

COCOA Code Consistency Committee
July 15, 2009

Question: Pete Marino, Dominion. Nu-Wool does not recommend a vapor retarder for its product. The 2009 IRC is creating 3 vapor retarder classes and defining what materials meet these new perm ratings. Bob DeVries, technical services with Nu-Wool, gave a presentation of the history of the new classifications. Three research reports were distributed.

Discussion: The RCO Section 116 gives specific direction how the new classifications can be accepted. None of the research reports were prepared by an organization in Appendix P of the OBC. Getting BBS approval per 116.1.2 would be the best solution to get this approved until the 2009 IRC is adopted. In the meantime, a design professional can take responsibility under 116.2.

Question: Al Sheldon, Pickaway County. Existing building on a campus being converted from B to R-2 with an existing fire suppression system. There is no existing backflow prevention on this system. Should it be required.

Discussion: The general discussion is B to R-2 is more hazardous and therefore the current code requirements should be enforced.

Question: Nick Montan, ECOBA. NFPA 58 (through the OFC and OBC 415). Fire protection including detection and suppression will be required for a 30,000 gallon LP above ground tank. Would these requirements need to be adjudicated.

Discussion: All jurisdictions present would agree if it required and referenced through OBC 415 an adjudication will be required if the fire protection is not to be installed.

Question: Joe Amato, Delaware County. What is the required height of the automatic safety pool cover switch.

Discussion: Per NSPI referenced in the IRC appendix, 60" A.F.F. minimum.

Question: Peter Lenz, BIA. What is the status of Dublin's certification.

Discussion: It is not known if Dublin has made application, or if so, what is the status of their application. In the meantime, Dublin continues to accept applications.

Keith Wagenknecht, City of Columbus. Non-PUCO contractors doing primary and secondary electric work, and site lighting are not being regulated. Some contractors (APL, NEP, PEM) may be doing similar work in other jurisdictions. NEC 90.1C provides exceptions to use NESC for the primary and secondary conductors. Contractors are hiring third parties for the inspections and submitting the information prior to a CO.

Question: Jeff Greetham, M2 Design. Bridging for 8' joist spans is on their general note and the contractor argues this exceeds the minimum code requirement.

Discussion: Code requirement is bridging is required for spans over 12' and joists larger than 2x12's.

Question: Ken Fultz, City of Gahanna. How do you register a contractor who, due to religious beliefs, does not get insurance.

Discussion: All jurisdictions present that have registration will require the certificate of insurance.

Question: Jack Pryor, City of Newark. Commentary to OBC 903.2 appears to imply that other uses except A-2 occupant load can be excluded if within the fire area.

Discussion: No jurisdictions would interpret 903.2.1 to not require sprinklers if the occupant load exceeds 100.

Question: Roger Eastep, City of Upper Arlington. When is everyone inspecting smoke alarms – electrical inspections or at the final inspection.

Discussion: Most jurisdictions present inspect smoke alarms at the final inspection.

Question: Al Sheldon, Pickaway County. In reference to NEC 406.8. Builders are not putting the weather resistant listed receptacles.

Discussion: Some jurisdictions are looking for them, others will begin looking for them.

Nick Montan, ECOBA. FBOA is sponsoring a 3 hour class on residential sprinkler systems at Medina High School.

Question: John Kuss, City of Grandview Heights. Does anyone know of electrical contractors that provides megger test of electrical wiring insulation after a lightning strike.

Discussion: The general discussion was any of the larger electrical contractors should be able to provide that service.