

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jeffrey
Mr. Craddock
Mr. Redelsperger

GUESTS PRESENT: Mr. Clay Hymer, Dir. Bldg. & Safety, City of L.V.
Mr. Robert Weber, Dir. Bldg. & Zoning, Clark County
Mr. Joe Cathcart, City of North Las Vegas
Mr. Jim Harris, Truckee Meadows Fire Prot. Dist.
Mr. Jim LeBlanc, Truckee Meadows Fire Prot. Dist.
Mr. John Iratcabal, City of Reno
Mr. Marty Richard, Fire Marshal, Reno
Mr. Jack Hardy, Nev. Hotel & Motel Association
Mr. Jerry Adams, Adams & Assoc. Fire Cause
Consultant

Mr. Jeffrey called the meeting to order at 8:15 A.M. The purpose of the subcommittee meeting today was to discuss AB 505. AB 505 creates board of fire safety and applies certain fire safety requirements to certain buildings.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that they would go through the bill section by section to see where there were problems. Mr. Jeffrey said that he didn't know how everyone else felt, but he thought that 5,000 sq. feet in a free standing building is too small. He said that 5,000 sq. feet is a portion of the building. A portion of the building against a shoulder where everything is on one level or whatever the changes are, it would be sprinklered anyway, as part of the main body of the room. Depending on the configuration of the building I think we could go considerably larger. I thought of something more than 10,000 sq. feet.

Mr. Craddock stated that the uniform building code was 12,000 sq. feet. Mr. Craddock asked Mr. Clay Hymer, Director of Building and Safety for the City of Las Vegas if that was correct.

Mr. Hymyer stated that was correct and he said just listening to some of the comments that were brought out the other day when most of the people testified, some of the fire marshals testified that our codes are more strigent than a lot of places across the nation. We feel also that the 5,000 sq. feet is going to cause a serious problem in the southern part of the state. We have literally thousands of buildings that would be involved. It is going to be a really costly situation, especially when those businesses are working on a very low profit. We think staying consistent with the 1979 building code would be adequate.

Mr. Robert Weber, Director, Building and Zoning, Clark County: A building could be built in the past under the 1979 code and then be retrofitted to a higher standard without what appears to be good solid justification. It would be a heavy impact.

Mr. Marty Richard, Fire Marshal for Reno: In Reno, we use 5,000 sq. feet for commercial buildings for new construction under a local ordinance that deals with new construction. Existing construction has a minimum of 10,000 sq. feet, which includes all types of commercial.

Mr. Hymer: We feel that the larger local entities should be allowed to deal with the problem as they see fit. Some areas might wish to go smaller on new construction but we feel that the 12,000 sq. ft. figure isn't that bad.

Mr. Jeffrey: Another concern is that local entities may get a little carried away with the provisions as far as retrofitting is concerned. He asked if anyone has given any thought to tying the retrofitting itself into an area that would be a little more difficult to deviate from and allow new construction to go which ever way the local entity desires to go.

Mr. Hymyer: We have felt all along that the bill was too restrictive. This bill should be feathered down a bit, it is too strong. I have talked to some of the city council and they feel the same way; that our present code is actually sufficient and we have held off on any action of any bill to see what comes out of the legislature.

Mr. Weber: Any political entity is going to have to deal with their voters and the people that they are serving and if it is too restrictive or more restrictive than the code in which it was built under, they are going to have to deal with that and I wouldn't foresee an entity just trying to outdo some other entity. They are going to have to serve their own entity and deal with that issue.

Mr. Craddock: A variation in codes in a local area could quite often cause confusion as relates to a contractor doing the work. We are going to be pushed over backwards, you might say, in trying to accomplish some of the work now. If we set up where a contractor has been familiarizing himself with the procedure with the requirements and work from Las Vegas North, Las Vegas County, Henderson, Boulder City with the same specific requirements as a minimum or maybe even as a maximum, I don't completely agree that we should back off the idea of having the uniform building code as criteria or retrofit.

Mr. Jeffrey: One of the problems he has seen in construction as general is that sometimes an entity will adopt ordinances that are different and more restrictive than others within the area. When you get into retrofitting a few hundred square feet or different provisions can come out to a lot of money. As far as I am concerned, I would prefer to see that the retrofitting has state wide application and allow the local entities to do what they feel is best to do with new construction.

Mr. Hymer: There are certain areas of the uniform building code that you couldn't apply to a retrofit, again, it would be very prohibitive. If you go into the 1-R corridor, as an example, if you were to follow the present 1979 code, it states that every corridor must be self-holding, 20 minute labeled, and that part is not difficult, but it also goes further and says you must have a tight fitting smoke controlled door and a gasketed jamb. That would mean they have to tear every jamb out and buy the label gasket jamb. So, the retrofit in AB 505 in that respect, I think is handled correctly. They are not asking for the jamb they are just saying the sub-closing door and 20 minute door. There are certain parts of the code you couldn't apply on a retrofit. There is one other thing that bothers me about SB 214. Fire does not recognize a different occupancy group. Whatever bill is passed, we should be consistent to where our designers, contractors and code people know that this is what we have to live with. We are not going to exempt fraternal organizations, theaters, or condominiums. A high rise condominium could be just as equally hazardous as a hotel or a motel high rise.

Mr. Jeffrey: Would Reno have any problem going 12,000 sq. ft. if we made this with state-wide application.

Mr. Richard: 12,000 sq. feet is consistent with the building code. If you were going back and dealing with it on an existing building basis, Reno would be more restrictive than the state.

Mr. Hymer: I have talked with the North Las Vegas building officials and their lobbyist this morning and they have told me that we are in complete agreement on the 12,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Weber: In Clark County the fire chief had some concern with certain occupancies that maybe more hazardous with them being under the 12,000 foot criteria. The thing that he was looking at there was just identifying those more hazardous areas in dealing with those on a local basis because they would vary from community to community depending on the type of facility and how they were maintained, how they interact with other buildings, etc.

Mr. Hymer: As far as the Hilton fire was concerned, certainly it is different than the general application of the 5,000 sq. feet. If we would have had sprinklered corridors and it would have gone into the lobby area, it would have taken care of that particular fire.

Mr. Richard: I have a comment on Page 2 of Bill 505. In Section 6, 6b and Section 7, if your intent is to maintain the public assembly portion under the high rise section, I think it would be necessary to move that particular paragraph up as a new Item 7.

Mr. Weber: I think the intent here was to cover all those various areas, whether it is a independent building or collectively within.

1719

Mr. Richard: You can have some pretty significant meeting rooms of 5,000 sq. feet in a high rise building and it may not be off of the corridors and, therefore, it could be construed as to not have any protection of coverage. So, I would think as a portion of that major building it should be covered under that public assembly, under the 5,000 sq. foot. Mr. Richard said he would agree if putting that Section 7(a) above to Section 6 and not putting the exceptions when you move it up into the buildings of 55 feet and above. Take out the exceptions of the church or theater in the high rise portion.

Mr. Weber: One other thing for clarification. We could have a major resort hotel complex, that is a low rise that is not 55 feet high, have the same type of danger regarding a 5,000 sq. ft. room that we discribed here in that complex. It would still be within a 2 million sq. ft. building complex and have significant danger, but not be high-rised as a dual complex.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he thought we should use the 12,000 sq. ft. as the requirement, first of all, to be sprinklered and then any room 5,000 sq. ft. or over in that building that is used for public assembly should be covered including any place used for display exhibition or public assembly. We could do this in Section 7.

Mr. Craddock: If a free standing building has plenty of space around it where you could expand the number of exists involved that may relieve some of the problems.

Mr. Jeffrey: The thing that I am concerned about is that we don't get confused with the definition of a portion of the building that has the improved fire walls, fire doors and all those kinds of things, not get those confused with free standing buildings. I think this should be under a separate section in Section 7.

Mr. Richard: Regarding subsection (B) Section 5, we discussed this with one of the fire protection engineers that put that item in there where they use the corridors as a means of receiving air up to the rooms. They have dampers that would shut in the event that smoke was picked up in the corridors. We checked with some other cities and they felt that one detector to operate the dampers could create a lot of problems to the industry by virtue of somebody walking down the hall and blowing up some smoke to trip the damper. In some cities they have used a dual detector. That is why (b) was put in there: activation of any two detectors. It was kind of a safe guard for the industry.

Mr. Weber: The uniform building code under a retrofit type or existing building type would allow battery-operated detectors to notify the people within that room. You have to be careful to establish your own standards because not everything needs to be to the 1979 code if you are looking

at a true minimums in providing minimum life safety, not necessarily building safety but life safety in regards to retrofit. There is some judgement and evaluation that has to be made and it gets fairly lengthy when you put all the criteria in it. It is minimum life safety and we would be looking at instead of having two smoke detectors regarding HBAC recirculation systems, you would have one for the mechanical code and the second for the fire marshal's regulations under NFPA. Under retrofit, maybe, it would only be necessary to have one to minimize that expense and do it back in the unit itself, rather than each outlet or return in the corridor because you run into a lot of smoke detectors under a retrofit program.

Mr. Craddock: Is the communications system required under UBC.

Mr. Hymer: Yes it is for high rise buildings.

Mr. Richard: Do you plan to leave Item No. B in there.

Mr. Jeffrey: Yes.

Mr. Richard: Do you plan to change any of the items in there.

Mr. Jeffrey: No.

Mr. Richard: What would be in interpretation of sealing the opening between the room and corridor?

Mr. Jeffrey: I think the only time that would come into play is when you are using the corridor as a plenum. If you have separate duct work both ducts would actually be in the room.

Mr. Hymer: To clear up the language where we equip each room with a fire sprinkler, merely say: Off of every required corridor that is sprinklered, each room adjacent to the corridor must have a sprinkler head installed inside of it.

Mr. Redelsperger: Each dwelling unit shall have a smoke detector in the room.

Mr. Weber: I think that would be appropriate. Dwelling unit would tend to catch the apartment problem he is talking about. It would also catch the hotel situation where you have master suites and so forth.

Mr. Jeffrey: Let's go through AB 505 from start to finish. He asked if anyone had any problem with the first page.

Mr. Hymer: I see one little problem with the first page only, under Section 3, where it says, "The owner or operator of any building, except a private residence", I think that we should clear that up because if I owned a condominium that could be considered my private residence.

Mr. Jeffrey: Let's say single family dwelling then, When we get into the condominiums, when we talk about sprinklering and so forth, do you get into each of the individual rooms or were you talking about public areas?

Mr. Hymer: I was thinking about a public area only.

Mr. Richard: I think if you are going to put the exceptions under the individual sections, it is going to be a very encumbered bill and difficult. I think that the safety board, fire board, would be able to allow for variances and the alternatives to some of the provisions as outlined and I think that some of these things would probably be better to let them deal with it on a building by building basis to alternatives.

Mr. Craddock: What kind of problem would we create if we go right back to the uniform building code as a criteria for retrofitting. The exceptions made in the uniform building code could be made by the state board.

Mr. Hymer: The only problem I see you would have with it Bob, is the one thing that I brought out earlier, your corridor would be a problem, you would have to make some exceptions.

Mr. Jeffrey: Any exception that needs to be made in an existing bill is handled by the board. We have a time frame here to, in 1984, to accomplish these changes. I don't think we do need to worry about writing in the exceptions as long as they can go to the board.

Mr. Weber: One thing that would kind of clarify the kind of thing he is talking about is there be a statement that the requirements are not to exceed those requirements as identified in the 1979 building code, which basically covers those because there are some occupancies and things that are not required and of course there is other system evaluation where you do one thing and it counter reacts. If you have an item or application that you are running into, I think it is the intent of retrofit to exceed standards for new buildings in order to make it more safe.

Mr. Harris: Section 2, where they speak of the authority having jurisdiction, after that first sentence "or unless otherwise exempted by the authority having jurisdiction," because if we are enforcing a great number of codes we might have some exemptions already adopted.

Mr. Jeffrey: If you would allow exceptions to be made on the local level I think you would take away the state wide application.

1722

Fred Welden: Under Section 3, part 2 and 4 there is already language about our alternatives approved by the authority and approved by the authority in subsection 2. I think in subsection 1, under this same logic you could have an approved by the authority clause. You are already in this section allowing the local authority a lot of discretion in what type of things they approve.

Mr. Jeffrey: When I read approved by the authority I am reading into it, and maybe I am not right. I am reading into it the variance . . .

Fred Welden: I think you are wrong on that. I think when it says approved by the authority refers back up to authority as defined in Section 2. Authority means the agency having authority for enforcement under subsection 1 of NRS 477.030 and when you get back there that means the state fire marshal in the rural areas and the fire chiefs in the urban areas so anywhere in this bill where authority is used it means the fire chiefs in the urban areas and the fire marshal in the rural areas. It is a completely separate thing from that big board that can give variances. This is allowing discretion at the local level. The fire marshal would be the authority in that area because Washoe and Clark are the only two counties under 477.030 that have their own "authorities" to enforce. The fire marshals regulations are state wide under that law. When he passes a regulation it applies state wide but the enforcement is done by the local fire chiefs in Washoe and Clark. Fred said that he felt that under subsection 1, it would be in section 3, it might be wise to add some type of a phrase as approved by the local authority or as defined by the local authority or by the authority so that you have this statement about safe evacuation of the building as defined by the authority. Some type of a statement here to pull in this approved by the authority so that it would cover you on the exemptions then that could go to the local authority and explain their situation and something of logic could come out of it rather than just across the board requirement.

Mr. Brown: When you are referring to Paragraph 2, Section 1202.b of the uniform building code it covers 3 story motels and apartments, 3 stories or taller. Every apartment house 3 stories or more in height and containing more than 15 apartments and every hotel 3 stories or more containing 20 or more guest rooms shall have an approved fire alarm system as specified. This section 4, as written, does away with the 3 story as written.

Mr. Hymer: If you would stay with a 3 story, we are consistent with the new construction with our retrofit but if we were to reduce that 3 story with something stronger for retrofit, again, we have a problem.

Mr. Harris: This would affect rural Nevada and every corner of Nevada. Again, I think this went beyond the Governor's commissions' recommendations because they addressed three stories or more.

1723

Mr. Richard: I would recommend that on line 19 you put in the words "the owner or operator of every hotel or motel 3 stories or more" and our building official asked that we delete the year 1979 and change that to the latest edition.

Mr. Jeffrey: We are talking about retrofit here and if we are going to retrofit then we better establish a standard. I think 1979 should be the standard.

Mr. Harris: I would like to suggest that we carry that 3 story thing along a little further and place that after apartment building also. So then we are talking about hotels, motels and apartments over 3 stories.

Mr. Jeffrey said line 9 would say "Equip every exit corridor and other means of exit with emergency lighting to permit the safe evacuation of the building," and add something there to the effect that as approved by the local authority or the exceptions may be granted, Fred can help us with that.

Mr. Weber: Was it your intent to do it on line 7 or on line 9?

Mr. Jeffrey: We could probably do it in the area that we were talking about in line 7 and Fred will help us work that problem out. It may be that if we put it in line 7, we won't need it anywhere else.

Mr. Jeffrey: Are there any questions on sections 5 or 6.

Mr. Hymer: In Section 5, we would have to go back and add the three-story concept that we just spoke of.

Mr. Harris: No. It was our intent to apply retroactively to all motel and guest rooms to at least get a smoke detector in the room and if there is a corridor, to make that sealed between the corridor and the room.

Mr. Jerry Adams, Adams & Associates, Fire Cause Consultants: I had one question on section 5, 2(a) "the corridor contains smoke detectors as required by regulation of the state fire marshal. Is that single station or is it tied into an alarm system?"

Mr. Jeffrey: The thing that kind of confuses me with this section is that we are talking about down to 6 guest rooms or 3 apartments. I asked the question before if the corridors would be tied into the main system and the answer was yes but I don't know if we have talked about an instance where we got down into this kind of unit or not.

Mr. Harris: When we talk about the minimum 6 guest room, 3 apartment type structure we are probably not going to have a corridor to contend with and all we are really getting there is a minimum of a smoke detector which is required in new construction now in any dwelling unit; that's not excessive

1724

Mr. Richard: The wording in section 5 when it talks about 6 guest rooms and 3 apartments is the definition under the Uniform Building Code to define those types of occupancies. I am sure it was amended to cover the occupancy as written by the building code. If you are talking about a place that has 4 apartments under the concept of putting detectors in the corridor, you are talking more than likely about a very old type, two or three stories, such as a lodging type house where the apartment enters into a corridor and those, I would agree, need to have a centralized corridor detector and single station units in the individual apartments. Those people are coming out into a usually wood frame construction and are coming down probably into a centralized corridor down a set of stairs to exit out of the building. In a lot of cases they have fire escapes as a secondary means of exiting out of those places. I would agree that the corridor detectors should be there because that is generally the only means of exiting out of there.

Mr. Jeffrey: I do think that in a high rise that they are calling for a central system in the corridor.

Mr. Weber: For the 1979 building code they would just have to be cross related. He said he did have one other item, on section 5 currently it says every hotel or motel, I assume that was to include condominiums.

Mr. Jeffrey: They probably should spell that out.

Fred Welden: Do you want condominiums covered under this?

Mr. Jeffrey: Yes.

Fred Welden: There was a NRS Chapter 17 that defines condominium. I don't know if it is the appropriate definition to fit here as well. You might have to look at that definition in the statutes.

Mr. Jeffrey: We could probably tie it to that definition. Is there any problem with section 6. Line 29 is where the language is that calls for the shut down of the equipment and takes care of the problems in section 5.

Jack Hardy: Nevada Hotel and Motel Association: The cost of sprinkling a full room that is already completed is tremendous. We checked with some sprinkler companies and we found that by going in through the vestibule area with the sprinkler they can mount a wall sprinkler head that they have out now that does cover a 24 foot area and it would cover 99% of all sleeping rooms. Line 20, section 6 says that "each room with at least one fire sprinkler above each door". There are a lot of people who feel that is completely worthless and it was for a life safety thing only. All bathrooms are on the inside of a hotel corridor with a vestibule area and by carrying that just to that corner and then putting a wall mounted sprinkler right there, it would cover the room and it would cover the bed area and that is where your fires will generally start. It would cover it without the wording we have in bill No. 214.

1725

Mr. Weber: Under the Governor's committee we were looking at minimum life safety and not property protection. Sprinklering throughout is certainly a property protection item. We looked at sprinklering the corridors to provide a safe area and also some means of taking care of smoke relative to that corridor and then, of course, the sprinkler was put in above the door on the inside of the room as a means of protecting the integrity of that door to prevent smoke and fire from coming into the corridor area to provide minimum safety to the occupant for getting out of the building.

Mr. Jack Hardy: Many of the insurance companies do give full credit now for sprinklering inside the door with one additional head covering the bedroom. Those that want to get the credit for full sprinklering can do it without going into closets and bathrooms and everywhere else.

Mr. Craddock: By sprinklering the corridor, the water is there readily available to project inside the room and the major part of the ceiling replacement in the corridor would be limited to the corridor.

Mr. Jeffrey: If you tried to fully sprinkler, there are a lot of high rises that are solid concrete. The only chance you have is the corridor.

Mr. Hardy: I am general manager of Hyatt Lake Tahoe and we are solid concrete.

Mr. Weber: Bud Sweitzer from the Gaming Industry proposed a modification. Under section 5 relative to closing off or sealing the corridor penetration for make up error if a building was fully sprinkled. He submitted a proposed amendment for that item.

Mr. Jeffrey: What you are really talking about is if a building is fully sprinklered then the ceiling requirement in section 5 should be eliminated.

Mr. Weber: It would be the general item 2, subsection 2.

Mr. Harris: I would oppose that amendment because even in a totally sprinklered building even if the MGM had been sprinklered in the casino level of the area where the fire actually burned, the smoke is what killed those people in the tower from those penetrations.

Mr. Hardy: I think what Mr. Sweitzer was talking about is if there was a room fire, the sprinkler system would take care of the fire. Consequently, there really wouldn't be that much smoke. We talked to Mr. Sweitzer yesterday and we talked about going with that additional head in the bedroom. It could be considered fully sprinkled and then get away possibly with section b under 5 about sealing off because it would take care of a fire in a room.

Mr. Jeffrey: I guess the question is and the decision that needs to be made is whether you are going to get enough smoke before the sprinkler system goes off to do damage.

Mr. Hymer: I have had mixed emotions on that. If the sprinkler system does the job a lot of times the fire will be put out before it will create black smoke.

Mr. Richard: We had just had a recent situation, one of our retail stores which is fully sprinklered and we had a small fire in the back hall way that sent smoke throughout the whole building and it didn't trip any of the sprinkler heads because it just had not generated enough heat. We had to evacuate the building because of the smoke in the building.

Mr. Richard: In section 7, was it generally agreed that you were going to put that 5,000 sq. feet portion (a) under section 6 as well, to cover a 5,000 sq. foot public assembly room in a high rise building.

Mr. Jeffrey: Well, either that or it would be a separate subsection instead of being separated. The 12,000 sq. foot requirement for a free standing building or a 5,000 sq. foot requirement for a portion of the building.

Mr. Jeffrey: Mr. Jeffrey reviewed what they had talked about earlier for Mr. Harris who was late. Mr. Jeffrey said they had talked about the 5,000 sq. foot requirement and thought that it was too stringent for a free standing building so we decided to go with the 1979 building code, the 12,000 sq. foot for a free standing building and maintain the 5,000 sq. foot requirement for a portion of the building.

Mr. Harris: For a portion of the larger building? My only comment would be is I thought the 5,000 is not too stringent when you are considering assembly areas because a 5,000 sq. foot area would allow for over 700 people which is an awful lot of people. And if you start with 12,000 sq. ft. you are talking about a lot more people that you are going to allow in a building without sprinklers.

Mr. Jeffrey: You have to consider that we are talking about a total building of 12,000 sq. feet and not necessarily the assembly area.

Mr. Jeffrey: One of the real problems that the building department brought out is that someone may have just finished a building last month under the 1979 building code and now they have to go and retrofit it.

Mr. Harris: The only problem I have with the 1979 building code language is they talk about 12,000 sq. feet used for display purposes and this an ambiguous term and this language here addresses assembly, its purest definition: assembling people for drinking, dining, entertainment, deliberation, etc.

Mr. Jeffrey: Well, it was my intent, and I think the intent of everyone here, that we are talking about a building with a total size of over 12,000 sq. feet. Not assembly areas. If you go to line 40 on page 2 it says, "The owner or operator of every building or portion of a building used for public assembly, except a church or a theater with fixed seating." It doesn't say anything about assembly areas, it says used for public assembly. The 12,000 sq. foot requirement would be the total building. In the assembly area it would be smaller than that.

Mr. Hardy: On line 41 were you going to leave theaters excluded.

Mr. Jeffrey: I don't see any real reason to exclude a theater.

Mr. Weber: I think under the interpretation of going with 12,000 sq. feet that you wouldn't need an exception of a church or a theater, it is not accepted currently in the Uniform Building Code in those applications as adopted in Southern Nevada.

Mr. Jeffrey: If they are not accepted now then we probably shouldn't accept them in this either. Mr. Jeffrey asked if that was all on page 2. There was a question of the definition I believe the other day of line 2, page 3, the definition of combustible parts - fiberboard.

Mr. Craddock: Fiberboard is all combustible, generally speaking. It is just a matter of having a retardant built into it. This terminology would probably throw out every ceiling in the state of Nevada.

Mr. Weber: I think your fiberboard definition is a little too general. It was brought up by one of the members on the Governor's committee. I would propose that it deals with no interior finishes of combustible fiberboard composition and all or part which do not meet the required flame spread ratings of section 4204 of the UBC. There are certain standards that are already adopted for flame spread in the Uniform Building Code. If it doesn't comply with those standards then it shouldn't be allowed. If you want you could just leave out fiberboard but say interior finishes would be allowed which meet the required flame spread ratings of section 4204 of the 1979 Uniform Building Code.

Mr. Hymer: That takes care of your petro chemical phony wood.

Mr. Hardy: Could we possibly add the wording for that reason since this bill is addressing retrofitting, so that somebody misinterprets that we have to tear down all the walls that they could at least be treated.

Mr. Weber: The Governor's board is going to be composed of Fire Marshals and Fire Chiefs and Engineers and licensed architects. I think this is a kind of issue that they should discuss.

Mr. Jeffrey: I think that we should plan on doing on what we can with the section. We will have to come back to it. The 50 or more persons on line 4 go back up to the same square footage basis so that really doesn't have any effect. I don't see any problem with section 8, does anybody else?

Mr. Harris: Let's not leave that 50 or more. That is the true definition that is from the building code fro assembly.

Mr. Jeffrey: I don't see where it does any harm to leave it in there. In section 9, I suggest that we add the superintendent of building and safety from the two largest counties. We do need a couple of representatives from building and safety.

Mr. Hymer: I agree with that. I think also to get a good representation on that board we should have a contractor.

Mr. Jeffrey: I don't have any problem with that but it makes it a 12-man board.

Mr. Cathcart: Out of the nine shown you have already five fire, maybe you can reduce that.

Mr. Weber: Perhaps you don't need two fire marshals and two fire chiefs, perhaps one of each or a combination.

Mr. Jeffrey: We have a fire marshal in Clark County, right?

Someone answered yes, Washoe has three fire marshals, one for the two cities and one for the county.

Mr. Weber: I don't know what their other duties are specifically related to this issue but certainly the board of fire safety is utilized under this bill. You have two fire marshals and two fire chiefs and a state fire marshal.

Mr. Richard: I think code wise you might be better off to put the fire marshals on there.

Mr. Jeffrey: Is the fire marshall generally the enforcement authority?

Mr. Hymer: Yes, actually the way it is set up right now your building official is responsible for getting all new construction corrected. This would have some part in the retrofit and in new buildings the fire marshal is responsible for seeing that buildings are maintained and in life safety condition. In our particular instance we work hand in hand down south with our marshal and the building officials.

Mr. Jeffrey: Maybe we could eliminate one of the fire chiefs and put a contractor in.

Mr. Weber: Are you looking at leaving two fire marshals and one fire chief then and then two building officials and a contractor.

Mr. Richard: On the Professional Engineer, is there a specific type of Professional Engineer you are referring to? Are we talking about a fire protection engineer or are we talking about a civil engineer?

Mr. Jeffrey: I don't know, I think they were probably talking about a civil engineer, or mechanical or electrical.

Mr. Craddock: I think mechanical or electrical would be better than civil.

Mr. Richard: I think the mechanical.

Mr. Jeffrey: You might have a real problem finding electrical engineers that are involved in the business. There is only one in Clark County that I know of.

Mr. Cathcart: Shouldn't it say general contractor.

Mr. Jeffrey: That would probably be a good idea. Is there any problem with anybody adding removing any three members and making that a majority, Page 3, Line 28.

Mr. Richard: What they are asking for here is if any three members can call for a meeting.

Man From Audience: You talk about two fire marshals, they are going to come from your big counties but you can have paid fire chiefs in your smaller counties. I am just wondering if you are not putting too many members on this board that are going to represent your two bigger counties. The only person that is going to represent the smaller counties is the state fire marshal. If you leave those two fire chiefs in, you can pull the chief out of some of the smaller communities. He may be the fire marshal and the fire chief.

Mr. Jeffrey: The way this thing reads is it is not a question on whether the fire chiefs are paid but whether the department is full time and paid. I don't know how many full time paid departments there are.

Man From Audience: There isn't very many. You may want to make it from paid departments and eliminate the full time.

Fred Welden: In fact, Clark County is that way.

Mr. Jeffrey: I think probably what they were after is to have a professional serve. To have people that are professional fire safety people on board rather than volunteers. I think we need to change the language to accomplish that.

Man From Audience: I think that would be the intent but I would hope that you might take a look at the smaller counties and give them a chance to have people on there. I am the fire chief of Washoe County.

Mr. Jeffrey: It may be best to leave the two fire chiefs on here and go head and add the contractor and then say the chairman won't vote except to break a tie.

Mr. Weber: The only problem I can see with it is the size.

Mr. Jeffrey: We will have a problem with size, I don't think there is any question of that. I think the representation is good. When we are talking about the differences between the large and small counties I think representation from both those areas is important.

Mr. Weber: Mr. Chairman, I have one further question on this section 9 and that is on the impact from a cost standpoint. In Lines 29, 30 and 31 on page 3 relative to the cost factors, there the number of meetings and so forth I would assume by the passage of this bill that there will have to be a fair amount of dollars allocated to that and also there is going to be a fair amount of impact just from the communities and the enforcement survey activities.

Mr. Jeffrey: I would assume that the fire marshal has something built into his budget if he doesn't, we better find that out.

Mr. Weber: A couple more people that he is talking about in those particular activities will help him in doing the staff work necessary if there is also additional funding, travel and \$40.00 a meeting that are identified and so forth. So, the costs are getting fairly large.

Mr. Jeffrey: I made a note here that the expenditures required for compliance are exempt from caps reasonable fees required for inspection and compliance.

Mr. Hymer: That would certainly be compatible with the Governor's committee recommendations who were extremely considered over those areas.

Mr. Jeffrey: I don't know if it is necessary to charge a fee for these inspections or not but if it is, we either need to make the decision whether fees will be required or whether the local entities in the state are going to have to pick those up within their budgets or we are going to have to provide an exemption from SB 411.

Mr. Redelsperger: It states in SB 411 that any state mandated projects such as they are mandating have to factor up reassessments once a year and then they are stating that the sheriffs deputies will now fall under retirement and all of these things are exempt from the caps.

Mr. Jeffrey: Is there any problem with section 10?

Mr. Craddock: In looking at that we are notifying the fire marshal the results with the various evaluations. Fire marshals in all incidences are not the responsible party.

Mr. Hymer: The only problem I see in section 10 is where we are referring to "fire codes" throughout. The wording should be changed to "building and fire codes."

Mr. Craddock: I think that the parties in Washoe County should be advised of the results of the evaluations in lines 37 thru 39.

Mr. Craddock: The Board of Fire Safety is making the evaluation. The information should go to the state fire marshal as well as the local people. The fire safety board still should pass the information to the two local jurisdictions which have the responsibility.

Mr. Richard: They are not doing that now.

Mr. Craddock: No, they are not doing it now because there is no such thing as the Board of Fire Safety. The Board of Fire Safety evaluate technological developments, new architectural designs as related to fire protection and so on and advise the state fire marshal of the results of his evaluation. They should advise the state fire marshal and the two local entities which are charged with the same responsibility as the State Fire Marshal has in the 15 urban counties.

Mr. Harris: You have to amend your section 15 a little bit.

Mr. Hardy: What is the time element on this for the various projects to be completed. On SB 214 it gave July 1, 1984, but it really doesn't define it.

Mr. Jeffrey: Three years, and then there is a mechanism for extensions if the board finds due cause. I think the difference between this one and SB 214 is if I am correct that the owner has 36 months after the evaluation to make the corrections of 505 and 214. They have until July 1, 1984 to make their corrections regardless of when the survey is done.

Mr. Richard: In the city of Reno we have been actively enforcing a retroactive provision for our existing bill and have for the past few years which fall under the over 10,000 sq. foot area. Realizing the intent of this is to sprinkler existing buildings in the corridors and support rooms, we did want to mention we have been using a ordinance that called for either full sprinklering in those existing buildings over

10,000 sq. feet or in lieu of the sprinkler go to full fire detention at the central station monitors to the fire department.

It has been effective in the city of Reno. This could be used as an alternative means by the Fire Safety Board.

Mr. Jeffrey: I think that we before we report back to the committee that we ought to explore some alternatives that may be allowed. We may need to spell it out in here.

Mr. Craddock: I would like to make one quick comment. In the process of going through the evaluation of the various tax packages we have good substantial reason to believe that some of the business interests in the state of Nevada, particularly, in the Reno, Sparks area, are not too healthy at this point and time so some of the restrictions that we place on them in the Reno, Sparks area maybe requirements which may be beyond what the rest of the state or anyone else has required at this point and time. I think the under 10 million dollar gaming operators in the Reno, Sparks area are down now where they operated last year with a negative 4% balance. I think these things should be considered too. I don't like this upmanship approach to solving this type of problem. It is nice to say that the fire safety record we have is among the best in the nation. The biggest problem seems to be the interior finish rather than the fire sprinklering systems. I think there is some real soul searching due at this point and time as relates to the building business.

Mr. Harris: I agree to some extent and I think that the Governor's Commission addressed that there would have to be some incentives and hopefully the Assembly could look at some incentives to offset some of these restrictive costs and tax incentives.

Mr. Jeffrey: The only thing I think we have left to do in AB 505 is to make sure that alternative methods may be taken. I know what Bob is saying and I agree with it but the problem is it is difficult to separate life safety from financial impact. I think there may be an opportunity to see the alternatives and options and provide a system that will be as effective and may be more effective than the bill.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:25 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Robbie Alldis

Robbie Alldis
Assembly Attache

1733

Clay Hymer | Dir. Bldg. + Safety
City of Las Vegas

Robert Weber, Dir. Bldg. + Zoning
Clark County

Joe Cathcart - City of North Las Vegas

and ^{Brown suit} Thomas Truckee Meadows Fire Prot. Dist.
" " "

John LeBlanc

John Tratebald

Marty Richard ^{W. H. H. H.} syst

Jack Hardy

Jerry Adams ^{Handwritten}

City of Reno
FIRE MARSHAL - RENO
New Hotel + Motel Assn
Adams + Assoc. FIRE CODE CONSULT.