



December 10, 2007

Planning & Development Department  
Inspection Services Division  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine  
04101-3509

RE: Residence Inn by Marriott  
Hancock Street and Fore Street  
City of Portland, ME

Dear Mike Nugent,

This letter is in response to your email dated December 6, 2007. Please see below your questions with the responses.

*1) In our pre-permitting meeting, we discussed the need for elevator lobbies that comply with section 707.14.1 of the 2003 IBC. This is not reflected in the submissions. Please explain.*

**We have reviewed this with this with International code council and they stated that the exception #4 in the 2003 does leave it up to interpretation based on the "lowest level of fire department vehicle access". In the 2006 International Building Code this was clarified to read "Buildings have occupied floors located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access". Please find attached the copy of the 2006 version of the section with the commentary clarifying that the elevator lobbies would not be required with our entire building equipped with an automatic sprinkler system. With this clarification to the code we believe we would not be required to install the elevator lobbies. Please review this information and verify if you agree with our interpretation.**

*2) Please provide a project spec book.*

**The specifications were sent under separate cover last Friday and should be in your office today. Please give us a call if you did not receive it and we will send an additional copy.**

*3) The submission lacks sufficient piling information. Please provide piling information that establishes compliance with all of the applicable portions of Section 1808 and 1809 of the 2003 IBC*

**Please review the specification section 31 62 16 "Steel Piles". We reviewed this with our geotechnical engineer Timothy Boyce from S. W. Cole Engineering and he said he would be happy to supply you with any additional information if the specification section and the geotechnical report did not answer all your questions.**

4) *The Seismic site class is a "D", yet the design category is a "B". Please provide the calculations that were used.*

**The "B" labeling on certificate of Design Application is incorrect.**

**The seismic site class is "D" and the seismic design category is "C". This can be found on the drawings on sheet S1.0 – Design loads - #6 Earthquake loads.**

An additional item that was discussed at our meeting was the alternating stairs for access to the roof. This has been added to the drawings, please see attached sheet A3.1.

Sincerely yours

James M. Ryan  
Associate - Architecture