



Community Planning & Permitting

Courthouse Annex • 2045 13th Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303.441.3930

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, Colorado 80306 • www.bouldercounty.org

Building Safety & Inspection Services Team

**BOULDER COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOCKET # BORC-22-0001
PUBLIC HEARING
BOULDER COUNTY BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS
WILDFIRE ZONE 2 UPDATE
May 12, 2022 at 11:30am
Boulder County Community Planning & Permitting
Virtual meeting via Zoom
Attendee Link: <https://boco.org/BOCC-BORC-22-0001>
REGISTRATION REQUIRED Call-in information:
1-833-568-8864, Webinar ID: 160 358 6830**

STAFF:

Ron Flax, Deputy Director of Community Planning and Permitting / Chief Building Official
/ Secretary to the Boulder County Board of Review Committee

Jim Webster, Wildfire Partners Program Coordinator

Abby Silver, Wildfire Mitigation Specialist

Kyle McCatty, Wildfire Mitigation Specialist

OVERVIEW:

Boulder County is currently divided into two Wildfire Zones. Wildfire Zone 1, which is the mountains / forested portion of Boulder County, and Wildfire Zone 2, which is the plains / grasslands of Boulder County (see Figure R 327.2 below). In response to the many wildfire events in the history of the mountainous/forested portion of Boulder County, the Boulder County Building Code requires comprehensive ignition resistant construction requirements in Wildfire Zone 1. Prior to December 2021, Wildfire Zone 2 historically had relatively few fire events that have resulted in widespread structure losses.

However, the Marshall Fire, which started December 30, 2021 and destroyed and damaged structures on over 200 parcels in Unincorporated Boulder County, compels us to acknowledge that the changing climate, continuing development, and fire becoming a greater risk requires us to update the code to help mitigate some of that risk. The intention of this update is to revise the Boulder County Building Code to ensure a minimum level of ignition resistance for all structures in Wildfire Zone 2.

This update is an urgent matter, which is why it is being addressed as a stand-alone update. Staff are currently engaged in a more in-depth evaluation and examination of this topic as part of the larger code update that involves moving from the 2015 Codes, to the 2021 Codes. This larger update and review will consider requirements for all wildfire zones as well as the

Matt Jones County Commissioner **Claire Levy** County Commissioner **Marta Loachamin** County Commissioner

possibility of creating a new, more nuanced framework for categorizing and regulating wildfire hazards county wide. Our intention is that after this interim update, further updates and refinements will occur on a regular schedule along with the full body of the Boulder County Building Code Amendments. It is anticipated the broader update and adoption of the 2021 codes will occur later this year.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF APRIL 6TH BOARD OF REVIEW HEARING:

On April 6, 2022, the Boulder County Board of Review met to discuss the staff recommendations regarding the increased ignition resistant construction requirements for the Unincorporated areas of Boulder County that are located in Wildfire Zone 2. The Board unanimously approved staff's recommendations with two notable variations:

- 1) Section R327.4.5 Protection of eaves for Wildfire Zone 1 currently reads as:

R327.4.5 Protection of eaves. The leading edge of the roof at the fascia must be finished with a metal drip edge so that no wood sheathing is exposed. Eaves, fascias, and soffits, covered decks or covered porch ceilings shall be protected on the enclosed underside by one of the following materials or methods:

1. *Noncombustible materials.*
2. *Ignition-resistant materials.*
3. *Materials approved for a minimum of 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction.*
4. *2-inch-thick nominal dimension lumber.*
5. *1-inch-thick nominal fire-retardant-treated wood.*
6. *¾-inch-thick nominal fire retardant-treated plywood labeled for exterior use.*
7. *Any materials permitted by this code.*

Exceptions:

1. *Vinyl or plastic soffits, fascia or trim are not permitted.*
2. *Rafter tails or roof beam ends may be exposed if they are heavy timber having minimum dimensions not less than 6 inch nominal in width and not less than 8 inches nominal in depth.*

This text was proposed by staff to be identical for Wildfire Zone 2 (but re-numbered to fit into the Wildfire Zone 2 text). The Board of Review Committee decided that the language of R327.4.5.7, which reads "Any materials permitted by this code," was insufficiently clear, and not needed. As such, they unanimously agreed to recommend the removal of this language from R327. They declined to remove this section from the identical list for Wildfire Zone 1 as the discussion was focused on Wildfire Zone 2 requirements.

It is the opinion of Staff that this recommendation creates two potential issues. First, if the Board of Review recommendations are approved by the BOCC, it would create a situation where the requirements of Wildfire Zone 2 are more restrictive

than the requirements of Wildfire Zone 1 (which is a situation that runs counter to the actual level of wildfire hazard). Second, the removal of the language in R327.3.5.7 would eliminate some common construction solutions for enclosing soffits without a comprehensive analysis of the need for such a change and an understanding of the potential cost and constraints from an architectural and construction perspective.

Therefore, Staff recommends that Section R327.4.5 Protection of eaves, be left unchanged in Wildfire Zone 1, and adopted in Wildfire Zone 2 without alteration. Staff intends to give further consideration to the concerns raised by the Board of Review of this section, and return to the Board with a comprehensive proposal to address these concerns in a subsequent update to these provisions.

- 2) During the Board of Review Hearing, the Chief Building Official pointed out that currently, in Wildfire Zone 1, per Section R327.4.12 Detached Accessory Structures have ignition resistant material requirements for exterior wall construction, but do not have any of the other ignition resistant construction requirements. Staff further pointed out that this exception is not in keeping with the intent of this code update (to reduce risks from wildfire in the Unincorporated areas of Boulder County) and represents a potential hazard with regards to ember production that could impact surrounding areas. For this reason, Staff recommended that the Board of Review eliminate this section of the code and require detached accessory structures to meet the same ignition resistant construction requirements as other structures. Because this proposal was not included in the original Staff Report, The Board of Review declined to discuss this section of the code and took no further action regarding this topic.

Staff does have some concerns about the less stringent ignition resistant construction requirements for Detached Accessory Structures in both Wildfire Zone 1 and Zone 2. Staff intends to address these concerns by bringing this topic to the Board of Review in an upcoming meeting, and then returning to the Board of County Commissioners with proposed updates.

In general, there was widespread support expressed through public comments as well as the membership of the Board of Review for improving the ignition resistant construction requirements for structures in Unincorporated Boulder County. The measures proposed were generally deemed to be cost effective and reasonable measures and were unanimously supported by the Board of Review.

COST IMPLICATIONS:

A critical aspect to increasing code requirements is understanding the cost, and the ability of the trades to meet any new requirements. After review of literature, conversations with contractors, testimony at the Board of Review Hearing, and staff research on material costs, staff finds the measure proposed can be done with current trade knowledge, materials are available but may be subject to similar supply chain issues, and the increased cost to comply

is minimal. To help understand the costs associated with using ignition-resistant materials, Staff reviewed data from existing published research. The following studies compared the cost of building homes with and without ignition-resistant materials: *Building a Wildfire-Resistance Home: Codes and Cost* (Headwaters Economics, 2018) and *Cost Impact of Building a House in Compliance with IWUIC* (Home Innovation Research Labs, 2020). The Headwaters Economics study found that a new home built to wildfire-resistant codes can be constructed for roughly the same cost as a typical home. The study compared 2,500 square-foot, single-family homes representative of building styles in southwest Montana. The Home Innovation Research Labs study provides cost information for several house components using different materials, and different reference houses in different locations (including Denver), but does not draw a final conclusion about the cost difference between a typical home and a home that complies with the IWUIC Code. In Denver, the study found an increased cost of \$4,274 for the low-cost house components, deck, and defensible space for IWUIC Code compliance.

It is important to note that the proposed changes to Wildfire Zone 2 do not include full defensible space treatments and therefore would not incur these costs.

Home Innovation Research Labs, 2020

<https://www.nahb.org/-/media/NAHB/advocacy/docs/top-priorities/codes/code-adoption/cost-impact-building-house-in-compliance-with-iwuic.pdf>

Headwaters Economics, 2018

<https://headwaterseconomics.org/wp-content/uploads/building-costs-codes-report.pdf>

Also noted in the Headwaters study was data and information regarding benefits beyond just safety.

- A 2017 report by the National Institute of Building Sciences estimated a savings of \$4 for every \$1 of additional construction cost by implementing the IWUIC at the community scale.
- An analysis of Florida's state building code—implemented after the devastation of Hurricane Andrew—not only was successful in reducing losses by up to 72% from major windstorm events, but also realized a benefit of \$6 for every \$1 of added cost. In Florida, homes built under more recent, stronger building codes saw a 10% higher price than older homes built before the code change. Anecdotal evidence from wildfire-prone areas suggests that some housing markets use wildfire-resistance as an advertising and marketing strategy

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that Section R327.5 Restrictions in Wildfire Zone 2, which currently only requires Class B roofing materials be expanded to include the ignition resistant construction requirements of Wildfire Zone 1 with exceptions for window and door requirements and defensible space requirements. A minimum three-foot non-combustible perimeter around the home will be required.


Staff recommends that Section R327.4.5 Protection of eaves be left unchanged.

Attachments:

- Redlined version of the Boulder County Building Code Amendments
- Home Innovation Research Labs, 2020 “Cost Impact of Building a House in Compliance with IWUIC”
- Headwaters Economics, 2018 “Building a Wildfire-Resistant Home: Codes and Costs”

FIGURE R327.2

WILDFIRE ZONE MAP



Created by Boulder County GIS
June 6, 2003
Copyright Boulder County, 2003



\\boulder\fire\zones\firezones2.mxd

In the currently adopted Building Code, Section R327.5 Restrictions in Wildfire Zone No. 2 contains a single item “R327.5.1 Roof covering” which requires a Class B roof covering. The text below expands and modifies the requirements of Wildfire Zone 2 to include all of the current requirements of Wildfire Zone 1 except the portions with strikeout text.

R327.5 Restrictions in Wildfire Zone No. 2. Buildings constructed in Wildfire Zone 2 shall comply with this section.

R327.5.1 Roof covering. Roof covering materials installed in Wildfire Zone 2 shall be listed Class A roof covering materials or be constructed as a Class A roof assembly. For roof coverings where the profile allows a space between the roof covering and roof decking, the space at the eave ends shall be fire stopped to preclude entry of flames or embers, or have one layer of 72-pound (32.4 kg) mineral-surfaced, non-perforated cap sheet complying with ASTM D 3909 installed over the combustible decking.

R327.5.1.1 Roof valleys. When provided, valley flashings shall be not less than 0.019 inch (No. 26 galvanized sheet gage) corrosion-resistant metal installed over a minimum 36-inch-wide underlayment consisting of one layer of 72-pound mineral-surfaced, non-perforated cap sheet complying with ASTM D 3909 running the full length of the valley.

R327.5.2 Gutters and downspouts. Gutters, downspouts, and gutter covering devices shall be constructed of noncombustible material. Gutters shall be provided with an approved means to prevent the accumulation of leaves, pine needles and debris in the gutter.

Exception: Buildings meeting one of the exceptions to Section R401.3 of this code may be constructed without gutters and downspouts.

R327.5.3 Spark arrestors. Chimneys serving fireplaces, barbecues, incinerators or decorative heating appliances in which solid or liquid fuel is used shall be protected with a spark arrester. Spark arresters shall be constructed of woven or welded wire screening of 12 USA standard gauge wire (0.1046 inch)(2.66 mm) having openings not exceeding ½ inch (12.7 mm). The net free area of the spark arrester shall not be less than four times the net free area of the outlet of the chimney.

R327.5.4 Fences, retaining walls and similar appurtenances. Fences, retaining walls or other appurtenances that connect to buildings must be constructed of *noncombustible materials* or *ignition-resistant materials* for a distance of 3 feet beyond the exterior walls.

R327.5.5 Protection of eaves. The leading edge of the roof at the fascia must be finished with a metal drip edge so that no wood sheathing is exposed.

Eaves, fascia, and soffits, covered decks or covered porch ceilings shall be protected on the enclosed underside by one of the following materials or methods:

1. *Noncombustible materials.*
2. *Ignition-resistant materials.*

3. Materials approved for a minimum of 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction.
4. 2-inch-thick nominal dimension lumber.
5. 1-inch-thick nominal *fire-retardant-treated wood*.
6. $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch-thick nominal *fire retardant-treated* plywood labeled for exterior use.
7. Any materials permitted by this code.

Exceptions:

1. Vinyl or plastic soffits, fascia or *trim* are not permitted.
2. Rafter tails or roof beam ends may be exposed if they are *heavy timber* having minimum dimensions not less than 6 inch nominal in width and not less than 8 inches nominal in depth.

R327.5.6 Exterior walls. Exterior walls of buildings or structures shall be constructed with one of the following methods:

1. *Noncombustible materials* approved for a minimum of 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction on the exterior side.
2. Approved *noncombustible materials*.
3. *Heavy timber or log wall construction*.
4. *Fire-retardant-treated wood* labeled for exterior use on the exterior side.
5. *Ignition-resistant materials* on the exterior side.

Such material shall extend from the top of the foundation to the underside of the roof sheathing.

Exception: *Trim* is not required to meet the materials requirements for exterior walls.

R327.5.7 Unenclosed under floor protection. Buildings or structures shall have all underfloor areas enclosed to the ground with exterior walls in accordance with Section R327.4.6. For decks, see Section R327.4.8.

Exception: Complete enclosure may be omitted where the underside of all exposed floors and all exposed structural columns, beams, and supporting walls are protected as required for exterior 1-

hour fire-resistance-rated construction or *heavy timber construction* or *fire-retardant-treated wood* labeled for exterior use.

R327.5.8 Decks, appendages, and projections. Decks and other unenclosed accessory structures attached to buildings shall be constructed of the following materials:

R327.5.8.1 Deck surface: *Non-combustible* material, approved wood thermoplastic composite lumber with an ASTM E84 flame- spread index no greater than 200, *ignition-resistant building materials* or any *approved* Class A roof assembly.

R327.5.8.2 Deck framing: Deck framing shall be constructed of one of the following:

1. 1-hour fire resistance-rated construction
2. *Heavy timber* construction.
3. Approved *noncombustible materials*.
4. *Fire-retardant-treated wood* labeled for exterior use.
5. *Ignition-resistant building materials*.
6. Wood with a minimum nominal thickness of at least 2 inches for joists and 4 inches for beams and columns or posts.

~~**R327.4.9 Exterior windows and glazing.** Exterior windows, window walls, glazed doors, windows within exterior doors, and skylights shall be tempered glass, multi-layered glazing, glass block, or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes. Unless they are part of a fire-rated assembly, window frames and sashes may be of any material permitted by this code.~~

~~**Exception:** Windows with unreinforced vinyl frames or sashes are not permitted.~~

~~**R327.4.10 Exterior doors.** Exterior doors and garage doors shall be approved noncombustible construction, metal clad, solid core wood not less than 1 3/4 inches in thickness, or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes. Windows within doors and glazed doors shall be in accordance with Section R327.4.9.~~

~~**Exception:** Vehicle access doors.~~

Sections R327.5.9 and R327.5.10 have been omitted.

R327.5.11 Vents. Attic ventilation openings, foundation or under-floor vents, or other ventilation openings in vertical exterior walls and vents through roofs shall not exceed 144 square inches each.

Such vents shall be covered with noncombustible corrosion-resistant mesh with openings not to exceed 1/8 inches or shall be designed and *approved* to prevent flame or ember penetration into the structure. Gable end and dormer vents shall be located at least 15 feet from property lines and shall be designed and *approved* to prevent flame or ember penetration into the structure. Underfloor ventilation openings shall be located as close to grade as practical.

R327.5.12 Detached accessory structures. Detached accessory structures shall have exterior walls constructed in accordance with Section R327.4.6.

R327.5.12.1 Underfloor areas. Where the detached structure is located and constructed so that the structure or any portion thereof projects over a descending slope surface greater than 10 percent, the area below the structure shall have all underfloor areas enclosed to within 6 inches of the ground with exterior wall construction in accordance with Section R327.4.6 or underfloor protection in accordance with Section R327.4.7.

Exception: The enclosure shall not be required where the underside of all exposed floors and all exposed structural columns, beams, and supporting walls are protected as required for exterior 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction or *heavy timber construction* or *fire-retardant-treated wood* on the exterior side. The *fire-retardant-treated wood* shall be labeled for exterior use.

~~**R327.4.13 Defensible space.** Individual buildings or structures on a property must be provided with a fuel modification zone in accordance with the *defensible space standard*. When additions requiring a permit occur, both existing and new structures must be provided with *defensible space* in accordance with this section. The fuel modification zone must be maintained at all times.~~

Exceptions:

- ~~1. The implementation and completion of an *approved wildfire mitigation plan* prior to final inspection approval for the project.~~
- ~~2. Participation in the *Wildfire Partners* program and the issuance of a *Wildfire Partners* certificate prior to final inspection approval for the project.~~

R327.5.13 Weed barrier and gravel or crushed rock. A weed barrier and gravel or crushed rock not less than 3/4-inch in diameter applied at least 2 inches thick must be installed beneath decks, unenclosed floors, and around the perimeter of the building to extend at least 3 feet beyond the exterior walls and at least 2 feet beyond the driplines of decks, bay windows and other eaves and overhangs.

Exception: Noncombustible surfaces, such as poured concrete or asphalt, or other *approved noncombustible* materials, such as a weed barrier and brick, concrete or stone pavers, may satisfy this requirement.



Community Planning & Permitting

Courthouse Annex • 2045 13th Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303-441-3930
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, Colorado 80306 • www.BoulderCounty.org

Boulder County Board of Review Public Hearing

Minutes

Wednesday, April 6, 2022

2:00 PM

Due to COVID-19 concerns, this hearing was held virtually.

On April 6, 2022, the Boulder County Board of Review met for a public hearing and to make a formal recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on **BORC-22-0001: Ignition Resistant Requirements for Construction in Wildfire Zone 2 (the Eastern Half of Boulder County)**.

The meeting convened at 2:05 P.M.

Board Members Present: Douglas Greenspan, Joseph Prinster, John Malcolm, Stephen Titus, and Michael Daley. Michael Daley was excused at 3:00pm for an appointment.

Staff Present: Ron Flax (Deputy Director of Building/Chief Building Official), Kathy Gissel (Permit Operations Manager), Erica Rogers (Senior Assistant County Attorney), Liana James (Assistant County Attorney), Rick Hackett (Communications Specialist), Michelle Huebner (Plans Examiner Supervisor), Heather Dodge (Plans Examiner), Chad Hagen (Plans Examiner), Abby Silver (Wildfire Mitigation Specialist), Kyle McCatty (Wildfire Mitigation Specialist), Jim Webster (Project Manager-Wildfire Partners), Dale Case (Director), Kim Sanchez (Deputy Director of Planning).

Interested Others Present: Multiple members of the public.

1. **Call to Order**

Ron Flax called the meeting to order and conducted roll call of board members present.

2. **Election of Chair & Vice Chair for 2022 BOR**

Chair Nomination: Motion for Joseph Prinster to serve as Board Chair.

Second: John Malcom

Approved: Motion was approved unanimously.

Vice Chair Nomination: Motion for Douglas Greenspan to serve as Board Vice-Chair.

Second: Michael Daley

Approved: Motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of Minutes**

Approval of Board of Review Minutes from Board's last meeting, which was September 1, 2016.

Motion: Douglas Greenspan moved to approve the minutes as written.

Second: John Malcolm

Abstained: Mike Daley & Joseph Prinster due to not having been at the September 1, 2016 Hearing.

Approved: Motion passed.

4. **Public Hearing**

BORC-22-0001: Ignition Resistant Requirements for Construction in Wildfire Zone 2 (the Eastern Half of Boulder County)

Presentation by Ron Flax of the proposed ignition resistant requirements for construction in Wildfire Zone 2. The proposed requirements can be found in the Staff Recommendation.

Presentation by Jim Webster about cost analysis done on ignition resistant construction materials.

5. **General discussion, input, and feedback from the public**

Alex Gore – 825 Crisman Drive

Stated that he agrees with Class A roofing materials, questioned the eaves, fascia and soffit requirement and advocated for simplifying the language in the Boulder County Building Code to make it more clear on what is allowed, i.e., item #7 from section 327.5.5 states “Any materials permitted by this code”. Alex also made a point about the expense that would be incurred by requiring a one-hour rating for exterior siding.

Jade Pender – Front Range Outdoor Living – 3034 Linden Drive

Requested adding steel or aluminum framing as an approvable type of non-combustible material and asked if there might be a requirement for full Class A standards to include other exterior materials other than just roofing materials.

Amy Aschenbrenner – 12788 N 66th Street

Stated that she is pleased to see the forward movement of building codes and is concerned about the additional cost to build in Boulder County as it increases the cost to live in Boulder County. She asked about the implications of the pause on building permits through June 6, 2022 and asked the Board to take into consideration the rural area of the County.

Julie Leonard – 1534 Marshall Road

Stated that the required 3’ barrier of gravel around buildings will increase the amount of heat inside the home, which will then create higher costs to cool the home and asked if there was a way to balance that. Julie also asked if the proposed changes apply to renovations as well as to additions.

Lance Cayko – 825 Crisman Drive

Indicated that he agrees with the Class A fire rating for roofing and requests that the County doesn’t require one- or two-hour fire rated exterior walls due to cost. He believes that the 3’ defensible space around buildings is a good idea but suggests

more xeriscape requirements to make landscape part of the defensible space. He also asked why the County isn't doing more prescribed burns and mowing more often.

6. **Board Questions and Discussion**

The Board asked about low-cost loan programs to help with the cost of materials, and Jim Webster indicated that the County does have a low-cost loan program for Wildfire Partners and that the County is working on expanding this program county-wide.

The Board talked about the complexity of requiring a one-hour rating to the exterior walls due to the cost of the extra materials. Staff indicated that it is not a requirement of the ignition resistant construction regulations.

The Board asked if there was a need for clarification on 2" thick materials for eaves and fascia. Ron Flax clarified that the exterior fascia materials are required to be non-combustible, but that the 2x sub-fascia material is not regulated by the ignition resistant construction requirements.

The Board asked about the comment made by Jade Pender during public comment regarding it being difficult to get metal framing approved and possibly adding that in to the code. Ron Flax indicated that it is a non-combustible material and works with our current code, so no change is needed for that.

The Board asked about the pause in building permits that is currently in place. Ron Flax indicated that there is pause is in place unless the property owner agrees to build to the non-combustible requirements listed in Article 19 of the Boulder County Land Use Code.

The Board addressed the question asked about whether this code applies to renovations as well as to additions, and Ron Flax confirmed that it does apply to renovations as well.

The Board asked if Xeriscaping falls under the building code, and Ron Flax indicated that the County does not have building code requirements regarding this, but that the defensible space requirements do have a landscaping impact.

The Board pointed out that it appreciates the County putting some focus on the cost of these proposed changes since it is a concern for residents.

The Board discussed Section 327.5.5(7) and felt that this provision was confusing and not needed. The Board wanted to only discuss this section as it pertains to the requirements in Wildfire Zone 2 and declined to discuss the identical section that regulates Wildfire Zone 1 (Section 327.4.5(7)) since that section of the code was not included as part of the agenda and Board Packet.

Staff brought up Sections 327.4.12 and 327.5.12 which regulate the ignition resistant construction requirements for detached accessory structures. The Board declined to engage in a discussion of this because it was not included in the Agenda and Board Packet.

7. **Board of Review Action:** With a unanimous vote, the Boulder County Board of Review approved a motion to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that they approve the staff recommendations for modifying the ignition resistant construction requirements for Wildfire Zone 2. They also recommended the deletion of item #7 from section 327.5.5.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:56 P.M.

A portion of this meeting was recorded beginning during Ron Flax's presentation under #4 above. For the portion of the meeting that was recorded, the official record is available from staff on MP4 Video and MPEG-4 Audio. For the remaining portion, these minutes constitute the official record. Detailed information regarding the docket items are available for public use online at <https://www.bouldercounty.org/property-and-land/land-use/building/building-code-amendments-borc-22-0001/>



Home Innovation
RESEARCH LABS™

COST IMPACT OF BUILDING
A HOUSE IN COMPLIANCE
WITH IWUIC

Prepared For

**National Association of
Home Builders**

DECEMBER 2020

Report No. CR1328-2 12302020

Disclaimer

Neither Home Innovation Research Labs, Inc., nor any person acting on its behalf, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this publication or that such use may not infringe privately owned rights, or assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this publication, or is responsible for statements made or opinions expressed by individual authors.

Condition/Limitation of Use

Home Innovation Research Labs is accredited by IAS in accordance with ISO 17020, ISO 17025, and ISO 17065. The evaluations within this report may or may not be included in the scopes of accreditation. Accreditation certificates are available at iasonline.org.

This report may be distributed in its entirety, but excerpted portions shall not be distributed without prior written approval of Home Innovation Research Labs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Definitions	iv
Background	6
Methodology.....	6
Reference House Characteristics	6
IWUIC Requirements.....	8
Fire Hazard Severity	8
Water Supply.....	8
Defensible Space	8
Fuel Modification for Reference House	8
Automatic Sprinkler Systems	12
Building Components.....	12
Results Summary of Cost Impact of IWUIC Code Compliance.....	13
APPENDIX A: Cost Implication of IWUIC Compliance	14
APPENDIX B: Construction Practices In Selected Locations.....	27
APPENDIX C: Location Adjustment Factors.....	28
APPENDIX D: Fire Hazard Severity	31
APPENDIX E: Reference House Characteristics	36
Reference House Characteristics – Previous Studies.....	36

TABLES

Table 1. Reference House Features	6
Table 2. Common Construction Practices in Selected Locations	7
Table 3 Fuel Modification for Defensible Space	9
Table 4 Fuel modification area.....	10
Table 5 Cost Impact Summary, Single-Story House	13
Table 6 Cost Impact Summary, Two-Story House.....	13
Table A 1 Cost Impact, protection of eaves, single story reference house	15
Table A 2 Cost Impact, protection of eaves, 2-story reference house	15
Table A 3 Cost Impact, Gutter and Downspouts, Single Story Reference House	16
Table A 4 Cost Impact, Gutter and Downspouts, 2-Story Reference House.....	16
Table A 5 Cost Impact, Siding, Single Story Reference House (Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Fiber Cement Siding for Wood Siding)	17
Table A 6 Cost Impact, Siding, Single Story Reference House (Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Brick Veneer for Vinyl Siding)	17
Table A 7 Cost Impact, Siding, 2-Story Reference House (Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Fiber Cement Siding for Wood Siding).....	18
Table A 8 Cost Impact, Siding, 2-Story Reference House (Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Brick Veneer for Vinyl Siding).....	18
Table A 9 Cost Impact, Exterior Deck, Single and 2-Story Reference House	20
Table A 10 Cost Impact, Window, Single and 2-Story Reference House (Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Vinyl with Metal Clad Wood Window).....	21
Table A 11 Cost Impact, Window, Single and 2-Story Reference House (Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Plain Glass Vinyl Window with Tempered Glass Metal Clad Wood Window)	21
Table A 12 Cost Impact, Vents, Single Story Reference House	23
Table A 13 Cost Impact, Vents, 2-Story Reference House	23
Table A 14 Cost Impact, Defensible Space, Single Story Reference House	25
Table A 15 Cost Impact, Defensible Space, 2-Story Reference House.....	25
Table A 16 Cost Impact, Automatic Sprinkler System, Single and 2-Story Reference House (Lower Cost Impact: Addition of Automatic Sprinkler System)	26
Table B 1 Common Construction Practices in Selected Locations.....	27
Table C 1 Location Factors, California Cities	28
Table C 2 Location Factors, Colorado Cities.....	29
Table C 3 Location Factors, Texas Cities.....	29
Table D 1 IWUIC Fire Hazard Severity (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC Table 502.1).....	31
Table D 2 Fuel Model Classification (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC).....	31
Table D 3 Fuel Models (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC APPENDIX D).....	32

Table E 1 New Construction Foundation Types	36
Table E 2 New Construction Number of Stories	36
Table E 3 Sites for Reference Houses.....	37

ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND DEFINITIONS

EA	Each
CY	Cubic Yard
HI	Home Innovation Research Labs
IBC	International Building Code
IR 1	Ignition Resistant Class 1
IR 2	Ignition Resistant Class 2
IR 3	Ignition Resistant Class 3
IRC	International Residential Code
IWUIC	International Wildfire Urban Interface Code
LF	Linear Feet
MSF	Thousand Square Feet
NAHB	National Association of Home Builders
O&P	Overhead and Profit
SF	Square Feet

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BACKGROUND

The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) asked Home Innovation Research Labs (HI) to study the cost impact of building a house to the 2018 ICC *International Wildland Urban Interface Code* (IWUIC 2018)¹.

METHODOLOGY

Baseline metrics were identified for two representative single-family homes, a single story and a 2-story home, built to the International Residential Code (IRC) in three different locations – Los Angeles, CA; Dallas, TX; and Denver, CO. Materials and type of construction were selected for the specific location based on market research data from HI (Appendix B).

The cost impacts in this analysis have been developed primarily with data adapted from *2020 Residential Costs with RSMMeans Data*². The costs for individual code changes are shown in Appendix A. Costs are reported at the national level and modified for selected locations by applying a location factor adjustment. Costs are reported as both total to the builder and total to consumer. The total cost to builder includes overhead and profit (designated in the tables as “w/O&P”) applied to individual component costs (i.e., materials and labor) to represent the cost charged by the sub-contractor. The total cost to consumer is based on the builder’s gross margin, reported as 18.9% of construction cost in NAHB’s *Cost of Doing Business Study, 2016 edition*³.

Reference House Characteristics

The features of the single-story and 2-story Reference Houses are summarized in Table 1. The basis for the selection of the characteristics of the Reference Houses are provided in Appendix E.

Table 1. Reference House Features

Reference House Features	1-story	2-story
Conditioned floor area, total, SF	2,600	2,600
First floor area, SF	2,600	1,080
Second floor area, SF	NA	1,520
First floor dimensions, ft.	40 x 75	40 x 38
Second floor dimensions, ft.	NA	40 x 38
Garage dimensions, ft.	20 x 20	20 x 22
Attic	Vented	Vented
Foundation: slab-on-grade (SOG)	SOG	SOG
Slab Perimeter, LF	230	156
Ceiling height, first floor, ft.	9	9
Ceiling height, second floor, ft.	NA	8

¹ <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IWUIC2018>

² <https://www.rsmeans.com/products/books/2020-cost-data-books/2020-residential-costs-book>

³ <http://eyeonhousing.org/2016/03/whats-the-average-profit-margin-of-single-family-builders/>

Walls, gross area, includes 1' rim for 2-story, SF	2070	2808
Window area, SF	360	360
Roof type (gable or hip)	Hip	Hip
Roof slope	7:12	7:12
Roof overhang at eaves/gables, ft.	1	1
Deck area, based on 20'x14' deck, SF	280	280
Roof cladding material	Asphalt shingle	Asphalt shingle
Wall cladding material	Varies	Varies
Soffit/trim cladding material	Lumber	Lumber
Window construction/material	Vinyl	Vinyl
Lot size/house setbacks, SF	11,250	11,250

Median lot size varies by region⁴ so a suitable size within the range was selected for the reference houses.

Construction practices vary depending on location and climate zone. Table 2 shows common construction practices used for given reference houses in selected location based on HI market research data.

Table 2. Common Construction Practices in Selected Locations

Construction	Colorado	East TX	Southern CA
1-story, % of all homes	50%	71%	36%
Foundation	Basement	Slab	Slab
Wall Cladding	Fiber Cement	Brick	Stucco
Roofing	Asphalt Shingle	Asphalt Shingle	Clay/Cement Tile
Exterior Trim	Wood Fiber Composite	Fiber Cement	Lumber Boards

(source: Home Innovation Research Labs)

Costs were compared for IWUIC Ignition Resistant Class 1 (IR 1) construction versus the baseline practices in Table 2.

For comparison, the baseline practice for wall cladding was assumed to be wood in this study even though the most common materials used there are fiber cement, brick, and stucco. For other components addressed in the IWUIC, such as windows, doors, exterior decks, etc., non-compliant vs. compliant materials were compared to evaluate the cost difference. The range of cost impact is

⁴ <http://eyeonhousing.org/2019/10/lot-size-remains-low-in-2018/#:~:text=The%20median%20lot%20size%20of,different%20from%20the%202017%20median.>

provided to show low and high cost impact for common practices that had more than one method of compliance.

IWUIC Requirements

IWUIC 2018 requires a house constructed, modified, or relocated into or within wildland-urban interface areas to be in compliance with one of the three classes of ignition resistant construction: Class 1 Ignition Resistant Construction (IR 1), Class 2 Ignition Resistant Construction (IR 2), or Class 3 Ignition Resistant Construction (IR 3,) depending on whether the site conforms to the water supply and defensible space requirements for the appropriate fire hazard severity.

Fire Hazard Severity

IWUIC 2018 classifies the fire hazard severity of locations as moderate hazard, high hazard, or extreme hazard based on the fuel type in the area. Vegetation of selected locations were studied to see if any location followed a particular fuel model. Appendix C shows fuel classification and fire hazard severity per the IWUIC 2018. The selected locations did not conform to a specific fuel model, so all three hazard severities were considered. To narrow down the study, only the cost impact for Class 1 Ignition Resistant Construction (IR 1) was analyzed and shown in the report.

Water Supply

The water sources, both manmade and natural, are required to be equipped with an approved hydrant in order to conform to the water supply requirements of the IWUIC, along with other provisions. IWUIC 2018 requires mandatory conformance with defensible space requirements for building in extreme hazard areas that do not conform to the water supply requirements (IWUIC Table 503.1).

Defensible Space

The IWUIC 2018 defines defensible space as “an area either natural or man-made, where material capable of allowing a fire to spread unchecked has been treated, cleared or modified to slow the rate and intensity of an advancing wildfire and to create an area for fire suppression operations to occur.”

Fuel Modification for Reference House

Depending on whether the building is located in a moderate, high, or extreme hazard area, homeowners are responsible for providing fuel modification over a distance of 30 feet, 50 feet, or 100 feet, as shown in Table 5 and illustrated in Image 1, for conformance with the defensible space requirements. For the purposes of this study, the cost of providing defensible space is limited up to the lot line, assuming that the reference house is on a developed lot and all the neighboring lots are complying with the defensible space requirements.

Table 3 Fuel Modification for Defensible Space⁵

WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE AREA	FUEL MODIFICATION DISTANCE (feet)³
Moderate hazard	30
High hazard	50
Extreme hazard	100 ⁶

For SI = 1 foot = 304.8 mm

Distances can be increased to reflect site-specific analysis based on local conditions and fire protection plans.





Image 1. Fuel Modification Requirement for Defensible Space

⁵ IWUIC 2018, Table 603.2


Assuming new construction on a developed lot as illustrated in Figure 1, the areas of fuel modification for the reference houses are shown in Table 6.

Table 4 Fuel modification area


Reference house	Lot area (SF)	Area of house and deck (SF)	Area of gravel addition (SF)	Area of sidewalk (SF)	Area of lawn modification (SF)
Single story	11250	3,275	1,395	195	6,385
2 story	11250	1,791	1,029	285	8,145




Single story house without defensible space



Single story house with defensible space



Two story house without defensible space



Two story house with defensible space

Figure 1 Fuel modification for defensible space

Automatic Sprinkler Systems

IWUIC 2018 requires an approved automatic sprinkler system be installed in all occupancies in new buildings meeting the requirements for IR 1 construction. California is not impacted by this cost because an automatic sprinkler system is mandated for residential buildings by the local code.

Building Components

Characteristics of a house that make it vulnerable to wildland-urban interface fires include exterior features like roof covering, exterior siding, door and window trim, the presence of an exterior deck, and the presence of trees, vegetation or other landscaping on the surrounding lot.

IWUIC 2018 requirements for IR 1 construction mandate specific practices for various exterior components of the building. Building components of the reference houses analyzed for this study include soffit and fascia, vents, downspouts and gutters, exterior wall cladding, exterior windows and exterior doors.

Cost of an automatic sprinkler, exterior deck and defensible space are provided as separate costs in Table 7 and 8 to differentiate the cost of the basic house components from the cost of additional features. The cost estimate does not include landscape maintenance costs.

RESULTS

Summary of Cost Impact of IWUIC Code Compliance

Tables 5 and 6 summarize the estimated cumulative impact of constructing the reference houses to the 2018 IWUIC. The cost is adjusted for selected city's location factor in each state.

Table 5 Cost Impact Summary, Single-Story House

Component*	Southern California (L.A, 0.99)		Colorado (Denver, 1.05)		Eastern Texas (Dallas, 0.98)	
	Low Cost	High Cost	Low Cost	High Cost	Low Cost	High Cost
Roof covering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soffit and Fascia	\$1,839	\$1,839	\$1,950	\$1,950	\$1,820	\$1,820
Gutters and Downspouts	\$860	\$860	\$912	\$912	\$852	\$852
Exterior wall (siding)	(\$3,839)	\$21,391	(\$4,071)	\$22,688	(\$3,800)	\$21,175
Windows	\$2,509	\$2,678	\$2,661	\$2,840	\$2,483	\$2,651
Door	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Vents	\$484	\$484	\$514	\$514	\$479	\$479
Total impact for house components	\$1853	\$27,253	\$1966	\$28,905	\$1,835	\$26,978
Exterior Deck	\$1,293	\$1,293	\$1,371	\$1,371	\$1,280	\$1,280
Defensible space	\$883	\$883	\$937	\$937	\$874	\$874
Automatic Sprinklers	NA ⁷	NA	\$4,311	\$6,743	\$4,024	\$6,294
Total	\$4,029	\$29,429	\$8,584	\$37,955	\$8,012	\$35,425

Table 6 Cost Impact Summary, Two-Story House

Component*	Southern California		Colorado		Eastern Texas	
	Low Cost	High Cost	Low Cost	High Cost	Low Cost	High Cost
Roof covering	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Soffit and Fascia	\$1,247	\$1,247	\$1,323	\$1,323	\$1,235	\$1,235
Gutters and Downspouts	\$470	\$470	\$499	\$499	\$466	\$466
Exterior wall (siding)	(\$5,628)	\$31,364	(\$5,969)	\$33,265	(\$5,571)	\$31,047
Windows	\$2,509	\$2,678	\$2,661	\$2,840	\$2,483	\$2,651
Door	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Vents	\$386	\$386	\$410	\$410	\$382	\$382
Total impact for house components	(\$1,016)	\$36,146	(\$1,077)	\$38,337	(\$1,005)	\$35,781
Exterior Deck	\$1,293	\$1,293	\$1,371	\$1,371	\$1,280	\$1,280
Defensible space	\$1,550	\$1,550	\$1,644	\$1,644	\$1,534	\$1,534
Automatic Sprinklers	NA	NA	\$4,311	\$6,743	\$4,024	\$6,294
Total	\$1,827	\$38,989	\$6,248	\$48,095	\$5,832	\$44,888

⁷ NA: Not Applicable

APPENDIX A: COST IMPLICATION OF IWUIC COMPLIANCE

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.2 Roof Covering.

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires roof assemblies that comply with a Class A rating. For roof coverings where the profile allows a space between the roof covering and roof decking, this section requires the space at the eave ends to be firestopped to preclude entry of flames or embers or have one layer of 72-pound mineral-surfaced, nonperforated cap sheet complying with ASTM D 3909 installed over the combustible decking.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section does not have any cost impact as the reference houses are assumed to have asphalt or clay/cement tiles that meet the Class A roofing requirement. These materials are the most common roofing materials for the three selected locations.

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.3 Protection of Eaves.

Summary of the Code:

IR1 construction requires soffits to be protected on the exposed underside by ignition-resistant materials or by materials approved for not less than 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, 2-inch nominal dimension lumber, or 1-inch nominal fire-retardant-treated lumber or ¾-inch nominal fire-retardant treated plywood identified for exterior use and meeting the requirements of Section 2303.2 of the IBC. It also requires fascia to be protected on the backside by ignition resistant materials of materials approved for not less than 1-hour fire-resistant construction or 2-inch nominal dimension lumber.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction for the given reference houses due to replacing 1" thick fascia board with 2" thick lumber and addition of fire retardant-treated soffit panels. The costs are applicable to all three locations.

Table A 1 Cost Impact, protection of eaves, single story reference house

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Fascia board, 1" x 6" lumber	LF	0.86	1.38	2.24	3.21	(230)	(738)
Fascia board, 2" x 6" lumber	LF	0.69	2.31	3.00	4.55	230	1,047
Soffit panels, plywood, fire-retardant treated, 3/4"	SF	2.03	1.95	3.98	5.45	230	1,254
Total to Builder							1,562
Total to Consumer							1,857

Table A 2 Cost Impact, protection of eaves, 2-story reference house

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Fascia board, 1" x 6" lumber	LF	0.86	1.38	2.24	3.21	(156)	(501)
Fascia board, 2" x 6" Lumber	LF	0.69	2.31	3.00	4.55	156	710
Soffit covering, plywood, Fire treated, 3/4"	SF	2.03	1.95	3.98	5.45	156	850
Total to Builder							1,059
Total to Consumer							1,260

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.4 Gutters and Downspouts

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires gutters and downspouts to be constructed of noncombustible material. It also requires gutters be provided with an approved means to prevent accumulation of leaves and debris in the gutter.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction for the given reference houses due to replacing vinyl gutters and downspouts with aluminum gutters and downspouts and providing gutter guards to cover the gutters. The costs are applicable to all three locations.

Table A 3 Cost Impact, Gutter and Downspouts, Single Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Gutter, Vinyl, O.G., 5" wide	LF	1.51	2.50	4.03	5.80	(150)	(870)
Downspouts, vinyl, rectangular, 2"x3"	LF	2.17	1.50	3.67	4.87	(40)	(195)
Downspouts elbow	EA	1.00	3.14	4.14	6.30	(12)	(76)
Aluminum , stock units, 5" K type, .027" thick, plain	LF	2.85	2.51	5.36	7.30	150	1,095
Downspouts, aluminum, embossed, .020" thick, 2"x3"	LF	0.95	1.65	2.60	3.79	40	152
Gutter guard, 6" wide strip, aluminum mesh	LF	2.46	0.58	3.04	3.66	150	549
Downspouts elbow	EA	1.00	3.14	4.14	6.30	12	76
Total to Builder							731
Total to Consumer							869

Table A 4 Cost Impact, Gutter and Downspouts, 2-Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Gutter, Vinyl, O.G., 5" wide	LF	1.51	2.50	4.03	5.80	(80)	(464)
Downspouts, vinyl, rectangular, 2"x3"	LF	2.17	1.50	3.67	4.87	(80)	(390)
Downspouts elbow	EA	1.00	3.14	4.14	6.30	(12)	(76)
Aluminum , stock units, 5" K type, .027" thick, plain	LF	2.85	2.51	5.36	7.30	80	584
Downspouts, aluminum, embossed, .020" thick, 2"x3"	LF	0.95	1.65	2.60	3.79	80	303
Gutter guard, 6" wide strip, aluminum mesh	LF	2.46	0.58	3.04	3.66	100	366
Downspouts elbow	EA	1.00	3.14	4.14	6.30	12	76
Total to Builder							400
Total to Consumer							475

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.5 Exterior Walls

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires the exterior walls of the buildings or structure to be constructed with materials approved for not less than 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction on the exterior side, approved noncombustible material, heavy timber or log wall construction, fire-retardant-treated wood on the exterior side or ignition-resistant materials complying with the code on exterior side.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will decrease the cost of construction for the given reference houses where a more-costly material such as wood siding is replaced with a less-costly material such as fiber cement siding, but will increase the cost of construction where a less-costly material such as vinyl siding is replaced with a more costly-material such as fiber cement siding or brick veneer. The costs are not necessarily applicable to all three locations as the most common siding materials in the selected locations are either fiber cement, stucco or brick veneer which all comply with IWUIC requirement for Class 1 ignition-resistant construction. However, to provide a range of cost implications, both low and high cost impact changes are included in the report assuming a change in siding is required.

Table A 5 Cost Impact, Siding, Single Story Reference House
(Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Fiber Cement Siding for Wood Siding)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Wood, cedar bevel, A grade, 1/2" x 6"	SF	4.46	0.98	5.44	6.50	(1,583)	(10,290)
Fiber cement siding, 6-1/4" exposure	SF	2.00	1.36	3.36	4.44	1,583	7,029
Total to Builder							(3,261)
Total to Consumer							(3,877)

Table A 6 Cost Impact, Siding, Single Story Reference House
(Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Brick Veneer for Vinyl Siding)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Vinyl siding, .048" thick, double 4	SF	1.09	1.17	2.26	3.12	(1,583)	(4,939)
Brick veneer masonry	SF	4.52	5.80	10.32	14.60	1,583	23,112
Total to Builder							18,173
Total to Consumer							21,608

Table A 7 Cost Impact, Siding, 2-Story Reference House
(Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Fiber Cement Siding for Wood Siding)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Wood, cedar bevel, A grade, 1/2" x 6"	SF	4.46	0.98	5.44	6.50	(2,321)	(15,087)
Fiber cement siding, 6-1/4" exposure	SF	2.00	1.36	3.36	4.44	2,321	10,305
Total to Builder							(4,781)
Total to Consumer							(5,685)

Table A 8 Cost Impact, Siding, 2-Story Reference House
(Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Brick Veneer for Vinyl Siding)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Vinyl siding, .048" thick, double 4	SF	1.09	1.17	2.26	3.12	(2,321)	(7,242)
Brick veneer masonry	SF	4.52	5.80	10.32	14.60	2,321	33,887
Total to Builder							26,645
Total to Consumer							31,681

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.6 Underfloor enclosure

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires underfloor areas (e.g. crawlspaces) be enclosed down to the ground with exterior walls in accordance with IWUIC Section 504.5 on exterior walls.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section has no cost impact as the reference houses have no underfloor enclosures.

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.7 Appendages and Projections

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires unenclosed accessory structures attached to buildings with habitable spaces, and projections such as decks, to have a minimum of 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction where a concrete patio is substituted for a non-fire-rated wood deck. A different cost impact is possible for replacing a non-fire-rated wood deck with a fire-rated wood deck, but due to the lack of pricing data for lumber that is both fire-retardant treated and preservative-treated for exterior use, only the costs for substituting a concrete patio for a non-fire-rated wood deck.

Table A 9 Cost Impact, Exterior Deck, Single and 2-Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Posts, 4x6, treated	LF	2.24	2.10	4.34	5.90	(12)	(71)
Girder, double 2x10	LF	2.49	1.05	3.99	4.97	(20)	(99)
Ledger, 2x10, treated, bolted 4' o.c.	LF	1.59	1.50	3.09	4.22	(20)	(84)
Joists, 2x10 treated	LF	1.47	0.64	2.11	2.68	(210)	(563)
Decking, 2x6, treated	SF	1.66	0.90	2.56	3.32	(280)	(930)
Excavation for footing, 12" x 36" deep	CY		55.50	55.50	91.50	5	458
Gravel for footing	CY	28.93	4.89	33.82	40.00	5	200
Gravel below slab, 4" deep	SF	0.52	0.14	0.66	0.80	280	224
Concrete slab on grade, 4", 3500 psi	CY	147.45	51.00	198.45	246.00	4	984
Thickened slab edge, reinforced 8" x 8"	LF	6.72	2.31	9.03	11.20	48	538
Concrete stair	LF	6.72	20.50	27.22	41.00	6	246
Concrete slab finishing	SF		0.43	0.43	0.70	280	196
Total to Builder							1,098
Total to Consumer							1,306

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.8 Exterior Glazing

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires exterior windows, window walls and glazed doors, windows within exterior doors and skylights to be tempered glass, multilayered glazed panels, glass block or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction where vinyl windows are replaced with metal-clad wood windows. There is a higher cost impact for replacing plain glass wood windows with tempered glass metal clad wood windows.

Table A 10 Cost Impact, Window, Single and 2-Story Reference House
(Lower Cost Impact: Substitute Vinyl with Metal Clad Wood Window)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Vinyl, double hung, 3040	SF	20.58	2.67	23.25	27.08	(360)	(9,749)
Metal clad wood, double hung, 3050	SF	26.33	2.40	28.73	33.00	360	11,880
Total to Builder							2,131
Total to Consumer							2,534

Table A 11 Cost Impact, Window, Single and 2-Story Reference House
(Higher Cost Impact: Substitute Plain Glass Vinyl Window with Tempered Glass Metal Clad Wood Window)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Vinyl, double hung, 3040	SF	20.58	2.67	23.25	27.08	(360)	(9,749)
Metal clad wood, double hung, 3050	SF	26.33	2.40	28.73	33.00	360	11,880
Float glass, 3/16" plain	SF	7.10				(360)	(2,556)
Float glass, 3/16" tempered, clear	SF	7.50				360	2,700
Total to Builder							2,275
Total to Consumer							2,705

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.9 Exterior Doors

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires the exterior doors to be approved noncombustible construction, solid core wood not less than 1 ¾ inches thick or have a fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section does not have any cost impact as the reference houses have solid wood core 1 ¾ inches thick exterior doors that are already compliant with the IWUIC.

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.10 Vents

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires attic ventilation openings, foundation or underfloor vents, or other ventilation openings in vertical exterior walls and vents through roofs to not exceed 144 square inches each. It also requires such vents to be covered with noncombustible corrosion-resistant mesh with openings not to exceed ¼ inch or be designed and approved to prevent flame or ember penetration into the structure. Further, vents are not permitted in the soffit areas.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction for the reference houses. The cost analysis is based on replacing soffit and ridge vents with gable wall louvers and static roof vents⁸ located close to the ridge. The total required vent area is calculated per the IRC 2018, and the quantity of gable vents and roof vents is determined based on the 144 square inch limit requirement per vent. Note that no deduction is taken for soffit vents; it is assumed that non-perforated soffit material (same cost) will still be installed.

Table A 12 Cost Impact, Vents, Single Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Gable wall louver, aluminum 12"x12"	EA	17.85	7.60	25.45	32.00	4	128
Roof vent, aluminum 12"x12"	EA	27.00	10.30	37.30	48.00	14	672
Ridge vent	LF	2.54	1.55	4.09	5.55	(70)	(389)
Total to Builder							412
Total to Consumer							489

Table A 13 Cost Impact, Vents, 2-Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Gable wall louver, aluminum 12"x12"	EA	17.85	7.60	25.45	32.00	6	192
Roof vent, aluminum 12"x12"	EA	27.00	10.30	37.30	48.00	7	336
Ridge vent	LF	2.54	1.55	4.09	5.55	(36)	(200)
Total to Builder							328
Total to Consumer							390

⁸ Example static roof vents: <https://www.tamtech.com/product/static-roof-vent-large-capacity-round-vent-vx25-series/>

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 504.8 Detached accessory structures

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires detached accessory structures located less than 50 feet from a building containing habitable space to have exterior walls constructed with materials approved for not less than 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, heavy timber, log wall construction, or constructed with approved noncombustible materials or fire-retardant-treated wood on the exterior side.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section does not have any cost impact as the lots for the reference houses do not have any detached structures within 50 feet of habitable space.

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 603.2 Fuel modification (Defensible space)

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires fuel modification up to 30', 50' or 100' around a building or structure for moderate hazard, high hazard or extreme hazard areas respectively to create a defensible space.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction where a 5-foot-wide strip of gravel is added for ground covering around the boundary of the reference house, standard shrubs are replaced with fire resistant shrubs and standard turf grass is replaced with drought tolerant grass for the lawn. The IWUIC does not specify fuel types requiring modification so external references were studied for this purpose.^{9 10}

Table A 14 Cost Impact, Defensible Space, Single Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Ground cover, pea gravel	Ton	11.80	24.50	36.30	53.00	13.95	739
Shrub, Russian olive, 3'- 4'	EA	26.00	13.40	47.95	60.50	(4.00)	(242)
Shrub, viburnum, 3' - 4'	EA	27.00	25.00	68.05	88.50	4.00	354
Sodding, bluegrass sod on level ground	MSF	335.00	82.50	430.65	520.00	(7.78)	(4,046)
Sodding, pallet of Zoysia	MSF	530.00	82.50	625.65	733.59	6.39	4,684
Total to Builder							750
Total to Consumer							892

Table A 15 Cost Impact, Defensible Space, 2-Story Reference House

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Ground cover, pea gravel	Ton	11.80	24.50	36.30	53.00	10.29	545
Shrub, Russian olive, 3'- 4'	EA	26.00	13.40	47.95	60.50	(4.00)	(242)
Shrub, viburnum, 3' - 4'	EA	27.00	25.00	68.05	88.50	4.00	354
Sodding, bluegrass sod on level ground	MSF	335.00	82.50	430.65	520.00	(9.17)	(4,770)
Sodding, pallet of Zoysia	MSF	530.00	82.50	625.65	733.59	8.15	5,975
Total to Builder							1,317
Total to Consumer							1,565

⁹ https://ibhs.org/wp-content/uploads/wpmembers/files/Near-Building_Noncombustible_Zone_Report_IBHS.pdf

¹⁰ https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_other/rmrs_2004_barkeley_y001.pdf

Reference Code Section

2018 IWUIC Section 602 Automatic sprinkler system

Summary of the Code:

IR 1 construction requires approved automatic sprinkler system to be installed in all occupancies in new buildings.

Cost Implication of the Code Compliance:

Compliance with this code section will increase the cost of construction where automatic fire sprinkler systems are not already mandated by the local code. The Home Fire Sprinkler Cost Assessment- 2013¹¹ report by The Fire Protection Research Foundation showed that the maximum cost for residential sprinkler system was \$2.47 (\$/sprinkled SF) because of the additional cost associated with different piping materials and permitting and fees for sprinkler system. This rate is used to calculate the high cost impact for the reference houses using a sprinkled area of 2600 SF. This cost is applicable to all selected location except Los Angeles, CA because California has a state-wide mandated requirement for automatic sprinkler system in residential houses.

Table A 16 Cost Impact, Automatic Sprinkler System, Single and 2-Sotry Reference House
(Lower Cost Impact: Addition of Automatic Sprinkler System)

Component	Unit	Material	Labor	Total	w/O&P	Quantity	Cost
Flow alarm	EA	112.00	12.45	124.45	144.00	1	144
Flow switch (valve supervisory switch)	EA	265.00	20.00	285.00	325.00	1	325
Sprinkler head, fast response glass bulb, 135°Fto155°F	EA	34.00	20.00	54.00	70.50	10	705
Sprinkler head escutcheons, standard, brass tone, 1"	EA	3.56	8.10	11.66	17.15	10	172
CPVC fire suppression pipe, 1"	LF	2.26	1.71	3.97	5.30	200	1,060
CPVC fire suppression tee, 1"	EA	5.10	21.50	26.20	40.50	12	486
CPVC fire suppression 90 elbow, 1"	EA	4.12	14.30	18.42	28.00	10	280
CPVC fire suppression cap, 1"	EA	1.55	7.20	8.75	13.50	4	54
CPVC fire suppression coupling, 1"	EA	2.39	14.30	16.69	26.00	2	52
CPVC fire suppression adapter, metal thread, 1"x1/2"	EA	5.25	7.20	12.45	17.55	10	176
Total to Builder							3,453
Total to Consumer							4,106

¹¹ <https://www.nfpa.org/-/media/Files/Fire-Sprinkler-Initiative/HomeFireSprinklerCostAssessment2013.pdf>

APPENDIX B: CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES IN SELECTED LOCATIONS

Table B 1 Common Construction Practices in Selected Locations

Component	Colorado	East TX	South CA
Percent 1-story	50	71	36
Foundations			
Basement	68	11	16
Crawlspace	6	3	13
Slab	23	78	71
Roofing Material (Top 4)			
Asphalt Shingles	85	92	33
Clay/Cement Tiles	9	2	38
Aluminum/Steel	3	4	2
Single ply/built-up	3	2	17
Roof Pitch			
Average Roof Pitch */12	6	7.4	4.8
Wall Cladding (Top 4)			
Fiber Cement	23	27	
Engineered Wood	17	9	10
EIFS	10		6
Stucco	12	8	37
Brick		30	7
Vinyl		11	
Stone			15
Exterior Trim Material (Top 4)			
Wood fiber composite	37	20	12
Lumber boards	12	18	49
Fiber Cement	18	40	8
Aluminum	13	9	
Stucco			19
Exterior Decking Material			
Treated lumber	9	32	14
Cedar or Redwood	7	13	26
Composite or Plastic	79	47	54
Windows			
Wood	18	17	41
Aluminum	1	5	7
Vinyl	77	66	49
Composite/Fiberglass	4	12	3

APPENDIX C: LOCATION ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

Location factors for various cities in California, Colorado and Texas from *2020 Residential Costs with RSMMeans Data* are shown in the following tables.

Table C 1 Location Factors, California Cities

SN	CALIFORNIA CITIES	LOCATION FACTORS
1	Los Angeles	0.99
2	Inglewood	0.97
3	Long Beach	0.95
4	Pasadena	0.94
5	Van Nuys	0.99
6	Alhambra	1
7	San Diego	0.98
8	Palm Springs	0.95
9	San Bernardino	0.97
10	Riverside	0.98
11	Santa Ana	0.99
12	Anaheim	0.97
13	Oxnard	0.98
14	Santa Barbara	0.97
15	Bakersfield	0.98
16	San Luis Obispo	1
17	Mojave	0.99
18	Fresno	0.99
19	Salinas	0.99
20	San Francisco	1.03
21	Sacramento	0.97
22	Palo Alto	0.98
23	San Mateo	1.03
24	Vallejo	0.96
25	Oakland	1.02
26	Berkeley	1.06
27	Richmond	1.07
28	San Rafael	1.03
29	Santa Cruz	1.05
30	San Jose	1.04
31	Stockton	1
32	Modesto	0.99
33	Santa Rosa	1

34	Eureka	1.06
35	Marysville	1.02
36	Redding	1.07
37	Susanville	1.07

Table C 2 Location Factors, Colorado Cities

SN	COLORADO CITIES	LOCATION FACTORS
1	Denver	1.05
2	Boulder	1.04
3	Golden	1.01
4	Fort Collins	1.03
5	Greeley	1.01
6	Fort Morgan	1.05
7	Colorado Springs	1
8	Pueblo	1
9	Alamosa	0.99
10	Salida	1.01
11	Durango	1.05
12	Montrose	0.97
13	Grand Junction	1.08
14	Glenwood Springs	1

Table C 3 Location Factors, Texas Cities

SN	TEXAS CITIES	LOCATION FACTORS
1	McKinney	0.94
2	Waxahachie	0.94
3	Dallas	0.98
4	Greenville	0.94
5	Texarkana	0.96
6	Longview	0.93
7	Tyler	0.95
8	Palestine	0.9
9	Lufkin	0.94
10	Fort Worth	0.98
11	Denton	1.01
12	Wichita Falls	1
13	Eastland	0.98

14	Temple	0.98
15	Waco	0.99
16	Brownwood	0.95
17	San Angelo	0.95
18	Houston	0.99
19	Huntsville	0.96
20	Wharton	0.96
21	Galveston	0.97
22	Beaumont	1.03
23	Bryan	0.91
24	Victoria	0.99
25	Laredo	0.95
26	San Antonio	0.98
27	Corpus Christi	1.02
28	McAllen	1.04
29	Austin	0.95
30	Del RIO	0.97
31	Giddings	0.96
32	Amarillo	0.99
33	Childress	0.96
34	Lubbock	0.97
35	Abilene	0.98
36	Midland	1.01
37	El Paso	0.95

APPENDIX D: FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY

Table D 1 IWUIC Fire Hazard Severity (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC Table 502.1)

FUEL MODEL	Critical Fire Weather Frequency (days)								
	≤ 1			2 - 7			≥ 8		
	Slope ≤ 40;			Slope 41-60;			Slope ≥ 61		
Light fuel	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High
Medium fuel	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	High	High	Extreme	Extreme	Extreme
Heavy fuel	High	High	High	High	Extreme	Extreme	Extreme	Extreme	Extreme

IWUIC 2018 defines light fuel as vegetation consisting of herbaceous plants and round wood less than ¼ inch (6.4 mm) in diameter. Fuel models A, C, E, L, N, P, R and S described in IWUIC Appendix D are classified as light fuel. Medium fuel comprises vegetation consisting of round wood ¼ to 3 inches (6.4 mm to 76 mm) in diameter. Fuel models B, D, F, H, O, Q and T are classified under this category. Similarly, heavy fuel comprises vegetation consisting of round wood 3 to 8 inches (76 mm to 203 mm) in diameter. Fuel models G, I, J, K and U are classified as heavy fuel. Table D2 lists the various fuel models provided in Appendix D of IWUIC 2018.

Table D 2 Fuel Model Classification (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC)

IWUIC Chapter 2 Definitions:	Fuel Models
Light Fuel: "Vegetation consisting of herbaceous plants and round wood less than 1/4 inch (6.4 mm) in dia."	A C E L N P R S
Medium Fuel: "Vegetation consisting of round wood 1/4 to 3 inches (6.4 mm to 76 mm) in diameter."	B D F H O Q T
Heavy Fuel: "Vegetation consisting of round wood 3 to 8 inches (76 to 203 mm) in diameter."	G I J K U

Table D3 provides elaborate description of various fuel models and is an excerpt from National Fire Danger Rating System, 1978, U.S. Department of Agricultural Forest Service, General Technical Report INT-39¹² that has been provided for information in Appendix D of 2018 IWUIC.

¹² https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_int/int_gtr169.pdf

Table D 3 Fuel Models (source: adapted from 2018 IWUIC APPENDIX D)

Fuel Model Type	IWUIC Description of Vegetation
Fuel Model A	<p><i>“This fuel model represents western grasslands vegetated by annual grasses and forbs. Brush or trees may be present but are very sparse, occupying less than a third of the area. Examples of types where Fuel Model A should be used are cheatgrass and medusahead. Open pinyon-juniper, sagebrush-grass, and desert shrub associations may appropriately be assigned this fuel model if the woody plants meet the density criteria. The quantity and continuity of the ground fuels vary greatly with rainfall from year to year.”</i></p>
Fuel Model B	<p><i>“Mature, dense fields of brush 6 feet (1829 mm) or more in height are represented by this fuel model. One-fourth or more of the aerial fuel in such stands is dead. Foliage burns readily. Model B fuels are potentially very dangerous, fostering intense, fast-spreading fires. This model is for California mixed chaparral generally 30 years or older. The F model is more appropriate for pure chamise stands. The B model may also be used for the New Jersey pine barrens”</i></p>
Fuel Model C	<p><i>“Open pine stands typify Model C fuels. Perennial grasses and forbs are the primary ground fuel but there is enough needle litter and branchwood present to contribute significantly to the fuel loading. Some brush and shrubs may be present but they are of little consequence. Situations covered by Fuel Model C are open, longleaf, slash, ponderosa, Jeffrey and sugar pine stands. Some pinyon-juniper stands may qualify.”</i></p>
Fuel Model D	<p><i>“This fuel model is specifically for the palmetto-gallberry understory-pine overstory association of the southeast coastal plains. It can also be used for the so called “low pocosins” where Fuel Model O might be too severe. This model should only be used in the Southeast, because of a high moisture of extinction.”</i></p>
Fuel Model E	<p><i>“Use this model after leaf fall for hardwood and mixed hardwood-conifer types where the hardwoods dominate. This fuel is primarily hardwood leaf litter. The oak-hickory types are best represented by Fuel Model E, but E is an acceptable choice for northern hardwoods and mixed forests of the Southeast. In high winds, the fire danger may be underrated because rolling and blowing leaves are not accounted for. In summer after the trees have leafed out, Fuel Model E should be replaced by Fuel Model R.”</i></p>
Fuel Model F	<p><i>“Fuel Model F is the only one of the 1972 NFDR System Fuel Models whose application has changed. Model F now represents mature closed chamise stands and oakbrush fields of Arizona, Utah and Colorado. It also applies to young, closed stands and mature, open stands of California mixed chaparral. Open stands of pinyon-juniper are represented; however, fire activity will be overrated at low wind speeds and where there is sparse ground fuels.”</i></p>

Fuel Model G	<i>“Fuel Model G is used for dense conifer where there is a heavy accumulation of litter and downed woody material. Such stands are typically overmature and may also be suffering insect, disease, wind or ice damage-natural events that create a very heavy buildup of dead material or the forest floor. The duff and litter are deep, and much of the woody material is more than 3 inches (76 mm) in diameter. The undergrowth is variable, but shrubs are usually restricted to openings. Types meant to be represented by Fuel Model G are hemlock-Stika spruce, Coast Douglas-fir, and wind thrown or bug-killed stands of lodgepole pine and spruce.”</i>
Fuel Model H	<i>“The short-needed conifers (white pines, spruces, larches and firs) are represented by Fuel Model H. In contrast to Model G fuels, Fuel Model H describes a healthy stand with sparse undergrowth and a thin layer of ground fuels. Fires in H fuels are typically slow spreading and are dangerous only in scattered areas where the downed woody material is concentrated.”</i>
Fuel Model I	<i>“Fuel Model I was designed for clearcut conifer slash where the total loading of materials less than 6 inches (152 mm) in diameter exceeds 25 tons/acre (56.1 metric tons/ha). After settling and the fines (needles and twigs) fall from the branches, Fuel Model I will overrate the fire potential. For lighter loadings of clearcut conifer slash, use Fuel Model J, and for light thinnings and partial cuts where the slash is under a residual overstory, use Fuel Model K.”</i>
Fuel Model J	<i>“This model is complementary to Fuel Model I. It is for clearcuts and heavily thinned conifer stands where the total loading of materials less than 6 inches (152 mm) in diameter is less than 25 tons/acre (56.1 metric tons/ ha). Again, as the slash ages, the fire potential will be overrated.”</i>
Fuel Model K	<i>“Slash fuels from light thinnings and partial cuts in conifer stands are represented by Fuel Model K. Typically, the slash is scattered about under an open overstory. This model applies to hardwood slash and to southern pine clearcuts where the loading of all fuels is less than 15 tons/acre. (33.7 tons/ha).”</i>
Fuel Model L	<i>“This fuel model is meant to represent western grasslands vegetated by perennial grasses. The principal species are coarser and the loadings heavier than those in Model A fuels. Otherwise, the situations are very similar; shrubs and trees occupy less than one-third of the area. The quantity of fuel in these areas is more stable from year to year. In sagebrush areas, Fuel Model T may be more appropriate.”</i>
Fuel Model N	<i>“This fuel model was constructed specifically for the saw-grass prairies of South Florida. It may be useful in other marsh situations where the fuel is coarse and reedlike. This model assumes that one-third of the aerial portion of the plants is dead. Fast-spreading, intense fires can occur even over standing water.”</i>

Fuel Model O	<i>“The O fuel model applies to dense, brushlike fuels of Southeast. O fuels, except for a deep litter layer are almost entirely living in contrast to B fuels. The foliage burns readily, except during the active growing season. The plants are typically over 6 feet (1829 mm) tall and are often found under an open stand of pine. The high pocosins of Virginia, North and South Carolina coasts are the ideal of Fuel Model O. If the plants do not meet the 6-foot (1829 mm) criterion in those areas, Fuel Model D should be used.”</i>
Fuel Model P	<i>“Closed, thrifty stands of long-needled southern pines are characteristic of P fuels. A 2- inch to 4-inch (51 to 102 mm) layer of lightly compacted needle litter is the primary fuel. Some small-diameter branchwood is present, but the density of the canopy precludes more than a scattering of shrubs and grass. Fuel Model P has the high moisture of extinction characteristic of the Southeast. The corresponding model for other long-needled pines is U.”</i>
Fuel Model Q	<i>“Upland Alaskan black spruce is represented by Fuel Model Q. The stands are dense but have frequent openings filled with usually flammable shrub species. The forest floor is a deep layer of moss and lichens, but there is some needle litter and small-diameter branchwood. The branches are persistent on the trees, and ground fires easily reach into the tree crowns. This fuel model may be useful for jack pine stands in the Lake States. Ground fires are typically slow spreading, but a dangerous crowning potential exists.”</i>
Fuel Model R	<i>“This model represents hardwood areas after the canopies leaf out in spring. It is provided as the off-season substitute for E. It should be used during summer in all hardwood and mixed conifer-hardwood stands where more than half of the overstory is deciduous.”</i>
Fuel Model S	<i>“Alaskan or alpine tundra on relatively well-drained sites. Grass and low shrubs are often present, but principal fuel is a deep layer of lichens and moss. Fires in these fuels are not fast spreading or intense, but are difficult to extinguish.”</i>
Fuel Model T	<i>“The bothersome sagebrush-grass types of the Great Basin and the Intermountain West are characteristic of T fuels. The shrubs must occupy at least one third of the site or the A or L fuel models should be used. Fuel model T might be used for immature scrub oak and desert shrub associations in the West, and the scrub oak-wire grass type in the Southeast.”</i>

Fuel Model U

“Closed stands of western long-needled pines are covered by this model. The ground fuels are primarily litter and small branchwood. Grass and shrubs are precluded by the dense canopy but occur in the occasional natural opening. Fuel Model U should be used for Ponderosa, Jeffrey, sugar pine, and red pine stands of the Lake States. Fuel model P is corresponding model for southern pine plantations.”

APPENDIX E: REFERENCE HOUSE CHARACTERISTICS

The Reference Houses for this study are based on similar reference houses that were initially defined in a report by Home Innovation titled “Estimated Costs of the 2015 Code Changes”¹³; additional details from this report are provided below.

Reference House Characteristics – Previous Studies

For earlier studies by Home Innovation, baseline metrics were defined for four representative single-family houses, built to the IRC, to determine the cost impact of any code changes. The Reference Houses and their site locations were initially defined in a report titled “Estimated Costs of the 2015 Code Changes” prepared by Home Innovation for NAHB. These single-family houses were selected for their similarity to new home offerings in the six metropolitan areas selected as site locations – Miami, Dallas, Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, and Chicago, and their size proximity to a national average of 2,607 SF. Features of the Reference Houses are summarized in the next section.

The four residential building designs are based on the data contained in the Census Bureau report, *Characteristics of New Single-Family Construction Completed*¹⁴. The report provides information about building foundation type and number of stories for new single-family detached construction over the previous nine-year period.

Table E 1 New Construction Foundation Types

Slab	54%
Crawlspace	17%
Basement	30%

Table E 2 New Construction Number of Stories

One-story	53%
Two-story	43%
Three-story	3%

The Census data supports defining the four reference houses as follows to encompass approximately 85% of the last decade’s new single-family construction:

- One-story on slab foundation
- Two-story on slab foundation
- One-story on basement foundation
- Two-story on basement foundation

¹³ Estimated Costs of the 2015 Code Changes, Home Innovation Research Labs.

https://www.homeinnovation.com/trends_and_reports/featured_reports/estimated_costs_of_the_2015_irc_code_changes

¹⁴ www.census.gov/construction/chars/completed.html

The table below covers the locations where each type of reference house foundation would be pragmatically constructed. All these selected cities, except Chicago, lie within the top ten states for construction starts in 2013.¹⁵ Chicago was selected to represent a Climate Zone 5 house.

Table E 3 Sites for Reference Houses

Reference House	Climate Zone	1	2	3	4
Foundation		Slab	Slab	Basement	Basement
Miami	1	X	X		
Los Angeles	3	X	X		X*
Dallas	3	X	X		X*
Seattle	4	X	X	X	X
New York	4	X	X	X	X
Chicago	5			X	X
Fairbanks	8			X	X

¹⁵ www.census.gov/construction/bps/pdf/2013statepiechart.pdf




Home Innovation
RESEARCH LABS™

A Research Paper by



Building a Wildfire-Resistant Home: Codes and Costs



November 2018

Building a Wildfire-Resistant Home: Codes and Costs

PUBLISHED ONLINE:

<https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes>

ABOUT HEADWATERS ECONOMICS

[Headwaters Economics](https://headwaterseconomics.org) is an independent, nonprofit research group whose mission is to improve community development and land management decisions.

ABOUT INSURANCE INSTITUTE FOR BUSINESS & HOME SAFETY

The Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety (IBHS) is an independent, nonprofit, scientific research and communications organization supported solely by property insurers and reinsurers. The mission of the IBHS is to conduct objective, scientific research to identify and promote the most effective ways to strengthen homes, businesses and communities against natural disasters and other causes of loss.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Stephen L. Quarles, Ph.D. | squarles@ibhs.org | 415-233-1141

Dr. Quarles was the Chief Scientist for Wildfire and Durability at the Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety when this document was prepared.

Kelly Pohl, M.Sc. | kelly@headwaterseconomics.org | 406-599-7841

Ms. Pohl is a Researcher and Policy Analyst with Headwaters Economics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was made possible through the generous support of the U.S. Forest Service, the LOR Foundation, and the Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety. It was completed at the request of Park County, Montana as part of the [Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire](#) program, which works with communities to reduce wildfire risks through improved land use planning. We would like to thank Ben Elias and Lee Elder with [Bechtle Architects](#) for their expertise and guidance in the creation of this report, and Mike Burnett, Daniel Gorham, Kelly Johnston, David Shew, and Paul Summerfelt for reviewing earlier drafts of this document. Any errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of Headwaters Economics.



P.O. Box 7059
Bozeman, MT 59771

<https://headwaterseconomics.org>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND	7
	Trends in the Wildland-Urban Interface	7
	How Homes Are Lost to Wildfire.....	8
	Building Wildfire-Resistant Homes & Communities	9
	The Costs to Homeowners and Builders.....	11
III.	WUI CODES AND STANDARDS	14
	Similarities Among the Codes	14
	Specifics of Each Code	15
	Building Components	16
IV.	METHODS	21
	Cost Data: <i>RSMeans</i>	21
	Model Home and Selection of Features.....	22
	New Construction Comparison.....	22
	Retrofit Analysis	22
V.	RESULTS	24
	New Construction	24
	Retrofit.....	25
VI.	ROOF VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST	27
	Vulnerabilities.....	27
	Mitigation.....	28
	Treatment in Codes.....	29
	New Construction Comparison.....	29
	Retrofit Analysis	31
	Co-Benefits and Efficiencies	31
VII.	EXTERIOR WALLS VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST	34
	Vulnerabilities.....	34
	Mitigation.....	34
	Treatment in Codes.....	35
	New Construction Comparison.....	35
	Retrofit Analysis	36
	Co-Benefits and Efficiencies	37

VIII. DECK VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST.....	40
Vulnerabilities.....	40
Mitigation.....	40
Treatment in Codes.....	41
New Construction Comparison.....	42
Co-Benefits and Efficiencies	44
IX. NEAR-HOME LANDSCAPING VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST	45
Vulnerabilities.....	45
Mitigation.....	45
Treatment in Codes.....	45
New Construction Comparison.....	45
Co-Benefits and Efficiencies	46
X. CONCLUSION.....	47
Wildfire-Resistant Building Codes and Standards Add Minimal Cost to Homeowners and Builders.....	47
Key Mitigations Can Be Implemented by Any Builder or Homeowner.....	47

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the cost differences between a typical home and a home constructed using wildfire-resistant materials and design features. Decades of research and post-fire assessments have provided clear evidence that building materials and design, coupled with landscaping on the property, are the most important factors influencing home survivability during a wildfire. With one-third of all U.S. homes in the wildland-urban interface¹ and more than 35,000 structures lost to wildfire in the last decade,² more communities are considering adopting building codes that require new home construction to meet wildfire-resistant standards.

While codes and standards have been developed for building in wildfire-prone lands, the perceived cost of implementing such regulations is a commonly cited barrier to consideration and adoption by some communities. However, little research has previously examined how much it would actually cost the homeowner or builder to comply with such regulations.

This study compares existing codes and standards for wildfire-resistant construction and estimates cost differences in constructing a wildfire-resistant home compared to a typical home. It also examines the cost of retrofitting a typical home to be more wildfire-resistant. Key findings include:

- A new home built to wildfire-resistant codes can be constructed for roughly the same cost as a typical home.
- Costs vary for retrofitting an existing home to be wildfire-resistant, with some components such as the roof and walls having significant expense. Some of these costs can be divided and prioritized into smaller projects.
- Many wildfire-resistant home features have additional benefits, such as a longer lifecycle and reduced maintenance.

This study was completed in partnership with [The Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety](#) (IBHS) and was prepared at the request of Park County, Montana, as part of the [Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire](#) (CPAW) program. CPAW is a program of Headwaters Economics and is funded by the U.S. Forest Service, the LOR Foundation, and other private foundations.

Wildfire-Resistant Codes and Standards

While certain jurisdictional codes have been established, three existing statewide or national building codes and standards guide wildfire-resistant construction. They are:

- the International Code Council's International Wildland Urban Interface Code (IWUIC),³
- the National Fire Protection Association's Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire (Standard 1144),⁴ and
- the California Building Code Chapter 7A—Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure.⁵

These three documents address construction requirements of the home by component parts (e.g., roof, walls, etc.) and often provide multiple options for complying with the provision. Many of the requirements in these documents are based on standard laboratory testing methods that evaluate the ability of a material or assembly to resist ignition or fire spread. California is one of only a few states to have adopted a wildfire-related building code at the state level for areas of high hazard, but many cities and counties have adopted portions of the IWUIC or other wildfire-related codes. In some communities, the


inaccurately assumed cost of constructing a home to comply with a wildfire-resistant building code is a barrier to implementing such codes.

Wildfire-Resistant Construction Costs

To identify whether the cost of constructing to a wildfire-resistant building code differs from typical construction, this study priced new construction and retrofitting expenses for a three-bedroom, 2,500-square-foot, single-story, single-family home representative of wildland-urban interface building styles in southwest Montana, one of the fastest-growing regions in the country. The typical home was assumed to have an asphalt shingle roof, wood siding, dual-pane windows, and a wood deck. Wildfire-resistant materials were selected for similar aesthetics but also comply with wildfire-resistant building codes. Costs were primarily derived from *RMeans*,⁶ a database that averages material and labor pricing from hundreds of U.S. cities and includes materials, labor, and contractor overhead and profit.

We examined costs in four vulnerable components of the home: the roof (including gutters, vents, and eaves), exterior walls (including windows and doors), decks, and near-home landscaping. Overall, the wildfire-resistant construction cost 2% less than the typical construction (Figure 1.1), with the greatest cost savings resulting from using wildfire-resistant fiber cement siding on exterior walls, in lieu of typical cedar plank siding. While cedar plank siding is typical in the wildland-urban interface of western Montana, fiber cement siding is already a common choice in many regions because of its relative affordability, durability and low maintenance needs. Wildfire-resistant changes to the roof resulted in the largest cost increase, with a 27% increase in gutters, vents, and soffits. The following sections describe the wildfire-resistant mitigations for each component.

Figure 1.1. New construction costs by component in typical home and wildfire-resistant home.




Roof

The roof is arguably the most vulnerable area of the home because of its large surface area. Embers can ignite vegetative debris that has accumulated on the roof surface or in gutters. Embers also can enter the attic through roof and under-eave vents. Also, unenclosed eaves and overhangs can trap embers and heat.

Wildfire-resistant modifications to roofing, vents, fascia, soffits, and gutters added \$5,860 (27%) to the cost of the typical roof (Figure 1.2), assuming both homes use Class A (fire-rated) asphalt composition shingles. Retrofitting an existing roof to be wildfire-resistant approached the cost of new construction, totaling \$22,010 for the model home. However, many of the wildfire-resistant roof materials have longer lifespan and reduced maintenance needs as compared to typical materials.

Figure 1.2. Roof subcomponents and new construction cost.




Exterior Walls

Exterior walls are especially vulnerable from exposure to flames or prolonged exposure to radiant heat, such as from burning vegetation or a neighboring home. These exposures can potentially ignite combustible siding products. Some plastic siding products (e.g., vinyl) can also melt, exposing underlying sheathing. Wind-blown embers can accumulate in gaps or pass through openings around windows and doors. Glass in a window or door can break from radiant heat or flame contact, exposing the interior of the home. Wildfire-resistant siding and installation design features, tempered glass in windows, wildfire-resistant doors, and weather-stripping can reduce home vulnerability. The relative importance of each of these items varies depending on home-to-home spacing and location of vegetation on the property. Siting on the property relative to topography and typical wind directions can also be important factors in determining necessary external wall mitigations.

Wildfire-resistant construction for exterior walls was \$12,190 (25%) less expensive than the typical home, with the cost savings resulting from the difference in using wildfire-resistant fiber-cement siding as compared to cedar plank siding (Figure 1.3). Fiber cement siding is already a common siding option in many regions and several styles mimic the look of wood siding. While the change in siding reduced the cost of the wildfire-resistant home, cost increases for other exterior wall features are \$5,370 (29%) more than typical exterior wall features. Retrofitting the exterior walls (including windows and doors) on the

model home totaled \$40,750. Depending on neighboring home spacing, not all retrofitting activities may be necessary, but several of these activities will have added benefits such as improved energy efficiency (e.g., multi-pane windows) and reduced maintenance.


Figure 1.3. Exterior walls subcomponents and new construction cost.



Deck

Embers can ignite vegetative debris or other combustible material stored or accumulated on top of the deck. If ignited, the burning deck could expose walls, windows, and doors to radiant heat. Embers can ignite decking materials directly when they accumulate on the surface of vulnerable decking, typically occurring in the gaps between deck boards. Decks can also ignite from below when vegetation or stored materials ignite beneath the deck. Mitigations to make a deck wildfire-resistant include using wildfire-resistant materials for walking surface (e.g., composite boards), using foil-faced bitumen tape on the top surface of the support joists, and creating a noncombustible zone underneath the deck. The wildfire-resistant deck added \$1,850 (19%) to the cost of the typical deck (Figure 1.4). Some wildfire-resistant decking materials can have a longer lifespan and require less maintenance than typical materials.


Figure 1.4. Deck subcomponents and new construction cost.



Near-Home Landscaping

If ignited by wind-blown embers, burning vegetation and other combustible materials near the home can allow flames to touch the home or subject it to an extended radiant heat exposure, potentially igniting siding or breaking glass in windows. Maintaining a noncombustible zone of five feet around the entire perimeter of the house and outer edges of the deck can significantly reduce the vulnerability of the home. Mitigations include using rock instead of bark mulch on top of landscape fabric. Placing landscape fabric underneath the area can reduce the growth of weeds, thereby minimizing the maintenance needed by the homeowner. These modifications increased the cost of near-home landscaping by \$2,570 (210%) (Figure 1.5). Rock has a longer lifespan than bark mulch and landscape fabric will reduce the maintenance required in the near-home landscaping area.

Figure 1.5. Near-home landscaping subcomponents and new construction cost.



Constructing a Wildfire-Resistant Home Is Similar in Cost to a Typical Home

Laboratory research and post-fire analysis have determined that local ignitability of the home itself, largely determined by the building materials and design features, is an important factor in determining survivability during a wildfire. Existing codes and standards provide ample guidance for how to construct a wildfire-resistant home and reduce vulnerability. This study demonstrates that a new home can be constructed to such standards for approximately the same cost as a typical home, and some of these materials have added benefits such as longer lifespan and reduced maintenance.

City, county, and state governments must weigh many issues when considering new regulations, but the cost of constructing a home to meet wildfire-resistant building codes need not be a barrier. If communities continue to allow growth in wildfire-prone lands, adopting wildfire-resistant building codes may be one of the most effective tools for reducing home loss. Absent such requirements, homeowners and builders can take steps to protect the home by carefully designing and constructing (or retrofitting) the most vulnerable components—the roof, walls, deck, and landscaping—to be wildfire-resistant. The long-term benefits may include longer lifecycle and reduced maintenance.

As recent wildfire disasters have demonstrated, the converging trends of rapid growth in the wildland-urban interface, fuel accumulation after a century of fire suppression, and a warming climate will make wildfires more costly and dangerous in years to come. Just as the cause of this problem is multipronged, there is no single solution to protecting lives and property, and we must employ a suite of solutions that include land use planning, vegetation management, and emergency preparedness. Constructing homes to be wildfire-resistant is a critical and cost-effective piece of the puzzle.

¹ Radeloff, V.C., D. P. Helmers, H. A. Kramer, M. H. Mockrin, P.M. Alexandre, A. Bar-Massada, V. Butsic, T.J. Hawbaker, s. Martinuzi, A. D. Syphard, and S. I. Stewart. 2018. Rapid growth of the US wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. PNAS. <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2018/03/06/1718850115.short>

² Derived from National Incident Coordination Center Annual Reports.

<https://www.predictiveservices.nifc.gov/intelligence/intelligence.htm>

³ 2018 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code. 2017. International Code Council, Inc.

⁴ National Fire Protection Association. 2018. NFPA 1144. Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire. 2018 Edition.

⁵ 2016 California State Building Code, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 7A.

<https://codes.iccsafe.org/public/chapter/content/9997/>

⁶ RSMMeans Online. 2018. Version 8.7. Gordian. <https://www.rsmeans.com/>

II. BACKGROUND

Trends in the Wildland-Urban Interface

Home development in the wildland-urban interface (WUI)—the area where housing and burnable vegetation meet or intermingle—is growing faster than in other land use types in the United States.¹ Homeowners in the WUI often are attracted to the natural scenery, access to public lands, privacy, and a rural lifestyle, but these amenities are accompanied by a rapidly growing risk.

Wildfires in the U.S. are bigger and burn longer than just a few decades ago, and danger to communities is increasing. Since the 1990s, the average acreage burned in U.S. wildfires has more than doubled.² In the western U.S., the average wildfire season is nearly three months longer than in the 1970s,³ and globally it is an average of one month longer.⁴ Since 2000, more than 3,000 U.S. communities saw 100 acre or larger wildfires within 10 miles of town.⁵

Current climate projections are likely to exacerbate the problem in the future. Fuel aridity is increasing in the western U.S. and climate trends are expected to expand the potential for wildfire activity.⁶ Earlier spring snowmelt in the West is also drying fuels in areas previously snow-covered into late spring, expanding the geographic and temporal extent of wildfires.

The spatial and seasonal expansion of wildfire is compounded by the expanding WUI and the increasing presence of people near wildland vegetation. Human-ignited wildfires account for 84% of all U.S. wildfires from 1992-2012, causing wildfires in places and during times of the year that would not typically occur.⁷

Due to these trends, the costs of wildfire in the U.S. are on the rise. In the last decade, federal fire suppression expenditures cost taxpayers an average of \$3.7 billion per year.⁸ Federal managers estimate that 50 to 95% of suppression costs are directly related to protecting homes in the WUI.⁹

While these numbers are staggering, the true costs are even higher. Wildfire suppression represents less than 10% of the full costs of wildfire to communities, and communities bear nearly half of the full costs of wildfire.¹⁰ Long-term damages can have devastating impacts, such as lost business and tax revenue, physical and mental health effects, watershed rehabilitation, and property and infrastructure repairs. Loss of human life in wildfire disasters causes immeasurable harm to families and communities.

Since 2008, wildfires have damaged or destroyed more than 35,000 structures in the U.S.,¹¹ putting insurance claims at \$5.1 billion.¹² Although firefighters successfully control most wildfires, WUI disasters generally occur when extreme weather conditions result in rapid fire spread that overwhelms firefighting resources.

Decades of research and post-fire analyses have resulted in guidance that can reduce the vulnerability of buildings located in wildfire-prone areas and improve their ability to survive when wildfire threatens. Nevertheless, few communities have adopted requirements for wildfire-resistant building materials and design in high-risk areas. Two documents establish model building codes and standards: the National Fire Protection Association's *Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire*¹³ and the International Code Council's *International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (IWUIC)*.¹⁴ Each addresses vulnerabilities of structures subjected to wildfire exposures. Most states have not adopted a building code on a state-wide level, but rather have left local jurisdictions to decide whether and how to adopt such model codes as regulations. California is a notable exception, having adopted *Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure* as Chapter 7A of the state building code in 2008.¹⁵

For some local jurisdictions, a barrier to implementing WUI building regulations is the perceived cost. Although research has shown that the benefits of wildfire-resistant construction far outweigh the costs to a community,¹⁶ little research has examined the immediate costs to homeowners and builders. Communities often assume that implementing wildfire-resistant building regulations will cost too much for homeowners and the homebuilding industry. The purpose of this study is to identify the cost differences of constructing or retrofitting a home to wildfire-resistant standards as compared to a typical home, not built to wildfire-resistant standards.

How Homes Are Lost to Wildfire

Home vulnerability is primarily driven by the home's local ignitability, based on the home materials and design features and landscaping selections and maintenance on the property.¹⁷ Modern wildland fire suppression is extremely successful, quickly controlling 97 to 99% of wildfires.¹⁸ Most WUI disasters occur during the 1 to 3% of events when severe weather conditions and terrain align to create rapid fire growth rates and widespread ember showers leading to extreme fire intensities that overwhelm firefighting capabilities.¹⁹ Post-fire studies have shown that most buildings ignited during a wildfire have been completely destroyed.

Buildings can be ignited from three types of wildfire exposure (listed in order of significance): wind-blown embers (also called firebrands), radiant heat, and direct flame contact.

Embers

Most homes lost in WUI disasters are burned not by the flame front of the wildfire, but rather by direct ember ignition, or from low-intensity fires ignited by embers near the home.²⁰ In dry and windy conditions often associated with extreme weather events, embers can be cast a mile ahead of the fire front, igniting spot fires across broad areas in advance of the wildfire front. In recent post-fire analyses, it was not uncommon to find more than two-thirds of home losses were from embers or low-intensity fires.^{21, 22, 23}

Direct ember ignition can occur when embers enter the building through openings such as vents or an open or broken window. Once inside, embers can ignite furnishings or other combustible materials stored there. Direct ember ignition can also occur when embers accumulate and ignite combustible parts of the building, such as a wood shake roof, combustible decking, or debris accumulated on a roof or in a gutter.

Embers can also result in an indirect ignition scenario if they ignite vegetation or other nearby combustible materials that cause a spot fire, subjecting a portion of a building to either a direct flame contact exposure where the flames touch the building or a radiant heat exposure.

Radiant Heat

Radiant heat can be generated by burning tree canopies or shrubs, landscape vegetation, neighboring buildings, or other nearby fuel. The vulnerability of a building to radiant heat depends on the intensity and duration of the exposure. If the radiant heat level is high enough and the duration long enough, it can result in the ignition of a combustible product (for example, wood siding), or it can break the glass in windows and doors, making ember-ignition of interior materials more likely. Exposures to lower levels of radiant heat can pre-heat materials, making them easier to ignite if exposed to flames.

Direct Flame Contact

Direct flame contact from the wildfire as it passes the property can be the trigger that leads to ignition of a building component, such as combustible siding. Once a building component ignites it is easier for the fire to enter the building through the component or through the stud cavity behind a component, such as wall siding. Fire can also spread vertically up the wall, impinging on and possibly breaking glass in windows or doors, or enter the attic through the eave or eave vent. Once glass breaks, embers can readily enter the building and ignite interior furnishings.

Building Wildfire-Resistant Homes & Communities

Although the factors affecting whether a home survives a wildfire are complex—including weather, topography, fuels, and fire suppression capabilities—empirical research and laboratory experiments have demonstrated that building construction and design play a major role in home survival.^{24, 25} Building wildfire-resistant homes and communities requires addressing all wildfire vulnerabilities, including provisions to make buildings less vulnerable to ember exposures, reducing the opportunity for the fire to reach the building, and minimizing the opportunity for radiant heat exposures from landscaping vegetation, outbuildings, or other nearby combustible materials.

Reducing home losses to wildfire requires a coupled approach, addressing two primary sources of home vulnerability:^{26, 27}

1. The selection, location, and maintenance of vegetation and other combustible materials within approximately 100 feet surrounding the home, referred to as the “home ignition zone” (HIZ).
2. The building materials and design features used in construction of the home itself.

Home Ignition Zone (HIZ)

Developing wildfire-resistant properties for HIZ (also referred to as defensible space) generally involves managing vegetation, landscaping, debris, and other combustible materials (like wood piles and outbuildings) in a 100-foot area around the home. Research has found that defensible space beyond that radius has little effect on a home’s survivability.²⁸ In general, the area is broken into three subzones:²⁹

- Zone 1: 0 to 5 feet;
- Zone 2: 5 to 30 feet; and
- Zone 3: 30 to 100+ feet.




Figure 2.1. The Home Ignition Zone (HIZ), comprising three sub-zones.

The exact recommendations for each zone will vary depending on topography, the siting of the home on the property, and the vegetation type, but the objectives are to reduce the energy of the fire and minimize the chance it will burn directly to the home, and, if present, to allow for safe fire suppression activities to protect the home.

Reducing potential fire energy and spread in Zones 2 and 3 involves carefully selecting and maintaining vegetation, creating separation between plant groupings, and eliminating vertical continuity of fuels, also known as ladder fuels. Information about creating, designing, and maintaining defensible space for different climatic regions, fuel types, and topography is readily available through state and local agencies and will not be further addressed in this report.

Zone 1, also called the near-home zone or the “noncombustible zone,” includes the 0- to 5-foot area immediately adjacent to the home where, if ignited, landscaping and other combustible materials could spread to and ignite the home. The strong likelihood of ember attack in most wildland fire events means that homes are most vulnerable to ignition in this near-home area. Although a completely noncombustible zone is desirable (e.g., use of rock mulch or other hardscape features), vegetation considered to be less combustible could also be used. This “less-combustible” vegetation would be restricted to an irrigated lawn and non-woody, low-growing, herbaceous vegetation, both of which must be well-maintained. Given the ability of wind-blown embers to pass over the defensible space created on most properties, incorporating a noncombustible zone provides additional protection by reducing the opportunity for a flame to directly contact the home as a result of ember-ignited combustibles located immediately adjacent to the home. The near-building zone is described in additional detail in Chapter VIII.

Building Materials & Design Features

The materials used to construct a home and their arrangement and design can have a major influence on survivability. Several components of single-family homes are most vulnerable to wildfire and must therefore be built and designed to specifically withstand ignition from embers, radiant heat, and direct flame contact. These components include:

- Roof, including vents, gutters, and eaves/soffits
- Exterior walls, including siding, windows, and doors
- Decks and other exterior attachments.

Definitions

Many of the terms used to describe favorable performance are used interchangeably, even though they may have different technical definitions. Different wildfire codes may have discrepancies, but are generally based on traditional laboratory tests that determine a material’s response or reaction to fire.

Wildfire-Resistant. A general term used in this report to describe a material and design feature that can reduce the vulnerability of a building to ignite, either from wind-blown embers or other wildfire exposures.

Fire-Resistant. Materials and systems that resist the *spread* of fire from the fire-exposed to a non-exposed side of an assembly (i.e., a wall or roof).

Ignition-Resistant. Material that resists *ignition* or sustained flaming combustion. Materials designated ignition-resistant have passed a standard test that evaluates flame spread on the material.

Noncombustible. Material of which *no part will ignite or burn* when subjected to fire or heat, even after exposure to moisture or the effects of age. Materials designated noncombustible have passed a standard test.

Given the relatively large surface area of the roof, this component generally is considered the most vulnerable. One recent study found that window preparation was especially important, but defensible space in the near-home area was as important as building construction.³⁰ Because of the many complex ways wildfire interacts with the landscape and fuels—including combustible materials used in construction—home vulnerability must be addressed through both property-level landscaping and the building materials and design.

Even if constructed with wildfire-resistant materials and design features, the home and its landscaping must be maintained to retain the necessary level of performance. The potential for extended radiant heat exposure and/or direct flame contact will depend on the defensible space and on the proximity of any neighboring homes or outbuildings. Therefore, overall land use planning decisions—including where homes should or should not be allowed on the landscape, proximity of neighboring homes, and siting of a home on an individual lot relative to neighboring structures, topography, and primary wind direction—are also important factors.

The Costs to Homeowners and Builders

The cost of building a single-family home using wildfire-resistant materials and design has not been previously analyzed in detail. Studies at the individual home level have mostly been tied to creation and management of defensible space. Australian studies have found the cost for retrofitting a home to be wildfire-resilient averaged \$19,000,³¹ and the cost of preparation is approximately \$8,000³² (U.S. 2018 dollars), but most of the modifications were related to management of the vegetation on the property and purchase of equipment to defend the home, not the construction of the home itself. Similarly, little research exists on the effects of WUI regulations on home or property values. A 2017 report by the National Institute of Building Sciences estimated a savings of \$4 for every \$1 of additional construction cost by implementing the IWUIC at the community scale.³³

Researchers have investigated the costs of building codes that address other natural disasters, such as hurricanes and tornadoes. A recent study in Moore, Oklahoma, found that implementation of new regulatory building codes to address severe tornado risk did not impact the quantity of homes sold, price of homes, or the number of permits for construction.³⁴ An analysis of Florida's state building code—implemented after the devastation of Hurricane Andrew—not only was successful in reducing losses by up to 72% from major windstorm events, but also realized a benefit of \$6 for every \$1 of added cost.³⁵

In addition, some research has shown that buyers were willing to pay a premium for safety. In Florida, homes built under more recent, stronger building codes saw a 10% higher price than older homes built before the code change.³⁶ Anecdotal evidence from wildfire-prone areas suggests that some housing markets use wildfire-resistance as an advertising and marketing strategy.

To address the research gap in the cost to construct a home to meet wildfire-resistant building codes, this study compares the three most well-known wildfire-resistant building codes and then examines the cost to build a home to those requirements.

-
- ¹ Radeloff, V.C., D. P. Helmers, H. A. Kramer, M. H. Mockrin, P.M. Alexandre, A. Bar-Massada, V. Butsic, T.J. Hawbaker, s. Martinuzzi, A. D. Syphard, and S. I. Stewart. 2018. Rapid growth of the US wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. *PNAS*. <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2018/03/06/1718850115.short>
- ² National Interagency Fire Center. Wildland fires and acres. https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_stats_totalFires.html
- ³ Westerling, A. 2016. Increasing western US forest wildfire activity: sensitivity to changes in the timing of spring. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1696/20150178?ijkey=fd3b263a8f7fb43890a4a6f114aba9a21dbfe721&keytype2=tf_ipsecsha#F1
- ⁴ Jolly, M., Cochrane, M., Freeborn, P., Holden, Z., Brown, T., Williamson, G., and Bowman, D. 2015. Climate-induced variations in global wildfire danger from 1979-2013. *Nature Communications*. 6. <https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms8537>
- ⁵ Headwaters Economics. 2018. Communities threatened by wildfire, 2000-2017. <https://headwaterseconomics.org/dataviz/communities-wildfire-threat/>
- ⁶ Abatzoglou, A. and Williams, A.P. 2016. Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US. *PNAS* 113(42): 11770-11775. <http://www.pnas.org/content/113/42/11770.full>
- ⁷ Balch, J. K., B. A. Bradley, J. T. Abatzoglou, R. C. Nagy, E. J. Fusco, and A. L. Mahood. 2017. Human-started wildfires expand the fire niche across the United States. *PNAS* 114 (11): 2946-2951. <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2017/02/21/1617394114>
- ⁸ Hoover, K. 2017. Congressional Research Service. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R45005.pdf>
- ⁹ U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2006. Office of Inspector General audit report: Forest Service large fire suppression costs. Report no. 08601-44-SF.
- ¹⁰ Headwaters Economics. 2018. Full community costs of wildfire. <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/full-community-costs-of-wildfire/>
- ¹¹ Derived from National Incident Coordination Center Annual Reports. <https://www.predictiveservices.nifc.gov/intelligence/intelligence.htm>
- ¹² Verisk. 2017. FireLine Risk Report. www.verisk.com/riskreport.
- ¹³ National Fire Protection Association. 2018. NFPA 1144. Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire. 2018 Edition.
- ¹⁴ 2018 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code. 2017. International Code Council, Inc.
- ¹⁵ 2016 California State Building Code, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 7A. <https://codes.iccsafe.org/public/chapter/content/9997/>
- ¹⁶ Multihazard Mitigation Council. 2017. Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves 2017 Interim Report: An Independent Study. Principal Investigator Porter, K.; co-Principal Investigators Scawthorn, C.; Dash, N.; Santos, J.; Investigators: Eguchi, M., Ghosh, S., Huyck, C., Isteita, M., Mickey, K., Rashed, T.; P. Schneider, Director, MMC. National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington.
- ¹⁷ Calkin, D. E., J. D. Cohen, M. A. Finney, and M. P. Thompson. 2014. How risk management can prevent future wildfire disasters in the wildland-urban interface. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 111(2): 746-751.
- ¹⁸ Stephens, S.L., and L. W. Ruth. 2005. Federal forest fire policy in the United States. *Ecological Applications* 15(2): 532-542.
- ¹⁹ Cohen, J. D. 2010. The wildland-urban interface problem. *Fremontia* 38(2-3): 16-22.
- ²⁰ Quarles, S. L., Y. Valachovic, G. M. Nakamura, G. A. Nader, M. J. DeLasaux. 2010. Home survival in wildfire-prone areas: Building materials and design considerations. University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources Publication 8393. 22 pages. <https://anrcatalog.ucanr.edu/pdf/8393.pdf>
- ²¹ Cohen, J. D. 2016. An Examination of Home Destruction: Roaring Lion Fire. Bitterroot Mountains, Montana. Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. <http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/forestry/docs/fire-and-aviation/prevention/roaring-lion-fire-document-for-web.pdf>
- ²² Graham, R., M. Finney, Ch. McHugh, J. Cohen, D. Calkin, R. Stratton, L. Bradshaw, N. Nikolov. 2012. Fourmile Canyon Fire Findings. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-289. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 110 p.
- ²³ Maranghides, A., and W. Mell. 2009. A case study of a community affected by the Witch and Guejito Fires. NIST Technical Note 1635. Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology. <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/Legacy/TN/nbstechnicalnote1635.pdf>

-
- ²⁴ Syphard, A. D., T. J. Brennan, J. E. Keeley. 2017. The importance of building construction materials relative to other factors affecting structure survival during wildfire. *International Journal of Risk Reduction*. 21: 140-147.
- ²⁵ Calkin, D. E., J. D. Cohen, M. A. Finney, and M. P. Thompson. 2014. How risk management can prevent future wildfire disasters in the wildland-urban interface. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 111(2): 746-751.
- ²⁶ Cohen, J.D. 2000. Preventing disaster: home ignitability in the wildland-urban interface. *Journal of Forestry*. 98(3) 15-21.
- ²⁷ Cohen, J. 2008. The Wildland-Urban Interface fire problem: A consequence of the fire exclusion paradigm. *Forest History Today*. Fall 2008. <https://foresthstory.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Cohen.pdf>
- ²⁸ Syphard, A. D., T. J. Brennan., and J. E. Keeley. 2014. The role of defensible space for residential structure protection during wildfires. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 23: 1165-1175.
- ²⁹ Names of the Home Ignition Zone subzones differ across North America. For simplicity, we refer to them in this paper simply as zones 1, 2, and 3.
- ³⁰ Syphard, A. D., T. J. Brennan, J. E. Keeley. 2017. The importance of building construction materials relative to other factors affecting structure survival during wildfire. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 21: 140-147.
- ³¹ Penman, T.D., C.E. Eriksen, B. Horsey, A. Green, D. Lemcke, P. Cooper, and R. A. Bradstock. 2017. Retrofitting for wildfire resilience: What is the cost? *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 21: 1-10.
- ³² Penman, T.D., C.E. Eriksen, B. Horsey, and R. A. Bradstock. 2016. How much does it cost residents to prepare their property for wildfire? *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 16: 88-98.
- ³³ Multihazard Mitigation Council. 2017. Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves 2017 Interim Report: An Independent Study. Principal Investigator Porter, K.; co-Principal Investigators Scawthorn, C.; Dash, N.; Santos, J.; Investigators: Eguchi, M., Ghosh., S., Huyck, C., Isteita, M., Mickey, K., Rashed, T.;P. Schneider, Director, MMC. National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington.
- ³⁴ Simmons, K. M., and P. Kovacs. 2018. Real estate market response to enhanced building codes in Moore, OK. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 27: 85-93.
- ³⁵ Simmons, K. M., J. Czajkowski, J. M. Done. 2018. Economic effectiveness of a statewide building code: the case of Florida. *Land Economics* 94(2): 155-174.
- ³⁶ Dumm, R. E., G. S. Sirmans, G. Smersh. 2011. The capitalization of building codes in house prices. *Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics* 42: 30-50.

III. WUI CODES AND STANDARDS

Before examining the cost of constructing a home built to wildfire-resistant standards, it is helpful to understand the primary guiding documents for wildfire-resistant construction in the U.S. This chapter compares the three most well-known building code options for construction in wildfire prone areas: the International Code Council’s Wildland-Urban Interface Code (IWUIC),¹ the National Fire Protection Association Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire (NFPA 1144),² and Chapter 7A in the California Building Code (Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure).³ Even though building codes are generally reserved for new construction or significant remodels that meet certain thresholds, they can be useful for improving resistance to wildfire risks when retrofitting.

This report focuses on the portion of the documents related to building design and construction, although the three codes incorporate additional information related to home survival during wildfire such as infrastructure (like water supply and roads), landscaping and site requirements, and fire protection systems. Some communities may adopt a stand-alone code specifically designed to address wildfire in at-risk portions of the community (generally called a “WUI Code”), but wildfire-related issues may also be incorporated into a variety of other existing regulations (e.g., building codes, zoning regulations, landscaping ordinances).

Few states have adopted wildfire-related codes at the state level, with some notable exceptions. California adopted Chapter 7A as part of the California Building Code in 2008. NFPA 1144 has not been adopted in its entirety by any state. In 2018, the State of Washington adopted portions of the 2018 IWUIC into its building code, specifically those sections related to ignition-resistant construction (IWUIC Section 504).⁴

Similarities Among the Codes

Each of the three wildfire-related documents (IWUIC, NFPA 1144, and California Chapter 7A) is similar in some respects. All acknowledge the importance of vegetation and vegetation management. In the IWUIC, construction requirements are tiered depending on the wildfire hazard zone. These zones typically are referred to as “fire hazard severity zones” – the levels escalate from “moderate” to “very high” or “extreme.”

Construction requirements divide the home or building into component parts (such as roof, exterior wall, vents, and decking) and provide material or assembly (i.e., “system”) options for the component (or assembly). An example of an assembly would be an exterior wall that includes the siding material, sheathing, framing, and other components used in the wall construction. In many cases, multiple options for complying with the provisions for a given component are provided. These options are separated by “or” statements in the code or standard. While these options are compliant, they do not necessarily provide equivalent protection. Table 3.1 summarizes the building requirements for the principal components specified in the IWUIC, NFPA 1144, and Chapter 7A.

Many of the material and assembly requirements in these codes and standards are based on “reaction to fire” and “resistance to fire” standard test methods. “Reaction to fire” standards provide procedures to evaluate whether a material can be considered noncombustible or ignition-resistant. “Resistance to fire”

Codes vs. Standards

Codes are model sets of rules recommended by experts and informed by research. Codes can be adopted by state or local jurisdictions as-is, or customized for local conditions to become law. Codes explain *what* needs to be done.

Standards include definitions, procedures for testing materials, and technical guidelines. They are intended to provide standardization and a common reference, explaining *how* to meet minimum requirements referenced in a building code.

standards provide procedures to evaluate the ability of an assembly to resist fire spread from the fire-exposed side to the non-fire-exposed side.

The response of the building and construction materials to a direct ember exposure is largely either assumed or inferred from flame or radiant heat exposures. Until recently the ability to generate a realistic ember exposure in a laboratory environment has been lacking. Based on efforts by researchers at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), an apparatus that can generate an ember exposure was developed. This design has now been modified and adopted by others, including the Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety.⁵ Standard test methods may be developed in the future.

Specifics of Each Code

Each of the three wildfire-related documents (IWUIC, NFPA 1144, and California Chapter 7A) is described and compared below and in Table 3.1

International Code Council: International WUI Code (IWUIC)

Chapter 5 in the IWUIC provides specifications for three ignition-resistant (IR) construction classes, designated IR 1, IR 2, and IR 3. The ignition-resistant class level depends on the fire hazard severity zone, and whether the water supply and defensible space requirements are in compliance. IR 1 has the most restrictive requirements and IR 3 the least restrictive. The three-tier set of requirements is unique to the IWUIC. By comparison, NFPA 1144 and Chapter 7A in the California Building Code have only one level of building construction requirements, which are applicable regardless of the fire hazard severity zone ranking.

The IWUIC provides explicit language about the need to maintain buildings, vegetation, and defensible space. Maintenance is a critical component for homes and landscapes.

NFPA 1144: Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire

NFPA 1144 is designated as a standard, but if adopted by a jurisdiction, it can serve as a building code. This standard provides a methodology for assessing the potential for wildland fire ignition around existing buildings and provides minimum requirements for reducing the potential for ignition. A feature of this standard, as well as other wildfire-related building codes used in the United States, is linking building survival with vegetation selection and placement on the property, and construction materials and design.

This standard provides the user with information to do an assessment of the building components and vegetation on the property (Chapter 4). The assessment results in a list documenting materials and components used on or attached to the building, location on the property relative to topographical features and location on slope, and location of vegetation. The standard also provides specific minimum requirements for new construction (Chapter 5) and information for modifying vegetative fuels in the structure ignition zone.

California Building Code: Chapter 7A

Chapter 7A of the California Building Code was implemented in two phases. It is applicable in all fire hazard severity zones in State Responsibility Areas (SRA) and only in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) in Local Responsibility Areas (LRA), as defined by CAL FIRE. In the SRA, fire protection is provided by the state. In LRA, fire protection is not provided by the state, but rather by the local jurisdiction.

Like the other codes and standards, Chapter 7A acknowledges the importance of well-maintained near-home (landscaping) vegetation to a fire-safe building by requiring compliance with Public Resource Code (PRC) 4291 and Government Code (GC) 51182. PRC 4291 applies to SRA land and GC 51182 applies to LRA land.

Building Components

The IWUIC, NFPA 1144, and Chapter 7A typically discriminate between the performance of materials and designs based on the response to direct flame contact or radiant heat exposure. However, as research results provide options, some sections are being added to address ember exposures. Since an ember exposure that results in damage or loss of a building is ultimately caused by a flaming and/or radiant exposure, selecting materials based on these exposures can be useful.

Roofs

Building codes rely on a standard test method to provide a fire rating for roof coverings. This standard test incorporates three separate components to evaluate the fire rating of the covering: (1) fire-resistance (fire-penetration), (2) flame spread, and (3) the ember generation potential of the roof covering and assembly (Figure 3.1). The “Class A” fire rating is the highest level of protection.

This test method does not address vulnerabilities that can occur at the edge of the roof, particularly where a gap occurs between the roof covering and the roof deck. Codes acknowledge this vulnerability and require that any gaps between the roof covering and the roof deck at the edge be plugged with a fire-stop or “bird-stop” material.

Roof vulnerabilities and mitigations are discussed in more detail in Chapter VI.



Figure 3.1. During a standard test to determine the fire rating of a roof covering. For this test, a Class A burning brand (wooden crib) was placed on top of the roof covering. Flames on the underside of the roof indicate that, as constructed, this roof covering is not Class A. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles

Wall and Eave Assemblies

For wall and eave assemblies, building codes provide the option of using noncombustible materials or combustible materials that meet fire-resistance and/or flame spread test procedures. These tests address only one of the vulnerabilities of a wall—the ability of fire to penetrate from the outside to the inside of the building. They do not directly address flame spreading up or laterally over the siding. Depending on the flame spread characteristics of the material, use of the fire-resistance rating to the exclusion of other requirements may just transfer the vulnerability of an exterior wall to another component (e.g., to a window, eave, vent) (Figure 3.2). Therefore, conservative use of combustible materials that meet fire-resistance test procedures is recommended.

Exterior wall vulnerabilities and mitigations are discussed in more detail in Chapter VII.

Decks and Attachments

Treatment of decks and other attachments in the building codes is challenging and complex. Like walls and eave assemblies, building codes provide the option of using noncombustible materials or combustible materials that meet fire-resistance test procedures. There are few noncombustible decking products available. The three wildfire-related documents reviewed in this report treat combustible materials differently.

IWUIC and NFPA 1144 limit combustible decking materials to only those that are ignition-resistant, which excludes the use of the most commonly used decking products (such as solid wood without fire-retardant treatment and plastic composite decking). However, Chapter 7A restricts the use of combustible decking products based on the heat release rate, which is the amount of energy released after the deck is ignited by a specified gas burner. Solid wood and plastic composite decking products comply with Chapter 7A, but not with IWUIC and NFPA 1144.

Chapter 7A explicitly states that only the walking surfaces of the deck are considered in the standard—the structural support members are not. IWUIC and NFPA 1144 both allow the use of a one-hour fire-resistance-rated assembly as one option for complying with the deck requirements. The one-hour-rated assembly implies the use of either a horizontal or vertical deck enclosure, thereby implicitly addressing the support members. Although not explicitly stated, this effectively excludes the use of deck boards unless, for example, a deck platform is placed on top of a lightweight concrete surface. If traditional deck boards were allowed without other ventilation or moisture removal requirements, moisture-related degradation (decay in wood timbers and joists, corrosion of metal fasteners and connectors) would eventually develop in the under-deck area.



Figure 3.2. Vertical flame spread after exterior siding ignites can threaten other components on the wall, such as windows and the under-eave area. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles

Deck vulnerabilities and mitigations are discussed in more detail in Chapter VIII.

Fencing is not addressed in any of the reference codes or standards. Guidance provided by education and outreach organizations state that a noncombustible section of fencing, typically 5 to 8 feet in length, should attach to an exterior wall to stop the spread of fire from the fence to the home.

Vents

Except for Chapter 7A, reducing ember intrusion through vents is accomplished exclusively by specifying maximum mesh size for the screen material and by restricting where vents can be located. The allowable screen mesh size in these documents ranges from about 1/16-inch to 1/4-inch. Chapter 7A specifies screen mesh information, but also allows vents with design features that resist entry of embers and flames. A standard test method to evaluate resistance to embers and flame intrusion has been developed and published by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and accepted for use by the California Office of the State Fire Marshal.⁶

NFPA 1144 and IWUIC restrict the use of vents in the under-eave area. Chapter 7A allows the use of vents in under-eave areas if the specified provisions have been met. The restriction of vents in an under-eave area comes largely from anecdotal evidence that these areas would be vulnerable to ember entry. Recent testing at the IBHS Research Center and at NIST has demonstrated that ember entry was more dependent on the eave construction than on the general eave area. Vents in open-eave construction (i.e., vents in the between-joint blocking) were more vulnerable to ember entry than vents located in a soffit eave. Gable end vents were particularly vulnerable to ember entry. This suggests that a design approach to vent location and type in high-hazard areas would also be valuable in minimizing the vulnerability of buildings to wildfire.

Vents are addressed in more detail in Chapter VI in conjunction with roof vulnerabilities and mitigations.

Near-Home Zone

Although the near-home noncombustible zone (the area within a 5-foot perimeter around a house) has been incorporated into educational materials developed and distributed by education and outreach organizations, including IBHS, NFPA-Firewise, and Nevada's Living with Fire, this guidance is not explicitly specified in any of the codes or standards. The vulnerability of the near-home zone is important when considering ember accumulation exposures either on or adjacent to exterior-use materials and assemblies.

Near-home vulnerabilities and mitigations are discussed in more detail in Chapter IX.

¹ 2018 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code. 2017. International Code Council, Inc.

² National Fire Protection Association. 2018. NFPA 1144. Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire. 2018 Edition.

³ 2016 California State Building Code, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 7A.

<https://codes.iccsafe.org/public/chapter/content/9997/>

⁴ 2018 Washington State Building Code. Revised Code of Washington, 2018, §19.27.560.

<http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=19.27.560>

⁵ Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety. 2011. Wildfire Demonstration.

<https://disastersafety.org/ibhs/research-center-demo-wildfire-2011/>. Also see video highlights at:

<https://vimeo.com/79340385>

⁶ ASTM E2886. 2014. Standard Test Method for Evaluating the Ability of Exterior Vents to Resist the Entry of Embers and Direct Flame Impingement. West Conshohocken, PA.

Table 3.1: Comparison of WUI Codes and Standards

Component	IWUIC (2018) (Ignition-Resistant Class 1)	NFPA 1144 (2018)	California Building Code Chapter 7A (2013)
Roof			
Roof	Class A fire-rated covering required. Plug gaps at the end (i.e., bird-stop) and underlayment full length of any valleys.	Class A fire-rated covering required. Roof covering must be tested using all components in the as-built assembly. Where gaps exist between covering and roof deck, a roll-roofing product shall be laid over the entire deck surface and gaps at end and ridge plugged with a noncombustible material.	Requires a fire-rated covering, actual rating (Class A, B or C) dependent on fire hazard severity zone. Plug gaps at ends (i.e., bird-stopped, fire-stopped). A minimum 36-inch-wide cap sheet must be installed under metal valley flashing.
Eaves & Fascia	Eaves and soffits protected by ignition-resistant material or one-hour fire-resistant-rated construction, or 1-inch fire-resistant treated lumber, or 3/4-inch plywood. Fascias required, protected by ignition-resistant material or 1-hour fire-resistant-rated construction, or 2-inch dimensional lumber.	Eaves must be enclosed with fire retardant-treated wood, ignition-resistant materials, noncombustible materials, or materials exhibiting resistance to wildfire penetration. Metal drip-edge required on eave edges.	Soffited or open-eave allowed. If open-eave, nominal 2x material required as blocking.
Gutters	Noncombustible gutter (vinyl gutters not allowed). Use of gutter cover is required.	Use of noncombustible gutter and gutter cover device required.	Metal and vinyl gutters allowed. Installation of a gutter cover is required.
Vents	Vents covered by 1/4-inch mesh screen. Vents in exterior walls shall not exceed 144 square inches or shall be designated/approved to prevent flame or ember penetration into the structure. Vents not allowed in under-eave areas. Gable end and dormer vents shall be >10 feet from lot line. Underfloor vent openings located as close to grade as practical.	Vents covered by 1/8-inch mesh screen or use of vents designed to resist flame intrusion and embers. Vents not allowed in under-eave area.	General requirement for vents to resist intrusion of embers and flame through ventilation openings. 1/16- to 1/8-inch mesh screening is specified. Vents not allowed in under-eave area unless vent has been accepted as ember- and flame-resistant.

Component	IWUIC (2018) (Ignition-Resistant Class 1)	NFPA 1144 (2018)	California Building Code Chapter 7A (2013)
Exterior Walls			
Siding	Specifies compliance with one of five methods: 1) one-hour fire-resistant-rated construction, 2) approved noncombustible materials, 3) heavy timber or log wall construction, 4) fire-retardant-treated wood on exterior side (rated for exterior use), or 5) ignition-resistant materials on exterior side.	Specifies ignition-resistant material (including exterior fire-retardant-treated wood) or an assembly with at minimum a one-hour fire rating. Six-inch noncombustible vertical separation required between a horizontal surface and siding.	Four options for compliance: 1) noncombustible material, 2) ignition-resistant material, 3) heavy timber construction, 4) log wall assembly, or 5) assembly complying with State Fire Marshal 12-7A-1 (10-minute direct flame exposure test).
Windows	At a minimum, all windows (including doors and skylights) shall be dual pane (multilayered) with tempered glass, or glass blocks or fire-resistant rated of not less than 20 minutes.	Requires all windows (including in doors and skylights) to be tempered glass, multilayered glazed panels, glass block, or fire-resistance rating of not less than 20 minutes.	Four options for compliance: 1) multi-pane glazing with a minimum of one tempered pane, 2) glass block units, 3) fire-resistance rating of not less than 20 minutes, or 4) meeting performance requirements of SFM 12-7A-2.
Doors	Approved noncombustible construction, solid-core wood not less than 1¾-inches thick, or fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes.	Solid-core wood not less than 1¾-inches thick, constructed of noncombustible material, or fire protection rating of not less than 20 minutes.	Four options for compliance: 1) Noncombustible exterior surface or cladding, 2) solid core wood meeting thickness specifications, 3) fire resistance rating of not less than 20 minutes, or 4) meeting the performance requirements of SFM Standard 12-7A-1.
Decks			
Decks	One-hour fire-resistant-rated construction, heavy timber construction, or constructed with noncombustible materials, or fire-retardant-treated wood or other ignition-resistant materials. A deck extending over a slope greater than 10% must be enclosed to within 6 inches of the ground using same exterior wall construction standards.	Requires heavy timber, noncombustible materials, fire-retardant-treated wood, or other ignition-resistant material, or be a one-hour fire-resistance-rated assembly.	Only applies to the walking surfaces of the deck. Four options for compliance: 1) ignition-resistant material that complies with SFM Standard 12-7A-4, 2) exterior fire-retardant wood, 3) noncombustible material, or 4) comply with SFM Standard 12-7A-4.
Near-Home Landscaping			
Near-Home Landscaping	Does not explicitly address near-home landscaping but addresses fuel modifications in 30+-foot defensible space area.	Does not explicitly address near-home landscaping but addresses location and maintenance of vegetation in two zones, including from the home to 30-feet, and from 30-feet to 100-feet, or to the property line.	Hazardous vegetation and fuel management required based on different fire hazard severity zones. Does not explicitly address near-home landscaping.

IV. METHODS

This study involves two cost analyses: (1) the cost of constructing a wildfire-resistant home compared to a typical home; and (2) the cost of retrofitting an existing home to be more wildfire-resistant. Similar methods were employed for both analyses. For the wildfire-resistant home, we selected materials that would comply with one or more of the codes or standards described in Chapter III.

Cost Data: *RMeans*

For both analyses, we used *RMeans*,¹ a national database of construction materials, labor, and contractor overhead and profit costs. *RMeans* is updated quarterly, includes average construction cost indices from more than 700 cities, and uses the latest negotiated wages across 21 building trades. It includes national averages as well as cost indices to compare regional variability across the country.

While using a national database like *RMeans* provided consistency for this study, it also has limitations. The values included in the database are averages and do not reflect local conditions such as product and contractor availability, managerial efficiency, competitive conditions, or local building or union requirements. In reality, many wildland-urban interface communities are growing rapidly and face highly competitive conditions and a short supply of contractors, which may raise overall prices for any style of home—wildfire-resistant or otherwise. Demand for contractors can also be especially high during reconstruction periods following wildfire disasters.

When *RMeans* provided multiple options for building materials, we used mid-range products typical of construction in southwest Montana. Expert judgment and guidance was provided by Bechtle Architects² in Bozeman, Montana, who queried the *RMeans* database for this study. In some instances, wildfire-resistant materials were not available in *RMeans*. For these cases, we acquired pricing directly from the manufacturer or received bids from retailers or local distributors and added labor, overhead, and profit rates at national averages using the appropriate cost indices from *RMeans*.

The monetized values include only the immediate costs of construction and do not account for long-term maintenance and replacement costs of the features. In many cases, wildfire-resistant materials have added benefits such as reduced maintenance, longer lifespan, and energy efficiency. We have noted where such co-benefits exist, even when they are not fully quantifiable.




Figure 4.1. Architectural rendering of the home used in this study. The home is representative of typical construction in Park County, Montana and is approximately 2,500 square feet.

Model Home and Selection of Features

To compare costs, we required a baseline home representative of typical building styles found in the wildland-urban interface in southwest Montana, one of the fastest-growing WUI regions in the country. The home used in this study is a mid-range home constructed in 2017 in Park County, Montana. It is a three-bedroom, 2,500-square-foot, single-level, single-family home with two exterior decks and a two-car garage. It was constructed for approximately \$140 per square foot, or a total of \$350,000 (Figure 4.1).³

For the purposes of this analysis, we made many assumptions about the typical home features, some of which would reduce or increase the cost difference with the wildfire-resistant home. We made these assumptions based on expert input about regional preferences for southwest Montana. The primary assumptions include that the typical home has a Class A asphalt roof, cedar plank siding, and a wood deck. Using a home typical of southwest Montana will make the cost comparisons less applicable in other regions due to different aesthetic preferences, climatological differences, functional needs, and local building code requirements. For several features, we include alternative product options to show how different choices and regional preferences may affect cost.

We identified the individual features on the home that make it vulnerable to wildfire, based on the best available science about home ignitions. We included features from four components of the home: roof, exterior walls (including windows and doors), deck, and landscaping.

New Construction Comparison

To compare the cost of constructing a wildfire-resistant home with the typical home, we priced: (a) typical building materials (including labor and contractor overhead and profit) representative of typical WUI construction in southwest Montana, and (b) wildfire-resistant building materials (including labor and contractor overhead and profit) that comply with or exceed the International WUI Code (IWUIC) for the vulnerable features. We did not only price materials, but also included labor and contractor overhead and profit because installation of some wildfire-resistant features may require more labor. We did not compare features that are unlikely to pose wildfire vulnerability issues (for example, the foundation, exterior building sheathing and framing, and interior walls).

This report shows a percentage increase in changing from typical to wildfire-resistant components but does not reflect a percentage increase as related to the entire cost associated with constructing a home. Because we did not evaluate the cost of constructing the entire home using *RMeans*, it is not possible to extrapolate precisely what percentage of the total home these costs represent. However, the costs associated with constructing wildfire-resistant components represent only a fraction of the total costs of constructing a home.

Retrofit Analysis

To examine the cost of retrofitting vulnerable features in the baseline home with wildfire-resistant materials, we priced: (a) labor costs for demolition of typical building materials (including contractor overhead and profit), and (b) wildfire-resistant building materials (including labor and contractor overhead and profit) that comply with or exceed the IWUIC. Where possible, we include the total cost of retrofitting the feature in the baseline home as well as a per-unit cost.

It is important to note that *RMeans*' labor costs for demolition do not include disposal costs, onsite retaining of material (i.e., a dumpster), nor do they account for challenges finding contractors willing to

take on small demolition projects. Finding a contractor willing to take on a relatively small job, like swapping out a gutter or roof vent, may be difficult in many markets.

However, some of the retrofitting techniques described here can be combined into a larger job that may be more attractive to contractors or completed independently by handy homeowners. Where possible, we have tried to indicate the difficulty of the retrofitting job for those inclined to D-I-Y. We have also tried to rank retrofitting tasks for each vulnerable feature to help identify where homeowners can achieve the most benefit for the least cost.

¹ RSMeans Online. 2018. Version 8.7. Gordian. <https://www.rsmeans.com/>

² Bechtle Architects: <http://bechtlearchitects.com/>

³ Andrew Ford, Ford Woodworks, LLC, Clyde Park, Montana. Personal communications.

V. RESULTS


New Construction

This analysis finds that a new home constructed to comply with a wildfire-resistant building code, as defined by the International WUI Code (IWUIC), can be constructed for roughly the same cost as a typical home. In fact, our model wildfire-resistant components cost approximately \$1,910, or 2% less than the typical home (Table 5.1). The roof, deck, and landscaping all added costs, while switching from wood to fiber cement siding for the exterior walls created a cost savings. Proportionally, the wildfire-resistant landscaping saw the greatest increase over the typical home, but in absolute dollars, the roof added the most cost (Figure 5.1).

Table 5.1: Cost and Proportional Difference of Components in New Construction for Typical and Wildfire-Resistant Scenarios

	Typical	Wildfire-Resistant	Difference	
Roof				
Roofing	14,870	16,380	1,510	10%
Vents	930	1,560	630	68%
Soffit & Fascia	5,080	6,970	1,890	37%
Gutters	930	2,760	1,830	197%
Subtotal	\$21,810	\$27,670	\$5,860	27%
Exterior Walls				
Siding	29,930	12,360	(17,570)	-58%
Sheathing	3,810	4,180	370	10%
Doors	6,170	8,120	1,950	32%
Windows	8,470	11,530	3,060	36%
Subtotal	\$48,380	\$36,190	-\$12,190	-25%
Deck				
Decking surface	8,230	9,430	1,200	15%
Framing	930	1,230	300	32%
Fascia	570	920	350	61%
Subtotal	\$9,730	\$11,580	\$1,850	19%
Near-Home Landscaping				
Mulch (bark vs. rock)	1,220	3,250	2030	166%
Landscape Fabric	0	540	540	-
Subtotal	\$1,220	\$3,790	\$2,570	211%
All Components				
Total	\$81,140	\$79,230	-\$1,910	-2%

Figure 5.1. Cost difference and percent change between typical and wildfire-resistant new construction. Orange bars are typical; green bars are wildfire-resistant.



Retrofit

Retrofitting costs for each component are detailed in Table 5.2. The cost of retrofitting the roof and exterior walls for the model home are both substantial if undertaken in whole. Retrofitting the roof, assuming removal of wood shingles and replacement of vents and gutters, approaches the cost of new construction at \$22,000. Retrofitting exterior walls, assuming removal and demolition of vinyl siding and wood-framed windows, came to \$40,350, which is more than the cost of new construction due to the expense of demolition of siding and sheathing. We did not price the cost of retrofitting the deck or landscaping, as these would be similar to new construction, but variable depending on demolition of existing conditions. Although retrofitting the roof or exterior walls in their entirety has substantial costs, there is also significant benefit as these can be especially vulnerable areas of the home.

Further, roof and exterior wall retrofitting can be broken into phases and prioritized based on existing conditions and neighborhood and landscape context. For example, many homes already have asphalt shingles that provide wildfire-resistance, so they would only need new vents and gutters to improve their wildfire-resistance. Homes that are 30 feet or more from neighboring structures and that have well-maintained landscaping are unlikely to be exposed to extended radiant heat and may not need siding to be replaced everywhere on the home. Homeowners may be able to prioritize siding replacement only at locations where radiant heat exposures are more likely (such as where other buildings are nearby, where walls face slopes, or on sides of the home facing common wind aspects) or in areas where flame contact from ember-ignited debris or vegetation is possible (such as at roof-to-wall junctions or within approximately 6 inches of the ground).

Table 5.2: Cost of retrofitting roof and exterior wall from typical to wildfire-resistant. Costs shown are for model home and assume removal of wood shingles on the roof and wood siding on the walls, to be replaced with the same wildfire-resistant materials described in the new construction scenario.

Roof	
Roofing	13,180
Vents	370
Soffit & Fascia	5,600
Gutters	2,860
Subtotal	\$22,010
Exterior Walls	
Sheathing and Siding	20,580
Doors	8,120
Windows	12,050
Subtotal	\$40,750

In the following chapters, detailed analyses of vulnerabilities, mitigations, new construction cost differences, and retrofitting options are provided for each component of the home. Detailed data tables can also be downloaded at <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes-appendix>. For the roof, exterior wall, and deck components, prices for alternative materials are included to show the range of potential costs. Prioritization of retrofitting activities and co-benefits are also described.

VI. ROOF VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST

This chapter analyzes the vulnerabilities, mitigations, code requirements, and detailed costs related to constructing a wildfire-resistant roof. For the purposes of this study, roof is defined as the peak of the roof ridgeline to and including the gutters and under-eave area. This includes the roofing materials and underlayment, ridge vents, soffit vents, soffit covering, and gutters.

Vulnerabilities

Roof coverings are vulnerable because of their relatively large surface area that can be exposed to wind-blown embers. Complex roof shapes that include dormers, split-level designs, and components with other roof-to-wall junctions increase the vulnerability of the roof because embers can accumulate in these joints. In these same junctions, vegetative debris can also accumulate, providing fuel that is easily ignited by embers (Figure 6.1).

The edge of the roof where a gutter can be attached and locations where the roof intersects with a vent can also be vulnerable locations, particularly when vegetative debris has accumulated in the gutter or at the inlet to the vent (Figure 6.2).

Roof vents are important for circulation of air to remove excess moisture in the attic but are also susceptible to ember and flame entry. The under-eave area is also vulnerable as construction detailing allows embers to be trapped in gaps. An open eave also traps heat, if near home vegetation (or other combustibles) ignite. If under-eave vents are present, they can be an entry point for embers to pass into the attic.



Figure 6.1. Complex roof showing roof-to-siding junction where pine needle debris has accumulated on top of asphalt composition shingle roofing (a Class A fire-rated covering), adjacent to wood shingle siding. The vulnerable component of this roof is the siding, should the pine needle debris ignite. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles



Figure 6.2. Debris accumulation at the entry of a (plastic) ridge vent. Ember ignition of this debris could result in ignition of the ridge vent. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles

There are two types of ventilation openings to provide circulation in attic spaces: one for inlet air and one for exiting air. Inlet air comes from vents located in the under-eave area, at the edge of the roof. Under-eave vents are located either:

- in the blocking, in the case of open-eave construction (Figure 6.3), or
- in the soffit material, in the case of soffited-eave construction (Figure 6.4).

Exiting air leaves through vents located on or near the roof. Exiting air vents are either:

- placed at the ridge of roof (called “ridge vents”),
- placed in an off-ridge location on the roof, or
- located on the exterior walls, at the end of the home (called “gable end vents”).

Ridge and off-ridge vents are considered “through-roof” vents. Embers and flames can enter the attic space of a home through any of these vent openings.

Mitigation

Use of a Class A fire-rated roof covering is the most common mitigation strategy. Depending on the roof covering, an underlayment with an enhanced fire resistance rating may be needed to attain the desired fire rating. In addition, removal of debris from the roof and gutter on a regular basis can reduce the likelihood of ignition of this material from embers when wildfire threatens the house.

Use of flashing where the roof meets other features will help reduce the vulnerability of materials at these locations to flame and radiant heat exposures. Examples include use of 1) metal drip edge at the roof edge (i.e., where gutter meets roof) (Figure 6.5), and 2) metal flashing at the base of the wall



Figure 6.3. Vent located in the blocking space in open-eave construction. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles



Figure 6.4. Under-eave strip vent located in a soffit. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles



Figure 6.5 Metal drip edge installed at the edge of the roof. In this case, the drip edge was part of the gutter. Photo: Stephen L. Quarles

where roof meets siding. Use of a noncombustible material can be necessary to plug gaps that can occur with certain roof coverings that create a gap between the covering and roof deck (e.g., barrel tile). This is sometimes referred to as “bird stopping” (Figure 6.6). Gutter cover devices are sometimes recommended or required to minimize the accumulation of debris in gutters.

Treatment in Codes

Building codes require a specified fire rating for the roof coverings. The specific fire rating depends on the designated fire hazard rating in the area. Because of the widespread availability of Class A roof coverings, these are most commonly used. Building codes also address ember exposures at some roof-to-wall or other roof intersection areas. The most common requirement is for providing bird stops at the roof edge and use of a gutter cover device.




Figure 6.6. Use of a mortar mix to provide an effective “bird stop” at the edge of this barrel style roof (this photograph was taken during a retrofit project while the work was in progress). Photo: Stephen L. Quarles

New Construction Comparison

Four key roof features were modified for wildfire-resistance:

- Roofing and underlayment
- Ridge and soffit vents
- Fascia and soffit covering
- Gutters

Figure 6.7. Roof subcomponents and new construction cost.



A wildfire-resistant roof can be constructed for an approximate 27% increase in cost (Figure 6.7). One of the most expensive features of the roof—the roofing material—was assumed on both the typical and wildfire-resistant home to be Class A asphalt shingles, a fire-resistant material and the most popular roofing material in North America. Wildfire-resistant additions to the roofing underlayment, vents, soffits, and gutters resulted in an increase of \$5,860 or a 27% increase. Several of the materials selected here exceed the requirements of IWUIC, including wildfire-resistant sheathing, membrane, and vents that have been approved in California as being “ember and flame resistant.” More expensive roofing materials that would comply with IWUIC such as metal or clay tiles, or more expensive gutter options, can increase the cost difference to \$33,340, or an increase of 153% (Table 6.1).

The typical sheathing of oriented strand board (OSB) was replaced with CDX plywood underlayment to reduce the potential for fire penetrating into the attic space. In the wildfire-resistant home, mineralized roll roofing was added in the roofing valleys to improve the fire resistance in this area because of the tendency of debris to accumulate in the roof valley area. When a roof covering allows for a gap between the covering and roof deck (e.g., a tile roof), one option to protect the roof deck is to install an asphalt fiberglass composition product.

Ridge and soffit vents in the typical home were replaced with vents designed specifically for fire-resistance that have finer-grained mesh and ember- and flame-resistant features. We examined a variety of manufacturers and found pricing to be in similar ranges. As an alternative to vents, we also priced an unvented attic option, which involves applying spray foam insulation to the underside of the roof deck, making the attic space part of the insulated building enclosure. Although removing vents eliminates the opportunity for ember entry, an unvented attic design can result in moisture-related performance issues.¹ It is important to manage moisture movement from the occupied portion of the home into the attic space. Additional measures—not priced in this study—will be necessary, such as applying a vapor retarder to the ceiling in the occupied portion of the home and sealing all gaps at through-ceiling penetrations.

On the wildfire-resistant home, the soffit was enclosed with fiber cement siding instead of plywood, resulting in a modest price increase. Cedar fascia was replaced with fire-retardant-treated redwood.

Vinyl gutters in the typical home were replaced with aluminum gutters. A metal drip edge was added to provide additional protection against flame and embers at the edge of the roof. A gutter cover device was added to reduce the accumulation of debris in the gutter.

Homes in cold climates will have added expenses for managing snow and ice when gutter cover devices are used. Gutter covers can increase the potential for ice damming and cause the gutter to detach from the building. Although it does not provide any direct benefit from a wildfire vulnerability perspective and may not be necessary in all climates, heat tape is necessary in cold climates and was priced here. Heated gutters were priced as an alternative.

As a complete alternative to gutters, a perimeter drain system was also evaluated. A perimeter drain eliminates the need for gutters and downspouts by using French drains around the perimeter of the house. This requires burying piping around the foundation of the home. Perimeter drain systems are not possible or advisable in all locations, depending on site conditions such as groundwater depth and foundation depth and material, for example. However, they can reduce vulnerability of the gutter by eliminating the ember-ignition likelihood from the accumulation of debris in the gutter.

Retrofit Analysis

Since the roof is one of the most vulnerable areas of the home to wildfire, retrofitting the roof to be more wildfire-resistant can be one of the most cost-effective and important actions a homeowner can take. Depending on which component is replaced and the size of the home, the cost can be as inexpensive as a few hundred dollars, to several thousand (Table 6.2). In the model home, complete retrofit of the entire roof to be wildfire-resistant totaled \$22,010. Individual replacement of features ranged from \$370 for replacing ridge vents to more than \$20,000 for an unvented attic option.

Co-Benefits and Efficiencies

Energy Efficiency

The roof is a key component of a home's natural ability to ventilate and moderate temperatures. A well-insulated and ventilated roof can improve the heating and/or cooling of the home. All of the features included here would contribute to improved venting (except an unvented attic) and efficiency.

Lifespan and Maintenance

Asphalt composition shingle roofs are very low-maintenance and can last several decades.

Gutter cover devices will reduce the amount of gutter cleaning required and can help reduce risk of falls during cleaning because fewer trips up the ladder will be required. When gutter cover devices are used in snowy climates, heat tape or heated gutters may be necessary to reduce the potential for ice damming. Use of heated gutter options require maintenance to ensure proper seasonal operation.

No matter what wildfire-resistant materials are used, none eliminate the need for ongoing maintenance. Homeowners should plan on regularly inspecting and maintaining the roof and gutters to remove accumulated debris.

¹ Quarles, L. and A. TenWolde. 2005. Attic and Crawlspace Ventilation: Implications for Homes Located in the Urban-Wildland Interface. In Conference Proceedings: Woodframe Housing Durability and Disaster Issues, October 2004. Forest Products Society, Madison, WI.

Table 6.1: Roof New Construction

Feature	Typical	Wildfire-Resistant	Cost Diff.	Percent Diff.	Notes	
Roofing	Roof covering	Asphalt shingles, class A architectural	Asphalt shingles, class A architectural	0	0%	
			Alternative: Steel roofing	8,060	86%	A
			Alternative: Clay tile	23,280	250%	A
	Valley flashing	Metal	Metal	0	0%	B
	Sheathing	Oriented strand board (OSB)	CDX Plywood	1,160	25%	
	Roll roofing	(none)	Mineral surface roll roofing in roof valleys	300		
	Membrane	(none)	APP bituminous membrane	40		
Roofing subtotal			\$1,500 – 24,780	10% - 167%		
Vents	Ridge vents	Flexible roll	Fire- and ember-resistant	-130	-28%	B
	Soffit vents	Aluminum strips	Fire- and ember- resistant with 1/8" mesh screen	760	161%	B
	Vents subtotal			\$630	68%	
Soffit & Fascia	Fascia	Cedar band board	Fire retardant treated redwood	1,280	60%	B
	Soffit covering	Plywood	Fiber cement	620	21%	
	Soffit & fascia subtotal			\$1,900	37%	
Gutters	Gutters	Vinyl	Aluminum	290	31%	
	Drip edge	(none)	Aluminum	750		
	Gutter cover device	(none)	Aluminum mesh	640		
	Heat tape	(none)	Flexible heat tape	150		B, C
	Heated gutter with cover	(none)	Alternative: heated gutter with guard	6,030	649%	A, B
	Perimeter Drain	(none)	Alternative: perimeter drain system	3,760	405%	A, D
	Gutters subtotal			\$1,830 - 6,030	197% - 649%	
TOTAL			\$5,860 - 33,340	27% - 153%		

Download detailed data tables at: <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes-appendix>.

Notes

- A. Denotes an alternative to another material; a home would not utilize all materials listed. Totals columns account for range depending on which alternative is selected.
- B. Materials priced from manufacturer, online retailer, or local distributor. Labor priced from RS Means.
- C. Perimeter drain systems are not possible or advisable in all locations, depending on site conditions such as groundwater depth, frequency of wind-driven rain events, foundation depth and material, and site drainage.

Table 6.2: Retrofitting roof features to be wildfire-resistant

Feature	Description	Cost for model home	DIY	Priority Rank
Roof covering	Removal of existing wood shake roof covering and replacement with Class A roof covering. (Asphalt architectural shingles were priced for this study).	\$13,180	Not recommended	Highest
Vulnerable Roof Vents	Removal of existing vulnerable attic vents and replacement with wildfire-resistant ridge vent, including replacement of surrounding shingles. (Other types of wildfire-resistant attic vents are available but were not priced for this study.)	\$370	Not recommended	High
Gutters	Removal of vinyl gutters and replacement with new metal gutter and gutter cover device.	\$2,110	Moderate skill required	High
Metal Drip Edge	Addition of a metal drip edge where gutter attaches at roof edge.	\$750	Moderate skill required	High
Soffit	Enclosing the roof overhang with wildfire-resistant fiber cement soffit material including needed ventilation.	\$5,600	Not recommended	High
Unvented Attic	As an alternative to ridge or other attic vents. An unvented attic requires removal of insulation in attic and replacement with spray polyurethane foam, as an alternative to replacing vents. Cost varies depending on climate zone and necessary thickness of foam. Cost does not include sealing the ceiling in occupied space below attic. Can be difficult in a retrofit scenario.	\$20,650 - \$32,910	Not recommended	-

VII. EXTERIOR WALLS VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST

This chapter analyzes the vulnerabilities, mitigations, code requirements, and costs related to constructing wildfire-resistant exterior walls, including sheathing and siding, doors, and windows.

Vulnerabilities

Exterior walls and components in the wall assembly can be vulnerable if exposed to flames or prolonged exposure to radiant heat from ignited items located relatively close to a home. Combustible items include bark mulch, vegetation, or nearby structures like neighboring homes, tool sheds, and fences. Fire can ignite combustible siding and penetrate gaps or joints in the siding and/or spread vertically and laterally to impinge on other wall components such as windows and the under-eave area. Walls that extend close to the ground (or, as already discussed, close to the roof) can be vulnerable to ignition if embers accumulate at the base of the wall and ignite it or components in the wall assembly (e.g., wood-based sheathing).

Doors and windows can also be vulnerable when exposed to flames or embers. Glass in a window can break from radiant heat or flame contact exposure. When a window is broken, the combustible materials inside the home (e.g., furniture, carpeting, drapes) can be ignited. Wood and vinyl framed windows can be vulnerable, burning or melting when exposed to radiant heat or flames if siding is ignited. However, studies have shown that glass is the most vulnerable component of a window.¹ Doors (including window glass set in doors) and door frames can fail for the same reasons. Small gaps between the door and frame can also create opportunities for wind-blown embers to lodge and ignite the door framing material and potentially the weather sealing material.

Mitigation

To minimize the chance of an ignition from an ember exposure, a vertical noncombustible zone of at least 6 inches should be created between the ground and the start of the siding. Some mitigation strategies for exterior wall features are dependent on home-to-home spacing. If the exterior wall is within 30 feet of neighboring homes, a noncombustible or ignition-resistant material should be used for the siding. In some cases, additional sheathing can provide added protection by enhancing the fire resistance of the wall.

Research has consistently shown that glass is the most vulnerable component of window failure during a fire. Multi-pane tempered glass windows should be used to reduce the likelihood of a window breaking when exposed to radiant heat. Vinyl frames are more susceptible to damage from radiant heat than other frame types. The horizontal interlock member in a vinyl-framed single- or



Figure 7.1. This window frame was exposed to radiant heat. The metal-reinforced member (in the back) did not deform when exposed during the exposure interval. The member without the metal reinforcement deflected downward, allowing insulated glass unit to fall out (without initial glass breakage), exposing the interior of the home. Photo: IBHS.

double-hung window can be vulnerable to radiant heat or direct flame contact if a metal reinforcement member isn't included (Figure 7.1). Aluminum or other metal window screens can help protect against ember entry if the glass breaks or if a window is inadvertently left open. When home-to-home spacing is less than 30 feet, metal shutters can provide added protection from embers, airborne debris, and radiant heat exposures.

Weather stripping around pedestrian and vehicle access doors can reduce the ability of embers to pass through openings between door and jamb but can also be vulnerable if embers accumulate against it and cause it to ignite or melt. The location of weather stripping on outswing doors is more vulnerable than inswing doors. Weather stripping containing fire retardants can reduce the vulnerability of this component.

Regardless of home spacing, mitigation strategies for exterior walls include creation and maintenance of an effective defensible space to reduce the chance of extended radiant heat or flame contact exposure to the siding, including a 0-5-foot noncombustible zone. This strategy is further discussed in a subsequent section.

Treatment in Codes

Code requirements for siding include specifying a noncombustible or ignition-resistant material. A specific kind of gypsum board can be used as an additional sheathing material that will improve the fire resistance of the exterior wall. This type of construction improves the ability of the wall assembly to resist the passage of fire from one side of the wall to the other. Care should be exercised when taking this approach as this is typically taken when a more vulnerable combustible material is used as the siding material. When using this option, siding materials with demonstrated lower flame spread should be used. This option will be problematic since a more vulnerable combustible material will most likely exhibit a higher flame spread.

Code requirements for the exterior wall also include multi-pane tempered glass windows and fire-resistant doors. Codes are typically silent on window frame material, meaning any framing material can be used.


New Construction Comparison

Wildfire-resistant exterior wall features are approximately 75% of the cost of typical features, creating a \$12,190 savings for this model home (Figure 7.2). These savings result primarily from using a fiber cement lap siding in the wildfire-resistant home, which is nearly one-third the cost of the typical cedar lap siding product. Some homeowners may have a preference to the aesthetics of wood siding over fiber cement siding. However, many fiber cement options on the market today mimic the look and texture of natural wood, as did the fiber cement product priced for this study. Alternative siding costs were also examined, including stucco (a 28% savings over cedar lap siding) and fire-retardant-treated cedar lap siding (a 20% additional cost to cedar lap siding). The wildfire-resistant home also uses wildfire-resistant sheathing (CDX plywood instead of typical Oriented Strand Board), which exceeds the requirements in the International WUI Code (IWUIC).

Fire-resistant doors cost 28-37% more, or an increase of \$1,640 to \$2,220, in the model home. The bulk of this cost comes from replacing vinyl-framed deck sliding doors with steel-framed doors. A cost savings was realized from replacing the vinyl garage door with steel. IWUIC is silent on garage doors, so this modification exceeds IWUIC. A range of different front and side door options were also priced, including steel fire doors and fiberglass doors.

Windows cost approximately 36% more, increasing the model home by \$3,060. Most of this increase is from using tempered glass in the windows, which increased their cost by an estimated 25%. This cost may be less for standard-sized windows or more for odd-sized windows, and may be less in markets where tempering is in higher demand or required by code. Tempered glass is specified as a requirement in IWUIC.

Figure 7.2. Exterior walls subcomponents and new construction cost.



Retrofit Analysis

To address the vulnerability of existing exterior walls to wildfire, several important components can be updated in pieces or in whole. Retrofitting the exterior walls of the model home (including doors and windows) to be wildfire-resistant cost \$40,750—more than the cost of new wildfire-resistant construction. Removing all siding and assembly, including vapor barrier and sheathing, and replacing with wildfire-resistant materials varies in cost depending on the type of siding to be removed.

In some situations, not all siding would need to be retrofitted to be wildfire-resistant. The prioritization of retrofitting many exterior wall features is dependent on home-to-home separation and home siting. If home spacing is more than 30 feet and good defensible space is established—including incorporation of the noncombustible near-home landscaping zone—the siding material and underlayment is less of a priority. However, if neighboring homes are closer together, if a home is near a slope, or if a side of the home faces the primary wind direction, noncombustible siding and multi-pane tempered glass windows become more important. Although not included in this cost analysis, metal shutters can provide improved protection from flames and extended radiant heat exposures, especially when neighboring homes are closely spaced, and are a viable alternative to replacing windows.

Co-Benefits and Efficiencies

Energy Efficiency

Heat gain and loss from windows account for 25-30% of residential heating and cooling energy use. Replacing old windows in an existing home with better insulated, multi-pane windows can significantly decrease energy usage. Tempered glass is also safer because it is approximately four times more resistant to heat (compared to annealed glass) and does not form sharp shards when it breaks, but rather breaks into smaller chunks.

Lifespan and Maintenance

In addition to costing considerably less than cedar siding, fiber cement siding can have a longer lifespan and requires less maintenance.

¹ Bowditch, P.A., A.J. Sargeant, J. E. Leonard, and L. Macindoe. 2006. Window and glazing exposure to laboratory-simulated brushfires. Brushfire CRC. East Melbourne, Australia.
<http://www.bushfirecrc.com/publications/citation/bf-1263>

Table 7.1: Exterior Walls New Construction

Feature	Typical	Wildfire-Resistant	Cost Diff.	Percent Diff.	Notes
Walls	Sheathing	Oriented strand board	CDX Plywood	370	10%
	Siding	Cedar clapboard siding	Fiber cement lap siding (woodgrain texture for aesthetics)	-17,570	-59%
			Alternative: Stucco	-8,520	-28% A
			Alternative: Fire retardant treated cedar horizontal lap siding	5,940	20% A, B
Walls Subtotal			-\$17,200 - 6,310	-51% - 19%	
Doors	Front door	Birch solid core	Birch solid core	0	0
			Steel fire door	330	144% A, C
			Fiberglass	370	162% A
	Side door (garage)	Steel insulated	Steel insulated	0	0%
			Steel fire door	-210	-27% A
			Fiberglass	-170	-22% A
	Sliding door (deck)	Vinyl	Aluminum	1,870	94% B
	Garage Door	Fiberglass	Steel	-490	-17%
	Weather stripping	Vinyl threshold weather stripping and door sweeps	Silicone, fire-rated weather stripping and aluminum door sweep	100	86% B
	Garage door bottom	Rubber	Aluminum and neoprene	460	293% B
Doors Subtotal			\$1,730 - 2,310	28% - 37%	
Windows	Windows	Vinyl frames; dual-pane insulated glass; no screens	Metal-clad wood frames; dual-pane tempered glass; aluminum screens	3,060	36% B, D
Windows Subtotal			3,060	36%	
TOTAL			-\$12,410 - 11,680	-26% - 24%	

Download detailed data tables at: <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes-appendix>.

Notes

- A. Denotes an alternative to another material; a home would not utilize all materials listed. Totals columns account for range depending on which alternative is selected.
- B. Materials priced from manufacturer, online retailer, or local distributor. Labor priced from RS Means.
- C. Steel fire doors have weather stripping integrated, so cost of weather stripping would be eliminated.
- D. Based on pricing from manufacturer, we added 25% to all window cost for tempered glass. We also added 2% for aluminum screens.

Table 7.2: Retrofitting exterior wall features to be wildfire-resistant

Feature	Description	Cost for model home	DIY	Priority Rank
Siding	Removing existing siding and replacing with fiber-cement. Siding demolition cost varies depending on type to be removed. Siding replacement can also be prioritized in only the most vulnerable locations (e.g., only at roof-to-wall junctions)	\$15,240	Not recommended	High if home-to-home spacing is less than 30 feet
Sheathing and Vapor Barrier	Removing existing vapor barrier and sheathing and replacing with wildfire-resistant materials, as an add-on when replacing siding.	\$5,340	Not recommended	High if home-to-home spacing is less than 30 feet
Doors	Replacing all doors and weather-stripping with wildfire-resistant materials.	\$8,120	Moderate skill required	Moderate priority
Windows	Removing existing windows and replacing with windows with tempered glass. Price varies significantly depending on type of frame to be removed and window sizes. Window demolition cost varies depending on frame type. Cost of new tempered glass window is approximately +25% cost of standard glass.	\$12,050	Not recommended	Higher if home-to-home spacing is less than 30 feet or if defensible space is not established

VIII. DECK VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST

This chapter analyzes the vulnerabilities, mitigations, code requirements, and costs related to constructing a wildfire-resistant deck, including the decking (i.e., walking surface), the framing, and the fascia.

Vulnerabilities

Attached decks are a vulnerable component to a home because a burning deck could result in an extended radiant heat exposure to the side of the house. A burning deck could also result in a flame contact exposure to the home. Even if the home has noncombustible siding, the glass in access doors could be vulnerable to breakage, resulting in fire being able to enter the home.

Although metal deck boards are available, most deck board products are combustible (including wood and plastic composite boards). Decks with a noncombustible walking surface, such as light-weight concrete or a flagstone product, are available, but these decks are typically more expensive. Regardless of the walking surface, decks are typically supported by solid wood joists, beams, and columns that have been treated with a preservative to reduce the effects of moisture. Because dual treatments for fire and water are not available, preservative-treated wood members are more commonly used because of the more likely water-related degradation of decks and decking (e.g., from rain or snow).

Decks are vulnerable to wildfire if they are susceptible to ignition from wind-blown embers (firebrands) or from flames impinging from the underside of the deck. A flame contact exposure from the underside of the deck could result from ember-ignited debris or combustible materials stored under the deck or from burning vegetation located downslope from the deck.

Mitigation

When considering ways to make any component better able to resist wildfire exposures, the combination of managing vegetation and the use of wildfire-resistant materials and design features should always be considered. In the case of decks, vegetation management should include location of other combustible materials on the property. To minimize the potential for a flame contact exposure to the underside of the deck, the near-home noncombustible zone should extend under the entire footprint of any attached deck. When a home is located on a slope and an attached deck extends out over that slope, vegetation should be selected, located, and maintained in such a way as to reduce the opportunity for fire to impinge on the underside of the deck.

Regardless of the actions taken to minimize the opportunity for flames to contact the deck, when threatened by a wildfire, it will have to resist ignition from wind-blown embers. Higher-density deck board products, including plastic composites and the tropical hardwood products such as Ipe, are much more resistant to ignition from embers than the lower-density softwood deck board products (such as redwood and cedar) that are more commonly used. Fire-retardant treated (FRT) wood products are also more resistant to ignition from embers.

Deck enclosure is sometimes recommended to reduce the vulnerability of decks to wildfire. Whereas deck enclosure could protect the underside of a deck from a flaming exposure, caution should be used with certain enclosure techniques that can result in water-related degradation of the deck (e.g., fungal decay and insect damage). Such enclosure techniques restrict the ability of wet deck boards and framing members to dry out. They can also result in corroded fasteners.

When using combustible decking products, use of a foil-faced bitumen product, applied to the top surface of the support joists, has been shown to reduce the vulnerability of combustible decking products, particularly the non-fire-retardant treated medium-density solid wood products such as redwood and cedar (Figure 8.1). The foil-faced tape will result in deck boards self-extinguishing before the fire propagates far from the support joists if the deck boards are ignited by embers. The tape should extend about halfway down the side of the joist.



Figure 8.1. Placing foil-faced tape on the top and sides of a deck joist has been shown to reduce vulnerability of deck boards, especially combustible products like cedar or redwood. Photo: IBHS.

Other mitigation strategies for decks include increasing the gap between deck boards (e.g., from 1/8-inch to 1/4-inch) and increasing between-joist spacing from 16-inch on-center to 24-inch on-center. Structural and safety requirements should be confirmed before changing deck board or joist spacing.

Treatment in Codes

The three wildfire reference documents—the IWIUC, NFPA 1144, and California’s Chapter 7A—all have provisions that address the deck. All three focus on the walking surface of the deck, but there are differences in what is permitted by each document.

IWIUC and NFPA 1144 don’t allow for the use of non-fire-retardant treated wood. The only nominally combustible decking products that are allowed are those that qualify as “ignition resistant material.” Currently none of the commercially available plastic composite products comply with this requirement, so technically no non-fire-retardant-treated wood or plastic composite deck board products could be used. Both documents have a provision that allows for a fire-rated assembly to be used (this is referred to as a “one-hour fire rated assembly”) (Figure 8.2). When using deck boards this type of construction would likely make the deck more vulnerable to moisture-related degradation. This leaves few deck options that comply with IWIUC and NFPA 1144.




Figure 8.2. One-hour fire rated assembly for a deck.


California’s Chapter 7A allows for the use of decking products that can pass a performance-based under-deck flame impingement test. Unlike the ICC IWUI Code and NFPA 1144, non-fire-retardant-treated wood and several plastic composite deck board products can comply with the standard test method and are therefore permitted under California’s Chapter 7A.

This approach has been controversial. Recent research has demonstrated that some non-fire retardant treated solid wood decking products are more easily ignited by wind-blown embers.¹ Use of foil-faced tape can reduce the vulnerability of these products. Some plastic composite products can be more vulnerable to a flame impingement exposure. To minimize the vulnerability of all combustible decking products, the noncombustible zone must include the entire footprint of the deck.

New Construction Comparison

The cost of a wildfire-resistant deck was 19 to 43% more than the typical deck, increasing the cost by \$1,860 to \$6,060 for the model home (Figure 8.3). This deck would not be compliant with IWUIC or NFPA 1144, but would be compliant with California Chapter 7A.


Figure 8.3. Deck subcomponents and new construction cost.



The majority of this price increase resulted from the deck boards. We compared costs of several options for both the typical and wildfire-resistant models and found that prices varied significantly for typical materials, ranging from approximately \$10 per square foot for redwood to \$28 per square foot for cedar, whereas wildfire-resistant materials all fell into the range of \$11 to \$16 per square foot (Figure 8.4).

Moderate price increases were realized from modifications to the deck framing and fascia. Rough-sawn cedar columns visible on the deck were given fire-retardant treatment and foil-faced tape was added to the tops and sides of joists to reduce the likelihood of fire propagating from the anticipated ember exposure. The fascia board was also changed from rough-sawn cedar to fire-retardant-treated redwood.

Figure 8.4. Cost of decking boards per square foot. Orange bars are baseline, non-wildfire-resistant; green bars are more wildfire-resistant. (Wildfire-resistance, in this case, is primarily related to resistance to ember ignition.)



Even the wildfire-resistant (ember-ignition resistant) materials priced here—polyethylene (PE) and PVC composite deck boards—are combustible and would currently only comply with California Chapter 7A—not with IWUIC or NFPA 1144. Prices for materials compliant with IWUIC and NFPA 1144 were difficult to find in the Montana market. Fire-retardant treated (FRT) wood is the most common option that would comply. Some estimates suggest a 20-25% cost increase for treatment, which would put the cost at a similar range to some composite options. However, availability and shipping of FRT deck boards may be challenging in remote, rural markets.

Testing shows that many products are not highly combustible in isolation. Deck fires become large when other fuel sources contribute, such as pine needles that accumulate on deck surfaces and in gaps between deck boards, combustible material stored under or on top of the deck, and decks overhanging slopes with combustible vegetation. Avoiding storage of combustibles under the deck and ongoing maintenance of defensible space are key to deck ignition-resistance.

Solid-surface decks provide an alternative to standard decking boards. These options can provide a noncombustible walking surface. Structural integrity and engineering requirements for sub-framing of a heavier, solid-surface deck are highly dependent on site conditions and local building codes, so they were not priced for this study.

Co-Benefits and Efficiencies

Lifespan and Maintenance

Plastic composite deck boards are reported to require less maintenance than wood deck boards, which can require regular cleaning and refinishing. Some of the composite decking products are resistant to fading and stains, and because of the plastic content are typically more resistant to rot, mold, and insect-related degradation. Some brands come with 25-plus year warranties and are made from recycled plastic and wood.

Regardless of decking materials used, ongoing maintenance of the deck is required. Regularly removing vegetation underneath the deck, as well as from between deck board gaps, is critical. In advance of an approaching wildfire, it is also important to remove furniture and other combustible materials from the surface of the deck.

Table 8.1: Decking New Construction					
Feature	Baseline	Wildfire-Resistant	Cost Diff.	Percent Diff.	Notes
Decking Surface	Redwood decking	Composite (non-capped, non-woodgrain)	1,200	15%	
		Alternative: PVC	1,820	22%	A
		Alternative: Composite Woodgrain	2,310	28%	A
		Alternative: Composite Capped	5,410	66%	A
Decking Surface Subtotal			\$1,200 - 5,410	15% - 66%	
Framing	Preservative - treated lumber	Preservative-treated lumber	0	0%	
		Cedar rough sawn columns (visible on porch)	50	19%	B
		(none)	Foil-faced tape for joist top and sides	250	
Framing Subtotal			\$300	32%	
Fascia	Cedar rough sawn band board	Fire-retardant treated redwood band boards	350	59%	B
Fascia Subtotal			\$350	59%	
Total			\$1,850 - 6,060	19% - 62%	

Download detailed data tables at: <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes-appendix>.

Notes

A. Denotes an alternative to another material; a home would not utilize all materials listed. Totals columns account for range depending on which alternative is selected.

B. Materials priced from manufacturer, online retailer, or local distributor. Labor priced from RS Means.

¹ Quarles, S. L. and C. D. Standohar-Alfano. 2017. Ignition potential of decks subject to an ember exposure. Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety. http://disastersafety.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Deck-Ember-Testing-Report-2017_IBHS.pdf

IX. NEAR-HOME LANDSCAPING VULNERABILITIES, MITIGATIONS, AND COST

This chapter analyzes the vulnerabilities, mitigations, code requirements, and costs related to developing wildfire-resistant near-home landscaping. For the purposes of this study, the near-home landscaping component includes the mulch and landscape fabric in a 5-foot zone immediately around the home, as well as under all attached decks.

Vulnerabilities

Landscaping makes the home vulnerable when, if ignited, it allows fire to burn to the home. Ignition of near-home mulch from ember exposure will allow flames to touch the home, regardless of how well defensible space has been planned and maintained.

Mitigation

Mitigation strategies include selection, placement, and maintenance of vegetation that reduces the chance fire can burn directly to the home. Professionals usually discuss this process by dividing the property into two to three zones where vegetation and other combustible materials are managed in such a way as to reduce the chance that fires can burn to the home. The incorporation of a near-home zone (typically specified as 5 feet wide, extending out from the building), where all combustible materials are removed (e.g., bark mulch, combustible vegetation, and stored materials like firewood) can minimize the opportunity of ignition.




Figure 9.1. Landscaping zones for wildfire-prone areas. All codes lump Zones 1 and 2 into a single description, neglecting to emphasize the importance of the 0-5' near-home landscaping area.


Treatment in Codes

Codes specify development and maintenance of two zones, the first zone being from the edge of the home to 30 feet from the home and the second in the 30- to 100-foot area. It is common for “or to the property line” to be included in the text. None of the major codes require the 0- to 5-foot noncombustible zone (Figure 9.1).

New Construction Comparison

To make the model home wildfire-resistant, bark mulch was replaced with pea gravel. Weed and erosion control fabric was added in a 5-foot zone around the home and in the spaces under the deck. This resulted in a 210% cost increase over the typical materials, or an increase of \$2,570 (Figure 9.2).

Figure 9.2. Near-home landscaping subcomponents and new construction cost.



Co-Benefits and Efficiencies

Lifespan and Maintenance

Compared to organic mulch, pea gravel has a much longer lifespan and requires little to no maintenance, whereas organic mulch will need to be replenished annually as it decomposes. However, organic mulch can be more efficient at maintaining soil temperatures and absorbing water. In drier climates or for xeriscaping, pea gravel can promote healthy soil drainage and prevent unwanted vegetation.

Table 9.1: Landscaping New Construction					
Feature	Typical	Wildfire-Resistant	Cost Diff.	Percent Diff.	Notes
Mulch	Bark mulch	Pea gravel	2,030	166%	
Landscape fabric	(none)	Polypropylene mesh erosion control fabric	540	-	A
TOTAL			\$2,570	210%	

Download detailed data tables at: <https://headwaterseconomics.org/wildfire/homes-risk/building-costs-codes-appendix>.

Notes

A. Includes fabric under the deck.

X. CONCLUSION

Wildfire-Resistant Building Codes and Standards Add Minimal Cost to Homeowners and Builders

Converging trends of hotter, longer, more severe fire seasons and growth in the wildland-urban interface put more people and communities at risk to wildfire disasters. Laboratory research and evidence from post-fire assessments have demonstrated that local ignitability of the home itself and the nearby landscaping are major factors determining home survivability in a wildfire. Three existing building codes and standards provide ample guidance for how to construct wildfire-resistant homes. Such regulations can reduce wildfire loss, and more communities are considering their implementation.

City, county, and state governments must weigh many issues when considering new regulations, but the cost of constructing to comply with wildfire-resistant building codes need not be a barrier. The results of this study demonstrate that the cost of constructing new homes to be wildfire-resistant is not substantively different than the cost of typical construction. Retrofitting existing homes can have substantial costs, but components can be prioritized based on neighborhood and landscape context. Other factors, such as material availability and builder knowledge of wildfire-resistant construction techniques may vary from region to region. For example, IWUIC-compliant decking options were difficult to locate in Montana. However, communities can customize portions of the model codes and standards to address such regional variability. As wildfire-resistant construction becomes more common and in higher demand in wildfire-prone landscapes, these limitations are likely to decrease.

Beyond protecting individual homes, wildfire-related building codes and standards are likely to have many long-term benefits to communities. Reducing wildfire losses can lessen the long-term and profound consequences and disruption borne at the local level following disasters, such as lost business and property tax revenue, physical and mental health impacts, and damage to public infrastructure. Constructing homes to modern wildfire-resistant standards delivers additional benefits to homeowners and the environment, as many components are more sustainable, require reduced maintenance, and provide added energy efficiency.

Key Mitigations Can Be Implemented by Any Builder or Homeowner

Regardless of whether it is required by code within a jurisdiction, individual builders and homeowners can act to mitigate wildfire vulnerabilities with little added cost. Home survival in wildfire-prone areas depends on effective implementation of a coupled approach where 1) vegetation (and other combustible materials) on the property is wisely selected, located, and maintained; and 2) materials and design features of the home are selected that will reduce vulnerability to anticipated wildfire exposures. Homes threatened by wildfires will always be subjected to wind-blown embers. Therefore, all homes in wildfire-prone areas should include design details that minimize vulnerability to embers. The likelihood of a long-term radiant heat or flame contact exposure will be less likely on properties that have developed and continue to maintain an effective defensible space in terms of selection, location, and maintenance of vegetation and other combustible materials on the property.

Roof

The roof—with a large surface area and potential for accumulation of combustible vegetative debris—is one of the most vulnerable parts of a home. Key mitigations for the roof include:

1. Install a Class A fire-rated covering or assembly.
2. Where applicable, install bird stops at roof edge, including any ridges. An additional layer of protection can be attained if a layer of roll roofing is installed over the surface of the roof deck.
3. For complex roof designs where there are junctions between a roof and a wall (e.g., dormers), consider noncombustible siding.
4. The under-eave area should be constructed using a soffited eave design.
5. Both inlet (under-eave) and outlet (roof or gable) vents can be vulnerable to ember entry.
 - Vents should be covered with 1/8- to 1/16-inch noncombustible and corrosion-resistant screening. Vents covered with 1/16-inch screening should be cleaned regularly so that they can perform their moisture management function.
 - Ridge or off-ridge vents are less vulnerable than gable end vents.
 - Use of vents approved by the California Office of the State Fire Marshal Building Materials Listing Program, which have demonstrated a resistance to ember and flame exposures.¹

Exterior Walls

Exterior walls and windows are especially vulnerable when exposed to flames or radiant heat for extended periods, such as from vegetation or neighboring homes that have ignited. Doors and windows can also be vulnerable to wind-blown embers and flames. If there is a home or neighboring building within 30 feet, the potential for radiant heat from that structure—should it ignite—may be enough to ignite siding or break glass in windows, so additional mitigations may be necessary. Key mitigations for exterior walls include:

1. Make sure there is, at a minimum, a 6-inch noncombustible zone at the base of the wall (i.e., between the ground and start of siding).
2. Install multi-pane windows having tempered glass.
3. When vinyl windows are used, make sure single- and double-hung windows include metal reinforcement in interlock members.
4. If there is a home or neighboring building within 30 feet, use ignition-resistant or noncombustible siding and metal shutters.

Decks

Attached decks can ignite from embers landing on top of the deck and from ignited vegetation or materials underneath the deck. An ignited deck provides radiant heat exposure to the home's siding, doors, and windows. Current wildfire codes and standards are inconsistent in their recommendations for decks, but key mitigations for decks include:

1. For deck boards, use noncombustible materials, fire-retardant treated wood, or decking products that meet the requirements of an ignition-resistant material. Non-fire-retardant treated redwood and cedar are vulnerable to ignition from ember exposures. Higher density decking products (e.g., plastic composite or imported tropical hardwood decking products) are less vulnerable to ignition from ember exposures. If used, plastic composite decking products should comply with the requirements of the California Office of the State Fire Marshal Building Materials Listing Program.¹

-
2. To reduce the likelihood of sustained flaming of ignited decking, install deck boards using a 1/4-inch gap between deck boards and install a foil-faced bitumen tape product on the structural support joists.
 3. If an attached deck overhangs a steep slope, particularly with shrub or woodland vegetation that is not on the property or that cannot be maintained, use of a solid surface deck with an enclosed underside is a better option.
 4. Incorporation of a noncombustible zone under the footprint of all attached decks is critical.

Near-Home Landscaping and the Home Ignition Zone

Managing vegetation and other combustible items on the property is important for reducing the energy and potential spread of fire. Regardless of vegetation maintenance and defensible space on the larger property, combustible vegetation and mulch in the near-home, 5-foot area immediately around the home can ignite and allow flames to touch the home. Key mitigations for landscaping include:

1. Follow readily available guidance on creating an effective defensible space on your property in a radius of at least 100 feet from the home (or to the property line).
2. Create a near-home noncombustible zone within 5 feet of the home and under the entire foot print of any attached deck.
3. A noncombustible fence section should be used for 5 to 8 feet where the fence connects to the home.

¹ California Office of the State Fire Marshal Building Materials Listing Program. Available at: http://osfm.fire.ca.gov/strucfireengineer/strucfireengineer_bml

