

Minutes
Board of Appeals
Council Chambers
Wednesday, August 9, 2011, 8 a.m.

Members Present

Daryl Christensen, Tim Fonder, Liz Squyer, Dave Van Nieuwenhuizen, and Keith Thompson

Guests Present

Ercell Fortney, Kevin Wilson, Kevin Meilke, Bruce Palen, Dean Lanier and Frank Ataiyan

Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Thompson and a second was made by Ms. Squyer to approve the minutes of the Tuesday, August 2nd, 2011 hearing, deferred Appeal No. 4-2011. Yeses, 5. Noes, 0.

Unfinished Business

1. The file was reopened for previously deferred Appeal No. 4-2011. Ercell Fortney of Empire Building Construction proposed the construction of a repair garage or shop addition onto the Sioux International facility located at 6401 W 12th Street. Kevin Wilson of Building Sprinkler was present as the sprinkler contractor. The portion of the building that the addition is attached to is equipped with an automatic fire extinguishing system. The addition will also be protected by an automatic fire extinguishing system. Presently the underground fire service extends below the existing building approximately 40 feet to the sprinkler riser. Mr. Fortney proposed to extend an additional 16 feet below the floor and foundation of the proposed addition due to the location of the existing fire service. Mr. Fortney specified that he understands that the standard, NFPA 24, intends that the sprinkler service occur inside the wall of a building but that the standard allows a sprinkler service to extend into the building a minimum amount. Mr. Palin of Sioux International specified that the service which extends under the existing building was installed, inspected, and approved 13 years ago, and that it seemed foolish to incur the cost of complying with the installation interpretations of the Fire Prevention Bureau. He specified that he has not been convinced that the extension under the addition is a safety issue or a problem.

Mr. Ataiyan of the Fire Prevention Bureau specified that they interpret NFPA 24, the standard for underground piping for automatic fire extinguishing systems, to require the contractor to eliminate the

extension of the underground service below both the existing building and the proposed addition, and to locate the sprinkler service immediately inside the addition. It was reiterated that piping located below grade is subject to maintenance issues from building settlement, and that pipes are not visible for maintenance purposes. Mr. Ataiyen specified that he intends to enforce the code and standards consistently, but said that this is an opportunity to correct the extension of the piping that was installed 13 years ago. Mr. Ataiyen additionally questioned the quoted cost of compliance.

Mr. Fortney reiterated that the existing riser is located adjacent to an exterior wall and that the service in the existing building was previously approved. He also said that it appeared that Mr. Ataiyen was questioning the integrity of his firm and Building Sprinkler by questioning the cost of modifications to comply with the Fire Prevention's interpretation of the code and standard.

Further discussions were related to the location of PIV and isolation valves for the system. Mr. Fonder specified that the decision should be based on the practicality and not the cost. Mr. Van Nieuwenhuizen said that such an issue should never occur on a new building but ventured to guess that this could be a more frequent issue on existing buildings with additions.

Subsequent discussions resulted in a motion made by Mr. Van Nieuwenhuizen and a second made by Mr. Fonder to approve the extension of the sprinkler riser under the proposed addition. Further discussions resulted in an amendment to the motion made by Mr. Christensen and a second by Mr. Van Nieuwenhuizen to additionally require the utilization of an isolation valve in addition to the otherwise required PIV valve. Upon calling the roll for the amendment to the original motion, the amendment passed, Yeses 5, Noes 0. Upon calling for the motion with the approved amendment, the motion failed, Yeses 2, Noes 3. It was the consensus of the Board to require the contractor to eliminate the extension of the underground service below both the existing building and the proposed addition.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Van Nieuwenhuizen and a second was made by Mr. Thompson to adjourn. Yeses, 5. Noes, 0.

Secretary