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
SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 - 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Greg Armstrong (left at 3:30 p.m.), Ross Barrick, Tony Blatt, Paula Laney-Cowart (arrived at 2:20 p.m.), Terrance Hellman, Mitchell Hort, Joe McKenzie, Jeremy Moore, Eric Pollard, and Cary Williamson

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Dave Evans (arrived at 2:06 p.m.)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Craiton Cooper, Robert Lassiter, Tom Sewell, and Adam Shupe

OTHERS PRESENT:
Billy Pope (Staff – OUBCC), Kathy Hehnly (Staff - OUBCC), Frank "Butch" Jeffers (Oklahoma Corporation Commission), 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 CHIEF JEREMY MOORE TO APPROVE THE JUNE 22, 2015 MEETING MINUTES

VOTING AYE:	Greg Armstrong	Joe McKenzie
	Ross Barrick	Jeremy Moore
	Tony Blatt	Eric Pollard
	Terrance Hellman	Cary Williamson
	Mitchell Hort	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Paula Laney-Cowart Adam Shupe
Tom Sewell

ABSTAIN: None

Discussion and possible action on Chapter Two definitions on the wording of “tested and certified” in the 2015 Editions of the IFC® and IFGC®

Mr. Hellman stated the item came up for discussion because Mr. Sewell had asked who could test a valve verses who could certify a valve. He stated testing could be performed by the owner of the valve, or the tank the valve was positioned on. He added a valve could not be certified unless it was removed and recertified at a shop holding a VR stamp in accordance with the ASME National Board. He noted the Oklahoma Department of Labor (ODOL) was still working with the National Board to get some formal procedures for the actual in-service testing of the safety relief valves. He stated it would be an issue as the NFPA documents required testing every three years. He noted he would personally like to see them removed and recertified at a repair shop, but in lieu of that, ODOL was trying to come up with a way for owners to have that done themselves. He added as far as the definitions "tested" and "certified" went, he didn't know of any specific language that needed to be incorporated into the codes to make the distinction. The committee discussed the requirements for the licensing of the Alternative Fuels Technicians, noting the Level I Technician would be considered an "operator" and the Level II technician would have more stringent requirements and would be considered a "mechanic." They discussed there was a committee formulating test questions and that curriculum was being drafted by some of the Metro Tech and Vo-techs for the Technicians and if further language was needed in the definitions. The committee consensus at the end of the discussion was the initial question was answered and no changes were needed.

Discussion and possible action on the definition of an “unattended” fueling station and the 25-gallon dispensing limit in Section 2304 Dispensing Operations in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

Mr. Hort stated there was some information in the committee books provided by Mr. Sewell. The committee discussed Section 2304.3.7, numbers one (1) and two (2) noting the issue was regarding the 25-gallon limit and the need for tube trailers to be filled. They discussed the documentation provided by Mr. Sewell that said the section did not seem to be enforced by any Authority Having Jurisdiction; if the ODOL would be required to enforce the section; if item two in the section took care of the problem since most tube trailer drivers would have the pre-programmed card that would control the quantity; that the requirements stated an "unattended" facility had to comply with one of the two requirements; if the language "motorized vehicles" should be added to item one; that there would still be issues for semi-drivers whose "motorized vehicles" had larger tanks and could hold more than 25 gallons; that the intent of the requirement was to prevent leaks; ways the dispensers were set up to detect leaks with fail-safes; increasing the amount to be filled at the "unattended" site; how over-the-road trucks usually filled their vehicles and if they were at a "public" facility or at a "private" facility. The reference used during the discussion was that a "public" facility was at a station where anyone could fill up a vehicle, and a "private" facility was where there was restricted access to only those associated with a specific company would have access to the facility, such as Tulsa Waste Management where they hooked up all their vehicles into the system to fill up overnight. Mr. Scott Minton with OnCue Express

discussed the programmable cards with the Committee. He noted at a "public" facility, almost always the semi-driver would have a pre-programmed "fleet" style card.

The committee debated different options to modify the Section by either clarifying the language requirements for the section to apply only to "public" facilities, deleting the requirement for the 25-gallon limit or increasing it to a larger limit, and how that might impact the growing industries; and several other options to modify the section. The committee discussed the fact that the requirements in the section affected the gasoline side of the industry as well as the inability to enforce the section requirements and concerns with changing the 25-gallon limit requirements for liquid fuels versus vaporous fuels. Mr. Frank Jeffers with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (OCC) addressed the Committee and stated their rules mandated any spills over 25 gallons had to be reported, but anything 25 gallons or less did not have to be reported. He noted the OCC did not limit the amount of fuel that could be purchased as that would impede an individual's right to work. There was further discussion on the limit requirements and ways to modify the section. Committee consensus at the end of the discussion was to include an exemption to number one stating dispensing devices equipped with a break-away device or equal approved by the Authority Having Jurisdiction would not be limited to dispensed quantity limits. Mr. Ross Barrick volunteered to create a comment form for the change.

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC-7 on Section 2303.2.1 Emergency disconnect switches – regarding lighting requirements in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®
Mr. Barrick stated the comment form was adding new text that required lighting during all hours of operation including darkness at several different locations and stated the emergency shut down controls would be visible to the operator. He noted the basis for his comment form came from the 2011 edition of NFPA-2, Sections 11.2.6 and 11.2.6.1. Mr. Minton and several of the committee members asked about the intent of the change and how the illumination would need to be handled. Mr. Barrick noted it was just the devices; he was not talking about the path of travel between the pump and the different ESDs and signage. The discussion clarified the ESD located behind the fence in the compression area was not included as it was not available to the public. There was further discussion that clarified it was not specific to the amount of lumens needed and how it was to be lit, so long as it was visible to the operator. Mr. Barrick noted his intent was for the change to be included only on new installations.

MR. ROSS BARRICK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. GREG ARMSTRONG TO ACCEPT AFPTC-7 AS PROPOSED

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

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC-8 on Section 2303.1(6) Location of dispensing devices – regarding canopy requirements in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®
Mr. Barrick noted the comment form dealt with the venting of canopies. He noted he had written one comment form and at the meeting in August where there was no quorum, there was discussion and as a result he had revised the form. He reviewed his modified form noting it was all new language and had numbered it where he thought it would best fit. Mr. Barrick and Ms. Paula Laney-Cowart discussed his proposal. At the end of the discussion she noted she didn't see anything she had an issue with on the modified language. Mr. Hellman asked about Section 6.2.1, and requirement length of two meters (2 m), if the two meters (2 m) could be changed to one and one-half meters (1.5 m). Mr. Barrick noted he took the measurements directly out of NFPA-58.

MR. CARY WILLIAMSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. ROSS BARRICK TO APPROVE PUBLIC COMMENT FORM AFPTC-8

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

Discussion and possible action on Section 2308.7 Emergency Shutdown Control (ESD) in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®
Mr. Hellman stated the committee originally discussed whether or not the emergency shutdown device should kill all circuits, or leave in place those circuits necessary to report the issue to emergency personnel. He noted the committee didn't want to make a decision until there could be input by the OCC on how they handle ESDs. Mr. Jeffers stated the OCC believed they should be two separate systems as they wouldn't want to shut down the gasoline side down if there was a problem with the CNG side. He added a lot of time when they received a call, the problem was limited to one dispenser that needed to be shut down, and shutting down a whole store would impede their business.

Mr. Williamson stated from an emergency response standpoint, when the firefighter pulled up to respond to a fire, they did not want to worry about which dispensers were still working and which were turned off, he noted the idea was to shut them all down. Mr. Evans asked if a customer should have the ability to shut an entire station down. Chief Moore noted if the dispensers were co-located from an emergency response perspective it was absolutely critical. Mr. Evans asked what if they were not co-located. Chief Moore stated if they were separate distances, he could see independent systems. He used the example of the Turner Turnpike facility between Oklahoma City and Tulsa, as one side of the facility was a CNG filling station and the other side was the liquid fuels. Mr. Barrick noted that example had two separate hazardous locations, which backed

up what Chief Moore was saying. Chief Moore noted from the emergency response perspective he wanted to know either his or someone else's action of pushing the emergency stop button was going to isolate everything on the island or under the canopy. There was further discussion between Mr. Jeffers, Mr. Minton, and the Committee over confusion with separate buttons, several different examples and how each station was currently set up, and several different options to modify the section. The consensus after the discussion was to revise the section to utilize a footage requirement between the co-located liquid and gaseous fuel dispensers and when the dispensers were set at a distance greater than the defined footage requirement, the systems did not have to be combined. Mr. Minton asked if the issue could be tabled until the next meeting so he could get input with his management as well as some other station owners to work on something acceptable to all the industries. Mr. McKenzie noted he would rather hold off and get the information from Mr. Minton before the committee made a decision. Mr. Hellman agreed to work with Mr. Minton to come up with some alternative verbiage.

Mr. Minton asked about interconnected ESDs and if the ones installed on different sections under the canopy would meet the spacing requirements proposed for the section. There was further discussion on the issue. Mr. Hellman noted the revised section as last proposed required an ESD within 15 feet of the dispenser and one greater than 25 feet from the dispenser. He added if a dispenser was inside a 15 foot radius of the ESD then the ESD should operate only those dispensers within its area. He added if not interconnected any ESD greater than 25 feet away could kill everything. Mr. Hillman noted it could, if they were within line of sight of the dispenser. Mr. Barrick noted, if all the interconnected pumps were inside of the hazardous location, a separate switch had to be located outside of the hazardous location. There was further discussion on the issue and the item was tabled for more input from industry providers.

Discussion and possible action on Public Comment Form AFPTC-6 Section 2308.4 Private fueling of motor vehicles in the 2015 Edition of the IFC®

Chief Moore stated the comment form was in response to discussion on the tube trailers. He noted the committee didn't want to make something contradictory to being able to fill the tube trailers in Oklahoma. He noted the change struck the language "on CNG powered vehicles." He noted under the same section, the committee had discussed the owner's responsibilities and if they would be able to train all the end users that may or may not pass through the State. He added other areas of the code require language on the dispenser on how to use the unit. He noted the stricken language was a result of the previous discussion.

Mr. Barrick asked if there was any standard used or certification process used when the tube trailers were manufactured. Chief Moore noted all tube trailers had to meet Department of Transportation (DOT) certification. He noted they were usually used as a temporary means when a gas line was down. Mr. Evans noted the storage vessels were approved through ASME. The committee discussed the people filling and using unapproved storage vessels for different types of fuels; use of expired CNG tanks; and adding the word "approved" in front of containers. Chief Moore noted Section 2308.2.1 already addressed the use of approved equipment. There was further discussion on the issue. Committee consensus was to revise the section slightly. Mr. Evans started to make a motion, but stopped to ascertain if he could as an alternate. Ms. Hehnly noted he could since Mr. Shupe was not at the meeting. In the meantime, Mr. Hellman made a motion, which Mr. Evans seconded.

MR. TERRANCE HELLMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. DAVE EVANS TO APPROVE AFPTC-6 AS MODIFIED WITH THE ADDITON OF THE WORD "APPROVED" INSERTED IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH BEFORE THE WORD "PERMENANETLY"

Ms. Laney-Cowart noted the section heading was "Private fueling of motor vehicles." She asked if the modification belonged there to address tube trailers or if it should be listed in a different spot. Mr. Evans asked what governed the tube trailers. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted they were discussed in Section 5303. She noted they were talking about filling the tube trailers and they were not a "motor vehicle." Chief Moore noted, it wasn't addressed anywhere else in the code and the conversation from the last meeting was that they should be able to fill at these sites and the section excluded them from filling them at the site. Ms. Laney-Cowart noted she was good with the change and had just wanted to make sure it wasn't going to cause an enforcement problem.

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

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®
Mr. Hort asked if there were any issues found in the comparison. Mr. Pollard asked if anyone had done their comparison. Ms. Hehnly noted since there was no quorum at the August meeting; there was no discussion on the assignment. Chief Moore asked if there were any LNG facilities in Oklahoma. Mr. Hellman noted there were two.

Assignment of review for the October 26, 2015 meeting
Mr. Hort reassigned the review of 2013 NFPA 59A® against the 2014 NEC®, and the 2015 IFC® and IFGC®.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:55 p.m.

MR. TERRANCE HELLMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CARY WILLIAMSON TO ADJOURN

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

Minutes approved in Committee Meeting on the 26 day of October, 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: *Originals with signatures in office file*