

Notes from School Safety Sub-Workgroup Agenda July 11th, 2019, 9:30 a.m.

Virginia Housing Center (VHC)

Attending:

Kenney Payne	AIA
Florin Moldovan	Spotsylvania County - VBCOA
Rick Witt	Chesterfield County – VBCOA Fire Code Committee Chairman
Steve Sites	Department of Fire Programs
Ron Clements	VBCOA
Vijay Ramnarain	Virginia Department of Education
Donna Michaelis	VDCJS
Doug Shifflett	Augusta County Schools
Gregg Fields	City of Alexandria – VBCOA (By phone)
Laura Frye	Door Hardware Institute
Linda Hale	Loudoun County Fire – VFPA
Mike Armstrong	Harrisonburg - VFPA
Mark Dreyer	VDGS
Zach Adams	Virginia Tech (By phone)
John Catlett	DHCD (Catlett Code Consulting)
Jeff Brown	DHCD
Cindy Davis	DHCD

1) Welcome, Introductions, and Discussion on Previous notes:

- a) Cindy Davis started the meeting with introductions and review of information received.

Linda Hale provided an overview of VFPA's position not to support Kenney Payne's proposal that would include security devices (barricades). The stated reason was that the proposals would not meet accessibility concerns and the unintended consequences of other possible emergencies that may be generated from a hostile situation. In the absence of the meeting facilitator, John Catlett, Ms. Davis indicated that her understanding of the last meeting was that a general consensus had been reached and expressed surprise at this letter.

- b) Recap of June meeting and approval of notes – Mr. Catlett arrived and started the recap. During the recap of notes, there were some concerns expressed by the fire service members representing VFPA and the state fire marshal. Other members recollected that there was consensus after the small workgroup discussion and the group was to move forward with Kenney Payne creating a draft as a starting point based on the consensus items from the previous meeting. Gerry Maiatico had offered to work with Kenney on the regulation proposals and also bring a draft of legislation for criminal penalties for misuse of security devices.

Considerable conversations were had that included various individuals, groups and organizations reiterating their positions from the first meeting, and general discussions were initiated about looking forward and where do we go from this point in the discussion.

A suggestion was made to develop a code provision as an appendix that would allow local officials make a decision to allow the barricade devices. Vijay pointed out that there needs to be consistency so that schools have a clear path without the fear of being cited by a fire code official. Donna agreed stating that schools do not have the funds to go back and change all of their doors to meet 2018 code requirements and they need other options. Discussions continued on whether a permit was required which led to a debate. A question as to authority of approval was raised and there appeared to be general consensus that the authority for approval resided with the building official. After some debate regarding the fire code application, Florin asked what violation would be cited if a device existed and was not deployed.

At the end of the morning, it was the general opinion that there was no consensus. The next steps were to review and provide feedback to submitted proposals. There was no common ground that, beyond currently approved locking devices. There was also no consensus for a locally adopted appendix allowing limited forms of barricade devices.

These conversations consumed the morning time allocation. The group broke for lunch and resumed at 13:05.

Review, discussion and revisions of VCC New Construction draft proposals (4-hour approximate time).

- c) Kenney Payne proposal (see Drop Box) - Discussion began following lunch with Kenney providing an overview. Kenney explained the background and thought process behind the proposal based on outcomes from the subworkgroup's 2nd meeting. These included new signage requirements for malicious deployment, first responder access refinements, and height of device deployment. As Kenney started to go through each of the areas, there were objections to the basis of the proposal in general, not specific to what he was proposing. Basically, the conversations continued on each item until the group felt there was no value in continuing. Kenney recommended that the group move to the second proposal from Laura Frye. He would be willing to try to merge comments for one more attempt at a consensus proposal.
- d) Laura Frye, Door and Hardware Institute, began with a PowerPoint presentation that provided information on the various locking devices that are approved for use under current code provisions. Laura demonstrated the concerns that teachers want to see the door is locked and it can be locked from the inside without reentering the hall way outside the classroom. She pointed to security classroom locksets that would lock the outside of the lock only while maintaining free access from the inside. Questions regarding if these locksets that required the use of a key would meet accessibility requirements. A second question regarding access by breaking door vision panels would be much easier if the lockset was readily openable from the inside. The answer regarding accessibility was no, but Laura continued on with locks that would meet all of the requirements in her presentation. These included visual indicators. Her proposal also included limiting the vision panel size and/or location. She also stated that security glazing was an option as well.
- e) Penalty for malicious use of barricade device – nothing submitted

2) New information and dissemination of materials for review

- a) A letter from VFPA was received was received the evening of July 10, 2019 from VFPA (in DropBox). The letter captured their position that accessibility would need to be maintained and given other potential emergencies that could be encountered during a hostile event, locks were the only viable solution.

- b) A letter was received from DEB Director Mike Coppa that stated the current 2018 IBC and IFC language should not be amended. There was concern expressed that this position was placed in record before the conclusion of the sub-workgroup's work.
- c) A code proposal from Natalia Larrimer was reviewed and discussed regarding day care facilities that would require egress devices that would prevent children from leaving the building unassisted. Consensus not to support the proposal.

Conclusions:

After several hours of what could be classified as circular conversations where no new information was presented, there appeared to be no path forward to consensus. After additional conversations the group agreed that the only solution is to put forth options for the Board of Housing to consider. They would be:

1. Do nothing - leave 2018 IBC language as is.
2. Prohibit barricades - increase lock/door requirements.
3. Allow barricades meeting requirements for deployment, heights, and first responder access from outside the classroom as an appendix.
4. Allow barricades meeting the same requirements as 3 above as part of the 2018 code language.

Kenney Payne agreed to draft various proposals based on these options.

Adjourn (Approximately 3:30 PM)