

Plumbing Board of Appeals  
Meeting Minutes  
October 12, 2016

Board Members Present:

Tom Day, Chairman  
John Pint, Vice-Chairman  
Brian Rogers  
Jim Meier-Gast  
Greg Wolfe

Board Members Absent:

Mike Hessenius

Also Present:

Sarah Fersdahl, Danisco Environmental Engineer	Kevin Ciabatti, Building Services Director
Dennis Smidt, Danisco Plant Manager	Duncan McCallum, Building Services Manager
Joe Kilburg, Danisco Maintenance Manager	Aaron Morrison, Chief Plumbing Inspector
	Dawn Kolosik, Recording Secretary

Chairman Tom Day brought the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. Roll call was taken by Dawn Kolosik.

Chairman Day opened the floor for nominations for Chairperson. Brian Rogers nominated Tom Day; Jim Meier-Gast seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Day opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chairperson. Brian Rogers nominated John Pint; Greg Wolfe seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

Minutes from the previous meeting held on October 26, 2015, were reviewed. Greg Wolfe made a motion to approve the minutes as recorded; seconded by Jim Meier-Gast. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Day introduced the next agenda item, Danisco US, Inc., appeal regarding the identification of potable and non-potable water systems. He gave a brief description of the duties of the Board and opened the floor for presentations. Kevin Ciabatti deferred giving his presentation until the end. Dennis Smidt, Danisco Plant Manager, introduced himself as well as Joe Kilburg, Danisco Maintenance Manager, and Sarah Fersdahl, Danisco Environmental Engineer. Danisco is requesting approval to defer from the 2015 UPC, Chapter 6, Section 601.3 requiring labeling of potable and non-potable water systems every 20 feet. They proposed an alternate labeling standard using a less specific method. Danisco discovered through an internal environmental audit that they did not fully meet the labeling requirements of the Uniform Plumbing Code. They are proposing a variation to the requirement they believe meets the intent of the requirement without creating a great deal of cost or disruption to their operations. They emphasized their full commitment to safety of their employees and the environment and do not propose anything that would jeopardize either. They stated their four core values are: respect for people, safety, environmental protection and full ethical behavior. They stated their intent is to be fully transparent about their current labeling status and provide their proposed plan for the Board's review to make sure it meets the threshold for the intent of the Uniform Plumbing Code as approved by the City as it pertains to potable and non-potable water. Sarah then presented the details of Danisco's request for this appeal. A copy of Danisco's Standard Operating Procedure was provided to show the equipment and labeling standard used in their facility. This labeling standard is not as specific as the UPC; however, they believe it will identify the system well enough that they would not have an instance where they would tap into one system thinking it was the other. Their team members are trained on

this practice as well as the practice of not allowing any eating or drinking on the manufacturing floor. This is also consistent when vendors are utilized assist with capital projects or any licensed design work. She stated they have several safe guards in place that help to meet the intent of the Uniform Plumbing Code. She provided color photo examples of the line-labeling practice currently in place at their facility. The photos showed the color system used and the direction of flow. Brian Rogers asked if the big difference is in the frequency of the labeling on the system that's required in the UPC. Sarah stated it would be difficult to label every 20 feet because of the height of the piping and the amount of piping within their facility. She stated the non-potable is not consistently labeled "Do Not Drink". They instead address this through training of their team members who understand this expectation. She also stated the source of the process water is the potable water. A backflow preventer is isolated between the two systems. The main backflow preventers for the fresh, incoming water are serviced annually for the backflow prevention testing for containment from the plant to the domestic water system; these are clearly marked. Chairman Day asked if a person was delivering a motorized lift on a hot day and there is a hose bib there, is that vendor instructed not to drink out of that hose bib. Sarah stated all approved contractors are required to go through extensive training which includes the good manufacturing practice of no drinking/eating on the manufacturing floor. They are also escorted unless they are approved vendors. Bottled water is provided to the approved contractors to consume. Greg Wolfe asked if all pipes are labeled on all visible sides in each room. Sarah stated she was not 100% sure as there may be instances where the labeling was not in every room.

Chairman Day stated they cannot consider cost in order to comply with Uniform Plumbing Code. Previous appellants have secured a letter from a professional engineer stating, in the engineer's opinion, the modification meets the intent of that section of the Uniform Plumbing Code; the Board has accepted that document as being compliant with the Uniform Plumbing Code. Kevin Ciabatti agreed with Chairman Day that the decision of the board can be deferred until the letter has been received from a professional engineer. He and Duncan McCallum have discussed this issue with the Cedar Rapids Water Dept who felt as long as all the proper backflow was in place and tested annually, there really was not a concern on the utility side. The Board said they appreciated the fact that Danisco brought this to their attention.

Brian Rogers asked if permits were pulled when projects/additions/remodeling are done. Duncan and Kevin stated the Building Services Department is not involved in the review of their processes but if they were to add/modify any bathroom, office, etc., permits would be required. Kevin Ciabatti re-iterated the fact that this issue was not found by the Building Services Department but rather through Danisco's own internal audit process; it was their decision to bring it to the Building Services Department's attention.

Duncan stated if a professional engineer completed an evaluation of the entire system including the labeling, training program and backflow locations, Danisco could then present that information to the Board; decision by the Board could be deferred until that time.

Chairman Day entertained a motion for a deferment. Greg Wolfe made the motion; Jim Meier-Gast seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

**New Business**

Rules of Procedure for the Plumbing Board of Appeals were presented to the Board showing the requested addition in Article 6, Item 3, which states "The maximum timeframe for a re-hearing to occur shall be within 60 days from the date of the original hearing." Chairman Day entertained a motion to accept the Rules of Procedure for the Plumbing Board of Appeals. John Pint made the motion; Brian Rogers seconded. All in favor. Motion carried.

Brian Rogers requested to add discussion of the International Residential Code (IRC). He asked if Cedar Rapids enforced the plumbing provision of the IRC or do they delete the chapters and refer to the State Plumbing Code. Duncan stated the plumbing section of the IRC is deleted out. He also informed the Board of the Building Services inspectors performing cross trade inspections.

Chairman Day entertained a motion to adjourn. Brian Rogers made the motion; Jim Meier-Gast seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 1:53p.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dawn Kolosik, Recording Secretary