OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PROGRAM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES BOARD/UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM
2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 2F
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107
MAY 26, 2015 - 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Greg Armstrong, Anthony Blatt (arrived at 1:38 p.m.), Terrance Hellman, Mitchell Hort, Paula Laney-Cowart, Eric Pollard, Tom Sewell, Adam Shupe, and Cary Williamson

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Craiton Cooper, Dave Evans, and Robert Lassiter (arrived at 1:58 p.m.)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Ross Barrick, Joe McKenzie, and Jeremy Moore

OTHERS PRESENT:
Kathy Hehnly (Staff - OUBCC)

CALL TO ORDER:
Mr. Mitchell Hort called the meeting of the Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee to order at 1:32 p.m. in the Construction Industries Board/Uniform Building Code Commission Board Room at Shepherd Mall, 2401 NW 23rd St., Suite 2F, Oklahoma City, OK 73107.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the April 27, 2015 meeting minutes
Mr. Hort noted the first item was approval of the minutes.

MR. ADAM SHUPE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. GREG ARMSTRONG TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS SUBMITTED

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Eric Pollard
	Terrance Hellman	Tom Sewell
	Mitchell Hort	Adam Shupe
	Paula Laney-Cowart	Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Ross Barrick	Joe McKenzie

	Anthony Blatt	Jeremy Moore
ABSTAIN:	None	

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #1, on Section 2308.3.1 Location on Property, on page 237 of the 2015 Edition of the International Fire Code® (IFC®, 2015) and Section 413.3.1 Location on Property, on page 83 in the 2015 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code® (IFGC®, 2015)

Mr. Hort asked if the committee had sufficient time to review the form and if Ms. Laney-Cowart would like to address her submission. Ms. Laney-Cowart stated the comment form was submitted as a follow-up from the discussion held at the April 27, 2015 meeting. She noted the form language provided a more clearly defined term for a "main" railway track. Mr. Pollard asked if the definition was from BNSF. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted it was from Allen Railroad, but she looked up several others that were similar. Ms. Hehnly asked for clarification on where the change should be located, in the definition section for each code or in the sections listed on the comment form. Ms. Laney-Cowart recommended the definition section for each code. Mr. Hellman asked if there was a way to discern what tracks were operated by a time table/ train order or both verses which did not fall into the operating guidelines. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted not by looking at the railroad track. Mr. Shupe asked if the change applied to the main tracks where power for train propulsion was provided by an outside electrical source. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted there was not.

MR. TERRANCE HELLMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CARY WILLIAMSON TO APPROVE PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AFPTC #1

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Eric Pollard
	Terrance Hellman	Tom Sewell
	Mitchell Hort	Adam Shupe
	Paula Laney-Cowart	Cary Williamson
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Ross Barrick	Jeremy Moore
	Joe McKenzie	
ABSTAIN:	Anthony Blatt	

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #2, on Section 2308.1.2.6 Signage, on page 238 in the 2015 Edition of the International Fire Code® (IFC® 2015) and Section 413.9.2.6 Signage, on page 84 of the 2015 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code® (IFGC® , 2015)

Mr. Hort stated he submitted the public comment form to address the questions everyone had regarding signage. He reviewed the modifications he proposed, noting the requirements proposed contained language from NFPA 52®. He noted he felt the reference to Section 310 should be kept in the requirement. Mr. Sewell noted there was a requirement for the cylinders in section 1-

d that included a mileage recommendation. He added there was one for 36-months as well. The committee discussed the verbiage from NFPA 52® and the 36-month requirement and determined the 36-month requirement came from the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards, CFR-49®. The committee consensus was to add the 36-month requirement to the language proposed. They noted the intent of the signage was to provide education as there was no way to enforce the requirement at the pump. Mr. Sewell noted at his facilities, they added language that allowed them to inspect the equipment, or the user could choose not to use the facility.

The committee discussed the language for item number three (3) in the proposed language: "The location of signs shall be determined by local conditions." Mr. Hort noted the committee had previously discussed the issue and the concern was due to columns and other items that could be around the site. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted in NFPA-58® the language indicated the signage should be visible to the public or emergency responders from any entrance to the site. She suggested language "visible to the public or emergency vehicles." Mr. Sewell asked if it should be "visible from approach" and "from point of transfer?" Ms. Laney-Cowart agreed with that language. There was further discussion on other signage requirements from other source NFPA 704®. Mr. Hort asked if the language should be "the location of the signage shall be determined by the authority having jurisdiction." He noted that way the whole site could be taken into consideration and locations and additional signage could be determined per site needs. The committee discussed in areas where there was no local jurisdiction, that the Oklahoma Department of Labor (ODOL) would have the jurisdiction and asked Mr. Hellman for input. Mr. Hellman noted he would prefer more clarity and uniformity across the board, with clear location requirements put in place. He added the ODOL could then exempt from those requirements as needed. Mr. Hellman suggested taking the wording in number three (3) out completely as number four (4) required the signs to be visible from each point of transfer and would catch all the items the signage was intended to do.

MS. PAULA LANEY-COWART MADE A MOTION TO REMOVE THE LANGUAGE IN NUMBER THREE IN THE RECOMMENDED PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AFPTC #2

The committee discussed if the same change needed to be made to NFPA 52®. The committee determined they were only looking at the IFC® and IFGC®. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted the modification to the IFC® was to give the Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ's) such as fire marshals a universal umbrella. She added fire marshals had to go by the IFC®. She noted NFPA 52® was a standard and codes supersede standards. Mr. Evans noted there was legislation passed that adopted NFPA 52® as law and that the documents would be in conflict with each other. There was further discussion on the issue. Mr. Hort noted there was a motion on the floor to remove item number three (3) and asked if there was a second or if the motion should be amended. There was further discussion on the comment form over what the language should be and other signage requirements in NFPA 52®, such as: Sections 7.4.3.11.1 and 7.4.3.11.2, on page 52-20, and requirements in Section 310 on page 53 and Section 2303.2 on page 229 of the IFC®. During the discussion the committee determined that a motor fuel dispensing facility was not limited to gasoline fuel but was any fuel that powered an engine on a vehicle and the requirements would apply. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted there was another labeling requirement in Section 2304.3.4 on page 230 of the IFC®. Mr. Hort noted the way he took the discussion in April; the signage was specific to the dispensing points, not for emergency stop. The committee

then discussed where the signage requirements should be located within the IFC®. The committee consensus was to include the language within Section 2308.

MS. PAULA-LANEY COWART WITHDREW HER MOTION TO REMOVE NUMBER THREE

MR. ADAM SHUPE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. GREG ARMSTRONG TO APPROVE PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AFPTC #2 AS MODIFIED BY EDITING THE LANGUAGE "APPROVED NO SMOKING SIGNS COMPLYING WITH SECTION 310 SHALL BE POSTED AS FOLLOWS" TO MATCH THE LANGUAGE OF THE FIRST PARAGRAPH IN SECTION 2305.6 WHICH READS "WARNING SIGNS SHALL BE CONSPICUOUSLY POSTED WITHIN SIGHT OF EACH DISPENSER IN THE FUEL-DISPENSING AREA AND SHALL STATE THE FOLLOWING", REVISE LINE ITEM 1-A TO SAY: "NO SMOKING" AND LINE ITEM 1-B TO SAY "SHUT OFF MOTOR" TO MATCH SECTION 2305.6, IN SECTION D ADD THE LANGUAGE "OR 3600 MILES" AFTER THE LANGUAGE "NOT EXCEEDING THREE YEARS" AND BEFORE THE LANGUAGE "TO ENSURE...", STRIKING LINE ITEM THREE, RENUMBER LINE ITEMS FOUR AND FIVE TO THREE AND FOUR AND ADDING THE LANGUAGE FROM THE FORM IN A NEW SECTION, 2308.3.2.

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Eric Pollard
	Anthony Blatt	Tom Sewell
	Terrance Hellman	Adam Shupe
	Mitchell Hort	Cary Williamson
	Paula Laney-Cowart	
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Ross Barrick	Jeremy Moore
	Joe McKenzie	
ABSTAIN:	None	

<u>Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #3 on Chapter Two, Definitions and Chapter Fifty, Sections 5001.3, 5001.3.1, 5001.3.2, and 5001.3.3 of the 2015 Edition of the International Fire Code (IFC®, 2015) compared to Chapter One, Sections 1.4, 1.4.1.1, 1.4.1.1.2, 1.4.2, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.4.1, and 1.4.5 and Chapter Three Definitions of NFPA 52, Vehicular Gaseous Fuel Systems Code®</u>

Mr. Evans stated as a result of the April meeting, he was requested to define the terms "certified, labeled, listed and tested." He noted "certified, labeled and listed" were all defined by NFPA 52® and the IFC®. He added "tested" was not. He noted the definitions (for "labeled and listed" in NFPA 52® and IFC®), were almost identical and meant the same thing. He added the biggest difference was the term "jurisdiction" in the NFPA 52® language that was not specifically stated in the IFC® definitions for "listed and labeled." He noted he had provided a recommendation for the term "tested". He reviewed his suggested change and asked Mr. Sewell if he had any insight.

The committee discussed the boiler code requirements for testing the relief valves, the ASME code requirements for testing every three years and certified every five years, and ODOL test requirements when the facility was inspected.

Mr. Hort asked if there were any recommendations. Mr. Evans noted in item D, the recommendation was the "tested" verbiage provided. He noted the remainder of the comment form was on a discussion on the alternative provisions comparison between the requirements in NFPA 52® and the IFC®. He noted his recommendation was to go with the language in the IFC as it covered all the bases more so than NFPA 52®. He added NFPA 52® gave a minimum standard but was not as inclusive the IFC® requirements.

Mr. Evans noted the definition for "tested" he proposed was broad so that procedures could be developed but would not restrict other areas of the code. The committee discussed the definition further. At the end of the discussion Mr. Evans withdrew public comment form AFPTC #3 from consideration and no further action was taken. Mr. Hellman volunteered to work on the definition further and bring another public comment forward for consideration.

Discussion and possible action on any issues found in the comparison of the 2014 Edition of the National Electrical Code® (NEC®, 2014) and the 2015 Editions of the International Fire Code® (IFC®, 2015) and International Fuel Gas Code (IFGC®, 2015)

Mr. Hort noted item E could be included with item F to be the assignment for review for the next meeting. Mr. Sewell noted the committee had discussed signs but he was still unclear on where Emergency Stop Device (ESD) signs needed to be for a multi-product station. Mr. Lassiter noted the committee should back up a bit before talking about signs. He stated the comment form from the last meeting assigned to the ODOL was not submitted on the ESD locations, intentionally. He noted as the ODOL staff reviewed the notes from the April 27th meeting, they could not get past the need for a definition of a "dispensing area." He added without one, all of the requirements could not be addressed. He noted ODOL had filled out a public comment form out, but didn't like it because, if the dispensing area was the edge of the canopy top, then a person could be beside a building in site of the canopy top, but not able to see a single ESD on the dispensers. He noted if the dispensing area was every dispenser, then the number and cost of ESD buttons could be excessive. He added before the committee could have a discussion on merging the ESD requirements for multi-fuel filling stations, a representative from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission should be present.

Mr. Lassiter noted the ODOL staff attempted to define what the dispensing area should be, but felt they needed input from the remainder of the committee. He noted it was needed to make the requirements uniform regardless of the set up. Mr. Evans asked what the verbiage was for a gasoline stations. The committee discussed reviewing the requirements in the NEC®, citing the Division I, Class 2 requirements, the classified areas for CNG and liquid gasoline dispensers, lengths of CNG dispenser hoses as a way to define the dispensing area, the number of dispensers installed on an island as a way to define the dispensing area, language related to line-of-site requirements, issues between the ESD requirements in NFPA 52®, the IFC®, NEC®, and NFPA 30-A®, issues when including CNG dispensers in already existing gasoline stations, merging those code requirements to prevent a false sense of security that hitting one ESD button would shut everything down when it may not, issues to be addressed when a facility was built for

expansion, creating a diagram to be utilized during the discussion to define the dispensing area, and following the more conservative rules when working on a mixed-fuel fueling station.

Mr. Evans noted there was a really good diagram in the NEC® in Section 514.3. The committee discussed different suggestions to define the dispensing area. During the discussion the committee touched on combining the emergency stop devises with existing infrastructure at an existing station, the electrical arc danger and why the NEC® defines the hazardous locations, and the authority of the ODOL to go out and inspect and require the ESD system to be combined into one system or find a facility out of compliance, when those systems would touch on already established requirements from OCC. The committee determined the last item was a discussion that needed to be held at the state level between the officials and not something the committee should address. There was further discussion on issues that covered: the expectation from firefighters when pulling up to a fuel fire that the stop button they would push would shut down everything, requirements in Section 2303 of the IFC®, requirements in NFPA 30A® and the difference in fighting a gasoline versus a CNG fire. Mr. Hellman noted a common sense approach would be the button at the dispenser, shuts down the dispenser, but the button at the station shuts down the whole facility. He added if the requirement was for one ESD on the island, then the ESD should shut down all the pumps on that island. They discussed providing a specific location for the ESD at the fire alarm control panel, safety of the public and emergency response personnel, and the spacing requirements for where the ESDs need to be located. Mr. Shupe suggested the language be one ESD located within the dispensing area, with the understanding the committee would come up with a definition of the dispensing area, and one away, within line-of-site of the dispensing area. There was further discussion on the topic. At the end of the discussion, the ODOL staff volunteered to work on a definition for the dispensing area based off the Class I, Division II requirements in the NEC® as well as modifications to Section 2308.7 Emergency shutdown control of the IFC®. Mr. Hellman verified with the committee the dispensing area would be defined by the NEC® classified areas and the ESD locations would be as follows: One ESD within fifteen (15) feet of the dispenser cabinet and another greater than twenty-five (25) feet from the dispenser cabinet, and using the signage language "conspicuously located..." No further action was taken.

<u>Assignment of review for the June 22, 2015 meeting</u>

Mr. Hort asked the committee what they wanted to review for the next meeting. The committee discussed if they had reviewed all the items from the three documents provided by different members at the previous meeting, regarding differences between NFPA 52®, the IFC® and the IFGC®. Mr. Hort noted he tried to address everything on the three handouts at the previous meeting. Ms. Hehnly noted the committee originally decided to look at each document and compare them to the IFC®, IFGC® and NEC®. Mr. Lassiter suggested the committee review NFPA 30A® before the next meeting. He added the committee had been working in the NEC® during the review of NFPA 52®. He asked if everyone would feel good once NFPA 30A was reviewed that all the issues for CNG would be addressed and the committee would be ready to move to the next fuel type.

Mr. Shupe asked if the committee had any actions with regard to ventilation of the canopy. Mr. Sewell noted he talked with an engineer at ONG who didn't want to discuss that without more details such as wind speeds and surface areas, etc. Mr. Lassiter suggested language be added to

the IFC® that required ventilation of the canopy in accordance with NEC® Section 514.3. He added he wasn't sure of the location for that, but not putting any kind of limitations on it as to amounts of ventilation. There was further discussion on the issue the covered, canopy lips, 4x4 and 4x6 girders that segmented the canopy, different canopy designs, and canopy gutters. At the end of the discussion, the ventilation issue was assigned to Mr. Evans to research and submit a comment form. Mr. Sewell stated he wasn't sure there had ever been an issue with an unvented canopy. He added he would make a call to the Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition that tracked all the accidents in the United States. Mr. Shupe asked why the language needed to be in the IFC® since it was in the NEC®. Mr. Hort noted it was because the IFC® would be the controlling document. Mr. Lassiter noted he agreed with that. Mr. Shupe noted the same thing would be an issue on maintenance facility. Mr. Hellman noted the NEC® took all its verbiage on canopies and other related CNG stuff right out of NFPA 30-A®. There was further discussion on inserting the language from the NEC® into the IFC® for the ventilation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

MS. PAULA LANEY-COWART MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. TERRANCE HELLMAN TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Eric Pollard
	Tony Blatt	Tom Sewell
	Terrance Hellman	Adam Shupe
	Mitchell Hort	Cary Williamson
	Paula Laney-Cowart	
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSENT:	Ross Barrick	Joe McKenzie
	Craiton Cooper	Jeremy Moore
	Dave Evans	
ABSTAIN:	None	

Minutes approved in Committee Meeting on the 22 day of June, 2015

MITCHELL HORT
Mr. Mitchell Hort, Chairman
Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee

PREPARED BY: KATHY HEHNLY
Ms. Kathy Hehnly, Executive Assistant
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission