



**THE CITY COUNCIL OF WATERLOO, IOWA
WORK SESSION TO BE HELD AT
Harold E. Getty Council Chambers
Monday, October 6, 2025
3:00 PM**

RULES FOR WORK SESSION PUBLIC COMMENT

Iowa Code Chapter 21 gives the public the right to attend council meetings, but it does not require cities to allow public participation except during public hearings. The city council shall not receive any public comment during a work session.

Roll Call.

Agenda, as proposed or amended.

Approval of Minutes of the September 15, 2025 Council Work Session as proposed or amended.

4:30 p.m. Discussion of an ordinance amending regulations for third party fire protection system reviews.

Submitted by: Bill Beck, Fire Chief

**Approx. 4:45 Update on Waterloo Fire Rescue Medical Services.
p.m.**

Submitted by: Bill Beck, Fire Chief

ADJOURNMENT

Kelley Felchle
City Clerk

September 15, 2025

COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Harold E. Getty Council Chambers
Roll Call.

Members present: Mayor Pro Tem Ray Feuss in the Chair, Mr. Boesen, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Simon and Mr. Feuss. Ms Wilder arrived at 4:29 p.m.
Ms. Creighton-Smith and Mr. Chiles were absent.

Agenda, as proposed or amended.

Nichols/Boesen
that the agenda as proposed be approved. Voice vote-Ayes: Four. Motion carried.

Presentation by Historic Preservation Commission regarding 521 Pine Street.

Noel Anderson, Community Planning and Development Director, provided background on the purchase of 521 Pine Street.

Ivan Valtchev, Historic Preservation Commission, shared that he lives in the Walnut neighborhood where the property is located and has strong feelings about seeing the dwelling renovated rather than demolished. He shared a number of photos of the property and asked the council to consider allowing the home to stand as is with the hopes that someone will choose to renovate it. He believes the home would add value to the neighborhood and offered to spearhead an effort to make the home less of an eyesore and limit its deterioration.

Mr. Boesen questioned how many developers have looked at the site.

Noel Anderson commented that approximately three or four to date.

Mr. Boesen expressed concern that it would just continue to get worse. He shared that the structure does not have a rating for historical significance.

Ivan Valtchev commented that the neighborhood is.

Joseph Dahlman, City Planner, explained that the building was surveyed for architectural significance, and it did receive an A rating, which is why it went before the Historical Preservation Commission to demolish it.

Mr. Boesen commented that unless the building is completely sealed up, it would continue to deteriorate, and then there would be the issue of black mold to deal with.

Mr. Simon questioned why we are trying to save a building that nobody wants.

Ivan Valtchev explained that there has been a lot of development in the Walnut neighborhood, and everything is trending up. He thinks that it is worth trying to preserve for a bit longer as the neighborhood continues to move in the right direction.

Mr. Feuss requested clarification on the recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ivan Valtchev explained that they don't want to demolish the property, but if it is left, they would like to see some dollars allocated to fixing the hole in the roof and allow the neighborhood to try to come up with a plan to repair the property.

Mr. Nichols questioned if there had been any sort of estimate put together to determine the costs to stabilize the property.

Noel Anderson commented that those efforts would likely cost at least \$70,000.

Discussion of updates to the public works facility.

Randy Bennett, Public Works Division Manager, gave a presentation on the strategic planning for potential updates they want to do with the public works site.

Mr. Boesen questioned what would happen to the current fuel site if a new site was built.

Randy Bennett explained that they would approach the Waterloo Schools about whether they would be interested.

Mr. Boesen commented that the location could be difficult to access at times due to trains sitting on the tracks for a period of time.

ADJOURNMENT

Boesen/Nichols

that the council adjourn at 4:52 p.m. Voice vote-Ayes: Five. Motion carried.

Kelley Felchle
City Clerk

WATERLOO FIRE RESCUE
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Bill Beck, Fire Chief

FROM: Brock Weliver, Fire Marshal

DATE: August 7, 2025

SUBJECT: Proposed Ordinance Change – Mandatory Third-Party Fire Protection System Reviews

Purpose:

This memorandum is intended to present a proposed change to the City of Waterloo's fire code ordinance that aligns with practices adopted by other full-time fire departments with limited plan review staffing. The recommendation involves requiring third-party review for all new fire protection system plans, which would shift the cost burden to the contractors and provide both operational and financial benefits to the City.

Current Ordinance:

The City currently follows the following policy for third-party reviews:

Section 104.7.2 – Automatic Third-Party Review (Proposed Language):

All buildings with fire protection systems (sprinkler and/or fire alarm system) and a total square footage over 15,000 square feet will require a third-party review. Any building containing a fire pump, standpipe system, or special detection/suppression system regardless of square footage will also require a third-party review. The third party shall be approved by the fire code official.

This policy results in the City covering the costs for these reviews. From December 16, 2024, to August 11, 2025, the City has paid \$12,000 in third-party review fees.

Proposed Ordinance Change:

We propose modifying Section 104.7.2 to require third-party review for all new fire protection system installations, regardless of building size or system type. The revised language would shift the financial responsibility for these reviews to the contractor/developer and align our policy with peer cities.

Proposed Revised Language:

All new fire protection systems (including but not limited to fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire pumps, standpipe systems, and special hazard systems) shall require review by an approved third-party licensed fire protection engineer. All third-party reviewers shall be approved by the fire code official. Review fees shall be the responsibility of the submitting contractor or developer.

Justification and Benefits:

Several other comparable full-time fire departments, including Cedar Falls and West Des Moines, already utilize this model. Adopting a similar approach would provide the following advantages:

Cost Savings: Estimated annual savings of up to \$20,000 by removing review fee obligations from the City budget.

Reduced Liability: Reviews are conducted by licensed fire protection engineers, enhancing code compliance and professional oversight.

Increased Consistency: Third-party reviews ensure uniform application of codes and standards across all projects.

Reallocation of Resources: Money saved could be redirected toward a part-time fire inspector position. Fire inspections not only reduce community risk but also generate revenue for the City.

Long-Term Goal:

The long-term strategy is to use the annual cost savings from shifting third-party review expenses to fund a part-time fire inspector. This would enhance our prevention and risk-reduction efforts and support our department's overall mission, while also providing a measurable return on investment through inspection-based fee collections.

Recommendation:

That the Fire Chief and City leadership consider supporting the proposed ordinance amendment to Section 104.7.2 and initiate the process of implementing the change through City Council approval.

Please advise if you would like this recommendation presented formally at a council meeting or work session.

Respectfully submitted,

Brock Weliver

Fire Marshal

Waterloo Fire Rescue