

# School Safety Sub-Workgroup Meeting August 12, 2019, 9:30 a.m.

Virginia Housing Center (VHC)

## Attending:

Kenney Payne	VA AIA
Rick Witt	Chesterfield County – VBCOA Fire Code Committee Chairman
Steve Sites	Department of Fire Programs, Fire Marshal's Office
Jimmy Moss	VBCOA
Ron Clements	VBCOA
Alex Thorp	CSA
Gerry Maiatico	Warren County-VFPA
Vijay Ramnarain	Virginia Department of Education
Donna Michaelis	VDCJS
Doug Shifflett	Augusta County Schools
Sandra Whitehead	DGS/DEB
Laura Frye	Door Hardware Institute
Ken Cook	Door Safety and Security Foundation
Linda Hale	Loudoun County Fire – VFPA
Mike Armstrong	Harrisonburg - VFPA
Zach Adams	Virginia Tech (By phone)
Jeff Brown	DHCD
Cindy Davis	DHCD
Nicole Donaldson	DHCD
Thomas King	DHCD
Richard Potts	DHCD

## Welcome, Introductions, and Discussion on Previous notes:

Ms. Davis started the meeting with introductions and review of the 4 options that Mr. Payne submitted. Option A- leave the code as is; Option B - make code amenable to barricade devices in new construction only; Option C - make barricade devices available as an appendix; and Option D – add code provisions for barricade devices with restrictions.

There had been a lot of conversation after last meeting and it was decided to start with Option D, come to whatever consensus around Option D may be available, even though there was not consensus with the Option D approach. We can put some language to alleviate that concern. It is a general consensus that the technical requirements should not be legislated by the General Assembly, if we don't come up with something it will most likely be legislated and not be able to be amended in the future.

The State Building Official/Office in DGS is not in support of Option D. They do not believe it needs to be changed. Mr. Maiatico on behalf of Warren County does not agree with Option D and doesn't need a code change; Option D addresses a problem that does not exist in Warren County. The appendix is the best option in Mr. Maiatico's opinion

Mr. Witt wants something in the code that's uniform and something that doesn't require a mandated process to use, but they are there if a school needs safety or something to judge. There is a problem with the appendix because not everyone will choose to adopt it.

Ms. Hale pointed out that Option D is anything but uniform. That it brings devices down to the local level and they (the schools) all will utilize different methods. Ms. Hale argues that the appendix is strong it brought it to a local level but leaves authority in the building and fire services and not schools. It was pointed out that option D also requires approval authority from building and fire professionals.

Mr. Armstrong stated that Harrisonburg has an issue with it going in the code verses the appendix because if it's in the code we have to adhere by it, but if it's in the appendix we can decide with the city council if it's good for Harrisonburg or not. Putting it in the code we take the local ability away from the locality that feels they don't need it.

Ms. Davis pointed out that there is nothing prohibiting any organization from submitting a change that puts it in the appendix, but the desire across the agency is to have a uniform standard that does not change from jurisdiction to jurisdiction or school to school.

Mr. Maiatico stated that he doesn't agree that if they don't do something then it's going to be legislative. He emphasized that the fire services has strong relationships with the General Assembly and have found that representatives value their input on whether to legislate a change.

The Board of Housing will decide on these proposals on September 16.

Ms. Hale took issue with ending discussion of Options A, B and C and proceeding with Option D due to outside direction which was not made clear to this committee before this meeting. Several others agreed that this was a sudden change of direction.

#### **Review of Option D:**

- Mr. Moss pointed out in Option D section 110.1.1 that the lines of communication exist for approval process and all stakeholders (school, building office, fire officials) have to communicate.
- Mr. Maiatico agreed with Mr. Moss and mentioned that when the legislation was passed out of the school safety select committee and he brought it up that the discussion has to be made by code statute in Virginia, Mr. Maiatico was told that it's only for the procurement of the device and he doesn't put a lot of weight on the consulting aspect. The code language is already there.
- Emergency Supplemental Hardware section 110.1.1
  - Strike "and when such events or drills are over, the emergency supplemental hardware shall be removed from the door and stored in accordance with the lockdown plan".
- 1010.1.4.4
  - Strike "office areas, group E facilities".
  - Add "except" in front of Group E day care facilities.
  - If they want it changed (removal of daycare facilities in group E) it would have to be from modifications.
  - Change "within corridors" to "across corridors".
  - Ms. Whitehead pointed out that #2 has to accommodate people with a disability.
  - Add Note under #2 that states, "School officials should consult with their legal counsel regarding provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act and any other applicable requirements".
  - Mr. Armstrong pointed out that we need to put something in place if the manufacturer of the doors doesn't certify or agree with ours/government's decision.
  - Barricade doors are starting to get approvals for use with fire rated assemblies.

- Add to the beginning of #3 “Installation of emergency supplemental hardware on fire door assemblies must comply with Section 716.2”.
  - #4 Add “permanently” in front of affixed, so it’s understood that it can be moved around to another location.
  - #5 change “into a” to “in the approved”.
  - #6 needs to match the language in #5 to reference the SFPC, change “with an approved maintenance schedule” to “with the SFPC”.
  - Add #7: “Approved emergency supplemental hardware shall be of a consistent type throughout a building. Exception: The building official may approve alternate types of emergency supplemental hardware in accordance with Section 110.1 when a consistent device cannot be installed.”
- 1010.1.9.6 (2:15 recording)
    - Add in front of #5 “One additional operation shall be permitted for release of”
  - 1010.1.9.8
    - Mr. Maiatico questioned have we created a code that prevents a three motion device.
    - Under the exception #2 change to “Emergency supplemental hardware shall not be considered a delayed egress locking system”.
  - 1103.2.15 (2:38 recording)
    - Take out “office area in Group E facilities”.
    - Change the Emergency Supplemental Hardware to state, “Any approved hardware used only for emergency events or drills to keep intruders from entering the room during an active shooter or hostile threat event or drill.”
  - 404.2.3
    - Strike the added language, “Such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld in an effort to control the methods and procedures identified in the lockdown plans, including the type of emergency supplemental hardware approved by the building official.”
  - 404.2.3.1
    - Strike part of #3 it’s unnecessary language, change to say, “A description of identified emergency and security threats addressed by the plan, including specific lockdown procedures to be implemented for each threat condition”.
    - Mr. Armstrong mentioned that sometimes the fire services practically write plans for the schools which are too over-tasked to be familiar with security management.
  - Add 406.4.1
    - “Where a facility has installed approved emergency supplemental hardware, employees shall be trained on their assigned duties and procedures for the use of such device. Records of in-service training shall be made available to the fire code official upon request.”

### Closing Statements:

Mr. Maiatico echoed earlier complaints about the way the committee was notified that Option D was preferred by senior officials within the government.

Ms. Davis summarized the remarkable progress towards a document that all stakeholders could make meaningful, good faith contributions towards. While not everyone would support this as a consensus document for approval, it shows good progress towards addressing the goals of previous legislation.

SCHOOL SAFETY SUBWORKGROUP MEETING  
 VIRGINIA HOUSING CENTER  
 4224 COX ROAD, GLEN ALLEN VA  
 August 12, 2019  
 SIGN IN SHEET

donna.michaelis@dcs.virginia.gov

NAME	REPRESENTING	EMAIL ADDRESS
Donna Michaelis ✓	DCTS - Virginia Center for School Camps Safety	
MIKE ARMSTRONG ✓	VFPA	MIKE.ARMSTRONG@HARRISONBURGVA.GOV
Steven Sits ✓	VDFP / SFMO	STEVEN.SITS@VDFP.VIRGINIA.GOV
Doug Shifflett ✓	Augusta County Public Schools	clwshiffle@augusta.k12.va.us
Kenneth Payne ✓	AVA-VA	KPAYNE.MORELEY@VAULTS.COM
Rick Witt ✓	VBCOA FIRE CODE	WITTR@CHESTERFIELD.GOV
Jimmy Moss	VBCOA	JMOSS@EXAFSSOCCENVA.GOV
Linda Hale ✓	VFPA / Loudoun County	LINDA.HALE@LOUDOUN.GOV
Geoff Miskico ✓	VFPA / Women County	GMALSKICO@WOMENCOUNTYVA.COM
Sandra Whitehead ✓	DGS/DEB	Sandra.Whitehead@dgs.virginia.gov
Laura Frye ✓	DH1	LFrye@dhi.org
Alex Khurip	DCSA	
James Clark Christian	DCTS	
Ken Cook	DHCD	
Vijay Ramnavaia	VDOE	
Don Clements	VBCOA	
Jimmy Moss	VBCOA	