

VIRGINIA FIRE SERVICES BOARD

Burn Building Subcommittee

Thursday, September 9, 2010

A meeting of the Virginia Fire Services Board Burn Building Subcommittee was held at the Virginia Department of Fire Programs Head Quarters in Glen Allen, VA at 10:00 am. Mr. Ken Brown served as Chair.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Kenneth J. Brown - Chair – Virginia State Firefighter’s Association

Brian Mullins – Virginia Board of Housing & Community Development

Robert Scott – Insurance Industry Representative

Edwin Smith – Virginia Fire Chiefs Association

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Felix Sarfo-Kantanka, Jr. – General Public

Ed Altizer – Virginia State Fire Marshal (Alternate)

Bill Kyger – Association of Counties

Mike Armstrong – VA Chapter of the International Society of Fire Service Instructors

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

NA

AGENCY MEMBERS PRESENT

Billy Shelton

Tyhissha Pittman

Brook Pittinger

Don Hansen

GUESTS PRESENT

Mike Matthews – The Structures Group

J.C. Boiling – City of Bristol

Kurt Kight – County of Fauquier

Chris Hubbard - Hanover County

CHANGES IN THE AGENDA

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Proposed NFPA Guidelines for Inspection Schedules
- B. Town of Coeburn Burn Building Application
- C. City of Bristol Burn Building Application
- D. Accomack County Burn Building Article
- E. Subcommittee Makeup
- F. Burn Building Grant Applications for Repair and Renovations

NEW BUSINESS

A. Burn Building Prop Award Determination Process

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kurt Kight, Fauquier County, provided the subcommittee with pictures of their burn building construction process – Enclosure 1. Kurt indicated that the locality is working on the punch list and will contact VDFP once they are ready for their final inspection.

COMMENTS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR

The subcommittee chair deferred making comments under his comment section and instead made specific comments under the various agenda items.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Topic: Proposed NFPA Guidelines for Inspection Schedules

Motion: To adopt the TSG Inspection Schedule dated 9.29.2009.

Discussion:

It was noted that the inspection schedule created by TSG for the Board is more stringent than the NFPA guidelines. The Board's policy on inspection schedules is more stringent because of the funding contributed by the Board to each locality's building.

A copy of the inspection guidelines can be found at:

http://www.vafire.com/grants_local_aid/burn_building/Schedule%20of%20Burn%20Building%20Prop%20Inspections_100209.pdf

Vote: unanimous

Action: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Topic: Town of Coeburn Burn Building Application

Motion: To deny the Town of Coeburn burn building repair grant request.

Discussion:

The Town of Coeburn submitted a repair request for a sprinkler simulator, second story to the structure, concrete apron, forcible entry, pitched roof, and

vertical ventilation; however, the application did not specify exactly what the jurisdiction was requesting for each item.

It was noted that the building is only one-story and therefore not in compliance with the NFPA 1001 requirement(s).

The Agency will send a letter to the Town of Coeburn notifying them of the grant denial.

Vote: unanimous

Action: To deny the locality's request.

Topic: City of Bristol Burn Building Application – Enclosure 2

Motion 1: To request that TSG complete a study to evaluate the cost of props in a Class B burn building.

Motion 2: To fund up to \$130,000 for a secondary prop in Class B burn buildings.

Motion 3: To fund the City of Bristol up to \$130,000 for a secondary prop in their class B burn building.

Discussion:

The City of Bristol submitted a renovation grant request for an additional burn room on the second story of their building (propane burn prop). The locality currently has a Drager burn prop on the first floor and sought bids for the second prop from Drager as well. The cost from Drager is cited as \$119,110 for the engineering design, material purchase and manufacturing at their production facility. An additional \$90,840 was cited for installation.

Also included in Enclosure 2 (tab 2) from the City is a cost quote from Kidde Fire Trainers. The cost quoted by Kidde is \$129,400 for the propane fuelled live fire training system (includes shipping and installation costs); and \$3,000 for the Omit Smoke Generator; \$1,000 for the Omit Interchangeable Mockup; \$2,800 for the 1 year warranty; and \$8,000 for the rollover/flare-up effect.

It was noted that if fire bricks were necessary, the locality would like to amend their grant application to include the cost of the fire bricks for the second floor and if possible for the first floor as well. The subcommittee chair noted that any request for the fire bricks would need to be submitted under the \$10,000 repair grant managed by VDFP and will not be considered part of the current grant application, as it was not included in the original grant request.

The subcommittee members questioned whether the Drager and Kidde burn prop systems could be integrated into one another so that they can work together within the Bristol burn building.

The intent of Motion 1 is to have TSG review the cost of propane burn props for Class B burn buildings and determine the average costs. This study will be used by the Board to determine if the cost quotes provided by localities are on-par with industry averages.

The intent of Motion 2 is to set a maximum funding availability for all localities, currently not in compliance with NFPA 1001 (i.e. currently have only one burn prop), and requesting additional funding for a second burn prop through the renovation grant program. The funding availability was set by the subcommittee as the maximum award amount, but will be modified, if needed, based on the outcome of the TSG study.

Vote 1: unanimous

Vote 2: unanimous

Vote 3: unanimous

Action 1: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Action 2: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Action 3: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Topic: Accomack County Burn Building Article – Enclosure 3

Motion: NA

Discussion:

On 8/27/10 an on-line article was sent to the members of the VFSB. The article, available at www.delmarvanow.com, stated that the Accomack County Board of Supervisors approved funding for a \$1M capital spending plan to construct an Eastern Shore Regional Fire Training Center, which will include a new burn building. According to the article, \$430,000 will come from the VFSB Burn Building grant program and will be used to construct a burn building at the

training site. The article noted that the VFSB has ranked Accomack County second in-line for the grant.

The Burn Building Subcommittee Chair noted that the intent of the Board's 'ranking' structure was to allow the Board to prioritize the burn building needs throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Subcommittee Chair noted that the Board will need to clarify the process for 'ranking' burn building needs to ensure that the direction of the Burn Building Subcommittee and the Board is accurately interpreted by the public. The subcommittee's intent on 'ranking' the requests for new burn buildings was for their internal purpose and does not ensure that a locality will receive a grant if they are 'ranked.'

The subcommittee requested that the Agency write a letter on-behalf of the Board Chair to Accomack County to clarify any misinterpretations generated by the Board's ranking structure.

Vote: NA

Action: NA

Topic: Subcommittee Makeup

Motion: NA

Discussion:

Per the current Burn Building Policy, the following positions have been appointed to the Subcommittee and must include a minimum of the following:

- Either a Board of Housing & Community Development or General Public member;
- Either a VACO or VML member;
- The Insurance Industry member;
- Training Committee chair (as currently appointed); and
- Chair of Subcommittee (to be appointed by the Board Chair).

The subcommittee members discussed the makeup and agreed with the current subcommittee assignment.

Vote: NA

Action: NA

Topic: Burn Building Grant Applications for Repair and Renovations

Motion 1: To reopen the renovation/repair grant application process to allow those localities currently not in compliance with NFPA 1001 for the delivery of Firefighter I & II to reapply for the grant by October 31, 2010.

Motion 2: To fund up to \$430,000 for the renovation/repair grants reapplication process.

Motion 3: To approve or deny each burn building grant application as received by the Board.

Discussion:

The subcommittee discussed whether the available funding for burn buildings should be used for current buildings that have known problems and grant applications submitted into the Board or if the funding should be reserved in the event new requests come forward.

The subcommittee also discussed the localities role in maintaining their buildings and ensuring NFPA 1001 guidelines are being followed.

The subcommittee chair noted that these issues will need to be tackled by the Burn Building Subcommittee so that these issues are resolved once and for all.

Don Hansen, VDFP, noted that the Board had the Agency complete a study 5 years ago to determine which localities still have a need for a permanent burn building. In examining the state, the Agency determined that a 40 mile radius should be the maximum distance between a locality and a burn building. The areas that the Agency believes still have a need for a permanent burn building, as they are greater than 40 miles away from a burn building, are: Tazewell; Chilhowie; Buchanan; and Bluefield (these are listed in no ranking order).

The funding for motion 2 is from the forfeiture of the new construction burn building grant by Montgomery County.

The intent of motion 3 is to eliminate the process of 'holding' new construction grant applications until funding is available. The Board's justification for this was to ensure all grant applications are current and being applied for under the current policy.

There was a motion made to modify the new construction grant application process to amend it to a once a year application process (currently a twice a year process). This motion did not receive a second and therefore was not voted on by the subcommittee. The current Board policy for twice a year application submission is maintained.

It was noted by Don Hansen that the remaining localities with one-story burn buildings are Lee County, Covington and, Buena Vista. It was noted that the Hopewell and Winchester buildings are more than one-story, but have flat roofs.

Vote 1: unanimous

Vote 2: unanimous

Vote 3: unanimous

Action 1: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Action 2: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

Action 3: To present to the Administration, Policy & Finance Committee at the October 2010 Board meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Topic: Burn Building Prop Award Determination Process

Motion: NA

Discussion:

This topic was discussed under Item F – Burn Building Grant Applications for Repair and Renovations – in Unfinished Business.

Vote: NA

Action: NA

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Clerk of the Subcommittee
Brook Pittinger

REVIEWED BY:

Tylisha Pittman

Tylisha Pittman
Accounting Manager

September 10, 2010

Date

Enclosures:

1. Fauquier County Burn Building pictures
2. City of Bristol – Burn Building prop costs/estimates
3. Accomack County Burn Building Article

DRAFT