

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 January 16, 2019. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 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	
Jeff Mertz	x	

3. Agenda Approval

- a. Motion to accept agenda as submitted
 - 1) Motion by Rod VanGenderen
 - 2) Second by Blake O'Brien
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 6-0 (Jeff Mertz was not present for the vote.)

4. Approve Minutes from Previous Meeting.

- a. Motion to approve minutes as posted.
 - 1) Motion by Dave Kuhn
 - 2) Second by Jay Mattas
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 6-0 (Jeff Mertz was not present for the vote.)

5. Public Comment

- a. Attendees: Keith Rash, Patrick Phelan, Cody Christenson.
- b. No public comments

6. Executive Liaison Update

- a. Jeff Mertz to joint IEBC/IBC committee as the general contractor representative. Dave Losen was appointed to plumbing mechanical committee today.
- b. Executive Committee is looking to have committee recommendations on new proposals done by April.

7. Agenda

- a. Update on Executive Board action on Subcommittee for CICC proposal IBC 503.1.5
 - 1) Executive committee determined it would be best that the IBC/IEBC committee serve as the subcommittee for the proposal 503.1.5. IBC/IEBC would simply hear public comments for/or against the proposal. The committee would be able

to ask questions of the public attendees. Date and location of public hearing T.B.D. The Executive Board will determine who to send invites to for the public hearing.

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

1) 2018 IEBC Section 302 – General Provisions

a) Change Summary – Add new section 302.7 Fire Protection with the following language: Existing buildings containing R-2 occupancies shall be made to comply with the International Building Code section 903.2.8 within 2 years of any of the following situations”

(1) Fire damage to 3 or more dwelling units.

(2) Issuance of a building permit for a Level II or II alteration as identified in Chapter 5 of the International Existing Building Code.

b) Justification – Multi-family residential occupancies pose a significant risk to occupants. When these buildings undergo alterations or repairs (from a fire), they should be made to comply with the building code for the requirement of fire sprinklers.

c) Committee Discussion:

(1) Patrick mentioned that the proposal has a typo. Proposal should read “Level II or Level III alteration”. The proposal shall also read “Chapter 6” instead of “Chapter 5” within line item 2.

(2) Committee member asked to clarify what “fire damage” was meant to mean in proposal. Patrick clarified that smoke/water damage and/or fire department operation damage was not meant to be included in fire damage. Committee member expressed concern that we should clarify the intent of fire damage definition.

(3) Cody clarified why the 3 or more dwelling units was added to proposal. It was added to help require sprinklers for older buildings with no passive protection systems in place. 3 units was decided to show that the passive fire protection systems were not working, and a sprinkler system should be required. New buildings have more passive protection in place.

(4) Committee discussed the implication of 3-unit threshold vs making the threshold a percentage total units.

(5) Cody and Patrick clarified intent of the second threshold was to require owners to add a sprinkler system when investment was being made into buildings. It was decided that Level II and Level III alterations would be threshold for the proposal. Committee members expressed some concern that Level II alternation may be onerous to the owner.

(6) Dave Voss discussed the fact that Architects tend to use the IEBC frequently.

(7) A committee member asked if Patrick had thought about making existing R-2 occupancies require sprinklers within a specific

timeframe a retroactive clause in the fire code. Patrick and others had considered it but thought that may be a little more onerous than an event-based requirement in the code.

- (8) Committee agrees that Level III alteration seems appropriate for the sprinkler systems threshold requirement. Various Level II alterations (door or window removal) seem onerous to require sprinkler systems.
 - (9) Cody C. discussed how owners and insurance companies generally require a code requirement to obtain funding for renovations.
 - (10) Committee member felt that if this a life safety is the goal, this may be better enforced if it's a retroactive IFC requirement. Another committee member felt that this proposal helped fill an enforcement gap in the current code.
- d) Jay Mattas motioned to table the proposal with the intent to modify the proposal. Seconded by Rod VanGenderen. 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		
Jeff Mertz	x		

- e) Motion carries 7-0.
- 2) 2018 IBC Section 1704.2 – Special Inspections and Tests
- a) Change Summary –

Section 1704.2 Special Inspections and Tests Where application is made to the building official for construction as specified in Section 105, the owner or the owner's authorized agent, other than the contractor, shall employ one or more approved agencies to provide special inspections and tests during construction on the types of work specified in Section 1705 and identify the approved agencies to the building official. These special inspections and tests are in addition to the inspections by the building official that are identified in Section 110. Exceptions:

- 1. Building that do not contain more than two dwelling units.

~~1. Special inspections and tests are not required for construction of a minor nature or as warranted by conditions in the jurisdiction as approved by the building official.~~

2. Unless otherwise required by the building official, special inspections and tests are not required for Group U occupancies that are accessory to a residential occupancy including, but not limited to, those listed in Section 312.1.

3. Buildings not more than one-story above grade plane.

~~3. Special inspections and tests are not required for portions of structures designed and constructed in accordance with the cold formed steel light frame construction provisions of Section 2211.1.2 or the conventional light frame construction provisions of Section 2308.~~

4. The contractor is permitted to employ the approved agencies where the contractor is also the owner.

b) Justification – Common design and construction practice is the application of exterior and interior wall sheathings and tie-downs to accommodate wind resistance for framed structures. Fasteners for these elements are often not available to be visually field verified by inspection personnel prior to installation and are not readily accessible from grade plane. This provision will provide for special inspection of these elements accordingly.

c) Committee Discussion:

(1) Committee members discussed whether requiring these types of special inspections was covered with the broad language contained in 1705.1.1 Special cases.

(2) Cody C. mentioned that the City of Des Moines uses exception 1, which is proposed to be replaced, in many instances. He liked the ability to use the exception to be practical with regards to special inspection requirements for small projects.

(3) Various members of the committee felt that the broad language was gave the building official the leeway to request special inspections.

d) Blake O'Brien motioned to reject the following code proposals 1704.2, 1705.11.1, 1705.11.2. Seconded by Rod VanGenderen. 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		
Jeff Mertz	x		

e) Motions carries 6-1.

3) 2018 IBC Section 713.3 & 707.5 – Shaft Wall Construction

a) Change Summary –

IBC Section 713.3 Materials. Shaft enclosures shall be of the following materials.

713.3.1 – 1 Hour Shafts. Shafts that are allowed to have a fire resistance rating of 1 hour or less are allowed to be constructed of materials permitted by the building type of construction.

713.3.2 – 2 Hour Shafts. Shafts that are required to have a fire resistance rating of 2 hours or more serving Interior exit stairs or Interior exit ramps shall be constructed of concrete or masonry. All other shafts that are required to have a fire resistance rating of 2 hours or more shall be constructed of non-combustible materials.

IBC Section 707.5 Continuity.

Exceptions:

3. Shafts required to be constructed as per section 713.3.2 having exterior walls that are not required to be fire rated per section 707.4 shall be permitted to be constructed of materials permitted by the building type of construction so long as a complete non-combustible separation of 2 hours is provided between the shaft and adjoining structure. In addition the provisions of section 1023.7 shall be met.

b) Justification – Numerous structures are being built that contain more than 3 stories thus requiring shafts to be 2 hour fire-resistance rating. The increased common type of construction techniques implemented are creating challenges whereas complete separation between the shafts and adjoining structure is not being maintained as required per IBC section 707.5. Implementing this proposal will also provide the following:

- (1) Greater occupant safety during tornado events – the majority of structures do not have basements or “safe rooms” installed within.

- (2) Greater protection for Fire Fighter personnel. Similar to the goal stated in IBC section 403.2.3 this proposal increases the level of protection for first responders during an emergency event for structures that are not classified as "high rise" but do require a greater degree of protection than buildings that are three stories or less.
- (3) Cleaner construction of shaft walls. This will prevent structural framing members from protruding into or bearing on the shaft walls denigrating the integrity of the shaft wall. The field construction staff will have an easier time constructing framing adjacent to the shaft wall as opposed to what is previously being witnessed by building inspectors in the field.
- c) Committee Discussion:
 - (1) IFC/IBC Committee has already approved this proposal. This proposal falls under the joint committee's purview.
- d) Jeff Harden requested to withdraw the proposal based on the IFC/IBC joint committee already taking action on this proposal.

8. Other Business

- a. Future meeting dates:
 - a) January 30, 2019
 - b) February 13, 2019
 - c) February 27, 2019 (Tentative)
 - d) March 13, 2019 (Date TBD)

9. Adjourn Meeting

- a. Motion to adjourn by Rod VanGenderen. Seconded by Dave Kuhn.
- b. Motion carries 7-0

10. Next meeting is January 30, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. at Urbandale City Hall.

Secretary - Blake O'Brien

Date of approval