

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 February 13, 2019. 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	
Jeff Mertz	X	

3. Agenda Approval

- a. Jeff Hardin requested to remove item 7.1 from the agenda. Proponent would like to resubmit a revised proposal through a committee member. A voting block also needs to be added to agenda item 3 under 7.2.
- b. Motion to amend agenda as described above.
 - 1) Motion by Rod VanGenderen
 - 2) Second by Jeff Mertz
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 7-0

4. Approve Minutes from Previous Meeting.

- a. Motion to approve minutes as posted.
 - 1) Motion by Jeff Mertz
 - 2) Second by Rod VanGenderen
 - 3) Discussion – None
 - 4) Motion carries 7-0

5. Public Comment

- a. Attendees: Norm Bormann, Bruce Amendt, Doug Chenek, Dave Briden, Kirk Johnson, Christine Maduro, Jeff Junker, Matt Adams, Tim Simpkins, Steve Bass, Roger Schemmel.
- b. No public comments

6. Executive Liaison Update

- a. Brian Bishop – No executive committee meetings have occurred since the last meeting. Brian will have updates for the next committee meeting.

7. Agenda

- a. The following Code Change Proposals was reviewed by the committee:
 - 1) 2018 IBC Section 423.4 – Storm Shelters in Group E occupancies

- a) Change Summary – Delete existing text under 423.4 Exception 4 “Existing schools undergoing alterations, additions, or construction of new accessory buildings.”
- b) Justification – The section on Storm Shelters, Section 423 in the 2018 edition has been modified, amended and added too. It would be prudent to delete the current CICC language and revisit this section if a new proposal was submitted. This provision was misunderstood at the time it was adopted in that the only time a storm shelter would be required would be if a new school undergoes an alteration, repair or even if a building has a change of occupancy to a group “E” occupancy. Specific language is contained within the IBC and the IEBC (International Existing Building Code) that address this.
- c) Committee Discussion:
 - (1) Committee member asked if there were other provisions in the IBC that would require emergency lighting/plumbing fixtures. Jeff H. answered that other provisions of the code would still be required to be followed, its just the ICC 500 requirements would be relaxed.
 - (2) Member of the public asked when these provisions would begin? Jeff H. clarified that each jurisdiction has the authority to decide when to adopt the code. Committee member responded that the earliest any jurisdiction would review these recommendations is April. The recommendations would then need to be approved by the city council of each jurisdiction.
 - (3) Member of the public asked that if storm shelters required for additions are a part of the code currently? Jeff H. clarified that it is not a part of the current code. It was also clarified that this committee’s intent is to recommend amendments to each jurisdiction.
 - (4) Committee member discussed that the previous CICC committees had removed this requirement based on feedback from school districts capitol planning projects, which are typically 5 years out from the present time.
 - (5) Member of the public asked what constitutes an addition? Jeff H. explained that an occupant load of 50 would trigger this requirement.
 - (6) Committee member asked Brian Bishop if the upcoming codes address the shelters in any detail. Brian clarified that the IBC and ICC committees are looking at ways to differentiate between tornado shelters and hurricane shelters.
 - (7) Member of the public mentioned that the state government is discussing the potential of a sales tax that could affect school funding. Member of the public mentioned that the schools are being pushed to add many safety measures. He asked that the committee consider storm shelters for new construction and

perhaps table the additions. Storm shelters designed for only the number of students being served by the new addition is putting the schools in a tough spot. If the committee requires storm shelters for additions, member of the public preferred it serve all students.

- (8) Committee member expressed concern about adding a small addition that would trigger a storm shelter as they are a significant cost. This cost was around 40 \$/SQ FT. Committee member did state that he felt the proposals was less onerous than standard language.
 - (9) Committee member discussed that it seemed a heavy financial burden to require a storm shelter capable of serving all students rather than those associated with the addition.
 - (10) Member of the public mentioned that it would be difficult to reinforce existing buildings for storm shelters for a new addition.
 - (11) Committee member mentioned that perhaps the 2021 code could provide additional guidance on storm shelters for additions. Another committee member mentioned the concern with kicking the can down the road regarding additions.
- d) Dave Kuhn motioned to approve the proposal. Seconded by David Voss. 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) Motions carries 7-0. Recommend approving the proposal as written.
- 2) 2018 IEBC Section 1106.1 – Storm Shelters in Additions to Group E occupancies.
- a) Change Summary – Modify existing text to the following “Where an addition is added to an existing Group E occupancy located in an areas where the shelter design wind speed for tornados is 250 mph in accordance with Figure 304.2(1) of ICC 500 and the occupant load of the addition is 50 or more, the additions shall have a storm shelter constructed in accordance with Chapters 1 through 5&8 of ICC 500.
 - b) Justification – This IEBC amendment would allow shelters for additions to existing Group E occupancies to be designed and constructed without having to implement the provisions of ICC 500 chapters 6&7. These two chapters describe ventilation, sanitation, fire separation, fire

extinguishers, emergency lighting and first aid kit requirements. For schools this amendment would strike out those provisions. Typically, schools have assemblies that are constructed with non-combustible materials that meet a minimum of a 1-hour rating. The fire separation requirements seem restrictive and unknown as to why a 2-hour separation would be required. The fire extinguisher and emergency lighting would still be required per the IFC and IBC general provisions. The IBC would mandate emergency power provided for up to 90 minutes while the ICC 500 document mandates 120 minutes. with weather events experienced in this region of the country, typically for a short duration, the question would be is there a need to provide plumbing fixtures for sanitation. Is it critical that water closets and lavatories be provided for tornado shelters?

Passing this amendment would allow for a reduction in cost while still maintaining a certain degree of safety and maintains the overall intent and scope of why shelters would be required. The weather events in this region of the country are limited time events. The majority of the time once the weather event has subsided the facility or area within the facility ceases to perform as a storm shelter. This amendment does not allow any reductions of the facility or area within the facility from meeting other provisions of the code if the storm shelter has a dual function/use such as emergency lighting, exit signage, panic hardware on doors, fire extinguishers, etc. The design, site, means of egress and construction requirements per Chapters 3, 4 & 5 of ICC 500 are still mandated as well as the administrative, definitions and test methods listed therein.

As a side note, storm shelters are only required to provide enough capacity to serve the occupants of the addition, not the entire existing structure. Refer to Exception #2 of section 1106.1.1.

c) Committee Discussion:

- (1) Refer to discussion regarding additions in meeting minutes item a.
- (2) Member of the public address the fact the rural schools will have a harder time addressing the needs for a storm shelter with new additions.
- (3) Committee member stated their support of the proposal as written provided some common ground could be found on how to size the storm shelters.
- (4) Committee member stated that all this proposal is doing is lessening the requirements for storm shelters for additions.

d) Jay Mattas motioned to approve the proposal as written, 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		

a) Motions carries 7-0. Recommend approving the proposal as written.

3) 2018 IBC Section 423.4 – Storm Shelters in Group E occupancies

a) Change Summary - Proposed Amendment to delete the 2015 CICC amendment to 2015 IBC section 423.4 exception #4 for Storm Shelters in Group E occupancies. "Existing schools undergoing alterations, additions or construction of new accessory buildings."

b) Justification – Deletes current code language adopted by 2015 CICC process.

c) Committee Discussion:

(1) Committee member mentioned that we need to do something with additions and set a threshold for the requirement of storm shelters.

(2) Member of the public mentions that the Iowa government is discussing legislation that may help clarify funding from a school's districts perspective. Member of the public mentioned this might happen within a month.

(3) Committee member liked the logic of a trigger for a storm shelter from an addition being designed around student population and storm shelter occupant load stated in the IBC. Since this proposal is does not mention the trigger, a new proposal would need to be written to address the trigger. If this proposal is accepted, then the IBC code language as written would be adopted.

d) Blake T. O'Brien motioned to table the proposal provided that a threshold for storm shelters being required for additions is discussed. Seconded by Jeff Mertz. 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) Motions carries 7-0. Recommend tabling the proposal until a future meeting.

8. Other Business

- a. Future meeting dates beyond what is already been discussed.
 - a) February 27, 2019
 - b) March 13, 2019

9. Adjourn Meeting

- a. Motion to adjourn by Jeff Mertz. Seconded by Rod VanGenderen.
- b. Motion carries 7-0

10. Next meeting is February 27, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. at Urbandale City Hall.

Secretary - Blake O'Brien

Date of approval