



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Building Construction Codes Commission

---

Monday, February 26, 2018  
4:30 PM

Conference Room 1A  
City Hall  
701 E Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Call the meeting to order. We're going to call roll, and you need to let the reporter know if -- if you're -- if you're voting on any or all the cases or specifically if you're not. So -- Kas Carlson?

MR. CARLSON: Here. And, yes, I'm voting on all cases.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: I'm going to go through the regulars first and then alternates.

Todd Noordsy?

MR. NOORDSY: Here. All of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: You're voting on all of them. John Page?

MR. PAGE. Here. And, yes, on all of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: David Weber?

MR. WEBER: Here. All of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt Young?

MR. YOUNG: Here. All of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rob Jackson? He's not here. James P. Watson?

MR. WATSON: Here. And voting on all of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Andrew Wallace is not here. Brian Connell is here and voting on all of them. Jay Creasy is not here. Richard Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Yes. All.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: So we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight voting

members -- eight regular members, I should say, and with that number, I don't know if we can ask Jonathan to sit in or not.

MR. SHANKER: Right now, it's moot with no applicant.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Okay. And we do have enough to conduct a vote. Let's go on with our business here.

**Present:** 10 - Kas Carlson, Brian Connell, Jay Creasy, Todd Noordsy, Richard Shanker, David Weber, Matthew Young, John Page, James Watson and Jonathan Trunk

## II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: I'd like to ask for a motion and second to approve the agenda.

Everybody have a chance to read the proposed agenda?

MR. PAGE: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: We have a motion from Mr. Page.

MR. NOORDSY: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: A second from Todd. Any discussion? All in favor? We're going to do the voice count, so all in favor of approving the agenda, and I'll read the roll.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Kas Carlson?

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Todd Noordsy?

MR. NOORDSY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John Page?

MR. PAGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: David Weber?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt Young?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rob Jackson is not here. James P. Watson?

MR. WATSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Andrew Wallace is not here. Brian Connell, yes. Jay

Creasy, are you in favor of approving the agenda?

MR. CREASY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Richard Shanker?

MR. CHAMBER: No comment on that.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: All right.

**Motion to approve**

**Yes:** 10 - Carlson, Connell, Creasy, Noordsy, Shanker, Weber, Young, Page, Watson and Trunk

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: I'm going to ask if everybody had a chance to review the minutes of the last meeting. That would have been January 22nd. Is there a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting?

MR. PAGE: Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Motion from John.

MR. WEBER: I'd second it.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Second from Mr. Weber. Again, all in favor of approving the minutes from the previous meeting. Kas Carlson?

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Todd Noordsy?

MR. NOORDSY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John Page?

MR. PAGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: David Weber?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt Young?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: James P. Watson?

MR. WATSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Brian Connell, yes. Jay Creasy?

MR. CREASY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Richard Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Okay.

**Motion to approve**

**Yes:** 10 - Carlson, Connell, Creasy, Noordsy, Shanker, Weber, Young, Page, Watson and Trunk

**Attachments:** [January Minutes - 01-22-2018](#)

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

**Attachments:** [Case #18-002](#)

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: At this point, we have old business. This -- this will be our first case today. Old business, I guess, because it was tabled; is that right?

MR. SIMON: Right. And it's withdrawn.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: It is withdrawn. Oh, I see. Withdrawn by applicant. Okay.

**Withdrawn by applicant**

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**Attachments:** [Case # 18-003](#)

**Motion to table**

**Yes:** 10 - Carlson, Connell, Creasy, Noordsy, Shanker, Weber, Young, Page, Watson and Trunk

**Attachments:** [Case# 18-004](#)

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: So moving on to new business. We have an appeal here, Case

No. 18-003. I'm going to pause. I know we're on the record, but we have no applicant.

Do we need -- do we proceed, not proceed? How do we -- how do we do this? Mr.

Weber?

MR. WEBER: Without them stating their case, I don't know how we could proceed, right? Even though we have the written application, it -- I don't know what everybody else thinks, but I wouldn't feel comfortable voting on just a written application.

MR. SHANKER: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Was that a motion?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. SHANKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: The motion from Mr. Weber to -- are we tabling it?

MR. WEBER: I think just tabling it, yeah.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: And we have a second from Mr. Shanker? Any discussion about that? Okay. Once again --

MR. CARLSON: Are you doing both of them?

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Pardon?

MR. CARLSON: Are you doing both of them? I guess that's my question. There's two of them here.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: It's the same applicant, so do we -- do you want to amend your motion to include both cases?

MR. WEBER: Yeah. So I'll amend my motion. I think it's -- people don't show up to present their case, we -- I don't feel comfortable voting on it, and that's my motion.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rick, do you --

MR. SHANKER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: You'll adjust your second to that? Mr. Page?

MR. PAGE: Question. They paid \$120 for this case. They didn't show up. If they want to come back next month, do they have to pay another \$120 and forfeit the 120 they paid currently or how does that work?

MR. SIMON: That's the way the ordinance reads.

MR. PAGE: So they have to pay 120 again and forfeit from tonight so we can split it, spread it around, and all that stuff, right? That's only fair. That's only a joke.

MR. CARLSON: General fund, John. General fund.

MR. PAGE: But, I mean, it's true. They didn't -- they didn't show up.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: There is no evidence that the appellants were here. So we have a motion and a second. I'm going to call roll. Kas Carlson?

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Todd Noordsy?

MR. NOORDSY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John Page?

MR. PAGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: David Weber?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt Young?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: J.P. Watson?

MR. WATSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Brian Connell, yes. Jay Creasy?

MR. CREASY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Richard Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: With that --

MR. WEBER: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President? Can I make a motion?

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Mr. Weber?

MR. WEBER: I'd like to make a motion to adjourn the meeting because -- unless we have further business.

MR. PAGE: Well, we do.

MR. WEBER: We do?

MR. PAGE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Do we have further business today?

MR. CARLSON: General comments, isn't it?

**Motion to table**

**Yes:** 10 - Carlson, Connell, Creasy, Noordsy, Shanker, Weber, Young, Page, Watson and Trunk

**VI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: General comments.

MR. SIMON: We had talked about maybe starting to talk about a review of the 2018 codes. Okay. It's not an agenda item, so it's not like anything we vote on, but maybe just your thoughts on how we proceed.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Mr. Weber?

MR. WEBER: I'd like to make a motion to approve the Code as written.

MR. CARLSON: Second.

MR. SIMON: Are you guys being serious?

MR. WEBER: I'm being serious.

MR. SIMON: I don't think we can do any votes because it wasn't made an agenda item.

MR. CARLSON: We tried, so --

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Hang on, Rick.

MR. SHANKER: John, at that time, do we look at rental things also?

MR. SIMON: The property maintenance code as an enforceable building code.

MR. SHANKER: And how is it determined occupancy for rental properties; do you know that? In other words, I've heard that if you have a four-bedroom house, you can only rent to three individuals unless they're familia. Is that part of a code that we look at? I've

heard that it is placed --

MR. SIMON: There's a definition of family in the zoning code.

MR. SHANKER: Wait. They're not family. They are not family.

MR. SIMON: I understand that.

MR. SHANKER: So you have three people that are not related. And I think it's a local ordinance that allows only three; is that correct?

MR. SIMON: In R-1.

MR. SHANKER: But it is --

MR. SIMON: In R-1 zoning.

MR. SHANKER: Right.

MR. SIMON: But that's a zoning issue, it's not so much a property regulation.

MR. SHANKER: So we don't deal with that?

MR. SIMON: We're not doing zoning review, no.

MR. SHANKER: All right. And how -- in your experience, how would that be addressed? Through Zoning or through -- how is that addressed?

MR. SIMON: If you wanted to make an amendment to the zoning ordinance?

MR. SHANKER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

MR. SIMON: Then I would say through your Councilperson or talk to Planning.

MR. SHANKER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Mr. Page?

MR. PAGE: So the new code's out, correct? But we kind of talked about maybe waiting until the first printing was done and they got rid of some of the erratas out of it and then start reviewing it. When does the -- when does that happen? Six months after the new one comes out or --

MR. SIMON: I'm uncertain that it's a time frame, but I know that it's not done yet.

MR. PAGE: We don't have a typical feel for how long that is, though?

MR. SIMON: I really don't. I know that -- I know that there's -- there's been code editions that have had five or six revisions.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Which could be a little confusing.

MR. SIMON: The first -- the first provision, I think, generally is going to get rid of the bigger stuff. I think it was unusual the last code cycle that we happened to have a whole section of the code that was left out of the IRC on the photovoltaic, so I'm not certain it makes a big difference.

MR. PAGE: How do we want to proceed with it? Are we going to break off into groups like we did before or what do we think?

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John, would you address your concerns about Sunshine Law and reporting.

MR. SIMON: And, you know, Jose did talk about how important it is that we follow through with Sunshine Laws if we break into committees, so we've got to be cautious on how many people we appoint to committees, and we need to stipulate what a quorum is going to be then on that committee so that we may think about some creative ways of making that easier -- an easier process. Maybe break up into less groups and cover more code kind of thing or do it all in here.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Well, the other -- the other part of that is recording minutes.

MR. SIMON: Yeah. Recorded minutes, which historically we've provided the staff person to do that.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rick?

MR. SHANKER: Two questions. You mentioned photovoltaic. Does the county have the same energy inspections that are requirements as the City?

MR. SIMON: Energy code?

MR. SHANKER: Yes, sir.

MR. SIMON: No, they do not.

MR. SHANKER: Okay. And then is there a way so we don't have to call ourselves committees or subcommittees? Can't we just say we are something else, and still obviously have it public and get a lot of input, but -- no? Okay.

MR. SIMON: I know that it -- and this is my understanding from Jose. Individuals can be assigned to report back to the committee, but they can't -- you can't hold meetings without having the public.

MR. CARLSON: Yeah. Did we not -- did we not last time review the Code as a whole and ask plumbing, mechanical, and electrical to give comments, but we still reviewed it and spent the time in --

MR. SIMON: We broke off on the plumbing committee, a mechanical committee --

MR. CARLSON: Yeah. But that was just to report back to us. We still reviewed it, so that -- their meeting or their comments would not come underneath the Sunshine Law, would it?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. But what got -- what got -- was the gray area about that, if you have several members meeting, and they're both in -- and they're not bringing all changes back to the committee, then they're de facto deciding what's important and what isn't.

MR. CARLSON: Yeah. We were just asking them to review and bring comments back to us. We still, as a group, overlooked all of that, correct?

MR. PAGE: And voted.

MR. CARLSON: And voted. So I did not think that their comments back to us by them having a meeting come under that Sunshine Law.

MR. SIMON: I think it does.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Mr. Weber?

MR. WEBER: Could I -- not to fundamentally change the process for the better, but could I propose that we fundamentally change the process from how we've been doing this since I've been here since '97 is, I think that the City, the municipality, should review

the code and suggest what they think should be adopted, present to us as a body, and let us take that and look at that and decide if we want -- I think the process is backwards. We -- we -- we spend a lot of time in these individual committees and then we go through this process. I really think that we should put more, not burden is the right word, but more the heavy lifting on the municipality, in my opinion. I don't think we should do it the way we've been doing it. I think we should have the municipality do all the homework and present to us what they think, you know, from their perspective, and then we, as a body, can review that and make suggestions for changes or not.

MR. SHANKER: I would think as a code official that you are bound by the code and you would not deviate from it, plus this is a way of the community inputting and that's important.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John Page?

MR. PAGE: I don't know if it was before -- it may have been before you were here, Dave. We had a code cycle where Dan Darnell presented the code to us.

MR. WEBER: 2003.

MR. PAGE: Was that when it was? And it didn't bother me, but some of the guys that were on the commission at that time felt like he was telling us what to do with the code and they didn't like that. So, I mean, I'm not necessarily against it, but I think you've got to watch that because I kept hearing guys say that. You know, Dan did that, and he was trying to tell us what to do. We don't want anybody telling us what to do.

MR. WEBER: And I -- I think that -- that we have the authority to make the suggestion to the Council, and we have to put our big-boy pants on and tell the municipality representatives like John or whoever that is -- maybe that's Nina and John, a group of them.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Shane.

MR. WEBER: What -- yeah. Shane or -- what we really think, and not be afraid to

tell them what we really think about their suggestions. I think that it's backwards. I think it puts too much work on the volunteer input from this body, in my opinion.

MR. CARLSON: Dave, are you trying to say that -- that we should ask the City how the new code changes how we're doing business as far as -- the change in the code cycle and if there's no changes, then we go from there, or where are the changes at? Is that what you're telling them to look for?

MR. WEBER: Well, what I'm saying is, is I think they should present, if we keep an old amendment and if it's appropriate, and they should present what changes and why we're keeping it or not, and then we decide if that's appropriate. And that way, they do the homework and we -- we do -- we are an administrator, not a practitioner, because I just think it's too much damn time. It takes too much time for us to keep up with the cycles. It takes us a year and a half or two years to keep up with the code cycle that's changing every three years. It's too cumbersome. This is a cumbersome process. There's no reason why we can't turn around a code in a couple months. I mean, this is -- this is bogging down the system for years and we're always years behind for that reason. And these guys get to paid to work here every day. They can do that homework.

MR. CARLSON: So we're asking John to present the differences in the new code versus what we are right now?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. CARLSON: Or if it's the same or if there's any changes?

MR. WEBER: And our amendments.

MR. CARLSON: And our amendments. And that's what we're asking for. So, I mean, that -- that sounds logical to us. Instead of reading through 687 pages or whatever it is and going word for word, and going, should it be and or is it is or whatever, and what are the changes, how does it affect us, and does it affect the amendments?

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rick?

MR. SHANKER: The changes are all marked on the side.

MR. CARLSON: Well, that's okay. But we -- we should look at how we do business now and what are the changes.

MR. SHANKER: Oh, well, I thought that's what -- I thought that was --

MR. CARLSON: But if you want to go -- if you want to spend the -

MR. SHANKER: Well, we -- none of us have to volunteer to do this, so --

MR. CARLSON: Eighteen weeks, twenty weeks.

MR. SHANKER: -- so for those of you that don't want to, don't do it.

MR. CARLSON: We didn't -- didn't say that.

MR. SHANKER: But for my trade, I would be remiss if I didn't invite people from my trade to put input into this.

MR. CARLSON: We weren't talking about input, we were just asking for what the changes are. In short, if there's two or three changes in electrical, we bring it up. If there's two or three changes in the framing, we bring it up. If there's a change in the plumbing, we bring it up. But we're going through -- I mean, we spend three weeks going through the plumbing code and if there's only one change in the plumbing code, why can't we hear it?

MR. SHANKER: I've never experienced that in the plumbing code.

MR. CARLSON: I don't know. Same way with the electrical code, same way with the frame code.

MR. SHANKER: Have you, Matt?

MR. CARLSON: Why do we spend 18 weeks going through it then?

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: David?

MR. WEBER: What I find is we go line by line.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Don't forget we're --

MR. WEBER: We're going line by line through the code as a committee, and that's

why it takes years for us to adopt a new code. The process is extremely cumbersome.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: John?

MR. PAGE: We've changed our procedure a little bit, too. If you think back a long time ago, we did all this stuff and then we had meetings in the Council Chamber just the Codes Commission having the public come in before we ever voted and ever done anything. We had -- we would do -- make it a couple a night or maybe three a night, depending on what it was. We would occupy the Council Chambers, the public would come in. Maybe it was plumbers and electricians one meeting, and maybe it was, you know, HVAC people and, you know, fire -- you know, whatever it was, we'd do a couple a night. And they would come in and we'd have a pretty good bunch of people in there, and they would make comment on it then. It was all on paper. They could pick up a copy from the office in the City or they could pick up a copy that night, and they could make comment on it to us. But it's kind of changed a little bit over the years. That was a long time ago, and that may have been before you. That was a -- remember those?

MR. WEBER: Oh, I -- we used to have the big showdown.

MR. PAGE: Yeah. It was upstairs, and I remember one year, we had a bunch of union electricians there throwing a fit about something. And -- but -- but it's kind of changed. But now we vote on it and send it to the Council. We haven't been having those public hearings just with us in the Council Chambers. So, you know, it may be a combination. It may be you all going through it and then we go to the Council Chambers and then have that public input that Rick is talking about. You know, have them all come in there and have that. That could be a possibility, too. But we do spend a lot of time on it. I agree, but -- and maybe that helps with the Sunshine Law? Would that help, John, with the -- this problem of subcommittee with the Sunshine Law?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. I mean, there's no reason that public hearing couldn't be held in this lobby, right?

MR. PAGE: Yeah. Sure.

MR. CARLSON: I would agree with that.

MR. PAGE: We used to have it in the Council Chambers because we got a pretty good bunch of people to come up there a lot of times.

MR. SIMON: So if I understand, what Dave is saying is, we would present all the changes to you guys? Does that say -- does that say what --

MR. CARLSON: Well, and John, when we're saying changes, we're not saying paragraph 3, word 7, instead of and, it should be but, and we're not saying it should be shall or should. We're saying the changes in the code as it pertains to the construction of a house.

MR. SIMON: Should and shall is significant.

MR. CARLSON: We spent -- we spent three weeks last code change on should and shall.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt?

MR. CREECH: Can we agree to just the things listed in the significant changes books? Well, there are significant changes books that we get.

MR. YOUNG: Correct.

MR. CREECH: Just like Kas said. What I'm -- what I'm hesitant about is there could be something that staff looks at and says that's not a big deal. It could be a big deal to somebody in this room or two.

MR. CARLSON: That's why I think all the -- I think--

MR. CREECH: So I would be hesitant that we would try and cover every change, pretty much what we do in those smaller groups.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt?

MR. YOUNG: And that's what I was hinting to, the significant change section of it? Do you even have the 18 code books yet?

MR. SIMON: I have ordered -- yes. I just got them. I just got them. I have seen some significant changes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Rick?

MR. SHANKER: I don't know how you guys do yours, but that's exactly what we do is we look through the significant changes book. That's what we look at. So that's -- we don't read through every word of the electrical code, the plumbing code, you know, the rental code, the fire code. We have Frazier that helps us with fire, and then electricians with Curt, since he's pretty much the electrical guy. We do significant changes, and I think that's what we did in plumbing, isn't it? So we don't go through line by line like you guys do.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: I'm going to weigh in on that. I'm going to tell you that with the building code, and I can't cite specific instances, but I recall where there are provisions in the building code that are not addressed in the significant changes, that I know for a fact that, whether we're scientific or not, I'll be reading through them to make sure that those issues are addressed.

MR. WEBER: I agree with you that the significant change book is pretty high level. There's a lot more things where the bars show the changes. I guess what I'm getting at is, I'm just trying to propose something, and what I'm asking is this; that it's like the difference between a college football game and pro football game. They've decided to make it a two-and-a-half hour game, so they have the offense clock and all that. For some reason, we need something, some change to make it so this does not two years. And I'm suggest that, but maybe there's a better idea to make it happen faster and I'm not smart enough to realize that right now, but it takes too long and we've got to change something so that we can get it done in under a year because these things change every three years. I mean, a year is already too long, kind of, you know.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Does this commission want to make a motion and second

to put this on the agenda for the next meeting for a discussion and vote? Mr. Weber?

MR. WEBER: Well, I would make a motion to put it on the agenda so that we can --

MR. CARLSON: Are we talking about the process?

MR. WEBER: We need to --

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Pardon?

MR. CARLSON: Are we talking about the process? We're putting something on the agenda, what are we talking about?

MR. WEBER: Well, I make a motion to put on the agenda to -- for us to try to figure out a process for the next code cycle adoption.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Fair enough. Is there a second?

MR. CARLSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Okay. Kas seconded. Okay. I'm going to have this memorized. I'm going to call a roll. All in favor and seconded.

MR. SHANKER: Excuse me? Is this on the agenda or is this public comment?

MR. WEBER: General.

MR. SHANKER: You're just asking to put it on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: We're asking to put it on the agenda.

MR. SHANKER: Anybody could ask anybody to put it on the agenda, so we don't need a motion, we don't need to vote. I can call you up and say put it on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Good enough, if that's appropriate. Any other discussion?

MR. WATSON: I've got just kind of a general question along those lines. I haven't been through this process before, so how has that worked? Are you referring to how we did it versus how they did it?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I'm not in on most of their committees, some I sit on. But for plumbing, I did on that, and fire and electrical. And we're lucky enough to have certain specialty people like Kurt for fire and Brad does fire. Did I say that right? Kurt is electric

and Brad is fire. So they'll bring in this book; have you seen any significant changes book? It's published and it goes through them.

MR. WATSON: All right.

MR. SHANKER: What Brian is saying is there's things in there that are not showing up as significant because that's just somebody's opinion whether it is significant or not. There's other things that -- I don't know about you guys -- but no one wants to seem to build in the City, is word I'm getting because of all of our rules, so we might consider doing some changes that would promote building in the City -- just things like that. And I am totally against the government of the City of Columbia -- nothing personal -- to dictate what is important and what is not. That -- that's too self-centered. It's not input from the community. So in answer to your question, that's how our committee works, but they may do it differently.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Mr. Weber?

MR. WEBER: But that's what I mean is I think that we all volunteer to have -- it's us that presents the code change to the Council, not John and not these other governmental overlords. And so we have to be diligent enough to say if they're going to present what they want, we've got to look through it to feel like this is appropriate or not. And so again, what it does is it just turns what we've done before upside down and it puts the burden on us to make sure we're diligent enough to review what they say. But if we're lazy and we don't review what they're proposing, then shame on us. We have that opportunity and, frankly, the -- the authority over them through the process, not them. And so what I'm asking is they do the homework and I'm going to read Chapter 16 on because -- no offense -- I know better about Chapter 16 and 17 than -- than -- I think than some of the folks in the City, because that's -- that's my thing. But -- and that's my job, and you're going to do the same, right? Because we're a volunteer in this commission. But if we just blow it off and make them do the work and don't look at it, well, yeah, then they're

going to dictate everything. That's not what I mean. What I mean is speed it up by making them react to them instead of us going line by line.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt?

MR. YOUNG: We did make suggestions the last code cycle that fell on deaf ears, you know. We all talked until we were blue in the face for no apparent reason whatsoever. So I don't see bogging ourselves down for something that's not going to change anything anyways, you know.

MR. SHANKER: There are political consequences to the fact that we are more restrictive than the -- than the county. I mean, that's what builders are telling me. So, you know, if they want to know why prices are high, this is nothing against John or anybody in the City. This is what we voted. Now, there's a certain faction of the community that wants to keep that on, that's what we're really faced with, so that's all I'm bring up.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Matt?

MR. YOUNG: There's a whole lot of different things and costs associated in the county and the city. The county doesn't look at the Energy Environment code, which strikes a lot.

MR. SHANKER: Right.

MR. YOUNG: You're looking at an \$8,000 one in the City, compared to an \$800 one in the county. I mean, they're the two largest numbers right there that change everything.

MR. WEBER: Well, and the county doesn't have an environmental commission and we do. You know, there's a lot of -- there's apples and oranges. It's never going to be the same.

MR. YOUNG: Right.

MR. WEBER: It can't be because we have bigger government here and more tax base.

MR. YOUNG: I mean, those are your big differences in cost. Kas could probably speak to that?

MR. CARLSON: Yeah. The biggest cost we had last year was what the Energy Environment Commission did to us at the Council level, skipped our groups, skipped our opinion, skipped what we all said, went to the Council and got it passed, and that's our biggest increase in our housing right now. And we can't change that. How are we going to change that?

MR. SHANKER: I think that a bigger lobbying group by the builders that just say, here's the numbers, put it on the board. I mean, there's just this reality that it's a feel-good thing and I'm guilty of insulating my house and taking advantage of all the credits and stuff like that. But by the same token, there's this reality that we're not coming up with, whether that's on builders, electricians, and plumbers, or whatever. In any case, I think we need to be more active. Not just this group, but the people that we represent, as well as the community.

And I'd like to make a further motion to end this?

MR. SIMON: Can I just say to you guys the codes are available online?

MR. SHANKER: What's that?

MR. SIMON: I think I spoke to you last meeting that all the codes are now available online and ICC public codes. And --

MR. WEBER: But you can't print them. You can view them only.

MR. SIMON: Correct.

MR. SHANKER: What -- what's are the black states, John?

MR. SIMON: What's the black states?

MR. SHANKER: Yeah. The ones -- the map you just had that had black states, what did they do?

MR. SIMON: States where ICC codes are adopted at the local level by jurisdiction.

We should be a black state.

MR. SHANKER: I was going to say that.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Yeah, we are not a green state.

MR. CARLSON: Yeah. It should be just a little deal of Boone County. That's all it should be. It should be the whole state.

MR. CREECH: Isn't there a really old -- isn't there a really old state adopted code, like the '06 or something like that?

MR. SIMON: There is not.

MR. CREECH: Okay. Some states are like four code cycles behind and they're going show up green on there.

MR. CARLSON: Well, no matter what we do, we're not going to fight the Energy Environment Commission.

MR. SIMON: So all the codes are available online, like Dave said. It's -- you can't print them or search over any of that.

MR. WEBER: I guess what I'm getting at is this; we already got punched in the mouth twice, so why are we even talking about the -- the environmental. We're adopting it as written. I mean, there's no sense in talking about it anymore.

MR. CARLSON: That's correct.

MR. WEBER: It's happened for two cycles. What's the point? So let's move on to the significant changes and the things in black and -- and let's try to streamline the process is what I'm asking for.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: I have a question for Mr. Weber. You work in a lot of jurisdictions, probably in a variety of states. Are you seeing a precedent out there like where jurisdictions will simply adopt the code almost immediately?

MR. WEBER: It's like 50-50. So what I'm seeing is, is most -- about half of them adopt it as written, except for the administrative things because, you know, the municipal

administrative section -- the costs and stuff. And then the other half adopt everything except for older energy codes.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Well, one thought that I have is -- is along with looking at the significant changes that are published by ICC, maybe our focus is on our own amendments.

MR. WEBER: We need to cull out some of those old things, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Well, and if it's a matter of we're going to generally adopt the code as published and then focus on our amendments, whether we decide to delete them or modify them or vote to maintain them, that's a far more streamlined process than line by line through the code perhaps.

MR. WEBER: But we as -- as, I think, commission members are remiss if we don't read through the sections that we know about, you know, in our respective expertise, you know -- plumbing, electrical.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Well, we didn't vote on it, but I think we're in agreement that we're going to put this on the agenda for discussion and possible vote next meeting. Any other discussion?

## VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: We need to set our next meeting date. In looking at my calendar, I believe that is March the 26th.

MR. WEBER: Yeah.

## VIII. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: And with that, since Mr. Carlson is --

MR. CARLSON: I've already seconded Dave's original motion, so call for a vote.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Would you repeat your motion?

MR. WEBER: My motion is to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Is there a second?

MR. CARLSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CONNELL: And with that, since Mr.

Carlson is --

MR. CARLSON: I've already seconded Dave's original motion, so call for a vote.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Would you repeat your motion?

MR. WEBER: My motion is to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Is there a second?

MR. CARLSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

CHAIRMAN CONNELL: Thank you

**Motion is to adjourn**

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.