

2012 CODE AMENDMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT December 13, 2012

Present: Kevin Gattis, Carson City; Eric Simonson, City of Reno; Jess Traver, BANN; Sheena Shrum, BAWN; Shannon Gardner, Storey County; Mark Meranda, City of Sparks; Jeff Ball, City of Fernley; Shawn Keating, Lyon County; Don Jeppson, Washoe County; Leonard Ramociotti, AGC; Mike McCulloch, NNICC

Visitors: Randy Canale, Local 350; John Madole, AGC; Craig Madole, AGC; Margaret Cavin, NAM/J&J Mechanical; Dwight Perkins, IAPMO

Meeting notes from December 13, 2012:

1: *Approve meeting notes from November 15 meeting.*

Randy Canale corrected his earlier statement that Local 350 members did not work on mechanical systems. Members do work on the "wet" side of those systems including setting boilers.

Notes were approved as corrected.

2: *Dwight Perkins from IAPMO would like to address the committee.*

Dwight stated that he was under the impression from the September meeting he attended that he and Leonard Ramociotti would prepare an amendment package and then the 2012 UMC would be adopted. He was unaware the package was deemed inadequate until he received a copy of the meeting notes. Dwight produced a letter of support for the UMC that was provided by the Southern Nevada chapter of SMACNA for the Southern Nevada adoption process.

IAPMO technical comments regarded some purported errors in ventilation rates for coin operated laundries and exhaust rates for kitchens in the IMC. There were other technical comments regarding the IMC (the chair has requested Dwight to forward his notes regarding these issues).

Local amendments submitted with the IAPMO package from Southern Nevada were not from the IAPMO national organization.

Dwight reiterated that IAPMO would provide free training and code books. He urged the committee to adopt the 2012 UMC like the rest of the state and offered any help he could provide.

John Madole from AGC and Margaret Cavin from NAM spoke briefly in support of the UMC.

3: *Decide on fuel gas code to adopt*

There are two fuel gas codes available; NFPA 54 and the IFGC. NFPA 54 is adopted by the Nevada LP Gas Board and cannot be modified without their approval. This only applies to LP gas installations. Both the IFGC and NFPA 54 technical requirements are based on the International Fuel Gas Standard which is co-owned by NFPA and AGA. ICC has a licensing agreement to use the technical portions of the standard. There are no current comparisons between NFPA 54 and IFGC available.

Local amendments for either fuel gas code would be minimal and consist of compatibility issues with already approved amendments.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the pros and cons of adopting which fuel gas code and mechanical code although the focus was on the mechanical code. The question was asked if the technical issues brought up by Dwight Perkins should influence the decision. The chair noted that there was never a technical analysis of either code and if needed, ICC could be invited to present their code analysis. It was stated that the State Public Works Board had initially planned to adopt the IMC but reversed its decision after pressure from special interest groups. It was identified that there are more stakeholders involved than the committee or its visitors, including BOMA, the building owners group and the end user himself. A suggestion to adopt both mechanical codes was deemed too impractical from an enforcement standpoint. Eric Simonson volunteered to contact mechanical contractors and designers regarding the mechanical code.

It was pointed out that the IMC has been voted twice to be the mechanical code adopted. The UMC was to be considered if the amendment package submitted resolved all conflicts between the UMC and the "I" codes and any missing requirements were included. This was not the case with the November 15 package.

It was finally decided by majority vote to continue with the process to adopt the IMC. The IFGC, by a 9 to 1 vote was selected as the fuel gas code. A meeting to

review amendments for both the IMC and IFGC will be held on January 17th. Any clean up amendments to other codes will also be reviewed on the 17th.

For the committee to reconsider the UMC, IAPMO would have until January 17 to deliver a complete amendment package to the committee. Delivery to the chair for distribution will be acceptable.

4. *Coordination between Fire committee and this group*

The chair gave an update on the fire code adoption. The fire committee is very motivated to produce a uniform amendment package. The exception will probably be requirements for fire sprinklers. There may be some coordination needed between the two groups on amendments but there should be a small amount of common amendments.

5. *Review UMC/IMC comparison spreadsheet*

The spreadsheet was updated to the 2012 UMC for any items originally included. This was not a comprehensive comparison between the 2012 UMC and the 2012 IMC as the direction of the committee has always been the adoption of the IMC. The comparison document was to highlight the differences from the 2006 UMC to the 2012 IMC. The spreadsheet was once again not reviewed during the meeting. There was a request to distribute the latest spreadsheet. Leonard Ramociotti requested direction for the IAPMO amendments. The comparison spreadsheet was suggested as a good resource if the items mentioned were checked against the 2012 UMC.

6. *Set date for the next meeting.*

The following meeting dates were scheduled. The IMC and IFGC amendments will be reviewed on January 17th. If the IAPMO package is delivered by January 17th, then a second meeting on January 24th to review the IAPMO amendment package is planned.