

## Smoke & Carbon Monoxide Alarms

**Proposed Revisions:** Require testing of these devices and reporting on their location

### **Our Response:**

- We believe that the current requirement is adequate, except that suggest removing the operate requirement. Operating these devices may only test the sound function and the interconnection. Stating that the device functioned as intended could create a false sense of security, especially if the report is poorly worded.
- Adding a location requirement provides little useful information for the client, and increases inspector liability without a corresponding increase in client benefit.

## Garage Door Operators

**Proposed Revision:** Adding to the SOP that resistance testing should be done with a 1-1/2" obstruction and if the door reversed when the photo cells were interrupted.

### **Our Response:**

- Adding a requirement to test the safety reverse photo sensors is reasonable.
- We recommend removing the requirement to test the pressure reverse function from the SOP. Testing this function creates a significant liability risk for inspectors if the door is damaged during this test. This has happened most home inspectors. The SOP should be revised to require Inspectors to state whether they operated the pressure reverse function, and if they did whether it functioned as intended.
- If the SOP is revised to require testing using a 1-1/2" obstruction the NCHLIB should provide a recommended statement related to the basis for the test method and requirement, the potential for damage to the door assembly and limiting the home inspectors liability and responsibility for damage to the door assembly.
- The NCHILB should establish a fund to compensate homeowners for doors damaged during testing using the 1-2/2" obstruction

## Kitchen Range Anti-Tip Device

**Proposed Revision:** There is currently no requirement to state check for the anti-tip-over device the following statement has been suggested as a revision to the SOP *"State the presence or absence of the anti-tip-over device on the range, stove or cooktop"*

### **Our Response:**

- We believe that there is no good way to verify that this device is properly installed without moving the appliance or removing components like the bottom drawer.
- The simple tilt-test, can only tell if there **may** be a bracket, but not whether it is properly installed and could damage the appliance or the utility connections
- Moving appliances or components is, and should remain, out of scope. Requiring the inspector to inspect something that cannot be seen without moving something violates the central premise of a visual inspection.

## Fireplaces

**Proposed Revision:** Changing SOP to read " The home inspector shall inspect permanently installed heating systems including: Solid fueled, gas fueled or electric heating devices and report on the energy source for each heating device"

### **Our Response:**

- We believe that addressing gas and liquid-fueled fireplaces is reasonable. Although some fireplace may not be intended to be used for heating.
- We suggest that the committee and board look at some of the existing standards from other organizations for guidance in this area.

## Ground & Arc Fault Circuit Interrupters (GFCI/AFCI)

### **Propose Revisions:**

1. Require operation of GFCI devices and report in writing the operation and location of GFCI's except where electrical appliance are connected.
2. AFCI are not currently addressed in the SOP. Recommendation is to add "The inspector shall inspect Arc fault circuit interrupters and state their location"

### **Our Response:**

- We believe that requiring the operation of GFCI devices, and especially of AFCI devices, increases inspector liability without a corresponding increase in client benefit.
- The SOP should remain as a visual confirmation and leave it to the inspector to determine whether to operate these devices based on the conditions at the inspection.
- Adding a requirement to describe the location of these devices increases, reporting time, report length and inspector liability without a corresponding increase in client benefit. In most cases, clients don't read or care about these descriptions. The only time most care is when there are other problems with the inspection, then description errors are used against the inspector.

## Corrugated Stainless Steel Tubing

Proposed Revision: The home inspector shall describe the presence of bonding of CSST

### **Our Response:**

- We agree that the current suggested language statement should be reviewed by the electrical or gas fuel code officials
- Determining if bonding is necessary requires researching the manufacture's installation instructions or referencing the building code requirement in place when the home was built
- We believe that the current reporting requirement are satisfactory and that since the home inspector is allowed to exceed the minimum SOP and include safety related issues at their discursion addressed this issue.

- If a change is made it should read "The home inspector shall describe the presence or absence of bonding of the CSST"

## **Structural Components**

### **Proposed Revisions:**

- Revise foundation description to include the word "Structure" to eliminate descriptions like crawlspace or slab
- Provide additional clarification on locations to report on columns and piers "In crawlspaces, on or under porches and on or under decks"

### **Our Response:**

- This reporting requirement provides little benefit and use to the client
- Determining the exact foundation type can be difficult as some components may be buried or not visible.
- Most clients won't know what the different types of foundation type are

## **Report Header Statements**

**Proposed Revisions:** The use of blanket header statements circumvents DDID and the SOP should be revised to require reporting the Specific Method use to inspect areas and systems such as, attics, roof covering and crawlspaces.

### **Our Responses:**

- If use properly generic header statements allow the home inspector to meet the DDID requirement, streamline the reporting process and be more efficient with their time.
- We believe that this is a training and education issue and should be addressed accordingly

## **Kitchen Appliances**

### **Proposed Revisions:**

- There is some discussion on the use of describe, inspect and operate and their use as conforming or non-conforming statements and the need to report on the appliance if there are no defects.
- Clarify what are considered built in appliances and those appliances that should be inspected. This is specific to the range as it could not be considered a built in appliance

### **Our Response:**

- We believe that current industry standards published by national associations address this well and should be reviewed by the committee and considered for adoption into the NC SOP

## **Plumbing**

### **Proposed Revisions:**

- Require a more specific description of piping material other than "plastic or metal"
- Require reporting on the condition or function of the water heater anode rod

Our Response:

- Material description is an education issue. The SOP definition of describe requires a sufficient description to distinguish the component from other similar components and in our opinion is sufficient.
- Inspecting the Anode rod would require dismantling which is outside of the current NC Sop and all national association SOP's. This would provide little to no value to the general public

### **Summary Statements**

**Proposed Revision:** State that general information statements and suggested upgrades are not to be included in the summary

**Our Response:**

- The current SOP statements regarding the summary and what should be included are clear and do not require revisions.
- This is an educational issue and should be addressed with training and direct communication with the licensee's