

**Plumbing Board**  
**National Code Review Committee – Meeting Minutes**  
**March 31, 2011 – 9:30 a.m.**  
**Department of Labor and Industry**  
**443 Lafayette Road No., Saint Paul, MN 55155-4344**

**Committee Members Present:**

Jim Lungstrom  
John Parizek  
Gale Mount  
Larry Justin  
Rebecca Ames

**Committee Members Absent:**

None

**Staff Present:**

Jim Peterson  
John Schultz  
Cathy Tran  
Chuck Olson  
Jessica Looman

**Visitors:**

Luke Westman  
Matt Marciniak  
Carl Crimmins  
Loren Kohnen  
Ron Rice  
Jeff Keough  
John Malone  
Greg Johnson

**I. Call To Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lungstrom at 9:30 a.m. Announcements and introductions were made.

**II. Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Parizek made a motion, seconded by Justin, to approve the Agenda. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed

**III. Regular Business**

- A) A motion was made by Justin, seconded by Mount, to approve the February 15, 2011 meeting minutes. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
- B) Members were asked to turn in their expense reports and per diems to the Board Chair for approval.

**IV. Special Business**

- A) Major items to be reviewed for today's meeting were presented:
  - i. Code Administration

- ii. Health and Safety
- iii. Costs and Training
- iv. Accessibility of Code

## **V. Committee Discussion**

Code Administration: Various aspects of administration of the code were discussed: Local vs. State authority, alternate approvals, inspections and testing, medical gas testing and inspections, backflow. Comparisons to other code adoptions, e.g., electrical code, mechanical code.

Health and Safety: Discussion on ICC as more performance based as compared to UPC, but health and safety deemed to be fairly equal between the IPC and the UPC. Backflow issues compared and seem relatively equal between the codes also.

Costs and Training: Discussion of change to ICC by state when building code was adopted. Rulemaking costs, individual costs may be difficult to quantify; staff time for rules and amendments, hearing costs; looking at present code as well as national code adoption concurrently; local authority reviews, municipalities with plan review agreements, designers and plumbers getting familiar with new code. Reciprocity with North and South Dakota; those states may drop reciprocal agreements if we went to ICC since they are UPC states. Training programs for apprentices could be expensive to revise. Amendments can be costly also since there are more items to keep track of.

Accessibility of Code: Designers generally have multiple codes for reference and need to keep up to date. Accessibility isn't a big issue for industry professionals, but for homeowners the MN code can be looked up on the internet so from that standpoint it is good; won't be as easy with a national code. National codes reference a lot of different codes, e.g., mechanical, building, fuel gas, etc. and if there are amendments you have to reference those too. MN code is very easy and accessible. MN Plumbing Board currently requires standards of both national codes (ICC and UPC) to be met before the Board will consider a proposed code change.

## **VI. Open Forum**

A number of written requests to speak to the board were received. Those requesting to speak were: Greg Johnson representing ICC addressed various aspects of the four discussion items; Matthew Marciniak representing IAPMO had comments on aspects of adoption, and how the process of adopting the UPC would work; John Gunderson representing ASPE MN asked what will happen to MN Plumbing Code and the Plumbing Board and wanted information he could pass on to his membership; Cathy Tran representing DLI Staff addressed costs and training assoc. with adopting new code; Loren Kohnen representing Metro West Inspection Services talked about code accessibility, and that MN code is very accessible, and that it will be expensive to conduct training. Amendments are problematic since they must also be referenced.

Follow Up Discussion: Electrical Code has no amendments. HPP adopted national code with very few amendments. Plumbing Code seems to be in a perpetual amendment process. Many changes considered by MN are already contained in the national codes; this is expensive in terms

of time as well as money. MN code is outdated- examples grease interceptors, siphonic roof drainage systems. These items plus many more have already been vetted at the National level but must be done again at the state level for the state code. Adopting nat. code would simplify the work of the Board. Reciprocal licensing and continuing education favors the UPC since Dakotas and Iowa have the UPC. Previous motion was made by Advisory Council to adopt UPC in the future. Debate about whether or not the purpose of the meeting was to either decide on adoption of a national code, or to determine specifically which national code to adopt. Comment that our state code is outdated and that it is inevitable that a national code will eventually be adopted.

Motion by Gale Mount that we explore in more detail the potential to adopt a national code, second by Justin;

Discussion proceeded regarding what is the intent of today's meeting. Proposal was made to try to get a national code in the 2012 cycle, would be most likely the middle of 2012 or later.

Previous motion by Mount was withdrawn.

Motion by Ames that the committee looks at adopting either the IPC or the UPC and to compare the two; second by Parizek.

Discussion: The two code bodies should make presentations to the Plumbing Board.

Motion by Peterson to make friendly amendment to Ames' motion: Committee to make recommendation that the board adopt a national code at the next possible rulemaking process. This friendly amendment was accepted by Ames and Parizek. Vote was unanimous and motion carried.

Next Plumbing Board meeting will be April 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **VII. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Mount, seconded by Parizek, to adjourn the meeting. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jim Lungstrom*

Jim Lungstrom