

DRAFT  
MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
BUILDING CODES COMMITTEE

April 20, 2005

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
Cholla Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bob Lee, Cave Creek	*Brian Goble, Mesa
*Dennis Dixon, Apache Junction	*Armando Rivas, Paradise Valley
Ken Sowers, Avondale	David Nakagawara, Peoria
*Phil Marcotte, Buckeye	Tom Wandrie, Phoenix
Mike Tibbett, Carefree	Tim Wegner, Queen Creek
A - Alex Banachowski, Chandler	*Larry Francis, Salt River Pima Indian Community
*Art Swanson, El Mirage	Michael Clack, Scottsdale
*Peter Johnson, Fountain Hills	Forrest Fielder, Surprise
John Smith, Gila Bend	A - Michael Williams, Tempe
*Jo Rene DeVeau, Gila River Indian Community	Mario Rochin, Tolleson
A – Ray Patten, Gilbert	*Lyle Murdock, Wickenburg
Jim Fox for Deborah Mazoyer, Glendale	Bob Cooperider, Youngtown
Steve Burger, Goodyear	Tom Ewers, Maricopa County
*Chuck Ransom, Litchfield Park	Rus Brock, Home Builders Association

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

A-Those members participating via audioconference

V-Those members participating via videoconference

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Cheryl Levandowski, Peoria	John Goss, Southwest Gas
John Armstrong, Bobier Sales	Jack Rankin, Southwest Gas
Hannan, Sioux Chief Manufacturing Company	Michelle Green, MAG
Robert Palmer, Southwest Gas	Ken Hussain, MAG

1. Call to Order

The Chairperson, Bob Lee, Town of Cave Creek, called the meeting of the MAG Building Codes Committee to order, at 2:05 p.m.

2. Introductions

Members of the Committee introduced themselves.

3. Water Hammer Arrestors

John Hannan made a presentation regarding water hammer arrestors, explaining that their purpose is to absorb the shock of a valve that closes suddenly. He continued by explaining that, if the pressure created by a valve closing suddenly is not absorbed by some mechanism, it is possible to damage water pipes. Mr. Hannan then noted that the pressure spike of a water hammer in a residential system, can reach 400 psi.

Mr. Hannan then began to describe a range of water hammer control devices that would be used at different locations in a home, for example toilet, sink, washer etc. Mr. Hannan explained there are different arrestors designed for different situations, noting that the whole house arrestor is a myth. Mr. Hannan explained that where arrestors are used, such as at sinks, washers etc., it is necessary to install an arrestor that is designed for that situation. Mr. Hannan added that there should be one arrestor for hot water and one for cold water.

Mr. Hannan explained his understanding of a standard as opposed to a code. A standard he explained, is written for a specific product whereas a code refers to many products. He then explained several requirements of the IPC and UPC.

Mr. Hannan then noted that the American Society of Sanitary Engineers (ASSE) standard 1010 is the only standard that is recognized by the most current versions of both the Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC) and the International Plumbing Code (IPC). Mr. Hannan then referred to the sections, of the most recent versions of the UPC and IPC, that require the use of water hammer arrestor devices.

Mr. Hannan continued by stating that it is recommended that the arrestor be installed within 6 feet of the valve.

Mr. Lee then asked if the requirements are the same for plastic pipe.

Mr. Hannan said that they were.

Jim Fox then asked if the arrestor needed to be installed in a vertical position.

Mr. Hannan responded by saying that they do not, noting that this is a recent change, because it was determined that there is no negative impact by installing them horizontally.

4. March 16, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Ken Sowers made the motion to accept the minutes; Mario Rochin seconded the motion. The chair asked if there was any discussion on the minutes, hearing none, a vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

5. Call to the Audience

Robert Palmer asked to address the committee regarding a change that Southwest Gas would like to make in the way they install gas meters. Mr. Palmer stated that there has been a lot of growth in the Valley and Southwest Gas is addressing the issue by asking to preset gas meters. Mr. Palmer explained that construction crews would do this.

Forrest asked Mr. Palmer to elaborate on the reasons for doing this.

Mr. Palmer explained that more work is being done with less people if the construction crew is allowed to service the riser.

Bob Lee then asked if there would still be testing on the part of Southwest Gas.

Mr. Palmer responded by saying yes.

Bob asked if anyone saw a problem with that.

Ken asked when the change would take place.

Mr. Palmer responded by saying that it would be mid-May.

No issues were noted.

6. Comments From the Committee

Bob Lee announced that the 2004 IECC supplement is out. He noted that the climatic zones are simplified and that Maricopa County falls into Climatic Zone 2. Mr. Lee also noted that the default insulation is now R-8 which poses a problem for our market. Mr. Lee then added that Chapter 11 of the IRC currently requires R-6.

Bob Lee explained that the payback period on the higher insulation is lengthy enough to make it not worth enforcing, adding that R-13 for walls would make it difficult for 2x4 construction, and sprayfoam insulation. He continued by stating that the payback time for R-13 is also too lengthy.

Rus Brock added that he met with the City of Phoenix, who agreed to allow R-6 for one year because R-8 is not available in the market. Rus then noted that he would prefer to change the code rather than dealing with the issue on a Jurisdiction-by-Jurisdiction basis.

Bob Lee added that an effort will be made, at the Detroit hearings, to ensure that it does not show up in the 2006 version.

Bob Lee continued by stating that there was a presentation to the American Society of Fire Protection Engineers on Performance Based Codes, noting that this may be a good topic for this committee in the future.

#### 7. SES Installation Practices

Cheryl Levandowski gave her report on this issue from the Regional Plan Review/Building Inspectors/ Plans Examiners RPR/BI/PE group meeting held on April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Cheryl reported that the group reached consensus on the fact that current practice is not code compliant. Ms. Levandowski continued by explaining that they intend to hold a special meeting in May to continue discussions. The concern of the group, she explained, is that there is a lack of expertise available at the meetings to properly discuss and make a recommendation on this issue. Ms. Levandowski asked if the Committee would identify people within their agencies who might have expertise in this area and allow them to attend future meetings of the group until this issue is resolved.

Cheryl continued by stating that three contractors are expected to present options to the RPR/BI/PE group. Ms. Levandowski also explained that some cities expressed concern about the liability associated with continuing to allow an installation practice that is known to be non-code compliant. It was noted that it is important for everyone involved to get past expressing opinions and find a reasonable solution. It was also noted that liability issues are not technical issues; therefore, they do not fall under the purview of the group. It was noted that the committee would like to review proposals brought forth by the contractors.

Steve Burger noted that the group agreed that the installation practice is not code compliant. He explained that this is an important decision and a good starting place for future discussions.

Rus Brock added that he understands that current practice is not code-compliant and he is interested in finding a uniform decision on the matter because he believes that this would be best for all. However, he explained, ultimately the homebuilder needs to go to each jurisdiction for a decision. Rus Brock used the adoption of the I codes as an example, he explained that although the committee agreed to adopt the I codes each agency still has to go through the Council to adopt them.

Tim Wegner asked if a solution is implemented by a jurisdiction; will the jurisdictions still be subjected to more approaches from homebuilders to find a solution if they do not like what is adopted?

Rus Brock stated that if a solution is agreed to, and implemented, then the homebuilders would accept that.

David Nakagawara added that he would like to steer discussions toward AZBO and get their input to provide an opportunity to hear as many voices as possible. Bob Lee supported this point of view.

Jim Fox suggested that the committee allow the RPR/BI/PE group to continue with their work on this issue. Mr. Fox then asked Ms. Levandowski if the group required additional resources.

Cheryl said yes that they could really use expertise in the area of electrical issues.

Bob Lee noted that the next meeting of the group is scheduled for May 17<sup>th</sup> and asked that any member agency, with qualified staff, allow them to participate in these meetings.

Tim Wegner stated that there are multiple options, but the current practice is not acceptable. He added that he looks forward to a report from the group and some reasonable, code-compliant alternatives.

The chairperson then noted that on a related topic, VW DIG is available with a proposal and mock-up for providing electricity to a job-site without using a generator. The representatives of VW DIG presented a proposal for homebuilders to use an electrical panel for electricity during construction rather than a generator. It involves installing the electrical panel early, in such a way that a maximum of 30 amps of power could be provided to the job-site. The representative noted that an advantage to this method is that temporary power does not need to be installed; the same panel can be used in the home when it is complete.

Forrest Fielder noted that as far as being code compliant, section 27 for temporary installation covers it but he asked the presenter if it would be weatherproof.

Several other issues were raised concerning the panel and access. If the panel is locked, how do you deal with the issue of how to provide access to people who need it? The panels cannot be accessible to children or others who may have accidents because of a lack of knowledge about what they are touching.

The presenter responded by stating that they are looking at ways of locking the panel, perhaps leaving a key with the construction supervisor.

Jim Fox then asked if it goes to a regular meter, are in a sense, providing final approval that we may not intend to provide.

Bob Lee responded by saying yes, I think that would be the case.

Forrest Fielder then noted that reducing the use of generators is in State Law and is directed at the Utility Companies. He also noted that he has been on job-sites where these panels are being used for temporary power and the difference in noise is significant.

Rus Brock noted that APS, SRP and the Homebuilders are required to report to the State once a year on what efforts have been made to reduce the use of generators to provide electricity on job sites.

Forrest Fielder ended the dialogue by stating that temporary solutions have been in place since 1999, adding that the committee should look at why there is still no approved, code compliant alternative.

8. NCSBCS/AMCBO

Forrest Fielder provided an update on the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards (NCSBCS), Inc. group, which is affiliated with the Association of Major City Building Officials. Mr. Fielder then said that they circulated a questionnaire to solicit topics of interest for a conference they are planning. He noted that he is a member along with a few other members of the Committee and he would be happy to participate and bring updates back to the committee.

Forrest then noted that the web address for this group is <http://www.ncsbcs.org/>

Mr. Fielder then explained that its mission is as follows: “NCSBCS serves as a forum in the interchange of information and provides technical services, education and training to our members to enhance the public’s social and economic well being through safe, durable, affordable, accessible and efficient buildings.”

Mr. Fielder said that he is a member of NCSBCS and he would be happy to provide updates and the organization’s activities as needed.

9. Building Codes Compilation and Web Addition Project

Michelle Green explained that Ken Hussain is in the process of collecting the background information for the project and that a draft document will be provided to the full committee for review in May. She explained that Bob Lee and Tim Wegner continue to assist in the process and will be very helpful in reviewing material prior to presenting it to the group.

10. Adopting The Most Recent Version of the NEC

This issue will be removed from the agenda.

11. Updated MAG Building Codes Committee Membership

Updates were provided following the meeting and will be incorporated into next months list as appropriate.

11. Update Survey of Code Adoption

Tolleson is now on the 2003 IFC.

12. Topics for Future Agendas

Topics suggested for future meetings include: Job-Site power, Energy Code talk, Dental Gas requirements, and appendix F and a talk regarding the 2003 IPC and UPC concerning greywater because ADEQ does not regulate this.

13. Adjournment

Tom Ewers made the motion to adjourn, David Nakagawara seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm. The next meeting will be held on May 18, 2005 at 2 pm in the Cholla Room.