



**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION  
OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL  
FIRE ENGINEERING DIVISION**

P.O. Box 944246  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460  
(916) 445-8200  
Website: [www.fire.ca.gov](http://www.fire.ca.gov)



**CALIFORNIA STATE FIRE MARSHAL  
FIRE SPRINKLER CERTIFICATION WORKGROUP**

**Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Date: May 28, 2015

Location: Maidu Community Center, Roseville California

Time: 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

**STAFF**

James Parsegian, Supervising DSFM  
Jeff Schwartz, Deputy State Fire Marshal  
Wanda Albritten, Assistant Program Coordinator

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Patrick Chew, Roseville Fire Department  
Randy Roxen, Sprinkler Fitters Association, California  
Randy Dysart, CalSAFE  
Wayne Weisz, Contractor  
Tom McKinnon, AFSA  
Steve Fox, UA Training Department  
James Carver, El Segundo Fire Department  
\*Derryl Bolden, LA City Fire Department  
Jose Colin, Woodland Fire Department  
\*Robert Rowe, Fire Sprinkler Advisory Board, Southern California  
John Upshaw, CAFSA  
Laura Blaul, Chairperson  
Darryl Hefley  
\*via conference line

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Bruce Lecair, National Fire Sprinkler Association

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Todd Golden, UA Sprinkler Fitters Local 709  
Chuck Frame, UA Sprinkler Fitters Local 669  
Dale O'Dell

## **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Laura Blaul at 10:17 AM on May 28, 2015.

## **ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Jeff Schwartz conducted a roll call and it was determined that we had a quorum.

## **DISCUSSION**

Laura wanted the workgroup to review the regulations to work on the clarity of the language and intent and not so much wordsmithing.

Steve Fox clarified that his previous motion of including C16 installers in the language was to require them to take the certification exam if they were on the job and installing.

The workgroup discussed the testing around certification and re-certification. They discussed scenarios of what would cause a re-test or what would cause the State Fire Marshal to call for a re-test of all who are certified. Jose Colin felt the language was too vague and that it should not be included in the regulations. James Carver agreed that it should not be in the regulations. Jeff Schwartz went over the previous meetings voting sheet to clarify what motions the group voted for and against. Laura advised the group that when the workgroup submits the regulations package, she will include a cover sheet that says it is the intent of this workgroup to not have that particular language in the regulations and reasons why for the State Fire Marshal to review.

Next, the workgroup discussed the hour requirements for the certification program. They talked about the various state programs around the country as well as the federal program. Jeff Schwartz suggested the workgroup add language from 971 (a) (i) stating "State or Federally approved apprenticeship program" to solve the problem of minimum hours for certification. The group agreed that this addition would be beneficial to the regulations.

Steve Fox wanted to make a motion to not require a re-test at any level. Laura Blaul reminded the group that they had already voted on that topic. Steve clarified that he wanted to remove the discretion from the State Fire Marshal to make the decision to require a re-test at any time they deem necessary. Darryll Bolden felt that it was important to keep the State Fire Marshal's discretion and explained his reasoning. Tom McKinnon offered an alternative of allowing the State Fire Marshal to require a re-test if a certified installer is cited by a jurisdiction in one certification period three times. Randy Roxson expressed his opinion that this should not over-regulate the certification program. The workgroup discussed this option and other scenarios that could require a re-test. Steve Fox clarified his motion that he did not want wholesale re-examination on the industry once certified. Jose Colin seconded the motion. The group discussed this motion thoroughly to ensure understanding and intent. All voted in favor of the motion.

Derryl Hefley asked for clarification of some definitions as he has seen different jurisdictions have different definitions and he wants to avoid confusion later on. The workgroup discussed where the definitions for the scope of the regulations will come from. They discussed "alterations", "maintenance", "repair" and "modifications". Jeff Schwartz agreed with Darryl that the definitions need to be addressed because at the State Fire Marshal's Office, he gets phone calls regularly

regarding issues with definitions. It was suggested by Steve Fox that the specifics of definitions will need to be addressed in Phase II of this workgroup. Laura asked the workgroup if there was a place they could pull the definitions from so they did not have to recreate them. The group agreed to pull them from NFPA 25, chapter 5, Section 901. Randy Roxson brought up his issue with the fire sprinkler trainee definition. The group then discussed the requirements for being an apprentice and the necessary supervision. They then decided to take out “direct” and change it to “on-site” supervision. Next, the group discussed other definitions for “trainee”, “journeyman” and “apprentice”.

Laura brought up the next topic of fees for the certification. There are separate subsections for trainee, apprentice and journeyman. They get 180 days to get their application in and the OSFM has 180 to process the application. The question was brought up if the applicant needs to keep proof of application submittal. The group discussed the time period that the applicant will get for a grace period of obtaining their certification and the various possible scenarios that could happen. They agreed on one year for the time frame. Tom McKinnon expressed that he was uncomfortable that an applicant would not be able to show proof of applying for certification for that entire year. Randy Roxson and Darryl Hefley gave their ideas on how to solve this issue and there were a few concerns with staffing at the OSFM for the impending workload when the program is complete. Jeff Schwartz assured the workgroup that the OSFM has been working on a Budget Change Proposal to obtain additional staff specifically for the certification program. He also explained where some of the delay in processing applications comes from and how the office is working to solve them. The group wanted clarification from the State Fire Marshal if she wants everyone at a jobsite to be certified or if it was for one person on the jobsite to be certified. Laura stated that she will call Chief Hoover on the break to get clarification.

Steve Fox was confused as to where Section 942 came from and if it is necessary. The workgroup discussed the language and time allowance in the section. Derryll Bolden asked for clarification on when the 90 days starts. Tom McKinnon and Derryll discussed their ideas and possible scenarios back and forth. Jeff Schwartz read from the transcription from the previous meeting where the workgroup discussed the 90 day time period for a trainee. He also explained to the workgroup that the meeting minutes are taking so long because there are a lot of people talking over each other which makes it difficult to understand what is being discussed and decided. Steve Fox would not like it if the 90 day trainee language was written in Section 942. Darryl Hefley made a motion to for the language to read that a trainee can work on-site for 90 days from date of hire prior to registering. Wayne Weisz seconded the motion. Nine were in favor of the motion. Two were opposed to the motion.

The workgroup discussed the language for the amount of employees a certified sprinkler fitter can supervise. Some felt it should be up to two apprentices or two apprentices and one trainee. Others felt it should be three apprentices and one trainee. Steve Fox reminded the group that they had a whiteboard at a previous meeting and decided two apprentices, one trainee and one certified sprinkler fitter. The group agreed on this regulation of a total of four workers in a group.

Laura suggested a change of “shall” to “may” in regards to an AHJ coming on site and asking to show their registration and certification cards. The group discussed what each meant and scenarios that could happen. They talked about the responsibilities of the licensed contractor, the sprinkler fitter applicant and for the Office of the State Fire Marshal. Jeff Schwartz read language regarding an AHJ giving a Stop Work Order for the workgroup to discuss and possibly use for

these regulations. Randy Roxson felt it was important to make sure the language included a “reasonable notice” section for the Stop Work Order language and explained his reasoning. The group discussed the pros and cons of having specific language or referencing a section in Title 24 and agreed to use specific language.

Next, the workgroup talked about report of violations and penalties. Tom McKinnon had an issue with the language for 955 (a). He felt that “in confidence” was too subjective. Randy Roxson offered an alternative of “in violation of this chapter,” and Tom agreed that this was better language and the change was made. They also added “dually appointed employees or local AHJ” to 956 (2) for the refusal to allow inspection. Next, the group discussed the issues with reporting employees and the possibility of employees going from contractor to contractor which creates a problem for reporting. They decided to remove “annually” from the employer responsibility section for reporting certified employees.

Randy Roxson recommended stopping work on Article 5 and finish working on the Registry language and then continue with Article 5. The group agreed. Jeff Schwartz showed the group registry examples from other OSFM programs. Randy Roxson made a motion to create a registry clause to resemble the registry in the Fire Extinguisher Program. Steve Fox seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

The group moved onto the language for Trainee Registration. The discussed timelines and agreed that 90 days to register as a Trainee was sufficient as they will have nine months to meet the requirements for the next step in obtaining certification.

Darryl Hefley wanted clarification regarding renewals and if the employee will have to prove if they are still in a program each year when they renew their certificate. Jeff Schwartz confirmed that they will need to provide proof of enrollment in a sprinkler fitter program each year when they renew.

Next was Section 965 and the group agreed on the language. Section 966 was next; Tom McKinnon discussed section (a) and that the examination should be taken prior to any work being done. The group agreed on that language.

The workgroup began discussing the Legacy Clause and out-of-state sprinkler fitters. They gave various scenarios and talked about the best way to handle them. They all agreed that the out-of-state fitters must take a test. They also discussed reciprocity and the “what-ifs” for amount of time required as well as coming from a state or federally approved program. Wayne Weisz wanted to clarify the goal of this topic and the possibility of making it very tough for companies to get jobs done without verifiable hours or apprenticeship program to show. The group recognized that the out-of-state sprinkler fitters are a difficult group to create regulations for. They wanted to ensure they create regulations that enable those who are qualified to obtain certification. The group deliberated for some time ensuring language for the regulations that would satisfy agency and industry.

Laura reminded the group that the next meeting will be on the ISOR and remaining Articles. She wanted a few people to work on these Articles before the next meeting. She also reminded the workgroup that they would not revisit items that they already agreed and/or voted on in future meetings. James Carver clarified whether or not this information would be reviewed by the AES Advisory Committee. Jeff Schwartz confirmed that the regulations would be reviewed by the AES

Committee. Randy Roxson made a motion to adopt the amended language and move forward to the AES Advisory Committee. Jose Colin seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Laura asked the group for volunteers to work on language for the next meeting. John Upshaw and Wayne Weisz volunteered to work on language for Article 1 and 2. James Carver and Darryl Hefley volunteered to work on Article 3. Patrick Chew and Jose Colin volunteered to work on Enforcement language. Darryl Bolden and Robert Rowe volunteered for ISOR language. Randy Roxson and Steve Fox volunteered to work on Certification language. Jeff Schwartz reminded everyone that if they had questions regarding the language or the ISOR to contact James Parsegian. He sent an example of an ISOR to everyone so they can get an idea of the direction and what the content needs to be in regards to the intent portion.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2015 from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM (Pacific Standard Time) at the El Segundo Fire Department Station 2, El Segundo, California. A conference line will be available.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned by Chair Laura Blaul at 3:50 PM.