

From: [Chris Fillios](#)
To: [Collin Coles](#)
Cc: [kcbocc](#)
Subject: RE: Building codes
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:14:00 PM

COLLIN:

Thanks for your comments.

Chris.

CHRIS FILLIOS
KOOTENAI COUNTY COMMISSIONER
DISTRICT 2
451 N Government Way • P.O. Box 9000
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83816-9000
Phone: 208-446-1600 • Email: cfillios@kcgov.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Collin Coles [<mailto:ccoles46@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 7:02 AM
To: kcbocc <kcbocc@kcgov.us>
Subject: Building codes

Gentlemen; as I understand we have laid out three positions regarding building codes in the unincorporated areas of Kootenai County:

1. Maintain the existing process and adopt the new ICC codes.
2. Make residential permits voluntary.
3. Make residential permits voluntary on parcels greater than five acres.

I'm sure that there may be some additional qualifiers but I just stated them as is for simplicity.

Position one is the proverbial easy way out. Many have expressed concerns with the international code but no one has really moved forward with any effort. Position one is the status quo; safe if uninspired. There is an expectation that going through the process will provide a safe well constructed home. I believe this is usually the case, but not guaranteed. If there is a failure of some kind, who is liable? Not the ICC or the county. The builder?

Position two, making the process voluntary might work. It's definitely a game changer, provides citizens the option, and allows more individual freedom to choose. I believe most customers will opt for a certificate of occupancy but many would choose to go without for some building activities. Not necessarily a bad thing.

Position three, allowing those with more than five acres to opt out, is really position two but discriminates against county residents with less than five acres. If I have 4 1/2 acres next to my neighbor who has five, there is little observable difference in our situation yet I would have to pay and he would not.

The easiest choice is position one. Maintain the status quo.

Between position two and three, position two makes the most sense since it doesn't disqualify someone due to parcel size.

In summing it up, it's a choice between 1 and 2. If the BOCC truly wants to make a change it should adopt position two. If you want to kick the can down the road, opt for position 1 and be safe.

Collin