S.C. Building Codes Bill Talking Points

• The intent of the bill is to promote and produce a S.C. Building Code for all construction that will be based on the geographic and weather conditions of our state. It will also promote a single code to allow for better enforcement and quality of construction for the citizens of S.C. The 2015 S.C. Building Codes Manual in use today that is published by the ICC will be the base code.

• The bill would modify the way codes are adopted. Instead of only a 17 member council with little to no experience in any construction process/standards it will instead use “Technical Review Committees” for both commercial and residential construction. These committees will be made up from experienced professionals from construction, safety and code enforcement fields who have had experience in their field for at least 10 years.

• This bill would allow S.C. to match a 6 year residential code cycle that many states have already turned to instead of the current 3 year cycle for residential, but maintain a 3 year code cycle for commercial. It will also allow for greater flexibility to update those codes within the cycle. Any modification, after promulgation, would then reflect the year it was adopted (i.e. Modifications in 2019 would then represent the 2019 S.C. Building Codes, which would keep SC ahead of every state in the adoption process).

• The S.C. Building Code will allow for greater flexibility to adopt nationally recognized codes, as well as, research concerning strength of materials, safe design and other factors that our public and private colleges/universities can and will provide (i.e. the wind and seismic maps produced by Clemson University and the Citadel).

• The S.C. Building Code would require that any modification to the building code also include a preliminary fiscal impact statement reflecting estimates of costs to be incurred by the public and state agencies in complying with the proposed modifications. This will safeguard such actions as the S.C. Building Code Council approving a modification on water supply in the last code adoption process that would have cost the citizens of the state tens if not hundreds of billions of dollars in an unfunded mandate.