

**Plumbing Board
Product and Code Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 29, 2008**

**Department of Labor and Industry (DLI) – Minnesota Room
443 Lafayette Road No., Saint Paul, MN 55155-4344
DLI.CCLDBOARDS@State.MN.US**

Members Present:

Karl Abrahamson
Lawrence G. Justin
Allen J. Lamm
John A. Parizek
Jim Peterson (DLI Commissioner's designee)

Staff Present:

Cathy Tran
Wendy Legge
Annette Trnka
John Rajkowski
Brad Erickson
Chuck Olson

Members Absent:

None

Board Members Present:

Brian Noma for Ronald Thompson
(MDH Commissioner's designee)
Mike McGowan

Visitors:

Joseph F. Harrison
Adam Johnson
Paul Granos
Bob Lechner
David Ghostley
Scott Schiesser
Mike Herman
Matthew Marciniak
Larry Currier
Mike Ritter
John Commers
Gary Thaden
Ira Funderberk
Brian Paulsen
Dale Blanchette
Bob Wolf
Jeffrey Hill
Luther Fistrom

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order by Justin at 9:41 a.m.

- A. Announcements – Justin made announcements and did the introductions
- B. Introductions

II. Approval of Agenda

Justin asked if there were any representatives from Toto, USA or Vista Clear attending the meeting. Seeing those companies were not represented, Justin moved item IV(B)(3) to item IV(B)(1). Hearing no further changes or objections, Justin declared the Agenda approved.

III. Regular Business

- A. August 27, 2008 Minutes – After the amendment on page three of six, Justin asked if there were further amendments or objections. Hearing none, Justin declared the Minutes approved.
- B. Expense Reports – Board Chair Parizek found the expense reports and Per Diems in order and declared them approved.

IV. Special Business

- A. Department of Labor and Industry Code proposed draft language for Water Treatment Equipment. Cathy Tran spoke on the Department's proposed language for water conditioning. Tran stated that as an outcome of the Licensing and Registration Committee meeting of the Plumbing Board, she was asked to draft language. The Department proposed separating the rules that are under the Department of Labor and Industry's jurisdiction from the rules that are under the authority of the Plumbing Board. The Board has previously voted not to separate those rules for this rulemaking session.

Tran stated the language of 4715.5000 was proposed to be moved to a new section in accordance with Minnesota Statute 326.57 (which will be renumbered 326B.52) – Justin read the statute which states, “The commissioner shall, by rule, prescribe minimum standards which shall be uniform, and which standards shall thereafter be effective for all new water conditioning servicing and water conditioning installations, including additions, extensions, alterations, and replacements connected with any water or sewage disposal system owned or operated by or for any municipality, institution, factory, office building, hotel, apartment building or any other place of business, regardless of location or the population of the city, county or town in which located.” Peterson stated that the intent of the possible rule amendment is for commercial application – everything other than single family dwelling.

McGowan stated that he finds it interesting that the proposed rules apply only to commercial equipment and that, technically, a water conditioning contractor's license doesn't allow a person to install commercial equipment in Minnesota. He went on to state that the Plumbing Board doesn't have authority over residential water treatment, yet the Plumbing Board has a water

treatment contractor on the Board. McGowan's opinion is the way the proposed rule amendment is worded with the NSF requirement would virtually eliminate all commercial water softeners from being installable in Minnesota. The vast majority of commercial water softeners are not NSF approved. McGowan stated that with NSF requirement none of the water treatment devices could be used. Parizek stated he thought the proposed language was acceptable except for the NSF term as well.

Brian Noma stated that the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) currently reviews the equipment for commercial establishments that are regulated by the Health Department. Requirements are in place that NSF approval is required on any equipment that would be used in potable water treatment. MDH is moving in that direction in the non-community program. The MDH is relying on the ANSI NSF Underwriter's Laboratory Water Quality Association to ensure that the equipment is safe to use to ensure that it's not going to impart something harmful to the drinking water. Justin asked if the MDH has determined that it's a system that's tested or parts. Brian Noma answered that they are proposed to the MDH in all different fashions and the MDH would eventually like to have all the pieces be NSF approved or as a system be approved.

Jeff Hill of the MN Water Quality Association states that he's been pleased regarding the speed at which the new Plumbing Board is moving and is optimistic with what can be accomplished. He would like to weigh in on each of the subparts of the Department's proposed language. Regarding Subpart 1 – the treatment standard; they are aware of their responsibility to public health, and are very aware that there aren't current regulations on it.

Mr. Hill then introduced Joe Harrison, Technical Director of the Water Quality Association in Chicago. Mr. Harrison did his under-graduate work in civil engineering with a Masters Degree in environmental engineering and a Masters Degree in water resources. He joined the U.S. Public Health Service drinking water division in 1968 with the Safe Drinking Water Act passed six years later. Mr. Harrison headed the Environmental Protection Agency's Drinking Water Program for the five-state region from 1974 to 1990.

Mr. Harrison recommended the proposal language be revised to say it "must conform to the applicable NSF drinking water standards" instead of the proposed NSF certification. NSF International writes standards that are public domain standards. NSF, who is accredited by the American National Standards Institute, tests products to those public standards. NSF is one of many certifiers of drinking water treatment products. Rarely do they certify point of entry or whole house water treatment products. The majority of products certified are products put in under the sink, on a counter top or on a faucet that are commodity made by a national manufacturer like Pentair or 3M who makes reverse osmosis systems. Those kinds of products are made

exactly alike and sold throughout the United States and it makes economic sense to spend \$50,000 to get them certified, because they don't change and the certification carries for every product. Mr. Harrison stated that products such as water softeners that remove soap curd (scale forming water hardness) from water or red water iron stains, or rotten egg (hydrogen sulfide) odors or arsenic from a health standpoint; those kinds of products are custom made and are not certified because there's not enough of those products exactly alike to justify the cost incurred with certification. Sometimes, such as for a chlorinator, there aren't even standards for those products. The NSF standard is a material safety standard which includes pipes, fittings, connections, etc. Usually it's the NSF ANSI Standard 61, or if it's chemical, it's standard 60, which is material safety only, meaning if the material touches the drinking water it's not going to impart something harmful to the drinking water. Mr. Harrison stated that's also part of a reverse osmosis and water filter standard, but in addition to that, to meet client requests to remove specific water contaminants, they make up challenge water tanks and run it for the life of the unit. There are not any specific standards for those types of products.

Mr. Harrison went on to state that the Minnesota Plumbing Code does not require anywhere that a pump or pressure regulator is required to work. He feels that Minnesota should not go beyond requiring safe materials for water treatment equipment either. He states that it's expensive and not practical to regulate performance for customized products. Mr. Harrison stated that it's such an important issue; he's here not representing any company, but to represent the industry as a whole.

Lamm asked that for John Q Public to look at water conditioning equipment and read the data; how do they know that it'll produce safe drinking water. Mr. Harrison answered that most of the products that are sold are for drinking water only. The highest technology available can be applied when the 1-2 percent of water used that people drink at their point of use – or at their kitchen sinks. Those kinds of things are commodity devices and they do get certified. There are states that require certification for point-of-use products that make a health claim. However, when you get into iron removal, hydrogen sulfide removal, or water hardness; those products don't need certification because if those "whole house" systems aren't working, the consumer knows it. Lamm asked how the general public is going to know the difference between a point of use and a product for the whole house. Mr. Harrison stated that when they buy a specific product, they are trying to cure a specific problem. Lamm asked what the Water Quality Association has so that a person can tell the difference. Mr. Harrison answered that they have a number of different technologies that a person can look at, but people generally have to go to someone they trust to fix the water. That person should have training and some are certified water specialists and have to get continuing professional credits in order to maintain their certification. The trained professional will start by testing a homeowner's water. Mr. Harrison

stated that there are written materials available from the Water Quality Association that will tell what technologies are available and the water quality problems they correct.

Justin asked about material safety standards versus system standards. Justin asked if the products that are in contact with drinking water are material safety standards. Mr. Harrison answered that all point-of-use products have to be materially safe. Tran stated the Department's intent was the point-of-use of water treatment units and whether it is NSF compliant (certified) and to adopt something that is assuring that product is safe. Mr. Harrison stated that most states require that the parts and equipment that touches drinking water must be certified to the NSF Standard 61 or 60 and state they must be certified to those standards by an ANSI accredited certifier. What that means is that you don't have to look for just NSF certification; you can look for IAPMO certification or WQA certification or UL certification to that NSF standard and it gives manufacturers the option to go to more than one certifier. Tran stated that's consistent with Minnesota's practice.

Brian Noma commented that he'd like to comment on community and non-community systems, which the Department of Health regulates. As a regulator, everyone has to be treated the same, which is difficult for a regulatory community. Mr. Harrison stated that they have a product testing certification program, so that consumers can trust the products. That's also why they certify people, because it gives better service to consumers and give that same level of trust.

Gary Thaden of the Minnesota Mechanical Contractor's Association spoke to the Committee about three points; authority, composition of the Board and the NSF requirement in commercial systems. The authority question has been dealt with before, and he stated that whether the authority is with the Department or the Board, the same result can be achieved either by rules from the Board or advice from the Board to the Department. Regarding the composition of the Board – having a water conditioning representative on the Board doesn't mean the authority or scope of the Board have changed. Having someone in the water treatment industry on the Board is important to have to give the Department advice regarding their feelings on the existing rules.

Mr. Thaden has concerns about the NSF requirement and how it's worded regarding the commercial side. He's looked at IAPMO plumbing code (UPC) and they don't have anything regarding commercial water treatment. He states that they have someone on the commercial side that is licensed, bonded and insured and putting an additional requirement on them by requiring that they have to have an NSF certification which is an unusual requirement considering all of the other certification they must hold, and is redundant and slows down the commerce between the public and the contractor. Most of

these systems are custom systems and there's no way an NSF certification is going to be obtained. He believes that if the Board/Department requires that a licensed plumber install these systems, that is enough and that NSF certification isn't necessary. He doesn't believe a certification is needed for the whole system.

Tran asked if Mr. Thaden was referring to point-of-use versus point-of-entry systems and he stated he's referring to custom systems and not a specific product that gets put in. Tran stated that a licensed and bonded plumber may not know that a point-of-use water treatment system that they're installing is safe. Thaden stated that whether that's true or not, the Department or the Board has the sanctioning authority.

Brian Noma stated that you get into situations where the plumbers are bidding or installing per an engineer's or designer's specification and they don't have a lot of latitude about what equipment is put in. In those situations there is a lot of "finger pointing" in the end if something goes wrong regarding what's approved and safe to be installed. Mr. Thaden states that's true throughout the construction industry and not just the water treatment segment. Noma stated that just because it occurs doesn't make it right and they are looking to remedy the situation. Mr. Thaden stated that it's the problem that exists between the contractor and the engineer. Lamm states that the aforementioned problems are exactly why a performance standard is needed. Mr. Thaden stated the principals of plumbing still exist. Noma asked if licensed plumbers are qualified to choose the system; what in their training gives them the expertise to choose the system which is being installed. Mr. Thaden responded that the principals are taught to plumbers throughout their four years of apprenticeship, which helps them learn what water treatment systems are best.

Mike Herman with Culligan stated that in regards to how does the public know about the equipment being safe; the water here and the water across the street could be different and have to be treated differently. A water test is done before any piece of equipment is put in. He states that they are there to meet the demand to solve the problem that exists with the water by testing and after the equipment is installed, another water test is done to ensure the problem is being taken care of. Lamm asked if he was answering as a water conditioning contractor, not as a plumber and was told yes.

Noma asked how would a plumber deal with the situation if the water conditioning expert was left out of the equation. Jeff Hill stated they supported Gary Thaden's comments and feels the best way is the process of licensing and bonding of the plumber. Lamm stated he feels it either has to be an engineered system or a certified product and not to rely on a licensed plumber. Abrahamson stated that he is personally not trained to design water conditioning systems, however, he is trained to install and design plumbing

systems and would like a representative from the industry to answer that question. Lamm asked if water conditioning is in the plumbing training process that deals with water conditioning. Thaden stated he could bring a training director to answer that question.

Peterson stated the phrase of “NSF standards, where they exist” means that if NSF standards are not in place, the Department looks at the components. The Department could do five things; 1) leave it open for interpretation; 2) re-draft the language so the water treatment components must conform with applicable NSF standards; 3) change the language so that water treatment systems not conform with NSF standards and let the designers run amok; 4) Strike the entire “Subpart 1” or; 5) because the language is still in draft form, this section could be left open to take comments on what would be acceptable language to those in the industry.

Mr. Thaden stated he would like the Board to form a sub-committee from this committee which could be comprised of a representative from the industry, someone from the Department, someone from the Water Quality Association; someone from the Minnesota Mechanical Contractor’s Association; someone from the training side and a Plumbing Board member, to work on Subdivision 1 and bring it back to the Committee. Peterson stated that could be done via e-mail as this language is only draft and not something that is going into this rulemaking session.

Mike McGowan stated they would love to bring some different wording back from those in the industry for comment from the Plumbing Board and states that the Water Quality Association hold themselves to a much high standard than the state requires. They would like to table this issue and come back and have the input for the rulemaking.

Justin stated there has been enough discussion on this issue, since this was just a draft. Justin made a motion, seconded by Parizek, to create a sub-committee of representatives from the Minnesota Department of Health, the Department of Labor and Industry, the Water Quality Association, Minnesota Mechanical Contractor’s Association and MN PHCC. Abrahamson made a friendly amendment, seconded by Parizek, to add a representative from the Minnesota Pipe Trades. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

The meeting took at break at 11:10. The meeting reconvened at 11:24.

- B. RFA’s Reviewed in past Committee Meetings – Updated information
 - i. 4715.2430, 4715.2440: Macerating Toilet Systems (File PB0035/7-22-08) (from 8/27/08 meeting). Mr. Bob Lechner and Paul Granos presenting. Mr. Lechner reviewed their product by saying it’s a system which allows you to install a bathroom with all of the plumbing above the floor, so you don’t have to break up concrete and put in a

sewage ejection kit. He stated they adhere to the ASME standard in its entirety. He stated that at the time their product was invented, there were no standards written to accommodate it and so the standard was virtually written to accommodate their product. Justin asked Tran if she had a chance to read through the materials. Tran answered that she had a chance to review it, but wasn't sure if their submitted materials answered all of the questions that were raised at the last meeting. Justin stated he wasn't sure where this product would fall under the Plumbing Code. Justin stated the presenter was proposing adopting language from the International Plumbing Code, but he's not sure where it would be placed in Minnesota's code. Tran stated that there were issues with the trap and the vent and where other sections may be applicable under 4715.2440, under sub-provisions. Tran stated that 4715.2430 and .2440 would be the applicable sections.

Manometer test. Abrahamson stated that a pump performance test is not what he was asking for. Abrahamson explained that the entire system has to be tested, including the connections, the toilet, the piping, etc, and everything has to hold a manometer air test which is a one inch water column. Mr. Lechner stated that Saniflo's engineer is the one who provided the information on the test provided on the pump performance.

Mr. Lechner stated he felt that their product wouldn't be able to be manometer test because of the little macerating box that sits behind the toilet and most applications have a ¾ inch discharge pipe that comes straight up. In the bottom of the box there's a little bi-frame switch and when the water comes up it reaches about ¾ of an inch and that bi-frame is going to flex and turn on to evacuate everything out of the box. There's a check valve built right into the discharge at the top and there's always going to be some discharge left in the vertical part. If there wasn't that check valve, the waste would fall back down into the box and turn the pump back on in a non-ending cycle. Mr. Lechner believes that the manometer would probably stop at that point, unless there would be some other leak in the box. Abrahamson asked if there is a vent line that comes off the box. Mr. Lechner answered there is. Abrahamson stated that the manometer is going to be testing the vent line and all the drainage lines coming into the box. For example, if a sink were going to be coming into it, it would be testing all the piping in that box and the connections from the toilet to that box to make sure that there's no leak and that there's no chance for sewer gas to come in.

Mr. Lechner asked if the vent was tied into an existing vent in the house, as they are typically not a new construction type of product. Abrahamson stated that the inspector may make you put a clean-out at

the tie in so it's accessible, and a balloon can be put in there and tested. Some inspectors may waive the final manometer test depending on the situation they're in. Abrahamson feels that because this is a new system, an inspector will require a manometer final test on the system to ensure that the box, the toilet, toilet connection, etc. is going to pass the manometer test. Mr. Lechner asked if the manometer test is testing the system or the installation. Abrahamson answered it's testing the workmanship, the fixture, the box, and all the piping. Mr. Granos asked if there was anything about the design which would lead Abrahamson to believe their system would not pass the manometer test and Abrahamson stated that there's a cover on the box and not knowing how the box is sealed, it could have problems such as the joint between the toilet and the box.

Justin stated there is water in the bowl itself, so a tube is put into the tank reservoir and a one-inch pressure is put on there to confirm that the tank cover isn't leaking, or any of the joints, nor any pipe connections are leaking. Abrahamson stated that the sink and the shower would already have a trap in there, which would be sealed off. Water has already been run through all the fixtures, the system is shut down, the vent and the waste discharge is plugged off and a final one inch water column is holding tight. If anything is leaking, if there's a small crack in the box or the top gasket isn't sealed properly, it's going to allow sewer gas into the house. Justin stated that the manometer test not being done isn't necessarily a "show stopper" but it may affect the product if it can't meet a final inspection test. Peterson stated that they may not require a manometer test; a smoke test can be done as an alternate test. Tran said that we don't want to adopt a product that the consumer can't pass a final test with.

Brian Noma stated it isn't just on the product, it's done at every installation site. Abrahamson stated that his concern is that the product can't pass the test in the factory, then it wouldn't pass it on any site where it's been installed.

Location in code – minimum pipe sizes. Tran stated that one place could be under 4715.2440, as some provisions are very similar to the sump provision. Justin stated there was some confusion because both the IRC and the IPC addresses them differently. Peterson stated it could be done in 4715.2450 or 4715.2440, subpart 6 and move subpart 7 to subpart 8, but both would be further down the line because the ASME standards would have to be referenced separately. Peterson stated it would be a system standard which could it be put under 4715.2450 or could it fit under 4715.2440. Tran asked if that provides minimum requirements of what we already have for sumps with a

water closet and shower. Peterson stated that he would prefer not to put each alternate in the code separately.

Abrahamson asked what the size of the pipe on the side of the tank is and Mr. Lechner stated it's a two inch inlet. Abrahamson stated that in Minnesota's code it has to be a shielded coupling which is a stainless steel metal band and if it goes from two different materials a stainless steel band is required. Parizek asked if Massachusetts requires a shielded coupling, what do they do with the discharge, as it appears to be a rubber coupling also. Mr. Lechner answered that years ago it was, but it's been changed to a hard pipe discharge and has a check valve built inside of the pipe. Parizek asked if it is still attached with a hose clamp and Mr. Lechner answered that yes, it is. Mr. Lechner stated he wasn't sure how Massachusetts has it written in their code for that connection between how a discharge elbow and the discharge pipe is. Brian Noma asked with the use of a banded shielded connection, could it possibly impede what the connections they show on here are trying to accomplish. Mr. Granos answered the macerating unit is made to be affixed to the floor, so it won't move.

Tran asked being they are proposing a sump water closet, potentially with a shower and lavatory, is it possible to end up on a property outstate where this is the only system in a residence where a gravity system isn't possible and this is all they have. The code requires that a single family residence has an eighteen gallon capacity for a sump. Justin stated the macerating toilet would be in its own section of, for instance, 4715.2450, requiring minimum standards. Tran stated that if that were the case, many other sections of the code would have conflict such as a three inch vent, building drain requirements, main drain vents, etc. Peterson doesn't foresee this as a problem.

Justin stated that Mr. Lechner still needs to confer with staff and determine where his product should be inserted in the Minnesota Plumbing Code. The venting issues, the horizontal discharge and the manometer test all still need to be addressed. Justin recommends it be placed under a separate section entirely for a macerating system. Peterson stated that this would be a stand-alone piece and a separate entity unto itself and it must comply with the standards and code. Brian Noma stated he felt it would be easier to find if it were in its own section.

The meeting broke for lunch at 12:15 for one hour. The meeting reconvened at 1:17 p.m.

- ii. 4715.0640, 4715.1950 and 4715.2030: Water Closet Seat with Spray by Toto. (File PB0031/5-7-08) (from 6/25/08 and 8/27/08 meetings) Justin states that Toto has submitted quite a few items which were

requested at the August 27, 2008 meeting, except for #4 – which was the cleanliness of the wand. Justin asked the Committee members if Toto has submitted enough for this issue to be referred to the Board. Abrahamson asked about the safety valve unit being high enough as a vacuum breaker. Tran stated she felt that the things they have submitted should be reviewed. Tran stated one issue is ASSE Standard 1001; they reference 2.9 which no longer exists and hasn't been updated to reflect the current 1001.

Tran states she feels the water diagram schematic that Toto submitted should be reviewed. After review of the schematic, the Committee has the following questions and/or issues:

Refer to water flow diagram 6-1.

Item #1 – Item safety valve unit #4 has a note that says “to the toilet bowl.” How is that run to the toilet bowl?

It appears that there is a possibility of cross-contamination.

Item #2 – the water heater #5 has a note “flows through the drain to the toilet bowl.” How does that drain to the toilet bowl?

It appears that there is a possibility of cross contamination/back siphonage?

Item #3 – the flow adjustment unit #6 appears to be a valve that could put back pressure on the atmospheric vacuum breaker. (Refer to 4715.2100A2)

Item #4 – the flow adjustment unit #6 appears to be a control valve downstream of the atmospheric vacuum breaker. (Refer to 4715.2100A3.)

Item #5 – the oscillating pump unit #7 could possibly put back pressure on the atmospheric vacuum breaker.

Item #6 – the water heater #5 notes the vacuum breaker. Please verify the location of the vacuum breaker location is at #5.

Item #7 – Please provide documentation on the water heater safety mechanism. (ASME A112.4.2, section 2.9)

Justin stated he has a question on the e-mail sent by Mr. Paulsen on 09-09-08, that the Neorest toilet was rejected by the city of Duluth inspector. The situation was that the Department of Labor and

Industry had told Toto, USA they need to work with the local inspectors in order to get products like the Neorest approved. When Toto, USA does try to do that, the local inspectors contact DLI for guidance. The code of 4715.0330 (Alternative Means and Methods), states that the inspector has to be convinced it's an acceptable product. The local authority has the jurisdiction to get the Department of Labor and Industry's opinion, and they can either take DLI's opinion, or reject it and make their own decision. It would be up to the consumer to convince the inspector that the product is acceptable.

After discussion, the Committee decided that the cleanliness issue has not been adequately responded to. It was stated that many of the above concerns could be resolved by additional backflow prevention.

It was stated that Mr. Paulsen should address all correspondence through Annette Trnka, Assistant to the Board, and it will be forwarded appropriately. (Please don't address the DOH, DLI, and Board/Committees.) This will ensure that everyone will be well informed and proper record keeping will be possible.

Tran stated there's a discrepancy in the standard Mr. Paulsen's requesting and would like Mr. Paulsen to clarify ASME 112.4.2, section 3.5.1.1, which references paragraph 2.9 of ASSE 1001, which is an incorrect reference.

Regarding the newly submitted RFA, Justin states that Toto, USA proposes that section 4715.1420 have an additional subparagraph, adding subparagraph 4, which reads: "Water closet personal hygiene devices shall conform to ASME 112.4.2." They are also requesting an additional paragraph under 4715.2100, which would read: "H. Deck-mounted and equipment-mounted vacuum breakers and faucets with integral atmospheric or spillproof vacuum breakers shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, with the critical level not less than one (1) inch (25 mm) above the flood level rim." Justin stated the concern is not that it's 1 inch above the flood line, but rather that the "port" and possibly drain line goes below flood level, as it's connected below flood level.

Peterson stated that it should have some kind of referenced standard for "H." Direction to Mr. Paulsen will be: concerning the new RFA Item 2H, please provide a reference standard under Subpart H.

- iii. 4715.2110I: Vista Clear Dental Units (File PB0012/01-30-08) (from 8-27-08 meetings). Jim Peterson stated that he picked out nine items and sent them to Mr. Jim Chandler requesting a response. Mr.

Chandler responded with a question which Mr. Peterson answered and hasn't heard back from Mr. Chandler yet.

V. Open Forum

There were no requests for Open Forum.

VI. Discussion

- A. New Request For Action items.
 - i. DLI to provide updated list of RFA's for Committee to schedule review date.

Tran stated she went to the Sprinkler Advisory Council meeting. They are working on the licensing rule for the statute that's been in place since 2003 on the multi-purpose potable piping system, which is serving residential and commercial sprinklers. Currently for the installer to be able to install these systems would require a plumber's license and a sprinkler certification under that statute. The Council is looking for some assistance in wording for the proposed language for licensing and Tran had stated she would bring it up at the Committee meeting. Tran feels that it should be looked at to make sure that the code doesn't contradict what they are proposing for language. Parizek stated that the Contractor's Association isn't concerned with this right now, as the soonest it could go into effect is 2011, even if the Plumbing Board adopts the IRC. However, it is already in statute that they can be installed, and it has to be done by a licensed plumber certified to install the systems. Parizek stated he doesn't think that there are any certification programs out there yet. The manufacturers are out there giving training sessions to install these systems, but Parizek isn't aware of what standards or certifications they going by or who they're certifying. The Board would respond to a Request For Action, but as of yet there hasn't been an RFA submitted, therefore the Board can't respond on this issue.

VII. Announcements

- A. Next Regularly Scheduled Meetings:
 - i. Thursday, December 11, 2008, 9:30 a.m. – Minnesota Room, DLI
 - ii. Wednesday, January 28, 2009, 9:30 a.m. – Minnesota Room, DLI (Tentative)

XI. Adjournment

Abrahamson made a motion, seconded by Lamm, to adjourn the meeting. The vote was unanimous, and the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lawrence Justin

Committee Approved 01-28-09
2008

Page 13 of 14

October 29,

Product & Code Review Committee

Lawrence Justin