

CENTRAL IOWA CODE CONSORTIUM
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
July 1, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lund called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Jonathan Lund, Chair	x	
Roger Schemmel, Vice-Chair		x
Jim Sanders, Secretary	x	
Brian Bishop	x	
Jeff Junker	x	
Ryan Mayer	x	
Luke Nelson		x
Keith Rash	x	
Clint Robinson	x	
Mike Whitsell	x	

3. AGENDA APPROVAL

Moved by Robinson, seconded by Whitsell to approve the minutes.

MEMBER	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Jonathan Lund, Chair	X			
Roger Schemmel, Vice-Chair				x
Jim Sanders, Secretary	x			
Brian Bishop	X			
Jeff Junker	X			
Ryan Mayer	X			
Luke Nelson				x
Keith Rash	X			
Clint Robinson	X			
Mike Whitsell	x			

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

- a. Recognize the resignation of Mike Pardekooper from the Executive Committee

The committee recommended MICC find a replacement for Pardekooper.

5. APPROVE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 26, 2020 MEETING

Moved by Rash, seconded by Robinson to approve the minutes.

MEMBER	YEA	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Jonathan Lund, Chair	X			
Roger Schemmel, Vice-Chair				x
Jim Sanders, Secretary	x			
Brian Bishop	X			
Jeff Junker	X			
Ryan Mayer	X			
Luke Nelson				x
Keith Rash	X			
Clint Robinson	X			
Mike Whitsell	x			

6. REPORT ON PROGRESS OF PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES ADOPTING 2018 CODES

Johnston - reported that no action had taken place

West Des Moines - starting the approval process with action anticipated by the end of August

Waukee – Rash and fire marshal are working toward a fall adoption

Clive – Plan to share with council July/August with approval September/October

Ankeny - adopted in March, adopted amendments historically supported by MICC and about 1/3 of the CICC amendments.

Norwalk has adopted with CICC amendments

Indianola has adopted with CICC amendments

Altoona adopted the 2018 in March

7. DISCUSS RECOGNITION OF THE EFFORTS OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO CONTRIBUTED TO THE FINAL PRODUCT

Prior to COVID -19 we were going to attend city council meetings and present certificates to city staff and local industries. The committee decided to send letters of recognition and certificates to participants. Also make sure the city councils know who has been recognized.

8. DISCUSS RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS

The committee discussed the results of the survey. The complete survey is available online on the CICC website. Highlights from the review:

- For the 2018 review we did a better job in notifying submitters when their proposals were going to be reviewed.
- There is concerns regarding conflict of interest for some committee members. There was discussion that as we try to get subject matter experts, there will be

conflicts of interest. We discussed the committee training session should devote more time to conflict of interest and when committee members should refrain from voting. With the three levels of code approval (committee, executive committee and city council) there is some protection against conflicts of interest. Sanders is going to follow-up with an attorney to receive direction on how to address conflicts of interest.

Junker left the meeting

- Feedback is 50/50 on instituting an appeals process. Appeals are justified if there is a question on whether the CICC followed the process. The committee discussed the need for factual data to justify an appeal, otherwise we undermine the committee process. Appeals may be justified if there is a difference in how government and industry vote on an issue since there are four government representatives on the committees and only three industry representatives, there should be equal representation from each group. The committee discussed the appeals can go to the executive committee or possibly an appeals committee. An appeal process needs to be widely known.
- Other ideas: state is adopting and mandating codes which may reduce some of the decisions from the CICC; goal is to promote regionalism, not adopt nationally vetted codes; rotate executive committee members.
- We need to make the code review process faster.
- Too many communities are not following CICC recommendations. Should communities that do not adopt CICC proposals continue to participate?
- Many cities are entrenched in their adopted codes, are we making progress in consistency?
- Comments on the committee make up; there were comments that the committees should be made up of only government representatives; to serve on a committee you should have some knowledge of the subject matter, ITPS has 10-20% of committee members that are not subject matter experts provide a dissenting view. If we set the standard too high, we may have trouble attracting committee members.
- Positive comments on committee training
- The liaisons are there to provide insight and guidance
- Feedback on whether to continue with a three-year cycle for code review or consider a six-year code review code: if we continue with the three-year cycle we need to tighten the timelines; one alternative is to go to a six-year cycle to review proposed amendments, but not accept proposals when amendments are being considered by the committees; another alternative is to reduce the code review to fire and residential only and have a committee that reviews and provides feedback to the state adopted codes (mechanical, plumbing and fuel gas)
- Committee members should vote at the committee level based on their professional opinion and not based on what they think their community will support.

- It was questioned why we review codes that have already gone through rigorous vetting through the ICC process, voted on by a committee of professionals. One thought is there is not much of an industry presence in the ICC process.
- Most of the participants felt their time serving on a code committee was well spent, time was better spent on the 2015 review than the 2018 review
- One big discussion item is residential sprinkler systems.

9. DISCUSS WHAT WAS LEARNED FROM THE 2015, 2018 REVIEWS AND HOW WE CAN IMPROVED ON THE PROCESS

10. DISCUSS WHETHER WE SHOULD COMPLETE THE CODE REVIEW PROCESS EVERY THREE YEARS OR SIX YEARS (POTENTIAL FOR ABBREVIATED PROCESS IN ALTERNATE CYCLES?)

Lund and Bishop have some ideas on this and will outline what this may look like.

11. HOW DO WE GAUGE SUCCESS (I.E. BY POPULATION OF COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE ADOPTED THE CODES; NUMBER IF JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE ADOPTED, ETC.)

A committee of Sanders, Kessinger and Nelson will discuss this.

- 2015 - a big issue was getting more communities on the same code cycle
- 2018 – trying to get more consistency on codes
- 2021 – we must figure out what success looks like in 2021

12. WHAT SHOULD BE THE MAKE UP OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. (I.E. DO WE ADD ANOTHER CITY MANAGER, AN INDUSTRY OR CAPITAL CROSSROADS REPRESENTATIVE?)

13. OTHER BUSINESS

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS

- a. none scheduled

Would like to meet in the next 4-6 weeks, Sanders will send out a Doodle Poll to scheduled next meeting

- b. Discuss proposed meeting schedule to review CICC process, policies and issues (outlined below)

At the next meeting, the committee will discuss:

- Three- or six-year cycle review
- Electronic recognition of 2018 participants, a committee Kessinger, Nelson and Sanders will investigate it.

- How we gauge success, a committee of Sanders, Kessinger and Lund will investigate it
- Discuss an appeals process

15. ADJOURNMENT

Posted on 7/30/20 at www.capitalcrossroadsvision.com/central-iowa-code-consortium, Johnston City Hall

Proposed meeting discussion to review process and discuss issues:

Meeting #1

- ~~Report on Survey results~~
- ~~What was learned from the 2015, 2018 reviews?~~
- ~~How do we gauge success (i.e. by population of communities that have adopted the codes; number of jurisdictions that have adopted, etc.)~~
- ~~Discuss do we complete code reviews every three years or six years (potential for abbreviated process in alternate cycles?)~~
- ~~What should be the make-up of the Executive Committee. (i.e. do we add another City Manager, an industry or Capital Crossroads representative?)~~

Meeting#2

- Review the rules of procedure and bylaws to make sure they are relevant with how we operate and what was learned during the 2015 & 2018 code reviews
- Discuss an appeal process
- Discuss creation of a conflict of interest policy

Meeting #3

- Create a tighter timeframe for future reviews (4 - 5 months)
- Review role of the liaisons, the liaisons and chairs are to follow-up with their assigned committees/communities to assure the work is getting done.
- How do we address different interpretation of the documents?
- Discuss how we handle administrative portions of the codes; do we leave that to local jurisdictions?

Meeting #4

- Review the MOU and reaffirm the commitment from participating communities