NBSIR 77-1413

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS

Sandra A. Berry, Editor

Office of Building Standards and Codes Services
Center for Building Technology
Institute for Applied Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

Held in Santa Fe, New Mexico
April 27 - May 1, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Juanita M. Kreps, *Secretary*

Dr. Sidney Harman, *Under Secretary*

Jordan J. Baruch, *Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology*

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, Ernest Ambler, *Acting Director*

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

ABSTRACT

This document contains the edited proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS), held in Santa Fe, New Mexico, April 27 - May 1, 1975.

In addition, it includes listing of the State Delegates and Committee members for the 8th Annual Conference Year, and the Committee Reports, as finalized, submitted and approved by the State Delegates to NCSBCS, meeting in Annual Session.

Key words: ASHRAE 90-P; building codes; mobile homes; 8th Annual Conference, NCSBCS; National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards; proceedings.

INTRODUCTION

The National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS) had its formal beginning in Wisconsin in 1967. This beginning represented a response by the States to recommendations prepared by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for intergovernmental reforms in the area of building codes. The formative meeting was a direct outgrowth of an earlier exploratory meeting called by the National Bureau of Standards. At this meeting, State representatives discussed the idea of creating a national organization of States similar to the National Conference on Weights and Measures, assisted by the National Bureau of Standards. This organization would lead to cooperative solutions regarding the multiple problems in the entire U.S. building regulatory process.

In 1967, the Governor of Wisconsin issued an invitation to the States to gather in Wisconsin to address the problem, to develop an organization which could effectively respond to this national need, and to consider the offer of assistance by the National Bureau of Standards. Representatives from 16 States attended this meeting and unanimously agreed to form the NCSBCS and to accept the secretariat role offered by the National Bureau of Standards.

The Conference is structured to develop technical and general recommendations in the field of comprehensive building code administration, and to explore opportunities to improve the entire system of this important segment of governmental regulatory service.

Between the time of this 8th Annual NCSBCS Conference and October, 1976, many significant changes have taken place within NCSBCS itself, and in the NCSBCS/NBS relationship. It had previously been decided that these proceedings would not be published. The completion of the NBS Secretariat role was a major milestone in the NCSBCS, Inc. organizational development. Thus, in order to complete the record of NBS Secretariat support, NCSBCS requested NBS to publish these proceedings. Some of these changes both within NCSBCS and in NCSBCS/NBS relationship are:

* In July of 1975 the NCSBCS was incorporated.

* In October of 1975, NCSBCS, Inc., hired its own Executive Director.

* Negotiations between NCSBCS, Inc., and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development led to a contract of May 26, 1976, for NCSBCS, Inc. to monitor the mobile home enforcement program, mandated by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

* Negotiations between NCSBCS, Inc., and the Energy Research and Development Administration led to a contract on June 15, 1976, for NCSBCS, Inc. to develop and carry out training programs in the building energy area.

* A phase-out of the NBS administrative assistance to NCSBCS, Inc., and an increase in technical assistance to NCSBCS, Inc., began during the summer of 1976; NBS administrative assistance was completed October 1, 1976.

* In July of 1976, NCSBCS, Inc., opened its offices in McLean, Virginia.

* NCSBCS, Inc., began vigorously to hire staff to carry out its contract responsibilities and its normal day-to-day operations. NCSBCS, Inc. now employs about 30 persons.

* NBS holds a voting membership on each of the NCSBCS, Inc. standing committees, and NBS provides a senior technical advisor to the NCSBCS, Inc. Board of Directors.

Several items of business discussed in these proceedings were incomplete at the time of the Conference. Since then, final action has been taken. These items are denoted by a double asterisk (**) and are discussed on pages 30 and 31 of the text. They are:

** On April 19, 1976, the President nominated 18 persons to serve on the initial National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) Board; nominations were confirmed by the Senate on June 24, 1976; nominees were sworn in on July 9, 1976.

** Public Law 94-168, "Metric Conversion Act of 1975," was signed by the President on December 23, 1975.

** NBS Technical Note 915, "Metrication Problems in the Construction Codes and Standards Sector," was issued in July 1976.

Acknowledgements

The editor appreciates the invaluable assistance rendered by the State House, Mr. David McNeill; his gracious wife, Muriel; and his most helpful staff, in addition to the following members of the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services: Mr. James G. Gross, Mr. Charles T. Mahaffey, Mr. Patrick W. Cooke, Mr. Robert M. Eisenhard, Mr. James H. Pielert, Mr. Bertram Vogel, and Ms. Kathy Pearce. The support rendered by the individuals greatly helped to achieve a most successful 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards.

The metric measurement units shown throughout the text have been converted and rounded, where appropriate, and are followed by the customary unit in parentheses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract iii
Introduction iv
Acknowledgments v
Table of Contents vi
List of Officers for 1974 - 1975 vii
List of State Delegates viii
List of Abbreviations xiii

Official Opening of Eighth Annual Business Session
Roll Call of Delegates 1

Welcome
Ms. Ernestine Duran Evans
New Mexico Secretary of State 5

Report of the Auditing Committee 7
Report of the Resolutions Committee 8

Report from the National Bureau of Standards/
Secretariat & Formal Technical Research Programs Reviews

Dr. Richard N. Wright
Director, Center for Building Technology 23

Mr. James G. Gross
Chief, Office of Building Standards and Codes Services 27

Mr. Gene A. Rowland
Chief, Standards Application and Analysis Division 32

Presentation of the Report of the Executive Committee 45

Presentation of the Report of the
Standards and Evaluation Committee 47

Presentation of the Report of the
Reciprocity Committee 48

Presentation of the Report of the
Education and Qualification Committee 49

Presentation of the Report of the
Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee 50

Election of Officers 55

Report on ASHRAE 90P 62

Discussion of Proposed Constitution & Organization Plan 64

Appendix I - List of Attendees 99
Appendix II - Executive Committee Annual Report 104
Appendix III - Standards & Evaluation Committee Annual Report 106
Appendix IV - Education & Qualification Committee Annual Report 112
Appendix V - Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee
Annual Report 117
Appendix VI - Reciprocity Committee Annual Report 121
Appendix VII - Bylaws of NCSBCS, Inc. 125

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS, INC.

1974 - 1975 Officers

Conference Chairman: Delmont C. Thurber
State of Montana

Immediate Past Chairman: Bernard E. Cabelus
State of Connecticut

Southern Regional Chairman: Charles E. Talmage
State of Texas

Western Regional Chairman: Harry Baker (deceased)
State of Oregon

Midwestern Regional Chairman: Kenneth C. Henke, Jr.
State of Iowa

Northeastern Regional Chairman: Charles J. Dinezio
State of Massachusetts

Members-at-Large: Charles J. Betts
State of Indiana

Glen R. Swenson
State of Utah

David McNeill
State of New Mexico

Edward Kimsey
State of Tennessee

STATE DELEGATES
to the
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS

ALABAMA (S)

John R. Farris, Chief Architect
State of Alabama Building Commission
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104
(205) 269-7266

ALASKA (W)

Ronald A. Hendrie
State Fire Marshal
Department of Public Safety, Pouch N
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907) 586-2946

ARIZONA (W)

Erik V. Thorne, Director
Division of Building Codes
1645 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 271-4072

J. Edward Swanty**
Superintendent of Building Inspections
City of Mesa
P. O. Box 1466
Mesa, Arizona 85201
(602) 262-6981

ARKANSAS (S)

Charles T. Crow, Director
Department of Planning
400 Train Station Square
Victory at Markham
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 371-1301

Jack Newbury**
Manager of the Community & Regional
Services Division
Department of Planning
Capitol Hill Building, 5th Floor
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 371-1211

CALIFORNIA (W)

James M. Hicks, Jr.
Division of Codes & Standards
Dept. of Housing & Community Development
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-9471

COLORADO (W)

James Fresques, Director
State Division of Housing
1575 Sherman
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 892-2776

CONNECTICUT (N)

Bernard E. Cabelus
State Building Inspector
Public Works Department
State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06115
(203) 566-4036

DELAWARE (N)

Calvin P. Hamilton
Architect
218 West Ninth Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 652-4200

FLORIDA (S)

John H. Haslam, Chief
Bureau of Codes & Standards
Dept. of Community Affairs
2571 Executive Center Circle, East
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(904) 488-7956

GEORGIA (S)

George Bullock, Chairman
State Building Administrative Board
P. O. Box 431
Athens, Georgia 30601
(404) 543-3852

HAWAII (W)

Joshua C. Agsolud*
Labor and Industrial Relations
825 Mililani Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801
(808) 548-3150

IDAHO (W)

Clyde Likes, Director
Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle and Manufactured Housing
506 N. 5th, Annex 3
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 384-3896

ILLINOIS (M)

Edward Jackson
Chief of Housing & Buildings
Dept. of Local Government Affairs
303 E. Monroe
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Jon D. Anderson, Research Architect**
Illinois Capital Development Board
705 State Office Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706
(217) 782-5585

INDIANA (M)

Dale R. Gatlin*
Director of Code Research
Indiana Administrative Building Council
215 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

IOWA (M)

Kenneth C. Henke, Jr.
Building Code Commissioner
Office of Planning & Programming
523 East Twelfth
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3861

KANSAS (M)

Louis J. Krueger
State Architect Director
State Office Building, 12th Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66612
(913) 296-3811

KENTUCKY (S)

Frazier Faulconer
Assistant State Fire Marshal
State Fire Marshals Office
Plaza Tower Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502) 564-3626

LOUISIANA (S)

Raymond B. Oliver
State Fire Marshal
109 State Office Building
325 Loyola Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112
(504) 527-5956

Mrs. Lee Melancon**
Director of Research
Governor's Office of Consumer Protection
P. O. Box 44091, Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

MAINE (N)

E. Francis Crowley, Engineer
Bureau of Public Improvements
State Office Building, Room 115
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-3881

MARYLAND (S)

George Lewis, Secretary
Department of General Services
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
(301) 932-8255

Willard E. Bryant, Director
Codes Administration
Department of Economic and Community Development
2525 Riva Road
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(301) 267-5161

MASSACHUSETTS (N)

Charles J. Dinezio
Executive Secretary
State Building Code Commission
141 Milk Street, 5th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 727-6916

MICHIGAN (M)

Keith Molin, Director*
Michigan Department of Labor
300 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48913
(517) 373-3575

MINNESOTA (M)

Herbert W. Meyer, Director
Building Code Division
Department of Administration
408 Metro Square Building
Seventh & Robert Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-4626

MISSISSIPPI (S)

Senator William J. Caraway
Executive Vice President
Mississippi Municipal Association
230 Sun-N-Sand Building
Jackson, Mississippi 39202
(601) 353-5854

MISSOURI (M)

John A. Cooper, AIA
Director, Division of Design and
Construction
P. O. Box 809
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
(314) 751-4174

MONTANA (W)

Delmont C. Thurber, Chairman
Montana Building Codes Advisory Council
3815 5th Avenue South
Great Falls, Montana 59405
(406) 452-0791

NEBRASKA (M)

Jacob J. Ruff*
Deputy Director
Division of Community Affairs
Dept. of Economic Development
Box 94666, State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

NEVADA (W)

William E. Hancock, Manager
Nevada State Planning Board
Nye Building, Room 225
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(702) 882-7445

Dan J. Quinan**
State Fire Marshal
101 South Fall Street, 2nd Floor
Carson City, Nevada 89701

NEW HAMPSHIRE (N)

William W. Hoffman*
Office of Comprehensive Planning
State House
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 271-2359

NEW JERSEY (N)

William Connolly, Administrator
Bureau of Housing Inspection
Department of Community Affairs
363 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-6415

NEW MEXICO (W)

David McNeill, Chief Administrator
General Construction Board
P. O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
(505) 827-2085

NEW YORK (N)

Louis Nielsen, Director
Housing & Building Codes Bureau
Division of Housing & Community Renewal
Two World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047
(212) 488-7080

NORTH CAROLINA (S)

Kern E. Church, Deputy Commissioner
Engineering Building Codes Division
Department of Industry
P. O. Box 26387
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 829-3901

NORTH DAKOTA (M)

Ben Meier, Secretary of State
Executive Office
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
(701) 224-2900

OHIO (M)

George K. Hodge, Architect
Superintendent, Building Regulation
Department of Public Safety
181 S. Washington Blvd.
Columbus, Ohio 43215

OHIO (continued)

Martin J. Hughes, Chairman**
Ohio Board of Building Standards
20525 Center Ridge Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44116
(216) 333-6363

OKLAHOMA (S)

Allie Isom, Director
Engineering Department
State Board of Public Affairs
Room 306, State Capitol Building
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
(405) 521-2111

OREGON (W)

Harry Baker, Administrator
Building Codes Division
Department of Commerce
674 Church Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 378-3176

PENNSYLVANIA (N)

Honorable William H. Wilcox
Secretary, Dept. of Community
Affairs, Room 216
South Office Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

RHODE ISLAND (N)

Frederick C. Williamson, Director
Department of Community Affairs
150 Washington Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 277-2850

SOUTH CAROLINA (S)

L. P. Hamilton, Chief Engineer
State Budget & Control Board
Office of the State Auditor
P. O. Box 11333
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 758-2469

SOUTH DAKOTA (M)

Everett N. Quam*
State Engineer
State Office Building #2
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 224-3466

TENNESSEE (S)

Edward W. Kimsey, Director
The Department of Insurance
Division of Fire Prevention
202 Capitol Towers Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
(615) 741-2981

TEXAS (S)

Charles Talmage, Director
Division of Housing
Department of Community Affairs
P. O. Box 13166, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 475-3383

UTAH (W)

Glen R. Swenson, Director
State Building Board
Room 124, State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
(801) 328-5561

VERMONT (N)

Pierre E. J. Donnet
Project Coordinator
St. Albans Target Area Program
86 N. Main Street
St. Albans, Vermont 05478
(802) 524-2194

VIRGINIA (S)

C. Sutton Mullen, Jr.
State Fire Marshal
P. O. Box 1157
Richmond, Virginia 23209
(804) 770-4751

WASHINGTON (W)

William C. Jacobs, Director
Department of Labor & Industries
General Administration Building
Olympia, Washington 98501
(206) 753-6307

WEST VIRGINIA (S)

Walter Smittle
State Fire Marshal
State Capitol, Unit 1
1800 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
(304) 348-2191

WISCONSIN (M)

John Wenning, Administrator
Industrial Safety and Buildings
Department of Industry, Labor, and
Human Relations
201 East Washington Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
(608) 266-1816

WYOMING (W)

Ed Bradley
State Fire Marshal
301 Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 820001
(307) 777-7288

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S)

William N. Dripps, Chief
Bureau of Building, Housing and Zoning
Potomac Building, Room 203
614 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 629-5050

PUERTO RICO (S)

Lic Rafael Alonso Alonso, Chairman*
Puerto Rico Planning Board
Box 9447
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00908

VIRGIN ISLANDS (S)

John E. Harding*
Director, Department of Public Works
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802

NOTE: (S) - Southern Region
(M) - Midwestern Region
(W) - Western Region
(N) - Northern Region

---

*Not an official delegate, only receiving mail until official delegate is appointed.
**Official State Delegate Alternate.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used throughout the text.

AIA----------American Institute of Architects
ANSI----------American National Standards Institute
ASHRAE----------American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers
ASTM----------American Society for Testing and Materials
BSS----------Building Science Series
CABO----------Council of American Building Officials
CBT----------Center for Building Technology
DIBA----------Domestic and International Business Administration
E&Q----------Education and Qualification Committee
ERDA----------Energy Research and Development Administration
FEA----------Federal Energy Administration
HVAC----------Heating, Ventilating, Air Conditioning
HUD----------U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
IAGLO----------International Association of Governmental Labor Officials
IAPMO----------International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials
ICBO----------International Conference of Building Officials
M&RP----------Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee
MHMA----------Mobile Home Manufacturers Association
NBS----------National Bureau of Standards
NCSBCS----------National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
NFPA----------National Fire Protection Association
NIBS----------National Institute of Building Sciences
NLAP----------National Laboratory Accreditation Program
S&E----------Standards and Evaluation Committee
TCA----------Trailer Coach Association
TIA----------Tentative Interim Amendment

EXCERPT OF
EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING
AFTERNOON SESSION
April 29, 1975
OFFICIAL OPENING

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It's now 2:00 p.m. Let the record show that this will be the opening business session of the 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards. At this time I will ask the Executive Secretary to call the roll. When the name of your State is called, if you are the delegate or the proxy, please answer. If you want to make a fifteen second Chamber of Commerce pitch for your State you may do so. Please call out your name as you answer. Mr. Rowland?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alabama?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alaska?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

MR. ERIK THORNE: Erik Thorne, Arizona.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arkansas?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

MR. JAMES M. HICKS, JR.: Jim Hicks, California.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Colorado?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

MR. BERNARD E. CABELUS: Bernard Cabelus, Connecticut.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Delaware?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Florida?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

MR. GEORGE H. BULLOCK: George Bullock, Georgia.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Hawaii?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

MR. BILL HOOP: Bill Hoop, Idaho.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

MR. DALE R. GATLIN: Dale Gatlin, Indiana.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

MR. KENNETH C. HENKE: Kenneth Henke, Iowa.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

MR. CHARLES BEARDMORE: Charles Beardmore, Kansas.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

MS. LEE MELANCON: Lee Melancon, Louisiana.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maine?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

MR. WILLARD P. McCRONE: Willard McCrone, Maryland.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

MR. CHARLES J. DINEZIO: Charles Dinezio, Massachusetts.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Michigan?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

MR. HERBERT MEYER: Herb Meyer, Minnesota.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mississippi?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Missouri?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Del Thurber, Montana.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

MR. FRED H. JOLLY: Fred Jolly, Nebraska.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nevada?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Hampshire?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

MR. WILLIAM M. CONNOLLY: Bill Connolly, New Jersey.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

MR. DAVID McNEILL: David McNeill, New Mexico, and we'll have somebody else do the pitch for our State in a moment.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

MR. KERN E. CHURCH: Kern Church, North Carolina.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Dakota?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Ohio?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

MR. ALLIE ISOM: Allie Isom, Oklahoma.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oregon?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Pennsylvania?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

MR. JOSEPH A. CIRILLO: Joe Cirillo, Rhode Island.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

MR. L.P. HAMILTON: Lawrence Hamilton, South Carolina.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Dakota?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Texas?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

MR. GLEN R. SWENSON: Glen Swenson, Utah.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Vermont?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

MR. C. SUTTON MULLEN, JR.: Sutton Mullen, Virginia.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Washington?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

MR. WALTER SMITTLE, III: Walter Smittle, West Virginia.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

MR. JOHN WENNING: John Wenning, Wisconsin.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wyoming?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Puerto Rico?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virgin Islands?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: District of Columbia?

(No response)

MR. ERIK THORNE: Mr. Secretary, I believe you did call the State of New York, and there was no answer. I recall that the delegate from the State of New York was present earlier. He may be absent now, for some reason or other, but the delegate from New York is here.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: The Constitution reads that the person must be present in order to be on the count for actions of the Conference, so when he arrives he can be added at a vote count.

MR. FRAZIER FAULCONER: Mr. Chairman, the Kentucky delegate is here.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, a count of twenty (20).

MS. JANE HERON: Mr. Chairman, Jane Heron casting the proxy vote for Illinois.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: O.K. Mr. Chairman, there are twenty-seven (27) delegates in attendance according to the roll call.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Gene. At this time, I would like very much to introduce to you, if you haven't already met him, your host of the 8th Annual Conference, a member of the New Mexico General Construction Board, and a real great guy. I'll give him the microphone right now, David McNeill.

MR. DAVID McNEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I introduce our welcoming speaker, I want to, again, announce that at 5:45 p.m. there will be three buses out in front of the hotel that will be here to take all of you who are registered, out to my wife's and my home for a reception. This reception is being sponsored by the Building Branch of the Associated General Contractors, Dave McCoy, Executive Vice-President; the Associated General Contractors, Heavy Industry Division, Bob Ragsdale, Executive Secretary; Mechanical Contractors, Bill Roth, Executive Secretary; New Mexico Home Builders Association, Howard Parsons, Executive Vice-President; and the Electrical Contractors, Tom Yondo. I am sorry that none of these gentlemen are in attendance, but I understand some of them might be with us this evening.

Now, let me make one other little announcement. Please dress warmly. I will just put it in the words of my wife, "if we have to have all of us in the house, and anybody passes out, there is not going to be room to fall down." So, some of us are going to have to be outside.

There will be plenty of food and drink for everybody, and at about a quarter of eight (7:45 p.m.) the buses will be leaving the house to bring you back here. It is my distinct pleasure, and it is the first time I have had this pleasure, and believe me, it is one, to introduce to you not only our Secretary of State, our beautiful Secretary of State I might say, but one of the most prominent people within our State. She was born here, she has lived here, and if I cannot say anything else, believe me she is a good politican.

She knows how the game is played; she is one of the most honest and forthright people it has ever been my pleasure to know. Without further adieu, I will now introduce to you Ernestine Duran Evans.

(Applause)

MRS. ERNESTINE DURAN EVANS: Destiguidos questres, dellegados y amigos y NCSBCS. Oh, I forgot; I'm not supposed to say that. I am supposed to say, distinguished guests, delegates and friends of NCSBCS, welcome to Santa Fe, and welcome to New Mexico, the Land of Enchantment.

I met the gentlemen from Iowa a little while ago, and I'll digress a little bit from my remarks here, and say I went to Iowa one time when I was eighteen years old, and with all due respect to those gentlemen from California, I think Iowa in the Spring of the year is the most beautiful State I have ever seen. The corn was just about so high and it was just beautiful. However, in Iowa, they said to me, "You are from Mexico?" "No, no, I am from New Mexico." "Yeah, Mexico." "No, no, I am from New Mexico." "Yeah, I know, well, you are from --." "No, I am not from Mexico, I am from New Mexico." So everywhere I went they asked me if I was from Mexico. Finally, I got tired of answering, "No, I am from New Mexico." So, when I was visiting some people, and they said, "How do you like Iowa?" I said, "Iowa is a beautiful State, it really is, but there must be something terribly wrong with your school system." "Oh, no, no. Why do you say that? We have the most beautiful school system. Why would you say that?" I said, "Because in New Mexico, we know that Iowa is a State of the Union, and none of you people here seem to know that New Mexico is a State of the Union."

Like David told you, I am Secretary of State in New Mexico. I have been Secretary of State before, and we do not have a limited term; I served two terms and then I laid off for four years, and I came back and ran again, and I must admit that I enjoyed running again. And I enjoyed winning, and I am back in the Capitol again, and I would like to invite all of you to come over and I will give you a tour of the Capitol.

When I was in the campaign here in New Mexico, the northern part of New Mexico, the majority of the people are Spanish, or Spanish-Americans. So I went down to Hobbs, that's the oil country of New Mexico, and they said, "Ernestine, are you sure you want to go to Hobbs? Why, they do not like the Spanish people down there." "Oh, that is ridiculous," I said. "Of course they like them." So I got up to speak and I said, "I represent the three cultures. I am Spanish, I look Indian, and my name is Evans." So how can you beat that combination?

And I would like to tell you that I do not think there is a single man, woman, or child that voted against me in Hobbs, New Mexico.

As you well know, this Conference was started by the Governor of Wisconsin back in 1967, when the first actual Conference took place and the organization adopted its governing requirements. The activities of this group are well known to the building industry, particularly concerning the problems of the nation with regard to mobile homes, energy conservation the metric system for weights and measures, innovations in fire prevention, plumbing and electrical codes, laboratory accreditation methods, and on and on and on. There is before you a new proposed organization structure, revisions to your Constitution and necessary funding thereof. The theme of this year's Conference is "Moving Forward." It is hoped that this theme will be carried out for years to come, particularly in the fields of reciprocity between the States and local jurisdictions. By this, I mean counties, cities, and State agencies. You, in the past, have been working closely with several of the Federal agencies concerned with buildings, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Bureau of Standards, Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, as well as the Federal Energy Administration. I feel sure that your cooperation with these latter Federal agencies has brought forth confidence and much satisfaction in the aid given from you to them and them to you. Now, let me give you a thought for the day. Wherever I go, I always give a little poem and this is my thought for the day:

I have to live with myself, and so,
I want to be fit for myself to know.
I want to be able, as days go by,
Always to look myself straight in the eye.
I don't want to stand with the setting sun,
And hate myself for the things I've done.
I don't want to keep on a closed shelf
A lot of secrets about myself,
And fool myself as I come and go,
Into thinking that nobody else will know
What kind of a man that I really am.
I don't want to dress-up myself in sham.
I want to go out with my head erect.
I want to deserve all men's respect.
But here, in the struggle for fame and self,
I want to be able to like myself.
I don't want to look at myself and know,
That I'm bluster, and bluff, and empty show.
I never can hide myself from me
I see what others may never see.
I know what others may never know
I never can fool myself, and so,
Whatever happens, I want to be,
Self-respecting, and conscience free.

I hope you take this to heart, and run your organization in that way.

Your work and cooperation with the several model code organizations, I am told, has been most fruitful and has produced much greater understanding of this organization, as well as their understanding your motive in moving forward, together with having these model codes coming nearer to corresponding than they have in previous years. It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to Santa Fe--the ancient city of Santa Fe. I hope that your Conference has been, and will continue to be a forward moving organization. You will find our State, and this city in particular, very quaint. It carries forth its motto, "The City Different." And it will be long-remembered and one to which I hope you will often return.

Bien benidos a Santa Fe, a tierra el encanto. Mi Casa es Su Casa, my home is your home. Estredo todos ting al buen tiempo en la Conferencia de mucho allor. God speed you on your deliberations. And, as I look around, I don't see too many ladies, I will say this. I was invited to a cocktail party the other night, and I should wait to give this toast at the cocktail party, but I will give it here. Here's to woman, once our superior, and now because of Women's Lib, our equal. Thank you.

(Standing ovation as Mrs. Evans leaves the room)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you again, Madame Secretary of State.

We will continue with the formal order of business, and call upon the Chairman of the Auditing Committee, Mr. Erik Thorne, from the State of Arizona. Erik, would you please give us the report of the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

MR. ERIK THORNE: Mr. Chairman, delegates, to begin with I think we owe a vote of thanks to Sandi Berry for the way she has kept these books. Without question, this is one of the best auditing reports I have ever come across. I have worked at it, it has been thoroughly gone over, and it has been approved. Sandi Berry approved it herself, Del Thurber has approved it for Charlie Betts, Treasurer, and Edward Kimsey, Bill Connolly, and I have approved this report. I have the original signed by all these people. Mr. Chairman, I will give this to you, and I have any number of copies which are not signed for distribution to the Executive Committee and other people who are interested in having them. And, the check books balance to the very, very penny. Not only did I take into account our own people, but my wife, who also happens to be an accountant, went over these very, very thoroughly, and although she is not a Women's Libber, she agrees wholeheartedly that Sandi has done a very outstanding job. Very rarely have I ever come across a gal who keeps every minute record to the penny. I think she must have had members of the Executive Committee and others who have had their expenses reimbursed where she has turned them down on twenty cents (20¢), and added twenty cents (20¢) here, on various other accounts. In other words, she never paid a dime unless they had a ticket to show for it. And, in other words, she used the adage, "No tickie, no washie."

Excuse me, let me have that again. I want to announce the balance which does check out in both bank books. We have two accounts. We have a checking account, and a savings account. In the savings account which balances out, we have $2,224.07, and in the checking account we have $1,144.58 which gives us a total cash on hand of $3,768.65. Now, this is income that has been generated by nothing more than the annual meetings' registration fees, and any regional meetings we may have held. We get the greater income from our annual meeting fees, telephone company rebates, the amount of monies we get in interest from our savings account is included. The 8th Annual Meeting registration fees up until the date this was prepared, the Southern Regional Committee Week income of $1,245.00, and various other items are included. The total receipts are $16,652.48. Some of you may be asking why do we have a balance today, therefore, of only $3,768.65.

The way the National Conference has been keeping itself until the present time, is by paying the expenses of the people who have to travel somewhere to meetings, and you certainly cannot expect them to pay it out of their own pockets. I have seen in auditing the account, where some of our members of the Executive Committee have paid out of their own pockets, monies that they felt that they were not legally entitled to, or money that they did not want to expend from the National Conference funds. Some of the members have gone so far as saying, "We are not legally entitled to a full refund here," because, for example, they left Washington and stopped enroute to one town, to visit the folks, and then from there they went a a Regional meeting, and they said, "Therefore, we are not charging NCSBCS for the stop that we made from Washington, D.C., to St. Louis." And this is the way that Sandi has been keeping her accounts, and again, I think we owe Sandi a deep vote of thanks for a job well done. Thank you.

(Applause)

By the way, I would recommend that this report be accepted.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman of the Auditing Committee. Acting on the recommendations of the Auditing Committee, we now have a motion to accept the report.

MR. McNEILL: I so move the audit report be accepted.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: McNeill of New Mexico moved that the audit report be accepted. Is there a second?

MR. EDWARD W. KIMSEY: I will second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Seconded by Kimsey of Tennessee. All those in favor signify by the usual sign, aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered. Dave, did you have another announcement that you wanted to make?

MR. McNEILL: No, that is all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We will now have the report of the Resolutions Committee by the Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Herb Meyer.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

MR. HERBERT MEYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce the members of the Committee, Mr. Glen Swenson from Utah, Mr. Joe Cirillo from Rhode Island, and myself. We have divided this report into two sections, and I am sure you will understand later why we have done that. But I would like to read the first set of six (6) resolutions, and then move their adoption, and then take up Resolution No. 7. Some copies have been passed out for review by various members in attendance.

Resolution No. 1:

BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards expresses its appreciation to David and Muriel McNeill, Conference Hosts, for their time and extensive efforts in assisting this 8th Annual Conference in accomodations, coordinating this program, arranging for an outing, and in many other ways contributing to the success of this meeting of NCSBCS.

Resolution No. 2:

BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards expresses its sincere thanks and appreciation to the State of New Mexico, the City of Santa Fe, and to Governor Jerry Apodaca, for the warm and gracious welcome and for the enjoyable hospitality shown to this 8th Annual Conference of NCSBCS.

Resolution No. 3:

BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards does extend its thanks and deep appreciation to the Executive Committee for its dedication to the goals of this National Conference and for its many efforts which have served to increase the growth of the Conference and to increase the influence of this Conference of States in codes and standards activities in this Nation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Conference commends and thanks the individual members of the Executive Committee and all Committee Chairmen and Committee members, whereas recognizing their duties to their individual States, these individuals have given freely of their own time and money in supporting and furthering the aims of this Conference.

FURTHER, this Conference is deeply appreciative of the dedication of these men, to the aims of the Conference.

Resolution No. 4:

BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards extends its sincere appreciation, gratitude, and highest commendation to Conference Chairman Del Thurber for his dedication to the goals and aims of this Conference, and for the immense amount of time and effort he has given to this Conference and its programs.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that this 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards expresses its heartfelf appreciation and thanks to all of those who have provided the excellent and highly valued staff assistance so necessary to the success of the Conference, and the achievement of its goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Conference individually thank and commend James G. Gross, Charles T. Mahaffey, Robert Eisenhard, Bertram Vogel, Sandra Berry, Kathy Pearce, and Jim Pielert.

Resolution No. 5:

BE IT RESOLVED that the 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States expresses its heartfelt thanks and appreciation to those that have provided the excellent and highly valued staff assistance from the New Mexico General Construction Board and the State Building Officials to the success of this Conference and its goals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Conference individually thank and commend Robert Berntsen, Linda Boydstan, Buelah Biaz, Herta Berntsen, Frances Yashven, Harvey King, Hubert McClure and Johnny Ruiz.

Resolution No. 6:

WHEREAS, Gene A. Rowland has served the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards under various titles, as Secretariat to the Conference through its formative stages to the present.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the NCSBCS extends its appreciation and commendation to Mr. Rowland for his excellent services, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the NCSBCS extends to Mr. Rowland its best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

I would like to move the adoption of those resolutions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SWENSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the resolutions as read. All those in favor signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered.

MR. MEYER: I would like to take up Resolution No. 7. I am sure there will be some discussion. We may have some more copies available for people that want them.

Resolution No. 7:

WHEREAS, the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards supports the Constitution of the United States of America, and

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States of America reserves to the States certain rights and prerogatives, and

WHEREAS, the various States and their political subdivisions have taken actions to safeguard and benefit the citizens, and

WHEREAS, some of these actions have pertained to the construction of mobile homes in a manner intended to render such mobile homes as safe and habitable for their occupants, and

WHEREAS, 43 States have formulated and implemented appropriate regulations intended to safeguard and benefit the occupants of mobile homes in those States, and

WHEREAS, other similar actions appear to be pending in other States, and

WHEREAS, the various States have voluntarily cooperated in the formulation and enforcement of standards to protect the citizens, and

WHEREAS, such cooperation and standards have been developed by consensus through an organization known as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), and

WHEREAS, through years of study and investigation by those possessing special expertise in such matters ANSI has developed a standard known as the ANSI A119.1 Standard, and

WHEREAS, the ANSI A119.1 Standard has received wide acceptance and application by the various States, and

WHEREAS, the ANSI A119.1 Standard, in addition to its embodiment of best available expertise of the state-of-the-art, provides for appropriate citizen involvement, through the various States and political subdivisions, in the formulation and enforcement of its provisions, and

WHEREAS, the ANSI A119.1 Standard is formulated through a process which provides for continued improvement commensurate with the state-of-the-art through the consensus process and expert citizen involvement, and

WHEREAS, certain activities appear to be imminent which the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards believes to be contrary to the best interests of the citizens,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it be made known to all appropriate organizations and individuals that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards favors the continued use, application and enforcement of the ANSI A119.1 Standard, through the various States and their political subdivisions, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards vigorously opposes any action, or actions, which may impose upon the citizens of the respective States arbitrary standards promulgated by any agency or organization lacking the expertise and experience of those involved in the consensus process, as exemplified by the procedures utilized in the formulation of the ANSI Standards.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Resolution No. 7.

MR. KIMSEY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Motion has been made and seconded for the adoption of Resolution No. 7.

Seconded by Kimsey of Tennessee. Mr. Swenson, would you like to elaborate on the resolution at all at this time?

MR. SWENSON: I might just say that possibly an apology would be in order here because the resolution is rather wordy. In preparing this resolution for your consideration we did feel that there were certain points to be made -- we thought that they should be made through repetition and that the preamble, so to speak, was necessary though it is lengthy. We thought that it was necessary to get the message across. We do not present this as a perfect document -- it is a discussion item at this point and I think rather than go into it in any further detail it might be well to open the resolution to discussion, questions, and suggestions.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Henke, did you have a comment on this resolution?

MR. HENKE: Mr. Chairman, Ken Henke from Iowa. Not really. I think it ties in with perhaps what Mr. Mullen was working on. Is your resolution close to completion, Sutton?

MR. MULLEN: Yes, it is. I have it ready if you want it.

MR. HENKE: I think the two are almost companion documents and for that reason, possibly Sutton may want to enlighten the delegate body of the subject matter of the other resolution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We could do that at this time, Sutton, if you would like. If we have to have a Resolution Conference Committee to resolve the two resolutions, this can be done under the existing motion and second, with the consent of those two persons. Go right ahead, Sutton.

MR. MULLEN: All right. I am Sutton Mullen from Virginia and I am not sure where we stand on this thing. There has been considerable discussion about the sponsorship of the mobile home standard. The present sponsorship consists of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), and two industry groups. There has been some sentiment expressed that the standard would have a better standing with the Federal Government and with other people if the industry sponsors were removed and possibly some other organizations were substituted. I have been active in the affairs of NFPA and I am a member of its Board at the present time. I know that NFPA does not wish to be the sole sponsor. They are primarily concerned with fire safety and, of course, the standard itself goes far beyond that field.

With that thought in mind, we have prepared the following simple "Declaration of Policy," which we offer for your consideration in whatever fashion is appropriate under our Constitution and Bylaws.

Declaration of Policy:

The National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards would consent to serve with the National Fire Protection Association as a co-sponsor of the national mobile home standards under the following conditions:

One, the present industry co-sponsors shall withdraw.

Two, the Committee shall continue to operate under the procedures of the American National Standards Institute, which will permit the Standard for Mobile Home Construction to be eligible for acceptance as an American National Standard.

That is it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard Mr. Mullen. Are there further comments as to the disposition of this resolution? Are there further comments concerning it? Mr. Swenson?

MR. SWENSON: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to commend Sutton for his effort on this. I think it makes a good point. I do not see that the one resolution really affects the other. It appears to me that each of these resolutions can and should stand on its own, and I would suggest that they be considered separately.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments? Further questions?

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Thorne?

MR. THORNE: I want to comment. I think basically, we are both referring to the same thing. I would say that both resolutions can be combined into one. Why don't we use NFPA 501B and/or ANSI A119.1? Basically, they are one and the same. I do not think that one resolution should be struck or turned down in its entirety, without having a committee meeting and straightening out the language of both of them, if that be at all possible.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Henke?

MR. HENKE: Ken Henke from Iowa. I even have to go against Erik in his proposal. The two documents are separate documents and both of them are extremely important, and I think they should be handled individually. The only reason that I brought it up at this point for Sutton to introduce is that I did want you to know that there were two parallel loops that might be going on, but for no other reason. As far as combining them, no, I would be against that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Church?

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, I think of the two as separate items. One is a statement, a policy that NCSBCS is against what the Federal Government is doing in the mobile home area. The other one is a statement of policy of what NCSBCS did to correct the situation, and I think the two should be separate and not interlining with one another.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: At the present time, I have a motion to adopt Resolution No. 7 as it was read. Are you ready for the question? If you are, I will call for a roll call vote on this resolution.

MR. BULLOCK: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? Bullock from Georgia. What organizations will these resolutions be sent to other than HUD?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I expect that the Executive Committee and the body assembled will decide that immediately, or some time during the remainder of this Conference.

MR. BULLOCK: Will the Members of Congress be supplied with a copy?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I am sure.

At this time we will call a roll call vote for the adoption of the resolution. Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I will call the States that were present at the time of the roll call. If I miss you, will you please identify your State and we will add your vote at the end.

Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

Abstain.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Nay.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, my count is twenty (20) -- (interrupted.)

MR. BUSBY: Mr. Chairman, Doug Busby from Missouri. I was not here for the roll call, but I am here now and I vote affirmative.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All right.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: There are twenty-nine (29) voting, one (1) abstained, one (1) negative, making twenty-seven (27) for.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The Chairman announces the passage of the resolution.

Now, Sutton, I would like to discuss and decide on the action on your policy statement as read. May I have action from the floor?

MR. MEYER: I move the adoption of the policy statement as submitted by Mr. Mullen.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb Meyer moves the adoption. Second?

MR. KIMSEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: David McNeill?

MR. McNEILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question as to whether or not all delegates here realize what is in this resolution that has been drawn and presented by Mr. Mullen? I just want everybody to understand what it refers to, because I think that it will do what needs to be done and I do not want anybody to not understand it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Bill?

MR. CONNOLLY: I do have a question. Do I understand the resolution properly to mean that we intend to become a standards-setting organization?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Mullen?

MR. MULLEN: Sutton Mullen. I would be happy to respond to that. The second condition was that the standard would be prepared under the procedures of the American National Standards Institute. The sponsors of the Standard have no extra vote, no special control over the Standard itself, they just serve really as secretary. Now, we feel that it would look better for the Standard not to have industry people on it as sponsors. It would not look so much like as industry standard.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments?

MR. NIELSEN: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen, the first resolution that was approved had as its tenor the view of the group here with regard to a government organization generating standards to which we must comply identically, and that is in the negative.

The second resolution here deals with the view of getting the sponsorship into the area of government for the generation of the present ANSI Standards. I think we are taking two different tacts on the same thing. We are getting government involved in the standards generation situation. In one case, we are objecting and in the other case we are to become the sponsor. We are telling HUD to stay out of standards, but we do not want to get ourselves involved, and then become critical about it and start sponsoring standards. Standards should come from those with the greatest interest in them.

And, personally, I think that the view taken in the first resolution should be consistently taken in the second resolution, that we keep out of the standard generation field. Let the standard generation work be done by those having the specific vital interest in them and then we could accept or reject them.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Church?

MR. CHURCH: I am sorry. I think the gentlemen from New York is misinterpreting what the gentlemen from Virginia is proposing. Actually, the sponsoring organization is an umbrella organization by which standards would be written. The National Fire Protection Association sponsors the A119.1 Standard, they do not write it. It is a committee under the NFPA that writes the Standard. A lot of good organizations consist of governmental officials who are the only voting members. They sponsor codes but they are written by committees within that organization and I do not believe that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards is going to change its policy to actually write a code. I think it is strong enough trying to be a co-sponsor of a Standard which is being criticized as being an industry-sponsored standard.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Further comment?

MR. GREENLEAF: Mr. Chairman, Frank Greenleaf, Trailer Coach Association. Is it the intent of the proposed reorganization of the sponsorship that input from the private sector continue in standards writing in this new organization? That is a question that I think industry has to know -- whether or not the expertise that has been available over the years and has been responsible mainly for the development of the standard in cooperation with environmental groups will continue?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I defer the question to you, Mr. Mullen.

MR. MULLEN: Sutton Mullen, Virginia. And I would like to ask Mr. Mahaffey when I get through if he has got an answer to that. It is my understanding, my interpretation of the procedures of the American National Standards Institute that standards in order to be accepted by the American National Standards Institute shall involve the consensus of those affected.

MR. GREENLEAF: That is fine, thank you.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Does Chuck Mahaffey want to add anything?

MR. MAHAFFEY: Chuck Mahaffey, National Bureau of Standards. The role of the Secretary in a Committee operating under the ANSI procedures is just what the name implies. A change in the Secretary should in no way change the make-up of the Committee other than perhaps making it adhere more closely to ANSI procedures. In other words, it is the responsibility of the Secretary to see that the ANSI procedures are carried out, so it should not really make any difference who the Secretary is.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Other comments? Mr. Greenleaf?

MR. GREENLEAF: My question pertained to actual participation in the writing of the standard rather than submitting written comments as interested persons, and I think Mr. Mullen has answered that question.

MR. FERGUSON: Earl Ferguson, Southeastern Manufactured Housing Institute. I have one question that is directed toward the financing, and maybe Chuck Mahaffey can answer it. When you take on a sponsorship, you are also accepting some financial commitment, is that correct?

MR. MAHAFFEY: They have a responsibility to see that these ANSI procedures are carried out, and it really takes money to do that. If I understand the sense of the motion that Mr. Mullen made, it would be a case where NCSBCS would become a co-sponsor of the Standard, not intended to replace NFPA who is the primary sponsor of the Standard.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Dowling?

JIM DOWLING: Jim Dowling, American Institute of Architects. We co-sponsor quite a few Standards with ANSI and there is a financial commitment involved.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the discussion, are you ready for the question? It is designated as Resolution No. 8 for lack of a better title.

MR. CABELUS: Mr. Chairman, Bernard Cabelus, Connecticut. Before you call for any vote, I would just like to know if the gentlemen back there can give us any idea of what this financial commitment might be?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Would you care to answer that?

MR. DOWLING: I cannot tell you offhand because it has been a while since we have been asked for money. It is up to you as the sponsor, and I believe it comes to somewhere around $500. It is not a very big amount really.

MR. SPENCE: Jim Spence, American Iron and Steel Institute. We sponsor a number of ANSI Standards. As a sponsor, the only financial commitment in which we ever have been involved is providing a Secretary to the Committee. That involves mailing and that sort of thing. Now I do not know what the commitment of ANSI is right now, carrying on the function for the A119.1 Committee, but I would imagine that it would be considered that it is between NCSBCS and the Committee. So you do have a commitment, but it is primarily a mailing and a Secretariat commitment.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ed?

MR. KIMSEY: Mr. Chairman, Ed Kimsey from Tennessee. Mr. Greenleaf, would you elaborate as to how much the Trailer Coach Association has committed itself to the operation of this Standard in the past?

MR. GREENLEAF: Well, I cannot give you the actual figure over the years. But, as Jim Spence just stated, the three (3) co-sponsors right now, MHMA, TCA and NFPA underwrite the cost of the Secretariat. Now, that is stationery, mailing, and so on. Mr. Tryon of the NFPA has covered the actual cost of salaries. The cost of the stationery and so on is not high. If I remember correctly, I think this year it is around $1000. It might be a little bit more than that, but it is not high.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K., you have heard the discussion, you have heard the motion, and you have heard the second. Are you ready for the question? All of those in favor of the resolution, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

IN CHORUS: No.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Secretary, will you take a roll call vote?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I am getting a work out today.

Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Florida?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

No.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mississippi?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Nay.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, twenty-eight (28) voting, two (2) negatives, twenty-six (26) ayes.

MR. BUSBY: Missouri -- Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: O.K. Twenty-nine (29) voting, two (2) negatives -- twenty-seven (27) and two (2).

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Resolution carried. Now, I would discharge the Auditing Committee at this time, but I will hold the Resolutions Committee in abeyance for a little bit, because if something comes up and we need a quick Resolutions Committee we will have it.

MR. HICKS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Recognizing Mr. Hicks.

MR. HICKS: There is a point that I believe you should consider in Resolution No. 7. It may be an editorial thing, but it is on the last page and I believe that we might have problems in the third line from the bottom, the last part where it indicates "lacking the expertise and experience of those involved in the consensus process." I propose that it be changed to "lacking a viable standards generating process which would qualify under NCSBCS prior to the national consensus process, as exemplified and so forth by the procedures." So this may be editorial, but the Executive Committee might review that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It may be editorial, but it may get me into a floor fight, too.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: The best procedure would be to amend the resolution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, the best procedure I can see at this time is to amend the resolution, and vote on the amendment.

May I have a motion to reconsider Resolution No. 7?

MS. HERON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane Heron moved.

MR. THORNE: I will second that motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Thorne seconded.

MR. THORNE: In reference only to that one particular paragraph that has been referred to, instead of going through the entire resolution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All those in favor of that motion, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Now, may I have the amendment in its exact wording, please?

MR. HICKS: O.K., starting in the third line from the bottom after "organization" -- after the word "lacking" enter "a viable standards generating process which would qualify under provisions required of a national consensus process." Then continuing, "as exemplified by the procedures utilized in the formulation of the ANSI Standards."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Is that amendment in the form of a motion?

MR. HICKS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second?

MR. MULLEN: Mullen -- second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Seconded by Mr. Mullen of Virginia. We are now voting on the amendment. Any discussion on the amendment?

MR. MEYER: Could we have it read again?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, read the whole paragraph with the wording in it.

MR. HICKS: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards vigorously opposes any action or actions which may impose upon the citizens of the respective States arbitrary standards promulgated by any agency or organization lacking a viable standards-generating process which would qualify under provisions required of a national consensus process, as exemplified by the procedures utilized in the formulation of the ANSI Standards."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the amendment, you have heard the motion, and you have heard the second. Is there any discussion? Jane?

MS. HERON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the author of the amendment would consider one further editorial change in that last paragraph? I think you will understand my only reason for having voted against the original motion, whence I mention this. It is not in the interest of NCSBCS to make the assumption that any such standard will, in fact, be arbitrary as stated in the final paragraph here and I would urge either the deletion of the word "arbitrary" or perhaps the substitution of a different word or phrase for "arbitrary" in that last paragraph, line three.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Hicks?

MS. HERON: He needs to think for a minute.

MR. HICKS: I believe the concept is right and I am in agreement. I do not know exactly what word to substitute, yet.

MS. HERON: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that Mr. Hicks consider for a minute re-reading the paragraph as he had revised it, simply deleting the word "arbitrary" and let us give him the opportunity to evaluate whether that makes sense or not.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead.

MR. HICKS: I believe that that would be satisfactory.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Please read the entire amendment again.

MS. HERON: Excuse me, may we have a moment for some discussion between the two of us? Just a little consultation?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thirty (30) seconds -- go ahead.

MR. HICKS: I will reread the amendment. "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards vigorously opposes any action or actions which may impose upon the citizens of the respective States standards promulgated by any agency or organization lacking a viable standards-generating process which would qualify under provisions required under the national consensus process as exemplified by the procedure utilized in the formulation of the ANSI Standards."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Is that agreeable with the second?

MR. THORNE: Yes.

MR. MULLEN: I think it needs a little more polishing. If those two people could go outside for a minute and polish it up and come back in?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think this is a good idea. Everybody understand this? We are coming up with a motion to amend Resolution No. 7. It has been brought back on the floor. We will amend it, then we will vote on the amendment, and vote on the motion to get it into the record. I would ask that the conferees, the maker of the amendment and the delegate from Illinois, and the second to the amendment please go out, polish the wording, and bring it back in. Yes?

MR. BONO: Jack Bono, Underwriters' Laboratories. If you look at the preamble to the Resolution No. 7, it deals precisely with ANSI A119.1. If you consider the resolution, it is a general statement. There are a number of instances in which standards are promulgated by an agency or organization lacking a viable standards generating process required by national consensus standards, which you want to impose on the citizens of your State and you do impose on the citizens of your State. For example, there are industry standards on lumber, on steel, on roofing, on a variety of products which are included in building codes, and are imposed as mandatory standards in the various States, and you certainly do not want to take a position in opposition to those standards in this resolution. I think the intent of this resolution is to resolve that in the case of the Mobile Homes Standard, you want it to follow this consensus process, and I would recommend that the conferees out in the lobby consider a further amendment to indicate in the resolution that it is a Mobile Homes Standard for which this concept is being adopted.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Would you care to talk with them on that? Ladies and Gentlemen, at this time, the Chair will rule the entire resolution will go back to the Resolutions Committee and be brought back in on this floor under "Unfinished Business." That is the easiest way. Mr. Meyer, will your Committee take charge of Resolution No. 7 and bring it back in a polished form?

MR. MEYER: In a form?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: In a form, yes. That is the pleasure of the Chair and I think that is the easiest way. We can amend, and amend, and amend, and amend, and amend, the amendments to the amendments. We do not want to do that. Would someone tell them to come back in and that it will go to the Resolutions Committee?

At this time, the program calls for a report from the National Bureau of Standards Secretariat -- the Formal Technical Research Program Review.

MR. CABELUS: I think that perhaps you are a bit presumptuous in having the Resolutions Committee moving this over without a motion from the floor. I think you should, just to make everything legal, ask for a motion to send those people out and then bring the resolution back.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: At this time, there is no motion on the resolution at all. When the conference committee comes back in, I will ask them to do that.

At this time, we will proceed with the program. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce a gentleman that I have come to know very fast, and when I say "fast," I mean I have only been associated with him for probably the last year, and he has been a great deal of help to me.

Dr. Richard Wright is a structural engineer, educator, and researcher. He succeeded Dr. James Wright -- no relation -- less than a year ago as Director of the Center for Building Technology. He is a native of Syracuse, New York and therefore, knows how to shovel snow. He earned his Ph.D. in Civil Engineering from the University of Illinois -- incidently, my home State many years ago -- an institution on whose faculty he served from 1957 until his appointment as Director of the Center for Building Technology.

While on leave from the University during 1971 to 1973, Dr. Wright headed the Center's Structures Section and later was made Center Deputy Director for Technical Operations.

Richard Wright's career, in addition to his University tenure, includes service with the Bureau of Public Roads, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Corps of Engineers. I can attest to the fact that he is a jogger, wears a red jogging suit. If you want to see him some morning, come out at 7:15 a.m. and you will see him. He is a member of numerous national and international engineering and building societies and at this time, I give you Dr. Richard N. Wright from the National Bureau of Standards.

REPORT FROM THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS/SECRETARIAT AND FORMAL TECHNICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM REVIEWS

DR. RICHARD WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman and delegates, I am very happy to have the opportunity to talk to you this afternoon. I want to bring you the regrets of Dr. Richard Roberts, the Director of NBS, who had hoped to be here. Instead he must give Congressional testimony on the pending metric legislation. I transmit his regrets and his greetings. However, I do appreciate this opportunity for a little more time to speak with you about where the Center for Building Technology is today and how we hope to see it advance in cooperation with the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards.

I have put together an overview of the activities in the Center for Building Technology. I want to state that these are not all of the activities, but they are a sampling so that you can be reminded of what we are, where we are going, and how we may interact with the National Conference of States.

The mission of the Center for Building Technology is to advance the Nation's building technology and to facilitate its implementation for the public benefit. We feel that our association with the National Conference of States, as well as our association with other organizations concerned with the building regulatory system, is an extremely important part of our interest in properly implementing technology.

The Center is fundamentally a building laboratory. We deal with many areas of building technology, many areas of research and application.

The Center is comprised of divisions and offices. The divisions are laboratory-based and contain most of our people. The Sections within the divisions deal with research on structures; materials and composites; building safety; thermal engineering; heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems; building services, such as plumbing and electrical distribution; architecture; the economics of building; and the sensory environment. One section consists largely of psychologists. We are trying to understand better how the building affects the comfort and productivity of people.

We address real building technology problems in their full complexity through the program management activities in our offices. The Office of Building Standards and Codes Services is concerned with providing technical support to the Nation's building regulatory system. You have known Gene Rowland very well in his capacity as Chief of this Office. He is being succeeded by Jim Gross, whom you are coming to know and who will be our primary liaison with the National Conference of States.

We also have an Office of Housing Technology, providing technical support to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other agencies concerned with housing problems.

The Office of Federal Building Technology supports the building technology programs of the many Federal agencies. The Office of Energy Conservation, organized only last August but already managing programs amounting to about $5 million per year, provides technical inputs to our national effort to conserve energy.

The Center for Building Technology deals with complex building technology problems and it does this by drawing on a very large number of disciplines, ranging from architects to urban planners, and including many types of engineers in between.

Our activity this fiscal year will amount to approximately $12 million. We will get about 70 percent of this money from other Federal agencies. This is applied research dealing with the building technology problems of these agencies. This, I think, is good for us. It helps us concentrate on providing real world solutions, not simply abstract theoretical studies.

I do want to emphasize in this discussion that the Center for Building Technology is not the only element of the National Bureau of Standards which contributes to the solution of building problems. We have important activities in fire research. Towards the end of my talk, I will give you a little insight into its programs.

We also have activities in consumer product technology which overlap very strongly with the area of building, and we have the Standards Application and Analysis Division. Later on in the program, Gene Rowland will give you an overview of these activities, as he is now Director of this Division.

I am going to sample three (3) program areas within building technology and summarize some of the activities in fire research to give you a view of our work. Parts of it fit very closely with the activities of NCSBCS and some parts serve other constituencies within the building community.

Our objectives in energy conservation include energy conservation in buildings, energy conservation in communities, and energy conservation in industrial processes. I will concentrate on the buildings and I want to note at the beginning some very important activities we are carrying out in cooperation with the National Conference of States.

In May of 1973, before the rest of the world or the rest of the country really understood the seriousness of the coming energy crisis, you called upon us to provide you with a conference on technical options for energy conservation in buildings. We faced a severe brown-out in the summer of 1973 and a severe fuel shortage in the winter of 1973. We feel rather proud that we were able to pull together this document in a period of less than sixty (60) days and make it available to those who needed these options.

At your request, in July 1973 we developed draft design and evaluation criteria for energy conservation in new buildings. We presented these to you and you, in turn, gave them to the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) to use the consensus process for formulation of a national standard for energy conservation in new buildings. I am sure you have had discussions here already on the progress of ASHRAE 90P, so I will not go into greater detail on that.

Let us look at some of the research activities in which underlie our participation with NCSBCS in the standards formulation process. We have a twenty (20) year old, four (4) bedroom house which was built near the Bureau of Standards, and we acquired it at the time the Bureau property was bought. This house has been used as an experiment in the energy retrofit of existing houses. Energy retrofit is the modification of existing buildings, so they require less energy to maintain a healthy and comfortable environment.

In the winter of 1973-74, we measured the energy requirements of this house with its oil burner and with its insulation according to practices twenty (20) years ago. In the summer of 1974, we replaced the oil burner and air conditioning with a heat pump. In the fall of 1974, we began extensively to apply retrofit measures: we added storm windows and measured the effect they had on the amount of energy required; we added caulking and measured its effect on energy conservation; we added insulation in the attic and measured its effects; and, we added insulation in the walls and measured its effects. This way, we could document the theoretical predictions and show to practical people in the building community the benefits of these measures.

We have been carrying out an economic study, looking at the major sources of heat loss in residential building and the most economical options for reducing these heat losses. We have a report of energy retrofit measures in existing housing (Building Science Series 64) which shows exactly which options will be profitable for an individual homeowner, depending on the nature of his house, the part of the country in which he is located, and the type of fuel he is using. The report shows that one hundred fifty millimeters (6 inches) of added insulation is not the optimum for everyone. In areas where you are using high-priced energy, such as electricity, and located in a Northern climate, if it is physically possible to place amounts of insulation as great as four hundred fifty millimeters (18 inches) in the attic, it can pay off for the homeowner.

Many of you have seen the Center's large environmental chamber. An experiment in the field is very valuable evidence, but sometimes you have to wait a very long time before you get that 40 degree Celsius (100°F) day that you want to really test the performance of the air conditioning system. In this environmental chamber, large enough to hold a four (4) bedroom townhouse, we can vary the temperatures from minus 45 degrees Celsius (-50°F) to 65 degrees Celsius (150°F), and we can verify the accuracy of predictions of thermal performance. These results show that the computer prediction is reliable; indeed, it has been used now as the basis for many energy conservation studies on individual buildings and for the preparation of standards.

We now have moved this four (4) bedroom townhouse to the outside environment on the NBS Campus. We have continued the thermal performance measurements under real conditions and we have installed a solar collector. These studies, for the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), will lead to procedures for predicting and testing the thermal performance of solar energy systems.

One of the other tools that we are exploring, and it can be very important to the building regulatory system, is thermography for measuring where heat losses are occurring in buildings. You can understand the losses through a window, but a loss could also occur where the boxes for an industrialized building are connected. If there is evidence of heat loss at that connection, the thermograph will give an indication to anyone concerned with the thermal performance of this house that remedial measures are required.

The next topic I wish to discuss briefly with you is the Center's research on plumbing system performance. Our research is concerned with better understandings of the hydraulic performance of plumbing systems and better understandings of the public demand for plumbing utilities. Of course, it is unhealthy to have inadequate facilities for the demand and it is also grossly wasteful to provide more services than are required. In the six (6) story plumbing tower in our plumbing laboratory we are able to simulate the hydraulic performance of various types of innovative plumbing systems and we are able to carry out accurate measurements of how well the systems perform. In order to assure that these laboratory findings are actually applicable to the way real people use real plumbing facilities, we also carry out similiar studies in the field. In a study of housing at Andrews Air Force Base, which is sponsored by Tri Services, we are evaluating our laboratory findings for hydraulic performance and measuring the demands put on the plumbing system by the occupants. These houses also include reduced size plumbing venting whose performance is being evaluated. Think of the substantial economy which could be achieved by replacing a one hundred millimeter (4 inch) vent pipe with a twelve millimeter (1/2 inch) vent pipe, which our research to date shows is adequate to maintain the trap seals.

We, of course, look forward to carrying the findings of this plumbing research into practice. We are working through the American National Standards Institute Committee A40, which is developing a new national consensus standard for plumbing systems, and we look forward to working with NCSBCS and the model codes to get the standards adopted and effectively used in the building regulatory system.

A third program that I will mention, and one with which a number here have been associated, is our Cooperative Federal Program on Building Practices for Disaster Mitigation. The objective of this program is to reduce the losses of life and property occurring in natural disasters. At the present time, we are concentrating on those dynamic hazards which arise from earthquakes and extreme winds, and we look forward to amplified work on disasters arising from flooding. We seek to reduce hazards in both existing buildings and in new buildings.

Much of the current construction uses unbonded post-tensioned flooring systems. There may be some problems with this technology as illustrated by a parking garage located at Skyline Towers in Fairfax County, Virginia. The adjacent tower collapsed, largely as a result of well-documented inadequate forming practices. And, either the crane fell on one or two panels of this roughly 10 panel by 10 panel, one hundred meter (300 foot) by one hundred meter (300 foot) parking garage, or two of the columns failed. From these severe loads you could well expect the failure of one or two panels of the parking garage. However, all the panels fell by a process known as progressive collapse.

This is a very serious problem; a locally extreme load may cause very widespread collapse and eventually, may cause a localized disaster.

We are studying a one-quarter scale model of the Skyline Towers parking garage in the laboratory and we hope that we can reproduce this type of behavior--progressive collapse--in the laboratory. If this behavior can be modeled in the laboratory, it will be an economical method to develop design criteria to prevent progressive collapse.

We are also working in conjunction with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to formulate performance-type design criteria applicable to all types of construction, which will give adequate safety against progressive collapse for any type of abnormal load--a construction accident, a gas explosion, a vehicle impacting a particular column or panel. We are exploring two approaches to achieving adequate safety. One approach is an alternate path mechanism where a building is designed to withstand the loss of one or two members without the whole building coming down. The other approach is "local resistance" where critical members are designed to withstand extreme loads and not lead to progressive collapse of the structure.

Another major emphasis in our disaster mitigation program is to look at strengthening and repair of existing buildings. This is a severe problem, as evidenced by a building in Managua, Nicaragua, located within about one hundred meters (100 yards) of a major fault of an earthquake. There has been a very interesting divergence of professional opinion upon inspection of this building. Some engineers will tell you this is just cosmetic damage, and you can replace those damaged surface panels and put the structure back into service. Other engineers will tell you this building has been severely damaged in the earthquake and should be torn down. We have very little well-documented information to guide the engineering profession in making decisions as to the safety of existing buildings when new hazards have been recognized, or for the strengthening and repair of buildings which have suffered some damage. We plan a laboratory program to study repair procedures and to study means for strengthening existing buildings. The eventual results will be standard practices, which may be used throughout the building community.

There is time for a few remarks about the programs in the Center for Fire Research. These programs are accessible to the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards. Working through your Secretariat, working with Jim Gross, or going directly to the people in the Center for Fire Research, you will find the same cooperative attitude and desire to work effectively with you to make the Fire Center's laboratory research findings useful in the building community.

The NBS Center for Fire Research is mandated by the National Fire Protection and Control Act of 1974, as a Federal agency responsible for research on the fire problem. It is a severe problem for the United States. We have the world's poorest fire record--eight to twelve thousand (8,000 to 12,000) deaths each year, and some four hundred thousand (400,000) injuries each year--you can probably remember from vou own experience the mose painful injury you ever had was a furn. Losses, direct or indirect, add up to about $13 billion.

The new Fire Research facility is located on the Bureau of Standards' campus. Major efforts are being made to model fire phenomena in studying basic principles. There are many questions about our current fire standards because we do not know how to relate the performance in standard fire tests to the actual performance of the total building when a fire occurs.

The Fire Science Division deals with basic studies, looking at the chemistry and the toxic effects of fire, the physics and dynamics of flame spread and smoke spread, and rational methods for assessing fire hazards.

The Fire Safety Engineering Division is headed by an old friend of many of you, Irwin Benjamin. The Division has programs dealing with fire prevention in consumer products; fire control programs for furnishings; and, the fire program for construction, which deals with the fire resistance of buildings, the program for life safety systems, and the program for fire detection and control systems in a building.

To summarize our viewpoint in the Center for Building Technology, we are doing our best within the resources of dollars and people available to us, to provide effective technical support to the whole building community--the design professions, the industry, labor, the public who occupy buildings, the Federal agencies with building program responsibilities, and State and local governments.

We have enjoyed working with the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards and we look forward to continuing activities.

From our viewpoint, we have found the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards to be increasingly effective in achieving uniformity, consensus, and reciprocity in the building regulatory system. We feel the effectiveness of the research and technical activities at the National Bureau of Standards have been augmented greatly by our cooperation with the National Conference of States. We feel you have helped us focus our programs on the real needs within the building regulatory system and we feel you have helped us in finding an effective avenue for implementation of the technical products of our research.

We greatly appreciate your desire to establish your own Secretariat and we feel we have been encouraging this move, since our most effective role, actually, is in providing technical support for the various elements of the building community, including the building regulatory system.

However, we want to assure you that we will continue to provide Secretariat support for the interim period if the National Conference of States finds it needs it. We do, however, look forward to expanding technical interactions with the National Conference of States: our best role and the role in which we feel we can serve you most effectively.

Now that Gene Rowland is moving over to the Engineering and Product Standards Division, your major liaison between the Center for Building Technology and between the other technical activities in the National Bureau of Standards will be through Jim Gross. Jim is our new Chief of the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services. As many of you know, Jim is no newcomer to the building regulatory system. As Director of Engineering and Technology for the Structural Clay Products Institute, he worked very closely with the masonry standards activities within the American National Standards Institute, and he worked very closely on building code liaison. Jim has been with the Center for Building Technology since 1971, working in our Office of Housing Technology, most recently, as Chief of this office.

I am sure that you will enjoy your interactions with Jim Gross as we within CBT have enjoyed our interactions with him.

Let me say a few things about his character, since this is most important in the interactions to which we look forward. One thing you will like about Jim is his enthusiasm. He is making it his career to apply better technology to building; it means a lot to him. It hurts him when things do not go right, and he will make great efforts when he sees there are hopes of accomplishments. You will find Jim listens well to you. He has the capability to understand other people's points of view. But, you will also find out that he is tough. You cannot steamroller him. You cannot snow him. He is going to keep you there and keep you explaining until you have explained it satisfactorily to him. You will find he knows the needs of the building community. Much he knows already, some he will pick up by listening. And you will find he understands the capability of technology to meet these needs. You will find that Jim is a good manager. He is efficient, he will meet his commitments and you will enjoy working with him.

Here is Jim to explain the way he sees the programs in the Office developing.

MR. JAMES G. GROSS: Thank you, Dick.

(Applause)

MR. GROSS: Chairman, delegates, ladies and gentlemen. I look forward with enthusiasm to this new opportunity in my career.

The National Bureau of Standards does not have building regulatory responsibility. You know that, but I want you to know that I know that. We are not out on the front line making the tough day-to-day decisions in this area. Let me tell you something that some of you may not know. NBS does not even have the responsibility for the development of standards in the building regulatory field. We do, however, actively participate with you and other organizations in the development of the standards. Our work, be it laboratory-based research, literature studies, or analysis of other people's findings, is to develop and disseminate building technology that will assist you and the building community as a whole in carrying out your responsibilities. The reputation of the National Bureau of Standards is built upon technical excellence. As we move forward, we look to an opportunity to apply these capabilities more and more in the building regulatory area.

Dick Wright very briefly discussed some of the capabilities and ongoing activities within the Center for Building Technology. I would like to touch on some of the ongoing and near future activities within the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services. I will use slides for that purpose.

Building codes and standards activities within NBS are within the Center for Building Technology which is in the Institute for Applied Technology--one of four NBS Institutes.

In 1970, NCSBCS requested NBS work relating to laboratory evaluation and accreditation. In 1973, that work was reported in preliminary form and delivered to NCSBCS for use. NCSBCS, in turn, requested the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) to take these documents and use them in development of national standards.

Two new committees were formed, E32 and E36. E32 is chaired by Sutton Mullen. NBS also actively participates in the work of these two committees. Both of these committees in the very near future will be promulgating standards--E32, Criteria for Evaluating Agencies Concerned With System Analysis, Testing and/or Compliance Assurance of Manufactured Building, and E36, a generic standard, Criteria for Evaluation of Testing and/or Inspection Agencies.

It is planned to take these experiences, the preliminary reports, and put them together in a final report which will be issued for use by those who want to apply the new standards.

Another request that came from NCSBCS was the development of a Coordinated Evaluation System. This project, to date, has provided seven (7) reports, the first four (4) of which were preliminary reports entitled "Model Documents for the Evaluation, Approval and Inspection of Manufactured Buildings." This work and response to comments offered by users are being used for the development of a final report. Again, a number of you have used these reports, applied them in your work and provided comments to our staff; these comments will be responded to in the final report.

State delegates recently received an additional request from us to answer a survey on building related codes used in your States. This is the next area of activity which we intend to investigate, analyze, and document.

Within the Center for Building Technology, we have the diverse capabilities of a number of different disciplines and backgrounds. Using the consensus process within our own organization, we have identified what we call "high priority standards." These standard activities are responsive to two criteria. First, they must meet a clearly identified national need. And secondly, there must be an opportunity to transfer technology -- technology developed through research -- into application in a relatively short period of time. After CBT management agrees upon a given high priority standard we apply intense activity to bring that standard up-to-date and implement its application.

The first standard which we identified as high priority is one that is widely known now as ASHRAE's 90P. I will not reiterate the background, except to point out that this, too, emanated from NCSBCS's early request in 1973, for NBS to develop a research document for use in developing an energy conservation standard for new buildings.

In February 1974 -- the NBS report, "Design and Evaluation Criteria for Energy Conservation in New Buildings," was turned over to this body. NCSBCS in turn requested ASHRAE to move ahead and develop a national consensus standard for use in this area.

Another identified high priority is the American National Standard A58 for which NBS is the sponsor. A58 provides building code requirements for minimum design loads for buildings and other structures. Through this standard, it is expected that research results; e.g., those related to progressive collapse that Dick Wright discussed, will find their way into useful practice.

The ANSI A119.1 "Standard for Mobile Homes," has also been identified as high priority. NBS has been very active in this area during the last three years. This year alone, we have proposed some thirty-four (34) changes to this standard, changes that we requested be considered by the consensus process established by the American National Standards Institute.

We will continue to maintain A119.1 as a high priority standard as long as we know that the results of this work will find their way into use. However, if the voluntary consensus process is not used, it will be dropped from our list of high priority standards.

Last January, it was agreed by the sponsors of A40, the National Plumbing Code, which was last published as a new document in 1955, that there was need for updating. One of the agreements for work is the development of a performance-based approach which will permit innovations in the plumbing area -- innovations such as reduced-size venting. It is not proposed to supplant other national standards that are used in this area, but rather that an umbrella be created to introduce the new technology that is coming down the line. Mobile homes, as I have indicated, have received considerable recent attention by NBS. The Office of Building Standards and Codes Services has the responsibility for coordinating all of the mobile home related activities at the Bureau. Mobile homes constitute a major portion of our housing. About thirty (30) percent of the single family dwellings produced in this country are produced by that industry. This has been true for the last five (5) years.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 calls for the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to establish a Federal Mobile Home Construction and Safety Standard. The same Act calls for the Secretary of HUD to authorize and conduct research and testing to carry out the obligation. It also calls for the Secretary of HUD to consider the research and testing carried out by other Government agencies.

We now have underway some seven (7) major projects related to mobile homes. When I say "we" I want to explain that the projects are not all within the Center for Building Technology. The Mobile Home Fire Safety Project listed on the slide is within the Center for Fire Research. This is sponsored in part through a grant by the mobile home industry itself--the Mobile Home Manufacturer's Association.

The second project listed, Energy Conservation Retrofit of Mobile Homes, is sponsored by the Federal Energy Administration. It is aimed at methods for improving the thermal performance of new and existing mobile homes and the development of a test method to measure these performance characteristics. We now have under test in the large NBS/CBT environmental chamber a full size factory-produced mobile home.

The Mobile Home Problem Identification and Analysis Project is sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under this project, we are identifying major problems that relate to mobile homes. We have randomly selected three thousand (3,000) files on mobile homes used in Hurricane Agnes. These files will be analyzed with problems identified relating to their design, production, and use.

We have looked at thousands of mobile home files from twelve (12) States and have physically inspected two hundred and fifty-six (256) mobile homes, and a number of mobile homes have been dismantled to ascertain hidden problems. We have identified over thirty thousand (30,000) problems related to mobile homes through these mechanisms. These are in a computer bank and are being collated and analyzed for submission to HUD, along with our recommendations for resolution.

The aim of this work is to identify the performance problems that relate to any deficiencies in the ANSI A119.1 Standard itself -- to pinpoint where the Standard is incomplete or unsatisfactory in stating the requirement. Secondly, we are reviewing the mobile homes regulatory system: e.g., are the plan reviews and enforcement procedures deficient? And third, we are looking at longevity and durability requirements that relate to HUD's mortgage insurance programs. Beyond these primary objections will be the identification of additional research needs.

Under HUD sponsorship, we are also looking at the problems of mobile home storage. As part of HUD strategy to alleviate human misery when a major disaster hits, HUD plans to have available mobile homes to house people that might be deprived of their housing when a major disaster occurs.

Safety regulations for mobile homes is a new study under which the mobile home laws in the various States have been reviewed, along with identification of variations from the ANSI A119.1 Standard, including different editions of this Standard. A preliminary report has been sent out for State delegate review. The final report will be forthcoming within a matter of months.

We have underway a study on performance criteria for mobile homes, with the intent to develop a guide so that mobile homes might be considered on a performance basis. This would encourage new ideas and permit innovation in the design and production of mobile homes.

Many of you have heard of the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS). We, in the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services, expect to have the responsibility of NBS liaison with NIBS. This is a new organization whose objective is improvement of the building regulatory system. The functions, as spelled out in the legislation, call for the development, promulgation, and maintenance of performance-based criteria, standards and other regulatory provisions. Secondly, the law calls for the evaluation of existing and new technology in respect to those standards; third, for studies and research to develop building technology, again, to further the criteria and standards; and, fourth, the compilation and dissemination of technology related to the performance of buildings.

We see NIBS as an opportunity to identify and focus on research needs. A number of the people have said, "If NIBS comes to be, there probably will be less need for work by the NBS." We do not see it this way. In a number of meetings held at HUD with individual concerned sectors, e.g., the building regulatory people, and a number of you in the room were at the meeting, the response came out very strongly that the major need for NIBS is the development of technology built upon sound research. So we see this as an opportunity for NBS to serve the interest of the country in a more effective manner.

The current status of the organization is this: HUD has recommended to the White House nominations to the NIBS Board. There have been numerous discussions between HUD and the White House staff about these 21 individual recommendations. Investigations of prospective White House nominations are being carried out by the FBI. The Presidential nominations will then go to the Senate for approval. **

Another building technology related opportunity that we see in the near future is the change to the metric system of measurement. The Director of the Bureau, Dr. Roberts, is testifying on proposed legislation before Congress today.** Metrication, in my view, is not a question as to whether the country is going to go metric or not. It is a question of when and how orderly are we going to make this conversion.

There are five (5) countries in the world today that do not have plans to move to this measurement system. These are: Burma, Burundi, Yemen, Liberia, and the world's most industrialized Nation, the United States of America.

This metric change will offer a unique opportunity to work toward coordination of dimensions for building materials, components and equipment. It is generally recognized that the principles of modular coordination are valid. The building industry has not completely applied these principles because of the many changes that would be required. It will be necessary for changes to be made in response to metrication. Therefore, there will be a unique, one-time opportunity to coordinate the dimensions of building materials, components, and equipment during the change to the metric system of measurement.

NBS/CBT is working with the American National Metric Council. We are supporting the work of the sector dealing with building standards and codes matters. Chuck Mahaffey has developed a preliminary paper which points out some of the considerations for the building regulatory community. Upon completion, this paper will be shared with all of you.**

Energy conservation is a big item under consideration. This slide, prepared last January, shows some nineteen (19) States with authority to control energy usage in buildings. We find that ten (10) of these States actually are moving ahead with regulations of their own. This points out the need for national consensus standards for energy conservation in buildings.

With the assistance of NCSBCS, a series of tasks have been identified that need to be carried out to implement performance standards for energy conservation. Work is now underway planning for the implementation of national standards, be they voluntary such as ASHRAE 90P or be they mandatory, such as is being considered in the Congress.

Let me try to summarize.

As NCSBCS moves forward, NBS will continue to provide support for your stated goals.

There are many signs which point to a healthy growth and development of NCSBCS -- recognition by people both within and outside the building construction community, both within and outside of government, indicates that the NCSBCS potential is receiving a great deal of attention. We see the NBS future response being more in the way of technical support, not only for NCSBCS but for the entire building regulatory community.

We want to improve our communications. We want to make our research results available to you in a timely manner and in a form usable by the regulatory community. Communication is a two-way street. This means that you have to tell us your research needs so that we can consider them in our programmatic planning. We want to communicate with all segments of the regulatory community. We recently invited the Executive Committee of the Association of Major City Building Officials to meet with us for a full day at the Bureau. We reviewed the capability, facilities, and the ongoing work at NBS and we asked them to tell us what they felt were building research needs of the major cities. We also invited the Executive Committee and the Executive Staff of the Council of American Building Officials to come and explain their research needs.

I hereby invite the new Executive Committee of NCSBCS to come and spend some time with us for the same purpose.

Further, NBS offers technical assistance to each of your standing Committees. We are pleased to provide staff technical support. I want to assure you any requests that come through your Executive Committee to CBT will be acted on. Hopefully, they will be favorably acted on, if our programs and resources permit.

It is my view, one I have held for a long time, that the building regulatory community is unfairly maligned, is unfairly blamed for many social, economic, and performance problems related to buildings. This occurs, not only by laymen, but also by some of the designers and producers in our country who are uninitiated to the regulatory system. This does not mean, however, that there is not room for improvement. I look forward to making some contribution to improving codes and standards and the regulatory system as a whole.

In closing, I want to recognize the Office of Building Standards and Codes Services staff, a staff that I by and large inherited. I particularly want to recognize Sandi Berry, who with our hosts, Mr. and Mrs. McNeill, had the responsibility for the detail workings in establishing this Conference.

I also want to recognize Gene Rowland. I have worked side by side with Gene for some four (4) years. I have observed him in action for a longer period of time and I want to say that, without reservation, he has given himself -- always keeping in mind the long term benefit and welfare of NCSBCS. Gene will now tell us about his new job and especially the laboratory accreditation program being considered by the Department of Commerce. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. GENE ROWLAND: I would like to explain a little bit about my present or I should say new responsibilities, and how they interface with some of your future activities.

My responsibilities now are that of Program Manager of all the standards activities within the National Bureau of Standards, and Chief of the Standards Application and Analysis Division. The Bureau consists of some thirty-six hundred (3,600) employees working in all areas of technology. These new responsibilities are much broader than my old responsibilities in the building area. These new activities extend into standards activities such as nuclear, laser, and clinical in medical technology. It is a new ball game for me talking about the responsibility of working with the total standards community.

In my line management function as Chief of the Standards Application and Analysis Division, I have assumed the responsibility of domestic standards participation and those policies of the Bureau relative to this participation. The Division is also responsible for the Department of Commerce Voluntary Standards Program, Standards Information Service, all the technical aspects of metrication and metric conversion, including the SI units to be used under the new Metric Act, a standards analysis center, and the operation of the new Department of Commerce national testing laboratory accreditation program.

Our main concern is the way the Bureau participates in voluntary standards and this concern has already been stated by Dick Wright and Jim Gross. We will continue to seek true consensus as it is our concern as well as yours.

I would like to bring to your attention a recent study report on voluntary standards done by the Library of Congress for the House of Representatives. This study lays out the problem of the evolving technology concerns of the country and the consumer, and it reflects upon our total NBS responsibility in trying to assure that public interest is carried through by our standards participation activities.

NBS has the responsibility to react in the public interest and the national welfare of organizations such as yours that are reaching for that goal. Specifically, it is the policy of the Bureau to do so through its standards participants.

The National Bureau of Standards participates through approximately four hundred and fourteen (414) professionals serving on some thirteen hundred and twenty-eight (1,328) known standards committees. There is a total of one hundred and three (103) organizations with which we participate. As Chuck Mahaffey has told you in previous presentations, we can identify some one hundred and forty (140) voluntary consensus standards generating groups.

At the Bureau, our concern is effective standards. An effective standard has to include a consensus development procedure, it has to have a clear format for users, and it has to be

properly defined as well as timely. In many cases, standards are very hard to define as to their use and applicability.

Right now, all of us at the Bureau are concerned with limited funding. Many times, we get into a standard process too late to do any good. Many times, we are in the standard process when the technology is already there to carry out that process. We have to look at our priorities, which is what Dr. Wright is trying to project. We must look at our priorities early to perform research where research is necessary, and not duplicate other research efforts. So, we are very much concerned with the Bureau's participation in the timely development of standards.

We are also very much concerned with the consensus process. The Bureau is committed to such a process. We put our technology on the table in the same way as other institutions and organizations. It is discussed by the committee and from the discussion a consensus standard is produced. The negative votes come from the reaction of affected individuals and must be resolved.

Is ANSI really the accepted organization in the country for voluntary standards? In the Bureau, the commitment is to try to work toward following those principles and procedures of consensus, as established by ANSI. The Director of the Bureau participates on ANSI's Board of Directors, as it is the only U.S. organization incorporated to direct its resources to the coordination of consensus standards development. However, it is a private organization, it is not governmental. It is carrying out a proper function.

Let me now discuss some of our Division activities. Currently, in our standards information library, we have some two hundred thousand (200,000) standards and one hundred and ten (110) standards' periodicals. This library is available to you. If you are looking for a standard referenced in your codes I am sure we have it in our library. However, as current standards are copyrighted, we cannot reproduce them. ANSI turns over its old standards to us and if the one you need is out-of-print we can reproduce it for you. We can also assist you in getting current standards.

We keep a quick index of all those national standards in our library and this index will be published within the month, and available to the general public. This tool will help you locate standards and references which you might want to use, rather than developing your own standards. We also have an international standards index.

In our technical laboratory activities, we are concerned with the question of nationally-recognized laboratories in all areas of technology, not just building. We want to make it clear what the program is and what the program is not.

Accreditation is the act of giving official authorization or approvals, and recognition of specific qualifications. Laboratory accreditation is an authoritative organized action for evaluating test facilities and improving and identifying those judged competent to perform product tests.

At this time our goal at the Bureau is to develop a national voluntary accreditation system to examine and accredit testing laboratories. The key word of this program is "testing." Many people have felt that this program is getting into the production quality control and certification activities of laboratories, and I will show you a little later that it does not.

The objective of our program is to establish a national system and its component parts to assess the development of operational documents and resources, plan a major technical facility for systems management, and promote other NBS technical support.

What we are really talking about in laboratory accreditation is accrediting those laboratories that are involved in test functions and those test functions only. These may involve some evaluation like non-destructive testing, but they must have a "testing" factor. An A/E firm that is doing engineering evaluation would not be considered a "testing" laboratory in our program at this time.

Correspondence from several sectors of our economy--Federal agencies, government regulators, inventors, designers, manufacturers and others--identify that they need to know

which laboratories can perform which tests. We see the output in the form of reports prepared after an evaluation has been done.

A certification program in which NCSBCS is involved is the labeling of mobile homes. Certification is the evaluation of the manufacturing process, as well as sample testing and assisting the manufacturer in evaluating a product against some standard or code, and then labeling the product to reflect this contractural arrangement with the manufacturer. Certification programs are being performed by Underwriters' Laboratories, Inc. and other similar testing laboratories, and the Bureau's only concern would be with any testing function that is being performed in this process. In other words, if there is a sampling process in which something has to be laboratory tested, our concern is that it be tested by what could be considered a proper testing function, and by a laboratory accredited to do so.

Our program is not for approving certification programs and labeling procedures. The testing activity is only a small piece of the certification activity; however, it is the area for which the Bureau's technology and assistance has been asked. We would like to get the testing and evaluation of products back into the private industry and independent laboratories.

Looking at the building regulatory area, how does our program fit into your program?

In the present normal evaluation procedure, against given sets of codes and standards, we see this going on in the present system without change. We see, however, that when performance standards or performance codes are developed, testing becomes a viable part of the operation and the society must identify laboratories qualified to not only do the initial test, but also laboratories involved with certification agencies. This will assure that the products that have been approved by you are getting to the marketplace as approved.

The applicant to the regulatory approval system can go specification or performance. We can presume that ninety (90) percent of evaluation would not need testing because it met existing specification standards through analysis and that only ten (10) percent would cover new innovations that might be tested against performance requirements.

What is the sequence? We have built up some expertise through the NBS LEAP and CES programs' research work and their respective outputs into the ASTM E36 and E32 activities, and your own national reciprocity agreements.

As originally planned, the laboratory accreditation program tried to identify what needed to be done in the total evaluation and labeling processes. In that original system, we saw three separate functions; engineering analysis, testing laboratories, and compliance assurance. We developed the documents that were presented to you earlier. We see Committee E32 handling engineering analysis and compliance assurance, with the testing laboratory function being turned over to Committee E36. However, Committee E36 has worked strictly in the generic area and has not gotten into the specific technical qualifications which may be needed for laboratories performing evaluations against a given standard.

The Coordinated Evaluation System (CES) project does effect some of our accreditation program too, because as the program was developed, there are six (6) parts. The primary piece with which we are concerned is that part of the evaluation which requires laboratory testing.

What is our investment to get into the field? What have we done? What is some of our experience? What are some of the things that we are now operating at the Bureau that effect this program? We have been dealing in cement and concrete evaluation. We are doing some direct work with the States now by inspecting their cement and concrete laboratories. We are doing work with medical groups, pathology as well as clinical laboratories. We have developed measurement assurance programs, which is the traceability of measurement to metrology laboratories. We have been dealing in collaborative reference programs, which is the sending out of blind samples to operating laboratories for their testing and analysis. After analysis at the Bureau, we inform the laboratory as to how they compared with other

laboratories performing the same activity. This process assists the laboratories in analyzing their proficiency in an operating mode, rather than by an inspection mode which is used in the initial on-site type of contact and inspection.

Our experience of actual accreditation has come about through two programs at NBS. One such program is the Cement and Concrete Reference Laboratory (CCRL) Program. Under this program, research associates are housed at the Bureau and are under our supervision, and inspect laboratories throughout the country against an ASTM standard, and issue an evaluation report to the laboratory. The report does not tell whether the laboratory is good or bad. It only rates the laboratory against a set of criteria. If you asked "Has your laboratory been evaluated by CCRL?" The laboratory could respond in the affirmative; however, unless you could understand the report you would not know the actual condition or ability of the laboratory. Accreditation adds the piece on to such a report which passes or fails the laboratory.

The second program is in the Asphalt Materials Laboratory Reference (AMRL) program. We are evaluating State laboratories for the Federal highway program and other road material analysis work.

In both programs the Bureau takes out test and calibration equipment to these laboratories and it makes actual on-site inspections. During these inspections, some testing of the capabilities of personnel is done through interviews and the witnessing of test performance.

A total of some two hundred and eight (208) laboratories were covered on our first tour of cement and concrete laboratories. We are now inspecting some four hundred and fifty-four (454) laboratories.

The interesting part is the increased compliance and conformance of the apparatus in these laboratories from our initial tours. In our first tours, only sixty-three (63) percent of the laboratories conformed to what we consider acceptable laboratory practices. In our last tour, we checked some two hundred thousand three hundred and twenty-five (200,325) laboratory apparatus pieces, and found ninety-four (94) percent conformance. So the inspection and evaluation program has brought up the level of the laboratories' testing equipment and thereby performance. The report you will hear tomorrow during the NCSBCS/NBS Workshop takes this program further as it looks at actual field operation of some of these laboratories.

The Bureau inspected some 52 State laboratories until 1969. Since then, the Bureau has inspected considerably more. Some of the larger States have several laboratories and we are inspecting them also.

These State laboratories, in turn, accredit other laboratories working within the State or field of operations. There has been an investment of millions of dollars in these programs to keep the CCRL and the AMRL programs operating. The AMRL program has a $300,000 annual operating budget. The CCRL program is carried out by research associates from ASTM, and no Federal monies are involved. Our investment in the LEAP project over a period of time has been roughly $1 million and in our collaborative reference program, we operate on $250,000 base monies every year. This does not touch on all the other measurement assurance programs in the Bureau connected with laboratories. In these areas I spoke about today, we have a major investment and will attempt to use this investment as we develop a workable national laboratory accreditation system.

In the Bureau's laboratory accreditation program, we are not involved nor will we be involved in any standards' development. We will be involved in identifying the tests in those standards, but in no way will we be developing new test methods for standards. Should a standard come to our attention in the program that does not have a reference test in it that we think is appropriate, we will go back to the standards development committee and ask it to identify what test would be acceptable for that particular standard.

The user will have to identify a specific standard or standards to which he wants laboratories accredited when making a request for accreditation, or the laboratory will say, "I would like to be accredited as a testing laboratory to perform tests as noted in this standard."

The Bureau will be helping to determine the laboratory equipment criteria necessary to perform these tests, setting up objective analysis of the laboratory's ability to perform these tests, and also determining the qualifications of the laboratory examiner who will inspect and evaluate the laboratories. There has not been much work done in the examiner qualification area, and the credibility and acceptance of the program is directly related to the expertise of the examiner.

We do not intend to train or use staff as examiners within the National Bureau of Standards. We do intend to use the examiners' criteria to which people who would like to be examiners can apply. Qualified individuals would then be contracted with for actual laboratory examination.

We will be working to help laboratories in the development of collaborative reference programs. Educational programs and training programs for laboratory personnel are scarce across the country and we will seek identification of any existing programs to assist laboratories in related accreditation needs.

Our present thinking in the operation of a laboratory accreditation program consists of three functions: an accrediting authority, criteria development, and actual examination. An accreditation authority would work in a particular class of technology under a national board. Construction could be considered as a class of technology. Another class of technology might be electronics; another might be medical. There appears to be about twelve (12) possible classes. These would work through a coordinating national board for basic general criteria required in all classes.

Which class would be first would be determined after receipt of requests. Considerable planning has been done as to operational aspects of the program. We have identified need of a data bank system that interfaces not only the criteria, but the qualifications of examiners, and collaborative reference programs and means of analyzing the measurement assurance process within the laboratory. When our program addresses quality assurance, we are talking about the quality assurance within the laboratory, not the quality assurance used by a manufacturer in product manufacturing.

(At this point Mr. Rowland discussed a proposed Federal Register Notice of the Department of Commerce, which at the time of this presentation was not final and context for the sake of this record was informational only). Readers are directed to the Federal Register Notice as published on May 8, 1975 (40 FR 200092-95).

As we move into the energy area, there is going to have to be a lot of testing of new products and materials. In order to be evaluated for some of our energy needs, even the products and materials will undergo tests.

In the energy area alone there is a need for testing laboratories -- at least identification of laboratories -- so that inventors, designers, and agencies that are now moving into the energy area can know whether a product will or will not perform a certain function.

This is the conclusion of my presentation. As delegate members to NCSBCS, you will all receive the Federal Register Notice. Others attending this meeting will also receive the Notice. Two major dates you should mark down are the dates of the hearings. As in all Federal Register Notices, there is a sixty-day (60-day) response period. Responses may be from any group or individual.

The hearings will be held in San Francisco on June 17, and in Washington, D.C. on June 23. Those are the two dates to mark on your calendar.

There is an ANSI Certification Board meeting being held the preceding week to look at the accreditation program as a part of certification.

When you read the Federal Register Notice, I am available to answer any questions by phone. The other gentleman that is working on the program who can answer your questions, is Ted Young of my staff.

We hope you will attend the hearings and take a look at the program after you receive the Notice.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Gene.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ladies and Gentlemen, before we go any further, I would like to take this opportunity to thank very deeply Dick, Jim, and Gene for their presentations this afternoon. I think they were most enlightening. I would like to thank them very, very sincerely for the help that we have received in the past year. It comes from the bottom of my heart, because if that help is not there, you cannot move forward, and that is our theme for this year.

I am going to ask you to bear with us just a little longer. The mind can only take as much as the matter can stand. We might be a little late in recessing this afternoon, but we will keep on going so that everybody has an opportunity to do the things for which he came.

At this time, I would like to ask the country gentleman sitting in the back of the room, Sutton Mullen, if he has any other remarks concerning E32, and his activities in that area relative to what Gene Rowland and the other two gentlemen spoke about. Do you have any comments or additions, Sutton?

MR. MULLEN: No, I do not. In fact, as I understood Mr. Rowland, his program has nothing to do with E32.

MR. ROWLAND: That is right.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Fine. Now, we have got a couple more things that we have to do this afternoon. We came here to chew some things, and we will be chewing some things. We may not get them all chewed up and spit out this afternoon, but we will sure continue tomorrow.

At this time, as it says on your program, we hear reports of NCSBCS Representatives to Other Organizations. Those are covered quite extensively in the S&E Committee report. I do not think we have to dwell on all those things.

If there is anyone in the audience who has a special committee or a special subject that he needs to comment on very briefly before we move ahead, I will give you a minute or two at this time. I mean something like the committee with which I happen to be involved - the Construction Codes and Standards Sector of the American National Metric Council. It is moving forward. That is all I will say about it.

Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to comment on other types of NCSBCS committees to which he is the representative?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Fine. Then we will move ahead and probably will recess a little bit after the 5 o'clock hour.

I have been asked to make two announcements, which I think are quite important to the evening session. One is that our kind friend from the State of Wisconsin -- Ed Starostovic -- has the cheese with him and there will be Wisconsin cheese at the reception tonight.

And also, the bad announcement that I have to make is that our good Conference Coordinator has assured me that it will cost $3.00 per person bus fare for the wives to accompany us on the big sojourn to the ranch house. So, if you want to take your wife along, and we certainly encourage you to do so, we need a little bus money and you can pay Sandi or Kathy.

We are now going into reports from special committees and we do have one very, very important special committee. I think you would call it a dual committee.

Those in the outer foyer who are delegates, we wish you would come in here, you have had your "LSMFT."

For quite some time now, we have been working tooth and nail, burning midnight oil and so forth on bringing forward to you as the delegate body assembled, a proposal for a reorganization plan and a proposed new Constitution for this organization. The last meetings of the special committee were held only recently and involved Ken Henke, Glen Swenson, Ed Kimsey and myself, practically the whole Executive Committee, to try to get this ready for you at this Conference and I believe we have succeeded.

The plan itself is self-explanatory as is the proposed new Constitution. At this morning's Executive Committee meeting I was authorized, as your Chairman, to present it to you for your edification and your acceptance or rejection.

At this time, I would like very much to ask Ken to assist me, and pass out to the delegates the organizational proposal. Then, Glen, if you will pass out the proposed new Constitution. We will accept some questions about the documents and I am sure that tonight we will find many, many rump sessions to discuss parts of the two documents.

Tomorrow, in the regular business session, we will hold the election of officers and we are going right down the line and talk about these documents so that we will have your input to the proposed new organization structure and the proposed new Constitution.

MR. SWENSON: You might have the delegates identify themselves if they do not have a copy.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Just raise your hand, delegates or proxies who need a copy of the plan and the proposed new Constitution.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, nobody is perfect. Spelling may be wrong and a few things like this, but bear with us. You have all evening after the party to study them, figure what you want to do with them or about them, come in tomorrow prepared to discuss them immediately after the elections.

Keep your hands raised if you need a copy, if you are a delegate or a proxy.

I want to assure you that there has been a tremendous amount of work done on these documents. We have received several comments concerning them. I will ask Ken Henke to field some of the questions and I will field some. We will discuss them in great detail tomorrow and I will assure you: You came here for a reason and we are going to give you a chance.

You might as well give them all away, Sandi, if you do not want to take them home. (addressing the delegation) Don't forget a quarter to six (5:45 p.m.) or thereabouts for the buses. Another announcement: tomorrow morning at seven-thirty (7:30 a.m.), the Construction Codes and Standards Sector of the American National Metric Council meets for breakfast.

I will recognize any delegate who wishes to address the Chair to discuss these documents. We are not going to resolve the documents or vote on the documents this afternoon. Ken, are you about ready to take on the questions? I see about four (4) hands up and I will recognize Kern Church first.

MR. HENKE: Do you want to discuss it, or ask a question?

MR. CHURCH: I really do not want to discuss it, but I will ask a question. Is that all right?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, just so we do not get into the details now.

MR. HENKE: Actually, what we propose to do is to discuss the documents briefly, give you an opportunity to digest them over the evening, prepare your rebuttal if that is what you so desire and tomorrow, we will take the documents and work through them.

MR CHURCH: O.K., I am Kern Church, the delegate from North Carolina. I, too, agree with the theme of moving forward and I know that in this Conference we have all had, on a number of occasions, differences of opinion as to how to move forward. I want to share with you some of my thoughts in this regard.

Moving forward, to me, in NCSBCS, means NCSBCS being an independent organization of State people in which the people cooperate with each other, cooperate with the Federal agencies, cooperate with the local government, and also with organizations within the building community.

I want to apologize to my learned Executive Committee members. I did not know that this particular proposed Constitution had been prepared by them until I got here. I did send out a paper and I have got some other copies, if you did not receive one in the mail and would like to have one on this subject matter.

I have been a member of NCSBCS since it started, I have been on the Executive Committee for a number of years and was the National Conference Chairman.

I would like to review with you just a little bit of the history. The original Constitution in 1967 stated that the Director of the National Bureau of Standards would be the Chairman of the Conference and he would appoint all of the committees. This was not accepted by the Conference.

There was an Amended Constitution that was accepted that did provide a role for the Bureau of Standards which said, "The Bureau of Standards would and shall serve as Secretariat."

In 1972, the Constitution was changed to more or less make this role "may." Since that time, NCSBCS in my opinion, has grown immeasurably in stature and also in cooperation with other Federal agencies, including NBS, in cooperation with the model code organizations, which are in fact, organizations of local building officials with which we as State people have to cooperate to get anywhere at all within our own States. This cooperation with the local building officials' organizations is highly necessary and mandatory, in my opinion, to effectively do our job, and the only way we can do that, in my opinion, is to stand on our own two feet.

In the Constitution as it is presently written the word has been "may" and I thought that the Bureau of Standards' assistance to NCSBCS has been carried out pretty well with the word "may" on a year-to-year basis.

In the theme of "Moving Forward," the proposed Constitution puts back some of the word "shall." In other words, we as State delegates, are saying that we are committing ourselves by Constitution from here on out that the National Bureau of Standards will have a certain relationship which we may or may not want to have in the future. We do not know. But so far, it has worked out pretty good, I think, under the 1972 Constitution which authorized the "may."

In this country we have Federal government, State government, and local government. In my opinion, the State government stands in a position, if it can stand independently, to deal effectively with all the Federal agencies, all local government agencies and also industry and others in the private sector building community.

In my opinion, if these Constitutional changes are adopted, instead of moving forward, we will be moving backward, because the local building officials' organizations, that is, the model code organizations and ASTM, ANSI, NFPA, the National Society of Professional Engineers, and the American Institute of Architects, were very interested and very concerned that NCSBCS adopt the Constitution in 1972, to more or less water down the role of NBS and make it a "may" rather than a "shall," so that the States standing on their own two feet could make arrangements with the Bureau of Standards, HUD, the Labor Department or any Federal agency, or any other governmental or non-governmental organization.

So I think, personally, the State delegates ought to think very seriously about this. I understand that there will not be a vote today, but I wanted you to think about this and I do have a few extra copies of the paper that I prepared in this regard and those delegates that did not receive a copy I will be glad to give you one. Thank you.

MR. HENKE: Mr. Chairman, let me, if I may, make a few remarks prior to the opening up for questions. Kern did touch on one thing and I think we ought to clarify it. To be amended, our Constitution requires that after the Annual Conference, the amendment must be mailed to the delegates for a mail ballot. So you will not be asked to vote on the proposed changes to the Constitution at this meeting. That opportunity will come when you receive the mail ballot.

As we discuss and go through it tomorrow the opportunity is there to amend it, and it can be corrected. Understand that this was handled by a relatively small group and we anticipated that once it was given an opportunity for review by the entire delegate body that here would be opposition to certain portions.

When you stay with a document like this as long as we have, you get too close to the woods to see the trees, and we see it slightly differently, maybe, than some of you.

As far as the concept and philosophy of the organizational plan, we will be asking you to take a position on it tomorrow. I think we need to discuss the concept and philosophy so you can have an idea of what our thinking was as we developed it.

MR. MULLEN: Sutton Mullen, Virginia. If I understood Mr. Church correctly, I believe he is advocating that rather than adopt a new Constitution, we stay with the one that we have. Now, there has been some feeling, I believe, that some Constitutional changes are actually needed in order for us to work with the National Bureau of Standards from this point forward and we did hear a letter that was given to us by the Bureau as to its role during the coming year. So I would like to ask Mr. Gross if he would comment on the position of the National Bureau of Standards if we do stay with the present Constitution?

MR. GROSS: I will ask Dick to confirm what I say, but as far as I can determine from discussion with others and reading that Constitution, we can operate fine with the existing Constitution. We have no big problem with that.

DR. WRIGHT: Dick Wright, Center for Building Technology. We have got a good working relationship and we feel we have the basis for continuing.

MR. HENKE: I might give you a little background on why a new Constitution was written. As we worked through the organizational proposal, we discovered that to amend the existing Constitution to make it fit was an extremely laborious activity. It was much easier to rewrite a Constitution and incorporate all the proposed amendments that were submitted in Austin a year ago, and that is the reason for it. We had to make provisions, if we become an independent organization, to enable us to operate and we have put these provisions in here.

Now, the existing Constitution says that we may hire a Director if we so desire, but there are a lot of mechanisms that are left out.

By the way, the rewrite of the Constitution was not at the request of NBS. If you have got anyone you want to throw bricks at, throw them at me because I have been harping on our Constitution for three (3) years. It is not adequate.

At the Austin meeting, we did appoint a Constitution Committee and in fact, we proceeded at the request of the delegate body.

O.K., I do not see any questions, so let us go through it a little bit at a time. As you examine the proposal, you see that there are a minimum of two alternatives that we could actually look at. Everything that we do is going to depend on the financial backing that our organization receives. It makes a lot of difference whether you receive $10,000 or $100,000 as to what you can do, and every time we went full circle, we came back to what it was we were going to receive in the way of money.

Now, assuming that we receive $10,000 in the form of assessments the first year, you can speculate as to how we are going to be able to operate. For one thing, we cannot hire an Executive Director and we are then right back where we are now, with NBS providing all the services that it is currently providing, and we all volunteer our time.

Let us say we receive $40,000. There is the opportunity to utilize an offer from NBS to house our Executive Director at no charges other than material costs. He would be our man and take our direction. The only thing that NBS would do would be to provide office space for him and give him access to secretarial services and other things.

If we receive $60,000 during the year and we can project a cash flow, the possibility then becomes that we can hire a Director, provide secretarial service and provide space for them to work from. They can be located in Washington, or they could be located anywhere in the United States, preferably a central location.

If we receive $150,000, then we can broaden it into additional staff people. As an example, we could provide or make provisions for transportation of your Executive Committee to meetings, because they are going to be meeting a lot more frequently than in the past. We are past the stage when we can be considered an infant. It requires contact with not only the Federal agencies in Washington, D.C. but many organizations in the private sector. We need more contact with the States and it requires more time than you imagine.

So far as the initial organization, what it would look like, would depend on the funding that can be projected for the first year. Gene?

MR. ROWLAND: Since Ken is talking about the monetary situation, the amounts shown in Kern Church's letter which has been circulated to you, reflect a meeting with the then Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Church uses the names Karl Willenbrock and Gene Rowland as not responding. I would like to take issue with the letter because you were told at that time that NBS goes through an appropriation process 1-1/2 years in advance of appropriating the money.

Monies that are specifically designated for line use can be only used for those functions which are clearly identified, and must be used within the Federal government program in that particular area.

During Mr. Kern Church's Chairmanship, the DIBA, or Department of International Business Administration, did have some extra funding and did expend some money to the Council of State Governments for two projects. One was a Model Mobile Home Act document and I believe the other one was the Model Manufactured Building Act document. The projects were to be completed, submitted back to the agency under contract conditions, and that was the expenditure of those monies. Following the meeting with the Assistant Secretary, it was pointed out that those two contracts could be handled. The Bureau can handle other contract monies for specific projects and programs. You notice in Ken Henke's breakdown, I think there is a figure something like $40,000 from government contract.

MR. HENKE: Fifty (50).

MR. ROWLAND: Fifty thousand dollars. In general, he has outlined here the possibility of products that might be produced through NCSBCS Committees, such as those two particular documents. But this is not general operating money, per se. What would happen here if the Executive Secretary was managing that project? Some of his time could be taken out of the money for managing that project. But to take monies from Federal government programs and just turn them over to an operating organization like NCSBCS is not possible. I want to clear up the issue of the possibility of a $200,000 financial transfer to NCSBCS at that time as reference in the letter.

I thought the issue had been resolved, Kern, because as you recall, you did come up with the two contracts. So read his copy of correspondence with regard to that financial question, I do not believe there is correctly any question.

MR. HENKE: Ed Kimsey?

MR. KIMSEY: Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. I think that it would be fine, Ken, if you would elaborate on the role the Executive Director could play beyond what NCSBCS is contemplating, as far as contacts that could be made in Washington, D.C. with Representatives and Senators regarding model legislation and that kind of activity.

MR. HENKE: Federal law prohibits the National Bureau of Standards from lobbying in behalf of an organization such as NCSBCS, and we are missing an important link in our operation. We need that contact; we need that lobbying capability and the Executive Director could fill that role. Now, he would not necessarily be a professional lobbyist. I think, if we needed a professional lobbyist, then funds can be committed for that. In cooperation with other organizations we could hire a professional who is there full-time. The outlay there would be more minimal than anything else, but since NBS or any Federal agency cannot provide this type of activity, then it behooves us as an organization to develop that capability. Erik?

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, Erik Thorne, Arizona. If I remember correctly, about 2-1/2 years ago, we developed a sliding scale State assessment and according to what I read here now, we do not have a sliding scale. At one time, I talked about this problem that we would have with our legislature and I imagine some of the other States may have, too, as far as a dues structure is concerned. Well, when I saw the sliding scale, as far as Arizona was concerned, I asked for $1,000. I went back to our State legislature and it empowered me to pay no more than the amount of $1,000 in dues to NCSBCS - period - and that is what my annual budget calls for. Now, we have to divide by 53 delegates; presumably, a potential of $2,000 a piece. I have got to go back to my State legislature and say now, will you please increase this $1,000 to $2,000 annually. So that presents a problem, I imagine not only to myself, but a problem to some of the others. It does present a legislative problem.

MR. HENKE: If we could, I would like to explain some of the philosophy behind the dues structure that is shown here. Now, understand that when you get ready to vote, even the dues structure itself is subject to modification, but we had to have some point of departure. We pulled out the old sliding annual assessment and we took a look at it. I do not mean to point out any particular State and say that they would do it, but the potential is there. California, whose assessment would be something like $5,000. California could say, I am paying ten times the amount of Idaho, therefore, I ought to have a greater vote than a State paying a lesser amount. With a flat assessment per State, this eliminates this potential from developing. Each State is contributing the same and has the same vote.

Now, we were also faced with another problem and that was to project income. It is pretty easy, then, to use a fixed amount for an initial point and say that if we get 22 States contributing $2,000 each, we have $44,000 of our initial operating capital, but if we got 22 States on a sliding scale - who knows?

Our greatest hurdle to overcome is the initial funding. Once we attain that, we can develop and as we gain experience and income, then the assessment can be changed if requested or desirable. Kern?

MR. CHURCH: I want to respond to Gene's remarks.

MR. HENKE: I think at this time I would much prefer that you wait until after our general discussion and then go to a private room to settle your disagreement. Right now, what we need to do is discuss this and get it ready for tomorrow. I think both sides will have an opportunity on this, Mr. Chairman, and if you would so rule, I think we should refrain from any further remarks and go back to the documents.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I so rule and we will go back to the documents for the balance of today.

MR. HENKE: I know that both of you have points that you want to make.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jim has some other questions.

MR. HENKE: I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, if we could wait until tomorrow after we get through with the discussion of the documents, and then let them make their points.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You are right. Today was just to talk about the documents, their broad scope, and comment on them. Everybody would have a chance, then, to get in a corner with his buddy and discuss it and then bring it back tomorrow.

MR. HENKE: I will comment a little bit further on the funding. That was where we arrived at the $2,000 figure for each State. The $100 figure for Associate Members, of course, was another figure that we arrived at, but there is no scientific data for its development. I will assure you at this point that we did not correspond with other similar types of organizations on their fee structure to see what it was and how ours would fit in. The same thing applies to the Affiliate Membership. Again, these are debatable figures and they can be argued up and down, but this is our proposal to you after our consideration of the subject matter.

We have here only a three (3) year proposal. We have been all the way from one (1) to five (5) years and now we are back to three (3). But the whole mechanism would provide NCSBCS the opportunity to enter in at a minimal cost, to start providing certain types of services to its own organization. As our capability of supporting ourselves increases, NBS's supportive role would decrease accordingly. We had projected by the end of five (5) years that the services received from NBS in the form of Secretariat services would be zero, and NCSBCS would be at one hundred (100) percent capacity. We have even made projections. As I say, we have a five (5) year projection. The staffing level for NCSBCS would be approximately eight (8) professional and two (2) secretarial people.

Are there any questions concerning the proposal itself? It is a flexible proposal. It has to be, and since it is a States' organization, the primary funding source as I have indicated here would be the States. Yes, sir?

MR. BULLOCK: Excuse me, I want to ask a question. George Bullock of Georgia. Did you think about the idea of a target date of implementing the dues structure for the States? Were all the States to start off equally as far as paying the dues to the structure?

MR. HENKE: Yes, George, we did. We discussed that point, but we ran into the problem that many States have to go through the appropriations cycle and this may be a one (1) to two (2) year delay. We recognize this. There are some states that have in their budget this current fiscal year monies with which to pay their assessment and they would have it for the next fiscal year, also. It might be interesting to note that there are two (2) States that have already indicated that they could pay their assessment yet this fiscal year. I say

"two" because there were two of us that were discussing it and have checked it out. I am sure that there may be other States that might be able to pay an assessment out of their fiscal 1975 budget, and there will be a portion of them that will be able to pay an assessment in fiscal year 1976, and there will be some that cannot. We recognize this. There will be some that might be able to pay starting in fiscal year 1977 and there will be some - and knowing politics the way we all do - that may never be able to pay an assessment. We have to recognize that possibility.

When you read through the Constitution, there is a stipulation under "expenditures" that only States that have paid their annual assessment will have voting privileges on budget matters. That is the only restriction, because it would not be fair for a State that had not paid an assessment to make a determination as to the expenditures of the organization. All other voting privileges would remain the same.

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, Erik Thorne of Arizona. Well, that puts me in quite a bind because I can write you a check for $1,000 tomorrow. This is already appropriated for NCSBCS.

MR. HENKE: Fine. I would be happy.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, we would take it.

MR. THORNE: My budget for the next fiscal year which was approved last week, still carries the same $1,000 appropriation as Arizona's dues to NCSBCS. What do I do for next year? I cannot very well take it from one area, because if the State Auditor comes along and finds I have taken $1,000 from one area and added it on to the dues structure, I can just about see my neck going under the guillotine.

MR. HENKE: Erik, I think you would be in about the same position that many States might be in. They have to go back and get a supplemental budget. But that will be strictly a procedural problem that some of us are faced with from time to time.

MR. BUSBY: Doug Busby, Missouri. In your draft organizational chart, you have only the National Bureau of Standards. Why couldn't HUD be listed in the organizational chart? To establish definitives insofar as what NCSBCS could support and how they will be supported by HUD, to get the recommendations and what have you, which the States bring up that they may want to put into the standards?

MR. HENKE: Well, one of the reasons we only identify NBS is they are the only ones that are providing Secretariat and technical assistance to us at present.

MR. BUSBY: I go along with your proposal as far as getting a Director for something like this. I think this would be good from a coordinating standpoint, but you would have to incorporate the organization which is most effective in our position, and right now, from a State standpoint, that is HUD.

MR. HENKE: Well, you go back into the Constitution under Relationships with Other Organizations and you will find that we carried forth the same statement that is in our current Constitution in which we do identify other Federal organizations such as HUD.

MR. BUSBY: Well, my next question is, why did you put just NBS in there?

MR. HENKE: Because they are the only ones that are in a position to provide technical assistance to us. HUD will not provide technical assistance.

MR. BUSBY: We have already got that from what their operative organization is doing now insofar as evaluating materials, etc. for industry. What we are looking for is something to establish standards and to get our voice into those standards. The coordination and correlation we have with NBS now is perfect.

MR. HENKE: All we are showing is a continuing role. It is conceivable that when we would print an organizational chart, even NBS could be eliminated. The concept is that NBS will provide technical assistance, and it is providing Secretariat services to us. All

we are doing is showing a current arrangement and showing how this arrangement would change over a matter of years.

MR. BUSBY: As far as funding is concerned, if you want to fund tomorrow, most Governors have a "slush" fund for an emergency. That is the way I would go, if you wanted it tomorrow.

MR. HENKE: Well, each State would have to handle that as they see fit, because no two States operate exactly alike. If I went over to my Governor right now, if I needed to request additional funds, he might buy me a one way ticket. But I happen to have money in my budget to pay an assessment right now. Erik?

MR. THORNE: Erik Thorne of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, you passed over very lightly something about a professional lobbyist in Washington, D.C. You know, I think we are losing cognizance of the fact that we already have the best professional lobbyists that ever existed. I do not know why in tarnation we do not contact our State Senators, and you talk about lobbyists. There is not a man in the world that could do a better job than our own people.

MR. HENKE: Erik, you answered your question in your first statement. I do not know why we do not contact them either.

MR. THORNE: It beats me. We have got lobbyists with the greatest amount of push and that we need a professional lobbyist, registered and so forth, I cannot see that.

MR. HENKE: Actually, all we are saying is that there are times when appearances before Committees to represent the views of the organization are necessary.

We are running out of time. It is 5:30, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to talk to you about it later tonight.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would like to make one or two short comments before we recess.

All these things will be talked about tomorrow in great detail, and I urge you, if you are a delegate to this body, be here this week. Do not go wandering home and then say, "I did not know what it was all about," or anything like that. I urge you, be here.

Herb, just one quick comment.

MR. MEYER: I would like to ask the group that is working on the revision to Resolution Number 7 to meet in this room tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. and we will try to get it worked out.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would like to thank you, Ken, for taking the questions so far. Hearing no other objections, we will recess until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. Thank you.

Morning Session
April 30, 1975

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Gentlemen, let us take our seats and call the meeting back to order.

As you recall, the meeting was recessed yesterday afternoon to be reconvened this morning. Let the record show the meeting was reconvened at 9:05 a.m. this morning.

We will continue with the normal Conference business. This morning's session will consist of the presentation of the committee reports.

Presentation of the Executive Committee Report

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I do not have ample copies for everybody. It is a narrative report and I will briefly read through it. We did itemize the achievements of the Conference this

year and I will just enumerate them to you. You will all receive copies of this report in the mail.

We have fourteen (14) achievements this past year that we feel are quite noteworthy. One of the first ones was an affirmative response to the Consumer Product Safety Commission request for assistance in a survey on aluminum wiring.

The second achievement was in July when the Executive Committee voted to proceed in the direction of establishing its own Executive Secretary.

The third achievement was the meeting with the then Chairman of the National Governor's Conference, Calvin Rampton of Utah. We delivered a letter to him familiarizing him with NCSBCS activities.

The fourth one was the fact that NCSBCS was ably represented at the Inflation Conference on Housing and Construction, and the Summit Conference on Inflation by Mr. Ken Henke and myself, respectively. Since that time, the White House has kept us closely informed on many of its activities. In fact, every once in a while, we receive a mailgram saying, "Can you send somebody back to attend the meeting?" For instance, if we get the mailgram today, and we have to be there tomorrow morning, we have to call on one of our staff people at NBS and ask him to cover it for us.

We did meet with the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency concerning the training on the energy document. We submitted nominations to HUD for membership on the Mobile Home Advisory Council and succeeded in getting about five (5) people on that. We submitted nominations to the White House for the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) Board of Directors and to this date, officially have heard nothing more on that.

The questionnaire which I sent out to all delegates saying, in essence, when did you last talk to your Governor about your NCSBCS activities? We received twenty-six (26) replies from that. Admittedly it took a little pulling and tugging, but we got them back.

We named a representative to the President's Council on Mental Retardation in the personnage of Charles Talmage of Texas.

And then, in December, the reorganization plan was finalized and sent to the delegates. We also had a request from the Deputy Executive Director of the National Governor's Conference to have a NCSBCS representative appear before that body and Sutton Mullen represented us on that.

We held an informal meeting with HUD during March concerning the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and a task force comprised of Bill Bryant, Sutton Mullen and Ed Kimsey were named to represent NCSBCS as a liaison between HUD and the States.

Chairman-Elect Henke, in item twelve, represented the Conference at a meeting concerning the Federal energy proposal.

Item thirteen - Chairman-Elect Henke and myself were briefed on the proposed National Laboratory Accreditation Program and invited to submit some comments thereto.

During the year we held Committee Week meetings in Providence, Rhode Island; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and, Arlington, Virgina. The minutes of these meetings are available.

We had a letter as late as yesterday morning from the National Bureau of Standards, pledging its continued assistance during the coming year and we feel that moving forward with the organization plan, which we will discuss later today, indicates a trend for better things to come.

Executive Committee actions which took place yesterday morning included the finalization of this report. The Committee approved three items which are voluminous in stature. One was the approval of submitting the proposed new organizational plan to this body. The second was the approval of the proposed new Constitution, and the third was the acceptance of the pledge of continued assistance from the National Bureau of Standards and its staff.

In essence, ladies and gentlemen, that is the Executive Committee report for the past Conference year and I would like a motion to put it on the floor for acceptance.

MR. MEYER: So moved.

MR. HENKE: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb Meyer moved the acceptance of the Executive Committee report and Ken Henke has seconded it. Are there any questions?

MR. MULLEN: Question. Mullen of Virginia. Does the acceptance of this report imply that the proposed Constitution will be sent out for ballot, now?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: No. Acceptance of this report merely says that these are the things that the Executive Committee has done during the past year.

MR. MULLEN: And we will have an opportunity to discuss them?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, sir. Any further questions?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All those in favor of accepting the report, signify with the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered. The Executive Committee Report goes into the record.

The next one will be the report of the S&E Committee, Chairman Ken Henke.

Presentation of the Report of the Standards and Evaluation Committee

MR. HENKE: I have for presentation to the Conference a report of the Standards and Evaluation Committee for the past year.

The report was reviewed and approved after several amendments by the S&E Committee members. There will be copies of it available for all the delegates and attendees of the Conference, and it will be mailed out.

As I stated to the S&E Committee the other day, my sincere apologies because I mailed 150 copies of the report down here and at the present time, they are somewhere between here and Des Moines.

The S&E Committee this year did not really take up what I would consider to be some earth-shattering types of actions. We proceeded to plow through many of the mundane things that are the responsibility of our Committee. We passed a lot of resolutions.

You know, somewhere in this country, there has got to be the biggest file ever to be seen and that is where all these resolutions go. Nobody ever acts on the things, but we send them in.

Many of our members are instructed delegates or liaison people to different organizations, such as the Model Codes Standardization Council, the ASTM E-32 Committee, the ASTM E-36 Committee, and the American National Metric Council. We have the Committee on the ANSI A117 Standard, which is the handicapped standard and about ten others. I sometimes think that our people really meet themselves going and coming.

We really do attempt to represent the Conference with these other organizations and quite frankly, I think our people - we and the other organizations - benefit greatly from our representation and our attendance at these meetings.

Our Committee has attended many conferences with HUD on Title I and Title VI of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and on the proposed energy documents that are being produced. We have worked closely with the National Governor's Conference on several occasions and have represented NCSBCS there.

The Committee report itself is more or less a summation of the activities of the year, and also projections of the items that we think need to be given attention in the coming year. I will say this, that from the original copy of the report the S&E Committee reviewed and approved, the corrections that we indicated have not been made, per se, on the copy itself. However, there is an addendum sheet which lists all of the corrections to the report. Each of you will receive a copy of it in the mail after the Conference is over.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would submit a copy of the S&E Committee's Report for the year and move its adoption.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Ken. You have heard the motion to adopt the S&E Committee Report. Is there a second?

MR. KIMSEY: I second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second by Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. Anyone have anything they want to say about it?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All those in favor of accepting the report, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The S&E Committee report is in the record. The next report that we will hear this morning will be that of the Reciprocity Committee. Will Herb Meyer come up and take the stand?

Presentation of the Report of the Reciprocity Committee

MR. MEYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and delegates. I would like to comment that we have passed out copies, and there is only one addition to the report. I would like to say that it has been a pleasure for me to have been Chairman of the Reciprocity Committee and worked this past year with the people. It is certainly a pleasure to have the people do the work that we have been able to do in the past. I will just review slightly that we established a handbook for the Committee; we established the Independent Agency Advisory Group; we reaffirmed a lot of actions that had been taken in the past and subsequently, the Executive Committee has concurred in those actions. We added one item at our meeting on Monday that I would like to read to you at this time.

Nominations were recommended to the Executive Committee and submitted by that Committee to HUD for membership on its Mobile Home Advisory Council. Five members were selected from the ten nominations submitted by the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards. I would like to submit this report today and I move its adoption.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It has been moved by the Chairman of the Reciprocity Committee to adopt the Reciprocity Committee Report. Is there a second?

MR. BEARDMORE: I second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Seconded by Beardmore of Kansas. Any discussion?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ready for the question. All those in favor of adopting the report, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered. The Reciprocity Report is in the record. The next report is that of the Education and Qualification Committee, Chairman Glen Swenson.

Presentation of the Report of the Education and Qualification Committee

MR. SWENSON: Thank you very much. In the interest of time, I would like to very briefly scan through the report, rather than read it in detail.

During the past year, the E&Q Committee took some very positive steps toward implementing what we believe to be the philosophy of NCSBCS with respect to energy conservation.

More specifically, some actions were taken of an initiative nature which we expect to lead to what we hope will be excellent courses and training programs for people involved in energy conservation.

The Committee received some proposals. We are soliciting additional proposals from organizations which might be able to contribute in this respect. We hope that within the next year, some positive results will be seen in the nature of training programs that could be conducted within various States, or, lacking sufficient interest to justify that, training programs within various regions.

The Committee believes that the highlight of the year probably was the emergence of the National Academy of Code Administration as a strong and viable organization which will fulfill a long standing need. The E&Q Committee, working through the Executive Committee, served as a catalyst to stimulate this development - and I will not recap the history of that. I think you are all quite familiar with it.

We have been looking to the future now and the need to address ourselves to the matter of metrication, and possibly of more immediate urgency, addressing ourselves to the matter of training and education relating to energy.

Briefly, this is the essence of the situation as it stands at this time and if I may, I will let it rest at that, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that all of you study the report of the E&Q Committee in greater detail and if you have any suggestions, any ideas that might be of help, I am sure that the E&Q Committee, as it may be appointed by Ken Henke, will be receptive and would receive your suggestions with great appreciation.

With that brief comment, I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that the report be accepted.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the motion to adopt the report. Is there a second?

MR. MEYER: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second by Herb Meyer of Minnesota. Is there any discussion?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All those in favor of adopting the report, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered. Is Bill Connolly in the room?

MR. CONNOLLY: I am.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Very good. The next report will be that of the M&RP Committee. Come on up, Bill.

Presentation of the Report of the Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee

MR. CONNOLLY: The Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee has long seen its objective basically as one, to foster as much as possible interstate uniformity in forms and procedures, and two, to foster as much as possible the adoption of innovative management and regulatory procedures.

During the past year, we undertook a number of specific activities directed towards those two major goals. We have, to date, met with very little success in terms of fostering interstate uniformity in forms and administrative procedures. The Committee, during this year, ended an effort of almost two years to see if it could get the States interested in utilizing the uniform building permit application. It finally came to naught. There appeared to be just too many differences within the several States and the way they were organized, and it appeared that it really was not possible in most instances for a State agency to impose any kind of uniformity throughout the State. States just do not have that much control over local procedures.

In the area of innovative administrative procedures, I do feel that we made a great deal more progress this year. This afternoon, we are offering to the Conference a program - "Innovation Workshop." We think it will be a very worthwhile program and hope that everyone here will take the opportunity to attend. We solicited papers from throughout the industry on administrative and regulatory innovations. We decided on six (6) papers, which we asked people to come here to this Conference and present. There are a wide variety of topics, very technical topics, concerning the use of automatic data processing equipment for the analysis of plans for their compliance with building codes, program public communications for agencies like ours, report on the progress made by the State of Massachusetts in implementing the LEAP Program, the use of computers and microfilm in a central automated processing and reporting system at the municipal level and at a State level.

Also, we have begun to direct our activities to try to develop information on the procedures the various States use to amend or adopt model codes for their own use, with a view towards trying to encourage some uniformity in that process during the next year.

There are copies of the full report available. With that brief summation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move adoption of our report.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Bill. You have heard the motion to accept the report. Is there a second?

MR. SWENSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second by Glen Swenson of Utah. Any discussion?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All those in favor of adopting the report, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered.

Incidently, I want to make a comment here and now. I was asked this morning at breakfast - and I think this is appropriate - somebody said, "What were you in the Navy or the Army?" And I said, "Well, the one I happen to have been in was the Army." And the guy said, "Well, you sure do it when you're on the platform." Well, I do not believe in letting motions hang for hours on end. I like to see action and that is the way we will try to keep the meeting today, an action session all the way.

At this time, I would ask your indulgence. If I make a mistake, don't all of you jump on me. Just delegate one guy to knock me down. That is all you have to do.

At this time, we have got a Resolution that was sent back to be rewritten, published and so forth. I am going to ask the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee to come up. We are talking now about Resolution No. 7; it is coming in again under "unfinished business" and copies are being passed out.

MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman, the Committee with the addition of some people that were interested in some changes in the resolution, namely Jim Hicks, Jane Heron, Jack Bono, Nick Carter, and Sutton Mullen, sat down this morning and reviewed Resolution No. 7 as to the "whereas's," and we modified both of them and I would like to read them. I am not going to read the original part of the "Whereas's" because I am sure you are all familiar with it. This is the amended language:

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it be made known to all appropriate organizations and individuals that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, favors the retention of the standard known as ANSI A119.1 as the Mobile Home Standard and the continued use, application and enforcement of that Standard through the various States and their political subdivisions.

AND NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards vigorously opposes any actions which may impose upon the citizens of the respective States, mobile home standards promulgated by any agency or organization not utilizing the voluntary consensus process, exemplified by such procedures as those established by the American National Standards Institute."

I would like to move the adoption of the amended Resolution, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Herb. As you recall, the Resolution was sent back to the Committee to be re-worked. I want to get a second to Mr. Herb Meyer's motion that we accept the Resolution.

MR. BEARDMORE: Second, Beardmore.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second by Beardmore of Kansas. You will be voting on the complete Resolution, not the amendment. The Resolution as redrafted and brought back on the floor.

All the "whereas's" for Resolution 7 were contained on the first sheet. The second sheet completes the Resolution.

Are there any further comments on Resolution No. 7? Jane?

MS. HERON: Mr. Chairman, excuse me for bringing up any more amendments from the floor, because they are both minor. It has just been pointed out to me that in line two there is a typo. It should say, "organizations and individuals" in the plural and in line three, it should say, "the standard known as ...," and before the word "ANSI A119.1" the full title of the Standard should be inserted. Perhaps someone could offer the exact title of the document.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Is this acceptable to the Resolutions Committee?

MR. MEYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It is minor and typographical, and it has no bearing on the Resolution itself. Thank you, Jane. Yes?

MR. NIELSEN: Editorial. In the second section on line two after "vigorously" it should be "opposed" instead of "apposes."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Does the Secretary have those changes? Bill?

MR. CONNOLLY: I would just like to speak briefly, because I think I am going to have to vote against the motion. It has been my experience with the Federal Government that it is proper or that it needs to achieve a consensus in the industry regulated before it can promulgate a regulation. We operate that same way on our State level. Regulations derive themselves from a number of sources, but basically, the responsibility of the agency that drafted them, then they are put out for public hearings and published in registers and what not in the manner like that of the Federal Government. I do not think that we in New Jersey can ask the Federal Government to follow a procedure that is not its standard procedure and, in fact, is not our standard procedure either.

MR. MULLEN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Mullen.

MR. MULLEN: I would like to respond to that. Certainly, we are not talking about a consensus within the industry when we talk about voluntary consensus. We are talking about the procedures established by the American National Standards Institute and this calls for a consensus by all of those affected by the standards. It is really a translation of representative government at the legislative level down to the regulatory level.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Are there any further comments on Resolution 7? Remember, you are voting on the entire Resolution as again presented by the Resolutions Committee. We will call for a roll call vote on this Resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

Abstain.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Missouri?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

(Laughter)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Texas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, I have thirty (30) votes cast and one (1) abstaining.

MR. MEYER: There is one delegate from Texas here and I do not know whether he wants to cast by proxy.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I called Texas on the vote. He is the thirty-first one.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You mean, we have all affirmatives?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: No, we have one abstaining.

MR. THORNE: Charles Talmage is the delegate. Is there a delegate here from Texas by proxy?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Forest, back here, and we have a telegram appointing him as proxy. It looks like Resolution No. 7 carries. Let it be entered into the record.

Now, let me ask a question. I hear rumblings, rumors and everything else, and somebody tell me - is Resolution No. 8 coming back in? Sutton?

MR. MULLEN: No.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you. Are there any items of unfinished business at this time? Mr. Mullen?

MR. MULLEN: Mr. Chairman, does the Constitution come under that?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Sutton, I am going to have to buy you a cup of coffee.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I do not think it will go unnoticed. At this time, we will go into new business and we have got some items of new business that we would like to clear off before we go into your comment, Mr. Mullen.

Election of Officers

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The first item of new business is the election of the officers for the coming year and I will try to explain to you how this works. There are four Regional Chairmen. There are four Executive Committee Members-At-Large. There is a National Chairman and a National Chairman-Elect or Vice-Chairman, as you wish to call him, under the existing Constitution, and there is also a Past Chairman of the Executive Committee. Those are the people who occupy the positions of officer. Now, for next year - this will take effect tomorrow morning - Mr. Ken Henke will become your National Chairman, thereby vacating the Midwestern Regional Chairmanship. I will become your Past National Chairman. The other Regional Chairmanship that is vacant is the Western Region and there are two (2) two-year Executive Committee Member-At-Large terms vacant and one (1) one-year term, which I will explain to you.

Charles Talmage stays for another year as the Southern Regional Chairman, Charles Dinezio of Massachusetts stays for one more year as the Northeastern Regional Chairman, and by vote at the Western Regional luncheon yesterday, Mr. Erik Thorne becomes the new Western Regional Chairman. By vote in the Midwestern election yesterday, Mr. John Wenning becomes the Midwestern Regional Chairman. I think a hand is in order for these gentlemen.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We now have the opportunity to elect the Executive Committee Members-At-Large. These do not have to go by Region, although some have been endorsed by Regions. This is fine. On March 17, Mr. Charles Betts of Indiana sent me a letter stating that Indiana now has a new delegate in the person of Mr. Dale Gatlin. Mr. Gatlin becomes the delegate from the State of Indiana in Charles Betts' place. Charles Betts' term as Member-At-Large would have run for one more year. I have accepted Mr. Betts' resignation in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws and whoever gets his position At-Large will be serving a one-year term. Therefore, there are two (2) two-year terms and one (1) one-year term.

I would like to call for nominations from the floor. Raise your hand, stand and be recognized, and offer your nomination for Executive Committee Member-At-Large. It has been suggested to me that we use the method that we used last year. The top two vote getters will take the two (2) two-year terms, and the third vote getter will take the one (1) year term. If that is not objectionable to a lot of people, that is the way we will do it.

I will now accept nominations for Executive Committee Member-At-Large. I will recognize Glen Swenson, first.

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, prior to nominations being placed, may I have a moment of your indulgence?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, sir.

MR. THORNE: Prior to any names for the Executive Committee being placed in nomination, I want to say one thing very emphatically. Ken Henke is taking over as National Chairman for the ensuing year. We are running into a very critical year. In my three (3) years, I have never missed a meeting, but I have been to many, many a meeting where I have seen the Executive Committee being unable to act because of a lack of a quorum.

I do not think any person should be nominated and accept an Executive Committee position with NCSBCS unless he is willing to put out. Unless you are willing to come to our Executive Committee meetings, unless you are willing to work for our organization, break your back a little bit and really put out, and give our National Chairman the helping hand he needs because he cannot do it alone and neither can the rest of us from Regional areas. So, please do not accept the nomination and do not accept a position unless you are willing to work.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Thorne. At this time, I will recognize Glen Swenson of Utah.

MR. SWENSON: In behalf of the Western Region, it is my pleasure to nominate a man who needs no introduction -- which is fortunate, because I have forgotten his name.

MR. SWENSON: However, you will all recognize him as being very capable. He has worked long and hard in behalf of NCSBCS. He has much talent. And despite the fact that he comes from California, he still works for all of us less fortunate States, and it is obvious by now that I am nominating Jim Hicks of California, and I suggest that you vote for and elect Jim Hicks.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jim Hicks has been nominated for Executive Committee Member-At-Large. Ken Henke?

MR. HENKE: Mr. Chairman -- Ken Henke of Iowa -- I would like to nominate an individual who has served one year on the Executive Committee. He is a hard worker, supports all of our programs, gives freely of his time -- other than that, he is a pretty nice fellow. Ed Kimsey, I would like to place your name on the ballot.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ed Kimsey of Tennessee has been nominated to the Executive Committee. Missouri?

MR. BUSBY: I move that the nominations be closed.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I have not called three times for additional nominations and that is the way the election will have to be run. I am sorry. I have additional hands in the air who want to nominate people. Yes, sir -- John?

MR. WENNING: John Wenning from Wisconsin. I would like to nominate Herb Meyer, the delegate from Minnesota.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb Meyer, the delegate from Minnesota, has been nominated as an Executive Committee Member-At-Large. Lee?

MS. MELANCON: I want at this time to nominate Mr. Kern Church of North Carolina.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Kern Church of North Carolina has been nominated. Charles?

MR. DINEZIO: The Northeast Region would like to nominate Bernard Cabelus to the Executive Committee At-Large.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Bernard Cabelus has been nominated as an Executive Committee Member-At-Large. Are there further nominations?

MR. BEARDMORE: Move the nominations be closed.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second call. Are there further nominations?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Third call. Are there further nominations? If not, I will accept your motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Mr. Dale Gatlin of Indiana.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: There is a technicality if you ever had one, isn't it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Make a liberal interpretation.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I will make a liberal interpretation. I will have to rule that the third call was issued and the motion was made before that nomination. I have made that ruling and that is how it will stand. You have heard the list of the nominations. Will the Secretary please read the nominations and let us have these gentlemen stand up and only delegates vote on these, by the way. Mr. Mullen, go ahead.

MR. MULLEN: Is it possible to ask a question at this point?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, sir.

MR. MULLEN: I was very impressed by my friend from Arizona who spoke about the willingness and the ability of the nominees to attend Executive Committee meetings. I would like to ask if it is possible to have each nominee make a statement before we vote, as to whether he will be able to attend the Executive Committee meetings.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think we should. As we go down the line, each person will stand up and make a "campaign statement," right? Go right ahead.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Did you accept the Dale Gatlin?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: No, I accepted the motion to close the nominations before Gatlin was nominated. Now, is there a second to close the nominations?

MR. BEARDMORE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So moved. All those in favor of closing the nominations signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Closed and so ordered. We will continue with the balloting. Call the roll and I will ask each person to stand up and tell us whether or not you can attend these meetings.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Jim Hicks, California.

MR. HICKS: Hicks of California, and I will fulfill my obligations if I am fortunate enough to be elected. Thank you very much.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Ed Kimsey, Tennessee?

MR. KIMSEY: Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. I will be able to fulfill my obligations on the Executive Committee, keeping in mind that it might be that State business takes precedence over the Executive Committee, but I will make every effort to fulfill my obligations.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Herb Meyer of Minnesota.

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Herb Meyer?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He just stepped out.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kern Church, North Carolina.

MR. CHURCH: I have to emulate Ed Kimsey's statement. I think, that in some cases, State business may take precedence, but in the past when I was on the Committee I do not believe I ever missed a meeting, but I would like to make this statement: I believe you have some real good members and I was about to withdraw, but for the sake of the Southern Delegation I will stay in.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Thank you, Kern. Bernie Cabelus, Connecticut.

MR. CABELUS: Well, I think that my record over the past eight (8) years on the Executive Committee will more or less speak for itself. I think I have missed, perhaps three (3) meetings in eight (8) years.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Can somebody get Herb Meyer in here?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Mahaffey, would you see if Herb Meyer is in the hall?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will pass out some blank sheets of paper, and I would like to appoint Bob Berntsen, Dale Gatlin, and Sutton Mullen as the tellers for the election. You have the names before you, and they will be written on the board.

MR. HENKE: We vote for how many?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You vote for three (3). The top two (2) vote getters will fill the two (2) two-year terms, and the third in line in the number of votes will fill the one (1) one-year term.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, if the delegates would stand while the ballots are being passed.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, if the delegates would stand as we pass the ballots.

(Off the record during voting preparation.)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Before we collect the ballots, we will ask Herb Meyer to make his statement. Would somebody give me a ballot, I would like to have one. Let's wait a second or two then, so you can find out about Herb.

(Mr. Meyer returns to the Conference.)

Herb, we would like to get a campaign statement out of you as running for Member-At-Large, and whether or not you would be able to fulfill your obligations, and take us all to coffee every now and then.

MR. MEYER: I have nothing to say, really. I think they all know who I am.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Stand up, Herb. This is Herb Meyer.

MR. HENKE: The question is whether you are going to be able to go to the meetings or not.

MR. MEYER: I have been attending all of them so far, and I guess I could make them in the future.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All right. You have heard from Herb Meyer. Delegates cast your votes, and will the Tally Committee pick them up, and get a tally, and report it to us. As soon as the votes are all cast, I will make a couple of announcements which are quite important so stay around. Delegates, please do not leave, we need you. Here is my vote, if somebody wants to pick it up.

(Tally Committee passes among delegates.)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: While the ballots are being tallied, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make a couple of announcements.

One of the announcements is quite important to you. We will be assembling before we go to lunch at the far end of the pool around the diving board for a group picture. Now, if you are not in the picture, sometimes you get a little problem when you get back to your home State.

MR. THORNE: You say it is the far end of the pool. Do you mean in or out of it?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Out of it. Please. That water is thirty-eight degrees (38°F) out there.

My second announcement involves the delegates only. I would like the delegates to assemble in the front chairs up here to go into the Executive Session under the existing Constitution, to accept the recommendation of the Executive Committee concerning the Executive Secretary offer of the National Bureau of Standards for the coming year. The rest of you can go out for coffee at the appropriate time. Delegates, please assemble up here.

Now, we are waiting for the results of this election. Don't forget that later this afternoon we will have the NCSBCS/NBS Workshop, "Innovation in Building Regulatory Agency Management and Procedures," presented by the Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee. I think that is going to be quite interesting. This is the first time for something like this.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I might say that these papers are well done. There is a lot of information. There is some material in them I am sure will concern a lot of you, especially some of the work that is being done in the Massachusetts study on concrete testing. There is some data that will be of real interest in these papers throughout, so we hope that you will definitely make it a point to listen to the presentations this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: If they get more than thirty-one (31) votes out there, we have got problems. Here it comes.

By the way, don't forget the banquet tonight, and the social hour beginning at 6:30 p.m., in the promenade area.

The banquet is at eight and we urge you all to attend. You will have a little fun there tonight and I am sure that you will enjoy yourselves. There is a very nice dinner planned.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who is watching the Tellers, Mr. Chairman?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sandi Berry.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is a competent crew. We got a good spread there.

MR. HENKE: Mr. Chairman, Ken Henke from Iowa. When Herb was out and we were wanting to affirm his ability to attend meetings, he was in a telephone conversation. Next week, the House of Representatives is going to take up its version of the Energy Bill, and it behooves the Conference, I think, to take a strong position, again, on whether or not the Federal Government should write its own document or reference the ASHRAE 90P document.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman. It might be appropriate, Ken, that you try to contact Ed Rovner, and get the testimony that the National Governor's Conference is going to introduce. You also may want to support that stated position which comes from the National Governor's Conference.

MR. HENKE: I did attend that meeting with Ed Rovner, and two other States' people on the legislation that went through the Senate, and I am sure that it will be the same statement that goes to the House that went to the Senate.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Except the House Bill is different?

MR. HENKE: Yes, but the energy document puts us in the same position as the mobile home construction standard, and I think we have to take a positive stand on it. Or, we can no longer go back to the private sector and request that they develop standards for us, if they are not going to be used.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Ken, immediately after we come back from the coffee break, would you like to discuss that?

MR. HENKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We will discuss this right after the coffee break.

We are waiting right now to see how the election comes out, see who is who, and where they are. They must have had a snag.

(Very brief off the record interim while awaiting the vote.)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You want to come up and write them on the board, Sutton? Or, let me read them.

We now have the tally on the ballots. The results of the balloting to elect the Executive Committee Members-at-Large are:

Ed Kimsey -- 23 votes.

Jim Hicks -- 19 votes.

Kern Church -- 17 votes.

Herb Meyer -- 16 votes.

Bernie Cabelus -- 11 votes.

You have elected Mr. Ed Kimsey and Mr. Jim Hicks for two-year terms to the Executive Committee, and Mr. Kern Church to fill the one-year term. I think these gentlemen deserve a hand.

(Applause)

Your new Executive Committee is comprised of Mr. Ken Henke, National Chairman; myself as the Past National Chairman; Charles Talmage, Charles Dinezio, Erik Thorne, and John Wenning, as Regional Chairmen; and Ed Kimsey, Jim Hicks, Kern Church, and Glen Swenson as the Executive Committee Members-at-Large. The Chairmen-Elect will be taken care of tomorrow morning at the Executive Committee meeting.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the results of the election but I will repeat them:

Ed Kimsey -- 23

Jim Hicks -- 19

Kern Church -- 17

Herb Meyer -- 16

Bernie Cabelus -- 11

At this time, we ask that the delegates please remain for a couple of minutes, and the rest of you can go for coffee.

(Brief Recess)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We will now go back into the general session and I will make a couple of announcements.

We have a Workshop this afternoon, and we do not want to ignore it. We want to get our constructive business done first.

In accordance with the vote of the delegates in Executive Session moments ago, the offer of the National Bureau of Standards of the Executive Secretary for the ensuing year under the existing Constitution, was unanimously accepted, and Mr. James G. Gross will be the new Executive Secretary. Jim, do you want to stand up.

(Applause)

I can tell you this, you will have tremendous cooperation from Jim and I am sure that Gene will bear us out on that, too.

The offer of the four committee staff people, Charles Mahaffey, Bert Vogel, Pat Cooke, and Jim Pielert was also in the letter that was accepted and we are real happy about that assistance. That is the action that was taken in Executive Session.

The next item concerns the energy hearings. Herb, maybe you would like to discuss that.

MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of names on a list, and if somebody would pass out the list I would appreciate it.

In light of the action that we took with reference to HUD and the mobile home standards, it is my personal belief that we ought to be consistent and take an action similar to that on the energy question. As was pointed out by Ken, there are going to be hearings, starting Monday, by the House Conferees on what is known as House H.R. 4485. I have got a list of the people who are on the Conferee Committee. I would like to move that the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards ask that the Executive Committee in its session tomorrow, draft a telegram outlining the position that we have always established in the past, and send the position to the members of the Committee, specifically proposing the adoption of an energy standard under the proposed bill, and that standard be the ASHRAE 90P Standard.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the recommendation of the delegate from Minnesota, Mr. Herb Meyer, and the motion. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. GREENLEAF: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It is seconded. Is there any further discussion on the motion that calls for the Executive Committee to take action at its session tomorrow, similar to the action that was taken on the mobile home situation, but for the energy hearings which are coming up. Any discussion on that motion and its second?

(No response)

Ready for the question: All those in favor of the motion, signify by the usual sign, Aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Then it is so ordered. We will refer it to tomorrow's Executive Committee meeting.

This gentleman has been waiting for a long time. He has been signaling me, and I am going to give him the floor, for what I suspect will be a very brief but concise report. I will not let him take more than an hour and a half, because we have got too many other things to do.

"Monk" Munger, the Managing Director of the Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, would like to give you an update on 90P. Monk, go right ahead.

Report on ASHRAE 90P

MR. MUNGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To digress a moment, this is my first meeting with this group, and I am most impressed with your activities and the way you handle your meetings, and with the Top Kick here. He runs a great meeting. I appreciate having these few moments to discuss something of great mutual interest, ASHRAE's 90P.

Our Director of Engineering, Fred Reed, has spent nearly full time for over a year now as Chairman of Panel 6 on heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment, and as Secretary to 90P's Executive Committee. In fact, he is no longer our Director of Engineering He could not do the job, spending all that time on 90P, so he has been replaced as Director of Engineering, but not really for that reason.

I talked with Jack Tumulty, the Chairman of 90P, this morning. And I was encouraged for the first time in many months about the situation. All of the chapters have been completed; that is, the review of the comments on the second draft, except for Chapter 5 on HVAC Systems and Chapter 10 on Systems Analysis. They are expected in soon.

The only other problem area, and it is the one that might just cause the greatest problem, is that fuel battle, the debate over the boundary of the structure versus back to the hole in the ground -- the electric, gas, oil battle. There is a committee working on that, and it was expected that the group would have recommendations by now. They have not come forth. Dave Rickelton, the President of ASHRAE, met with the chairman of that committee last week in Dallas, and has urged them to come forth. That looks like the biggest thorn, but we shall have to wait and see.

The 90P Executive Committee now plans to meet at the end of May, and hopes for final approval of the Standard at the ASHRAE meeting in Boston at the end of June, with publication shortly thereafter. And while Jack Tumulty is an optimistic guy, even when things seem awfully dark, he did sound more optimistic this morning than I have heard him in a long time. So I think if we keep our fingers crossed and club a few people, we may get this thing off the ground, and thanks to you for starting it.

Our organization, ARI, plans a conference, which we have discussed very briefly with Ken Henke, Jim Gross, and your Chairman. It will be held in Washington, D.C., in the Fall. It will be by invitation only, and we will have to limit it to five hundred people. It will start at one o'clock or so on a Monday, and end up at four or five o'clock the following day. The hope is that those who are coming to Washington, D.C., perhaps for the first time, might be able to come on the weekend, and despite all you hear -- it is a beautiful city. I have been there a year and I love it.

At this conference, we want to cover how Standard 90P was developed, the legislative introduction of it in the States, and the implementation and the enforcement of it. I think by the Fall we will probably want to look at its influence, or the interplay of it on the myriad of related proposed legislation, just as we heard about a moment ago on energy. I think with the ever increasing activity of HUD, how 90P and HUD's activities relate will be important.

So I think what I would like from you are any suggestions that you might have as to the content of this conference which State people would be the appropriate ones -- I do not mean which State, but I mean which people in the States -- which titles, which jobs held, are the ones that are going to have the greatest interest in the ramifications of 90P, and how we can gear this conference to be most helpful to you, because that is its purpose. If you have any thoughts, -- and you don't fall in the pool tonight -- we could talk about them then. If you have some ideas later on how it might best be organized, I would appreciate you dropping me a note at the address on the attendance sheet.

So I am asking for your help to make something most useful for you, and I think I am bringing optimistic news on 90P, which I am sure you will appreciate.

Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Munger. Are there any comments from the floor that anyone would like to make to assist Monk?

(No response)

Monk, I appreciate you coming. Yes?

MR. FERGUSON: Earl Ferguson, Southeastern Manufactured Housing Institute. I missed the first part of this, but I gather you are asking for comments on 90P. I have a question on 90P. Why don't you leave mobile homes out of it?

MR. MUNGER: Since I do not have any control over it, I cannot answer that.

MR. FERGUSON: I ask anybody on the committee that question.

MR. MUNGER: As a matter of fact, at ASHRAE's Executive Committee meeting in Atlantic City during January, I believe they said that if A119 were revised in time, they could put it forth in its revised form or they would drop it. That was the consideration of the Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We ask that you address your comments to the Chair, if you will, so that we can get them over here, because if you talk between yourselves we are going to miss it and the lady is not going to get it down on the tape. Jim?

MR. GROSS: I do want to mention that the National Bureau of Standards has gone on record and is specifically making the recommendation that mobile homes not be included in

90P, and that the Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) now in preparation and nearing completion will suffice for mobile homes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Kern?

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, is 90P now considering the recommendations of HUD, NBS, and the Federal Energy Office, as Monk spoke about it?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Do you want to answer that, Mr. Munger?

MR. MUNGER: The Federal comments all were combined into one document, and those comments have been considered by those working on all of the Chapters that have reported.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K., are there further comments? Sutton?

MR. MULLEN: As part of the original proposal for ASHRAE, I believe we asked that the standard eventually be processed through ANSI procedures, as an American National Standard, and it has also come up in the courts some time ago. I really felt that it was premature to do so at that time. Has anything changed on that?

MR. MUNGER: ASHRAE is one of the few organizations that has complied with the ANSI procedure whereby when ASHRAE standards are developed, they are developed on a consensus method, and therefore, it is a fairly quick shot to get ANSI approval. As soon as 90 loses its "P" as a proposed standard through ASHRAE, it is my understanding that ASHRAE intends to go through ANSI, but it is a relatively fast process.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Nothing further to be discussed on this?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, again, Mr. Munger. I am sure that if you have any questions you want to ask or any comments you want to make, speak with this gentleman. He is going to be here until tomorrow. Are there any other items of new business that we would want to dispense with before we go into our heavy discussions? Any other items that you can think of that anyone would want to bring up?

(No response)

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION PLAN

CHAIRMAN THURBER: At the present time, the delegates and others have in their hands, a proposal. We will call it a "Reorganization Plan," or "the Plan of Organization," and a proposed draft of the new Constitution. I would offer a few words of caution to all of you who would like very much to consider these two things separately. In order to consider anything on this floor, I am going to have to get a positive motion for acceptance of the proposal and a second, and then open it to discussion. Any discussion that we have, I would ask that you stand, address the Chair, and make a positive, constructive amendment. This is to prevent everybody in the room from talking back and forth, raising hands, stamping feet, and so forth. We want to do this in a logical, sensible manner.

I want to say here and now that the Chair is not going to rule anybody down that wants to speak constructively. This Chair does not do that. But, if it is going to be rabble-roused or personality conflicts or anything like that, I will rap the gavel, and that will be the decision.

I would like very much, at this time, to hear a motion. If the delegate will give his or her name, the motion to accept the proposal and a second, then we will proceed. May I have said motion?

Mr. Kimsey, you have been recognized.

MR. KIMSEY: Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. I make the motion that we accept the proposal that pertains to the organization plan.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. SWENSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Seconded by Glen Swenson of Utah. Now, any questions or amendments that you have, please address the Chair. I will defer a lot of the questions to Ken, and I will answer some of them myself.

I now open the floor to discussion and positive amendments to the proposal. There has been a motion properly made and properly seconded, to accept the proposal as it is written.

If you wish to discuss it or amend it, please raise your hand.

Mr. Mullen -- there is my first candidate.

MR. MULLEN: Mullen, Virginia. I just want to get a clarification in my own mind of the nature of this proposal. As I understand it, this is simply a guide or a general plan, and the Executive Committee can deviate from it or alter the plan as may be necessary to make it work out in practice. In other words, this is just a general proposal?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is true, Mr. Mullen.

MR. MULLEN: If that is the case, I am wholeheartedly in favor of it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Are there other comments? Sir -- your name?

MR. McCRONE: Willard McCrone, Maryland. The proposal has two alternatives, so you are going to have to take separate votes as to which alternative on which you are going to vote? Will you clarify that?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes. Ken, do you want to explain the reason we have got two alternatives?

MR. HENKE: Actually, there are probably all the way from two to a dozen alternatives that might be possible, but it all depends upon the level of funding that may be received. That is the reason we made it flexible at this point.

As I say, if we have participation up to $20,000, we are going to be extremely limited in what we can do. If we can be sure that our cash flow during the year is, say, $60,000, we can deviate from this in many ways. We do not know what we are finally going to come up with at this point. It depends upon the reaction of the States and other funds that we might receive. It might be that we start out with one person, we may be able to go to two people and conceivably, we could go to three. We are going to have to wait until we receive a response from the States before we pass on that.

Where we eventually hope to go is to develop our own staff and our own means to keep going.

One other thing, Mr. Chairman, if I may?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead.

MR. HENKE: On voting on this, you are not committing your State to paying an assessment. If you accept the proposal, there will be a statement sent to your State and at that time, you are going to have to make a decision as to whether you have the money or the financial support. You are not committing yourself at this point other than to a concept.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Henke. Are there other comments from the floor? Mr. Kimsey?

MR. KIMSEY: Mr. Chairman, Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. Would it be possible to get a show of hands from the delegates of those who feel they may have some money to put into this for the first year of its operation? No commitment -- I am just talking about giving the Executive Committee some indication whether or not there is any money here for the coming year.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: In other words, an unofficial show of hands to give us a little bit of a bite? This will be unofficial; it does not say you have got to throw your money in tomorrow. Let us just have the people who feel their States could do it, stand up -- and I am standing, too. Let me count before you sit down, please. Would you take a count for me, Sandi? I will take it too.

MR. KIMSEY: Mr. Chairman, I had this question posed to me. What type of figure are we talking about? I am talking about a $2,000 figure.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I am talking about the figure in the proposal.

MR. KIMSEY: O.K.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K., That is sixteen (16) States who indicate that they could possibly come in, and incidentally, I was standing, too. Yes, sir?

MR. FAULCONER: At this time, I have a letter addressed to you that I would like to present.

(Mr. Faulconer hands the referred to letter to Chairman Thurber.)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It is either damning me or impeaching me or something, I don't know what. But we will see. May I be permitted to read this letter?

MR. FAULCONER: Yes, it is fine with me, if you want to read it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It is addressed to me as National Chairman. It is from the State of Kentucky.

"Dear Mr. Thurber. Mr. Frazier Faulconer, Assistant State Fire Marshal for Kentucky, is hereby authorized to become a contributing delegate member for the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards." Signed by Ralph S. Coffman, Chief Executive Assistant.

In other words, the State of Kentucky, I might say, is the first official contributing member.

MR. HENKE: I think we ought to give him a hand.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think so.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Meyer, you have the floor.

MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman, Herb Meyer. I just have one question and I think some people may have had the same one. Is it the intent that this organizational proposal will go to a letter ballot to those States that are not here, or are we committing them all as a group here today.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The organizational proposal will be voted on at this meeting by roll call vote of those delegates in attendance. The Constitution, when we come to that, after debate and so forth, will be sent to the State delegates for the mail ballot. Does that answer your question, Herb? Mr. Church?

MR. MEYER: Yes.

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, under the present Constitution, the Executive Committee can establish dues. And as I understand it, if this proposal goes through, this really will amend the dues that have been established, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It just follows the Constitution that says the Executive Committee has the authority to establish dues.

MR. CHURCH: Well, it will be $2,000 across the board, instead of on a sliding scale?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Just what the proposal says there. Any further comments? Yes sir?

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. I see in here the NCSBCS Seal Program, but nowhere does the document describe how it works, nor does the new Constitution mention the Seals. I am asking whether it would replace State seals or just what is involved.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would defer that question to Ken Henke.

MR. HENKE: Number one, it would not replace State seals. Now, understand that this proposal was written back before HUD became involved with Title VI and how it will relate right now, I frankly do not know. That is something that the task force working with HUD is going to have to investigate and bring an answer back to us. It is possible that HUD may not even be working on it at this time.

What we essentially envisioned was a check-off if it could be worked out, and that would be related to NCSBCS and become a part of our funding source.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Ken. Now, are there other comments concerning the proposal?

MR. HENKE: I have one other thing from last night and I think we ought to verify it. Yesterday, we were asked the question of what we envisioned the Executive Director doing, and one of the comments was that he might do some lobbying for us. Let us get out of the lobbying picture at this time. That is not a primary purpose. That would be an incidental duty. I would envision the Executive Director would appear before Senate or Congressional Committees such as I did not long ago before Proxmire's Committee on Title X. This is what I really mean in talking about lobbying and working with the Congress, not true lobbying that we have all experienced back in our home States.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments concerning the proposal?

(No response)

If not, are you ready for the question on the proposal? If you are, we will call for a roll call vote.

MR. BULLOCK: Would you explain again the voting privileges, based upon the new structure? You vote on all matters except financial matters?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is in the Constitution. This is the organizational proposal that we are voting on right now. Jane?

MS. HERON: Mr. Chairman, I need some clarification on what we are proposing to vote on, because as I understand it, we have here a document which is full of alternatives, various approaches, and a number of different issues. Now, what are we talking about voting on?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Once more, I will defer this to Ken Henke, and he will explain once more what we are voting on.

MR. HENKE: Let us put it this way. At this point, you are voting on a concept and you are giving the Executive Committee the authority to proceed.

MS. HERON: To take these or other alternatives and pursue the general objective?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Right.

MR. HENKE: There is no way to know the exact amount of money at this time. But you are giving the Executive Committee the authority to proceed.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Kimsey of Tennessee?

MR. KIMSEY: Ed Kimsey of Tennessee. In regard to the question that the delegate from Georgia posed yesterday, and in my opinion, it would be wise to elaborate on that question. Only those States that contributed to this organization could vote on financial matters. We have used the figure of $2,000 because it is the figure that is in the proposal. If the State does not contribute its portion or its share, then it would not be privileged to vote on a financial matter dealing with the organization. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is correct. Budgetary matters only. Now, again, I will call for any further discussion on the proposal.

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: There is none. I will call for a roll call vote.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Missouri?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Texas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, there are twenty-nine (29) voting, all affirmative.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Twenty-nine delegates voting, all in the affirmative. I want to thank you very much for your time and effort on the proposal, and your considerations.

Now, the proposal has been accepted. We will go into the next order of business.

Sutton, you asked when the Constitution would be discussed and we cannot vote the Constitution in or out at this meeting. It has to be a mail ballot. It will be done by correct procedures.

Again, I will call for some positive, constructive discussion on the Constitution and proceed accordingly. I will give you first chance at the floor, Mr. Mullen. Do you want to come up here? Or, do you want to stay down there?

MR. MULLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All right.

MR. MULLEN: I want to offer this sort of motion and see if you will recognize what I am concerned with. I move that the document that was circulated not be considered at this time, but that it be given additional consideration by the Executive Committee, recirculated, and possibly developed at a later date.

We have heard from Mr. Gross of the Bureau of Standards that under our existing Constitution NBS can maintain its relationship perfectly satisfactorily, including the proposal that was given us for the forthcoming year.

Mr. Henke stated yesterday that the new proposal on which we have just voted can be accommodated under the existing Constitution. So there is no particular urgency about amending the Constitution at this time.

On the other hand, we have heard some of our members on the floor and in private sessions who feel that in the new Constitution there is some error by giving actually more

emphasis to the relationship between the Bureau of Standards and NCSBCS than there was in our old Constitution, while at the same time we are trying to develop an independent posture in NCSBCS.

There are some things that have been proposed in the new Constitution of which I approve. However, at this time, I believe it would be better if we were to send it back to the Executive Committee with the thought that it attempt to eliminate those portions that tie us to the Bureau of Standards.

From time to time I attend organizations' meetings as a NCSBCS representative and it is very, very frustrating to me to have people come and say, "Well, you know, you-all are just supported by the Bureau of Standards, you are a Bureau of Standards organization." I am very tired of hearing that. I am in favor of the proposal we have just voted on, but at the same time our Constitution also should be clean.

So my motion is not to send out a special ballot on this document, but to have the document reworked by the Executive Committee.

MR. THORNE: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thorne of Arizona seconded that motion. Now, we will accept discussion on the motion. Bill Connelly of New Jersey.

MR. CONNELLY: Mr. Chairman, I am Bill Connelly of New Jersey, and I would like to say that we support the statement Sutton just made in its entirety. I think it should be referred back to the Executive Committee, and I do not see the value of the special relationship that is proposed in the draft Constitution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Henke, do you have any discussion, or would you like to wait for a little bit.

MR. HENKE: I am only going to make one comment. Rather than to just send it back to the Executive Committee to rework, for God's sakes, give us some comments on what is wrong with it. That means one thing: The Executive Committee can tear it apart and rewrite it again, and it may come back in essentially the same form that it is in currently. You understand, this thing was approved by the Executive Committee before it was even released.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Further comments? Recognizing Mr. Mullen.

MR. MULLEN: I think I will amend my motion or clarify it, at any rate. The reason for sending it back to the Executive Committee is to purge the new Constitution of any material that has to do with the Bureau of Standards and NCSBCS together.

MR. SWENSON: Is that the only reason?

MR. MULLEN: Yes.

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. We did submit written comments, but I think in addition to what Sutton says, that the Officer's Section, Article V, needs extensive reworking. Overlooked, is how you elect a Chairman, his term of office and a few other factors. I think this very deservedly should go back and be restudied.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Further comments? Jim?

MR. HICKS: Jim Hicks, California. I certainly support Sutton Mullen's motion, because I believe, too, that the concepts here are important. If we are moving towards this new plan and we are developing our own capability, then we should not have a contrary position in our Constitution, and I believe that the National Bureau of Standards certainly can well understand that position. So I support the motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Church?

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, not to be misunderstood, I hope. When I reviewed the two

documents together, I took the position that they were ambiguous. We were going to get away with the proposal, but then, at the same time, the Constitution to be very broad like it is now and have resistance to an offer of assistance by the Bureau and let us stand on our own rather than to be locked in. So I think that the Constitution does need to be revised.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I do not think I would have to have that as an amendment to his motion, because I will take the prerogative to set aside some time right now to bring these discussions out. I sincerely appreciate your thought. Jane?

MS. HERON: Then I call for a question on Mr. Mullen's motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Well, we will set aside some time for discussion.

MS. HERON: That is what I had in mind. Get it off the floor, so we can proceed with the discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is under discussion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All right, you have called for it. You heard Mr. Mullen's motion. Would you care to restate it?

MR. MULLEN: I would rather not.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would like to have you restate your motion.

MR. MULLEN: I would like to have it read back, I might give another version.

(Off the record discussion.)

MR. MULLEN: The motion is not to send the proposed new Constitution out for ballot at this time, but to refer it back to the Executive Committee for the prime purpose of purging it concerning those items that tie the Bureau of Standards and NCSBCS together.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I do not think that was the first motion.

MR. MEYER: It is pretty close. He did not have the part about purging.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: That is what I thought.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You reopened an issue. Who seconded that motion of Sutton's?

MR. THORNE: I did. It is practically verbatim, but not exact. It is impossible to ask a man after ten minutes of discussion to restate his motion unless it can be read back.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Do you have a comment on that particular part?

MR. SWENSON: Swenson from Utah. I would like to ask a question. When you use the term "purge" it has a connotation of a complete severance of all ties.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Is that what you mean?

MR. SWENSON: I infer that that is what you mean by "purge."

MR. MULLEN: Do you have a better word? That is just one that came to mind, really.

MR. SWENSON: Well, just by way of a bit of elaboration that you made, I think what you mean is to eliminate those portions concerning any mandatory administrative tie with the National Bureau of Standards.

MR. MULLEN: That is exactly what I had in mind.

MR. SWENSON: Retain the technical expertise.

MR. MULLEN: Well, I think the details will come back into the discussion that follows.

MR. SWENSON: Well, it seems to me that that should be made clear, because when you say "purge" you are talking about a complete physical severance of relations and I do not believe that is what you meant.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would take the prerogative of the Chair and ask you if you would withdraw your second and you would withdraw your motion. Would you withdraw your second, Mr. Thorne?

MR. THORNE: I will.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Mullen, would you withdraw your orignial motion and restate it? The motion will now be restated. Please do it for the benefit of Sandi Berry, who will take it down in total, en masse, and verbatim.

MR. MULLEN: The motion is not to submit the proposed new Constitution to ballot at this time. Refer it back to the Executive Committee for the elimination of -- how did you put it?

MR. SWENSON: The mandatory administrative tie.

MR. MULLEN: -- the mandatory administrative tie with the Bureau of Standards.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the motion. Now, is there a second?

MR. THORNE: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Second by Erik Thorne of Arizona. Now, any further comments concerning the motion?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, if I hear the motion correctly, there is only one specific direction to the Executive Committee, and it could imply that the rest of the document is acceptable. Could you just put in a specific reason for putting it back to the Executive Committee? I question, Mr. Chairman, unless you want to bring up another motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Meyer of Minnesota.

MR. MEYER: Meyer of Minnesota. I guess I would speak against that particular motion. I was willing to support the original motion, which was not to submit it to written ballot, but to refer it back to Executive Committee. There should be discussion and I agree with Mr. Rowland that we severely limit the Executive Committee and I would hope that both the maker of the motion and the second would withdraw that part. Then let us get to the discussion and come up with some guidance for the Executive Committee. I sincerely believe that we should not send it to written ballot at the present time.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Further comments -- Mr. Mullen?

MR. MULLEN: I do not want to withdraw my motion, because that is the only thing I am interested in. Now, if someone here wishes to amend that motion to include that all ties be studied by the Executive Committee, I would be willing to accept that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane, now?

MS. HERON: I will make that amendment. I would like to suggest an amendment. In keeping with the motion, do not submit the document for letter ballot at this time, but refer it back to the Executive Committee for reconsideration or alteration of the language pertaining to the relationship with the Bureau and other matters that are controversial, and are of concern to delegates present, and have been commented on previously in writing.

We need a consensus of the Conference on the content that should be in a proposed new Constitution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the amendment to the motion. May I have a second?

MR. MEYER: Second.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The amendment has been made and seconded. Are there further comments on the amendment?

(No response)

We will vote on the amendment first by roll call vote. Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Roll call vote, Mr. Executive Secretary.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Nay.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She stepped out.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Missouri?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Texas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Twenty-seven (27) votes cast, Mr. Chairman, one negative, twenty-six ayes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The amendment carries. We will now vote on the original motion after a period of short discussion, if you have any comments, verbatus, or word changes. We will take a roll call vote on the original motion to which we have voted the amendment.

You are going to get a work out, yet, Gene.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Alaska?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Arizona?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: California?

Aye.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Connecticut?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Georgia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Idaho?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Illinois?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Indiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Iowa?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kansas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kentucky?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Louisiana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Maryland?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Massachusetts?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Minnesota?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Missouri?

(No response)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Montana?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Nebraska?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Jersey?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New Mexico?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: New York?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: North Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Oklahoma?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Rhode Island?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: South Carolina?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Tennessee?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Texas?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Utah?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: West Virginia?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Wisconsin?

Yes.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Twenty-eight (28) votes cast, Mr. Chairman, all of them affirmative.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K. Ken Henke, recognized.

MR. HENKE: Ken Henke from Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to request that we take a few more minutes and go through the document.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think this is in line with the motion.

MR. HENKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane, did you put a specific time.

MS. HERON: That was a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that a specific period of time be set aside and perhaps rather tight rules on debate, in order that we stay as much as possible with the specific issues taken one at a time, and keep an eye on the clock, so that we do not run into too much time.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thanks, Jane. It is now a quarter after eleven. We will go with specific comments until a quarter to twelve, and then we will come back after lunch at 1:15 p.m and go until two o'clock. That is an hour and fifteen minutes. I will recognize anybody from the floor on proper procedures. Ken, you might want to start. Or the man behind you, there, do you want to make a specific comment?

MR. BULLOCK: George Bullock, Georgia. Yes, Mr. Chairman. On Article V, I believe this section makes it a little more democratic as far as the election of officers, am I correct? I believe the Executive Committee elects a Chairman. This gives the delegates the right to elect the Chairman-elect?

MR. HENKE: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would urge the Executive Committee to take cognizance of these comments because they are going to need them.

MR. BULLOCK: I would also like to suggest that the two positions, Secretary and Treasurer, be separated, and become two positions on the Executive Committee. I think this might give another delegate a chance to participate in the business affairs carried on by the Executive Committee.

One other suggestion might be that all the voting privileges be tied directly to dues payment. I think this might expedite membership dues being paid to the organization. It might expedite collecting the dues.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane Heron?

MS. HERON: I would say that a very difficult problem that NCSBCS has to face is that on the one hand, it wants to be an organization representing all of the States, if possible, on matters relating to building regulations. On the other hand, it may be that some States

will have problems of one kind or another in meeting what may turn out to be the financial requirements of paying membership. It is imperative the Conference keep in mind the potential conflict, which means wanting all States to be dues-paying members, and not necessarily being able to get all States to be dues-paying members, and in fact, the Conference's strength lies in the expected participation of the maximum number of States.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: One of the things that I would like to advance is, that in order for the Executive Committee to rationally consider input to make its deliberations more meaningful, that we take the document from the beginning in an orderly manner and speak only on the subsequent parts as they come. And now, I will recognize you, Gene.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: There is some precedent for this. I think that the Executive Committee, as it has been studying the document, took that into consideration. One is the data that Mr. Mullen had submitted earlier on the membership fees paid by the Insurance Commissioner's group in which they are not ruled out of participation for not paying the assessment. The other is IAGLO, the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials, which is comprised of State Labor Commissioners. It has the same clause in its program. In some States, even the Labor Commissioners cannot get money for memberships, and yet they are allowed voting rights on policies and positions of State governments. So it is not something new. It is being used in other State organizations with financial problems.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you, Gene. Now, as we get through the document, if you have constructive criticism speak up. Who would like to be first?

MS. HERON: I would.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane, why don't you stand up. We cannot quite hear you.

MS. HERON: On Article I, there is a minor matter that at least requires attention. In the one clause, "-- shall be a not-for-profit organization." I am not a lawyer, so I do not know -- but there needs to be clarification of what kind of an organization it is. There may be some legal implications that have to be evaluated before we know exactly what to say in that small change.

MR. HENKE: May I comment?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead.

MR. HENKE: The reason it is stated that way is to keep us out of possible conflict. We did have legal opinion on this and it is a not-for-profit organization.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Are there further comments on Article I, Ken?

MR. HENKE: No, not on Article I, but I have one question and it goes back to the Preface. It goes into some of the other Articles, too. Since there are strong feelings concerning the way we have written the relationship between NBS and NCSBCS, is there any argument with using the existing language in our Constitution?

MR. MULLEN: Well --

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead, Mr. Mullen.

MR. MULLEN: My feeling is that in a basic document like this, it is not necessary to mention any specific organization other than the organization itself, NCSBCS -- just as a principle. We could refer to "research and testing organizations," and we could refer to "government organizations," and we could refer to "local government," but not by name, just as general classes of organizations.

Now, that does not prohibit us from making formal, informal, or other agreements with the Bureau or other organizations. In fact, the proposal for setting up the Executive Secretary mentions the National Bureau of Standards by name, specifically. We have accepted specifically your proposal--the Bureau's proposal--for a relationship for the coming year.

All of those things can be done under a Constitution without mentioning the organization in the Constitution.

MR. HENKE: I am not seeking an argument with anyone, but we are seeking guidance. I have heard remarks about written comments being submitted. The only comment that I have seen is from Kern Church.

MR. MULLEN: I am not going to lose any sleep over it if you do put it in, but I just do not think it is necessary.

MR. HENKE: There are changes that are necessary in the document and we recognize it, but unless we get some concrete statements from you people, we are not going to react the way you probably want us to.

MR. CHURCH: I am going to make a comment here. Prior to 1972, there was a mandatory tie that the Bureau "shall" serve as Executive Secretary and "shall" serve as Secretariat. We would come to a meeting and we would have no choice as to what we would do in dealing with other organizations. To tell you the truth, HUD did not look so friendly to us. I do not want to raise a lot of old questions and what not. But, before we decide on the language if we keep the same tie with the Bureau that we always have had and change all those "shalls" to "may" -- that we "may" do this with this, and each year reaffirm by the delegate body in Executive Session, we are still on our own two feet. We have a choice, you see, as to just how we do it, and the proposal, as I see it, is just gradually moving away from that. I think, at least, any mention of the Bureau in here should be "may" rather than "shall."

And I agree with Sutton that theoretically it would be better not to mention the Bureau at all and be free to deal with anybody we want to. Maybe, eventually, that will happen, but at this stage it might be unwise for us to do it, even if the Constitution is voted on next year. Even next year, it may be unwise not to mention NBS at all. Maybe, it is still wise to leave the "may."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments? Gene, I will recognize you and then, Jane.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I do not think there was any problem with Kern's suggestion. The reason that the Bureau originally requested to be included in your Constitutional document is that we are the only organization in the Federal Government that has gone ahead and explicitly received funding to give you technical assistance. In order for us to do this, it is necessary for us to document that there may be a request from an organization in writing to give that service and under the theory that it may come as it has been in the past, we can appropriate staff monies for Jim to operate and bring the staff to these meetings, and have money for travel and whatever is necessary to carry on that assistance.

Without that mentioned in the Constitutional document, we have a problem. We would probably fall back into the situation which you now have, with no members from HUD and other agencies here.

So that is the only reason for our request. We have no argument with the "shall" or "may" at all. It is just a matter of individual recognition.

Let me go back a little bit on history, because I think many of you people do not realize that we would not be an organization -- and I say "we" because I am looking back to when I got involved to bring this thing about, along with Chuck Mahaffey and other people at the Bureau. This organization was not created by the States. This organization was created by a request from a fellow from New Jersey that asked the Bureau to bring together the States in a conference to discuss the problems, and there was a financial investment and an encouragement to do this.

Other Federal agencies were not interested in doing this type of program and assistance work and so over time, the organization has received this assistance by a cooperative arrangement between NBS and NCSBCS.

Now, even today, a mission agency such as HUD would have a very difficult time setting up budget requests to work with your organization in such a relationship, because they have

a regulatory responsibility, and they have to work with you at arm's length. You know you are a group they are going to be working with, but they cannot allocate money with which to support you on the one hand, and turn around and deal with you on a regulatory basis on the other hand. Because of this, the Department of Commerce, interestingly enough, through its Organic Act, does not have a mission except for the commerce of the country. What you are talking about is interstate problems and this is a Commerce issue.

By appropriation, Commerce can direct technical assistance to carry on that activity and that is a lot of difference from other agencies who have regulatory authority. You really have to say that HUD has some regulatory authority, DOD has some regulatory authority. That is why the specific difference between your relationship with the Department of Commerce and any other Federal agency. Our Organic Act allows this relationship.

Now, I agree that Kern Church is perfectly right in his statement. It has created some problem in working with other agencies.

I think, in looking over the way it is written, it could be written to go with the "may" and that is perfectly acceptable.

I think that our request from Commerce would be that we would continually be referenced in the document in some way, by name and by activity, so we can get funding to give you the technical assistance.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane Heron?

MS. HERON: Gene, I would like to ask you a question and perhaps I should address the question to Jim, as well. Do you feel that the statement in the Constitution per se, is necessary in order to give the Bureau this kind of support or incentive, or is a letter from the Conference Chairman, in keeping with certain prerogatives set forth in the Constitution, adequate for the purpose?

MR. GROSS: I do not know.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: This, I think we could discuss.

MS. HERON: It might help us in considering appropriate language.

MR. GROSS: I will react. We would ask you to favor the "may" language because that gives us the option also to consider the question. But in regard to your question, I think a letter may not suffice, because as Gene pointed out, we are talking about budget matters a year and a half ahead, and we cannot go forward and say, well, we may get a letter request.

MS. HERON: I mean, you would get a letter at the appropriate time in budgeting.

MR. GROSS: Well, is NCSBCS prepared to make requests two years hence? I think not.

MS HERON: Well, in certain broad, open-ended language, I think quite possibly. That is why I asked the question.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Are we still on the same portion of the Constitution? I believe the man behind you, Sutton, had his hand up first.

MR. MULLEN: Yes.

MR. GATLIN: Gatlin of Indiana. I would agree, in general, with NBS to the effect that an Executive Committee appointed for a one-year term cannot obligate this organization for something that it has when half of their term expires. I think the letter really would not mean a heck of a lot.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Meyer from Minnesota. And then Mr. Mullen from Virginia.

MR. MEYER: I have thought about this and in line partly with what Gene said, I do not think the Constitution recognizes one of the purposes of this organization and that is to

foster commerce between the States. There is nothing that I can find that implements that, and it might be a way to go. Rather than get down to the last small segment of that Federal agency that is devoted to that, we could take the broad terms and then we could incorporate those sort of things afterwards. I think that approach would still give you exactly what you want. I do not have a good enough idea of what to say, but I think that is an important thing to indicate, which we do not do at the present time. That would again, tie down to which of the Federal agencies that can do those sort of things. That could be incorporated in general plus specific language, and tied up with that sort of approach without harming us in all the other things we want to do.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I will still take one or two more comments on this phase. Let us get some concrete, constructive criticism so that the Executive Committee has guidance as to how to react. Jane?

MS. HERON: I am not sure that it is appropriate to incorporate among the purposes of NCSBCS the fostering of commerce among the States. That does not happen to be one of its purposes. Its purposes support that, but I think there is perhaps an umbrella way the Executive Committee might consider to deal with this. I think it is just as important that NCSBCS try to develop a special working relationship with HUD, and probably with the Federal Energy Administration, and we do not know with whom else next. I would suggest that in Article III -- (Interrupted)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Hold it. We are still under the first Article.

MS. HERON: That is what we are discussing. I did happen to name the statute of what we are discussing.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K.

MS. HERON: Where you find language about the Bureau, it might be appropriate to give the National Chairman of the Conference or the Executive Committee the authority to request of various Federal and national agencies, and organizations the naming of a liaison, such as I think Jim Gross is or perhaps will be to the Conference. I think we should have a liaison from the Office of the Secretary of HUD, and I hope we will have one from the Office of the Director of FEA, and then perhaps it should either use some umbrella language authorizing the Conference to request such a standing liaison or else each such agency, including NIBS, should be named in a very brief paragraph, saying the Conference made a request to the director of said agency for a liaison, a standing person who will do certain things -- provide two-way communication, technical assistance, etc.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Sutton, you had your hand up.

MR. MULLEN: Yes. As I say, I am not real uptight about this idea of the Bureau being mentioned in our Constitution, although I favor taking it out. I wonder if we could not skin this cat another way. Obviously, we want to have and need a special relationship, a continuing relationship, with the National Bureau of Standards. Why could not this special relationship be in a form of an auxilliary document, independent of the Constitution and Bylaws, that is agreed to in principle by the Bureau and by NCSBCS.

Now, the nice part about doing that is that you could also have special relationships developed with other organizations, as the need arises. It could be stated in broad, general terms, and you could go from year to year and make the individual adjustments as to exactly what you do for that year.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We want to get these points down so when they go back to the Executive Committee, it will have something to work from, so please continue to give us some good ideas.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: May I make one comment to the group?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: May I make this suggestion. Rather than continue the subject, I

think there have been many points discussed here that are relevant, but need to be discussed in more depth with the Bureau itself, as far as the policy issue is concerned. I would suggest that before the Executive Committee addresses such officially, that maybe Mr. Mullen, Mr. Church, myself, and Jim meet with the Bureau people and work out what might be acceptable, so that we are talking about something that is real, and not something that is not real. For instance, the concern I have with Mr. Mullen's statement now is that a minority of this group in Executive Session here is making a decision for the majority of the States -- I mean, like the Constitutional problem -- it is going to take a majority of the members through a mail ballot to make the decision. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to accept continued responses from the group, and to work with them to try to come up with a decision.

MR. MULLEN: I would like to clarify just one thing. You put some words in my mouth -- "minority here would make such an agreement." That is not my intention. The agreement would be prepared, possibly by the Executive Committee, but it would definitely have to be ratified by the entire membership.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Your thoughts are well taken. We have belabored that point. Article I -- are there any further comments on Article I?

Are there any further comments on Article II?

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. In (c), "In the nationally recognized standards generating organizations." I would suggest adding the word "building" in front of "standards" so that it will be recognized as "building standards."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is a good suggestion. Jane?

MS. HERON: In subsection (a), "To provide a forum for the Governors of the States," --I talked with Mr. Henke and I understand his reasoning, but I feel that that is probably adding a confrontation. The Governors are the chief elected and Executive Officers of the States. I feel that in several places it is probably preferable to stick with the old language, "A forum for the States." Let us hope the delegates are effective in involving their Governor's concern with NCSBCS. I think it confuses things in terms of the Governors' Conference, the Governors' role, what the delegates' relationship is, and I would urge you to change that language back to the old language.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think the attempt to strengthen that was the result of a problem we had last year where we plugged, pulled, shoved, and screamed to get the twenty-six votes back on a little letter that I sent out.

MS. HERON: Writing some words on paper will not change the physical reality.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: No, that is right. Ken, you had a comment on that?

MR. HENKE: No, I was just going to comment that we are attempting through this to get a better relationship with the National Governors' Conference. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Most of you are, or you should be, aware that there was a survey taken about six months ago in which the National Governors' Conference was trying to find out to which organizations their individual States belonged, and which ones could be eliminated, and we wanted to be sure that NCSBCS was not one of those eliminated.

MS. HERON: I would suggest that that is better done in Article III.

MR. HENKE: Jane, we can put it anywhere we want to, as far as that goes. It is a question of whether or not you want it in the document at all. Now, if you do not feel that you need the support of the Governors, just strike it. I happen to be a firm believer that my Governor had better know what I am doing and support what I am doing. Anything I can do to solicit that support, whether it is by putting it down in a few words or whatever it may be, I will attempt to do it. I have no strong feelings on it, but we are a part of our Governor's office and why not recognize it and spell it out?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The gentleman back here?

MR. BAULDREE: Mr. Chairman, Aaron Bauldree of Florida. We concur with the opinion of the delegate from Illinois on this particular item. We feel that it is not realistic to think that you are providing a forum for the Governors. More realistically, you are providing a forum for the regulatory agencies within the States that have the responsibility for building regulations. I will speak in more detail on this under Article IV, Delegate Membership.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I would make one comment before we go further and that is, when you suggest that you do not like an item in the Constitution, please also add what you think you would like to see in the document for the guidance of the Executive Committee. Tell us what you think ought to be in there, so that when the Executive Committee gets it, it can act accordingly. Thank you.

MR. BAULDREE: I will do that, then.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: All right.

MR. BAULDREE: Rather than saying a "forum for the Governors of the States through their appointed delegates," either leave the language as is, or substitute "a forum for the regulatory agencies responsible for building codes and regulations within the various States."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you. Mr. Meyer of Minnesota?

MR. MEYER: I still feel that it is important and I have strong feelings about it. I might suggest, as Jane said, to say "provide a forum for the States, through the Governors' appointed delegates." Which would still tie the two down together and it would really be the States. I strongly oppose having anything about regulatory bodies, because there are many States that do not have that particular forum and it is not really part of this Constitution, as such.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I will take one or two more comments under the timing rule that has been set.

MR. THORNE: Erik Thorne from Arizona. Unless I have the wrong impression, I thought all the State delegates were appointed by the Governors and/or their legislative bodies. Well, then, who are we responsible to? When I get through here, I brief my Governor, and he is the man I am responsible to. And if he goes to the Governors' Conference and I do not brief him, he is left out in the cold, not knowing what he is talking about. He is the one that supports us. The Governors' Conference could cut us short. They had a survey taken a while ago and lo and behold, they were supporting something like three hundred and some odd different organizations. They are now in the process of trying to cut down the number of organizations they are supporting for economic reasons, and I feel that we are directly responsible to our Governors. They are the ones that appoint us.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane, you have a comment?

MS. HERON: Yes, I think the thing is getting inflated or distorted.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I am sure.

MS. HERON: My comment was merely this: You cannot solve some political problems that we all face by putting some language into Article II. I feel that there are some ways in which the language in Article II could in the future cause some confusion or problems. I would absolutely agree with Mr. Henke and with Mr. Thorne that backing the interest of Governors in the activities of NCSBCS is vital. That is why in Article III, perhaps, it should be mentioned that the National Governors' Conference and NCSBCS continue to work to develop more awareness in Governors' offices. I merely said that I do not think that that little language solved the problem, and it may confuse the issue in the future. That is all.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Thank you very much. You told me that you would agree to break for lunch at fifteen minutes to twelve. I urge you again to be down by the pool at exactly twelve o'clock for the picture taking and then we will reconvene here at 1:15 p.m. this afternoon and continue this discussion.

(Lunch Recess)

AFTERNOON SESSION

CHAIRMAN THURBER: With your permission, we will go ahead with the commentary on the Constitution so that we do not run over into another program that will be going on this afternoon. We were on Article II and I think we finished that. I think we have belabored the point as far as we would need to belabor it on the NCSBCS/NBS relationship aspect. I think now we should continue, skim over the Constitutional things that you feel you would like to see changed, and again, I will recognize people from the floor by raising your hand.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which Article do you wish to discuss?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Well, we will start with Article III, but I think we have belabored that point quite a bit through Section 1. If you want to say something about Section 2 or 3 in that Article, why, say so. But if you do not, we will go into Article IV. What is your pleasure on Article III?

(No response)

Is everybody satisfied with that, knowing that will go back to the Executive Committee to be reworked? How about Article IV? Herb Meyer of Minnesota?

MR. MEYER: I would just make the comment that when we talk about agencies we should review all of this, because I think there are some omissions in agencies that probably should be incorporated. I do not want to take them up here, but very obviously, there are some to take a second look at to be sure.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Your points are well taken on that, Herb. Are there any other comments on Article III? Article III -- are there any further comments or anything you would like to recommend to the Executive Committee? Article IV -- Membership.

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. In Section 1, I think there should be some provision for a proxy. It is contained later on in the section on voting, but actually, it should be stated here that a State be represented by a delegate or a duly designated proxy -- something like that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: A point well taken. Any further comments on Article IV?

MR. BAULDREE: Aaron Bauldree, Florida. My concern with Article IV, Mr. Chairman, is maybe partially out of ignorance. But, within our State we have three specific areas of responsibility. We have Mobile Homes, we have Manufactured Housing, and we have our Statewide Building Code, which covers conventional type construction. For example, at the present time we are concerned with Manufactured Housing and we are mandated by legislative enactment to pursue reciprocity with neighboring States in terms of insignias on Manufactured Housing inspection systems and so forth.

Now, if we have one person from the State, for example, who comes and sits on the Reciprocity Committee, he is no doubt qualified to represent us in specific areas like Manufactured Housing, if our delegate does not come from that area. The delegate's qualifications for actually representing Manufactured Housing are limited somewhat by his lack of direct involvement with the programs within the State.

What I am really saying here is we have no objections to the classification, but we would like very much some provision made in the Constitution whereby the people from those areas like Mobile Homes, Manufactured Housing, or State Building Code, whichever the case might be, could be directly involved as full voting members when areas concerning new procedure for domain are concerned.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: A point well taken. Are there any further comments on Article IV? Mr. Gatlin?

MR. GATLIN: It appears that problem could be handled appropriately under a later Article, under a section governing proxy. Article VII, Section 6 says that "A proxy may serve for a delegate member." And I think it says that the delegate may appoint the proxy.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes.

MR. BAULDREE: What happens to the delegates' standing when the proxy is voting?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead, Mr. Rowland.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: This has been a problem since the group started, and one of the responsibilities of a delegate is to marshal State members, and get the voice-vote of that person in that particular activity. In other words, as a delegate, you should have the other person present at the time of the meeting, to counsel on what you are voting. That is a responsibility of the individual State delegate. NCSBCS has had the problem since the beginning, but one of the things I think is in this Constitution is the fact that an Executive Director can help you marshal your State, be of assistance until you get those other agencies working together with the delegate, sitting with the State member responsible for that area, and to cast that ballot accordingly.

The proxy issue is cumbersome. The delegate is really a representative of the Governor and some problems arose when someone designated a delegate without the Governor's approval. In other words, you get down so far in the State organizational structure that policy decisions cannot be made. This is a problem.

All the meetings are basically open. I do not think that even in an Executive Session of a meeting State members who are really employees of State programs have ever been refused attendance. You can get counsel to participate in any of the committees.

We would like to see more State members on other committees. One problem up to now is that the State delegate thought that he was the only one who could come to the NCSBCS Annual Meeting. We would like to see Florida sitting here with five State members who are participating in all these committees, going back home, and deciding how to cast Florida's vote.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb?

MR. MEYER: I just have a question on Section 7 of Article IV. Is that the termination of the delegate who represents the State or is this the termination of the State's membership?

MR. HENKE: The delegate.

MR. MEYER: I do not think it is clear the way it is written.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You would urge clearer language?

MR. MEYER: Yes, at least take a second look at it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments on Article IV?

MR. MEYER: I think Mr. Chairman, we might comment on Section 8.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Membership Determination?

MR. HENKE: Kern did raise a question on this one. It is not the intention in this section that NCSBCS would determine the classification of the delegate that is appointed by the legislature or the Governor. What we had in mind is whether or not an individual would be qualified as an Associate member or as an Affiliate member. That is where the decision making is; it does not effect the State's role. It is our belief that that classification determination should be made by the Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K. Jim?

MR. HICKS: Mr. Chairman, I was in another Committee meeting and I missed out possibly on the comments made on Section 1, and I am questioning the "designated by their Governor." -- There is a narrow construction for the State of California. My point is that my Governor presently delegates or designates authority through the various agencies who make these appointments, and unfortunately, where some of the other States go to their Governor and talk directly with him about these kinds of things, I cannot. I think that this is an arrangement that should be considered when the wording is revised.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I see your point. Any further comments on Article IV?

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, along the lines that Jim Hicks was talking about, as long as you are delegated by a duly delegated authority --

MR. HICKS: That is right.

MR. THORNE: -- in other words, if the Governor of your State delegates his authority to others and they, through the Governor's office, delegate you, why, you are a duly appointed delegate. Basically, the laws of NCSBCS read "by the Governor and/or legislature." So in this case, it is a duly delegated authority, anyway. What would you think, Gene?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: I would say that was the intention from the beginning and that is where the "and/or legislature" came in, because in some States it is very clear by legislative action. If the authority is given to a Commission the Commission, once appointed by the Governor, does not have an executive responsibility to the Governor. Also, like in Kern Church's State of North Carolina, his Commissioner of Insurance is elected statewide, and the legislature has given to the Insurance Commissioner the responsibility for building regulations. Mr. Church gets appointed by the Insurance Commissioner, not necessarily the Governor. That is why the slash is in that statement -- the "and/or." I think the Executive Committee should address this issue, go through the individual States, and review the condition in each State. I am sure that Kern Church's Insurance Commissioner could be receiving much of the mailing information, rather than his Governor.

The mailing procedure has failed to recognize that fact, and I think it is a concern of Kern's. Mailings to your State may not go to the Governor, but to the delegated authority who has the responsibility.

MR. THORNE: The Governor receives a duplication of the material that I receive.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Kern has had this occur in his State, I think, consistently since the beginning. He recognizes that his Insurance Commissioner should receive the correspondence rather than the Governor.

MR. CHURCH: I do not mind if the Governor sees it, too.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Then they both should receive the information.

MR. CHURCH: The man who is responsible is the Commissioner of Insurance.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Right, and I would hope that this situation would be cleared up State-by-State.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I hope that these comments are being written down so that the Executive Committee, when it gets the document back for reworking, can take all these things into consideration. So please give us constructive comments if you will. Jane?

MS. HERON: It is probably -- (Interrupted)

MR. THORNE: Are notes being made of all the data that we are bringing up here?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes. Jane, go ahead.

MS. HERON: It is probably superfluous at this point, but it seems to me that the addition of some phrase in Article IV about State delegates being designated, approved, signed off, or whatever, by the Governor is the correct way to obtain the involvement of the

Governors, which we discussed this morning briefly under Article II. I understand all these different internal problems, and in our State, not too many people talk to the Governor either. But, memoranda do go back and forth and when a decision is made at the Governor's level, it can be signed off in the Governor's office. It is my view that that is a method of involving a Governor and by extension, the National Governor's Conference and the activities of NCSBCS, so I would like to see the States pretty much in accord.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Glen?

MR. SWENSON: Mr. Chairman -- Glen Swenson, from Utah -- I think this could be very easily handled by adding words after "Governor" such as: "In accordance with the administrative procedures of the States involved."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Right, I think this is a point well taken. Article V, now.

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. The explanatory note says that delegates "ballot for Chairman-Elect," -- the way Section 2 is written, the Constitution excludes the Chairman and, as written, does not really provide how he is elected.

Also, "Term of Office," which is Section 3, it says, "at the start of the fiscal year," and the intent evidently is that he will start at the beginning of the second fiscal year. So those points ought to be clarified.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes. And by the way, before I forget this, I better make an announcement right now.

Chairman-Elect Ken Henke has asked that written comments on the Constitution be sent to him. If you have anything else that we do not get through today, certainly feel free to send the comments to him. I am sure that when the Executive Committee gets the document back to rework, those comments will be recognized and taken into consideration.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think that Ken would appreciate it if you would take a swing at rewriting the paragraph. It would certainly help the Executive Committee in cleaning up any language that you thought ought to be cleaned up. That would give the Executive Committee something to work from, rather than just stating a problem with the paragraph. Try to rewrite it the way you think it should be and submit it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Exactly. Anything further on Article V?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Moving on to Article VI -- "Committees." Any comments on Article VI?

Jane?

MS. HERON: Section 1 -- it is not clear to me, that the last sentence of the first paragraph is necessary. I would suggest eliminating it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You mean, about the Senior Technical Advisor?

MS. HERON: Yes. I think that in accordance with the spirit of what we suggested this morning, that kind of thing can be worked out either in agreement with the Bureau or on a from time-to-time basis, at the request of the Executive Committee. I am not sure there is any reason for having that sentence in there.

MR. HENKE: Well, I think really that this was part of the discussion this morning.

MS. HERON: Right, exactly.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Anything further on Article VI?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out something that is not in the note on Article VI. Last year the Executive Committee recognized that the Committee

Chairmen were an important part of the operation of the Executive Committee. The Committee Chairman have been added in this fashion so that they become a part of a non-voting sector of the Executive Committee. And I think this is an advancement that was recognized by the group that studied the situation. There have been non-Executive Committee members as Committee Chairmen that felt uncomfortable about participating in Executive Committee activities.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Right.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: It is not in the note here, but I think it is really a step forward.

MR. HENKE: That was an oversight on my part, Gene, when I went through and tried to note the changes that we were making. But, you are right. That should be brought out.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb?

MR. MEYER: I have one question. People that are now placed on Committees as ex-officio members, are you going to consider them as being part of making up the quorum of the Executive Committee?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: No, it is a quorum of States, not voting members. That is also a problem which occurred last year. As Executive Secretary, I was an Executive Committee member and when there were not enough State Executive Committee members in attendance, I was counted. That has been cleared up now and the document says, "of voting members a quorum shall be..."

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, over here.

MR. BULLOCK: Mr. Chairman, -- Bullock, of Georgia, -- my suggestion for the present would be that a delegate be assigned to each of the four (4) Standing Committees -- that we be a part of the four (4) Standing Committees.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Jane?

MS. HERON: Well, in fact, that is one object for consideration. In Section 2 on Standing Committees, I think there is a little technical problem. It says that each Committee shall consist of fourteen (14) members -- four (4) delegates, four (4) affiliates, and one (1) NBS person -- and again, in accordance with what we discussed this morning, it may not be necessary to have one NBS person.

Secondly, it says that the Chairman "shall appoint, with approval of the Executive Committee, six (6) members for two (2) years." I want to know where the other six (6) members come from, who appoints them, and if the intention here was to say, six (6) members for 1975-76 and six (6) members for 1976-77, so that there is a total of twelve (12) plus the Chairman? We need to change the language a little bit to get those other six (6) back in and to make it clear that these are staggered terms, if that is the intention.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: A point well taken. Anyone else have a comment? Ken?

MR. HENKE: I have just one question I might ask. Is there any objection from the group to making the Reciprocity Committee a Standing Committee rather than a Special Committee?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: A good point. Jane?

MS. HERON: Editorial comment on Section 3 -- look in line four (4), the words, "who has the authority," bla bla bla -- should come after the word "representative" in line three (3). It is mixed up. It is the representative who has that authority, not the delegate.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Further comments? Mr. Church?

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, when the Reciprocity Committee was first formed, there was a provision that there would be more time spent on mobile homes than on State building codes -- putting out State fires and not paying a lot of attention to other things. I would

like to see special recognition, either within the Reciprocity Committee or another Committee be given to a State building code or State building officials committee. More and more these people need to address themselves to common problems.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: This would answer the gentleman from Florida's question. That is good.

MR. BAULDREE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes?

MR. BAULDREE: Also, in Section 3, Reciprocity Committee -- "The membership of the Reciprocity Committee shall consist of a representative of each State, appointed by the State Delegate, who has the authority and responsibility to preempt local inspection on industrialized building, mobile homes, and/or a statewide building code;" suppose no such authority exists in a given State then do you have a member on the Reciprocity Committee from the State?

MR. HENKE: The authority does not exist?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is right.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: That was the original intent.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Going further in Article VI, any further comments? Please feel free to write in your comments, if you wish. We will move to Article VII -- "Meetings." Any comments on Article VII, "Meetings?"

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. Section 4 should recognize the fact that a quorum either is delegates or proxy delegates.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Or Proxies?

MR. McCRONE: Yes, further in Article VII.

MR. HENKE: Any objections to the "(20)" figure?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Do you like the "(20)" figure, Kern?

MR. CHURCH: I am not sure, because the fact is that there have been times when it has been hard to get --

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Tell me about it.

MR. CHURCH: -- and I am not sure we are mature enough as an organization to be sure that we can get twenty (20), or if we do get twenty (20), we are representative with twenty (20).

And the other thing, in most organizations, you usually have a majority of the Committee, at least as a quorum? Are there any more than ten (10) on the Executive Committee? If you have five (5), there is a quorum. They should be a majority.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: A point well taken and debated quite a bit.

MR. CHURCH: Based on what happened this morning, I believe you have a quorum anyway.

MR. HENKE: We cut the Executive Committee's quorum requirements down to five (5) because we had too many meetings where we would only have six (6) people in attendance. We never could cut this, even with all kinds of subterfuge.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think, though, Kern has a point here that there ought to be some consensus to either say five (5) is basically acceptable or not. This is a key issue and the Committee wrangled a long time on this and I think that there needs to be more than a suggestion. I think there is a case where a shown of hands or something as to the number is really apropos.

MR. CHURCH: Or, at least ballot the Executive Committee members on actions to be taken.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Anyone got a suggestion? Let us have a suggestion, first, and see what we get.

MR. THORNE: Well, I would like to speak in favor of the five (5).

CHAIRMAN THURBER: On the Executive Committee?

MR. THORNE: The Executive Committee. Legally, a group can set what it wants for a quorum. There is no legal definition that a quorum has to be a majority. I think business must be performed in between the meetings. You have got to have something that will work and if I cannot trust five (5) members to conduct the business of this organization properly, we are in bad shape. I cannot see that six or seven (6-7) members are going to speak any better for fifty (50) States than five (5) members, to be very frank with you.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Let us see a show of hands on those who think five (5).

MR. THORNE: I think that five (5) should be more than sufficient. On past experience alone, we have seen how many showed up. We all know that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Let me see a show of hands of those who think five (5) members only. Let us get a count.

(Secretary Rowland counts show of hands.)

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Seventeen (17).

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K., let us see a show of hands of those who think five (5) is not sufficient.

(Show of hands)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is an indicator, not a vote. Yes, sir?

MR. CIRILLO: Cirillo from Rhode Island. I was just wondering if it was possible to use a majority of those present at any one meeting?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is pretty tough.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: We could get two (2) people out of three (3) in attendance running the Conference.

MR. CIRILLO: But I think referencing back to what someone else mentioned; at the Executive Committee level, if it so happened that three (3) members were the only ones in attendance and they have communicated well with the rest, it would still be effective. It is not something that is not used. I know that is the way our own State works. We have an eighteen (18) man board and it is very difficult to get them together at all times, so we work on the majority present constituting a quorum.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: There are many thoughts on that, believe me. Go ahead.

MR. SWENSON: Swenson from Utah. There is a point here that he raises, because just like Gene said, if three (3) people are able to run the organization, they can only do it by default of the others and that raises the question, do the others really deserve that much of a voice if they are not in attendance? I am not saying that this should necessarily be the approach that is taken, but there is a philosophical argument for it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes?

MR. CIRILLO: Cirillo of Rhode Island, again. The same thing, I think, applied even to the "(20)" figure on the total membership. I do not know how many have attended annual meetings before, but we keep talking about fifty-three (53) delegates. But I wonder if there have ever been any times that fifty-three (53) have been in one place. If not, then really, we are talking about any other typical organization where a group have always been the ones that run the organization. We can say twenty (20), twenty-five (25).

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Kern?

MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, maybe a more democratic solution would be to say that after the twenty (20) and after the five (5) votes, any action taken is ratified by a majority of the members, by letter ballot.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think before this is finally decided, the Executive Committee will deliberate quite a bit.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, in answer to your question. When I was going over the history or kind of looking back at the organization over the last eight (8) years in which I participated, this group has always been practically a majority. In other words, a simple majority in attendance -- twenty-seven (27) or twenty-six (26), O.K. Those actions that really affect the delegate body of the organization have gone unanimous. Therefore, in these kinds of meetings where we had had roll calls up to now of thirty-one (31) in attendance, the majority of the fifty-three (53) have really been voicing an opinion. It is interesting to note that we really have not run into that so far. Now, when you get a split fifty-fifty (50-50) on a vote, or like seventeen-fifteen (17-15) like we did this morning on some roll call votes, then you do get back to the question of a minority running an organization. But this group has been very interesting that on voice votes through most of the chairmanships, they have been able to pull a unanimous vote which has been a majority.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Herb?

MR. MEYER: I just have one comment to what Kern said. He sympathized with us. I am very frankly opposed to it because we could not take action on the Energy Act if we had to wait for ratification of the majority, if we had only twenty (20) members -- that really hampers.

And I sympathize with majorities in all the other sort of things, but let us recognize that we have either got to perform or we will never be able to get ratification for some very important things that have happened. I have observed, Mr. Chairman, we would never have been in business if we had waited for ratification.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K. One more point here and we will not belabor this any more.

MR. BULLOCK: If we are going to set quorums on the Executive Committee and the general memberships then we ought to give quorums the right to conduct the business of the organization.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any questions or comments on that Article? Moving on to Article VIII -- "Finances."

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, -- Thorne of Arizona -- I hope I do not stir up a hornets' nest, but nowhere have I seen anything with reference to recall officers or members of the Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It comes later, further in the document.

MR. THORNE: Is there a procedure in there?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, there is.

MR. McCRONE: Article X, Section 2.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It is back in the Constitution a little further. You will see it when we come to it, Erik.

Let us again go to Article VIII, so we stay in order.

I might make a comment here I do not usually make. These are general rules that you usually have in any organization for finances. Every organization varies, but these are pretty general -- Yes?

MR. BULLOCK: Mr. Chairman, will you have the individual who is handling the funds bonded?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I suspect that is the normal procedure, yes. I do not know whether it is in here or not. Is it, Ken?

MR. HENKE: There is a provision in here.

MR. BEARDMORE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes?

MR. BEARDMORE: Beardmore of Kansas. In considering the assessments to the States, I have heard two (2) systems mentioned, perhaps three (3) -- a fixed scale, a sliding scale, and then the check-off system. I wonder if the possibility of combining a fixed assessment and a check-off scale might be considered. If the assessment is based solely on seals, then perhaps one section -- mobile homes, let's say -- one segment of the regulatory system might be supporting the whole action.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: That is a good point. Any other points or comments on Article VII, "Finances?"

Article IX -- "Duties?"

Yes?

MR. McCRONE: McCrone, Maryland. I wonder if the salary of Executive Directorships should be subject to confirmation or approval at the annual conference by the delegates? I would suggest that it be confirmed. Of course, it will be before the budget comes out.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Right. Point well taken.

Any more comments on Article IX? I am going to run just a few moments overtime, and I think it is in order to do that.

Anything further on Article IX?

(No response)

Article X -- "Removal of Officers?"

MR. SWENSON: One question on Section 7 of Article IX -- how are these vacancies created that are referred to in the first sentence?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: "The Committee Chairman, with the approval of the Executive Committee, shall fill any vacancies of the Committee." I would suspect that one way would be by resignation, one way would be death, and I do not know any others.

MR. SWENSON: Other than that, do they perpetuate themselves -- I mean, members of the committees?

MR. HENKE: Ken Henke from Iowa. Remember, membership on a Committee is for a two (2) year term.

MR. SWENSON: O.K., that answers my question.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Article X -- "Removal of Officers," any comments?

(No response)

Article XI -- "Amendments."

MR. THORNE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes?

MR. THORNE: Section 2 of Article X.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Section 2 of Article X? Recognized.

MR. THORNE: "Any officer or member of any Committee may, for just cause," -- well, -- I guess that takes care of that.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K. -- Article XI -- "Amendments."

MR. THORNE: Just cause is one thing. I was just trying to get an idea of what happens if he cannot show up at meetings because he is sick or through no fault of his own. He just cannot show up and so on and so forth. I guess, "just" is very explicit.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Article XI -- "Amendments."

MR. CHURCH: That is excellent. That is a lot better procedure than we had.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, I believe it is, Kern. I think Article XII, probably is self-explanatory.

Are there any further comments of a constructive nature or suggestions to the Executive Committee who will take this Constitution and rework or repolish it?

MR. HICKS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes, Jim?

MR. HICKS: I have not found it here but it may well be here. But, if a member has been removed from the Executive Committee is there a means between the annual meetings if you actually have a replacement?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Yes, under the authority of the Chairman to fill positions that are made void.

MR. HICKS: O.K.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: With the approval of the Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Does that answer your question, Jim?

MR. HICKS: Yes, it does.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Then, I think we will put the Constitution to bed with the Executive Committee and let them go ahead and massage it in accordance with the motion that we passed this morning and the Amendment thereto. Does that sound satisfactory to you, Ken?

MR. HENKE: Yes.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The Bylaws of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc., as approved September 23, 1976, are appended to these Proceedings.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Let us go on with the meeting, then.

We had a resolution coming in at this time. Where is it?

MS. HERON: We are not ready yet.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You are not ready yet? Could you indicate to me about when you will be ready?

MS. HERON: Well, I need to consult with Mr. Meyer.

(Ms. Heron departs the conference room to consult with Mr. Meyer.)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: While I am waiting for Jane to come back, Ken Henke has asked me to throw something on the floor that I believe is quite important, also, and that is the timing. It doesn't need to be in the form of a motion, or a second. I think it has to be in the form of a suggestion for Ken and his Executive Committee for next year. It is the timing for the Annual Conference. I am concerned, as well as he, that every once in a while we hear, "Well, my legislature is in session," or "I have got to go back home tomorrow," or this or that or the other thing. They are valid thoughts but at the beginning of the Conference this year you were asked to say when your legislature did go into session, how long it stayed, and a few things like this.

Many of you come to the conference with your back pockets open because you might get called back to testify at your legislature. This is a prime factor.

Maybe, there are other things. Maybe you have your building regulatory board meeting at a particular time. Today, for instance, someone informs me that their board meeting is tomorrow morning and they have to be there.

I think it behooves us to take a few suggestions to the Executive Committee and to the Conference Chairman for next year as to what are some of your thoughts on the timing of the annual meeting. I will recognize anyone from the floor.

You must all have some thoughts on it?

MR. CABELUS: Bernie Cabelus, Connecticut.

It seems that yesterday in our discussion it was brought out that NBS has a complete listing of all the model code groups, AIA, all the various organizations and when their meetings are being held. It would seem that the consensus at that time was that that should be reviewed prior to NCSBCS establishing a date, so that there would be no conflict with any other organization and I just wanted to bring that out.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Yes. That listing, by the way, is here and it is probably as complete as it can be, now.

Are there any other thoughts on this, or suggestions to the Executive Committee?

SECRETARY ROWLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think that what you are asking is, what is your preference? Spring, fall, winter?

Now, earlier in the game because of the weather conditions and stuff, there was some reason to try to stay away from winter months because some of the northern states that would like to be hosts did not want to host a meeting necessarily in January. So, we moved it kind of to the spring. But, I think the Chairman is looking for just an indication of a season with regard to your operation and it almost could go on a show of hands, Mr. Chairman.

Does anybody object to a winter meeting? Does anybody object to a spring meeting or summer meeting?

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Does anybody here -- go ahead, Bernie.

MR. CABELUS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest perhaps September or October as two real good months because you are getting into the cooler weather and you are still not getting into the snows and very inclement weather.

I think if we are going to move to consider one season of the year or the other, those are the two months that should be considered.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Charlie?

MR. DINEZIO: I would like to object to that. That is the time that you have to write your legislation to get it ready for the next fiscal year. You start in January. So the fall of the year is very important. It is the time for us to start reviewing legislation. We file some eight thousand (8,000) bills in our State.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Gatlin of Indiana. Who, by the way, has the next Annual Conference scheduled for his State?

Would you like to comment, Dale?

MR. GATLIN: Yes, my only comment was that IAPMO and ICBO both have meetings in the latter part of September or the early part of October, which will be a conflict.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The suggestion was even made yesterday about the Annual Conference and I think, at this moment, it is June.

Go ahead.

MR. BULLOCK: Mr. Chairman, you will be considering budget matters in the future, so it would look like to me it would be important for the Conference to meet prior to the fiscal year each time.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Well, I think that he is looking for suggestions on this and I am sure he is going to review everything.

Kern?

MR. CHURCH: I was going to say that I think it would be nice to get as many dates as you can. But if you follow it to the ultimate, you will get the dates of your State association meetings, you get the dates that you had for all your pre-arranged State board meetings, etc. It would be impossible.

Actually, during the summer months is bad because of vacations and during legislation time -- that is from January to about July -- is a bad time. Around the first of June, before you go on vacation, the first week or two in June is a pretty good time.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Mr. Cabelus?

MR. CABELUS: Around that time, I think you are ready to vote for the Conference. In line with this, it seems to me -- and I think Kern Church's memory is pretty good -- he may remember back some time ago when we debated the whole thing of dates, and I am going back now, four or five (4-5) years. It seemed that everything we discussed, we always ended back where we are at this time of year, and this is right, and I think the consensus at that was that no matter when we held a meeting, we would be in conflict with somebody. We would have people who would have to leave or perhaps could not make it and I think that we went into that pretty thoroughly before, and this may very well be just a rehash of what has transpired in the past.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: We brought this thing up yesterday, as you recall, at the Executive Committee meeting and, of course, no action was taken on it because that is the prerogative

f the new Executive Committee. But somebody suggested approximately mid-June for the Annual onference and September and mid-December and/or March for other meetings.

That is what I think you brought up a few minutes ago. But we did bat it around a ittle bit yesterday.

Any other suggestions on this thing?

MR. CHURCH: Maybe it might be a good idea, if the staff could do it, if those delegates ho do have pre-arranged dates set way ahead of time send them to the Secretariat for onsideration.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Good thought.

MR. CHURCH: Maybe the States could be worked around. I mean, within their own States, hings they have to attend and so forth. Like their State board meetings.

SECRETARY ROWLAND: You remember one time, Kern, we even had an opportunity to meet at he same time as CABO and there were some real advantageous things in doing that. There could e some interface with that community. That might be re-evaluated, too.

MR. CHURCH: Well, keep all of the dates and the Executive Committee can decide.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: O.K. Now, how about the Resolution? How are we doing?

MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that you allow Jane Heron to read the esolution that has been prepared.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: If she will consent to come up to the platform.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of a sudden, you cannot be heard.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Go ahead.

MS. HERON: Resolution Number 9 - Declaration of Policy.

BE IT RESOLVED that it is the policy of the National Conference of States on Building odes and Standards that in the promulgation of mandatory national building and related tandards, the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards strongly urges doption of standards which have been voluntarily generated through broadly representative rocedures involving participation of technically-qualified representatives of all affected nterests.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: You have heard the Resolution. What is your pleasure?

MR. SWENSON: I move its adoption.

MR. THORNE: Would you read that last sentence again, please.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The Resolution has been moved for adoption. I will get a second, irst.

MR. CABELUS: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Seconded by Bernard Cabelus.

Now, will you re-read the Resolution?

MS. HERON: BE IT RESOLVED that it is the policy of the National Conference of States n Building Codes and Standards that in the promulgation of mandatory national building and elated standards, the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards strongly

urges the adoption of standards which have been voluntarily generated through broadly representative procedures involving participation of technically-qualified representatives of all affected interests.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: It has been moved and seconded. Now, comments?

MR. SWENSON: I think it is a well-written Resolution.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Any further comments on the Resolution?

MR. SWENSON: Question on the Motion.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: The question has been called for. All those in favor of the Resolution read, signify by the usual sign, aye.

IN CHORUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: Opposed?

(None)

CHAIRMAN THURBER: So ordered. Resolution Number 9 is read into the minutes.

Question from the Chair - are there any other items of new business that we need to take care of before we go into the next portion of our program?

Mr. Mullen?

MR. MULLEN: I guess this is new business. I have heard comments from some of the new delegates particularly, that they are not really fully aware of what we are doing here, what we have done in the past, and maybe what their proper role would be in this organization. I would like to see the Executive Committee and some of the Standing Committees, too, make some procedures for taking our newer members in and orienting these people, making them feel welcome to our organization and sort of filling them in on what we are trying to do and where we are.

CHAIRMAN THURBER: I think our Chairman-Elect, who will become Chairman tomorrow morning, has that golden thought already and I am certain that that point is well taken, Mr. Mullen.

Any other suggestions before we go into the next portion of the program?

Now we will be going into the portion of the program called "Innovations in Building Regulatory Agency Management and Procedures." I think that this is something to which it behooves us all to listen.

Let us take a ten-minute break while we get set up then hurry right back in so we can continue with the program.

(Immediately following the break the "Joint NCSBCS/NBS Innovations in Building Agency Management and Procedures" was held. This material is contained in another published document.)

Attendees
of the
8th Annual Meeting
of the
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS
April 27 - May 1, 1975

DELEGATES AND STATE MEMBERS

Aaron Bauldree
State of Florida
2571 Executive Center Circle, East
Tallahassee, Florida 23201

Charles Beardmore, P. E.
Chief of Review
Kansas Architectural Services
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

George Bullock
Chairman, State Building
Administrative Board
P. O. Box 431
Athens, Georgia 30601

Douglas R. Busby
Public Service Commission
Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Bernard E. Cabelus
State Building Inspector
525 State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Kern E. Church
Deputy Commissioner
State Building Code Council
4 W. Edenton Street
Labor Building
Raleigh , North Carolina 27611

Joseph A. Cirillo
State Building Commissioner
Department of Community Affairs
150 Washington Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

William M. Connolly
Administrator, Bureau of Housing
Inspection
363 W. State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08690

Charles J. Dinezio
Executive Secretary
State Building Code Commission
141 Milk Street, 5th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02134

Frazier Faulconer
State Fire Marshal's Office
Plaza Tower Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Joseph J. Ferrer
Department of Community Affairs
P. O. Box 155
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Dale R. Gatlin
Director of Code Research
Indiana Admin. Building Council
215 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

L. P. Hamilton
Chief Engineer
Budget and Control Board
P. O. Box 11333
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Ronald A. Hendrie
Fire Marshal
Pouch "N"
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Kenneth C. Henke, Jr.
State Building Commissioner
Office for Planning and Programming
523 East Twelfth
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Jane Heron
Program Development Coordinator
Department of Local Government Affairs
Office of Housing and Buildings
300 - 160 N. LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601

James M. Hicks, Jr.
Chief of Codes and Standards
Department of Housing and Community Dev.
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Bill Hoop
Deputy Director
Dept. of Labor and Industrial Services
317 Main Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

Allie Isom
Director of Engineering and
Physical Plant
Room 306, State Capitol
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Fred H. Jolly
Director, Div. of Envn. Health Services
Nebraska State Health Department
1003 O Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Edward W. Kimsey
Director, Dept. of Insurance
202 Capitol Towers Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Willard P. McCone
Chief, Codes and Standards Branch
Dept. of Economic and Community Dev.
2525 Riva Road
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

David McNeill
General Construction Board
P. O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Lee Melancon
Assistant Administrator
Mobile Home Division
4981 Jefferson Highway
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809

Herbert W. Meyer
Director, Building Code Division
Department of Administration
408 Metro Square Building
Seventh and Robert Streets
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

C. Sutton Mullen
Chief Fire Marshal
P. O. Box 1157
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Louis S. Nielsen
Director, Housing & Bldg. Codes Bureau
Division of Housing & Community Renewal
Two World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047

Forrest C. Nelson
President-Elect
Southern Building Code Congress
Beaumont, Texas 77705

Walter Smittle, III
State Fire Marshal
1800 Washington Street, East
Room 634, Building 3
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Glen R. Swenson
Director, State Building Board
Room 124, State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Erik V. Thorne
Director, Division of Building Codes
1645 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Delmont C. Thurber
Chairman, Montana Building Code Council
3815 5th Avenue South
Great Falls, Montana 59405

John Wenning
Safety and Building Division
P. O. Box 2209
201 E. Washington Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

George Anikis
Consumer Product Safety Commission
5401 Westbard Avenue
Room 906
Bethesda, Maryland 20207

Robert H. Berntsen
General Construction Board
P. O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Jim Brennan
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
431 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20401

Richard Bullock
P. O. Box 2209
201 E. Washington Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

William T. Chaney
Arizona State Inspector
1645 Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Rex Early
Chief Engineer, IBU Section
521 Blanton Building
P. O. Box 1157
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Vernon Eder
Director, Manufactured Bldg. Div.
Administrative Building Council
215 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

George T. Goforth
General Engineer
Defense Civil Preparedness Agency
Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310

Bob Gore, Jr.
State Fire Marshal
State Capitol
7 Hunter Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Sidney R. Harman
Director, Mobile Homes & Rec. Vehicle Division
Utah Dept. of Business Regulation
330 East 4th South Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Robert S. Heheman
Supervisor of Central Services
Room 334, City Hall
801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Alex C. Kelley
Executive Director
State of Georgia
166 Pryor Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Harvey King
General Construction Board
P. O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Hubert McClure
General Construction Board
P. O. Box 5155
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Norman R. Osterby
State of Minnesota
Department of Administration
Administration Building
114 Sherburne Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

James Shields
Codes Administrator
Department of Community Affairs
Room 500, South Office Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Erik Svenson
Federal Energy Administration
Office of Energy Conservation and Env.
Room 7148 - FEA
Washington, D.C. 20461

James Talentino
Mechanical Engineer
Consumer Product Safety Commission
5401 Westbard Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20207

Robert M. Vanderford
City of Santa Fe
P. O. Box 909
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Lionel W. Vincent
Staff Consultant
State Building Code Commission
141 Milk Street, 5th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Charles W. Volz
City of Albuquerque
City Hall
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87114

Dr. Richard N. Wright
Director, Center for Building Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

AFFILIATE MEMBERS

Ralph F. Askins
Urban Data Systems, Inc.
1515 W. Lane Avenue
P. O. Box 712
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Douglas Betts
(Trailer Coach Assn.)
Fleetwood Enterprises
3125 Myers Street
Riverside, California 92503

Jack Bono
Assistant Chief Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.
333 Pfingsten Road
Northbrook, Illinois 60062

A. W. Cacciola
Vice President
United States Testing Company
1415 Park Avenue
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

T. H. Carter
Executive Director
International Conference of
Building Officials
5360 South Workman Mill Road
Whittier, California 90601

Fred Caruso
Director, State Legislative Affairs
Mobile Homes Manufacturers Assn.
P. O. Box 201
Chantilly, Virginia 22021

W. Dewey Clower
Executive Vice President
Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute
2029 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

John T. Daly
Architectural Services Manager
Boise Cascade Corp.
P. O. Box 8358
Boise, Idaho 83707

Jan Louise Diggins
State Legislative Director
Recreation Vehicle Industry, Assn.
2720 Des Plaines Avenue
Des Plaines, Illinois 60018

Alan Donheiser
Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Acorn Park
Cambridge, Massachusetts 01843

James R. Dowling
American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Steven Fenves
Professor of Civil Engineering
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Earl A. Ferguson
Director, Technical Services
Southeastern Manufactured Housing
Institute
2810 New Spring Road
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

William E. Fitch
Owenings Corning Fiberglas
Fiberglas Tower
Toledo, Ohio 43659

Dr. Richard S. Frazer
Chairman of the Board
American Society of Building and
Construction Inspectors
Suite 550, 625 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Francis E. Greeleaf
Trailer Coach Assn.
3855 E. La Palma
Anaheim, California 92807

Richard S. Harrington
Urban Data Systems, Inc.
P. O. Box 712
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Paul K. Heilstedt
Building Officials and Code
Administrators, International
1313 E. 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Stanley H. Jones
Director of Housing
General Testing and Timber
Products, Insp.
Big Elk Meadows
Lyons, Colorado 85040

E. H. Kinelski
Eastern Regional Manager
Copper Development Assn.
P. O. Box 716
McLean, Virginia 22101

Ralph Klinker, Jr.
Statistical Surveys, Inc.
3773 28th Street, S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49508

Krish Kudva
Philips Industries
222 Collins Road
Elkhart, Indiana 46514

Craig Lentz
Arthur D. Little, Inc.
35 Acorn Park
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140

Neil Macfarlan
Executive Secretary
National Academy of Code Administration
3900 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Glendon R. Mayo, P.E.
President
Glendon R. Mayo, P.C.
1 Van Dyke Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Daniel McGee
American Iron and Steel Institute
25 E. Salem Street
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Lee W. Moses
Recreational Vehicle Industry, Assn.
3855 E. La Palma Avenue
Anaheim, California 92806

G. R. Munger
Managing Director
Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Inst.
1815 N. Ft. Myer Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Ray Nokes
1st Vice President
International Conference of Building Officials
5360 South Workman Mill Road
Whittier, California 90601

George Schoonover
Code Advisor/2nd Vice President
American Society of Plumbing Engineers
1111 Spring Street
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

James C. Spence
American Iron and Steel Institute
1000 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ed Starostovic
Executive Vice President
Product Fabrication Services
303 Price Place
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

William G. Vasvary
Southern Building Code Congress
2617 8th Avenue South
Birmingham, Alabama 35222

Richard J. Werner
President
Hilborn, Werner, Carter & Assoc.
1627 South Myrtle Avenue
Clearwater, Florida 33516

Jack White
President
International Conference on Building Officials
5360 South Workman Mill Road
Whittier, California 90601

Mike Zieman
Trailer Coach Assn. (RADCO)
7045 Marcelle Street
Paramount, California 90723

Staff

National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

Sandra Berry
Patrick Cooke
Robert Eisenhard
James G. Gross
Charles Mahaffey
Kathy Pearce
James H. Pielert
Gene A. Rowland
Bert Vogel

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Annual Report
to the 8th Annual Meeting
of the
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
April 27-May 1, 1975
Santa Fe, New Mexico

The year 1974-75 has been good to the NCSBCS. The year saw a definite move forward in many areas. The regular standing committees, the Reciprocity Committee, and many special committees all played their role with good attendance and justifiable results. Cooperation with other Federal agencies, some of which are the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), National Bureau of Standards (NBS), Occupational, Safety, and Health Administration (OSHA), Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), and Defense Civil Preparedness Agency (DCPA). Inroads into and recognition by the White House stamped the Conference action theme as worthy of note.

Specifically, all committees as noted by the reports already on file have delved into many new fields of endeavor. Each Committee, befitting the tasks placed before it, has seen many of its members cooperating with other organizations, model code groups, and actual assistance to the States themselves.

Itemized achievements of this Conference this year:

1. One of the first actions taken this year was to honor a request by CPSC for a survey on aluminum wiring. The NCSBCS delegate body was polled and the results of the survey furnished CPSC.

2. At an early meeting in Washington, D.C., in July, the Executive Committee voted to proceed in the direction of establishing its own Executive Secretary, while still maintaining appropriate relationships with NBS. Appointment of a subcommittee to further develop a new organizational structure has moved the Conference further in this area.

3. An Executive Committee meeting was held in Salt Lake City, Utah, August 15 and 16. At this meeting a letter was drafted to Governor Calvin L. Rampton, Chairman, and Members of the National Governor's Conference in an effort to familiarize the Governors with the NCSBCS activities and concerns. The Committee met with Governor Rampton on August 16 with the request that the National Governor's Conference actively promote the passage of Federal legislation reserving to the States regulatory authority for the adoption and enforcement of building codes and standards.

4. As a result of letters written to the White House and Congressional delegation, the Conference gained further recognition on a national level by being invited to Inflation Conference on Housing and Construction (attended by Henke) and Summit Conference on Inflation (attended by Thurber). During the year all reports emanating from the White House as concerns of NCSBCS have come to us with requests for representation, which we have honored to the best of our capability.

5. Meetings were held in various areas concerning the energy document (90P) and with DCPA concerning training pertaining thereto. Ongoing monitoring of the energy document is continuing with the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) and the Federal Energy Administration (FEA).

6. Nominations were submitted to HUD for membership on the Mobile Home Advisory Council with five persons from NCSBCS being named to the Council. Nominations of several NCSBCS members have been placed before the White House for the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) Board. Action on that Board has not been announced as yet.

7. A questionnaire was sent to all delegates requesting information as to the latest date on which each delegate had contacted his Governor concerning NCSBCS. This was done in an attempt to more solidly bring NCSBCS before each Governor. Twenty-six State delegates replied to the questionnaire.

8. A representative was nemed (Mr. Charles E. Talmage) to the President's Council on Mental Retardation.

9. In December, the reorganization began to take shape and in January a subcommittee developed it in the preliminary form which would be submitted to the Conference at Santa Fe for its action. The companion document Constitution and the reorganization plan itself were finalized in February and sent to delegates for their comments.

10. A request from the Deputy Executive Director of the National Governor's Conference to have a NCSBCS representative appear was honored, and C. Sutton Mullen represented NCSBCS before that body.

11. Meetings were held during March with HUD concerning Title VI, and a task force of Mr. Willard Bryant, Mr. C. Sutton Mullen, and Mr. Edward Kimsey was named to represent NCSBCS as a liaison with HUD. This committee has already had one meeting with HUD and another is scheduled in the near future.

12. Chairman-Elect Henke represented the Conference at a meeting concerning the Federal Energy proposal testifying before Senator Proxmire's Committee.

13. Chairman Thurber and Chairman-Elect Henke were briefed on the Laboratory Accreditation Program proposal at NBS, and were requested to submit comments on the proposed draft.

14. Chairman Thurber offered to chair and convene the Standards and Codes Sector of the American National Metric Council (ANMC) and since ANMC accepted the offer, has held two meetings with that body and has reported directly to the ANMC First Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.

During the year, committee week meetings were held in Providence, Rhode Island; Minneapolis, Minnesota and Arlington, Virginia, the minutes of which are available upon request.

Pledge of continuing assistance by NBS and other organizations during the coming year and a moving forward of the reorganization plan have indicated a trend for better things ahead for NCSBCS.

STANDARDS AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Annual Report
to the 8th Annual Meeting
of the
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
April 27 - May 1, 1975
Santa Fe, New Mexico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STANDARDS AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE -- GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	107
THE PAST YEAR	108
MCSC - MODEL CODE STANDARDIZATION COUNCIL	108
CTAB - CONSTRUCTION TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD	108
A119.1	108
CABO -- COUNCIL OF AMERICAN BUILDING OFFICIALS	108
ANMC - AMERICAN NATIONAL METRIC COUNCIL	109
ANSI - A40 NATIONAL PLUMBING CODE	109
ASHRAE 90P	109
ACTIONS REQUIRED	109
MCSC	109
CTAB	109
ASHRAE 90P	110
A119.1	110
CABO	110
AMERICAN SOCEITY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS (E32)	110
ANMC	110
OTHER ACTIONS REQUESTED	110
LOOKING AHEAD	111

5

STANDARDS AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives selected by the Standards and Evaluation (S&E) Committee to further the role of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS) are:

A. Promote the activities of the Model Code Standardization Council (MCSC) in the establishment of a national consensus standard development project (including timetable goals) to produce:

   1. standard definitions used in building codes;

   2. standard building code occupancy classifications;

   3. standard types of construction; and,

   4. standard format for building code use.

B. Develop support as may be needed for the continued study of the HUD-FHA performance standards document as a National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards/ Council of American Building Officials draft that could be used for the development of a national consensus standard useful as a supplement to building codes for the evaluation of innovative housing systems.

C. Promote the development of national consensus standards for regulatory reference in conserving energy used in new buildings.

D. Promote the speedy completion of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E-32 and E-36 standards making sure that this standards' activity accurately reflects the needs of the States.

E. Investigate the feasibility of establishing a consensus standard development project related to the material emanating from the NBS Coordinated Evaluation System (CES) research project.

F. Encourage the adoption of recognized model building codes and consensus standards, discouraging the development and/or use of standards that duplicate existing model building codes and consensus standards.

G. Support the development and promotion of recommendations that will resolve the overlap of fire codes and/or building security requirements, with those of building codes.

H. Continue NCSBCS participation in the A119 standards activity and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Construction Technical Advisory Board (CTAB), including the development and timely introduction of agenda items for each that are of special interest to the States.

I. Identify other building standards activities of special significance to the States and recommend an appropriate NCSBCS relationship to each.

J. Promote the completion of the study of model building codes, identifying: those subject areas for which there are no consensus reference standards; those subject areas where the model codes differ from existing consensus standards; priorities among regulatory standards needs.

K. To review the role of building regulations relative to disaster mitigation (earthquakes, extreme winds and similar dynamic hazards).

THE PAST YEAR

Representation on various national boards and committees was continued. The contribution of time, money, and effort by the people is paying dividends through better relationships, early identification of problems and input into solutions. Listed below are the organizations and the people who represent us:

ORGANIZATION	REPRESENTATIVE
ASTM E32	C. Sutton Mullen
ASTM E36	Richard Furlong
MCSC	Ed Starostovic
CTAB (ANSI)	Joseph Stein
Tall Building Conference	Richard Furlong
CABO	
ASHRAE 90P	Kenneth C. Henke, Jr.
ANMC (Metric Conversion)	Del Thurber
ANSI A40	Bernie Cabelus
ANSI A119	Kenneth C. Henke, Jr.

MCSC

The MCSC list of reference standards for model codes has been prepared. It was considered at a public hearing on November 2 as a part of the MCSC documents. BOCA is modifying its occupancy and definition portions to conform in its 1975 code edition. ICBO has targeted its 1976 publication for adoption of the changes, and SBCC has scheduled to adopt it in 1977. The American Insurance Association and the National Fire Protection Association have shown no progress towards adoption of these changes at this time.

CTAB

Joe Stein has been elected as chairman of the CTAB committee. Most activities of the committee for this year have been in routine nature, with the exception that they made a strong recommendation to ASHRAE that it process its energy standard 90P through the ANSI procedures.

A119.1

Amendments to the ANSI A119.1-1975 are currently in progress. Ballots on the proposed amendments have been mailed and a return date of May 2 is requested. The issue of the longevity of A119 has been clouded considerably by Federal intervention into the construction code for mobile homes. HUD is scheduled to publish on May 22 their mobile home construction standards that will be mandatory on a national basis with state enforcement. The 24-person advisory board is in the process of being appointed at this time. NCSBCS has been assured that there will be ample representation of their organization on this advisory board. No decision has been made by HUD as to what format will be employed for amending the federal document. Several meetings between representatives of NCSBCS and HUD have been held in the last year. Results to date have not been totally satisfactory.

CABO

Two new programs are being initiated this year. One, a national research board; and two, a board for coordination of model codes. The National Research Board is formed for the purpose of reviewing new materials and systems and to be certified by CABO. It was reported that the one and two family building code had been withdrawn because of the pessimism regarding the possibility of its success in going through the ANSI balloting procedure. If the one and two family dwelling code is to be useful, it must be given wide support by all states.

ANMC

A national move for conversion to the metric system is gaining speed in the United States. Our representative on this council is Mr. Del Thurber, our Conference Chairman, who is heading one of the subcommittees. Each state should recommend to its governor an individual be designated with the responsiblity of keeping their state informed and in a position to move into the metric conversion process.

ANSI-A40

The A40 main committee has approved two subcommittees--one, specification code subcommittee; and two, a performance code subcommittee. The performance code levels must be compatible with existing specification level. Several meetings have been scheduled for the balance of this year and the beginning of next year to work in this subject area.

ASHRAE 90P

90P is presently on its second draft and has been sent out for comments and for final inclusion in the document. It is anticipated that the document will be ready mid-1975 for adoption by the states. New Federal legislation currently going through Congress again pre-empts states' powers in the field of energy standards. The Federal Government in Senate Bill 594, Title X, is considering legislation authorizing the Federal Government to promulgate standards for energy conservation. It is reported that they will use the 90P document as a basis to proceed from. Once again, we are not assured of the states having any input into the final document, not in the amendment process to keep the document current. Strong action by NCSBCS is necessary if the states are to retain a role in this vital area.

NCSBCS is continuing to develop a delivery system for the energy conservation program. Action with the Federal agencies is continuing to insure that the states, through NCSBCS, can play a role in the development of standards and in the development of the enforcement concept.

ACTIONS REQUIRED

MCSC

1. NCSBCS Executive Committee to request of NBS that they publish a separate list referencing only MCSC Standards.

2. The S&E Chairman appoint an ad hoc task group to investigate with MCSC the areas of agreement necessary for the eventual submittal of MCSC recommendations to ANSI for approval as an American National Standard.

3. MCSC requested to identify the progress or lack of progress on its recommendations by the various model code groups.

4. Letter of commendation be sent to the model code groups that have made progress in adopting the MCSC recommendations.

CTAB

NCSBCS ask CTAB to hold a national conference on the subject of security standards to resolve the conflict between fire, police, and building codes.

ASHRAE 90P

1. NCSBCS strongly encourage ASHRAE to request submission of 90P to ANSI procedures as soon as possible.

2. That ASHRAE conduct concurrent review of 90P by ANSI while holding public comment review.

3. To authorize the S&E Committee to coordinate the implementation of a delivery system for the national standard for energy conservation in buildings with those interested and affected.

A119.1

1. NCSBCS recommend that HUD be requested to use ANSI A119.1 for mobile homes instead of writing a new HUD Standard. If amendments are necessary, HUD could use them as a supplement to A119.1.

2. Request NFPA to consider the development of a national standard for mobile units other than mobile homes, such as schools, offices, banks, and other mobile units.

CABO

NCSBCS request CABO to consider the development of a national rehabilitation standard for dwellings.

American Society for Testing and Materials (E-32)

The committee has held two meetings since the NCSBCS Annual Meeting in Austin. At the June meeting in Washington, the Committee prepared a revised second draft after the first draft had failed to secure the necessary affirmative vote. The second draft was successful, but there were negatives. These were dealt with at the Committee's meeting in Williamsburg in November. Some of the negatives were removed by editorial changes, some were withdrawn by the voter after discussion, others were found nonpersuasive and others were referred to task groups for consideration for a future edition of the standard.

The document now must be submitted to Society ballot. This will be completed in March so that any resulting negatives can be dealt with at the Committee's meeting scheduled for May 6-7, 1975 in Atlanta, Georgia. It is hoped that the standard will be published shortly thereafter.

ANMC

1. NCSBCS establish a Metric Advisory Committee.

2. NCSBCS identify and request funding from NBS for support of the Metric Advisory Committee.

OTHER ACTIONS REQUESTED

1. NCSBCS request the Federal Agency (HUD) that ASHRAE 90P be used as the energy standard. The states be encouraged to adopt legislation for implementing the energy standard.

2. NCSBCS contact FTC expressing concern over the elimination of reference to flammibility ratings in test methods. Recommend that until new test methods are available, old rating system be retained.

3. Referred to the Reciprocity Committee the proposed "Factory Follow-Up Testing Program for Roof Trusses." Request that it be reviewed for relevance and need.

LOOKING AHEAD

It is recommended that NCSBCS continue to be represented on various committees and expand the number of committees it currently now serves.

Areas of continuing concern:

1. The establishment of an accreditation board, using the E-32 document.

2. Continued progress be made towards uniformity in the model code groups.

3. Fire codes, building codes, and safety codes must be reviewed for continuity and elimination of overlap.

4. Continue working in the energy standard development regardless of which direction it takes.

5. Continue working towards a smooth transition to the metric system.

6. Develop and implement a follow-up action procedure for committee use and recommend full NCSBCS utilization.

7. Develop a coordination role with NBS.

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE
Annual Report
to the 8th Annual Meeting
of the
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
April 27 - May 1, 1975
Santa Fe, New Mexico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Program Outline	113
Meetings	113
Objectives	113
Need for Sustained Efforts	113
Intergovernmental Cooperation	114
Support of NACA	114
Energy-Related Training	114
Legislation	114
Training Features in Other Legislation	115
State-based Code Information	115
Progress in Certification Programs	115
System for Evaluation of Code Officers Qualifications	116
Model Legislation	116

1974-1975 Program Outline*

Education and Qualification of Enforcement Personnel

A. Develop minimum criteria for identifying and qualifying various types and grades of code enforcement personnel, and support the implementation of programs utilizing the criteria.

B. Participate in the review and modification of model legislation and model rules and regulations for the certification of code enforcement personnel. Recommend such model legislation be (re) submitted to the Council of State Governments for adoption.

C. Cooperate in the development of model educational programs for code enforcement personnel and support the implementation of such programs.

D. Support the compilation and maintenance of educational and training programs, and instructional materials for code enforcement personnel.

E. Develop model procedures to encourage interstate reciprocity for the certification of code enforcement personnel.

F. Cooperate with other appropriate organizations and institutions in carrying out the above tasks.

Meetings

During the 1974-75 Conference Year, the Education and Qualification Committee met as follows (minutes available on request from the NCSBCS Secretariat):

--September 18, 1974, Providence (Cranston), Rhode Island
--December 4, 1974, Bloomington, Minnesota
--February 27-28, 1975, Arlington, Virginia
--April 28, 1975, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Objectives

A continuing concern of the Committee has been to shape a realistic program geared to the interests and needs of the States, and manageable in the context of available resources.

--The Committee, through its Chairman, has urged the Executive Committee to take appropriate steps to obtain continuing staff assistance for NCSBCS so that more substantial progress may be made by this and other Committees.

--Such progress is essential, among other things, to the maintenance of Committee interest and member participation.

--During the year, the Committee further refined its program objectives.

Need for Sustained Efforts

The Committee is concerned with long-term professional development of education and qualification activity as well as with shorter term technical training needs of code personnel and the design professions. The Committee recognizes that its objectives require sustained efforts over time and depend on the still emerging development of code responsibilities, standards interests, and commitment to code professionalization at the State level.

*Statement as revised at Rhode Island meeting of Education and Qualification Committee, September 1974.

Intergovernmental Cooperation

The process of professional development and Committee objectives entail a variety of intergovernmental relations and cooperation with national associations of local code officials, Federal agencies, and professional and educational societies.

--The Committee membership was strengthened to provide for direct relations with and involvement by nationally significant organizations and agencies.

--The further emergence of the National Academy of Code Administration (NACA) was a highlight of the Program Year, particularly as the E and Q Committee was a prime force in securing greater participation in and support for NACA.

Support of NACA

The Committee believes that the institutionalization of NACA will afford a nationally significant mechanism for carrying out the Committee's several key objectives and thereby serve States and communities and strengthen the place of code functions in American Government.

--During the year, the Committee officially occupied two NCSBCS positions on the NACA Executive Committee.

--A continuing problem will be to assure NCSBCS attendance as an active participant in NACA meetings. To enhance this, the Committee requested NACA to schedule some meetings to coincide with NCSBCS meetings.

--The Committee Chairman, on behalf of NCSBCS transmitted a letter of official endorsement of NACA to the Academy's Executive Director.

--For the coming year, implementation of Committee recommendations to secure Federal support for NACA and specific Academy activities is expected.

--The Committee believes that the interests of NCSBCS can be well served if States undertaking the development of education and qualification programs employ NACA in activities for which consultant services are authorized.

Energy-Related Training

In addition to long-term program professional development, the Committee devoted attention to the development of a training approach to assure professional implementation of energy conservation standards for construction.

--The National Bureau of Standards, particularly Mr. Eisenhard, contributed much effort to the design of a training approach and the means for implementing it. The approach contemplates development of a concensus standard for energy conservation and would require revision if legislation is enacted to require Federal designed standards.

Legislation

The Committee exercised strong interest in a variety of new Federal legislation affecting the codes field and professional development.

--(A) Fire Prevention and Control

--In connection with the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, the Committee recommended close collaboration between NCSBCS and the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control because of the latter's potential activities in building code and training areas.

-NCSBCS Participation in Fire Academy

--The Committee specifically recommended that the Secretary of Commerce be informed of NCSBCS interest in the National Academy for Fire Prevention and Control and request (a) reservation of a position on the Academy's Board of Visitors for a NCSBCS nominee and (b) a position for NCSBCS on the Academy's Committee for Fire Training.

-(B) Housing and Community Development Act of 1974

--Similarly, the Committee closely examined the Housing and Commnity Development Act of 1974.

-National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS)

--The Act authorizes creation of the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) which will have responsibilities in the codes and standards area, including information dissemination and possible training activity.

-Mobile Home Construction

--The Act's Title VI, "The Mobile Home Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974," directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development to establish Federal mobile home standards. The Committee will be alert to training, professional development, and reciprocity of inspections implications.

-Block Grants

--Title I of the Act authorizes block grants for community development and replaces categorical programs. Unlike predecessor programs, the legislation does not permit HUD to reference model codes and nationally recognized standards, nor does it require code enforcement activity although key objectives relate to community development, neighborhood improvement, and housing conservation and rehabilitation. For the long-term, States will be concerned to determine the extent to which code modification and uniformity and effective code enforcement will be sustained as a base for meeting interstate reciprocity concern, the safe introduction of new technology and assuring the conduct of inspections and the quality of professional staffs.

raining Features in Other Legislation

continuing objective recommended by the Committee is the identification of various other ederal legislation that authorizes support for the development and conduct of training rograms in the codes area, or attendance of code staff at such programs.

--The Committee recommended that State legislation in code-related fields, e.g., energy standards, be assigned to code-related agencies.

--The Committee urges member States to be equally alert to the need for and provision of training under State legislation as under Federal legislation.

tate-based Code Information

he Committee also recommended the examination of means by which code-related information ay be collected on a regular basis from the several States and be compiled and disseminated o the States.

--A specific recommendation to be explored is the possible use of The Book of the States through the Council of State Governments, and as a possible companion, The Municipal Year Book, published by the International City Management Association.

rogress in Certification Programs

he Committee was concerned about the lack of accurate information concerning the nature and xtent of programs of certification and qualifications. This lack prompted the Committee's onsideration of means to obtain uniform data on an annual basis in time for Committee ction and reports concerning model code organization activity. ICBO has established a ertification program based on the Uniform Building Code, SBCC has established a similar rogram based on the Southern Standard Building Code, and BOCA anticipates a similar pproach based on the Basic Building Code.

System for Evaluation of Code Officers Qualifications

In the previous year the E and Q Committee outlined a basic approach to the evaluation of code personnel as an aid to job definition, as a base for scheduling training and as a means for comparing job levels and needs among the States.

Apparent options for the implementation of this concept are additional NCSBCS resources for staffing or work with NACA and, through it, with the model code organizations.

Model Legislation

In the prior year, the Committee had recommended reactivation of the Special Working Group to revise the "Model Registration of Code Enforcement Officers Act" in order that it could be supported by the Council of State Governments. No action on the recommendation or the legislation was taken during the year, and the subject merits further attention.

MANAGEMENT AND REGULATORY PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
Annual Report
to the 8th Annual Meeting
of the
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
April 27 - May 1, 1975
Santa Fe, New Mexico

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COMMITTEE MEETINGS	118
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	118
COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	119
1. Uniform Building Permit Application Form	119
2. Innovations Workshop - 8th Annual Conference	119
3. State Building Code and Regulatory Programs	119
4. Model Code and State Code Amendment Procedures	119
5. Computer Based Systems for Code Administration	119

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

During the 1974-75 Conference Year the Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee met on three occasions: in Providence, Rhode Island, on September 18, 1974; in Minneapolis, Minnesota, on December 4, 1974; and in Arlington, Virginia, on February 27, 1975. Copies of the Minutes of these meetings have been published, distributed to Delegates, and are available from the Secretariat.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives of the Management and Regulatory Procedures Committee as contained in the 1974-75 NCSBCS Program Outline are as follows:

A. Recommend and support the development and establishment of uniform management and regulatory procedures which will provide the States with appropriate models for efficient code administration and enforcement.

B. Gather and report appropriate statistical and background information and data on the administration and technical operations of code enforcement programs.

C. Facilitate the transfer of code administration information through educational and informational programs.

D. Provide suggested model procedures and documents (forms, checklists, reports) pertaining to the evaluation, approval, and inspection of buildings, building components, and products.

E. Provide suggested remuneration and fee schedules, general budgetary information, and fiscal procedures.

F. Support the development and adoption of uniform information collection and storage systems (manual, microfilm and computers) in order to achieve administrative effectiveness and efficiency, and to promote nationwide exchange of statistical information relating to building regulation and failures (fire, structural, electrical, mechanical).

G. Foster interstate code uniformity by developing code preparation and amendment procedures designed to minimize state and local amendment.

H. Recommend suggested outlines and procedures for prosecution of code violators.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

1. Uniform Building Permit Application Form

The concept of promoting adoption of a reasonably uniform building permit application form on a national basis received some attention. The standard permit application form selected was that model form containing uniform code information desired by the U.S. Bureau of Census. This position is in accordance with Resolution No. 6 approved at the 6th Annual Conference.

In order to test the interest and responsiveness of local officials and the effectiveness of the State building official as a vehicle for implementation of the form, letters were sent on March 7, 1974, to all permit issuing municipalities in Indiana, by Charles Betts, explaining the background and advantages of adopting a standard building permit application form throughout Indiana.

Only six of the three hundred communities in Indiana which were contacted replied. The Committee concluded that such forms are not likely to gain any widespread acceptance except in those instances where State agencies are in a position to mandate the use of such forms.

2. Innovations Workshop

In order to foster a wider exposure for and better understanding of various code administration advances the Committee understood to organize and sponsor an "Innovative Workshop" to be conducted at the 8th Annual Conference.

Papers were solicited through normal NCSBCS channels, through personal contact by Committee members, and through announcements in many trade and related publications. Of those abstracts submitted, six were chosen for presentation at the Annual Conference. They represent a cross section of innovative management and regulatory procedures and techniques including microfilm, computers, third party accreditation, and agency/public communications.

A list of the papers to be presented is attached.

3. State Building Code and Regulatory Programs

The Committee undertook to identify those aspects of State building code regulatory programs for which permanently updated profiles should be maintained. Work will continue to establish a system which will accomplish the maintenance of such profiles as a source data bank for State building regulatory officials.

4. Model Code and State Code Amendment Procedures

The Committee investigated the amendment procedures used by model code groups and States having State building codes. Work continues with the objective of identifying and recommending optimum amendment procedures for States and model codes which will foster the maximum possible interstate uniformity among State building codes.

5. Computer-Based Systems for Code Administration

The Committee reviewed the final report of the AIA Research Corporation project entitled "Planning Computer Compatibility for Uniform Building Regulation Documents."

NCSBCS/NBS WORKSHOP
"INNOVATIONS IN BUILDING REGULATORY AGENCY MANAGEMENT AND PROCEDURES"
APRIL 30, 1975
SANTA FE HILTON INN, SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

NAME AND ADDRESS OF PRESENTER	TITLE OF PAPER
1. Professor Steven J. Fenves Head, Department of Civil Engineering Carnegie-Mellon University Schenley Park Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213 (412) 621-2600	"A New Method for Representing and Processing Building Code Provisions"
2. Mr. Ralph F. Askins President Urban Data Systems, Inc. 1515 West Lane Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43216 (614) 228-0911	"Innovative Computer Code Administration"
3. Mrs. Lee Melancon Executive Administrator Mobile Home Division State Fire Marshal's Office 8941 Jefferson Highway Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809 (504) 389-7084	"A Proven Approach to Public Communications Between State (Louisiana) and Citizens"
4. Mr. Lionel W. Vincent Staff Consultant Massachusetts State Building Code Commission 141 Milk Street, 5th Floor Boston, Massachusetts 02109 (617) 727-6916	"Progress Report on Massachusetts Laboratory Evaluation and Accreditation Program--(MASS-LEAP)"
5. Mr. Robert Heheman Supervisor of Central Services Department of Buildings and Inspections Room 334, City Hall 801 Plum Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (513) 352-3000	"Successful Use of Microfilm and Computers"
6. Mr. William M. Connolly Administrator Bureau of Housing Inspection New Jersey State Department of Community Affairs 363 West State Street Trenton, New Jersey 08625 (609) 292-6415	"Computer Assisted Housing Inspection Reporting, Processing, and Management System"

RECIPROCITY COMMITTEE
Annual Report
to the 8th Annual Meeting
of the
National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards
April 27-May 1, 1975
Santa Fe, New Mexico

The "Handbook of the Reciprocity Committee" authorized at the Boston, Massachusetts, December 5, 1973, meeting of the Committee, prepared by Sutton Mullen of Virginia and Jane Heron of Illinois was issued on August 22, 1974, to committee members and State Delegates.

The Committee met at Providence, Rhode Island on September 17, 1974, and re-elected the chairman of the previous year. The area regional chairman continued in office.

Mr. James A. McCullough, Director of Architectural and Engineering Services, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)/Housing Protection and Mortgage Credit (HPMC), reviewed for the Committee the Title I and Title VI portions of the Federal Legislation, Public Law 93-383 known as the "Housing and Community Development Act of 1973," and signed by President Ford on August 22, 1974. Mr. McCullough informed the Committee that HUD would accept nominations by NCSBCS of proposed members of the "National Advisory Council for Mobile Homes." The Committee recommended to the Executive Committee for nomination: Ed Kimsey--Tennessee, Vern Eder--Indiana, Erik Thorne--Arizona, and Kern Church--North Carolina.

The "Independent Agency Advisory Group" was established at the Providence meeting as follows:

Independent Agency Advisory Group

Purpose: An Independent Agency Advisory Group shall be established to assist the Reciprocity Committee by offering recommendations to the Committee on request or on its own initiative. The objective of all recommendations shall be improvement of interstate reciprocity in the implementation of State manufactured building regulatory programs.

Eligibility for Membership: Membership shall be limited to independent agencies accredited by at least two states for evaluation and/or inspection of manufactured buildings or mobile homes.

Applications for Membership: Applications shall be made through the Chairman of the Reciprocity Committee.

Appointments to Membership: Appointments shall be made by NCSBCS with the provision that membership does not constitute endorsement of the agency by NCSBCS.

Meetings: The Independent Agency Advisory Group shall provide adequate advance notice of its meetings so as to permit NCSBCS and the Reciprocity Committee to appoint observers.

Mr. Morgan of Pennsylvania and Mr. Beardmore of Kansas were appointed as liaisons to the Independent Agency Advisory Group.

At the Providence meeting the Committee reviewed previous actions that had been referred to the Executive Committee, but had not been accomplished. The Committee reconsidered previous actions of the Committee and disposed of them as follows:

1. Original action--Raleigh, North Carolina 8/11/72:
   National Bureau of Standards (NBS) be asked by Reciprocity Committee to establish a central file of interpretations of nationally recognized codes and standards which would identify sources of standards and consensus procedures used;

Reconsidered previous action and revised request to Executive Committee to formally request NBS to establish a central file of the sources and procedures of obtaining interpretations of the nationally recognized codes and standards.

2. Original action--Atlanta, Georgia 12/20/72:
Method of test for the evaluation of exterior mobile home walls for horizontal wind load and factory follow-up testing programs for roof trusses approved as interim standards;

Took no action because of recommendation by National Chairman that this must be clarified by the Executive Committee.

3. Original action--Denver, Colorado 2/27/73:
Secretariat send to each member of the Executive Committee and the Reciprocity Committee any future Federal bill dealing with mobile homes, manufactured buildings, "or similar type legislation" as soon as they are introduced;

Reconfirmed previous action and again request the National Chairman and Executive Committee to request NBS to furnish copies of the Title VI Federal law and any other new or future Federal legislation to Executive Committee and Reciprocity Committee members.

4. Original action--Denver, Colorado 2/27/72:
Reciprocity Committee should communicate with the three model code groups expressing concern that these organizations have not sought an ANSI consensus on the "One and Two Family Dwelling Code," a consensus process like that to which NCSBCS is committed;

Moved to reconfirm the previous request and asks support of Executive Committee and National Chairman in accomplishing the request.

5. Original action--Des Moines, Iowa 9/20/73:
Voted to request NCSBCS instructed delegate to A119.1 (Henke) and NCSBCS Executive Committee request that American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A119.1 Standard and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 501B carry the same yearly date. Also, these standards be published in a three year cycle with only supplements published in the intervening years. Reciprocity Committee voted to recommend to all States that they use interim standards "adopted" at Atlanta in December, 1972, for certain structural elements;

Reciprocity Committee acted to refer request to Executive Committee as recommended by National Chairman and requests Executive Committee to take necessary actions to accomplish the proposal.

6. Original action--Salt Lake City, Utah 2/28/74:
NBS requested to provide technical review of those A119.1 amendments selected by the Reciprocity Committee for NCSBCS endorsement. (See Meyer-Rowland correspondence.) NBS will be asked to assist in preparing NCSBCS presentation to ANSI Task Force reviewing proposed amendments;

Reciprocity Committee voted to request National Chairman to formally submit the necessary request to NBS to continue the pilot project and that Executive Committee concur in that action.

7. Original action--Salt Lake City, Utah 2/28/74:
Reciprocity Committee requested that the Executive Committee establish an Advisory Committee to be composed of Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Reciprocity Committee to be available to the delegates for consultation when the entire Reciprocity Committee is not in session;

Reconfirmed previous action and asks that the Executive Committee consider the proposal and take necessary action to accomplish request.

8. Original action--Salt Lake City, Utah 2/28/74:
Motion reiterating proposed use of NBS technical assistance "to make certain that information and data in the proposed amendments is correct;"

Reciprocity Committee concurred in National Chairman's statement, "No action required."

9. Original action--Salt Lake City, Utah 2/28/74:
The Executive Committee asked to appoint Mr. Early (Structural), Mr. Kimsey (Mechanical), Mr. Steele (Heating), and Mr. Baker (Electrical), as Task alternates for the ANSI delegate;

Moved to refer request to Executive Committee as recommended by National Chairman and request consideration and action by the Executive Committee.

10. Original action--Salt Lake City, Utah 2/28/74:
Reciprocity Committee requested NBS to develop procedures and model forms for interstate agreements;

Reciprocity Committee moved to refer to National Chairman and Executive Committee to consider and make formal request to NBS.

11. Original action--Austin, Texas 4/30/74:
Reciprocity Committee placed on Austin agenda a proposal that Engineering Standards of ANSI A119.1 be reviewed and an amendment be prepared moving them from the Appendix to the Body of the A119.1 Standard. NBS was requested to review this change and provide technical support and comment;

Reciprocity Committee moved to refer request to S & E Committee with concurrence in that action by the Executive Committee.

12. Original action--Austin, Texas 4/30/74:
NBS requested to develop methods to "solve the problems" with reference to mobile homes and one- and two-family dwellings that NBS suggested not be covered by the Design and Evaluation Criteria for Energy Conservation in New Buildings;"

Reciprocity Committee moved to refer to S & E Committee to consider with their consideration of American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) 90P and accept Reciprocity Committee request to delete mobile homes from 90P as a separate task force is considering the matter under ANSI A119.1.

The committee adopted a motion that the Executive Committee and S & E Committee proceed through proper channels to secure development of a National Standard to cover mobile units other than mobile homes.

At the December meeting the committee reaffirmed its Program Outline with an amendment to Paragraph "F." The program as amended is as follows:

IV. Interstate Reciprocity for Manufactured Building
(Reciprocity Committee--Herbert W. Meyer, Chairman)

A. In cooperation with the S & E Committee, identify and encourage uniformity of recognized model codes and standards which can serve as a basis for interstate reciprocity for manufactured building and components.

B. Promote development and maintenance of operational rules and criteria for agencies which are qualified to perform one or more of the following functions:

1. evaluation of prototypes and systems;
2. performance of the necessary tests required by the standards; and,
3. inspection and compliance assurance at the point of manufacture.

C. Promote the development and operation of a cooperative monitoring program to assure that evaluation, testing, and inspection agencies are performing properly.

D. Promote the adoption of the model acts by the States in order to encourage interstate uniformity.

E. Develop procedures for uniform interpretations, uniform amendments, and uniform dates for adoption of the model codes and standards by the States.

F. In cooperation with other committees of the NCSBCS, promote acceptance of the above programs by the Federal Government, among the States and throughout the building industry. The revised program was referred to the Executive Committee.

The Committee reviewed smoke detectors and their problems and heard a presentation by Mr. Richard Bright of NBS. As a result, the Committee directed a request to the Executive Committee and the National Chairman that the States be advised not to approve the MOS-metallic oxide semi-conductor sensors (Tagouchie Tube) as a home warning detector until it meets the proposed Underwriters' Laboratories (U.L.) Standard (U.S. 217) for Single Station Home Detectors.

As a result of a proposal with reference to manufactured buildings (dwellings) submitted by the National Association of Building Manufacturers (NABM), the Committee adopted and referred to the Executive Committee the following for implementation:

> "In order to provide a uniform interstate basis for the acceptance of manufactured dwellings (as well as site-built dwellings), the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards urges all States to accept units that comply with the latest edition of the nationally recognized One- and Two-Family Dwelling Code. This should be accomplished: (A) by adopting the One- and Two-Family Dwelling Code; or (b) by declaring that compliance with the One- and Two-Family Dwelling Code will be accepted as an equivalent and approved alternate means of meeting the applicable health and safety provisions of the existing State code or regulations."

At the request of Wisconsin, the Committee requested that the Executive Committee and the NCSBCS ANSI A119.1 Committee members process the following proposed amendments to ANSI A119.1:

1. RECOMMENDATION: Part C of the NFPA 501B-1974 to include a proposed section 5.1.4.7 which would read: "Black steel pipe shall not be used for drain, waste, and vent piping."

2. RECOMMENDATION: Section 11.7 have its title changed to "Valves" and the existing paragraph be numbered 11.7.1 and Section 11.7.2 be added to read "Control Valves." "Valves shall be required on the downstream side of the water connection to control the entire water distribution system for the water closet and in the cold water supply to the water heater. No valve shall be located between the water heater and the relief valve.

3. RECOMMENDATION: An addition to Section 11.3.1.3 should be made to read as follows: "An air gap shall be provided in the relief valve drain line within the mobile home so that leakage or discharge may be visible."

4. RECOMMENDATION: Section 11.5.6 be created or add to Section 11.5.11 the following requirement: "Piping shall be so aligned and graded that the entire system or parts thereof can be drained. The formation of traps or sags shall be avoided where possible. When unavoidable, such sags, traps, or inverts shall have provisions for properly draining the same."

5. RECOMMENDATION: A new Section 6.1.3 labeling is suggested and the wording would be as follows: "Each pipe, pipe fitting, trap, fixture, material, and device used in a plumbing system shall have cast, embossed, stamped, or indelibly marked on it, the maker's mark or name, weight, and quality of the product. Where an approved standard exists that does not provide for labeling it shall be done in accord with this Section."

Nominations were recommended to the Executive Committee and submitted by the Executive Committee to HUD for membership on the Mobile Home Advisory Council. Five members from NCSBCS were named to the Council.

BYLAWS
OF
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATES
ON BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS, INC.

ARTICLE I
ORGANIZATION

The name of this corporation shall be the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards, Inc., hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation." It has been organized under Chapter 504A, Code of Iowa, 1975, the Iowa Non-Profit Corporation Act, the membership of which is voluntary and is restricted as hereinafter provided.

The term "State," as referred to in these Bylaws, shall mean a State, a commonwealth, and an area under the jurisdiction of the United States.

ARTICLE II
OFFICES

The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The Corporation shall have such other offices as the business of the Corporation may require from time to time.

The registered office of the Corporation required by Iowa law to be continuously maintained in Iowa shall be initially as provided in the Articles of Incorporation, subject to change from time to time by resolution of the Board of Directors and filing of statement of said change as required by Iowa law.

ARTICLE III
MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. CLASSIFICATION OF MEMBERS. This Corporation shall be composed of the following members, as classified below:

Delegate Members. A State shall be represented by one individual currently active in the development and/or enforcement of building codes and standards in his State, and designated by his appointing authority.

State Members. This classification of membership shall include any State government employee, or State commission, board or committee member or employee who is legally responsible for or working in an agency which has any building regulation and/or building standards generation responsibilities of a statewide nature.

Associate Members. This classification of membership shall include any government employee other than a State member who is involved in building standards or code regulatory activities (Federal, county, township, city, village, etc.).

Affiliate Members. This classification of membership shall include all other individuals not heretofore mentioned and who are interested in the activities of, and participation in, this organization.

Honorary Members. The Board of Directors, with approval of the Conference, may designate individuals who have specific direct responsibilities and/or concerns with the building regulatory responsibilities of the States as honorary members.

SECTION 2. TERMINATION. The period of Delegate membership is at the will and pleasure of the State. The appointing authority may terminate its Delegate membership by transmitting to the Chairman of the Board of Directors a written statement indicating that such State no longer desires to have membership in the Conference or wishes to appoint a new Delegate.

SECTION 3. MEMBERSHIP DETERMINATION. In case of question as to membership classification, a majority vote of the Board of Directors shall decide the issue, and such determination shall be binding.

SECTION 4. ANNUAL MEETING. The annual meeting of the Delegate members shall be held on the third Monday in September of every year, at such place as designated by the Board of Directors, for the purpose of electing directors and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. If the day fixed for the annual meeting shall be a legal national holiday, such meeting shall be held on the next succeeding business day. If the election of directors shall not be held on the day designated herein for any annual meeting, or at any adjournment thereof, the Board of Directors shall cause the election to be held at a meeting of the members as soon thereafter as conveniently may be.

SECTION 5. SPECIAL MEETINGS. Special meetings of the Delegate members may be called by the President, with the approval of the majority of the Board of Directors, or upon written request of a majority of the Delegate members, at such time and place as may be deemed expedient, upon thirty (30) days' written notice to the Delegate members; the notice shall be served by the Executive Director. The notice shall state the time, place, and purpose of such special meeting.

SECTION 6. PLACE OF MEETING. The Board of Directors may designate any place, either within or without the State of Iowa, as the place of meeting for any annual meeting, or for any special meeting called as provided herein. If no designation is made, the place of meeting shall be the registered office of the Corporation in the State of Iowa. All notices of all meetings, of the members or of the Board of Directors, may be waived by a written waiver of notice form signed by all persons.

SECTION 7. NOTICE OF MEETINGS. Written or printed notice stating the place, day, and hour of the meeting, and, in the case of a special meeting, the purpose or purposes for such meeting, shall be delivered as provided for herein, either personally or by mail, by or at the direction of the Executive Director, or those persons calling the meeting, to each Delegate member of record entitled to vote at such meeting. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail, addressed to the Delegate member at his address as it appears on the books and records of the Corporation, with postage prepaid.

SECTION 8. VOTING. At all meetings, the Delegate member or his duly authorized proxy in attendance, shall be entitled to one vote on all matters subject to determination by vote, and unless otherwise specified, all matters subject to determination by vote shall be resolved by a majority vote of the Delegate members in attendance.

SECTION 9. PROXIES. A proxy may serve for a Delegate member at any membership meeting. The proxy must be appointed in writing by the Delegate member. Only State members may be appointed as proxy. When a proxy is appointed, the Delegate member shall notify the Executive Director of the Corporation by letter or wire, and send a copy of such notification to the President of the Corporation, to be retained in the corporate records.

SECTION 10. QUORUM. At the annual meeting of Delegate members and at all special meetings of the delegate body, twenty (20) delegates shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SECTION 11. SPECIAL MATTERS. Approval may be obtained from Delegate members by mail ballot on matters arising between meetings, unless a special meeting is called as provided herein. Approval shall require an affirmative vote by a majority vote of those ballots cast and returned. Twenty (20) mail ballots shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except as provided hereinafter, in regard to amending these Bylaws. Mail ballots must be received within thirty (30) days of the dated letter calling for the vote by mail ballot in order to be a valid vote.

ARTICLE IV
DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. GENERAL POWERS. The business and affairs of the Corporation shall be managed by its Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. NUMBER AND ELECTION OF DIRECTORS. The number of directors of the Corporation shall be nine (9). At the first annual meeting thereafter, the delegates shall elect directors and each director shall hold office for the term for which he is elected and until his successor shall have been elected and qualified.

SECTION 3. COMPOSITION. The Board of Directors shall consist of four (4) regional directors, four (4) directors-at-large and the immediate Past President of the Corporation.

A. The regional directors shall be elected from the delegate members, one from each of the following designated regions:

1. Western Region: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

2. Midwestern Region: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

3. Southern Region: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

4. Northeastern Region: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

B. The directors-at-large shall be elected from the delegate members, generally.

SECTION 4. TERMS OF OFFICE

A. Regional directors shall serve two-year staggered terms of directorship. At the first annual meeting of delegates, the delegates shall elect two (2) regional directors to serve one-year terms and two (2) directors to serve two-year terms. Every year thereafter, the delegates shall elect two (2) regional directors to serve two-year terms.

B. Directors-at-large shall serve two-year staggered terms of directorship. At the first annual meeting of delegates, the delegates shall elect two (2) directors-at-large to serve one-year terms and two (2) directors-at-large to serve two-year terms. Every year thereafter, the delegates shall elect two (2) directors-at-large to serve two-year terms.

C. At the first annual meeting of delegates only, the delegate body shall elect one (1) regional director each from the Southern and Northeastern Regions for two-year terms and elect Directors Thorne and Wenning for one-year terms.

D. At the first annual meeting of delegates only, the delegates shall elect two (2) directors-at-large for two-year terms and elect Directors Hicks and Kimsey for one-year terms.

SECTION 5. REGULAR MEETINGS. A regular meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held without other notice than this Bylaw, immediately after, and at the same place as, the annual meeting of Delegate members. The Board of Directors may provide by resolution

the time and place, either within or without the State of Iowa, for the holding of additional regular meetings without other notice than such resolution.

SECTION 6. SPECIAL MEETINGS. Special meetings of the Board of Directors may be called by or at the request of the Chairman or a majority of the directors of the Corporation. The person or persons authorized to call special meetings of the Board of Directors may fix any place, either within or without the State of Iowa, as the place for holding any special meeting of the Board of Directors called by them.

SECTION 7. NOTICE. Notice of any special meeting of the Board of Directors shall be given at least ten (10) days previous thereto by written notice delivered personally or mailed to each director at his business address, or by telegram. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail so addressed with postage prepaid. If notice be given by telegram, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when the telegram is delivered to the telegraph company. The attendance of a director at any meeting shall constitute a waiver of notice of such meeting, except where a director attends a meeting for the express purpose of objecting to the transaction of any business because the meeting is not lawfully called or convened. Neither the business to be transacted at, nor the purpose of, any regular or special meeting of the Board of Directors need be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting.

SECTION 8. QUORUM. A majority of the number of directors fixed by these Bylaws shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business; provided that if less than a majority of such number of directors are present at said meeting, a majority of the directors present may adjourn the meeting from time to time without further notice.

SECTION 9. MANNER OF ACTING. The act of the majority of the directors present at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 10. VACANCIES. Any vacancy occurring on the Board of Directors and any directorship to be filled by reason of an increase in the number of directors may be filled by the affirmative vote of a majority of the directors then in office, even if less than a quorum of the Board of Directors. A director so elected shall be elected for the unexpired term of his predecessor in office or the full term of such new directorship.

SECTION 11. COMPENSATION. By resolution of the Board of Directors, the directors may be paid their expenses, if any, of attendance at each meeting of the Board and for any other expenses incurred as directors, but not for services.

SECTION 12. PRESUMPTION OF ASSENT. A director of the Corporation who is present at a meeting of its Board of Directors at which action on any corporate matter is taken shall be presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his dissent shall be entered in the minutes of the meeting or unless he shall file his written dissent to such action with the person acting as secretary of the meeting, before the adjournment thereof or shall forward such dissent by registered or certified mail to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Corportion immediately after the adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent shall not apply to a director who voted in favor of such action.

SECTION 13. INFORMAL ACTION BY DIRECTORS. Any action required by the Iowa law to be taken at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Corporation, or any action which may be taken at a meeting of the Board of Directors or a committee of directors, may be taken without a meeting if a consent in writing setting forth the action so taken, shall be signed by all of the Directors or all of the members of the committee of directors as the case may be.

ARTICLE V
OFFICERS

SECTION 1. OFFICERS. The officers of the Corporation shall consist of a President, Vice President, and Secretary-Treasurer, or such other officers as may be elected or appointed by the Board of Directors. The officers of the Corporation shall be elected from among the four (4) regional directors and the four (4) directors-at-large of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. PRESIDENT. The President shall be the principal executive officer of the corporation and shall, in general, supervise and control all of the business and affairs of the Corporation, subject to the general powers of the Board of Directors. He shall preside at all meetings of the members and of the Board of Directors. He may sign, with the Secretary-Treasurer or any other proper officer of the Corporation thereunto authorized by the Board of Directos, deeds, mortgages, contracts, or other instruments which the Board of Directors has authorized to be executed, except in cases where the signing and execution thereof shall be expressly delegated by the Board of Directors or by these Bylaws to some other officer or agent of the Corporation, or shall be required by law to be otherwise signed or executed. In general, he shall perform all duties incident to the office of President and such other duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Directors from time to time. The President shall serve concurrently with his Presidency, as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of the President or in the event of his inability, resignation, retirement, death, or refusal to act, the Vice President shall perform the duties of the President, and when so acting, shall have all the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the President. The Vice President may sign instruments with the Secretary-Treasurer and shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 4. SECRETARY-TREASURER. If required by the Board of Directors, the Secretary-Treasurer shall furnish a bond for the faithful discharge of his duties in such sum and with such surety or sureties as the Board of Directors shall determine. He shall have charge and custody of and be responsible for all funds and securities of the Corporation; receive and give receipts for monies due and payable to the Corporation; and deposit all such monies in the name of the Corporation in such banks, trust companies or other depositories as shall be selected in accordance with the provisions of Article X of these Bylaws. He shall, in general, perform all duties incident to the office of Secretary-Treasurer and such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Directors. The functions of the Secretary-Treasurer may be delegated to the Executive Director by the Board of Directors.

The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep the minutes of the membership and the Board of Directors' meetings in one or more books provided for that purpose; see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these Bylaws or as required by law; be custodian of the corporate records; keep the post office address of each member which shall be furnished to the Secretary-Treasurer by such member, and, in general, perform all duties incident to the office of Secretary-Treasurer and such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 5. ELECTION AND TERM OF OFFICE. The officers of the Corporation shall be elected annually by the Board of Directors at the first meeting of the Board of Directors held after each annual meeting of membership. If the election of the officers shall not be held at such meeting, such election shall be held as soon thereafter as conveniently may be. Vacancies may be filled or new offices created and filled at any meeting of the Board of Directors. Each officer shall hold office until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified, or until his death, or until he may resign or shall have been removed in the manner hereinafter provided. The election or appointment of an officer or agent shall not of itself create contract rights.

SECTION 6. REMOVAL. Any officer or agent may be removed by the Board of Directors whenever, in its judgment, the best interests of the Corporation will be served thereby, but such removal shall be without prejudice to contract rights, if any, of the person so removed. Removal of any officer may be effected at an annual or special meeting of the Board of Directors, after notice has been given as provided for herein.

SECTION 7. VACANCIES. A vacancy in any office because of death, resignation, removal, disqualification, or otherwise, may be filled by the Board of Directors for the unexpired portion of the term.

ARTICLE VI
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SECTION 1. POSITION. There is hereby created the position of Executive Director, whose office shall be at the principal office of the Corporation, and shall possess all powers and responsibilities delegated to him by the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall be hired by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. DUTIES. The Executive Director shall administer the business of the Corporation in accordance with the policies of the Board of Directors; he shall have full charge of all books, papers, records, and other documents of the Corporation and shall receive and have charge of all fees and other monies and shall keep a complete and full record of all receipts and disbursements. He shall conduct all correspondence pertaining to his office and shall compile statistics and other data as may be required for the use of the Corporation and of its members. He shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may, from time to time, designate. The Executive Director shall devote his full time to the office and shall receive an annual salary, as set by the Board of Directors. In the case of a vacancy of the Executive Director, the Board of Directors shall appoint an acting Executive Director until the vacancy is filled by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. BOND. The Executive Director shall be required to furnish a bond in an amount satisfactory to the Board of Directors, but not less than $50,000.00. The premium for such bond shall be paid by the Corporation.

SECTION 4. REMOVAL. The Board of Directors, by a majority vote, shall have the authority to suspend or dismiss the Executive Director from the office for malfeasance in office or for any other good or just cause.

SECTION 5. ASSISTANTS. The Executive Director may select assistants to aid him in the carrying out of his functions; and said names of assistants shall be submitted by the Executive Director to the Board of Directors for its prior approval.

ARTICLE VII
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. CREATION. There is hereby created an Executive Committee which shall consist of the President, Vice President and Secretary-Treasurer of the Corporation. The Executive Committee shall have authority to act in such matters as are specifically delegated by the Board of Directors. The Secretary-Treasurer of the Corporation shall keep and take full and accurate minutes of all meetings of the Executive Committee and submit minutes of said meetings to the full Board of Directors. In the interval between meetings of the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee shall have authority to take such action as it deems prudent in the furtherance of the general objectives of the Corporation, reporting such actions to the Board of Directors at its next meeting.

ARTICLE VIII
COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. STANDING COMMITTEES. There shall be four (4) Standing Committees known as (1) Education and Qualification, (2) Code Administration, (3) Reciprocity, and (4) Standards and Evaluation. Each Committee membership, except the Reciprocity Committee, shall consist of thirteen (13) members who shall be as follows: Chairman, four (4) delegate or State members, four (4) associate members, and four (4) affiliate members. The Chairman of each Standing Committee shall be a delegate member and shall be appointed for one year by the President of the Corporation or until the next annual meeting, whichever is earlier. The committee Chairmen, except for the Reciprocity Committee, shall appoint, with approval of the Board of Directors, six (6) members for two (2) years. Of these six (6) members, two (2) shall be delegate or State members, two (2) shall be associate members, and two (2) shall be affiliate members.

SECTION 2. RECIPROCITY COMMITTEE. The membership of the Reciprocity Committee shall consist of a representative of each State, appointed by the State delegate member. Only State members who have the authority and responsibility to preempt local inspection on industrialized buildings, mobile homes and/or a statewide building code may be so appointed. Membership shall also include ex-officio nonvoting members consisting of the President and Vice President of the Corporation, the Chairman of the Standards and Evaluation Committee, and such others as the Committee may invite to participate.

The scope of the Committee shall be the development and operation of cooperative programs that will provide a practical basis for interstate reciprocity in the acceptance of industrialized buildings, components, or subsystems.

The Committee shall meet regularly to provide for better communication and understanding among States, so as to lead to a broader basis of agreement for interstate reciprocity.

SECTION 3. STAFF SUPPORT. The Executive Director shall provide staff support to each Committee and shall maintain a record of Committee activities and meetings.

SECTION 4. SPECIAL COMMITTEES. Special committees may be appointed by the President, with the approval of the Board of Directors. The life of a special committee shall not exceed two years but may be re-appointed.

ARTICLE IX
FINANCES

SECTION 1. MANAGEMENT. The finances of the Corporation shall be managed by the Board of Directors. These management functions may be delegated by the Board of Directors to the Executive Director of the Corporation.

SECTION 2. ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS. The Corporation, through the Board of Directors, may establish annual assessments for each class of membership, to be ratified by the delegate members at its next annual meeting.

SECTION 3. BUDGET. The Board of Directors, through the Executive Director, shall establish an annual budget. Said annual budget shall be presented at the annual meeting of the Corporation.

SECTION 4. EXPENDITURES. The Board of Directors may authorize the Executive Director to commit the expenditure of corporate funds.

SECTION 5. AUDIT. The Executive Director shall submit to the Board of Directors a quarterly statement of revenues and expenses of the Corporation, and shall have the books of the Corporation audited annually by a certified public accountant, and submit a report of said audit to the Board of Directors and to the delegate members at its next annual meeting. The expense of said audit shall be paid for by the Corporation.

SECTION 6. ACCESS TO BOOKS AND RECORDS. The members of the Corporation shall have access to the books and records of the corporation at appointed times, as arranged by said member or members seeking access to said books and records with the Executive Director of the Corporation. Said request for review of the books and records of the Corporation shall be at reasonable times and at reasonable places.

SECTION 7. FISCAL YEAR. The fiscal year of the Corporation shall be from July 1 to June 30 of each year.

SECTION 8. RESERVES. The Board of Directors may establish such reserves of funds to meet the needs of the Corporation as it deems prudent. Said reserves shall be established through the use of the corporate depository bank, through the Executive Director or the Corporation. At the discretion of the Board of Directors, funds of the Corporation that are idle may be invested for such periods as to meet the needs of the Corporation.

ARTICLE X
CONTRACTS, LOANS, CHECKS, DEPOSITS, AND ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

SECTION 1. CONTRACTS. The Board of Directors may authorize any two (2) officers to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name and on behalf of the Corporation, and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances.

SECTION 2. LOANS. No loans shall be contracted on behalf of the Corporation and no evidence of indebtedness shall be issued in its name unless authorized by a resolution of the Board of Directors. Such authority may be general or confined to specific instances.

SECTION 3. CHECKS, DRAFTS, ETC. All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of the Corporation, shall be signed by such officer or officers, agent or agents of the Corporation and in such manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 4. DEPOSITS. All funds of the Corporation not otherwise employed shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the Corporation in such banks, trust companies or other depositories as the Board of Directors may select.

SECTION 5. ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY. The Board of Directors may authorize any officer or officers, agent or agents to enter into any agreements or execute and deliver any instrument relative to the acquisition, sale, transfer, or conveyance of real property by the Corporation. Any instrument of conveyance as to real property shall be executed by the President of the Corporation, and accompanied by a resolution of authority from the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE XI
RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The Corporation may establish a working relationship with the following: National Associations of State Governments, National Building Officials Associations, and Agencies of the Federal Government.

ARTICLE XII
WAIVER OF NOTICE

Whenever any notice is required to be given to any member or director of the Corporation under the provisions of the Iowa Non-Profit Corporation Act or under the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws of the Corporation, a waiver thereof in writing, signed by the person or persons entitled to such notice, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be equivalent to the giving of such notice.

ARTICLE XIII
AMENDMENTS

These Bylaws may be amended by the delegate body at any general meeting. Proposed amendments must be submitted to the Executive Director forty-five (45) days prior to the annual meeting for transmittal to the membership no later than 30 days prior to the annual meeting.

ARTICLE XIV
ORDER OF MEETINGS

All meetings provided for herein shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order Modified, except as otherwise authorized by the Board of Directors.

NBS-114A (REV. 7-73)

U.S. DEPT. OF COMM. BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. PUBLICATION OR REPORT NO. NBSIR 77-1413	2. Gov't Accession No.	3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards

5. Publication Date January 1978

6. Performing Organization Code

7. AUTHOR(S) Sandra A. Berry (Editor)

8. Performing Organ. Report No.

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20234

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Complete Address *(Street, City, State, ZIP)*

National Bureau of Standards
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20234

13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final

14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT *(A 200-word or less factual summary of most significant information. If document includes a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here.)*

This document contains the edited proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS), held in Santa Fe, New Mexico, April 27 - May 1, 1975.

In addition, it includes listings of the State Delegates and Committee members for the 8th Annual Conference Year, and the Committee Reports, as finalized, submitted and approved by the State Delegates to NCSBCS, meeting in Annual Session.

17. KEY WORDS *(six to twelve entries; alphabetical order; capitalize only the first letter of the first key word unless a proper name; separated by semicolons)*

Key words: ASHRAE 90-P, Building codes; Mobile homes; 8th Annual Conference; NCSBCS; National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards; Proceedings.

18. AVAILABILITY

☒ Unlimited

☐ For Official Distribution. Do Not Release to NTIS

☐ Order From Sup. of Doc., U.S. Government Printing Office Washington, D.C. 20402, SD Cat. No. C13

☒ Order From National Technical Information Service (NTIS) Springfield, Virginia 22151

19. SECURITY CLASS (THIS REPORT)	21. NO. OF PAGES
UNCLASSIFIED	147
20. SECURITY CLASS (THIS PAGE)	**22. Price**
UNCLASSIFIED	$7.25

USCOMM-DC 29042-P74

64341

WERT
BOOKBINDING
MIDDLETOWN PA
JUNE '80
We're Quality Bound