foundation components, that receive gravity loads from retrofitted components shall also be retrofitted if required to comply with these design loads.

Exception: Where this damage was not caused by or related to snow load effects, it shall be permitted to use the applicable design snow load provisions of the building code in effect at the time the existing, valid certificate of occupancy was issued.

Section 3405.3.3

3405.3.3 (503.3) Existing structural elements carrying gravity load. Any existing gravity load-carrying structural element for which an *alteration* causes an increase in design gravity loads of more than 5 percent shall be replaced or altered as needed to carry the gravity loads required by this code for new structures. Any existing gravity load-carrying structural element whose gravity load-carrying capacity is decreased as part of the *alteration* shall be shown to have the capacity to resist the applicable design gravity loads required by this code for new structures.

Exceptions:

1. It shall be permitted to use the applicable design snow load provisions of the building code in effect at the time the existing, valid certificate of occupancy was issued.
2. Buildings in which the increased dead load is due entirely to the addition of a second layer of roof covering weighing 3 pounds per square foot (0.1437 kN/m²) or less over an existing single layer of roof covering.

Section 3407.6.2

3407.6.2 (706.2) Addition or replacement of roofing or replacement of equipment. Any existing gravity load-carrying structural element for which an *alteration* causes an increase in design gravity load of more than 5 percent shall be replaced or altered as needed to carry the design gravity loads required by this code for new structures.

Exceptions:

1. It shall be permitted to use the applicable design snow load provisions of the building code in effect at the time the existing, valid certificate of occupancy was issued.
2. Buildings in which the increased dead load is due entirely to the addition of a second layer of roof covering weighing 3 pounds per square foot (0.1437 kN/m²) or less over an existing single layer of roof covering.

Section 3408.5.2

3408.5.2 (805.2) Existing structural elements carrying gravity loads. Any existing gravity load-carrying structural element for which an *alteration* causes an increase in design gravity load of more than 5 percent shall be replaced or altered as needed to carry the design gravity loads required by this code for new structures. Any existing gravity load-carrying structural element whose gravity load-carrying capacity is decreased as part of the *alteration* shall be shown to have the capacity to resist the applicable design gravity load required by this code for new structures.

Exceptions:

1. It shall be permitted to use the applicable design snow load provisions of the building code in effect at the time the existing, valid certificate of occupancy was issued.
2. Buildings in which the increased dead load is attributable to the addition of a second layer of roof covering weighing 3 pounds per square foot (0.1437 kN/m²) or less over an existing single layer of roof covering.