

Local Plan Review Competency Criteria
Work Group of the
Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission

November 13, 2014
South Government Building
Conference Room 130
Indianapolis, Indiana

The meeting of the Local Plan Review Competency Criteria Work Group of the Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission was called to order by Matt Mitchell, Chairman, at 10:05 a.m.

Work Group members in attendance were as follows:

Ron Ritchey
Bobby LaRue
Ben Miller
Mark Sinsko
Mike Arany
Matt Mitchell, Chairman
John Hawkins, Commission Chairman
Pam Walters, Council

Work Group members not in attendance were as follows:

Craig Von Deylen
Doug Elmore

2. Minutes

Chairman Mitchell called for approval or correction to the minutes for the October 9, 2014, meeting. Mike Arany moved to accept, with the second by Mark Sinsko. It was voted upon and carried.

3. Discussion of LaRue proposal with amendments

Chairman Mitchell noted that the intention was to complete their work on it today so that it could be submitted to the Commission for discussion and the next step. Chairman Mitchell called for any comments or additional changes to the proposal. Mr. LaRue stated he would prefer to make his comments following discussion of the proposal, allowing other to speak first.

Before discussion of the amended proposal began, Ron Richey, Lafayette Fire Department, voiced concerns about the fire protection system reviews, and whether local units would have the experience needed to do an effective review. It was thought that the local units would be guided by the MOU and guidelines in the current proposal, and the results of the audit process by the State. It was felt that logistical details, such as the submission of partials, needed to be listed in the MOU between the local unit and the State.

John Hawkins, Fire Prevention and Building Safety Commission Chairman, stated that the group did not need to worry about reformatting and typographical errors, as those would be the responsibility of Pam Walters. He urged the group to finish their work today, so that the proposal could be presented at the January meeting of the Commission for their study. It would then be voted upon at the February meeting.

Chairman Mitchell called for any comments, questions or proposed changes to Section A. Hearing none, he moved on to Section B. Chairman Hawkins stated that in Section B, number 3, in the sentence beginning "All local units without" should read "understanding" instead of "understand".

Mark Sinsko, City of Indianapolis, then requested that a discussion of the Tier system, in general, concerning the striking of Tier IV, which had been in place. It had established that a local jurisdiction would perform all plan reviews and issue all CDR's, a "one stop shop" concept. He was concerned about the vetting of information by the State with a Tier III correction, for example. Conversation then turned to the issue of fees, and the interpretation of the statutes. It was stated by Chairman Mitchell that he felt the competencies for Tier I and Tier IV had been established within Tier I, and that Tier IV only added that they had sole authority to issue CDR's for their jurisdiction. That fell, he felt, outside the authority of the work group's mandate. Mr. Sinsko provided a proposal for discussion concerning Tier IV competency requirements and third party reviews. After members had an opportunity to read the proposal, Chairman Mitchell called for a motion. Bobby LaRue moved to accept C (4) item (i) only, and the numbering changed to reflect the change. Ben Miller made the second. It was voted upon, and did not pass with a vote of two to three, and one abstention.

Chairman Hawkins recommended, in the second sentence in 2(a) in Section C, instead of using Certified Building Plans Examiner, using Tier II Plans Examiner instead. It was also noted that the letter (b) was omitted, with (c) in its place.

Chairman Hawkins recommended, in Section D(2)(a) recommended adding "as" following the phrase "local unit review". On Section D(4), he also questioned if they had intended "Commissioner" instead of Commission, since the Commission meets monthly. Following Mr. LaRue's explanation, Chairman Hawkins suggested the phrase be changed to Commission, omitting "The State Building".

Section E led to a discussion of the fees assessed for the education fund in (1) and the concern that a document, as used in (2), was archaic thinking since things are moving toward a paperless system. It was explained that the intention was that all CDR's for a project be in one place, not in a pile of local CDR's and a pile of State CDR's. It was then suggested that "in one document" be replaced with "central file".

Bobby LaRue asked the committee if they felt it was important that you have to have a certified plans examiner in direct employ for Tier I certification. A lengthy discussion of persons with certifications and competent persons without certifications doing reviews was held. Chairman Mitchell then called for a motion. Ron Richey moved to accept the document as amended. Bobby LaRue made the second. It was voted upon and carried with a vote of five to zero.

Chairman Mitchell recessed the meeting at 11:22 for a short break. He called the meeting back to order at 11:31.

4. Issues to consider

In item 6, Chairman Mitchell asked if local units needed an approved ordinance in place before they can do plan reviews. Following discussion, the group felt that issue was outside the scope of the criteria. Item 11 asked if a local unit could do plan reviews without a local inspection program. It was felt to be outside the scope again. Chairman Hawkins asked if one city could do plan review for another city. It was felt that inter-local agreements should be part of the Memorandum of Understanding between the State and the local unit. It was also suggested that the issuance of a CDR should be limited to the scope of your inspection area.

5. Adjournment

Chairman Mitchell announced that they had completed their mandate, and thanked everyone for their participation. Mr. LaRue asked if there would be another meeting before the criteria was voted upon. Chairman Hawkins stated that it would be heard by the FPBS Commission in January, and it would be made public at that time. Chairman Mitchell felt that the committee members would receive a copy of the document between the January and February meeting of the Commission, upon which they would be able to comment. Jonathon Whitham, General Council, advised the group that if they had questions on the document they received, they were welcome to ask for clarification, but it was not to be sent to all members for response, as that would violate the open door policy under which the committee operated.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

Matt Mitchell, Chairman