



STATE FIRE MARSHAL

ITM TASK FORCE

November 30, 2023, Meeting Minutes, 1:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.

Pacific Daylight Time (PDT)

Office of the State Fire Marshal

Zoom Meeting Conference Call

Meeting ID: 210 520 3211

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Peter Hulin, National Fire Sprinkler Association (NFSA)

Wayne Weisz, American Fire Sprinkler Association (AFSA)

David Karrick, California American Fire Sprinkler Association (CAFSA)

Vahe Zohrabian, California Fire Protection Coalition

Kim Stocking, Advanco Fire Protection

Rigo Vasquez, Advanco Fire Protection

James Carver, LB Community Development

James Feld, University of California, Berkeley

Jason McBroom, Alpine Fire Protection District

Amber Barrios, Associated Compliance & Training

Daniel Valencia, AVN Testing Co.

Ted Hakimi, California Fire Protection Coalition

John Holmes, Sprinkler Fitters and Apprentices, Local 709

Steven Fox, Sprinkler Fitters and Apprentices, Local 483

Gerald Cox, Business Agent, Local 669

Brian Hutto, Sprinkler Fitters and Apprentice, Local 669

Jose Colin, Suisun City Fire Department

Shane Clary, Bay Alarm Company

Shawn Gray, London Pearson McLaughlin

Steven Miles, Sprinkler Fitters Local 483

Rick Cortina, Bay Alarm Company

## **OSFM STAFF**

Chief Greg Andersen, Committee Chairperson, OSFM

Brice Bennett, OSFM

Ben Salazar, OSFM

Adam Stewart, OSFM

Cortney Walker, OSFM

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **A. Welcome and Logistics Briefing**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Chief Greg Andersen, at 9:01 A.M. PDT on November 30, 2023.

#### **B. Attendees were informed of meeting logistics and etiquette.**

#### **C. Introductions**

All attendees introduced themselves. (All Listed Above)

#### **D. Announcements**

Staff Service Manager Cortney Walker announced changes in staff related to programs. For Portable Fire Extinguishers Program, SSA Adam Stewart will now take program responsibilities from Wanda Albritten, who is now moving to Flame Retardant & Chemicals Program. SSA Taylor Machado and SSA Alex Rapphahn will now be taking AES Program responsibilities. Cortney Walker ensured that the information gets out there for both programs.

#### **E. Chief's Intent**

For the ITM Work Group to come up with a need for what an inspection testing and maintenance certification is. And then, if what the need is, how we address that need with a program. What that program looks like in detail. For the ITM Work Group to move forward with that process, it would create the regulations and the justification which is called the ISOR.

#### **F. Goals**

Chief Andersen's goals for the ITM Work Group, is to come to some form of consensus on this. On our last meeting there was a general consensus

that we need a program. Chief Andersen requested some suggestions on what that would be. Chief Andersen stated that we did receive little content. We did receive a couple, and we'll go in over that. And then in the agenda. Chief Andersen put the justification afterwards, because when we look at each one individually, the individual justification, it will depend on what we're doing, on how we spell that out, we have the overall justification. But we also have the individual justification.

### **Balanced workgroup**

Chief Anderson stated that on the membership, he did have some comments on this. He would like to set up a membership for this group, because they may be very different things. He'd like to make a balance group, maybe adding a few more positions to that couple of things may be off balance, but the end, this is just a working group. This is all just something that goes to the advisory committee who they're appointed by the state fire marshal. Chief Greg Anderson stated that he is open for questions on things that the group has about this, but we try to keep this a transparency process.

1.904.1

2. § 905. Licenses/Certificates. Creating the workgroup / Framework

### **Brainstorming**

Chief Anderson stated on the proposed minimum qualifications provided by ITM Group members, there were suggestions of minimum qualifications to take the exam. Chief Andersen turned it over to ITM Group Member David Karrick to further expand on the proposal. Member Karrick stated per request, he sent over ideas of what people thought might look like or, this program might look like. Member Karrick stated that this was just him spit balling ideas on what he thought was not only a combination of reasonable, but also something that could be enforced. Member Karrick thinks it's very easy to come up with a million ideas, and this is just one of them. He was looking at multiple ways to get to take the state exam. He doesn't think the deletion of a State exam is a good idea. Member Karrick stated that California focusing on ITM work mainly on NFPA 25 as a skeleton of our requirements, but with a fair amount of modification, puts us in a position where there's not a tremendous amount of places that are specifically teaching explicitly, California oriented stuff. We are getting to a point where we can take somebody's experience and quantify that to some level and say, okay, you have an element of hands on experience. You

have an element of book learning. and we think that you're qualified, according to these other programs to take our test and prove that you know what's required in the State of California as modifications to an NFPA 25 seems like a pretty good approach to Member Karrick. He continues to add that he thinks there's a lot of pathways in his presentation that get somebody to that that point of having to take California's State test. But still, no matter how you got there, you're still going to prove that you know the basics of what California requires. Member Karrick mentioned that, It was brought to his attention by Mr. Fox, that there may be some more pathways that are that are pertinent to, or applicable to this, and by no way is his summary some sort of set in stone kind of a thing. It is just an idea that he had that and put out there. So passing the test, his thought would be that we need to probably look at. Member Karrick doesn't think anyone would argue that there should be some sort of CEU element to this, but from a logistical standpoint of actually enforcing this. Member Karrick would prefer to see CEUs required annually that way, there's never a question of are they due, or they're not due. It makes the renewal of these certifications very easy. Everyone must provide 10 hrs., or 8 hrs., or whatever that number is due every single year. It lessens the burden on staff. He thinks a little bit more on determining whether these people have to include these things. And he just thought this was relatively robust enough program without being overly complicated. Member Karrick continued to add, that he spent some time Member McBroom, who spoke in our last meeting and had some ideas and liked those ideas personally. Ultimately, Member Karrick doesn't think the mechanics of issuing them, maintaining them, and keeping up on those certifications is something that staff is necessarily ready to accomplish. If this program is going to have any legs and have any real teeth. It has to be something that's not only certifiable and renewable, but also has to be enforceable as well. So, the levels of complication and getting something so outlandishly complicated that it can't really be done doesn't seem like something that's real appealing to him.

Chief Andersen thanked Member Karrick for the proposal presentation and for submitting something. Chief Andersen asked for ideas. So, we're not going to just say, well, this is not good at all. But where could it be better? Or where the issues are so.

Member John Holmes asked, on the bullet points. Anyone of those items will be eligible to the seat for the exam? Member Karrick responded "Correct."

Member Daniel Valencia asked, any one of them? Or are you suggesting all of them? Member Karrick responded, "Any one of them, it's a multi-tiered approach to qualify to take the exam."

Member John Holmes asked, on the second item, where it says, any state program. Is that any state in the U.S. or just the California State? Member Karrick responded by stating that he would think, due to the ITM needs in the

State of California. That excluding programs from other States is not beneficial to the end user. Ultimately, taking a State approved fire sprinkler fitter apprenticeship program in any 50 states, he thinks, would be the best approach, and that person still has to seat for the California specific.

Member Daniel Valencia stated and asked, that UL is coming out with an ITM certification program. So, as other individuals or companies. How are they going to be incorporated in this too? Or can it be under like, what CSFM does is the NURDLE, nationally recognized testing lab slash nationally recognized training? Chief Andersen responded by stating that there's always another way where any other program can be reviewed by the State Fire Marshal's Office for approval. Member Karrick added, either that or leaving the wording in there that says, any other nationally recognized program approved by a committee by the AES Committee, and that kind of gives the committee leverage to add additional programs as they come about or to the State Fire Marshal, or whatever that language would be, he doesn't think this is in perpetuity is probably the smartest idea.

Chief Andersen mentioned in our last meeting discussion, he wanted to bring this up. About having multiple different certifications for different type of systems. That the concerns are that it could become much more complicated. In looking at Member Karrick's proposal. Chief Andersen asked Member Karrick You're looking at one certifications? Would that be correct? Member Karrick responded with "That would be correct, yes."

Member Jim Feld stated that Member Karrick did a nice job on his proposal. Member Feld started looking into a couple of these and finding some things that needed to be addressed, he believed, and to compare these different programs. First, has somebody mentioned the any state approved sprinkler program. Member Feld doesn't agree with that. They don't know what the other states are doing. So, he thinks, we should keep that within California. But in looking at some of these, the ASSE. Which he had to add parenthetically, that he's wondering why they're getting involved with ITM for fire sprinkler systems and fire protection systems when it's American Society of Sanitation Engineers. Member Feld doesn't know what possess them to get involved with this. Member Feld has the 2015 edition of their standard and he doesn't know if there's any changes to the 2020 edition, but what he saw was that they wanted 200 a question exam. which is okay, you have 5 h to complete it. NFPA has a 140-question exam, and you have 2 and a half hours to complete it. Are these equivalent? NFPA has multiple certifications, so you mentioned here the sprinkler ITM specialist certification which I agree with. They also have one for facility managers. and we have to make sure that people out there understand? There's a distinction there, but the facility manager certification may work or the problem that we have in Title 19 that will allow the building owner to use their employees, if they're properly trained, and experience and so forth. They could

probably take this and become certified to do the inspection part of the program for their facility. This may be a good place for them to fit into the program.

Member Jim Feld continued to state, if we're going to go with any one of these, we need to create a matrix with all the different aspects of these programs. For example, how many years of experience, when he read on a couple of them, they want 5 years. So verifiable experience. And the number of questions on the exam. The recertification he thinks he saw a couple of 3- year recertifications, and what you have to do to get recertified and we need to compare all of these programs on an item-by-item basis, not an easy task. He's not sure what addition the ASSE certification standard requires of NFPA. 25, the 2015 used to 2014. He's assuming that the 2020 edition is going to use the 2017, or 2020. Member Feld stated, that we have to make sure. Whoever we have, whoever selector's using the 2020 edition. He believes that's very important. NFPA obviously will use the 2020 edition, they want you to buy it. Member Feld would like the ITM Group to really consider this building owner inspection requirement in Title 19. Member Feld gave an example. They can have the stock boy doing inspection, testing, and maintenance on their system. It's a simple, wet pipe system, if he's properly trained certified, then he'd say, go for it. But he doesn't want some guy just filling out a piece of paper and not knowing what he's doing, he's got a normal pressure of a hundred PSI. Static pressure. He sees it at 40. He writes down 40 and walks away from it. Got a problem, and he doesn't recognize that.

Member David Karrick wanted to address Member Felds questions before the group moves on. As far as the ASSC 15010, he can't speak as to how they've got into the business of NFPA 25. But, what he can say is that the reason he added them to this list is that he does recognize that they are in that business, that they are producing a certification. He believes their certification exceeds the standards of ITM. And with that, He felt it was appropriate to add them to the list. He knows they have a high volume of certified individuals in California as well as across the nation, so it seemed pertinent to add to the list, and then he wanted to make sure that he was clear that these that he listed here or not an exhaustive list. There may be other things out there he recognized that could be added to this list and are appropriate. Member Karrick clarified, that It wasn't his intention that you know these items produced parity. He's not saying that, a 5 year sprinkler, fitter apprenticeship program is equal to a NICET Level 2 ITM certification. But what he is saying is that all of these certifications, once completed, do touch on elements of the ITM side of the fire sprinkler industry. And he does think that everyone involved in these types of programs, whether it be, 5 year fire sprinkler fitter apprenticeship programs. NICET or ASSE would tell you at the end of the day, their certified individual is qualified to do this work. What Member Karrick's intention was to say, okay, these are qualifiers to sit and take the test that this group develops. So ultimately, we would produce parity in the test that these individuals sit and take, and then, when it comes to recertification, he doesn't care if someone recertifies their NICET, ASSE, or their

NFPA. Once they've attained the California certification, those 2 things would be separate issues. This is how you got to take the test is through this certification whether you maintain it is on your own. But the maintenance of California certification would be through a CEU. Member Karrick ended by stating, that those were just some points of clarification for what he's intention was.

Member Jim Feld asked, one other thing here, is that the NICET Level 2 that was mentioned, is that the proper level? Why not consider 3 or 4? Member Karrick responded " those are all things we could explore as a group."

Member Fels added that he would like to see what levels of expertise is, if you go from a 2 to a 3 to 4. What level do we really need out there? He doesn't know if 2 is too low, too high, or whatever. But he thinks we need to investigate that.

Member James Carver wanted to verify a statement that Member Feld mentioned regarding inspection and certification for inspection only. Member Carver believes we do not have a mandate certified for regulated inspections. So, why would we do a certification for inspection only? Chief Andersen stated that he believes he's talking about the Type L, Member Carver continued to add that a Type L, which is ITM. The Type L, Member Carver could see doing some form of this for, but the facility manager certification. So, I do not know where it would fit into that, because you got to know 25 requirements, and we already got certification for the fire pump. So, you have a lot of people out there that have valves. Why do I need the holders and the engineers and the basic building management? Why do I need to have my guys doing the private standpipe, the other facets of an L. Member Carver continued to add that a lot of people won't do it, liability owner companies for the ITM. Those who went through the fire pump day in and day out they do not want the liability for their engineers to do the rest.

Chief Andersen responded by stating that it was a very good question. Was he talking about expanding the requirements? To do just the visual inspections would require certification, or we talking about that Type-L?

Member Shane Clary had a couple of questions or points to make. First question was to Member David Karrick, Shane Clary stated that he was on the NFPA website, and he couldn't seem to find what their requirements were. He found their page that has all the various certifications, but when he clicked it ,it just took me to basically sign up for the exam that never told me what experience was needed to take the exam. Was he able to find that? Member Karrick responded by stating that he has not done a deep dive into that previously. That when he went to go sign up for it, as you go through the sign-up process. It starts talking about requirements to sign up and get approved, but admittedly has not done a deep dive on it.

Shane Clary's second question was to the general group. Shane asked if the group has discussed the minimum requirements for an individual to even get the certification, because, like the NICET Level 2 that requires 2 years of experience before you can get the certification license. NICET Level 1 is 6 months as indicated, the other one by the sanitation people was 5 years. Shane continued to add, that there's a difference between one is 5 years. One is 2 years, the requirements. For NICET Level 3 that is 5 years' experience. Shane Clary having taken all those exams, he would say that for what he thinks, what this group is intended for the level 2 is sufficient as opposed to level 3.

Shane Clary gave an example, if you have an individual, let's say that I hire someone tomorrow and we'll train them as a fire inspector. If it takes up to 2 years before they do sprinkler inspections. About training, can they do anything with their training. How is that done? Is it going to an apprenticeship program, is a one-on-one ratio between the cadet, and the journeymen, he thinks all that has to be at some point spelled out. Shane Clary just wanted to bring it to the table.

Member Vahe Zohrabian, in summary. Wanted to add on the qualifications part from NFPA72, which is super important, that we have all kinds of walks of life in our coalition, and last time around manufacturers, brought this up, and the chief Anderson agreed that we are forgetting the manufacturers. The people that inventing are devices and equipment. Have a right not only touch, test, inspect, do everything. This is coming from NFPA 72 is:

1. The qualification factor trained, and certified for specific type brand of system service
2. Certified by nationally recognized certification organization, except to Authority Having Jurisdiction.
3. It either individually or through affiliation with organization that is registered, licensed, or certified by a state or local authority to perform service on systems addressed within the scope of Code.
4. Employed and qualified by an organization listed by nationally recognized testing laboratory for the servicing of the system within the scope of the code.

So this will include everybody that is basically selling us the fire pumps and the valves and the devices, they have any right to test them and obtaining any kind of certification from this manufacturer and sources going to be valid.

Chief Andersen stated that he thinks that's fairly easy to put an exception for the program for factory trained personnel working on their own equipment.



Member Zohrabian, continued to state, in summary. Another point that Member James Carver mentioned, that's going to make it a lengthy process. Bringing years of experience and going to the same route that we went first time around is not the correct route, because what Member David Karrick is suggesting in his letter, is having all the avenues open that most of us, majority of us mentioned. This is the fifth meeting, and we want to make sure that all the doors are open. All the certificates which are valid and relevant are respected and permissible in order to achieve a qualified person who work. And as mentioned before. California is number one in rental properties and homeowners, high-rise buildings. and honestly State Fire Marshal was not helping with having that type. L, working on fire pump. A qualified person goes to a building once a year on annual, which is a must. An unqualified person. He's doing it 51 times until the last week. There's 52 weeks in a year. and we are missing 51 times that person can damage that pump and put everything in jeopardy. The heart of the system, which is fire pump. That person doesn't have the right PPE to touch and safety of the OSHA to open up a diesel power pump's battery. He is not allowed. As a matter of fact, we are not allowed per your own admission, and sending out the Bulletin to open a controller. So an unqualified person opening a controller that UL then NFPA, State Fire Marshal sent out a bulletin and causing death and injuries to him. Member Zohrabian doesn't see a Type-L, a simple test can be justified if we want to do the right thing and creating that loophole.

Member Peter Hulin stated, he doesn't know where we come off with our arrogance. To think that we cannot accept something that is already a national standard or a national test to put these people through. Some of these programs that are quote unquote out of State work in 49 other States. Apparently, we are so special that they're not applicable to the State of California. Member Hulin feels that we are reinventing the wheel. Member Hulin continued, #2 as a committee member. He doesn't want to be the one who reviews and accepts one of these programs. That's the State Fire Marshal's job, not this committees. Some of these people do this for profit. He thinks it is a mistake to have this committee review something especially from a for profit organization and tell them that they cannot do business in California. Member Hulin ended with stating that he thinks that's really overstepping the bounds of what the function of this committee is.

Member Daniel Vanecia just wanted to comment on the proposals that Member David Karrick put together. He thinks it was a great proposal, he could tell Member Karrick put a lot of time and thought into it, and going on with Bob said, as far as the individual certification. This might open a discussion as well, he's along the lines of having an individual certification or a fire pump or a sprinkler system. a different test for each one which you get certified. Instead of having a certification as a whole. Member Vanencia wanted to see what the groups opinion was on that.

Rick Cortina responded by stating, that there's a city called La and La City. Cortina, agrees with Member Vanencia, that it opens the door for more people and reduce the cost to the end user at the end of the day.

Member Vanencia also stated, on a closer control on the on the test questions. Instead of having a fire pump test, which has a hundred questions or 75 questions compared to an all-inclusive test that might have a few questions on fire pump and keep a few questions on combined sprinkler standpipe. It's basically creating a red 4 program kind of out of state level, obviously with the input of everybody else.

Member David Karrick clarified, when he put this together, it was his thought, as well. Are we looking to build an exclusionary program that takes a select few highly trained individuals, and funnels them into these select little things? Or are we looking to set a baseline of fundamental, acceptable education? While he does think that there are some systems that are inherently difficult to work on, that require some additional levels of training that require some specific knowledge of whatever it is that you're working on. Member Karrick also thinks it's important that the committee remembers the individuals doing this stuff work for businesses that also are taking on liability. So there's a level of that that we have to keep in mind the business doing the ultra-specialized thing hopefully, has someone who's specialized so that they hedge their own liability to some degree. The fly-by-night guy isn't doing the giant foam system at the port. That's pretty typical. Member Karrick thinks most of the group would agree with that. So are we looking to build an exclusionary program that's a gatekeeper for everything? Or are we looking to build a wide gate with a with a broad gatekeeper that says to do baseline work in this industry? You're going to have baseline knowledge. That's the root of Member Karrick's proposal, and he does agree, without a doubt, that there are some highly complicated systems out there. There are some systems that only a select few people should have their hands on. Member Karrick completely agrees with that. But setting up a standard and a program that is that detail oriented, is going to become something that is not enforceable and is going to exclude a tremendous amount of individuals from doing any volume of work in the State of California. Ultimately, at the end of the day, we have a regulation in the State of California that requires end users to open their wallet and comply.

Member Karrick ended with stating that It has to be something that's enforceable. It must be something that's affordable, and it has to be something that can be done, annualized and hopefully at a level that we're all comfortable with is better than today.

Shane Clary added in summary, he thinks there does need to be different levels.

Member Vanencia stated that it could become very expensive for everybody. Some companies just specialize in pumps right now. All they do is repair test

pumps, all sorts of pumps, but just pumps right? There are a few companies that come to mind, so they should be able to take just the pump exam. Right? It's just a matter of the concept is, and we have a great opportunity to be the leaders in fire safety throughout the world. Member Vanencia believes this is what we're creating right now, right? Having a just a different test for each system which would be pretty easily created by the wealth of knowledge that we have here. Member Vanencia sees it being productive, not just for the building owners. For the people testing.

Member Amber Barrios, agrees with what is being mentioned, because looking at it from an apprenticeship standpoint, when she has guys take a place in exam, she knows when all they do is wet systems. They have no idea. They look at a fire pump question and go. Yeah. So if you have a company that's only doing wet systems, why do you need those guys certified in deluge, pre- action and foam? Let them focus on what they know.

Member Daniel Vanencia commented when they are ready, have them level-up.

Member Shane Clary stated that they do wet-pipe, dry-pipe, and some pre-action systems. They do not do fire pumps. Though he's been through the program on fire pumps at Oklahoma State. So he's gone with the Peto- Tube out there, so he would agree and been taking the NICET idea that exam is over all the chapters in 25. Right? So, to pass that exam. You have to know all the stuff about fire pumps and standpipes and water-mist systems and all sorts of stuff that a lot of people, probably the most the standard person that does the majority of sprinkler inspections going be on wet type systems for the for the most part for California, so he would sort of follow that. And then we talk about other states. Shane is licensed in Arizona as a CR-16, which is very equivalent of the C-16, and then to do inspection, testing, and maintenance, especially with them, Phoenix and the Greater Valley of the Sun. All the gentlemen and ladies that inspect sprinkler systems have to have a minimum of a NICET Level 2. And the responsible party meaning him, has to have a NICET Level 3. You go up to State of Washington. It's the same thing. The people who do all the work, turn all the valves and so on, NICET Level 2, him as an individual who receives them. Needs a NICET Level 3, but both of those states do not require a separate exam. And there could be some other states like Florida. They're completely different, like in Florida. You need to be a sprinkler contractor even to open to touch the inspectors test valve. And if you're a 72 guy that's just trying to test the water flow. So it depends on the state.

Member Brain Hutto stated , him as a licensed fitter, he can install a fire pump, a standpipe, foam system, deluge system. But he's going to need a certification to inspect each one of those. And during his installation he's already testing all those as well for commissioning, and then obviously for the AHJ. Member Vanencia intervened by stating Member Hutto's statement isn't true, that you're testing it after you install it. Cause a lot of times when you install a fire pump,

the manufacturer rep comes down and test. Right? They're with you. Because to make sure, it still works the same.

Member Hutto acknowledge, correct to Member Vanencia's statement.

Chief Andersen stated that Member Hutto brought up a good point. About what levels of what certifications would other certification goes on there, he's not sure quite where to the point to find out all those details because we do not really have on what's required for the basics.

Member Davis Karrick stated that you can't install those systems as a journeyman sprinkler fitter in the State of California Sprinkler, you need to be a certified journeyman sprinkler in the State of California, so that Hurdle exists already.

Member Danile Valencia stated he thinks it's important to also separate the installer and the tester inspection testing maintenance. Member Vanencia added that their company is specifically ITM. They do not do any install. He continued to state, "Do we have the C 16 license? Yes, I have it. Do I have the AES license. Yes, I have it, but we specialize in ITM." There's a lot of good inspectors out there that don't know how to necessarily thread the pipe and install pipe, but they know the code on distances between pipes. This is between sprinkler heads. I think this committee is creating a whole new kind of field here, which is the ITM field, and it shouldn't Member Vanencia stated. There is going to be some overlap with the with the installers. But it is a different field in a different group of people that are going to be part of this program.

Chief Andersen stated that he thinks maybe the harder of the question is, if I have a certified fire sprinkler fitter are they familiar with NFPA 25, and all the departments.

Chief Brice Bennett reminded the group that was the point of order for everybody. So, when we're taking minutes and we get into a spirited conversation, the staff cannot identify who is speaking. So please allow airspace between conversations.

Member David Karrick stated that the heart of his proposal was exactly that, the multi-tiered approach to sitting to take a test. Was his thought being that this address, this exact issue is the fitter qualified to take it. Do you just give it to him? He doesn't know if he agrees with that, is the inspector that's been an inspector for 10 years and has never been a fitter qualified to take a test and prove that he's qualified to do this. His proposal is to provide multiple pathways to take the test and prove that you're competent and he thinks it addresses is the fitter competent. Is the inspector competent, is the building owner competent, at the end of the day he thinks a competency exam is something

most of us agree on, and multiple pathways to get to that competency exam is the only thing he viewed, as providing parity across the board.

Member John Holmes stated that he agrees. Everybody's got to have a different background, just because your apprentices don't do it. Ours do, ours get rotated from employer to make sure that they do that and do that kind of work as part of our program.

Member Karrick responded to Member Holmes statement, that he thinks they should be able to take that test. No problem.

Member Steve Fox added an analogy. He's also a C-10 contractor so that my licenses like to go, and basically run their power plant, or a commercial building. You don't want me anywhere near doing that, but he's very confident in doing automatic detection system, fire alarm systems, that's what he's been doing for close to 50 years. Then California, though we also have the blue card which is administered through Division Department of Industrial Relations Division of Apprenticeship Standards and if you work on the fire alarm system that's over 100 kva, you need to show that your certified, that you know what you're doing, because he has seen that just because you're a C-10 electrician you may know great deal about wiring a panel board .You may have no idea what is required within Article 725, and Article 760. And you see in California we sort of went that route, that we're working on fire alarm at least as the individual doing the work, not the contractor.

Member Fox continued to add, when he took the C-10 exam. He thinks he may have had one question on fire alarms. Everything else was on all this other stuff, but he has taken the blue card exam. The original exam was all on the NEC. Since have modified that, and now the majority of that of that exam is on NFPA 72, with some stuff that are 725, 760, and article 300. So, we have to look at the experience of the person that's doing the work, as opposed to, if you are a C-16 contractor you got to have the certification for running the pipe, you basically can do anything that that particular license will allow you to do. Fire Pumps, wet-pipe, pre-action, also UL-300 hood systems. The suppression systems, all down the line.

Member Amber Barrios stated that one of the things she wants to say is about the levels idea that she thinks is a great idea because you take your more basic system, wet system for example starts at level 1 and build them up, because not every guy is going to touch a wet system or a foam system. The same thing to what Member Holmes stated, not every program teaches ITM differently. Member Barrios continued to add that they're all hired to teach the basics of it. They all teach it to a certain extent, and not every company does inspections. So, if you're not rotating guys for different companies, they're not going to get that level of experience. and in my experience dealing with taking a guy to be an installer and sending him out to do a 5-year inspection is generally

not a good idea, if all he does is installs. Because he's going to look at it from a very different perspective from somebody who just does inspections. So, she doesn't think they are completely different bills like, Member Vanencia stated.

Member Vanencia adding to that is, if we do levels, that means that we'd be doing groups. So, we would be grouping together the wet system with whatever we think is basic. But the approach he's taking is more like a la cart. We do the basic wet systems. And we only do fire pumps. So, this is what he wants his guys to be certified to be touching. Or are these 2 things.

Member Barrios asked Member Vanencia, does that overcomplicate it, though, from an administrative aspect if you're breaking it up too much? Member Vanencia responded by stating It just depends on how hard it is. You just create different tests.

Chief Andersen stated that's one of his action items, what would those appropriate levels or groups be? And he thinks we need some proposals from the group to start really looking at what that could look like.

After a brief break, Chief Andersen stated that he will open the floor for any other questions about our discussions or comments.

Shane Clary had a question and comment. If these proceeds. how many people do you feel we're looking at certifying? And the reason he asked that question is because if you have one and if we're looking at 4 or 5,000 right now. AES, certification. Initially, we thought that was probably 8,000. If you go a la cart, and these numbers are very small. Are they financially viable? Where, if you have a single one. Chief Andersen stated these are questions that he has. But we need to start getting some data. How many people actually do inspection testing and maintenance.

Member Wayne Weiz stated, just looking back. We're talking about sending out notices to people. He just thinks about what we did when we enacted the fitter certification program. And we sent notices out. We sent out flyers to all the supply houses the associations reached out to their members. We did everything we could for months to try. And for guys, he thinks it was almost a year and a half to try and find a number on how many fitters were out there, and we came up with a number we've never reached. We've never reached the number that we projected, and even after all of that reaching out to everybody. We still had people coming forward and saying that they never even heard of it. The program was enacted for a year and a half 2 years and got people coming out saying, they know nothing about the fitter certification program. So that was a little bit of a challenge. And he doesn't know that there's anything to that we could apply. Moving forward for this program as far as reaching out. He doesn't know that we're going to be able to accomplish that, and if we can, he's not sure how.

Member Gerald Cox Yeah pointed out that when we're talking about the original certification, we we're talking about 8,000 sprinkler fitters. He believes that that number is probably still legitimate and could possibly even be more. Member Cox thinks that you have 30 to 50% of the people doing the installations that have still not obtained a certification. And then he thinks you can also probably go pretty close to a percentage. You talk to the companies If they look at their overall manpower. They can probably come up with a pretty good percentage of how many inspectors to actual installers, also.

Member Jim Feld stated, as far as notifying people, the problem that we had before with the certification process. The requirements said that the C-16 contractor, the owner of the company, whatever it was, had to make sure all their people were certified, and registered, the individual person did not have to be notified. If you're working for somebody that somebody, you're working for should notify you. You got to get your registration. So, all this stuff about people not being notified, and it's a State Fire Marshal's fault is bogus. Member Feld continued to add, we notify all the C-16 contractors. We have their names, addresses through the Contractor State Licensing Board, and say, get your people certified, registered. So, it doesn't matter. Wayne went above and beyond in a good way, trying to notify people if we're putting flyers up all over the place. That's great. But it still comes down to the owner, the C-16 license holder, to make sure all of his people have the proper registrations and certifications. Member Feld ended his statement by saying that he can't believe that somebody did not know that. There's anybody at fault, it's a C-16 license holder. Not the State Fire Marshal, and not for this committee.

Member Amber Barrios added to Member Feld's point, she still talks to fitters on a daily basis that have no idea what the fitter certification is. So, there are still plenty of contractors that did nothing to notify their people. But she actually thinks, using what Member Wayne Weiz stated as a screen board. To get the information from people is a good idea. You didn't get to get your 2 cents in on the fitter certification. Here's a chance. Your opinion on this, you might use that as kind of a motivating factor for some of these contractors. "You know, you guys hear it every day, too. I didn't know about it. I didn't know I didn't get a chance to say anything. Well, here's a chance." Member Barrios stated,

Member Weiz clarified that he didn't want to give the impression that he was blaming the State Fire Marshals Office for anything there. He was just saying that we did an awful lot to try and notify everybody. C-16 Contractors and everything. And there were still guys. And again, that he attributes that to just laziness on their part. If you didn't know that was happening by the time it happened, then shame on you. That's because there was plenty of notification that went out.

Chief Andersen turned it over to Member Vahe Zohrabian to present his proposal. Member Zohrabian began by stating that we are forgetting the main

reason why we are doing this. The main reason is proposing something that it will pass. It will go through OAL. So, we are forgetting that everything that we are suggesting matters, and it has to be within the structure of OAL as we had a crash course, every single one of us. We had a crash course in Arcadia.

We need to introduce what we need to talk about and the framework. So, it's easy to forget that matter, as Member Bryan's says, C-16 is not there as a qualified person. And lessons are to be learned that a C-16 is qualified automatically within the structure within the laws of OAL, within any sense of code, NFPA, whichever you want to take. More importantly, after this letter, Member Zohrabian noticed the entire website was replaced with something new. Either it was coincidence, or what he doesn't know, but something that we cannot change is 102 pages of regulation that we have. So the regulation stays, but it's a double sword, he stated. So it's not when we can refer to it we have to refer. There is more than 50 times, or 60 times mentioned about testing, and honestly within 102 pages. We have 80 pages almost about testing about subjects that we are talking about. So, that gives us a sense of what the scope must be VRAE. S. Testing committee, we are within the scope of our work.

Member Zohrabian continued, any encroachment of not having water, base. or fixed system mentioned within our regulation, we are encroaching our other divisions of State Fire Marshal, which is already set for fire alarm. He has all these notes. He was listening, that everybody says that some guy, who's qualified, who's not what we can do? It's obvious that pipe fitter certified pipe fitter is qualified for most of it. Again, within the range and within the scope. We cannot go all over the place and do a fatal mistake of Rickford. The only thing Member Zohrabian can give credit is obligation and understanding of testing. Testing is easy in 5 years, whatever form or shape in a regulation like it, or live it. It is, but testing every single category that has been created. 16 categories, for example. It takes a lifetime to learn. You cannot just be an elevator tester, or you cannot encroach in mechanical C-20 or C-36. Not to insult anybody Member Zohrabian commented, he's seen guys, they are across the board. You should be at least 150 years to 200 years old to have accrued that much experience on a field and you should have the knowledge, experience, and certification by State of California like the elevator guys.

Member Zohrabian wanted to remind the group, the scope that we started with started with one thing, that he questioned with, right now, for 15 min that we are talking about it. That if the State Fire Marshal's going to be broke or have the money to offer it, Member Zohrabian says, it'll be too late. The State Fire Marshal before proposing a regulation should have done the 399 or economic impact of a program. That right now, we are suggesting not only economic impact in a broader means of where we will have the funds. How many testers will we impact or get and how this program will be run.



Member Zohrabian thinks it might be too late. We are already in our 5<sup>th</sup> meeting over a year, almost a year and you're talking about it, but he hopes that the State Fire Marshal is aware of it, that without money no program can be around, that's number one. Number two is too late to touch on, on what happened 5, 6 years ago with notification. And he's one of those publicly, that has not received any kind of notification, so we are not going to open any can of worms. We want to stay concentrated on job at hand. So, what he proposes. Is only 2 pages. It's exactly a copy paste of what we already have within our regulation and within. This used to be the State Fire Marshals website, which has recently changed. In bold right bottom section of NFPA 25. The standard governing the inspection testing of maintenance of water-based power protection system hold central importance within the rules and regulation of OSFM. Which is the critical point that Member Zohrabian wanted to mention. Of course, the State Fire Marshal broadly, however they implement this, but dragging other classifications C-10, C-36, and C-20. All those people in which they need to know about our job is not the intention of this work group and we have to be careful of if we can subrogate. We can propose a program that Member David Karrick mentioned that it's simple, it's doable. And don't forget, very important thing that Member Karrick had mentioned how expensive the program is ran. So, keeping it simple. The reg for right now, 16 categories for every single test are \$2,000 he believes \$500 per category for a tester or a worker to be certified? Where is the justification on that?

Member Zohrabian continued by stating that the City of Los Angeles is one of those cities which is super hard to work on, and they are lagging under enforcement on defects. We are going back to buildings that defects exist for 20 years. 10 years, so regulations are not making defects go away, enforcements are. So, per NFPA, every building liability of testing and maintaining and keeping the record is with the owner. If Syrian authorities can push the owners to get their defects taking care of, then the program can be run smoothly. If not, Member Zohrabian doesn't think it's the duty of authority chasing the contractor and punishing the contractor because owner decided to do an inhouse. We are at the mercy of the owner because he is the owner. The owner says they'll take care of it. But we go back. Surely, it's not done. Member Zohrabian added by stating that they have enough people in their coalition. They have the same experience, unfortunately and we cannot have enforcement done with authorities. So Member Zohrabian made it as simple as possible that whenever we touch anything. It's very nicely put in a C-16, in a California State License Board that how, and what license is needed with elevators, with C-10, C-11, C-16, C-36, and C-7, and most of them of course within State Fire Marshal, is obligated because it's insane to address that. I'll give you one certificate. You can tomorrow start testing everything. It's not going to be possible.

Member Zohrabian continued to state, that we don't want to waste our time proposing something that will be denied. It will be rejected, that's what Chief Anderson keeps telling us. We need to make sense with our proposal. And we

need to just keep reminding. Every time he wants to bring this up, he goes back and revisit that day that we were there. They gave us a slide and they explained every single step of the way. And of course, the economic impact is going to be major thing, because not only are we impacting the economy. All of our means are good. But we need to see if the financials are going to back us up. Basically, it will translate to numbers. Or it will be just a few? If they go to an A-License like Brice suggests for everything across the board. It's a huge obstacle to carry, everybody's sensing that it's not doable. It's forcible, but it's not practical for a company to have all of them, because they are not doing it all. But subrogating will generate more for the State Fire Marshal. It will make it doable for all contractors having a guy working on fire sprinklers for 10 years and doesn't touch a pump. It's not necessarily forcing him to learn because he needs to pass the test with the State Fire Marshal versus if it can align to know about all the standpipes or fire pump. or any specialty that is touching it. Everything going to be manageable and easy to do.

All we need to do is develop that test that State Fire Marshal has for pipe fitters, that's certifying it and then we will have at least one guy across the board. We will have 10 guys. It's more doable for the people and is more practical.

Chief Greg Andersen responded to Member Zohrabian's statement by saying that he had a lot of points, but he did not present a specific proposal in the different categories. So Chief Andersen would ask, next time you're looking at different categories and the one thing he added for the next meeting as an action item that have a list of the different categories. Chief Andersen stated that he lost a little bit on what Member Zohrabian's categories are, what his thoughts are on that are on that.

Member Zohrabian responded with "Yes, of course." First, he didn't want to have a 16-page letter, he will have it next time. This is just a framework. What we must be within the range of this AES Regulation. Next time he'll introduce his letter with the categories.

Member Daniel Vanencia in summary to Member Zorabians statement, the next step is just breaking down what those groups look like. So, if it's down by specialized extinguishing system fire pumps on its own. Chief Andersen added, that's why we need to have a list.

Member James Carver added that the whole thing is because of Assembly Bill 433, which is the section in the Health and Safety Code and State Fire Marshal in their section of authorizations. It authorizes them to do certification for more than just sprinkler systems. And so, we're working off that, but it's for the people doing it. It's not for company. CSFM, C-16 really, with the exception of trying to get them to get the word out, has really nothing to do with this whole thing, Member Carver stated. It's on State Fire Marshals Office, just like for fires here, just like professional effect. Just like if I'm applying the fire retardant. It's the

same thing. It's a certification through the State Fire Marshal's Office to do the task. And Member Carver thinks we all need to come back and realize that's what we're doing here, because we keep going off the CSFM and it says this in 25. It's very specific in the Health & Safety Code with State Fire Marshal Office in dealing what we are trying to do here, and he thinks it's been given to us what their intent is trying to get them here.

Chief Andersen commented to the group, as of right now we do not have anything. So, there's a consensus. So, we need a minimum standard. What does that minimum standard look like? And that that's very debatable, as you can tell, Chief Andersen stated. We have to go back to the basic of what the law says, and the law has given the State Fire Marshal the authority over the individuals who do the work. They expand. It's not to license the companies.

Member Zohrabian stated that we are not debating A. B. 433, and you, as a State Fire Marshal, have the badge to do whatever you want. We know you have the badge. You're talking about logic here. You're talking about rationale. We are talking about crash courses in Arcadia and within the scope of legislative to propose something, so we don't waste hundreds of hours may be thousands by the time you are done and get rejected every single time. On the opening you mentioned, we need to propose something that is doable, which it will be within the framework of what it was discussed. So, the best way that he looks at it is to fall back to our regulation, which is a State Fire Marshal Regulation. It's not his liking or disliking. He's saying we need to stay within that. Boundaries.

Chief Andersen replied to Member Zohrabian's statement by adding that we have to come up with something that is workable. He doesn't know why you talked about the fiscal impact. But we can start on some of the basics. We have to figure out the program for would figure out all the economics of everything too, which may change. What is a feasible process at the end.

Chief Andersen stated that he has 3 things for the next meeting.

1. List of the test and categories or individuals, or what that should be?
2. List of training requirements.
3. Experience requirements.

Member Peter Hulin wanted to comment to the group on a couple of comments that were brought up in our discussion. How this is the responsibility of the fault or the responsibility of the contractors in the State of California and he thinks it's being extremely intellectually dishonest to say that it is the contractors solely because any of these programs are going through either financial difficulty,

notification, difficulty. He felt a little bit insulted. He continued to add that every one of his sprinkler fitters has a certification. He ended by stating that there are honest C-16 contractors in the State of California. We're not all evil.

Chief Andersen opened the floor to the group for brainstorming & discussions.

Member Daniel Vanencia stated that we maybe we should on the next one, the proposals we start getting a consensus or a vote on who is kind of leaning towards certain proposals. We'll put together some proposals, present them, and say, who likes this one better with this concept, or start getting an idea like bundling them up individually.

Member Vahe Zohrabian added, a misunderstanding about economic impact that we talked about. It's one of the processes of getting any kind of regulation done. What he meant. The economy study is that is the part of the process of getting anything approved. Member Zohrabian just wanted to make that clear.

Member Kim Stocking had a question for the group. On the last meeting we were talking about having justification and showing, having surveys sent out in different ways to see if it was needed. Did she miss where we got the justification going forward? Chief Andersen responded by stating that we're going based on the consensus of the group that we needed a program. We have not completed the justification for the whole program, but based on moving forward to what a program would look like work on individual what the justification for the individual proposal as we continue to work on justification for the whole program.

Chief Greg Andersen moved on to the next item on here is justification. So we do have to still spell out an overall justification of why this is needed and Chief Andersen thinks that is very important for our package where it is completed. Chief Andersen knows there is a consensus that we had last time that it is needed. We will continue to work on that. He got some good drafts that came in from different people with some pretty good justification. We'll probably go back to dwell into those deeper, and may have to expand on that.

He doesn't know if the survey is the right approach, but it's still open, but he'll figure if you start looking towards what we're proposing. It might focus a little bit of what we're trying to do. As we move forward and come up with individual things that we're coming up with. We have to give an individual justification for why we are doing each section. So, if we're doing multiple things like fire pump, the justification of the specialized training that's needed for this. And it's going to become an exhaustive doc.

Member John Holmes asked, if we have 5-categories do we need 5 justifications? Chief Andersen responded by saying "Oh, probably more than

that. By the time we're done. But yes.” Because if we're breaking into 5 categories. Why did we need 5? Why did we do 10? Why don't we do 1?

Chief Andersen continued to state, what is our justification for each thing that we're going through there. We need to be able to verbally paint a picture to somebody who is not an expert in the field. They will read this and go. Oh, okay. And here's their justification. Chief Andersen is not expecting big justifications now. But if we start writing on proposals, sometimes when you have a good idea write it at the same time. Chief Andersen knows we're doing a very preliminary list right now, and you know, do a lot of work on the justification. But as we move forward, we start doing that at the same time. So the rules of the office administrative law and how we spell out they have no qualms by asking for more justification.

Member David Karrick asked if it would it be possible to give us examples of of not only stuff that has made it through OAL. But things that have been rejected by OAL. That would be helpful in tailoring what we put together and streamlining it.

Chief Andersen asked the group if they had any questions on the justification. As we go forward. Chief Andersen actually coming from code development thinks it is a very critical thing to understand. Do the work as we go along. We start really building it because we're doing it later. It hurts and it really slowed everything down. So that's what he had for this meeting at this time.

**Next ITM Meeting is scheduled tentative for January 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 1:00 PM in Sacramento**

Chief Andersen open the floor for Public Comment – No Comments

Meeting Adjourned at 3:16 PM

---



DRAFT