

## **2012 CODE AMENDMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **November 15, 2012**

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

Visitors: Randy Canale, Local 350; Doug De Angeli, RHP; Randy Walter, Places-Consulting Services; Leon Mills, Energy Insight; Neal Van Citters, Pro Energy Consultants; Charlene Parish, Washoe County

Meeting notes from November 15, 2012:

**1: *Approve meeting notes from October 4 meeting.***

There were no corrections or additions to the meeting notes.

**2: *Hear presentation by Randy Walter, Places-Consulting Services regarding energy audit tests.***

Energy Fit Nevada is a state program that provides grant money for energy upgrades. One of the requirements is to perform a flue gas test that entails drilling a hole in the flue for a test probe and then repairing it. The State Contractors Board has said that a licensed Nevada contractor must perform this work. Randy wanted to know what the steering committee would require. After much discussion regarding the test procedure, alternative testing and contractor licensing requirements it was stated that this group could not override the state regarding licensing. It was decided to take a quick straw poll to see if the jurisdictions present would require a permit as this would automatically trigger a requirement for a valid contractor's license. Answers varied but it was decided that this committee was not the correct venue for this discussion. It was suggested that Northern Association of Building Officials should be contacted about this. The president of NABO, Don Jeppson was present and gave contact information to the energy group.

**3: *Comments from local mechanical engineers regarding mechanical code.***

Doug De Angeli, a mechanical engineer from RHP was present and made the following points in favor of using the UMC. RHP is both a design and contracting firm so Mr. De Angeli represented both groups. The prescriptive nature of the UMC levels the playing field for contractors and with the appendices adopted reduces the amount of code interpretation. Mr. De Angeli stated that there is more leeway in the IMC so Building Officials would see new things that they may not know how to deal with. Questions from the committee determined that Mr. De Angeli had used the IMC in design work and when asked if using the IMC would alter his design. The answer was no, as the two codes basically use the same standards. As for compatibility with the IECC, both codes use ASHRAE standards for commercial design.

It was pointed out that SMACNA, the national sheet metal and air conditioning contractors association supports the use of the IMC. The chair had sampled the roster from the Nevada Engineering Board and found that there was a significant number of out of state mechanical engineers licensed in Nevada from states that have adopted and use the IMC. Mr. De Angeli was asked if area designers would be at a disadvantage if the IMC was adopted and answered no.

**4. *Vote on carbon monoxide alarm amendment.***

**IRC R315** Carbon monoxide alarm

Unanimous For, The intent was to make the requirements for retro fit should more closely align with the smoke detector triggers

**5. *Hear explanation of IBC 1803.2 Soil Investigation.***

Steve Le Cam, who was the chair of the engineering sub-committee, was contacted by telephone to recount his recollection of this amendment. The steering committee's concern was that the EOR could unilaterally exclude the requirement for the soil report without a submittal to the building department. Steve thought that the engineers wanted the decision making the providence of the designers.

There was a discussion regarding the merits of changing the language of the amendment. Most jurisdictions do not require a full soils report for single family dwellings. There was an up or down vote on the amendment as submitted. *The vote was unanimous against.* There were concerns that the cost of a liquefaction report would be very expensive and there is insufficient data at the state level. Jess Traver volunteered to look at the code section and propose an amendment if appropriate.

## **6. Review IAPMO UMC amendments.**

The amendments submitted by the IAPMO group were reviewed not with the intent of a vote of approval or not, but to see if they addressed the conflicts between the mechanical codes and add the IMC provisions that are lacking in the UMC.

The amendment package had four basic categories; Definitions, IMC language, plastic pipe restrictions and Southern Nevada amendments.

The two definition amendments were not needed as the group does not adopt the IFC and the IECC was already modified in the prior amendment process.

The first IMC language was to include the dryer vent language from the IRC. The second deleted the duct insulation from the UMC to bring it into compliance with the IECC. The next two added the gas test pressure and manometer amendments from the UPC and IRC. The last was dry cleaner ventilation rates. The chair pointed out that there was quite a discrepancy between the codes in regards to ventilation rates. There are 104 uses in the IMC and 78 in the UMC. It was noted that the rates could be obtained from ASHRAE but that ruined one of the main arguments for using the UMC and that is it is a complete document without the need for additional code books. There was a question about the footnotes in the ventilation table. The UMC has an exception for parking garages of a certain size that does not exist in the IMC. The problem is larger than that because the IMC has a dedicated section for parking garages detailing specific installation requirements.

The next category included prohibition of plastic pipe in Type I or II construction. Every national code allows plastic pipe in all types of construction. Mr. De Angeli pointed out that California allowed plastic pipe and that would have an adverse economic impact on Northern Nevada.

The Southern Nevada amendments included one that required duct supports for duct enclosures to be outside of the enclosure. This is a 2009 code section and would have to be renumbered for 2012. It was noted that the IMC has a requirement that duct supports be of the same fire resistance as the building construction. The next two were requirements for performance tests. There was roof access and ladder construction details requirements added to the UMC. It was pointed out that the IMC language is superior in that it addresses sloped roofs and unlike the UMC tells you when guards are required. The next one was deleting Chapter 10 to avoid a conflict with state regulations regarding boilers. This would create a void for pressure vessels less than 15 psi which is not regulated by the state. The last one addressed running gas piping under buildings.

**7. *Decide on the direction of the mechanical code.***

The chair gave a partial list of content and requirements that are addressed in the IMC but not the UMC. Conflicts between the UMC and the other "I" codes were not listed because of the complexity of finding and comparing references between five codes. Don Jeppson had found 73 references to the IMC but had not researched the content. Kevin Gattis thanked the IAPMO group for their attendance and efforts but stated Carson City was still convinced that the IMC was a better fit with the other "I" codes and contained more content. Even though Local 350 members do not install mechanical systems, Randy Canale again voiced his concern that the Pipe Fitters would have to change their training. It was pointed out that the majority of the nation uses the IMC and it is perhaps a disservice to his members to limit their knowledge and their ability to work out of the area.

There was a motion to vote on adopting the IMC. *The vote count was 8 for adoption and 3 against.*

Dale Lowery thought it was wrong that it was adopted even though industry was against it. Sheena Shrum pointed out that her industry group was for the IMC. The chair pointed out that there were other stakeholders then those present such as SMACNA, AIA and BOMA. BOMA is the building owner's group.

**8. *Set date for the next meeting.***

The next meeting will be on December 13th. The chair will check the availability of the meeting room.