

MEETING MINUTES
Central Iowa Code Consortium - IBC/IEBC Committee

1. A meeting of the Central Iowa Code Consortium was held at Urbandale City Hall on October 31, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chairman Jeff Harden.

2. Roll Call - Attendees Included:

Member	PRESENT	ABSENT
Jeff Harden, Chair	x	
Dave Kuhn, Vice Chair	x	
Blake O'Brien, Secretary	x	
Rod VanGenderen	x	
Jay Mattas	x	
David Voss	x	

3. Agenda Approval

- a. Dave Kuhn requested confirmation that all persons who submitted proposal requests were notified. Jeff Harden confirmed.
- b. Motion to accept agenda as submitted
 - 1) Motion by Blake O'Brien
 - 2) Second by Rod VanGenderen
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 6-0

4. Approve Minutes from Previous Meeting.

- a. Motion to approve minutes as posted.
 - 1) Motion by Jay Mattas
 - 2) Second by Rod VanGenderen
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 6-0

5. Public Comment

- a. None

6. Executive Liaison Update

- a. Brian Bishop gave an update for the proposal for masonry shafts four-stories and above at the IBC/IFC committee hearing. Proposal passed IBC/IFC committee. Brian believes this proposal will come up at IBC/IEBC committee.
- b. Brian also discussed updates for proposal for emergency lighting requirements at the IBC/IFC.
- c. Brian Bishop provided an update on filling of committee openings. Executive committee will meet on November 24 to discuss.

7. Agenda

a. The following Code Change Proposals was reviewed by the committee:

1) 2018 IBC 102.6.3 CSST – Bonding Required

- a) Change Summary – Add section 102.6.3 to Section 102 Applicability in the IBC. New language allows code officials to require bonding of CSST when an alteration, addition, or repair occur unless deemed technically infeasible by the code official.
- b) Justification – Existing CSST installations pre-dating code adoptions requiring bonding may not be installed with a bonding jumper. This amendment would provide a retroactive bonding requirement where feasible.
- c) Committee Discussion:
 - (1) Would be required for any type of permit work.
 - (2) The wording “technically infeasible” is vague. Committee discussed what would constitute “technically infeasible.” More clarity should be provided for this term.
 - (3) Discussion on whether this would require a separate electrical permit in addition to the building permit.
 - (4) Discussion on why this would be put in administrative section of IBC. It appears Chapter 28 of the IBC would require you to follow IFGC requirements where bonding is required.
 - (5) Committee supports the proposal in spirit but feels that this code proposal best resides in the IFGC and not in the IBC.
- d) Dave Kuhn motioned to deny the proposal as submitted but make a favorable recommendation to the IFGC committee as this proposal is more applicable to the IFGC. Seconded by Blake O’Brien.

Approval/Denial of motion is as follows:

Member	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
Jeff Harden, Chair			X
Dave Kuhn, Vice Chair	X		
Blake O’Brien, Secretary	X		
Rod VanGenderen	X		
Jay Mattas	X		
David Voss	X		

e) Recommend to deny the proposal with favorable recommendation to IFGC.

2) 2018 IBC Section 406.3.2.1 – Dwelling Unit Separation

- a) Change Summary – This proposal revises current IBC 406.3.2.1. It requires 5/8” Type X gypsum board in lieu of 1/2” gypsum board for separation between garages and dwellings as well as structures supporting the separation between habitable rooms above the garage.

- b) Justification – This amendment proposes an increase in protection between the dwelling unit and garage. The IBC has been back and forth on this amendment though the current code language has been in for at least three consecutive times. This is not a change from what is being constructed in the field and what builders are familiar with. This proposal is an historical amendment that was not submitted during the first CICC event. For some communities, this amendment would bring back in line with what is currently adopted and enforced.
- c) Committee Discussion:
 - (1) Committee discussed the fact that most installers used 5/8" Type X everywhere because of difficulty working in different jurisdictions and ease of using 5/8" Type X on all surfaces in lieu of a mixture 1/2" and 5/8" Type X boards.
 - (2) Committee discussed the benefit of using 5/8" Type X vs 1/2" board. What is the reasoning to go above code? Is there any documented benefit?
- d) Dave Kuhn motioned to deny the proposal as submitted based on the feeling that no technical data has been provided showing the increase from 1/2" to 5/8" Type X is justified. Seconded by Jay Mattas. Approval/Denial of motion is as follows:

Member	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
Jeff Harden	X		
Dave Kuhn	X		
Blake O'Brien	X		
Rod VanGenderen	X		
Jay Mattas	X		
David Voss	X		

- e) Recommend to deny the proposal.
- 3) Proposed Amendment to 2018 IBC Section 1608.2 – Ground Snow Loads
- a) Change Summary – Amend IBC text to require 30 psf snow load for roofs.
 - b) Justification – Historically (approximately 50 years or more) designers of buildings located in Central Iowa have had to use the 30 lbs. snow load provision. This amendment helps maintain that standard. The proposal was not submitted during the first CICC event as with many other historical amendments. This amendment brings the provisions back and in line with what is currently still being adopted and enforced.
 - c) Committee Discussion:
 - (1) Discussed that many area engineers/designers already use the 30 psf ground snow load value for their designs.
 - (2) 30 psf line starts in Story County.

- d) Blake O'Brien motioned to amend the proposal by deleting the existing IBC 2018 1608.2 text and replacing with the following text "The ground snow load to be used in determining the design snow load for roofs is hereby established at 30 pounds per square foot. Subsequent increases or decreases shall be allowed as otherwise provided by code, except that the minimum allowable flat roof snow load may be reduced to not less than 80 percent of the ground snow load." Seconded by Rod VanGendren. Approval/Denial of motion is as follows:

Member	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
Jeff Harden	X		
Dave Kuhn	X		
Blake O'Brien	X		
Rod VanGendren	X		
Jay Mattas	X		
David Voss	X		

- e) Recommend to approve the proposal as amended.

4) 2018 IBC Section 2902.6 – Small Occupancies

- a) Change Summary – Allow water dispensers in lieu of drinking fountains for occupant loads not more than thirty (30) for business occupancies and mercantile occupancies with occupant loads not more than one hundred (100). Model code requires drinking fountains for any occupancy with an occupancy load greater than 15.
- b) Justification – The proposed amendment allows for more flexibility for smaller spaces such as existing tenant spaces in strip centers/malls. Many of those occupancies are classified as either "B" Business or "M" Mercantile. The code over the past few editions has relaxed the number of plumbing waste fixtures for these occupancies; this amendment is keeping in line with the current methodology. In a sense it is intended to keep up to date with those changes. The amendment will provide financial relief for these small types of tenants.
- c) Committee Discussion
- (1) UPC threshold for drinking fountains is 30 or less occupants regardless of occupancy.
 - (2) What is considered a water dispenser? Some jurisdictions use water tanks such as a Culligan water dispenser or break room sinks with cups as water dispensers.
 - (3) Committee wants to make sure that the IPC and UPC requirements match.
 - (4) It was unclear how this proposal related to the UPC requirements. All committee members were open to reducing requirements for drinking fountains if clearer language was provided relating to IPC, UPC, and IBC Chapter 28.

d) Jay Mattas motioned to deny the proposal as submitted. Seconded by Dave Kuhn.

(1) Discussion – Dave Kuhn encouraged the proponent to resubmit proposal with clearer language.

(2) Approval/Denial of motion is as follows:

Member	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
Jeff Harden	X		
Dave Kuhn	X		
Blake O'Brien	X		
Rod VanGenderen	X		
Jay Mattas	X		
David Voss	X		

a) Recommend to deny the proposal.

5) 2018 IBC Table 2902.1 Footnote E

a) Change Summary – Revise footnote “e” in Table 2902.1 to allow an exception to not require service sinks for “B” business occupancies with an occupant load of not more than thirty (30) and “M” mercantile occupancies with an occupant load of not more than one hundred (100). Model code does not require service sinks for business and mercantile occupancies with an occupant load of 15 or fewer.

b) Justification – The proposed amendment allows for more flexibility for smaller spaces such as existing tenant spaces in strip centers/malls. Many of those occupancies are classified as either “B” Business or “M” Mercantile. The code over the past few editions has relaxed the number of plumbing waste fixtures for these occupancies, this amendment is keeping in line with the current methodology. In a sense it is intended to keep up to date with those changes. The amendment will provide relief for these types of tenant spaces that typically would not need to have a service sink in addition to providing financial relief.

c) Committee Discussion

(1) Committee felt that service sink requirements were important for cleanliness.

(2) Committee members felt that 100 occupant load threshold for M occupancies was too high and cleanliness could become an issue in M occupancies less than 100.

(3) UPC requires service sinks regardless of occupant load.

(4) Licensed food establishments require service sinks. So, food establishments would have separate consideration.

(5) Due to the many different uses associated with M occupancies, it is difficult to assess whether a service sink would be needed.

- d) Jay Mattas motioned to deny the proposal as written. Seconded by David Voss.
 - (1) Discussion - Committee is open to hearing new thresholds for service sinks if the proponent of the proposal is willing to submit new thresholds for the committee to consider.
 - (2) Approval/Denial of motion is as follows:

Member	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN
Jeff Harden	X		
Dave Kuhn	X		
Blake O'Brien	X		
Rod VanGenderen	X		
Jay Mattas	X		
David Voss	X		

- e) Recommend to deny the proposal.

- 6) 2018 IBC Section 713.3 & 707.5 – New Sections Shaft Wall Construction
 - a) Dave Kuhn motioned to table discussion of this topic until the next meeting. Motion seconded by Jeff Harden.
 - b) Motion carries 6-0
- 7) Approval of future meeting dates
 - a) December 5, 2018
 - b) January 16, 2019
 - c) February (Date TBD)
 - d) March (Date TBD)

- 8. Other Business
 - a. None

- 9. Adjourn Meeting
 - a. Motion by Jay Mattas. Seconded by David Voss.
 - b. Motion carries 6-0

- 10. Next meeting is December 5, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. at Urbandale City Hall.

Secretary - Blake O'Brien

Date of approval