

Nevada State Fire Marshal Division  
May 11, 2018  
8:30 AM  
Stewart Facility  
107 Jacobsen Way  
Carson City NV 89711

Minutes of Workshop

**Members Present:**

Bart J. Chambers – State Fire Marshal, Chief  
Michael Kolpak – State Fire Marshal, Investigator  
Lynn Nielson – City of Henderson, Building and Fire Safety Division  
Fulton Cochran – Clark County Fire Department, Assistant Fire Chief  
John Holmes – City of Elko, Fire Marshal  
Dennis Pinkerton – State Fire Marshal, Training Bureau Chief  
Albert Ruiz – State Fire Marshal, Plans Examiner Bureau Chief  
Gwen Barrett – State Fire Marshal, Administrative Assistant  
Susie Riolo – State Fire Marshal, Licensing  
Danny Brennan – State Fire Marshal, Licensing Bureau Chief  
Doug Sartain – Certified Fire Protection, President  
Pete Mulvihill – Retired  
Bill Erlach – Reno Fire Department, Captain  
Dave Fogerson – East Fork Fire Department, Deputy Fire Chief  
Rich Harvey – Central Lyon Fire Protection District, Chief  
Scott Baker – Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, Fire Chief  
Nathan Hastings, Deputy Attorney General

**1. CALL TO ORDER (Non-Action Item)**

Chair Chambers called the meeting to order.

**2. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE OF COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW (Non-Action Item)**

Chair Chambers verified with Gwen Barrett that compliance has been met in accordance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

**3. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS (Non-Action Item)**

Chair Chambers asked for introductions and affiliations.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Action Item)**

Chief Nielson from the City of Henderson expressed his disappointment that workshop materials were not disseminated until the start of the workshop. Fire Marshal John Holmes indicated he had looked it over.

**5. WORKSHOP ON NAC 477**

Chief Chambers stated the purpose of the workshop is to solicit comments from interested parties on general topics in preparation of accepting and implementing the International Fire Code of 2018, the International Building Code, and the appropriate documents.

## Proposed Changes to General Provisions

**NAC 477.035 and .040** were removed as they are not in the document.

**NAC 477.062** There are some proposed definition changes to the following terms:

- “Category 1 and 2 residents” is changed to the NAC definition.
- Add “Campus” is the area and buildings in and around a University, college, or school
- Add “Certificate of Compliance” is a document issued by State Fire Marshal to an occupancy in compliance of state standards
- Add “complex” is a group of buildings, close together

**NAC 477.075** Remove “Chief of Police” as it is not in this document

**Add** The words “deficiency” and “impairment” were added for the purpose of inspection testing and the definitions mirror NFPA 25. Lynn Nielson expressed that he cannot comment these items because he has not read all of the proposed changes, he knows NFPA 25. Susan Riolo, Program Officer for Fire Protection Licensing, explained this was something the fire protection industry requested.

**NAC 477.110** Removed

**NAC 477.115** Removed

**NAC 477.130** Removed

**Add** “Impairment”

**NAC 477.135** The term “inspection” was redefined

**NAC 477.281 and 477.283.** In addition to codes adopted pursuant to Subsection 1, the State Fire Marshal adopted other codes of the National Fire Codes. Added were 10.2.7.1, 10.8, 10.10.9.3, 10.11.1.3, 10.14.2, NFPA 1 2018 edition. They were added to enhance what is listed in the IFC.

- Section 10.2.7.1 Fulton Cochran expressed his concern over the unfunded mandate of 10.2.7.1 and encouraged that it be dropped because it is a huge unfunded mandate that you will see coming back on you. It will affect thousands of buildings. Lynn Nielson agreed. Elko and Carson City attendees had no concerns.
- Section 10.8.1 Emergency action plans shall be provided for high rise, health care, ambulatory health care, residential board and care, assembly, daycare centers, special use buildings, hotels and dormitories, correctional facilities,

educational, underground and windowless structures, facilities storing or handling materials covered by Chapter 60 or where required by the AHJ. Fulton Cochran asked if this section could be correlated with Chapter 4 of the International Fire Code (IFC.) Chief Chambers said that he is speaking to the Chief of DEM as well as the AHJ to coordinate the language.

- Section 10.8.2 This section will outline procedures for reporting of emergencies, occupant staff response to emergencies, evacuation, and relocation, shelter in place, use of elevators, design and conduct of fire drills, and fire protection systems or other items required by the AHJ. Plans will be submitted, reviewed, and updated as required by the AHJ. Fulton Cochran asked who the AHJ would be and Chief Chambers replied that in some departments where fire prevention is still within the fire department it would be the fire chief and in your neck of the woods it would probably be a discussion. Fulton Cochran replied that is why they are asking the questions. Lynn Neilson added that there is not anyone here from the City of Henderson Fire Department. Chief Chambers reiterated that is why the workshop is being held and continued on. Emergency action plans shall be submitted for review when required by the AHJ. This is an option that we are looking at to support DEM and the agencies throughout the state.
- Section 10.10.9.3 This section will prohibit the use of free-floating devices using an open flame. Chief Chambers stated that the current International Fire Code (IFC) allows agencies to issue permits for their use. Lynn Nielson said that he specifically addressed it in the last code adoption and was told by then Fire Marshal Peter Mulvihill that that was completely unnecessary because it is already covered in the IFC. Fulton Cochran added that the 18 version of the IFC in Section 308 and 1.6.3 states “a person shall not release or cause to be released an untethered sky lantern.” Lynn Neilson added that this section is completely unnecessary. Susie Riolo confirmed that this statute is already “in the book.” But she gets called all the time from other states. The point is to get the word out, if it is in our regulations they know they cannot possible come to the State of Nevada and do a sky lantern. Chief Chambers indicated there are jurisdictions in the north end of the state that are currently dealing with this and some jurisdictions have allowed this to occur. Based upon what we are seeing this is nothing that states “prohibited”. If you have any information that you could provide to me, it would be greatly appreciated. Lynn Nielson commented again that it is in the 18 code, so why do you need to duplicate yourself? Lynn Neilson added that he will look for an email he has from Pete Mulvihill. Chief Chambers noted their concerns and thanked them.
- 10.11.1.3 Equipment utilized to communicate address data to 911 communications centers shall be programed and maintained for accuracy. We are moving to First Net which is one reason we are looking at it specifically.

- 10.14.2 This is under Special Outdoor Events, Carnivals, and Fairs. The AHJ shall be permitted to regulate events as it pertains to emergency vehicle access, access to fire protection equipment, placement of stands, concession booths and exhibits and the control of hazardous conditions. The October 1 event experienced some of these difficulties. Fulton Cochran said Clark County is going to take advantage of the updated language in 3103 of the ISA which outlines a new permit requirement for outdoor assemblies. He suggested that Chief Chambers reach out in a coordinated fashion. All we had to do was add the word “fairs” and everything else was a replication. Carnival and fair permit has no backup inside the code, therefore we are moving everything to this new outdoor assembly permit and it would be helpful if the state would follow along with the same methodology. Other than that, I think the based fire code provides all the other language that you talked about, we need to be careful that we are not in conflict with that you put in NAC 477 and what is written into base fire code. Chief Chambers noted the comments and added that he was trying to mirror some of the items that that he received in regards to the October 1 incident, to support your needs specifically as well as giving the agencies throughout the state and thanked Fulton Cochran and he commented that that is great, we just need to make sure we are correlated on that.
- Chair Chambers detailed some updates for the NFPA current editions.
- Added was NFPA 1041, the 2019 edition. Lynn Nielson indicated they had just finished up their fire code amendments and the State Fire Marshal Division is adopting newer standards which will probably bog down their adoption process in Southern Nevada because they will have to revisit it and will recommend to his fire chiefs that they revisit the topic in light of this new information. Chief Chambers did not realize that they were that far along with the adoption and asked if there was an invite to the SFM to be in attendance to support the codes down there. Lynn Nielson replied that he knows multiple jurisdictions were contacted and there are public hearing later this month and then it will go through the formal adoption process but the committee work is pretty much done. He did reach out to Dave Cochran in Carson City but does not recall sending them to Chief Chambers in particular. Chief Chambers commented that they are in the same boat when we say we do not provide the appropriate documents to one another in a timely fashion and would like to get together to find out what we can do to have a uniform code statewide, especially the rurals because they might be impacted by changes in fire codes. Chief Chambers indicated that he has to look at the State in totality to ensure the safety of the citizens and visitors, not just one specific agency. Lynn Nielson indicated that he understood. Chief Chambers indicated that we will get this taken care of and identify what we need to and move forward.

- Chair Chambers went on to outline more changes. All dates will be updated from 2012 to 2018. 477.281-283 changes the codes adopted by the IFC.
- The Uniform Mechanical Code, Plumbing Code, and E, Section 109 is deleted. Additionally, H, Section 308.1.4 is deleted. Section 308.1.7 is amended to specify only LED or battery-operated candles will be allowed for religious ceremonies.
- Added to Section 505.1 is the requirement that complexes and campuses shall be individually identified on all four sides and the roofs that are visible from the street and air for at least 500 feet. Size of markings for sides of buildings will be 36X36 inches; size of markings for roofs will be 48X48 inches. Minimum stroke width of 3 inches using Arabic or alphabetical numbers. This is in light of the NFPA 3000 in regard to suggestions; the use of drones and rotor wing aircraft in regards to an active shooter for law enforcement and fire. Fulton Cochran asked about the scope and the impact this is going to have on local zoning and planning regulations. Lynn Nielson asked if this will be applied existing buildings or only new buildings. Chief Chambers answered that new building would be going in but schools ultimately as well as those complexes that would be critical or potentially high profile and to have accountability of personnel. Fulton Cochran disagreed and said in Section 505.1 of the Code it states, “new and existing buildings shall be provided with...” which would make this a retroactive requirement statewide. Chair Chambers replied it would not be very building, campuses, and complexes. Fulton Cochran replied campuses and complexes backing your definition are so that a group of buildings, so a shopping center, apartments, hospitals, government – how far apart does the group of buildings need to be before they are not considered being a complex? You are going to have to further define exactly what you are looking for if this is going to be put into retroactive. Chief Chambers indicated that again, the reason why we are having the public comment to have this brought up. His concern in responding to incidents trying to locate or deal with something on a campus or a large structure for accountability of personnel and/or patients and/or individuals, so we are looking for something globally and from a code standpoint. Fulton Cochran added that there is no argument on identification, they have been battling this for years, but be careful of the unintended consequences. Lynn Nielson added particularly the existing building retrofit requirement. Chief Chambers completely understands that and went on to reference to NFPA 3000: Unconventional first responder procedures, these are the people that are going in and dealing with this. External, first responders advance access to all door locks, auto systems and controls, release of drones, real time data and collection. If you’re flying a drone, how do you know where the chemistry building is at a school if you have 14 buildings there, if you are coming in from another jurisdiction. He was concerned with this issue “in totality.” Especially as many agencies throughout the country and this state may be looking at NFPA 3000 not only for the safety of our kids but our first responders. Fulton Cochran

commented that they support the concept we just have to do our homework ahead of time as a bureaucracy. Chief Chambers understands we have to have something tangible and palatable for everybody.

- Remove 3 and 4 in Section 907.5.2.3.
- Section 11 is deleted except for 1103.2, 1103.35, 1103.7.5.1.1, 103.7.5.2, 1103.9 and 1104.3. Fulton Cochran said Chapter 11 was deleted in its entirety in Clark County, so putting language back in will require more work for them.; they will have to go back and look at them individually and go back to State Board of Examiners if anything more comprehensive than what was originally approved back in the original retrofitted stuff. Chair Chambers stated again, if we knew that you were heading down this road, maybe we could have identified this sooner, but this is good information. Chief Chambers is concerned with buildings that have basements that would compromise first responders' communication efforts and asked if that has been addressed down south. Lynn Nielson replied that they have identified places where we are not able to communicate and it is in their local ordinance adoptions to work with those building owners to get provisions put in. Fulton Cochran said that 1103.2 is being addressed in Section 510 and they've accomplished the exact same thing. He doesn't see 1103.3.5 in 2018 code. The fire retrofit, 1103.7.5.1.1, it was all in recognition of the state law that sets the minimums coming out of the 1980's MGM fire. We definitely need to be in communication. Chief Chambers agreed about the communication especially if you have something in place for existing structures for communication it would be good to know what we can implement statewide and support our first responder for communication. Lynn Nielson went on to say that NRS 477.110 puts limitations on retrofit provisions and by following your lead from last time, where effectively the state deleted Chapter 11 because it is a retrofit chapter, we did the same this time for our adoption of 2018 because if we don't it requires us to go back to the State Board of Examiners and get approval for the retrofit provision. Chief Chambers appreciated the comments and asked how they have overcome the existing structures, in regards to communication and Lynn Nielson said they put it in 510; they can deem it "eminent hazards" and deal with it. There was discussion about evacuations Fulton Cochran said IFC has formed a nationwide add-on task group under leadership of the Fire Marshal from Saint Paul. They are taking a look at that whole topic with the idea of coming up with some recommendations from IFC. Fulton Cochran indicated all Southern Nevada is one school district, so everything is Clark County School District; you actually have a better pipeline into them. Chief Chambers understands, and inquired if they are addressing any of the private schools or anything else that is not with CCSD. Fulton Cochran as far as he is aware, it is among certain fire chiefs and yourself. I do not think the conversation moved beyond that stage yet, other than I took the comment from Chief Cassell and I think indirectly I am the reason ICC is now putting together a nationwide committee to look at this. There are other states where the fire

marshal has issued decision papers on evacuation of schools, in particular an alarm situation and what they expect to occur. Chief Chambers made the comment that this is a positive.

- 1103.9 changes carbon monoxide detectors and 1104.3 exit sign illumination.

Fulton Cocharn commented that 1103 is an unfunded mandate that would require huge staff to go out and identify, there will probably be some comments made.

- Section (r). Added “table 105.2” and changed from 75 percent to 25 percent. Update editions.

**477.2833** Changed from State Fire Marshal to Division of Emergency Management (DEM) since DEM has the ability to outfit this information to the agency statewide and DEM has over 40 boxes with 40 books per box sitting on pallets and are available free of charge. The SFM pays just over \$5 per book.

- Fulton Cochran asked to go back the page where the IFC 447.283, Subsection 2 is adopted; the high rise height is changed. Chief Chambers responded that we didn’t change the high rise height, you folks did. Fulton Cocharn commented that we are staying with you, but he doesn’t see the changes to occupancy classification that was put into the Fire Code and recommend that you put the same language into building code or you create a conflict. It is also going to require you to notify all building officials down here because they are currently planning on adopting regulations that will be in conflict. Fulton Cochran added that any changes to the Fire code such as “complex” would be better if you also put that into your adoption of the building code - correlate it all or you have a conflict in your own requirements. Lynn Nielson pointed out that under 477.283, sub item 1G, occupancy classifications, all those definitions for the fire code need to be brought over to sub item 2, item E where the only definition you have modified is “high rise.” Chambers replied in regards to Item 2, subsection E, my understanding is that there are a few agencies down there looking to go to base code for 75 feet for a high rise. Lynn Nielson agreed, he was the chair of the Fire Code Committee which had representation from every jurisdiction of the fire department as well as industry. The Code Committee sent Southern Nevada Building Officials (SNABO) to keep it at 55 feet. They have a conflict with SNABO and said that all the definitions in the Fire Code need to be brought over to sub Item 2, Item E. Training of Firefighters (2835) was updated again to NFPA Standard 1041 and SNABO decided to let each jurisdiction make their own decision as to the definition of a high rise and deleted it out of the fire code amendments. Fulton Cocharn: His understanding is that Clark County plans on staying at 55’ and are rushing to get their adoptions in place so they can exercise the provision that allows them to be exempted from the State Fire Marshal

requirements. Lynn Nielson added that the vote from the General Committee passed by one vote. Fulton Cochran thinks that Chief Chambers could be out of date, as he heard yesterday that some jurisdictions are pushing for their ordinance to their governing bodies in August to comply with State law. Chief Chambers added that that would be under NRS 477.030, subsection 12 and wants to make sure that the fire chiefs up here understand what is going on..

**NAC 477.2835** Updated NFPA Standard 2041 to the 2019 edition, which goes into effect January 1, 2019.

**NAC 477.287** State Fire Marshal may address by variance or approved alternate means and methods.

**NAC 477.288** Interlocal agreements reviewed by the State Fire Marshal the word “shall. Chief Harvey: If you are going to make it “shall” you should at least define the information that you want and we can adjust accordingly. We take data like number of inspections performed and collect electronically. I will provide the information in the format we have. Chair Chambers responded that that information is outlined in the interlocals and I can be on the agency’s forms. Chief Harvey noted that it is in the Interlocal but it is not outlined in the NAC, and suggested that the NAC should match the interlocals.

## **Proposed Changes to Licensing and Certificates of Registration**

### **NAC 477.300**

- Remove “underground” adding “assemblies.” Doug Sartain asked if this meant all plumbing companies would need to be licensed by the SFM. Chief Chambers replied that at this point it would be all assemblies unless it specifically state fire protection.; fixed fire extinguisher systems, fire alarm systems, fire stand pipe system would be the backflows that we would be looking at. Doug Sartain wanted to be sure that they were not tying it to domestic water. Fulton Cochran expressed concern here is the Las Vegas Valley Water District, they test and maintain thousands of these devices that have sprinkler systems on the other side. Susie Riolo indicated that it applies only to fire protection companies that are testing backflows. Water districts are covered by the PUC. Lynn Nielson said that his utilities department does all testing and they are not registered with the State Fire Marshal’s office, and he suggests that exemptions be included in the document. Chief Chambers will put the exemption in and reminded everyone that this is where the discussion begins and whether it was underground, above ground, or all backflow assemblies, we are finally catching it now in 2018. Chief Chambers expressed that he hopes everybody would understand that he is looking statewide; not specifically one jurisdiction. There are a few things that have been in oversight for many years.

- Add D, “a licensee shall maintain accurate records of all service agreements and services performed.” Doug Sartain indicated records are already maintained so it will not be a problem whatsoever to any of the fire protection companies. Lynn Nielson asked about record retention. Doug Sartain commented that that is a great question. There is a 12 year hydro testing, so perhaps it should be 12 years. Lynn Neilson referred to NFPA 72, 30, 25, and 20 states building owners shall keep records for the life of the building. This is a new one over and above and beyond that; now it says that the company licensee has to maintain records but there is no duration in the standard on licensees. The regulations are silent on records retention for licensees. Doug Sartain agreed and added that the owners are supposed to keep the records for the life of the building, unfortunately what we see every day building ownership changes, management company changes, etc. He suggested that for the best interest of industry that the companies maintain records in accordance with the standards, in case there is ever an investigation or a failure of a system, you are not going to be able to get those records from the building. Chief Chambers commented to Lynn Nielson that this could be a huge lift for industry down south. Doug Sartain does not think industry would have a problem with that.
- No. 12 and 13, “hold a valid Level II certification” was changed to “hold a *current* and valid Level II.”

Nathan Hastings left the meeting at this point.

- Number 15. We notice for fire extinguishers but protection systems was not put in. Again, for discussion and consistence not to segregate a fire protection system from those servicing extinguishers. A conviction of a felony is a basis for denial of a certificate of registration. Doug Sartain suggested that “a conviction of a felony is a basis for denial of a certificate of registration” be changed to “a conviction of a felony will result in an *absolute denial* of a certificate of registration.” There were no other questions or comments.

**NAC 477.310** Number 8 was added, “within seven calendar days after employing a current register and a licensed burn shall report to the State Fire Marshal the name of the register. The licensed firm shall report any termination of employment by register within seven calendar days.” Susie Riolo stated this provision was already in the regulations, and was simply being moved to 310. Doug Sartain added that he doesn’t think industry will have any issue with this at all.

**NAC 477.3142** Add the words “approved and”

**NAC 477.323**

- International Fire Code updated to 2018.

- Fees were increased from \$90 to \$150. This is a 60/90 split with State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) so they can get grants for firefighter training and cost recovery for hazardous materials response. The response issue must be examined “globally” to ensure that this fund does not run out and that it could go hand in hand with county ordinances for civil cost recovery or hazardous materials’ response. No comment from Clark County. John Holmes expressed strong support. Chair Chambers added that a new quarterly report will be provided to the agencies with established interlocals to inform them of entities in their jurisdiction that have pulled a hazardous materials’ permit. Chief Chambers added that the Douglas County 2015 event in regards to cost recovery for Hazardous Materials was mitigated by the HazMat team; they tried to go after costs incurred from the property owner but have been unsuccessful due to the DA’s unwillingness to move forward. The request was made to the SERC as per statute to repay those agencies that responded. If a county does not go after the funds, we could potentially decimate that fund in a matter of one or two incidents, causing the grant process funds for agencies to be unavailable. It would also go hand in hand for civil cost recovery.
- Number 7 Adding “Failure to pay by March 1 of each year may result in late fees and forms. There has been no accountability on this; some companies have gone years without paying fines or fee imposed. In addition with regard to interlocals we are providing a quarterly report of those entities in those jurisdictions.

#### **NAC 477.325**

- Remove and/or update wording changes
- Instructor fee will increase to \$55.30 per hours, the current workforce fee. Chair Chambers said they are looking at an 18 to 23 percent increase in fees across the board for licensing, plan review and inspections. Doug Sartain responded that the industry would support a fee increase as long as it was tied to a state ID with a photo on it. Danny Brennan assured the workshop participants that this was in the works and there will be a photo ID system in place at some point in the future. Doug Sartain applauded the SFM for their support for this undertaking.

### **Proposed Changes to Fire Systems**

#### **NAC 477.350:**

- Number 4: The word “listed” was added and “smoke detectors shall be installed per manufacturers recommendations and located per applicable codes.” Lynn Nielson responded that “smoke detectors” should be changed to “smoke alarms” because smoke detectors are part of the fire alarm system whereas smoke alarms have integral notification appliances built into them. Chief Chambers said this would be noted and changed.

#### **NAC 477.370**

- If the system remains impaired and the licensee does not have the authority to correct the impairment, the word ‘impairment’ must be written across the tag.”
- Add Number 6, “if a deficiency is discovered in a system and it is not impairment, the licensee shall notify the owner and the authority having jurisdiction of the deficiency in writing by the next business day after completing the work.” Lynn Neilson suggested that “in writing” include electronic communication and that should be detailed in the new wording.

#### **NAC 477.395** update editions

#### **NAC 477.400**

- Since the provisions do not prohibit new employees of a licensed firm from performing service under direct supervision of a registrant, Chair Chambers asked if “for a maximum of 90 days after the beginning of employment” should be removed. Doug Sartain questioned what this new wording was addressing. Susie Riolo responded by saying this was the original language from the inception of the State Fire Marshal Division and it needed to be changed in response to public feedback.
- There was a brief discussion about item No. 2, “a new employee shall not perform service on portable fire extinguishers or fix fire extinguishing systems if, after the completion of 90 days the new employee fails to pass a written examination.” Chair Chambers said if that verbiage was left in place, their department has latitude and ultimately industry will have control of the employees. If the verbiage is removed, that will not be the case. Susie Riolo, Doug Sartain, and Chief Baker agreed that this item should be the target of further discussion.

#### **NAC 477.420** Add “or registrant”

#### **NAC 447.441** update editions

#### **NAC 477.442**

- Update edition
- Add “voice evacuation will be required if the main campus fire alarm also is equipped with voice evacuation.” This applies to portable buildings only. Fulton Cochran expressed concerns about CCSD’s 200 portables that are moved from campus to campus because retrofitting requirements would be huge in terms of staffing and money. Chief Chambers said the Bureau Chief has been in contact with CCSD to find out what’s needed for the safety of students and responders.

**NAC 477.444** “Fire truck” was removed and replaced with “Apparatus.” A “truck” is something that has an aerial ladder, so the terminology was changed. Dates were updated.

## **NAC 477.455** Update editions

### **NAC 477.460**

- Update editions
- Doug Sartain inquired about NAC 477.460, Number 1, the last sentence, “records of inspections must be kept onsite for review” correlates to the prior discussion about who keeps and maintains records and for how long. Doug Sartain also thinks the word “onsite” needs clarification. Chair Chambers noted this for workshop records.

### **NAC 477.465**

- Fulton Cochran asked for a clarification of 5b “fire hydrants may provide”. He did not know that a fire hydrant could provide an installation. Susie Riolo replied that we are trying to clarify that a sprinkler company may service, replace the cap and lube; however as far as installation of a hydrant it is not a water purveyor it can only be done if you hold an A contractor’s license under General Engineering. Chief Chambers explained that a company which holds a current license for fire hydrants may provide only the installation, maintenance, and repair in serving fire hydrants with the proper state contractors’ license. It is not the first hydrant; that has been there for years, we are identifying things, it has been missed.
- Chair Chambers read part of the body of 5 that’s been added: “All portions of the automatic fire sprinkler system, including the underground service from the gas valve, road box or check valve to the rear must be installed, tested, and flushed by a company licensed by the State Fire Marshal to perform this work.” Doug Sartain thought this additional verbiage was long overdue and said he was sure the industry would strongly support it. Dates updated.

## **Proposed Changes to Child Care Facilities**

### **NAC 477.562**

- Add “This will include all fire protection systems.”
- Update NFPA Standard 10 and add IFC 2018. There was a discussion about plumbing codes and fire codes, and an unidentified speaker suggested this should be put in the Fire Code as an amendment specific to this occupancy. NAC 477.568

### **NAC 477.568**

- Update editions
- Verbiage for automatic sprinkler systems for childcare facilities used after midnight was updated.

## **Proposed Changes to Fireworks/Flame Effects**

### **NAC 477.611**

- Add “Flame Effects” to this section for consistency.

### **NAC 477.616**

- Add: Alcohol, Liquid, Solid, Natural Gas, Propane. Fulton Cochran asked if the new gel materials classified as Class 2 combustibles would be included in this section. Chief Chambers said it would be added and he thanked Fulton Cochran for the good information and suggestion. Chief Chambers concluded it would be safe to say this applies to live performances only, to prevent misunderstanding that a commercial business that has flame effects would be affected.
- Add “if a fee for a licensed firm is not paid by the time it is due, a late charge of 12 percent per month will be assessed. A licensed firm may not engage in any work authorized by this Chapter or Chapter 477 NRS until the fee is paid”.
- Chief Chambers reminded all to be sure proper safety attire is used at all times pursuant to NFPA 1123, 2018 edition.

**NAC 477.635** “Events liquids and events alcohol” were added and based upon the information about pyrotechnic gel, which will be added as well.

**NAC 477.641** Assistant Pyrotechnic Operator Certificate and Flame Effects Assistant Certificate language was updated regarding qualifications fee, authorized acts, and renewal specifics.

**NAC 477.646** New phone number that will take it to DPS dispatch so that there is 24/7 coverage for communication.

**NAC 477.661 and 477.663** Editions updated

### **NAC 477.710**

- Deleted “pass a background check” because in order to get a permit candidates must go through an ATF background check first.
- Update editions

### **NAC 477.730**

- Add verbiage to Number 2
- Update editions

**NAC 477.810** Update editions

### **NAC 477.910**

- Dates were updated.

- Add verbiage

**NAC 477.917**

- Update editions
- For Item No. 1, Lynn Nielson noted that the listed building provisions were from Chapter 34 of the International Building Code, (2012 edition) which has been removed from the IBC. Therefore, Item No. 1 needs to be removed because there is no longer a Chapter 34. Fulton Cochran stated that the southern jurisdictions are adopting the 2018 edition of the International Building Code as a replacement. Chief Chambers said this was noted and would be acted upon. For Item No. 2, Lynn Nielson stated it was referring to a section of the code that no longer exists. Fulton Cochran clarified that this refers only to new buildings constructed by the State or for the State and would not affect privately owned buildings. Chief Chambers concurred and said this is also for the interlocal agreements. Chair Chambers noted this is still a discussion item.

**NAC 477.920** There was a discussion about the definition of “rural regions.” Pete Mulvihill provided some historic background and explained if a building is 5,000 square feet or more and meets the requirements, then how to address that building’s water supply is provided by that subsection. This was a way to put a recognized alternative method within the NAC so you didn’t have to impose on developers. Chair Chambers said he would welcome any recommendations or input to make this workable statewide.

6. **ADJOURNMENT.** Chair Chambers thanked all participants for their input and adjourned the public workshop on NAC 777.