

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
JULY 27, 2015 - 1:30 P.M.**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Greg Armstrong (left at 3:30 p.m.), Ross Barrick, Mitchell Hort, Joe McKenzie, Jeremy Moore (arrived at 1:37 p.m.), Eric Pollard (left at 3:50 p.m.), Tom Sewell, Adam Shupe, and Cary Williamson

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert Lassiter

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Anthony Blatt, Craiton Cooper, Paula Laney-Cowart, Dave Evans, and Terrance Hellman

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kathy Hehnly (Staff - OUBCC) and Scott Minton (OnCue Express)

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Mitchell Hort called the meeting of the Alternative Fuels Program Technical Committee to order at 1:35 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 June 22, 2015 meeting minutes

Mr. Hort asked if everyone had time to review the minutes and asked if there were any changes needed.

MR. CARY WILLIAMSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. ROBERT LASSITER TO APPROVE THE JUNE 22, 2015 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Jeremy Moore
	Ross Barrick	Eric Pollard
	Mitchell Hort	Tom Sewell
	Robert Lassiter	Cary Williamson
	Joe McKenzie	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Anthony Blatt Dave Evans

Craiton Cooper
Paula Laney-Cowart

Terrance Hellman

ABSTAIN: Adam Shupe

Discussion and possible action on Chapter Two definitions on the wording of "tested, certified, listed, and labeled" in the 2015 Editions of the International Fire Code® (IFC®, 2015) and the International Fuel Gas Code® (IFGC®, 2015)

Mr. Hort noted the history of the item was listed in the spreadsheet on the back of the agenda. He noted from previous meetings the committee determined more review was necessary. Mr. Hort asked Mr. Lassiter if he had looked at the issue. Mr. Lassiter replied he had not done so and asked if copies of the handout provided by Mr. Hellman at the last meeting could be handed out again. Mr. Lassiter noted he thought Mr. Evans was supposed to submit something. Mr. Hort that was correct and nothing had been received. Mr. Lassiter asked if the committee had any issues with the definitions of "label" and "listed" were written on page 30 of the IFC®. Mr. Sewell replied the issue was more the language said "tested" versus "certified."

Mr. Lassiter stated regardless of what the committee did, there was still a dilemma regarding how NFPA 52® read regarding testing every three years and the Boiler Pressure Vessel Law for the State of Oklahoma that did not have that requirement. He added according to the statute, there could be a fifteen-year difference on a Section eight pressure vessel and it pass inspection. He noted he ran into the issue recently while doing an inspection of a compressor area. He added the Oklahoma Department of Labor (ODOL) had passed it and assigned a state number and the pressure relief device had not been inspected in four years. He noted a Boiler Pressure Vessel Inspector could pass it under that law, but it would not pass under the Alternative Fuels act as it was currently enforced. He noted he had requested clarification from the ODOL legal department. The committee discussed defining requirements in the rules and the conflict with the law already in existence, the difference between testing and certifying the relief valves, and Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) regulations for their pressure valves, ASME requirements for certification and testing, if the document provided for the last meeting answered any of the questions the committee had, industry expectations, similar issues and allowances for testing and certifying for electrical equipment already in the rules and the definition of a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory. Mr. Lassiter asked if there was a possibility of accepting the IFC® definitions of "listed" and "labeled" as written and holding off on the definitions of "tested" and "certified." He added until he had legal clarification he did not feel comfortable voting on those definitions.

MR. LASSITER MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. ROSS BARRICK TO ACCEPT THE DEFINITIONS OF "LISTED" AND "LABELED" AS WRITTEN IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIRE® CODE, 2015 EDITION AND TABLING THE DEFINITIONS FOR "TESTED" AND "CERTIFICATION" UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING SO CLARIFICATION COULD BE OBTAINED

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Jeremy Moore
	Ross Barrick	Eric Pollard
	Mitchell Hort	Tom Sewell
	Robert Lassiter	Adam Shupe

Joe McKenzie

Cary Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Anthony Blatt
Craiton Cooper
Paula Laney-Cowart

Dave Evans
Terrance Hellman

ABSTAIN: None

Mr. Hort asked Mr. Lassiter and Mr. Sewell to work on the issue for the next meeting. Mr. Lassiter noted it would not be an issue to work on the item once he had the clarification from ODOL's legal counsel and knew he had the authority to do so.

Discussion and possible action on the definition of an "unattended" fueling station and the twenty-five gallon dispensing limit in Section 2304 - Dispensing Operations, in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

Mr. Sewell noted he had spoken with Chief Moore regarding the issue as well as the Fire Marshal in Tulsa. He noted Chief Moore had spoken with the Fire Marshal in Tulsa just before the meeting as well and asked Chief Moore what was discussed. Chief Moore noted the greatest concern in the City of Tulsa's opinion was deviating from the requirements for the twenty-five gallon limit because the section dealt with all fuels not just CNG. He added a subsequent concern was the IFC® had already been approved and doing something different would be lessening the code. Mr. Sewell asked if they were enforcing the limit. Chief Moore replied he didn't know. Mr. Sewell stated enforcement would require all locations that turned pumps on auto when they left at night would have to have a twenty-five gallon limit.

The committee discussed the differences between twenty-five gallons of liquid fuel versus the same amount of CNG, using a time-factor versus a gallon-factor for CNG, and that most of the stations in existence were built under NFPA 52® requirements which did not have any limit on the amount to be dispensed. Further discussion covered credit card/debit card network requirements for shutoff, job duty description for staff working at a convenience store and if the staff would be considered as "attendants" under the definition for a "qualified attendant" in the IFC®, 2015. The committee discussed the ability to suggest making modifications to the IFC® 2015 that was already adopted and other ways to modify the language for the CNG needs, the way industry manufactured equipment, possible benefits for making modifications to the section, industry market needs and customer expectations, commercial applications and issues with the section applying to private commercial stations, the ability for a station to be shut down using the code requirement even if it was not currently being enforced in Oklahoma, programming the dispensers, hazard differences between CNG, Propane, hydrogen, diesel, and gasoline, modifying the section to apply to "heavier than air" fuels, high- and low-flow requirements for dispensers and hose-break circuits. Mr. Sewell offered to speak with the Petroleum Institute Group (PEI), the lobbying body for gasoline stations in Tulsa to see if anyone else had asked the same questions the committee was. No further action was taken.

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC #4, second revision on Section 2308.7 - Emergency Shutdown Control, in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

Mr. Hort noted based on previous discussions, a request was made to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC) to send a representative to attend and discuss the issue. Mr. Hort added the representative was unable to attend. Mr. Hort stated the committee could hold off on the issue or could take action and then readdress the action at a later date if necessary. Mr. Lassiter noted he was going to make a motion to modify the language that was submitted on the revised AFPTC Public Comment Form #4.

MR. ROBERT LASSITER MADE A MOTION TO MODIFY THE LANGUAGE IN THE FOURTH LINE STARTING WITH "AND SHALL ALSO BE PROVIDED IN THE COMPRESSOR AREA" TO CHANGE TO "AND SHALL ALSO BE PROVIDED INSIDE THE COMPRESSOR AREA WITHIN TEN (10) FEET OF AN INGRESS OR EGRESS POINT"

Mr. Lassiter noted Mr. Hellman had provided the comment form revisions based on the discussion at the last meeting. He noted Mr. Sewell sent in some information that suggested the language needed further clarification. Mr. Lassiter stated he and Mr. Hellman agreed and came up with the language proposed in the motion. The committee discussed the need for the change, waiting on the representative from the OCC, verbage for video requirements and illumination requirements found in the NFPA 2®, Section 11.2.6 Lighting. The committee discussed how the modifications would affect Section 2303.2 on page 229 as well. After further discussion the committee determined the comment form should be revised again and the item should be tabled until the next meeting. As a result of the discussion Mr. Lassiter withdrew his motion.

Discussion and possible action on Alternate Requirements allowed in Section 1.4 of the 2013 edition of NFPA 52® - Vehicular Gaseous Fuel Systems Code, and moving that language into the IFC®

The committee discussed that a comment form was supposed to be submitted to carry the language from NFPA 52®, Section 1.4 over into the IFC® 2015. The committee discussed industry technologies regarding storage of CNG in NFPA 52®, Section 1.4 - Alternate Provisions - requirements for sound experience and engineering judgment to be needed before the alternate requirement would be approved, and the language in the IFC® 2015 in Section 104.9 - Alternative materials and methods - that allowed for alternate requirements to be approved by the authority having jurisdiction. At the end of the discussion, the committee consensus was the language in the IFC® did provide for alternate provisions.

MR. GREG ARMSTRONG MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. TOM SEWELL TO ACCEPT SECTION 104.9 - ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS AND METHODS - OF THE 2015 EDITION OF THE IFC® AS WRITTEN

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Jeremy Moore
	Ross Barrick	Eric Pollard
	Mitchell Hort	Tom Sewell
	Robert Lassiter	Adam Shupe
	Joe McKenzie	Cary Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Anthony Blatt Dave Evans
 Craiton Cooper Terrance Hellman
 Paula Laney-Cowart

ABSTAIN: None

Discussion and possible action on Section 2308.3 - Location of dispensing operations and equipment - regarding venting of canopies and lighting requirements in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

The committee discussed the difficulty with determining ventilation requirements, noting there were too many variables to come up with any specific requirements applicable to all canopies. The committee discussed older canopies that were not ventilated, classification of the dispensing locations, requirements in NFPA 30A®, Section 12.4 Dispenser Installation Beneath Canopies and if the section should be brought into the IFC® 2015. Mr. Shupe stated he was looking at the requirements in the NEC® 2014, Article 511 for enclosed garage facilities. He noted since the requirements for enclosed spaces were more stringent, the committee could add something similar for canopies. There was discussion between the committee and Mr. Scott Minton with OnCue express regarding the design of the scuppers for the OnCue canopies when there was both gasoline and CNG under the same canopy. The committee consensus was to bring the language from NFPA 30A®, Section 12.4 - Dispenser Installations Beneath Canopies - into the code as a new section in the code under 2308.3.1, number 5 and to add a reference back to NEC® 2014, Section 514.3(B)(2), Compressed Natural Gas, Liquefied Natural Gas, and Liquefied Petroleum Gas Areas. Mr. Barrick offered to write up a public comment form for the modification and no further action was taken.

Discussion and possible action on 2308.4 - Private fueling of motor vehicles - regarding users and requirements for training in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

The committee started to discuss the issue with tube trailers and possible corrections for it.

MR. TOM SEWELL MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY CHIEF JEREMY MOORE TO EDIT THE LANGUAGE IN SECTION 2308.4 BY DELETING THE WORDING "ON CNG-POWERED VEHICLES" IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH

Mr. Lassiter noted the issue with the tube trailers was actually the next discussion item on the agenda. He added the first issue was with the requirements for training. Ms. Hehnly read aloud the minutes from the April meeting where the issue was defined as an onerous burden on owner to provide training. She added the consensus in the April meeting was to utilize the language in NFPA 52®. The committee discussed possible solutions and determined dispenser instructions were required in Section 2304.3.4 - Operating Instructions of IFC®. They determined editing the language in the second paragraph of Section 2308.4 - Private fueling of motor vehicles - by deleting the wording "and the training of the users" would take care of the issue. Chief Moore volunteered to write a public comment form to address both issues with the Section. As a result Mr. Sewell and Chief Moore withdrew their motion and second and no further action was taken.

Discussion and possible action on 2308.4 Private fueling of motor vehicles - regarding the private fueling of motor vehicles being limited to filling permanently mounted fueling containers on CNG powered vehicles and the industry practice of filling tube trailers to be used at other locations.

The issue was tabled so Chief Moore could submit a public comment form. Mr. Pollard noted the NEC® would be the base code to be reviewed regarding electrical vehicle charging. He stated that most of the electrical vehicle charging companies he had spoken with did not see any modifications needed to the NEC®. He wanted to know if any action would need to be taken. He added he didn't think it needed to be decided at the meeting, but would it need to be looked at. Mr. Hort noted the committee would need to look at it at a future meeting and asked Mr. Pollard to document his research.

Discussion and possible action on any issues found in the comparison of NFPA 59A® - Standard for the Production, Storage, and Handling of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)®, 2013 Edition and the 2014 Edition of the National Electrical Code®, and the 2015 Editions of the IFC® and IFGC®

The item was tabled until the August 24, 2015 meeting.

Assignment of review for the August 24, 2015 meeting

The committee determined they should keep to the review of NFPA 59A® and the public comment forms assigned at the meeting. The committee discussed the timing for the committee completion of the review of the codes and if the committee should be meeting more than once a month. The committee consensus was to keep the meetings to once a month.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Scott Minton with OnCue Express addressed the committee. He wanted to go back to item "C" on the agenda regarding the twenty-five gallon limit for "unattended" versus "attended" facilities. He noted when the tube trailers were filled; they could be fuel 1000 gallons in one fill. He added the tube trailer could hold 1500 gallons, but because of pressure and temperature it would have to be turned back on. He added filling 1000 gallons could be an all-day or all-night process. He noted the twenty-five gallon limit could have a significant impact on the person required to be there for every twenty-five gallon fill.

Mr. Minton stated he wanted to bring the issue to the committee's attention as it could also have economic impact in areas like mining or drilling. He added the industry needed to be able to accommodate those areas. He cited an example as the Tulsa Refuge as a private "unattended" site. He noted they had fifty trucks filling at the same time. He stated he wasn't sure on how it all needed to be addressed, but those other scenarios were equally as important. Mr. Barrick asked if the multiple vehicle sites had individual dispensing units. Mr. Minton replied no, it was a hose with one main supply into a manifold. He noted each truck was not metered, just one for the entire system. Mr. Sewell noted for fast-fill fueling, the person fueling should always be in attendance. He added in slow-fill it was not as necessary. Mr. Minton replied that the slow-fill system was still putting out a lot of gas quickly in a multiple site location. He noted pumping would still be at eight to ten gallons a minute. Mr. Sewell stated most of what the committee was looking at was the retail stations, but the committee should keep in mind the other time-fill locations as well. Chief Moore stated he would be worried about the overzealous inspector applying the language to a scenario like the Tulsa Refuse and shutting the system down.

Mr. Minton noted new tube trailers were being built that would be able to hold 2500 gallons. He noted his stations were fast-fill stations designed for a pick-up truck but he was also trying to design the station for a tube-trailer scenario. He cited some examples of accommodations needed for both cost and time to pump. He noted he felt it was going to be a growing side of the industry. He added semis were the fastest growing segment to the industry and were 100 to 160 gallons or DGE coming off the factory line right now. He noted most of those would be fueled at "unattended" cites. He asked if the definition of an "attended" facility could incorporate a smart system where someone was watching the system remotely all the time or if it had the ability to call out to someone who could attend the site. He noted most of those facilities being built for semis were not going to be a convenience store where there was someone there all the time. He added it was not a good traffic pattern for a semi at a convenience store. Mr. Barrick stated that type scenario should be a special use or have its own definition and procedures for that type of installation as new technology. Mr. Hort thanked Mr. Minton for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

MR. ROSS BARRICK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. ROBERT LASSITER TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Jeremy Moore
	Ross Barrick	Eric Pollard
	Mitchell Hort	Tom Sewell
	Robert Lassiter	Adam Shupe
	Joe McKenzie	Cary Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT:	Anthony Blatt	Dave Evans
	Craiton Cooper	Terrance Hellman
	Paula Laney-Cowart	

ABSTAIN: None

Minutes approved in Committee Meeting on the 21 day of September, 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

OFFICIAL COPY: *Original with signatures in office file*