

Indiana Mechanical Code Committee Meeting Minutes
Plainfield Guilford Township Public Library
July 18, 2012

Participants:

Cecilia Ernstes-Boxell, Chairperson	cboxell@dhs.in.gov
Ron Brown, Commission Representative	brown@nfsa.org
James Asel	James_Asel@edwardreseapts.com
Steve Bartrom	sbartrom@indy.gov
Dan Bates	
J. Michael Carson	jmcarson@purdue.edu
Bill Ciriello	wjcplmbg@aol.com
Darrell Cross	dcross@noblesville.in.us
David Donahue	dcdconsultingllc@gmail.com
Kim Mann	kdm65@hotmail.com
John Shimer	jshimer@indianapropane.com
Frank Bruggner	frank.bruggner@viega.com
T.J. Burns	tj.burns@indy.gov

Summary

1. Cecilia Ernstes-Boxell opened the meeting.
2. Cecilia introduced Dan Bates, from Ft. Wayne/Allen County as a new member to the Committee.
3. Minutes:
Cecilia announced that Darrell Cross had found 2 errors in the minutes that needed to be corrected and that everyone should have received a copy of the e-mail with the corrections noted. David Donahue made the motion to accept the minutes as corrected. Ron Brown seconded the motion. Minutes were accepted by the Committee as corrected.
4. Code change proposals:
 - a. Code Change Proposal 5-2:
Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 501.1, Scope. Mike state that the language added was for clarity.
There being no further discussion, Bill Ciriello made the motion to accept the proposal as written and Mike Carson seconded the motion. Vote to accept the proposed code change was 10-0-0.

b. Code Change Proposal 5-3:

Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 502.8.1.1(4); System Requirements. The code change proposal is to delete Item (4) without substitution. Mike stated that Item (4) requires an automatic shut off and this could create a dangerous situation where fume hoods in laboratories all share one exhaust. An emergency shut off would shut off the exhaust to the entire building and depending on what is under the fume hood, the exhaust system should not be shut down, because the exhaust system is needed to exhaust the hazard.

Ron Brown asked if this requirement was in the current code. A discussion followed regarding current code requirements and it was determined that the language requiring emergency shut offs was removed from the current code.

David Donahue asked if just one room could be shut down.

Mike explained to shut down one room would require the installation of dampers and the code does not allow dampers to be installed in an exhaust system. Mike further explained that most exhaust systems are a “manifold” exhaust system.

T.J. Burns further explained the logic of not having each room on its own individual exhaust system.

Darrell Cross read the IMC commentary to the Committee and the commentary only addressed the fire hazard.

The Committee discussed whether the Fire Code amended this section and the IMC Committee did not want to create a conflict between the two codes.

David asked if it would be better to table the proposal so the Committee members could do some research.

T.J. asked if “shut offs” could be next to the fire alarm panel. Therefore, allowing the fire department to manually switch off the exhaust system when the fire department determined that the system needed to be shut off.

Darrell stated if the shut off was not located at the “room”, the fire department would have to find the breaker to turn off the exhaust system. Darrell further stated that the current code, as written, already gives authority to make the decision of where to put the shut off switch.

T.J. asked Mike if fume hoods had an off/on switch.

Mike stated no, fume hoods always on.

Dan Bates asked how would he as an inspector, know what approved location means.

Ron Brown stated that when he reads the Scope Section of 502, the Scope Section seems to require a “shutter”, which stops the movement of exhaust through air handlers. Ron stated that you would not want to shut down the entire building. It seems to him it should be two different systems.

Mike stated that Section 510 is Hazard Exhaust System and asked would the requirements of Section 502 apply to Section 510.

Cecilia stated no it would not, unless there was something in Section 510 that specifically applied to Section 502.

T.J. stated that Section 502.8 is a general requirement.

Cecilia stated that Section 502.10 does reference the reader back to Section 502.8.

Darrel stated that the Section 502, Scope, would also cover hazardous materials. Hazardous materials would have to comply with both Section 502 and Section 510.

Cecilia agreed that Section 502.10 does take the reader of the code back to the section referenced in the proposal. So the proposal would apply to this section. A lengthy discussion followed about which sections apply.

Darrell stated that from the fire department perspective, they would like to have a way to shut down the exhaust system. Current code gives flexibility to determine where the shut off can be placed. Darrell further stated that he has to be concerned for not only the university system, but the small factories and other research and development facilities as well.

T.J. stated that the code already gives the fire department and the building owner the option of where to place the switch. T.J. further stated that Section 510.4 Independent System – other types of exhaust in the same fire area can have multiple rooms on one exhaust system as long as the exhaust system is in the same fire area.

Darrell states that the switch would have to be labeled to indicate which room(s) the switch would shut down.

T.J. asked Mike if he would be ok with the proposal being amended to leave “approved location”.

Mike Carson made a motion to table the proposed code change until after lunch so he could have an opportunity to discuss the proposed code change with a colleague. Darrell Cross seconded the motion. Code Change Proposal was tabled until the afternoon by a vote of 10-0-0.

c. Code Change Proposal 5-4:

Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 506.3.11; Grease Duct Enclosures. Mike stated they added the words “fire resistance rated” and “assembly”. Without the proposed change grease ducts would be required to be wrapped as soon as they entered a “T” bar or lay-in ceiling. Mike stated that grease ducts go through the “t” bar or lay-in ceiling and the duct travels several feet to the “chase” and the “chase” is the rated assembly. Mike further stated that this proposal is a current amendment he is carrying forward.

Darrell Cross stated that this section is specific to grease hoods and the proposal is in agreement with NFPA 96 and he is ok with the proposal.

Darrell Cross made a motion to accept the proposed code change as written and the motion was seconded by Bill Ciriello and accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

d. Proposed Code Change 5-5;

Darrell Cross presented his proposed code change to Section 507.1, Exception 2; Factory-built commercial cooking re-circulating systems. Darrell stated that the proposal came about after a discussion the committee had on these systems at the June meeting. Darrell stated that the proposed code would require the room where the equipment is located to be considered a “kitchen” for code purposes. Darrell stated that the proposed code appeared to be too restrictive. If the equipment were in use in a convenience store or sandwich shop then the entire convenience store or sandwich shop would have to be considered a kitchen.

A discussion took place regarding placement of the re-circulating equipment near or under a “hood”.

Darrell explained to the Committee how the factory built “fryers” looked. He further stated that since these “fryers” are so small he does not think the entire area should be considered a kitchen.

T.J. stated that when you have a “kitchen” there are several other code requirements that require compliance and by calling the area a “kitchen” would create a greater fiscal impact.

Mike asked what the code meant by the word “space”, what is “space”.

Darrell stated, it is difficult to determine what is meant by “space” and it is not defined.

Bill Ciriello made the motion to accept the code change proposal as submitted and Dan Bates seconded the motion. The proposed code change was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0

e. Code change proposal 5-6:

Darrell Cross presented the proposed code change to Section 507.2.1, Exception; Type I Hoods. Darrell stated that the proposed code, 2012 IMC, is specific where Type I Hoods are required. The Exception to Section 507.2.1 specifically referenced “electric” cooking equipment and he did not understand why the exception applied only to “electric” equipment.

Ron Brown stated he felt that this exception might work for school home economics class rooms.

T.J. Burns stated the proposed code change seemed appropriate, if the gas appliance could meet the same requirements as electric.

Darrell Cross stated that the proposed code also takes out the “subjectivity” of the current code and the proposed code is based on the type of appliance being used.

Dave Donahue made the motion to accept the code change proposal as submitted and it was seconded by Mike Carson. The code change proposal was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

f. Code Change Proposal 5-7.

Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 510.6.3: Wall Assemblies. Mike stated that the proposed code change is currently in the code. The proposed code change addresses the horizontal run of a duct in hazards exhaust systems eliminating the requirement to be wrapped.

Cecilia asked Mike if he wanted to carry the existing amendment forward. Mike responded in the affirmative.

Ron Brown motion to motion to accept the proposed code change as submitted and Mike Carson seconded the motion. The proposed code change was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

g. Code Change Proposal 6-3:

Ron Brown presented the proposed code change on the behalf of John Hawkins, who is the proponent of the code change proposal to Section 602.1, Exception; Plenums. The proposed code change is to allow sealed combustion, fuel fired, no open flame appliances within the plenum.

Dan Bates asked how plastic piping (PVC), would be allowed the plenum. Would the PVC be in a chase since PVC intake and exhaust ducts cannot be located in the plenum. PVC piping is not have a 25/450 listing or rating for use in a plenum.

Bill Ciriello stated that if PVC is insulated in can be installed in a plenum.

Ron Brown stated it was more than likely a UL system or the Commission would not have approved variances to this section of the code.

Dan Bates stated that the appliance is UL listed, but the PVC piping is not UL listed.

David Donahue stated that as more green construction, LEED Certification happen in the construction industry and the increase in fuel efficiencies of these appliances the use of sealed combustion appliances will increase.

David and Mike both agreed that the issue of sealed combustion appliances in plenum will only increase.

Darrell Cross read the mechanical codes commentary for this section to the Committee.

Ron Brown made a motion to accept the proposed code change and Darrell Cross seconded the motion. The code change proposal was accepted by a vote of 8-2-0.

h. Code Change Proposal 6-4:

Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 607.5.4; Corridors/Smoke Barriers. Mike stated that the proposed code change is currently in the code and provides correlation between the IMC and IBC. Mike further stated that a plenum system would still be required to have smoke dampers.

Bill Ciriello made the motion to accept the code change proposal as submitted and Mike Carson seconded the motion. The code change proposal was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

i. Code Change Proposal 6-5:

Mike Carson presented the proposed code change to Section 607.5.5; Shaft Enclosures. Mike stated that the proposed code change is currently in the code and provides correlation between the IMC and IBC. Mike explained that fire dampers are activated by a fusible link, where fire and smoke damper are required to be tied into the fire alarm system. If the current amendment was not carried forward there would be a significant increase in the fiscal impact.

Dan Bates stated that a slow smoldering fire would not close a fire damper and then the fire could be in the duct.

Bill Ciriello asked if smoke detectors in the ducts would detect the smoke.

T.J. Burns stated that units over 2,000 cfm will have duct detectors.

Darrell Cross stated that this proposal is a current amendment in the current code and not accepting this would be a significant cost impact.

Bill Ciriello made the motion to accept the proposed code change as submitted and Dave Donahue seconded the motion. Then it was pointed out that Ron Brown had previously made a motion to accept the proposed code change as submitted and no one made a second. Therefore Bill and Dave both withdrew their motion and their second, then Bill Ciriello seconded Ron Brown's motion. The code change proposal was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

j. Code Change Proposal 6-6:

Mike Carson presented the code change proposal on Section 607.5.5, Exception; Shaft Enclosures. Mike stated that the proposed code change is currently in the code and provides correlation between the IMC and IBC. The proposal is to require fire damper instead of fire and smoke and to delete the 2nd item in exception and renumber the remaining items.

Darrell Cross asked if the proposal was a carry forward from an existing IBC amendment.

Mike answered in the affirmative.

Bill Ciriello made the motion to accept the code change proposal and David Donahue seconded the motion. The code change proposal was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

k. Proposed Code Change 9-1:

Darrell Cross presented the code change proposal to Section 917.4; deep fat fryers. Darrell stated that this requirement has been contained in NFPA 96 for several years, and since Indiana did not adopt NFPA 96 he felt this important requirement needed to be added to the mechanical code.

Darrell further explained that the exception allowed an alternative, if the 16 inch separation between the open flame and deep fat fryer could not be met, to keep the appliances separated.

Dan Bates asked if it was common practice to find deep fat fryer next to an open flame appliance.

Darrell stated the proposed code change is currently common practice, when commercial kitchens are installed and he did not know of any fires, where the deep fat fryer was too close to the open flame appliance.

A discussion followed on fiscal impact and it was determined by the Committee that a fiscal impact did not exist, since the proposed code change allowed for an option.

Bill Ciriello made a motion that the code change proposal be accepted and Steve Asel seconded the motion. The proposed code change was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

l. Proposed Code Change 11-1 and 11-2:

Duane Mowrey was not present to present the code change proposal.

Cecilia stated that Duane Mowrey sent an e-mail requesting that his code change proposals be tabled, if the Committee required further explanation.

Bill Ciriello made a motion to table proposed code change 11-1 and 11-2 and Darrell Cross seconded the motion. Code change proposals 11-1 and 11-2 were tabled by a vote of 10-0-0.

m. Proposed Code Change 5-3:

Mike Carson stated that based on his conversation with his fellow colleague that there is additional information from NFPA that needed to be brought to the Committee's attention. Based on the addition information needed, Mike Carson made a motion to table the proposed code change until the next meeting. Ron

Brown seconded the motion and the motion was to table the proposed code change was accepted by a vote of 10-0-0.

5. Review of Chapters 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. References and Appendix.

- a. Review of Chapter 10 of the IMC 2012 edition.
 - i. Section 1002.1; added solid fuel burning water heaters.
 - ii. Section 1003.1; added a reference to the ASME Standard for Boil and Pressure Vessel Code.
 - iii. Section 1004.1; added a reference to a UL listing.
 - iv. Section 1004.3.1; added a new table.

The Committee accepted the above changes to Chapter 10 of the 2012 IMC by consensus.

- b. Review of Chapter 11 of the IMC 2012 edition.
 - i. Section 1101.10; is a new section. A discussion followed regarding Refrigerant circuit access ports located outdoors being fitted with locking-type tamper-resistant caps or secured to prevent unauthorized access.

Cecilia verified that if the Committee took no action on the new code section it would remain in the proposed code as written.

A discussion followed regarding fiscal impact and “what is secured”.

Bill Ciriello felt that the section should be deleted and John Shimer agreed and further pointed out if the way to secure the outdoor ports is by a locking device of some type, who and where would the key be kept.

Dave Donahue stated that the section seem almost priority requiring the use of a certain product.

Darrell Cross read the commentary to the Committee for clarification and the commentary stated that by locking or “securing” the outdoor ports to refrigeration was to prevent people from “huffing” the refrigerant. The pictures in the commentary showed only pictures of a locking cap device.

Bill Ciriello made a motion to delete the section and John Shimer seconded the motion and Section 1101.10 is deleted by a vote of 10-0-0.

Cecilia stated that someone from the Committee will need to follow up with a written code change proposal form and the number assigned to the code change proposal will be 11-3.

- ii. Table 1103.1 has had 9 additional refrigerant types added.
- iii. Section 1104.2.2, item 6 revised; add language to except Ammonia type of Refrigerant.
- iv Section 1105.6 was revised. Mike Carson stated the new language has simplified the section.

- v. Section 1105.6.3 is a new. Ammonia has been relocated to its own section.
- vi. Section 1106.4 was revised.
- vii. Section 1106.5 was revised.
- viii. Section 1106.5.1 the exception was deleted.
- vix. Section 1107.2 is a new section and is consistent with ASHRE. These are not new requirements.
- x. Section 1107.3 – 1107.8.3 are only section number changes.

The Committee accepted the above changes to Chapter 11 of the 2012 IMC by consensus, with the exception of Section 1101.10, which has been deleted by proposed code change 11-3.

- c. Review of Chapter 12 of the IMC 2012 edition.
 - i. Section 1201.2 was revised by adding the word components.
 - ii. Section 1201.3 allows the option of compliance with ASME B31.9.
 - iii. Table 1202.4 is a new table.
 - iv Table 1202.5 is a new table.
 - v. Section 1203.1.1 was revised.
 - vi. Section 1203.3.4 added the exceptions.
 - vii. Section 1203.8.2 is a new section.
 - viii. Section 1203.8.3 is a new section for press joints; specifically for cooper.
 - vix Section 1203.15.1 the standards were revised.
 - x Section 1203.15.3 was revised by the addition of standards.
 - xi. Section 1203.16 new section for Polyproplene (PP) Pipe.
 - xii. Section 1203.17 new section for Raised Temperature Polyethylene (PE-RT) plastic tubing.
 - xiii. Section 1203.18 new section for Polyethylene/aluminum/polyethylene (PE-AL-PE) pressure pipe.
 - xiv. Section 1203.19 new section for Cross-linked polyethylene/aluminum/cross-linked polyethylene (PEX-AL-PEX) pressure pipe.
 - xvi. Section 1203.19.1 new section for PEX-AL-Pex compression fittings.
 - xvii. Section 1203.19.2 new for PEX-AL-PEX to metal connections.
 - xviii Section 1206.1.1 in the current 2008 Indiana Mechanical Code has been deleted and does not appear in the proposed code 2012 IMC.
 - ixx Section 1206.2 added a new exception.
 - xx. Section 1209.5 is a new Section.

Darrell Cross asked if anyone had experience with 1209's subject matter of "embedded piping".

Bill Ciriello stated yes, and that most installations already put down a "blanket" to separate the piping from the earth.

James Asel asked if the requirements listed in 1209 comply with the Indiana Energy Code.

Bill stated that the piping has to be installed per the manufacturers' installation instructions.

John Shimer stated he did not see a problem with the section.

Darrell asked if fiscal impact added too to the bottom line, could the Committee go back and delete this section.

Shelly answered the question regarding fiscal impact. Shelly explained that yes, if the fiscal impact appears too great, the Committee can make modifications and she used the Plumbing Code Committee as examples.

The Committee accepted the above changes to Chapter 12 of the 2012 IMC by consensus.

- d. Review of Chapter 13 of the IMC 2012 edition.
 - i. Section 1306.4 is revised.
 - ii. Section 1307.1 is revised.

The Committee accepted the above changes to Chapter 13 of the 2012 IMC by consensus.

- e. Review of Chapter 14 of the IMC 2012 edition.

There were no changes in Chapter 14.

- 5(a). Answer to questions from previous meeting.
 - i. Cecilia stated that solar pool covers were not a conflict.
 - ii. Cecilia provided information to the question raised in Section 1003.3, Indiana amendment language "approved nationally", does the word "nationally" need to remain. Cecilia stated she had a discussion with Mara Snyder and the word "nationally" needs to remain.

- 6. Discussion of 675 IAC amendments to Chapter 5 and 6.

Chapter 5

- (a) 501.1 – Mike Carson's proposed code change addressed this time.
- (b) 501.2.1 in the 2012 IMC this section number was changed to 501.3.1. The question was asked if item #3 in the amendments needed to be retained. The item numbers between the 2006 and 2012 IMC editions have changed, item 4 has become item 5 in the 2012 edition.

Cecilia suggested that the committee look at the amendment as they are written.

Mike Carson suggests that (b) 501.2.1.1 be deleted. T. J Burns and Darrell Cross agreed.

By consensus the committee agreed not to carry 501.2.1.1 forward.

(c) 502.8.3 John Shimer stated Section numbers changed.

(d) 504.6.5 was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee, by consensus, agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(e) 505.1 a portion of the Indiana Amendment was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The exception was not incorporated into the 2012 IMC. It was the consensus of the Committee to delete this amendment, including the exception. The Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(f) 505.2 a portion of the Indiana Amendment was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The exception was not incorporated into the 2012 IMC. It was the consensus of the Committee to delete this amendment, including the exception. The Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(g) 506.3.1.1 was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee agreed, by consensus, that the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(h) 506.3.1.3 Mike Carson asked previous committee member if they could remember the reasoning behind the amendment.

T.J. Burns asked if they were afraid the flames would go up the duct.

Darrell Cross stated he has not seen flames go up the duct.

The Committee, by consensus, agreed to delete the Indiana amendment. The Indiana amendment and not carried it forward.

By deleting this amendment the Committee felt they may have created a cost savings.

(i) 506.3.6 the exception was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee, by consensus, agreed that the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(j) 506.3.8 a portion of the Indiana amendment has been incorporated into 2012 IMC. Item 6 was not incorporated in the 2012 IMC.

Dan Bates asked if anyone could remember why the pervious committee would have lowered the gasket rating.

Mike Carson stated the only words that are different between the amendment and the 2012 IMC are “and grease tight”.

The Committee, by consensus, agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(k) 506.3.9 a portion of the Indiana amendment has been incorporated into 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(l) 506.3.10 was incorporated into the 2012 edition of the IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(m) 506.3.10.1 a portion of the Indiana amendment has been incorporated in 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(n) 506.3.10.2 was incorporated in the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(o) 506.3.10.3 was incorporated in the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(p) 506.3.10.4 was incorporated in the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(q) 506.3.12.3 a portion of the Indiana amendment was incorporated into 2012 IMC. The section number changed between the 2006 IMC and the 2012 IMC. The last sentence of the Indiana amendment was not incorporated into the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(r) 507.2 Darrell Cross stated he preferred the language in the model code. He felt that the current Section 507 was too subjective as to what produces grease. The model code text in the 2012 IMC now specifies where Type I hoods are required. It takes the subjectively out of out of the code.

Dan Bates stated that the Committee needed to consider the fiscal impact. Dan used an example of kitchens in the church.

Darrell Cross stated the only difference in the current Table and the model code is in church, day cares and those facilities that are frying foods less than once a week. Darrell further stated that the commentary had several good comments on the section. The commentary also speaks to the intent of what the equipment is being used for. Section 507.2 will require a Type I hood over all commercial cooking appliances. Darrell felt that the model code text gives lee-way when a Type I hood would not be required.

John Shimer asked the members of the Committee if the table in the current code provide more or less protection then the 2012 IMC model text.

Darrell stated he believes that the model code and the current table are equivalent.

John further asked if the current table and model text in the 2012 co-exist. Darrell stated no.

T.J. Burns stated he has accepted documentation from churches stating they are not “frying” foods to eliminate the Type I hood. T.J. also stated he did not believe there would be a fiscal impact.

Darrell stated the model is crystal clear on when a Type I hood is required and he understands the model code.

Steve Bartrom and Darrell both stated that the current table adds confusion when attempting to make a determination when a Type I hood is required.

Based on the discussion the Committee, by consensus agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(s) Table 502.7 based on the discussion of Section 507.2, the Indiana amendment of Table 502.7 will not be carried forward.

(t) 507.2.1, by consensus, the Committee agreed not to carry the Indiana amendment forward.

Before the Committee moved on to Indiana amendments (u) and (v) a discussion was held regarding “commercial cooking” and “type of duty cooking”

Dan Bates stated that commercial cooking was defined as “in commerce”. Dan asked how Residential ranges would be viewed, as what “type of duty” cooking would be done on the appliance.

Darrell Cross stated it is how the appliance is being used. Type 1 hood would not be required for light duty cooking.

(u) 507.2.2, exception 4 was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(v) 507.2., exception 5 was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. By consensus, the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(w) 507.2.3 the current Indiana amendment deletes this section. The Committee, by consensus agreed to not carry the Indiana amendment forward.

(x) 507.11 the 2012 IMC model text added a reference to UL 1046. The Committee agreed, by consensus, that if the new referenced UL listing is for the mesh filters and the listing states they can be used the Committee would be ok with the model code. If the UL listing is not for mesh filter, then the Indiana amendment should be carried forward.

(y) 508.1 the Indiana amendment was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee agreed, by consensus, the Indiana amendment would not be carried forward.

(z) 508.2 the Indiana amendment was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee, agreed by consensus, the Indiana amendment would not be carried forward.

(aa) 509, the Committee agreed, by consensus, the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(bb) 510.4 the Indiana amendment was incorporated into the 2012 IMC. The Committee agreed, by consensus, the Indiana amendment will not be carried forward.

(cc) 501.6.3 a portion of the Indiana amendment was incorporated into 2012 IMC and a previous code change proposal satisfied the remainder of the current

amendment. By consensus the Committee agreed that the current Indiana amendment as written will not be carried forward.

Chapter 6

Current Indiana amendments (dd) and (ee) have been satisfied by previously accepted code change proposals and the current Indiana amendments will not be carried forward.

7. Discussion of next meeting and date.

Cecilia stated there were three (3) tabled code change proposals that will be discussed at the next meeting. She further stated she was hopeful that she would be able to get a draft proposed rule to the Committee, for their review at the next meeting.

Cecilia stated that they should also start the fuel gas code at the next meeting.

The next meeting will be August 15th at the Plainfield Gilford Public Library, in Plainfield at 9:10 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.,