

Indiana Fire Code Committee Meeting Minutes
Wayne Township
June 21, 2012

Participants:

John Haines, Chairperson	jhaines@dhs.in.gov
T.J. Burns	tj.burns@indy.gov
Tim Callas	tcallas@jtconsult.us
Tim Clapp	clappt@bloomington.in.gov
Jeff Dean	jdean@indygov.org
Randy Gulley	randy.gulley@waynefire.org
Monti Harris	msharris@oes-corp.com
Mark Herron	herronm@fishers.in.us
Carlie Hopper	carlie@buildingindiana.org
John Houchin	john_houchin@edwardroseapts.com
Rodney Johnson	johnsonr@greenwood.in.gov
David Kish	dkish@purdue.edu
Dave Kelly	dnkelly99@koorsen.com
Mel Lane	mellane@iu.edu
Robert Miller	rmiller2@dhs.in.gov
Jim Murua	jim.murua@ci.ft-wayne.in.us
Tim Puls	puls@lilly.com
John Shimer	jshimer@ipca.org
Shelly Wakefield	rwakefield@dhs.in.gov

Summary

1. John Haines opened the meeting and asked everyone to signed-in. John asked everyone to include their e-mail address.
2. It was announced that Adam Holman has left the City of Indianapolis, and Jeff Dean will replace Adam on the Committee
3. Minutes:
Rodney Johnson made motion to accept the minutes. Jeff Dean seconded the motion. Motion carried.
4. July Meeting Announcement:
John Haines advised the Committee that the next meeting will be a combined meeting with the Building Code Committee on July 17, 2012. The meeting will be held at the

Sterrett Center, 8950 Otis Avenue, Lawrence, Indiana on the former Fort Benjamin-Harrison Post at 9:30 a.m. The agenda is Chapters 9 and 10 as well as other topic that overlaps between the two codes.

5. Discussion on Fire Code and Building Code:

a. David Kish asked for a clarification on how the building code and fire code work together. John Haines explained that the building code was for construction and stayed with the building until occupancy changed or when an addition or renovation was made to the building.

T.J. Burns explained the history between Western Fire Chief Association and the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) and how the two groups developed the first Uniform Fire Code. T.J. further explained that a consensus between the two Associations put combustible high-pile storage and a few other construction items in the fire code. In addition, T.J. explained that the Uniform Fire Code as well as the International Fire Code, includes one and two family dwellings, but through our Indiana Amendments, the Commission removes that scope. A discussion took place on how Class 2 structures are outside the scope of the Fire Code. T.J. further explained that in the global universe of code adoption, the “codes” were originally developed to be adopted by local jurisdictions, not States. T.J. gave an example of Ohio who has combined building code and fire code into one code.

b. Jeff Dean asked about items in the Fire Code that relate to building issues such as Chapters 23 and 34 that govern construction. He also stated that when a building is built both the Building Code and the Fire Code need to be referenced.

c. John Haines stated duplicate subject matters in the Fire Code and the Building Code are deleted in the appropriate code so conflicts are not created.

5. New proposed code changes:

a. PCC #1:

Robert Miller presented his proposed code change to Section 202, Definitions. The code change proposal is to add a new definition for Concession Stands. Rob stated that this definition will help with Section 316, carnivals and fairs (IN Amendment). Section 316 refers to concession stand(s), but there is not a definition of what is a concession stand.

Mel Lane asked if the proposed code change addresses permanent or temporary concession stands. Mel suggested that the words permanent or temporary be added.

Rob stated he felt if the concession stand had wheels it was not regulated by Section 316.

John Haines stated yes, Section 316 was applicable to all concession stands as was the requirement for a hood.

T.J. Burns asked if the concession stand were on wheels and it is brought onto a ball field then the concession stand cannot be regulated. A discussion followed on wheeled “vehicles” and trailers.

Motion made by Jeff Dean to accept the proposed code change. Mark Herron seconded the motion. Motion carried.

b. PCC #2

Matt Mitchell is the proponent of the proposed code change to delete the text of Section 311.2.1, Security and substitute revised language.

Jeff Dean stated by what he reads, he thinks Matt is trying to mirror something Indianapolis has about securing buildings in a local ordinance.

David Kish stated that the word placard should not be struck from the proposed code change.

The Committee agreed to delay taking action on the code change proposal, until Commissioner Mitchell could be present to explain his reasoning for the code change. Mark Herron made the motion to table proposed code. The motion was seconded by Rodney Johnson. Motion carried.

c. PCC #3

Matt Mitchell is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 311.2.2, Fire Protection.

Rodney Johnson made a motion to table proposed code change for the same reason as in PCC #2. Motion was seconded by Mark Herron. Motion carried.

d. PCC #4

Matt Mitchell is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 311.5, Placards.

David Kish made a motion to table the proposed code change for the same reason as in PCC #2. Motion was seconded by Rodney Johnson. Motion carried.

e. PCC #5

Matt Mitchell is the proponent of the proposed code change to Sections 311.5.1 through 311.5.5, Placards.

Rodney Johnson made a motion to table the proposed code change for the same reason as in PCC #2. Motion was seconded by T.J. Burns. Motion carried.

f. PCC #6

Matt Mitchell is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 314.2, Indoor Displays; Fixtures and displays.

Rodney Johnson made a motion to table the proposed code change for the same reason as in PCC #2. Motion was seconded by Mel Lane. Motion carried.

g. PCC #7

Robert Miller presented his code change proposal to Section 403.1, Fire Watch Personnel (Indiana Amendment).

Rob explained his reason statement and rationale for the proposed code change. Large buildings required to post a fire watch currently incur an excessive monetary expense based on our current amendment for the number of personnel required for a fire watch. Examples were given for such venues at Bankers Life and Lucas Oil.

Jeff Dean asked if a fire watch is required for all Colt's games. Rob responded by stating that events that use pyrotechnics are required to have a fire watch. Rob further stated that it has to be something of a unique nature to the event to require a fire watch.

Randy Gully gave an example of where the current amendment is deficient in the number of personnel required to perform a fire watch. The example was an office building with 120 people, which would require one person, but the building is 6 stories. In this scenario one person is inadequate because of the 6 stories.

Everyone agreed that the language was flawed and needed to be fixed. It was suggested by Tim Callas that a table be developed and inserted.

Tim Clapp agreed with the proposed code change and stated that large assembly areas may not need as many people to perform a fire watch, when a smaller event may need a larger number of people to perform a fire watch.

Mel Lane made a motion to accept the code change proposal as written. David Kish seconded the motion.

A discussion followed on how would the number of people required for a fire watch be determined. How do you qualify how many people need to be there. The Committee determined that it would be discretionary, based on the hazard, e.g. Kenny Chesney with charcoal grills and motor coaches; grills located near the stage for circus performers, etc.

Motion carried.

h. PCC #8

Robert Miller is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 403.2.1, Qualified Person (Indiana Amendment).

Rob explained that he would like to add language that would allow a person who held a Fire Inspector I or II Certification be allowed to do a Fire Watch, as well as a person certified under IC 36-8-10.5.

A discussion followed on what is “a qualified person” as defined by IC 36-8-10.5 versus a Certified Fire Inspector I or II and what the responsibility was of the “qualified person” performing the fire watch. The Minimum requirements from IC 36-8-10.5 were read for the committee. Both Jim Murua and Randy Gully agreed that a “minimally qualified person”, for a fire watch was a person who had completed the 12 hour mandatory training.

Jim Murua further stated that Ft. Wayne Fire Department does a 12 hour class for security personnel at the Ft. Wayne Coliseum, so they can assist the Ft. Wayne Fire Department with a fire watch.

Randy Gully stated a fire watch does not mean you are going to fight the fire, it means you look for fires, call the fire department and direct the responding personnel to the fire.

David Kish made motion to table the proposed code change, so additional information could be brought back to the committee. Jeff dean seconded the motion. Proposed code change was tabled by a vote of 6 to 4.

i. PCC #9:

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 404.3, Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans; Contents.

Tim explained that the proposed code change was to provide an exception to the content requirement in the Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans. The requirement for Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans for group “B” occupancies with an occupant load of 500 or more first appeared in the 2006 model code (2008 Indiana Fire Code). The 2009 International Fire Code, which Indiana did not adopt; the requirement for Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans for group “F” occupancies with an occupant load of 500 or more became a requirement. The addition of an exception for very large companies is to allow the elimination of some of the required contents for a Fire Safety and Evacuation Plan, with the approval of the Local Fire Official. The addition of the exception would eliminate the need for a variance and could be a cost savings to very large companies.

David Kish asked if the proposal would apply to the evacuation plan or life safety plan. Tim Puls stated the proposal is applicable to both plans. Since the evacuation plans and the life safety plans would not contain the same information on one drawing.

Jim Murua stated that “plans” can be different for employees, versus what is given to the fire department.

Tim Puls gave a brief overview of Lilly’s compliance program. Tim Puls stated that other very large companies may not have the same strict compliance program as Lilly and that may be the reason this section has not been an issue.

Tim Puls withdrew the proposed code change for additional research and possibly bring back a revised code change proposal.

j. PCC #10:

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section Sec 404.4, Maintenance of Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans.

Tim Puls explained based on the reading of the code, a company may be continually updating their fire safety and evacuation plans. One component that requires a revision is a change in staff assignment. A discussion followed on what is a change in staff assignment.

Jim Murua stated that if the person happens to be the emergency contact person for the company and they are re-assigned, it is very important to have that information up dated.

Jeff Dean stated that the code appears to be written fairly loosely already.

Tim Puls suggested an amendment to the proposal to leave the model text as written, but delete the word “annually or”.

David Kish stated that the word “annually” is the trigger to re-evaluate the plans and make the necessary changes, if there are any.

Tim Puls withdrew proposed code change #10.

k. PCC #11

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section Sec 404.5.1 Fire Safety and Evacuation Plans; Distribution.

Tim stated this is a new requirement in the 2012 model code. Tim’s reason statement for the proposed code change states that additional expense will be incurred by reproducing and distributing new copies of fire safety and evacuation plans several times a month or year.

Members of the committee agreed that the text in the code did not dedicate how the information was distributed. The Committee members agreed that “posting” the plans was allowed. The Committee agreed that the text of the code did not require that each employee be physically handed a copy every time the plan changed.

Tim Clapp stated if the section was deleted, then no one would see evacuation plans.

Based on the discussion Tim Puls suggested a revision to the proposed code change, keep the model text and insert the words “shall be posted or distributed..”.

Mel Lane made a motion of accept the proposed code change as modified, by keeping the model text and inserting the words “or posted” after the word “distributed”.

Rodney Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

l. PCC #12:

David Kelly is the proponent of the proposed code change to Sec 303.5, Asphalt Kettles; Fire extinguishers.

Dave explained that the proposal is for clarification only, because Table 906.1 references the reader back to Section 303.5.

Mark Herron made the motion to accept proposed code change. Mel Lane seconded the motion. Motion carried.

m. PCC #13:

Matt Mitchell is the proponent for the proposed code change to Section 407.1 Hazard Communications requirements.

Rodney Johnson made a motion to table for the same reason as PCC #2 and Jeff Dean seconded the motion. Motion carried.

n. PCC #14:

Matt Mitchell is the proponent for the proposed code change to Sections 407.2, 407.3, 407.4, 407.5, 407.6, and 407.7.

Jeff Dean made a motion to table for the same reason as PCC #2 and Rodney Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried

o. PCC #15:

Matt Mitchell is the proponent for the proposed code change to Section 408.9.5 Emergency Duties.

T.J. Burns made a motion to table for the same reason as PCC #2 and David Kish seconded the motion. Motion carried.

p. PCC #16:

Randy Gully is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 503.2.8, Fire Apparatus Access Roads; Angles of approach and departure. The proposal rewrites the current Indiana Amendment for fire access roads into this section. Randy stated that “round-a-bouts” are becoming widely used throughout the State and they are being constructed too tight for fire trucks to make the turns.

Discussion followed on if the State or INDOT had requirements for “round-a-bouts”. Carmel and other cities have had problems getting trucks around the curve.

Rodney John made a motion to accept the proposed code change and T.J. Burns seconds the motion. Motion carried.

q. PCC #17:

Randy Gully is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 503.4.1 Traffic calming devices.

The committee discussed “speed-bumps” and not enough ground clearance for emergency vehicles to drive over the top of “speed-bumps” and this causes damage to the undercarriage of the vehicle. The Committee agreed that the “speed-bumps”

design needs to consider not only the responding fire department but the vehicles of the fire departments that provide mutual aid.

The Committee agreed by consensus that the word “for” be deleted and insert “to”.

Motion made by Mel Lane to accept the modified proposed code change. Motion seconded by T.J. Burns. Motion carried.

r. PCC #18:

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 505.1, Premises Identification, Address identification.

Jeff Dean stated that the Building Code Committee also had a proposed code change to this section. Jeff thought it best that the Committee table the proposal until the July 17th combined meeting to be discussed. Jeff Dean stated that the Building Code Committee didn't like the word “existing” in the building code. A discussion followed on which code should take precedents in identifying a building.

Jim Murua stated this is an identifier of the building, not necessarily the address.

Randy Gully suggested that Tim Puls revise the proposal to include wording for facilities that have 24 hours security personnel in attendance. A discussion followed on the pros and cons on 24 hour security personnel and the proposed code change. Tim Puls is going to revise the proposed code change and bring it back.

A motion was made by David Kish to table the proposed code change and Rodney Johnson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

s. PCC #19

Tim Puls is the proponent for Section 605.1, Electrical Equipment, Wiring and Hazards; Abatement of electrical hazards.

Tim Puls presented his proposal and agrees with the first sentence of the section, but did not understand the intent or reason for the second sentence in the section.

The Committee discussed the text of the second sentence and it was determined that the language was in the code for local jurisdictions for the First Responder to notify someone of code violations.

Jeff Dean made a motion to accept the proposed code change and Mark Herron seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 8 to 2.

t. PCC #20:

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change. The correct code section is 901.6.2 not 906.6.2, as written on the submitted proposed code change form. Section 901.6.2, Fire Protection; Records.

A discussion followed on several different scenarios of where reports should be kept. The language in the Fire Code Commentary was read for clarification and the Committee agreed the Commentary was addressing maintenance issues, not inspection issues.

Jim Murua suggested that the language “and or made readily available...” be added to the proposed code change.

Tim Puls agreed to the language change and stated that “where approved by the code officials” is to be deleted.

T.J. Burns made the motion to accept the revised code change proposal. The motion was seconded by Mark Herron. Motion carried,

u. PCC #21

Tim Puls is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 907.4.1, Fire Alarms and Detection Systems; Protection of fire alarm control units.

Tim Puls stated the proposed code change is to eliminate unnecessary smoke detection devices. The 2009 Fire Code eliminated smoke detection at the “NAC-panels” and the 2012 Fire Code has added the requirement back in for smoke detection at “NAC-panels”. NAC (Notification Appliance Circuit).

The Committee had a discussion that maybe NFPA 72-2010 should be consulted. Tim Puls suggested that the proposed code change be tabled to allow for more research and to consult with Lilly’s fire alarm people.

David Kish made motion to table the proposed code change and Mel Lane seconded the motion. The motion carried.

v. PCC #22

Mel Lane is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 905.4 (1), Standpipe System; Location of Class I standpipe hose connections.

Mel explained based his own research, fire fighters prefer to connect the fire hose to the standpipe on the floor level below the fire.

John Haines stated by connecting the hose to the floor below, it decreases the amount of hose length.

Tim Callas stated that intermediate landings allow for a safer “staging” area for equipment and hooking up the hose line and usually keeps the responding personnel from interfering with people evacuating, for example the opening and closing of the exit door.

Rodney Johnson made a motion to table the proposed code change to allow for more research. David Kish seconded the motion. Motion carried.

w. PCC #23

Mel Lane is the proponent of the proposed code change to Section 1103.5, Fire Safety Requirements for Existing Building; Sprinkler system.

Jeff Dean noted that Chapter 11 seemed to contain several requirements that are retroactive. Jeff suggested that before the Committee considers the proposed code change it would be helpful to know what changes staff anticipates making to Chapter 11.

Mel explained that the proposed code change is for buildings that are going to be sprinklered and is based on language contained in Chapter 10, Means of Egress, where occupants cannot exit from a protected area to an unprotected area.

Jeff Dean raised the question that the proposed code change will result in a fiscal impact by requiring the extension of a sprinkler system to areas that may not be in the area where sprinklers are proposed. He also asked how the code of record would be applied.

Mel stated the proposal is for the sprinkler system to be continuous to the exit for that floor or area where construction is performed. This is not a requirement to make people install a sprinkler system, but if they chose to partially sprinkler the building then they would have to sprinkler the means of egress to the exit.

David Kish made a motion to not accept the proposed code change and the motion was seconded by Jeff Dean. The motion, to not accept the proposed code change, carried by a vote of 9 to 1.

6. Discussion on Section 510.1 Radio Communication.

A brief discussion was held concerning Section 510.1, Radio Communication and the possibility of two different radio systems in one building or on a large complex of buildings for large companies.

John Haines stated that everyone should in compliance since everything went to 800 Megahertz. John also stated the section in question is not retroactive.

7. Chapter 11

John Haines stated that Chapter 11, with the exception of Section 1104 may be deleted based on his initial review. Chapter 11 appears to be in conflict with the General Administrative Rules.

8. Fiscal Impact

Shelly had a brief discussion on Fiscal Impact Analysis. She advised the Committee members that fiscal impacts are not always cost increases, but are also a cost savings. She also asked that when information on cost is given on the proposed code change forms could the proponent provide private information on where the cost figures were obtained. She also reminded Committee members that if the code section is new and it applies to “everyone” there would be a fiscal impact. If the code section is an option and not a required for everyone, there would be no fiscal impact.