



Oregon Mechanical Officials Association

www.omoaonline.org

Monthly Membership Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2014

Marion County Public Works, Salem

The Oregon Mechanical Officials Association is dedicated to providing a professional environment for mechanical code officials and industry professionals to share knowledge and educate each other to enhance the public welfare.

CALL TO ORDER:

President Troy Skinner called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m., October 16, 2014.

ATTENDANCE:

Executive Board members present included: President Troy Skinner, First Vice President Mike Remesnik, Second Vice President/Treasurer John Corliss, and Secretary Bill Hendrix. Also present were Rob Peters, Mark Heizer, Mark Krenz, Bob Wentz, and OMOA's Cory Cross.

MOTION: Bill Hendrix moved and it was seconded that the minutes from the July 24, 2014, meeting be approved. Motion approved unanimously.

OMOA COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Education Committee: Cory Cross reported that registration at the 2014 OMOA Fall Institute was down by more than half at this year's institute, compared with the 2013 institute.

Code Change Committee: Mark Heizer indicated he would like input from the OMOA Code Change Committee about proposing a change to the IMC regarding wood-fired pizza stoves.

Scholarship Committee: Mark Krenz said that he heard that PCC was having internal problems trying to put their building inspection technology together. Members indicated that many of the

people they were hiring now were from the trades. They also indicated that departments were looking for people with computer skills and people skills.

CODE DISCUSSION:

1. Rob Peters and Mark Krenz (Gresham) brought a question about smoke detection systems within duct systems as it pertains to a project that Gresham is currently working on. In this project the question was raised that according to OMSC 606.4.1 Supervision. “The duct smoke detectors shall be connected to a fire alarm system where a fire alarm system is required by Section 907.2 of the *Fire Code*. The actuation of a duct detector shall activate a visible and audible supervisory signal at a constantly attended location.” Exception #2 states, “In occupancies not required to be equipped with a fire alarm system, actuation of a smoke detector shall activate a visible and audible signal in an *approved* location. Duct smoke detector trouble conditions shall activate a visible or audible signal in an *approved* location and shall be identified as air duct detector trouble.” The project supervisor and occupant of their project want to use their portable laptop/I-Pad device as their *approved* location. Was this acceptable and did this meet the intent of the OMSC? Their project includes other buildings on their site which would also be included in the approved notification to the laptop/I-Pad. Their project is not required to have fire alarms for their buildings. They would like to use the exception if approved.

The general consensus of the group was that the approved location should be onsite given the obvious nature of laptop use. What if the laptop/I-Pad user were on vacation or not able to utilize their laptop as it was shut down or inoperable? Discussion was brought that in other AHJ situations a Written Protocol might be warranted whereby the jurisdiction would have a written document included in their property records that would show what happened and who would use the laptop when the primary user of the communication device was unable or incapable of using it. No one seemed to mind if the laptop was used as a secondary notification device in addition to an onsite notification. Additionally, if the building was used after normal business hours for training, etc., an onsite notification station would be available to all users of the buildings if the laptop/I-Pad user was not a part of the after-hours assemblies. If the buildings are closed and vacated, and the buildings were not occupied after hours, then it did not seem problematic to use the I-Pad/laptop as the primary notification location.

In the discussion of this question it was assumed by the group that “constantly attended” was a prerequisite for the notification system. Further research by this author noted that it is not written as a requirement in exception #2. Constantly attended is required for the first exception as well as the parent code section that the exceptions pertain to. No additional insight was garnered from the 2012 IMC commentary either. It is implied or inferred? The answer to this question seems to be unsettled and will likely be revisited at our next meeting.

2. As a separate question, Rob and Mark provided some sketches of possible examples where smoke detection may be required in some areas of the Code, but not in the exceptions as follows:

- a. The first example is a square building (think a Bi-Mart style) that has four rooftop units conditioning the space. Each unit is 2000 cfm but there are no supply or return ducts connected to the units. Is it required to have smoke detection per the OMSC?

The answer is that they are not required to have detectors per the exception to 606.2, "Smoke detectors shall not be required where air distribution systems are incapable of spreading smoke beyond enclosed walls, floors and ceilings of the room or space in which the smoke is generated."

- b. The second example was for a single RTU that is greater than 2000 cfm, in the same Bi-Mart style store. Is it required to have smoke detection?

Again the answer is that it is not required to have a smoke detector due to the exception to 606.2

- c. The third example is for four individual rooms, enclosed by surrounding walls that terminate at the roof/ceiling above. (Think four rooms within an office building). Each room has its own 2000 cfm RTU's. Is smoke detection required?

The answer would be that if smoke is not able to move into the adjacent rooms through the attics or crawlspace (if applicable), the exception above would indicate that no detection is required. If however, the smoke can move up into the attic spaces or beneath the floor, then the smoke detection requirements of Section 606 would apply.

- d. The fourth example would be a large room with four 2000 cfm RTU's, each having its own supply and return ducts, and having partitions in the room to separate the space into compartments or rooms. Would smoke detectors be required?

The answer would seem like detection isn't required as no individual unit exceeds 2000 cfm until you look at section 606.2.1, which states, "Smoke detectors shall be installed in return air systems with a design capacity greater than 2000 cfm, in the return air duct or *plenum* upstream of any filters, *exhaust air* connections, outdoor air connections, or decontamination *equipment* and appliances." (With an exception). The aggregate total of all of the RTU's exceeds 2000 cfm ($2000 \times 4 = 8000$ cfm), therefore a smoke detection system would be required per Section 606.

- e. The fifth example would be a building that is walled off into four rooms. Two of the rooms have their own 2000 cfm RTU's and smoke cannot leave the confines of the spaces. The other two rooms share a 4000 cfm RTU with each having supply and return ducts supplying the conditioned air from the RTU. There is a full-height wall separating the two spaces. Would smoke detection be required in this building?

The two rooms that do not share the RTU, but have their own systems, would not need detectors. The two rooms that share the larger RTU would be required to have detectors per 606.2.1 as they share the unit. Smoke could be pulled into the return duct of the one space and be transferred into the other room even though they are walled off from each other-through the RTU. See 606.2.2 Common Supply and

Return Air Systems, “Where multiple air handling systems share common supply or return air ducts or plenums with a combined design capacity greater than 2000 cfm, the return air system shall be provided with smoke detectors in accordance with Section 606.2.1.”

End of the code discussion for this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business discussed.

NEW BUSINESS:

Next month there will be an OMOA Board Meeting at 11:30 a.m. before the Member Meeting at 12:30pm.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully,

Cory Cross
Administrative Services Mgr

**Next OMOA Membership Meeting
12:30 P.M., Thursday, November 20, 2014
Marion County Public Works
Silverton Road, Salem**