

MINUTES

Virginia Plumbing & Mechanical Inspectors Association
Second Board of Directors Meeting
Prince William County
September 12, 2014

President called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM
Meeting was started with the Pledge of Allegiance
Quorum was established

In attendance:

Curtis Campbell, David Beahm, Dennis Martinelli, Dustin McLehaney, Emory Rogers, James Anjam, Jim Collins, John Seay, Jon Sargeant, Paul Rimel III, Richard Grace, Robert Adkins, Shawn Strausbaugh, Skip Harper, Thomas Clark

President Harper asked for an approval of the agenda and to include moving up the Certification/Education/Training report, the Membership/Website report, and the Information Technology report to the Presidents report section of the agenda. The Board approved the agenda and the change.

Reports of Officers:

Secretary: The May 16, 2014 BOD Meeting minutes were presented for approval. A motion and a second was made for approval and unanimously voted in favor by the Board. Additionally, Secretary Grace announced that all support letters for ICC positions have been completed and sent out to the appropriate candidates. A letter supporting Michael Redifer for the Building Official position on the DPOR Board for Contractors had not yet been completed, but was due to be finished and sent out in the near future as voted on in the July 25, 2014 General Membership meeting at Graves Mountain Lodge.

Treasurer: See attached

Executive Secretary: See Attached

Vice President: Vice President Campbell announced that he would soon be retiring from Chesterfield County, and that he would not be pursuing the VPMIA presidency in the coming year, and suggested that President Harper continue on in his role as VPMIA president for an additional year. Additionally, Vice President Campbell announced that he would also be stepping down from the position of Chairman of the Joint Conference Committee, and recommended that Dustin McLehaney step forward into that position. Immediate Past President Paul Rimel, Chairman of the Nominating Committee this year, stated that the Nominating Committee would take Vice President Campbell's suggestion regarding the continuance of President Harper's position into consideration when that committee next meets to discuss nominations.

President: See attached

Old Business:

No Old Business presented

New Business:

Emery Rogers reported that there are two cities being considered for the location of the 2018 ICC Conference, that being Richmond, Virginia and Louisville, Kentucky. ICC representatives recently visited Richmond to look into possible facilities/locations for the conference. Mr. Rogers stated that a committee was formed with VBCOA, dubbed ICC Host Ad Hoc Committed, to look into and present supporting documentation to ICC to consider Virginia as the host for the 2018 ICC Conference. Mr. Rogers distributed this document to the Board for their review (see attached). Mr. Rogers has pledged the support of DHCD for this action, and asked that VPMIA pledge their support to this action as well.

At this time, with the blessing of the Board, Mr. Rogers continued to present the DHCD report. Mr. Rogers stated that, based on information that he received, many VPMIA and VBCOA members that submitted their applications to be members of different ICC committees were receiving favorable consideration from ICC (code development committees, counsels, educational committees, etc.). Mr. Rogers reported that Cindy Davis and Rick Witt were on a professional development committee that is looking into the ICC certification and education process, including the preferred provider program. Mr. Rogers stated that the Virginia Code Academy will be one of the ICC preferred providers.

Mr. Rogers thanked the organization for their participation in the 2012 USBC code change process, and stressed the importance and impact of our participation. Mr. Rogers stated that DHCD will be providing a limited number 2015 code books to code change committee members in support of their participation in the national and local code change processes. Mr. Rogers stated that the code update training was going well, and that DHCD was updating the knowledge center to include updated reporting abilities. Additionally, he stated that the Code Academy was looking into developing and offering advanced courses in the next three years such as an advanced structural course and an Existing Building Code course. Mr. Rogers stated that there were currently 11 errata to the 2012 codes that were going to be published, and that if others are discovered, they would be published as soon as practical.

Ex-Officio Committee Reports

ICC: No Report submitted

ICC Region VII: See Attached

DHCD: See above

DPOR: No Report submitted

Ad Hoc Committees

BCAAC: No Report submitted

Building Safety Month: No Report submitted

Virginia Tradesman Education Coalition (VTEC): See Attached

Joint Conference: No Report submitted

VBCOA Liaison: See Attached – Additionally, Mr. Strausbaugh stated that the new VBCOA website was up and running, including the discussion forum. Mr. Strausbaugh noted that the VBCOA mid-year conference was scheduled for April 12 and 13 in Charlottesville. The annual conference is in the works for September in Virginia Beach. Mr. Beahm added that VBCOA just had a bylaws change that will permit honorary members to hold committee chair positions.

Standing Committees

Advertising/Yearbook: No Report submitted

Auditing: No Report submitted

Awards: No Report submitted

Bylaws: No Report submitted

Certification/Education/Training: See Attached

Finance: No Report submitted

Legislative: See Attached

Membership/Website: See Attached

Nominating: Past President Paul Rimel wanted to point out at this time that the Bylaws change the Membership/Website committee into two separate committees (1) Membership Committee and (2) Website was changed to Information Technology Committee. Additionally, the Executive Secretary would be the default chairman of the Membership Committee. In light of Vice President Campbell announcement of retirement, Mr. Rimel stated that, with President Harper's permission, he would go back to the Nominating Committee and suggest the committee consider a second term for President Harper.

At this point, a discussion ensued regarding the organizations Tax Exempt status and it's stability from year to year. It appears that this is one of those items that hasn't carried on from one officer to the next, ending in the expiration of our status. A motion was made to have VPMIA permanently employ a CPA to maintain this status, and have the VPMIA treasurer maintain this employment. A second to this motion was cast and the Board unanimously approved this action.

PMG Code Change Committee: See Attached – Additionally, Mr. Strausbaugh stated that code changes cannot be submitted without registering with cdpAccess, and encouraged everyone to register. Mr. Strausbaugh stated that the letter that was sent to ICC regarding the separation of the

IPC and the Private Sewage Disposal Code was sent out in a survey to the PMG Membership Counsel, and the results will be forthcoming. Mr. Strausbaugh stated that as of September 5, he has received two scholarship applications to attend the hearings in Fort Lauderdale (one from himself and one from Rick Fortner). Bob Adkins requested approval for a scholarship during the meeting. A motion was made to approve the three scholarship applications, a second to the motion was provided, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of approval.

School of Instruction: Dennis Martinelli stated that he did not have a lot to report, and that he was looking for assistance in this committee. He noted that he was in the process of scheduling classes, and stated that he has a possible prospect for a Variable Refrigerant Flow class. President Harper stated that he had a few classes that were in the works and would pass them along to Mr. Martinelli.

Time & Place: The Annual School of Instruction will be held April 8, 9, and 10 in Front Royal.

Other Business

Mr. Strausbaugh brought up the topic of low water consumption water closets and how the Plumbing Energy Research Coalition (ASPE, IAMPO, ICC, PHCC) did some investigating on drain line effects on high efficiency water closets. Their studies are showing drain line blockages on some of the installations utilizing high efficiency water closets.

Adjourn: 2:00 PM

VPMIA

9/9/2014 8:07 AM

Register: Checking

From 07/25/2014 through 09/09/2014

Sorted by: Date, Type, Number/Ref

Date	Number	Payee	Account	Memo	Payment	C	Deposit	Balance
07/28/2014	1467	Reimbursement	graves mountain SOI	Reimbursement...	1,174.54			34,211.93
07/28/2014	1468	2014 Va Govenors H...	Conference Program	exhibit booth	500.00			33,711.93
08/12/2014	1469	CNA Surety	Dishonesty bond	Dishonesty bon...	233.89			33,478.04
08/15/2014		PayPal	Membership:Members...	Four membersh...			154.16	33,632.20
08/21/2014		service charge	service fee		3.00			33,629.20
08/22/2014		Industry Code Updat...	District III Training Pr...	Deposit			400.00	34,029.20
08/27/2014		Industry Code Updat...	District III Training Pr...	Deposit			100.00	34,129.20
08/29/2014		Industry Code Updat...	District III Training Pr...	Deposit			200.00	34,329.20
09/03/2014		Industry Code Updat...	District III Training Pr...	Deposit			200.00	34,529.20

Grace, Richard

From: Geary Showman <gshowman@shentel.net>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 10:02 PM
To: 'Skip Harper'; 'Curt Campbell'; Grace, Richard; 'Dustin McLehaney'; 'Paul Rimel'
Subject: New Membership List
Attachments: VPMIA 2014 Active Membership.xls; VPMIA 2014 Associate Membership.xls

VPMIA Officers,

Please find attached the New Active and Associate Membership List after i removed the purge list approved at the Graves Mountain Membership Meeting.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Geary W. Showman
VPMIA Executive Secretary
540-459-2789 or 540-975-0782



This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.

President's Report

September 12, 2014

I am still seeking someone to man the Governor's Housing Conference booth October 29 thru 31. ICC, VBCOA, and VPMIA has all secured tabletops, and will be located side-by-side in a room of about 80 tables.

All officers bonded to 50,000.00

MEMORANDUM

TO: VBCOA Ad-hoc Committee ICC 2018 Annual Conference Richmond, VA

FROM: Emory Rodgers, PP VBCOA, PP BOCA, Past ICC BOD member

DATE: September 5, 2014

SUBJECT: ICC 2018 Annual Conference, Richmond, VA

Pros for holding ICC 2018 Annual Conference in Richmond, VA

- Virginia last hosted the legacy BOCA Annual Meeting for Henry Green in Norfolk, VA and before that in Alexandria for Charles Everly. These events were 20 plus years ago.
- Holding the ICC 2018 Conference in Richmond is our time to do so again and shine for our many friends and for our Virginia code enforcement community. We deserve to be the host state.
- Virginia has had two board members since 1978. Virginia has had 3 of the 14 ICC presidents that no other states can match our contribution of leadership.
- Virginia has more members on ICC code committees, councils and ad-hoc committees than any other state.
- Virginia is one of the top purchasers of ICC services; one of 22 states with a customized ICC set of state codes; and, has been in the top 5 states with attendance at conferences and code hearings.
- Virginia stakeholders and code enforcers will be gracious and warm hosts with the resources available. Whatever event is planned for hosting our guests, there are folks ready and able to raise funds.
- Virginia's code associations have been honored for ICC Chapter of Year awards and many more Meritorious Awards. So how can VBCOA not be on-board?
- Virginia's code system, success rate for code changes and award recipients like this year for Bill Shelton and a few years past my receiving the Bob Fowler Award. Why not use this 2018 event to shine for the new Virginia leaders of ICC?
- Virginia has the opportunity to elect an ICC BOD member or even the next ICC President. We can elect another ICC President-elect by putting forth the ICC Secretary-Treasurer candidate in 2018. Do we want to throw that opportunity away? I don't think so.
- Richmond has the meeting space, the addition of 3 new hotels with 600 rooms and existing hotels with over 1,000 rooms within a 4 block walk

- Venues for eating, social events for the members and the ICC BOD abound along with the rich history offered by our museums, plantations and neighborhoods like the Fan and Church Hill. Bill adds the best venues can sometimes be the least expensive citing Salt Lake City and Minneapolis event done outside.
- Richmond is within driving distance for more than 1,000 ICC voting members and would enable code officials to send staff members who have never gone to an ICC conference and code hearing. What an opportunity for these new plan reviewers, inspectors and code officials. Bill adds this will be perhaps the only time our staffs might be able to attend even for a day.
- The Richmond Airport is 15 minutes from the downtown hotels and offers flights to all major hubs and an increasing number of direct flights from the major hubs
- If ICC selects Richmond, Virginia over Louisville and VBCOA elects not to be part of the host team, then what?
- Richmond businesses gain thousands of business dollar income. Bill adds we owe it to our state and localities that have spent thousands of dollars sending our delegation across this country to attend code hearings and conferences.
- Raising the profile for our profession with PR in local papers, radio and TV
- Richmond is farther east in the mid-Atlantic region, in Region 7 while ICC will be in Columbus for 2017 and will have code change spring meetings in Memphis down the Ohio River from Louisville.
- Hundreds of conference attendees attending some often return to the conference sites to further explore the rest of the state. Clarence Bechtel, the former BOCA CEO, often came back to Virginia with his family.

ICC Region VII report for the VPMIA BOD meeting September 12th, 2014

- ICC Region VII held their last meeting on August 7th and 8th, 2104 at the Ramada Inn Hagerstown, MD.
- On Thursday August 7th proposed code changes were discussed for the upcoming 2015 group A cycle.
- A portion of the ICC Region VII website will be dedicated to a blog to discuss further proposed code changes being submitted for the upcoming 2015 group A and B code change cycle, which will create the 2018 ICC codes.
- Thursday evening was dedicated to an ICC candidate forum allowing ICC candidates to be asked and answer questions from the ICC Region VII body.
- On Friday August 8th the general business meeting was held. An overview of the ICC Preferred Provider program was given by current ICC President Stephen Jones.
- ICC Region VII will be awarded the first ICC Region Spotlight award at the upcoming ICC conference in Ft. Lauderdale FL. Congratulations are due to all of the member states which include, PA, MD, DE, NJ, VA, WV, and DC. A special thanks is due to Kris Bridge of Martinsville VA, for completing the report and submitting on behalf ICC Region VII.
- The next ICC Region VII meeting is slated for Thursday January 22nd and 23rd, 2015 to be held at the Ramada Plaza Hagerstown 1718 Underpass Way Hagerstown MD 21740. See the ICC Region VII website for further information and the meeting agenda which will be posted on the website closer to the meeting date. - <http://www.iccregionvii.org/>



President
Skip Harper
SBCC
(804) 475-5933
skipharper@vpmia.org

Vice President
Curtis Campbell
Chesterfield County
(804) 814-7003
campbellcu@chesterfield.gov

Secretary
Richard Grace
Fairfax County
(703) 374-1657
richard.grace@fairfaxcounty.gov

Treasurer
Dustin McLehane
Chesterfield County
(804) 751-4165
mclehanevd@chesterfield.gov

Immediate Past President
Paul Rimel
City of Staunton
(540) 332-3862
rimelpm@ci.staunton.va.us

District 1 Director
James Anjam
Arlington County
(703) 228-3875
janjam@arlingtonva.us

District 2 Director
William Aldridge
Town of Christiansburg
(540) 382-6120
baldrige@christiansburg.org

District 3 Director
Donald Minnis
Chesterfield County
(804) 814-6999
mimmsd@chesterfield.gov

District 4 Director
David Harris
City of Newport News
(757) 926-8866
dharris@nmgov.com

Executive Secretary
Geary Showman
Shenandoah County
Retired
(540)-459-2789
gshowman@shentel.net

September 12, 2014

To: VPMIA Board of Directors
RE: Tradesman Continuing Education Workgroup

The Board For Contractors Continuing Education Workgroup held its third meeting on August 25, 2014 at the DPOR offices in Richmond. The following Virginia Tradesman Education Coalition (VTEC) representatives attended the meeting: Kris Bridges (VBCOA), Richard Hibbard (QGC's of VA) and Paul Rimel (VPMIA).

Several documents were reviewed and discussed outlining the direction in which the workgroup is moving in preparation for its upcoming recommendations to the Board For Contractors at their meeting on December 16, 2014. These documents are attached for your review.

The next CE Workgroup meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2014 at 10:00 am in Richmond. The meeting is open to the public and an opportunity for public comment is provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul M. Rimel III, Immediate Past President
Virginia Plumbing and Mechanical Inspectors Association

BOARD FOR CONTRACTORS
Education Workgroup
Board Room 2--2nd Floor – 10:00 AM

Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation
Perimeter Center, Suite 400
9960 Mayland Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23233-1463
(804) 367-2785

Monday, August 25, 2014

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes from meeting of June 23rd
3. Public Comment*
4. Regulatory Update
5. Survey Update and Discussions
6. Staff Recommendations
7. Committee Recommendations
8. Open Discussion/Topics for October Meeting
9. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR Monday, October 20, 2014 at 10:00 AM

**Five minute public comment, per person, with the exception of any open disciplinary or application file. Persons desiring to participate in the meeting and requiring special accommodations or interpretative services should contact the Department at (804) 367-2785 at least ten days prior to the meeting so that suitable arrangements can be made for an appropriate accommodation. The Department fully complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act.*

BOARD FOR CONTRACTORS EDUCATION WORKGROUP
Draft MINUTES OF MEETING
August 25, 2014

The Board for Contractors Education Workgroup met on Monday, August 25, 2014, at the Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation, 9960 Mayland Drive, 2nd Floor, Richmond, Virginia.

The following members of the Education Workgroup were present:

Herbert "Jack" Dyer, Jr., Chairman
Kris Bridges
H. Bailey Dowdy
Richard Hibbard
Douglas Murrow
John Nolde, Jr.
Paul Rime
Dwight "Todd" Vander Pol

The following members of the Education Workgroup were not present:

E. G. Middleton, III, Haywood Kines and Randy
Baldwin were absent.
Chancey Walker not present due to resignation.

Staff present for all or part of the meeting:

Mindy Spruill, Regulatory Boards Administrator
Adrienne Mayo, Regulatory Boards Administrator
Karen Bullock, Administrative Assistant,
Compliance Specialist
Sheila Watkins, Administrative Assistant,
Compliance Specialist

In July Mr. Chancey Walker resigned from the workgroup.

Chairman Dyer called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Call To Order

Mr. Nolde offered a motion to approve the agenda. **Mr. Vander Pol** seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously. Members voting "Yes" were: **Bridges, Dowdy, Dyer, Hibbard, Murrow, Nolde, Rimel, and Vander Pol.** **Kines, Middleton and Baldwin,** were absent.

Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Nolde offered a motion to approve the minutes of the June 23rd meeting. **Mr. Vander Pol** seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously. Members voting "Yes" were: **Bridges, Dowdy, Dyer, Hibbard, Murrow, Nolde, Rimel, and Vander Pol.** **Kines, Middleton and Baldwin,** were absent.

Approval of Minutes

There was no public comment.

Public Comment

Ms. Spruill briefed the members of the workgroup on the status of the Regulations. She shared that all Regulations have moved from the Secretary's desk to the Governor's office.

Regulatory Update

No workgroup action needed.

The workgroup members were given a handout that included a compilation of the survey data and the comments received. After reviewing the data the members discussed the contents of the handout in detail with respect to continuing education. **Ms. Spruill** shared that surveys were mailed to 500 Tradesman and currently 170 have responded. Their responses were compiled and provided in the handout for workgroup's consideration. **Staff shared** that based on the survey results and the comments of the workgroup the suggestions and constructive criticism of survey responders will be compiled and presented in October at the next meeting for the group's consideration and recommendation.

Survey Update and Discussions

Ms. Spruill addressed the group about the continuing education handout.

Staff Recommendations

The workgroup members decided to review the handout and critique each area. Their recommendations are:

Online offerings:

- Keep online options and enhance the security measures.
- Consider Provider fees and Course fees.
- Initial application fees and renewal fees.
- Separate course fees with expiration 6 months after Virginia's code change.
- Consideration of non code update courses expiration date.

Course Expiration Dates:

- Staff to review, critique other area i.e. Real Estate, CNG, and provide feedback and additional options for consideration to the workgroup at the October meeting.
- Test creation and Cost assessment.
- Pay if you fail assessment test.

Knowledge Assessment:

- Provide the option of pre testing.
- Perhaps proctor the exam.
- Economic burden to the licensee.
- Consideration of Regulatory requirements.
- The workgroup wants staff to gather additional information on how other states completes this process; specifically Colorado. Workgroup wants staff to review monitoring, fees, online options and costs involved.

Expanded Course Offerings:

- Confer with Board counsel for change requirements
- Management of primary and supplemental courses.
- Review management of partial course completion, i.e. Real Estate.
- Expansion of course offerings.
- Primary and supplemental course changes.
- Electable in addition to code update 1 code hasn't updated within the renewal cycle.

Licensing the provider/courses/instructors

- Recommendations were included in course expiration dates area.

Additional Discussion:

- Requiring Tradesman on the job site – would like to look into this as a regulatory change option.

The group took a break for lunch from 12:15 am to 12:42 pm.

Lunch Break

Open discussion/topics

Open discussion/topics for October Meeting

The workgroup discussed the following:

- Licensed Tradesman on the jobsite/Regulatory Requirements
- Continuing Education Change Requirements
- Workgroup requests staff to send out proposal along with agenda to members
- Thanks to all for participation and hard work exhibited.

There will be a Workgroup meeting Monday, **October 20th, 2014**. The work of this group needs to be wrapped up by October so the information can be presented to the full board by December of 2014.

Next Workgroup meeting

Chairman Dyer requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Mr. Vander Pol** made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:04 p.m. **Mr. Hibbard** seconded. By unanimous vote, Chairman Dyer adjourned the meeting. Members voting "Yes" were: Bridges, Dowdy, Dyer, Hibbard, Murrow, Nolde, Rimel and Vander Pol. Baldwin, Kines and Middleton were absent.

Adjourn

Herbert "Jack" Dyer, Chairman

Date

Jay DeBoer, Director

Date

Continuing Education Work Group Changes/Recommendations

1) Online offerings – the Board must address the issue of online course integrity. The preliminary results of the survey show that the preference of online vs. classroom courses is evenly split, so the restriction of courses to the classroom, such as the Certified Natural Gas Automobile Mechanics program, would not be a popular option.

Staff research has shown that online course integrity is an issue at all levels of education, including academic degrees, vocational training, and continuing education. Cheating and “academic dishonesty” are reported almost daily in the media. The Board for Contractors recent dealings with a fraudulent education provider has brought the issue much closer to home.

A recent article by *Virtual Student* stated that, although the opportunities to defraud are almost limitless, responsible providers are taking steps to make it more difficult. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning went into more detail regarding single source “one-stop” identification authentication. Some of these steps involve biofeedback mechanisms, security questions, proctored in-person assessments, and detailed audits.

The Board will need to be cognizant of the fact that any requirements placed on providers that have a cost, will likely result in one of two outcomes. The first being that those costs would be passed on directly to the student or, second, the provider would find the requirements to be cost prohibitive and would no longer offer the courses. While neither outcome would be desired, the Board must weigh the benefits of the ~~online~~ course integrity with the burden placed on the licensees.

2) Course expiration dates – currently, providers are approved for “life,” unless they do something to get themselves “unapproved.” Not having an expiration date for providers can certainly be argued and there are merits for either leaving the system as it is or requiring providers “renew” their approval. There should be no argument, however, that courses should have an expiration date in order to ensure that the information given is current.

When looking at courses that are directly linked to the USBC, there is a natural expiration date built into every course. Blanket requirements that all providers supply updated course curricula when the effective date of the USBC changes, serves as a way to ensure the “freshness” of the course material. If the Board moves toward expanding the available subject matter, however, that natural flushing of the system will not occur, necessitating the need for course expiration dates.

Both the Real Estate Board and the Natural Gas Automobile Mechanics programs have expiration dates to courses. After the expiration date course completions are not accepted by the programs. Providers must reapply for approval of the course and each application is reviewed by the board. This would require a regulatory change, but language has already been developed by multiple programs so it would be relatively easy to put forward for review.

3) Knowledge assessments – requiring individuals to spend time and money taking a class that they do not need is certainly not what the Board intended when it required continuing education as a prerequisite for renewal of tradesman licenses. Additionally, the advantage of identifying a particular weakness and concentrating training on that weakness sounds like a logical best practice when looking at continuing education. The “Colorado Solution” of having all tradesman complete a periodic assessment of their knowledge of the code and then, based on that assessment, require a targeted continuing education requirement (if any is required), would be advantageous to all parties. The licensee would be taking continuing education in the area(s) where it is most needed, the Board would not putting a “burden” only on those that need it, and providers would be able to develop more detailed classes, instead of simply an overview. Additionally, the system could be adopted to provide a range of time requirements instead of just assuming that everyone receives adequate training in three hours.

There are several issues that the Board would have to consider before adopting this type of requirement.

- a) Who would develop the assessment to ensure that it is psychometrically sound?
- b) Who would administer the assessment and where would it be available?
- c) What would be the cost to the Board to develop and implement this type of requirement and would that result in an increase in the cost of licensure?
- d) What would be the cost of the assessment to the licensee and, if there are courses that must be taken, what would be the total economic burden to the licensee?
- e) Would the economic burden to the licensee be offset by the increased assurance that tradesman are more aware of the USBC and, by default, ensures an increased level of safety and protection to the consumers?

This would require a regulatory change

4) Expanded course offerings – currently courses must be directly related to the USBC with the original board requirement be that the courses be solely based on updates to the applicable code for the attendees. For example, CE providers for electrical courses would only be approved

to teach courses that provided updates from one version of the NEC to another. This was modified a number of years ago to allow providers to give classes on any part of the applicable code. Now, for example, a CE provider for electrical courses could teach a course based on any chapter in the current NEC, not just a course based on updates. Water well system providers and elevator mechanics have had this option since the inception of their licensing programs. Unfortunately, trade related providers have not stepped up to the plate to expand their course offerings. Only a small percentage of course are available that are not just update based.

Expanding the course offerings to include other aspects of the trade would likely result in an increase in available courses. Additionally, in certain circumstances, manufacturer's training could be approved to meet the CE requirements. Often, when new products are available, training is provided to associations and other groups that can be very beneficial. As a matter of fact, the local building officials will generally rely on the manufacturers installation specifications when doing inspections, so indirectly, these courses are related to the USBC.

It is arguable as to whether or not this would require a change in the regulations. If the Board were to stretch its interpretation of what is meant by "covering the articles" of the applicable code, it could be done on a provider application by provider application basis. Staff would recommend, however, that the regulations be amended at some point, to become a little less specific, allowing a greater number of courses. Keep in mind that approval is not guaranteed, and the Board would still have final say in what is approved and what is not, changing the regulations would give the providers a little more clarification.

5) Licensing the providers/courses/instructors – Currently, providers and courses are approved by the Board at no cost. It is the only "regulant" of the Board that does not have to pay its way. Providers of education courses for the Real Estate Board (which has the most extensive education requirements) pay for providers and courses. Additionally, individual instructors are approved and must meet certain eligibility criteria in order to be considered for approval. These requirements provide a basic level of integrity to the Board's education program. While the Board for Contractors would not necessarily be best served by adopting the entire education scheme of the Real Estate Board, certain requirements would be beneficial.

This would include:

- a) Requiring providers to apply for approval by submitting an application and paying a fee. This would make them licensees and would put them under the authority of the Board in the same way as a contractor or tradesman. Certain eligibility requirements could be built into the regulations and violations of the prohibited acts could result in fines, suspensions, probations, etc. Additionally, an expiration date could be set, if desired, and renewal requirements could be developed.

- b) Requiring courses to be approved similar to how specialties are approved on a contractor license. Fees would be charged for each individual course and regulations could be developed that would outline eligibility requirements. Providers could add courses at any time, similar to how a contractor adds a specialty to a license.

- c) Licensing or approving individual instructors would give the Board a way to ensure that certain criteria are met before an individual is turned loose on a group of licensees. Tighter eligibility requirements would mean more qualified instructors. There have been instances in courses that have been audited by the Board that it was obvious the instructor was an expert in their field, but just as painfully obvious that relaying that expertise to a room full of adults was not only a challenge, but resulted in a less than acceptable learning experience for the students.

The implementation of these requirements would require a regulatory change.

Continuing Education Workgroup Initial Survey Data

During the month of July, the Board for Contractors sent continuing education surveys to 500 randomly selected tradesmen. As of August 21st, the Board has received nearly 170 replies which, while not a statistically valid sample size, has still provided some good data and given some valuable basic information.

A more thorough analysis of the information will be provided at the October meeting, but the following is a quick synopsis of the information we have been able to compile at this time.

- 1) Nearly 43% of the respondents take their CE online, with 37% of the respondents traveling one hour or less to the course. More than 19% of the respondents traveled more than one hour to attend the course.

- 2) 53% of the respondents paid \$76 dollars or more for their course (nearly 14% paying more than \$150) with 46% paying \$75 or less. The vast majority (81%) paid within the range of \$26-\$150 for the course. 5% of the respondents did not pay at all for the course.

- 3) More than half (54%) found the course to be helpful in the performance of their job. 30% felt it did not help them.

- 4) As expected, based on anecdotal data, two-thirds (67%) of the licensees absorbed the cost of the course; with 29% being paid by an employer and 1% being paid by an association.

- 5) More than 46% indicated that they would take the course, even if it was not a requirement for renewal. A little less than 30% were undecided as to whether or not they would attend if it weren't required, with 24% stating that would only attend if required.

- 6) An overwhelming majority of more than 88% agreed that the course was specific to their tradesman category.

- 7) The type of training preferred by the respondents was very evenly split. 47% for the classroom and 45% for online/computer based training. A small percentage (2%) prefers the correspondence method with 6% stating that they do not like any method of training.

- 8) Only a small percentage of providers (21%) gave a code knowledge pretest, however 60% provided reference material to the students.

Several individuals added written comments and remarks to their surveys with many taking a side as to whether or not the training was worthwhile or desirable. These comments tend to be very polarized and succinct. A few, however, offered suggestions and gave constructive criticism, which will be compiled and presented in October.

Comments	How Many	How Often?	How Many
Waste of Time and Money	6	3 Years	5
Expensive	3	4 years	3
Gets code updates daily			
Minimum of 4 hours a year in classroom			
Great refresher			
It's Important	3		
Always learns something			
Interesting but not needed	2		
Course is general and they are Industrial			
Knows how to use the code			
Mike Holt good online course			
License held hostage			
Shouldn't be mandatory			
Couldn't access study guide			
A way for the state to make money	2		
Online to fit schedule			
Has WV license so doesn't need VA			
Get it together - should coincide with code change			
Very beneficial	3		
Stan Massey is the best			
Inconvenient			
Instructor needs to stay on course			
Inspectors shouldn't have to take	2		
Found it useful			
Likes classroom to ask questions			
Online is easier and cheaper			
Online is all we need			
Making someone rich at our expense			
Prevents damage and mistakes			
Classes are mostly fill in the blanks			
Should discontinue this!			
Get your money scam			
NC Way - No infractions, no CE			
More classroom locations			
Not job specific			
Should be for contractors not tradesmen			
Wants testing online			

VPMIA – VBCOA Plumbing, Mechanical, and Fuel Gas (PMG) Board Report

September, 2014

- The ICC Group C cycle, IgCC, is underway with the upcoming hearings being held at the 2014 Annual conference in Fort Lauderdale. See the following link for further conference info – <https://ww2.eventrebels.com/er/EventHomePage/CustomPage.jsp?ActivityID=10579&ItemID=42305>

The VPMIA PMG committee has not acted on the group C code cycle to date.

- The VPMIA/VBCOA PMG committee will be meeting for the first time for 2015 Group A code change (creating the 2018 I-codes) discussion on Friday September 19th, 2014 from 10:00 am until 2:00 pm at the Louisa County Building, 1 Woolfolk Ave, Louisa VA 23093. This meeting will be to start discussion on what proposed PMG changes this committee wishes to submit for the upcoming code change cycle. Please bring your ideas, written or thoughts, to the meeting so that we can begin the process. If you have any proposed changes in written form please forward them to me prior to the meeting. Future PMG committee meetings will be determined at this meeting.
- Some significant changes have been posted in regard to the specific codes that are to be in the group A code change cycle and the group B code change cycle. See the following link for the complete list - <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/2015-17cycle.aspx> In the PMG arena the 2015 group A code change cycle, which will create the 2018 codes, will be very busy as not only will the group A code change cycle contain the IPC and IMC but will now also contain the IRC plumbing and IRC mechanical. The ISPSC (swimming pool and spa code) will also be part of the Group A code change cycle.

Codes moved to Group A: IEBC non-structural; IPMC; IRC-M, IRC-P; ISPSC; IZC

Codes moved to Group B: IBC - S (which also includes IEBC structural provisions)

VBCOA report for the VPMIA BOD meeting September 12th, 2014

- The last VBCOA BOD meeting was held on Sunday September 7th, 2014 in Blacksburg VA.
- Due to the dates of the VBCOA and VPMIA meetings and limited timeframe between the two meetings I will report verbally at the VPMIA meeting on any pertinent information from the VBCOA BOD meeting.

Sincerely,

Shawn Strausbaugh

Chairman VPMIA - VBCOA Plumbing, Mechanical, and Fuel Gas Committee, VPMIA-VBCOA Liaison

sstrausbaugh@arlingtonva.us

Certification Report

September 12, 2014

On behalf of VPMIA on September 11th I taught the 2012 IPC & IFGC to a group of ASPE DC members at The Joyce Agency (thank you Mr. Sargeant). We had roughly 35 in attendance.

On October 14th we have a DPOR training event scheduled in Chesterfield and on November 10th in Chantilly at The Joyce Agency.

Looking to find more participants for the mechanical updates in Chantilly.

Legislative Report 1

OPTION #1

36-105(C)(4)

If the local building department has initiated an enforcement action against the owner of a building or structure and such owner subsequently transfers the ownership of the building or structure to an entity in which the owner holds an ownership interest greater than 50%, the pending enforcement action shall continue to be enforced against the owner. If the local building department has initiated an enforcement action against the owner of a building or structure within the limitation period set forth in section 19.2-8 and such owner subsequently transfers the ownership of the building or structure and the violation has not been abated, the local building department may bring an enforcement action regarding the same violation against the new owner no later than six months after the transfer of ownership.

19.2-8

Prosecution of Building Code violations under § 36-106 shall commence within one year of discovery of the offense by the building official; provided that such discovery occurs within two years of the date of initial occupancy or use after construction of the building or structure, or the issuance of a certificate of use and occupancy for the building or structure, whichever is later. However, prosecutions under § 36-106 relating to the maintenance of existing buildings or structures as contained in the Uniform Statewide Building Code shall commence within one year of the ~~discovery of~~ issuance of a notice of violation for the offense by the building official; provided that a notice of violation is issued within one year of the discovery of the offense.

OPTION #2

Alternate Proposed Revision to 19.2-8

19.2-8

Prosecution of Building Code violations under § 36-106 shall commence within one year of discovery of the offense by the building official; provided that such discovery occurs within two years of the date of initial occupancy or use after construction of the building or structure, or the issuance of a certificate of use and occupancy for the building or structure, whichever is later. However, prosecutions under § 36-106 relating to the maintenance of existing buildings or structures as contained in the Uniform Statewide Building Code shall commence within one year of the ~~discovery of~~ issuance of a notice of violation for the offense by the building official.

BILL NO. _____

Offered _____

A BILL to amend and reenact §§ 36-103 and 36-105 of the Code of Virginia, relating to the Uniform Statewide Building Code; enforcement by counties and towns of provisions for existing buildings.

Patrons—

Referred to _____

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That §§ 36-103 and 36-105 of the Code of Virginia are amended and reenacted as follows:

§ 36-103. Buildings, etc., existing or projected before effective date of Code.

Any building or structure, for which a building permit has been issued or on which construction has commenced, or for which working drawings have been prepared in the year prior to the effective date of the Building Code, shall remain subject to the building regulations in effect at the time of such issuance or commencement of construction. However, the Board may adopt and promulgate as ~~part~~ Part III of the Building Code, building regulations that facilitate for the maintenance, rehabilitation, development and reuse of existing buildings and structures at the least possible cost to ensure the protection of the public health, safety and welfare. Subsequent reconstruction, renovation, repair or demolition of such buildings or structures shall be subject to the pertinent construction and rehabilitation provisions of the Building Code. The provisions of this section shall be applicable to equipment. However, building owners may elect to install partial or full fire alarms or other safety equipment that was not required by the Building Code in effect at the time a building was constructed without meeting current Building Code requirements, provided the installation does not create a hazardous condition. Permits for installation shall be obtained in accordance with the Uniform Statewide Building Code.

§ 36-105. Enforcement of Code; appeals from decisions of local department; inspection of buildings; inspection warrants; inspection of elevators; issuance of permits.

A. Enforcement generally. Enforcement of the provisions of Parts I and II of the Building Code for construction and rehabilitation shall be the responsibility of the local building department. There shall be established within each local building department a local board of Building Code appeals whose composition, duties and responsibilities shall be prescribed in the Building Code. Any person aggrieved by the local building department's application of the Building Code or refusal to grant a modification to the provisions of the Building Code may appeal to the local board of Building Code appeals. No appeal to the State Building Code Technical Review Board shall lie prior to a final determination by the local board of Building Code appeals. Whenever a county or a municipality does not have such a building department or board of Building Code appeals, the local governing body shall enter into an agreement with the local governing body of another county or municipality or with some other agency, or a state agency approved by the Department for such enforcement and appeals resulting therefrom. For the purposes of this section, towns with a population of less than 3,500 may elect to administer and enforce Parts I and II of the Building Code; however, where the town does not elect to administer and enforce Parts I and II of the Building Code, the county in which the town is situated shall administer and enforce Parts I and II of the Building Code for the town. In the event such

town is situated in two or more counties, those counties shall administer and enforce Parts I and II of the Building Code for that portion of the town situated within their respective boundaries.

B. New construction. Any building or structure may be inspected at any time before completion, and shall not be deemed in compliance until approved by the inspecting authority. Where the construction cost is less than \$2,500, however, the inspection may, in the discretion of the inspecting authority, be waived. A building official may issue an annual permit for any construction regulated by the Building Code. The building official shall coordinate all reports of inspections for compliance with the Building Code, with inspections of fire and health officials delegated such authority, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. Fees may be levied by the local governing body in order to defray the cost of such enforcement and appeals.

C. Existing buildings and structures.

1. Inspections and enforcement of Part III of the Building Code. The local governing body may also inspect and enforce the provisions of Part III of the Building Code for existing buildings and structures, whether occupied or not. Such inspection and enforcement shall include enforcement of the unsafe structures provisions for tenant complaints in subdivision 2 of this subsection and enforcement of the elevator, escalator, or related conveyance inspections in subdivision 5 of this subsection and shall be carried out by an agency or department designated by the local governing body. Where a county elects to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code, the county shall also inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code in any town situated in the county with a population of less than 3,500, unless the town elects to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code. In the event that any such towns are situated in two or more counties, then those counties, if electing to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code, shall inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code for that portion of the town situated within their respective boundaries, unless the town elects to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code. A county shall not inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code in towns situated in the county when such towns have a population of 3,500 or more, except by agreement between the respective local governing bodies.

2. Complaints by tenants. However, in any locality which has not elected to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code, upon a finding by the local building department established for the enforcement of Parts I and II of the Building Code, following a complaint by a tenant of a residential dwelling unit that is the subject of such complaint, that there may be a violation of the unsafe structures provisions of Part III of the Building Code, the local building department established for the enforcement of Parts I and II of the Building Code shall enforce such provisions.

3. Inspection warrants. If the local building department receives a complaint that a violation of the Building Code exists that is an immediate and imminent threat to the health or safety of the owner, tenant, or occupants of any building or structure, or the owner, occupant, or tenant of any nearby building or structure, and the owner, occupant, or tenant of the building or structure that is the subject of the complaint has refused to allow the local building official or his agent to have access to the subject building or structure, the local building official or his agent may present sworn testimony to a magistrate or a court of competent jurisdiction and request that the magistrate or court grant the local building official or his agent an inspection warrant to enable the building official or his agent to enter the subject building or structure for the purpose of determining whether violations of the Building Code exist. The local building official or his agent shall make a reasonable effort to obtain consent from the owner, occupant, or tenant of the subject building or structure prior to seeking the issuance of an inspection warrant under this section.

4. Transfer of ownership. If the local building department has initiated an enforcement action against the owner of a building or structure and such owner subsequently transfers the ownership of the building or structure to an entity in which the owner holds an ownership interest greater than 50 percent, the pending enforcement action shall continue to be enforced against the owner.

5. Elevator, escalator, or related conveyance inspections. ~~The~~ In localities which have not elected to inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code, the local governing body shall, however, inspect and enforce Part III of the Building Code for elevators, escalators, or related conveyances, except for elevators in single- and two-family homes and townhouses. Such inspection shall be carried out by an agency or department designated by the local governing body.

6. A locality may require by ordinance that any landmark, building or structure that contributes to a district delineated pursuant to § 15.2-2306 shall not be razed, demolished or moved until the razing, demolition or moving thereof is approved by the review board, or, on appeal, by the governing body after consultation with the review board ~~unless the local maintenance code official consistent with the Uniform Statewide Building Code, agency or department designated by the local governing body to enforce Part III Maintenance, of the Building Code~~ determines that it constitutes such a hazard that it shall be razed, demolished or moved.

For the purpose of this subdivision, a contributing landmark, building or structure is one that adds to or is consistent with the historic or architectural qualities, historic associations, or values for which the district was established pursuant to § 15.2-2306, because it (i) was present during the period of significance, (ii) relates to the documented significance of the district, and (iii) possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period.

7. Fees may be levied by the local governing body in order to defray the cost of such enforcement and appeals. For purposes of this section, "defray the cost" may include the fair and reasonable costs incurred for such enforcement during normal business hours, but shall not include overtime costs unless conducted outside of the normal working hours established by the locality. A schedule of such costs shall be adopted by the local governing body in a local ordinance. A locality shall not charge an overtime rate for inspections conducted during the normal business hours established by the locality. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit a private entity from conducting such inspections, provided the private entity has been approved to perform such inspections in accordance with the written policy of the maintenance code official for the locality.

D. Fees may be levied by the local governing body to be paid by the applicant for the issuance of a building permit as otherwise provided under this chapter, however, notwithstanding any provision of law, general or special, if the applicant for a building permit is a tenant or the owner of an easement on the owner's property, such applicant shall not be denied a permit under the Building Code solely upon the basis that the property owner has financial obligations to the locality that constitute a lien on such property in favor of the locality. If such applicant is the property owner, in addition to payment of the fees for issuance of a building permit, the locality may require full payment of any and all financial obligations of the property owner to the locality to satisfy such lien prior to issuance of such permit. For purposes of this subsection, "property owner" means the owner of such property as reflected in the land records of the circuit court clerk where the property is located, the owner's agent, or any entity in which the owner holds an ownership interest greater than 50 percent.

Information Technology Report

Septembet 12.2014

VPMIA has purchased a replacement laptop for the webmaster, and purchased the Windows Office Suite for this computer. This upgraded computer if for the use of operating the VPMIA website, and the previous computer can be retired.