

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus	Stakeholder Consensus	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High					Y or N	Y or N		
CHAPTER 31 SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION															
822	3101.1	same	same as 2021	General	N	IBC updates to scope: The provisions of this chapter shall govern special building construction including membrane structures, temporary structures, pedestrian walkways and tunnels, automatic vehicular gates , awnings and canopies, marquees, signs, telecommunications and broadcast towers, antennas, relocatable buildings , swimming pools, spas and hot tubs, enclosures and safety devices , automatic vehicular gates, solar energy systems, greenhouses, relocatable buildings, public use restroom building on publicly owned lands in flood hazard areas and intermodal shipping containers.			Add window cleaning anchors	A					
823	3103.1	same	same as 2021	General (temporary structures)	N	IBC added two exceptions: 1. Public-occupancy temporary structures complying with Section 3103.1.1 shall be permitted to remain in service for 180 days or more but not more than 1 year where approved by the building official . 2. Public-occupancy temporary structures within the confines of an existing structure are not required to comply with Section 3103.6.				A					
824			3103.1.1	Extended period of service time		IBC new section: Public-occupancy temporary structures shall be permitted to remain in service for 180 days or more without complying with requirements in this code for new building or structures where extensions for up to 1 year are granted by the Building Official in accordance with Section 108.1 and where the following conditions are satisfied: 1. Additional inspections as determined by the building official shall be performed by a qualified person to verify that site conditions and the approved installation comply with the conditions of approval at the time of final inspection. 2. A qualified person shall perform follow-up inspections after initial occupancy at intervals not exceeding 180 days to verify the site conditions and the installation conform to the approved site conditions and installation requirements. Inspection records shall be kept and shall be made available for verification by the building official . 3. An examination shall be performed by a registered design professional to determine the adequacy of the temporary structure to resist the structural loads required in Section 3103.6. 4. Relocation of the public-occupancy temporary structure shall require a new permit application. 5. The use or occupancy approved at the time of final inspection shall remain unchanged. 6. A request for an extension is submitted to the building official . The request shall include records of the inspections and examination in Items 1 and 3.				A					

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus	Stakeholder Consensus	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High	Y or N		Y or N	Y or N				
825	3103.1.1 - 3103.1.2	same	3103.1.2 - 3103.1.3	renumbered						A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial only changes.
826			3103.5	Bleachers	N	IBC new section: Temporary bleachers , grandstands and folding and telescopic seating that are not building elements shall comply with ICC 300.				A					
827			3103.6	Structural requirements	N	IBC new section: Structural compliance				A					
828			3103.6.1	Structural loads	N	IBC new section: Public-occupancy temporary structures shall be designed in accordance with Chapter 16, except as modified by Sections 3103.6.1.1 through 3103.6.1.6.				A					
829			3103.6.1.1	Snow loads	N	IBC new section: Snow loads on public-occupancy temporary structures shall be determined in accordance with Section 1608. The ground snow loads, pg, in Section 1608 shall be modified according to Table 3103.6.1.1. Exception: Ground snow loads, pg, for public-occupancy temporary structures that employ controlled-occupancy procedures per Section 3103.8 shall be permitted to be modified using a ground snow load reduction factor of 0.65 instead of the ground snow load reduction factors in Table 3103.6.1.1. Where the public-occupancy temporary structure is not subject to snow loads or not constructed and occupied during times when snow is to be expected, snow loads need not be considered, provided that where the period of time when the public occupancy temporary structure is in service shifts to include times when snow is to be expected, one of the following conditions is met: 1. The design is reviewed and modified, as appropriate, to account for snow loads. 2. Controlled occupancy procedures in accordance with Section 3103.8 are implemented.				A					
830			Table 3103.6.1.1	Reduction factors for ground snow loads	N	IBC new table				A					

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus	Stakeholder Consensus	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High					Y or N	Y or N		
831			3103.6.1.2	Wind Loads	N	IBC new section: The design wind load on public-occupancy temporary structures shall be permitted to be modified in accordance with the wind load reduction factors in Table 3103.6.1.2. Exceptions: 1. Design wind loads for public-occupancy temporary structures that implement controlled occupancy procedures per Section 3103.8 shall be permitted to be modified using a wind load reduction factor of 0.65. 2. For public-occupancy temporary structures erected in a hurricane-prone region outside of hurricane season, the basic wind speed, V, shall be permitted to be set as follows, depending on risk category: 2.1. Risk Category II: 115 mph. 2.2. Risk Category III: 120 mph. 2.3. Risk Category IV: 125 mph.				A					
832			Table 3103.6.1.2	Reduction factors for wind loads	N	IBC new table				A					
833			3103.6.1.3	Flood loads	N	IBC new section: Public-occupancy temporary structures need not be designed for flood loads specified in Section 1612. Controlled occupancy procedures in accordance with Section 3103.8 shall be implemented.				A					
834			3103.6.1.4	Seismic loads	N	IBC new section:				A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial
835			3103.6.1.5	Ice loads	N	IBC new section: Ice loads on public-occupancy temporary structures shall be permitted to be determined with a maximum nominal thickness of 0.5 inch (13 mm), for all risk categories. Where the public-occupancy temporary structure is not subject to ice loads or not constructed and occupied during times when ice is to be expected, ice loads need not be considered, provided that where the period of time when the public-occupancy temporary structure is in service shifts to include times when ice is to be expected, one of the following conditions is met: 1. The design is reviewed and modified, as appropriate, to account for ice loads. 2. Controlled occupancy procedures in accordance with Section 3103.8 are implemented.				A					
836			3103.6.1.6	Tsunami loads	N	IBC new section:				A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG				
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM-	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	TAG Group Consensus Y or N	Stakeholder Consensus Y or N	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High	Comments						
837			3103.6.2	Foundations	N	IBC new section: Public-occupancy temporary structures shall be permitted to be supported on the ground with temporary foundations where approved by the building official . Consideration shall be given for the impacts of differential settlement where foundations do not extend below the ground or where foundations are supported on compressible materials. The presumptive load-bearing value for public-occupancy temporary structures supported on a pavement, slab on grade or on other collapsible or controlled low-strength substrate soils such as beach sand or grass shall be assumed not to exceed 1,000 pounds per square foot (47.88 kPa) unless determined through testing and evaluation by a registered design professional . The presumptive load-bearing values listed in Table 1806.2 shall be permitted to be used for other supporting soil conditions.				A				
838			3103.6.3	Installation and maintenance inspections	N	IBC new section: A qualified person shall inspect public occupancy temporary structures that are assembled using transportable and reusable materials. Components shall be inspected when purchased or acquired and at least once per year. The inspection shall evaluate individual components, and the fully assembled structure , to determine suitability for use based on the requirements in ESTA ANSI E1.21. Inspection records shall be kept and shall be made available for verification by the building official . Additionally, public-occupancy temporary structures shall be inspected at regular intervals when in service to ensure that the structure continues to perform as designed and initially erected.				A				
839			3103.6.4	Durability	N	IBC new section: Reusable components used in the erection and the installation of public-occupancy temporary structures shall be manufactured of durable materials necessary to withstand environmental conditions at the service location. Components damaged during transportation or installation or due to the effects of weathering shall be replaced or repaired.				A				
840			3103.7	Serviceability	N	IBC new section: The effects of structural loads or conditions shall not adversely affect the serviceability or performance of the public-occupancy temporary structure .				A				

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM-	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus Y or N	Stakeholder Consensus Y or N	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High	Comments							
841			3103.8	Controlled occupancy procedures	N	IBC new section: Where controlled occupancy procedures are required to be implemented for public-occupancy temporary structures in Section 3103.6.1, the procedures shall comply with this section and ANSI ES1.7. An operations management plan in accordance with ANSI E1.21 shall be submitted to the building official for approval as a part of the permit documents. In addition, the operations management plan shall include an emergency action plan that documents the following information, where applicable: 1. Surfaces on which snow or ice accumulates shall be monitored before and during occupancy of the public-occupancy temporary structure . Any loads in excess of the design snow or ice load shall be removed prior to its occupancy, or the public-occupancy temporary structure shall be vacated in the event that either the design snow or ice load is exceeded during its occupancy. 2. Wind speeds associated with the design wind loads shall be monitored before and during occupancy of the public-occupancy temporary structure . The public-occupancy temporary structure shall be vacated in the event that the design wind speed is expected to be exceeded during its occupancy. 3. Criteria for initiating occupant evacuation procedures for flood and tsunami events. 4. Occupant evacuation procedures shall be specified for each environmental hazard where the occupant management plan specifies the public-occupancy temporary structure is to be evacuated. 5. Procedures for anchoring or removal of the public-occupancy temporary structure , or other additional measures or procedures to be implemented to mitigate hazards in snow, wind, flood , ice or tsunami events.				A					
842	3109	same	same as 2021	Swimming pools, spas and hot tubs	Y	MBC has deleted this section in it's entirety			Retain amendment	A					
843	3111.1	same	same as 2021	General (solar energy systems)	Y	MBC specific exception: Buildings regulated by Minnesota Rules, Chapter 1309, the Minnesota Residential Code.			Retain amendment	A					
844	3111.1.1	same	same as 2021	Wind resistance	N	IBC changed 'panels and modules' to '(PV) panel systems'				A				Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial only changes.	
845	3111.1.2	same	same as 2021	Roof live load	N	IBC changed section reference to 1607.15				A				Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial only changes.	
846	3111.1.3			Roof access points	Y	MBC specific section for roof access points			retain amendment	A					
847	3111.2	same	same as 2021	Solar thermal systems	N	IBC added: Where light-transmitting plastic covers are used, solar thermal collectors shall be designed in accordance with Section 2606.12.				A					

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A- Accept Reject Amend	R- AM- Comments	TAG Group Consensus	Stakeholder Consensus	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High						Y or N	Y or N	
848	3111.3	same	same as 2021	Photovoltaic solar energy systems	N	MBC references compliance to MFC and MEC and adds MN specific exception: Solar photovoltaic power systems installed on detached, uninhabitable Group U structures including parking shade structures, carports, solar trellises, and similar structures need only comply with the Minnesota Fire Code, the Minnesota Electrical Code, and the manufacturer's instructions.			Retain amendment	A					
849	3111.3.1 - 3111.3.3	same	same as 2021	multiple	N	IBC adds new UL listing options and changes terms to 'BIPV'				A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial only changes.
850	3111.3.4	same	same as 2021	Access and pathways	Y	MBC amends this section and adds multiple subsections for access and pathway compliance				A					
851	3111.3.4.1 - 3111.3.4.2.3				Y	MBC specific sections				A					
852			3111.3.5	Elevated photovoltaic (PV) support structures	N	IBC new section: Elevated PV support structures shall comply with either Section 3111.3.5.1 or 3111.3.5.2. Exception: Elevated PV support structures that are installed over agricultural uses.				A					
853			3111.3.5.1	Photovoltaic (PV) panels installed over open-grid framing of a noncombustible deck	N	IBC new section: Elevated PV support structures with PV panels installed over open-grid framing or over a noncombustible deck shall have PV panels tested, listed and labeled with a fire type rating in accordance with UL 1703 or with both UL 61730-1 and UL 61730-2. Photovoltaic panels marked "not fire rated" shall not be installed on elevated PV support structures .				A					
854			3111.3.5.2	Photovoltaic (PV) panels installed over a roof assembly	N	IBC new section: Elevated PV support structures with a PV panel system installed over a roof assembly shall have a fire classification in accordance with Section 1505.9.				A					
855	3111.3.5	same	3111.3.6	Ground-mounted photovoltaic (PV) panel systems	Y	MBC amended to: Ground-mounted photovoltaic panel systems shall comply with this section and Section 3111.1. Setback requirements shall not apply to ground-mounted, free-standing photovoltaic arrays. A clear, brush-free area of 10 feet (3048 mm) shall be required for ground-mounted photovoltaic arrays. IBC references compliance with Chapter 16 and IFC.			Retain amendment, pick up IBC language	A					
856	3111.3.5.1	same	3111.3.6.1	Fire separation distance	N	renumber				A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial
857	3111.3.6 - 3111.3.6.3			Buildings with rapid shutdown	Y	MBC added section for rapid shutdown requirements			Retain amendment	A					
858	3113	same	same as 2021	Relocatable buildings	Y	MBC has deleted this section in it's entirety, and directs compliance to MR 1361			Retain amendment	A					
859	3114			Window cleaning anchors	Y	MBC specific sections			retain section - coordinate with Statute	A					
860		3115	3114	Intermodal shipping containers		IBC new sections - multiple			renumber with window cleaning anchor section	A					

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus Y or N	Stakeholder Consensus Y or N	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High								
CHAPTER 32 ENCROACHMENTS INTO THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY															
861						No amendments, no changes				A					
CHAPTER 33 SAFEGUARDS DURING CONSTRUCTION															
862	3301.1	same	same as 2021	Scope	N	IBC added: Fire safety during construction shall also comply with the applicable provisions of Chapter 33 of the International Fire Code.				A					
863	3301.2	same	same as 2021	Storage and placement of construction equipment and materials	N	IBC added 'of construction equipment and materials'				A					Not reviewed by TAG. Listed for tracking purposes only. Non-substantial or editorial only changes.
864		3301.2.1	3301.3	Roof loads	N	IBC new section: Structural roof components shall be capable of supporting the roof-covering system and the material and equipment loads that will be encountered during installation of the system.				A					
865	3302.1	same	3301.4	Maintenance of exits, existing structural elements, fire protection devices and sanitary safeguards	N	IBC renamed and moved this section from construction safeguards to general									
866	3302.2	same	3301.5	Removal of waste materials	N	IBC renamed and moved this section from construction safeguards to general									
867	3302.4			Construction barrier	Y	MBC specific section: Where construction, remodeling, or demolition is taking place involving the use of cutting and welding, temporary heating with open flames, or flammable-liquid-fueled equipment, such areas shall be separated from occupied areas of a building by materials that will resist the spread of fire and smoke as specified for draftstopping materials in IBC Section 718.3.1.									
868	3302.3	3302.3	3302	Owners responsibility for fire protection.		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
869			3302.1	Site safety plan		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
870			3302.1.1	Components of site safety plans		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
871			3302.2	Site safety director		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
872			3302.3	Daily fire safety inspection		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
873			3302.3.1	Violations		IBC new section			Review new section of 2024 IBC						
874	3305	same	same as 2021	Sanitary	Y	MBC has deleted this section in it's entirety			Retain amendment	A					
875	3307.1	same	same as 2021	protection of adjacent property	N	IBC updated from 'adjoining buildings' to 'adjacent property'				A					
876		3307.2 - 3307.2.3	same as 2021	Excavation retention systems	N	IBC new sections			Review new section of 2024 IBC	A					
877	3313	3313.1 - 3313.5	same as 2021	water supply for fire protection	N	IBC new sections			Review new section of 2021 IBC	A					

New Changes in the 2024 International Code

Minnesota Rule 1305										To be completed by TAG					
Item No.	Minnesota Code Section	2021 "I" Code Section	2024 "I" Code Section	Subject	Current MN Amend	Description of Change	Safety & Health Value	Cost Impact	Recommendation Accept Reject Amend	A- R- AM- Comments	Recommendation A Accept Reject Amend	R - AM -	TAG Group Consensus	Stakeholder Consensus	Comments
					Y or N		N=None, L=Low M=Med, H=High	Accept Reject Amend		Y or N	Y or N				
878	3314.1	same	same as 2021	Fire watch during construction	N	IBC updated: A fire watch shall be provided during nonworking hours for construction that exceeds 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above the lowest adjacent grade at any point along the building perimeter, for new multistory construction with an aggregate area exceeding 50,000 square feet (4645 m2) per story or as required by the fire code official.				A					
REFERENCED STANDARDS															
879	Referenced standards				Y	ANSI/IWACA I-14.1—01: Standard for Window Cleaning 3114.1			review for proper version						
880	Referenced standards				Y	A18.1—2017: Safety Standard for Platform Lifts and Stairway Chairlifts 1109.8, Table 3001.3			review for proper version						
881	Referenced standards				Y	ANSI MH29.1—12: Safety Requirements for Industrial Scissors Lifts Table 3001.3			review for proper version						
882	Referenced standards				Y	99—12: Health Care Facilities Code 407.11, 422.6, 425.1			review for proper version						
883	Referenced standards				Y	101—12: Life Safety Code 1029.6.2			review for proper version						



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/15/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 202 Definitions- Sidewalk, public

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
IBC Section 201 Definitions: Sidewalk, public

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Sidewalk, public . A sidewalk located in the public right-of-way and a sidewalk from a public entrance to the public right-of-way or passenger loading zone, or parking made available to the public.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
Yes, Minnesota Rule 4715, the Minnesota Plumbing Code, Section 1101.2.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
There has been confusion regarding the interpretation of what is a public sidewalk as implied in the building code section 3201.4 and the prohibition of storm water roof drainage onto a public sidewalk being interpreted as all sidewalks.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Minnesota Rule 1305 only regulates roof discharge onto sidewalks in the public way. Minnesota does have seasons where roof discharge may freeze and create ice when coming into contact with the ground or sidewalks. The plumbing code strict interpretation would apply to all sidewalks that could be potentially used by the public, even if only during emergency situations. Since the building code does not address multiple hazards occurring simultaneously even when likely, such as earthquake and fire, it is reasonable to not regulate discharge onto sidewalks only intended for emergency means of egress or general maintenance. Furthermore, because of the potential icing condition, it is reasonable to be more restrictive than the model building code and prohibit storm water discharge onto both sidewalks in the public way and sidewalks used as a means to enter a building.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
Since the prohibition of discharging roof storm water onto secondary sidewalks will be removed, the overall cost of construction should decrease.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Roof discharge for primary and secondary roof drainage systems will continue to need to be piped to approved discharge locations at increased expense to construction.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/11/2022

Email address: Greg.Metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: 202 Definitions

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Ambulatory Care Facility

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? List Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
202 Definitions- Ambulatory Care Facility

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

[BG] Ambulatory Care Facility. “Ambulatory care facility” means buildings or portions of buildings used to provide medical, surgical, psychiatric, nursing, or similar care no less than 24-hour basis to individuals who are rendered incapable of self-preservation by the services provided. For the purposes of this code, federally certified end-stage renal disease facilities (kidney dialysis facilities) located on the level of exit discharge shall not be considered ambulatory care facilities. An ambulatory care facility which is not located within a building containing an I-2 occupancy hospital shall be considered as “freestanding out-patient surgical center.”

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
To clarify when ambulatory care facilities are defined as “state licensed facilities” in accordance with Minnesota Statute 326B.103, Subd. 13.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
MN DLI/CCLD has jurisdiction over other state licensed facilities where care recipients are rendered incapable of self-preservation. Clarifying this definition will ensure the life-safety of care recipients who receive care in municipalities that do not enforce the Minnesota State Building Code.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
Consider if all ambulatory care facilities that are located outside of an I-2 occupancy of a hospital should be interpreted as a “freestanding outpatient surgical center.” Would lead to better uniformity and clarity of responsibility.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change. This is a clarifying modification to an addendum to positively link Minnesota Statute 326B definitions with the rules to unify enforcement.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, health care providers in the outpatient surgical business.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None. The cost of plan review and inspections is paid for through plan review and permitting fees which are scaled to the value of the work being performed.
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting the amendment to the definition will perpetuate confusion as to whether certain ambulatory care facilities are under DLI/CCLD jurisdiction or not. Projects where people will be rendered incapable of self-preservation will be constructed without public safety verification.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 4/14/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1305

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Definition: Restricted entrance

Code or rule section to be changed: IBC Section 202 Definitions

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
202 Definitions: Restricted Entrance

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.
RESTRICTED ENTRANCE. An entrance that is made available for common use on a controlled basis, but not public use, and that is not a service entrance. A controlled basis is where entry access is verified by security personnel and entry is limited to authorized occupants and excludes their guests or companions.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
NO

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)
With the current definition of restricted entrances, there is a misinterpretation that locking a door and requiring a card or key for access makes the entrance a restricted entrance. With the requirement for automatic doors added to the codes for all public entrances, this becoming even more of an issues for hotels and office buildings.
The following is from the guidance for the US Access Board.
Restricted Entrances [§206.4.7] If entrances are restricted to certain occupants on a controlled basis, at least one must comply in addition to public entrances required to be accessible. This applies to those entrances where entry access is verified by security personnel and is strictly limited to certain occupants, but no one else, including guests or companions of authorized individuals. All other types of entrances, excluding service entrances, are considered “public entrances” under the Standards, including employee-only entrances requiring keys or access cards or codes but that lack the level of security of restricted entrances

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
This addition to the definition reduced confusion and clarifies code requirement

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
This is an editorial change and should not impact the cost of construction.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.
No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
NA
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change will perpetuate the current misinterpretation of the code requirements resulting in structures that are out of compliance with both state accessibility codes and federal regulations.
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings by a vote of 14-0 and is unlikely to be overturned at the final action hearings and voting. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 1/24/2023

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Table 302.2 Care Facilities

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC Table 302.2 Care Facilities

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Type of Licensed Facility		Number or Type of Care Recipients	IBC Occupancy Classification
Clinical Care Facility	Nursing and Medical Care for < 24 hours	Care recipients are capable of self-preservation. Includes skilled medical care, emergency care, surgery, or obstetrics.	B
Ambulatory Care Facility	Nursing and Medical Care for < 24 hours	Care recipients may be rendered incapable of self-preservation. Includes skilled medical care, emergency care, surgery, obstetrics, or patient stabilization for psychiatric detox.	B

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

- Why is the proposed code change needed?
Clinical care facilities are not currently directly addressed except for those defined as Ambulatory Care Facilities. Ambulatory Care Facilities include patients who are rendered incapable of self-preservation, typically by anesthesia.
- Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It clarifies that there are some types of clinical care facilities that get classified as a B occupancy, but don't need to follow all of the building code criteria of an Ambulatory Care Facility because they don't render care recipients incapable of self-preservation, like natural birthing centers.
- What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

- Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change.
- If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
- Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No

4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued confusion over whether care facilities providing services less than 24 hours need to provide for all of the requirements listed for Ambulatory Care Facilities.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/18/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 303.3.1 Dining accessory to places of worship

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC 303.3.1 Dining accessory to places of worship

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

303.3.1 Dining accessory to places of religious worship. Banquet halls and similar dining facilities (including associated kitchens) are not considered separate occupancies to A-3 places of religious worship.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
Dining facilities are very frequently associated with places of worship. Since sprinkler thresholds for dining facilities are significantly lower than *places of religious worship* and occupant loads frequently double-count the occupants actually using the spaces, these types of facilities require sprinkling long before the practical occupant load would require sprinkling.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The proposed change will enhance uniform construction standards since Minnesota Statute 326B.108 has been revised to not require sprinkling of *places of public accommodation* until there are 300 occupants. Since wedding venues are a primary type of *place of public accommodation* and *places of religious worship* provide similar functions, it is reasonable to modify code language so that they are treated similarly.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
Will tend to decrease costs for places of religious worship that include banquet facilities because it will raise the sprinkler threshold from 100 to 300 occupants.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?

Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, religious organizations that own buildings.

2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
Discrepancy and non-uniformity in application of sprinkler requirements between secular wedding venues as a *place of public accommodation* and *places of religious worship*.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/19/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 305.2.1 Group E day care in Places of Religious Worship

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC 305.2.1 Group E, day care within places of religious worship.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

305.2.1 Group E, day care within places of religious worship. Rooms and spaces within places of religious worship providing such day care during religious functions shall be classified as part of the primary occupancy. Rooms and spaces within places of religious worship providing day care during periods when religious functions are not occurring shall be classified as occupancy group I-4 or group E.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
To clarify the model code language that the exception for day care only applies when the building is occupied in other portions (presumably by parents) for religious functions. If the day care is run as a business during the week, the occupancy exemption does not apply.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It merely clarifies the existing code language to enhance uniformity.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, religious organizations that own buildings and run day care.

2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued non-uniformity in enforcement of Section 305.2.1 and confusion upon the parts of designers, building officials and building owners as to how this provision is to be applied.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/26/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 308.5.1 Classification as Group E

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
IBC Section 308.5.1 Classification as Group E.

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

308.5.1 Classification as Group E. Day care and day services uses ~~shall~~may be classified as Group E occupancies subject to sections 308.5.1.1 through 308.5.1.3.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
The reclassification of Group I-4 daycare or day services to Group E is not always advantageous. Typically Group I-4 has greater safety criteria and building owners constructing these facilities should have the option to maintain the higher construction standard if they chose. The change from “shall” to “may” can eliminate an occupancy separation.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Allowing the higher standard of care for construction to remain as an option only enhances end-user safety and allows designers greater flexibility in design.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
There should be no cost change because the rewording takes a mandate and makes it an option.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, schools, places of worship, daycare facilities.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None

3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Care facilities may be required to include occupancy separations where they would rather have a more open plan.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/26/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 308.5.1.2 Adult Day Services as Group E

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
IBC Section 308.5.1.2 Adult Day Services as Group E.

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

308.5.1.2 Adult day service centers serving both persons capable and persons not capable of self preservation. Adult day service centers shall may be classified as Group E where all of the following conditions are met:

- a. ~~At least one person served but not~~ Not more than 50 percent of persons served require limited assistance with self-preservation under emergency conditions.
 - b. All rooms and spaces used to care for adults shall be on a level of exit discharge and all means of egress from care rooms shall discharge directly to grade with no intervening stairs, elevators, or places of rescue assistance along the means of egress. The exit discharge shall have no intervening stairs or areas of rescue assistance and shall lead to the public way or safe dispersal area in accordance with the exception to section 1028.5. ~~The rooms in which the adults are cared for are located on the level of exit discharge serving such rooms, with all exits discharging directly to grade without intervening stairs. Each exit discharge shall provide an accessible route, without stairs, to the public way or safe dispersal area in accordance with the exception to section 1028.5.~~
 - c. The day services center is protected with an automatic fire alarm system consisting of automatic smoke detection in all corridors and at the top of all stairways, and automatic detection in boiler and furnace rooms, kitchens, storage rooms, custodial closets, laundry and soiled linen rooms and other hazardous areas.
4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
 - a. There need not be at least one person that requires limited assistance in order for this reclassification to occur.
 - b. Limited assistance is added because the term was added in the previous code cycle to the model building code as a descriptor for I-1 Condition 2 which is a very similar care recipient type that may require adult day services.
 - c. Language is changed regarding the means of egress to clarify that elevators, lifts, or areas of rescue assistance are not to be part of the means of egress. The means of egress should be walking surfaces or ramps only, with no other impediment to egress. Egress must be to grade from the care spaces, but need not be directly from the care spaces themselves, but may proceed through corridors or intervening rooms.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The code change clarifies the requirement without materially changing the requirement.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
There should be no cost change because the rewording clarifies the condition required for reclassification rather than introducing a material change.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, schools, places of worship, daycare facilities.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Adult day service facilities could be designed with lifts or elevators to convey care recipients from one level to another, not a full story, or means of egress could include areas of rescue assistance. Scenarios inhibit egress which is counter to the intent of the amendment.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz, Ryan Rehn, Britt McAdamis

Date: 7/15/2022 revised 7/17/2024

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 308.5.1.3 Child Day Care

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
IBC Section 308.5.1.3 Child day care.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

308.5.1.3 Child day care. A child day care facility ~~shall~~ may be classified as a Group E occupancy where all of the following conditions apply:

- a. The facility provides care for more than five but not more than 100 children 2 ½ years or less of age.
- b. The rooms in which the children 2 ½ years or less of age are cared for are located on the level of exit discharge serving such rooms.
- c. Each room providing day care to children 2 ½ years or less of age, has an exit door directly to the exterior, and the exit discharge from the exterior exit doors serving rooms providing care shall not include stairs.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?

There has been confusion regarding the exit discharge requirements for daycare rooms. Level of exit discharge does not mean that the exit discharge is at or near finished grade, but merely that a door passes through an exterior wall. Level of exit discharge is defined as a story where exits end and exit discharge begins. Requiring the day care to be located on the level of exit discharge does not guarantee that exit doors from care providing spaces discharge to grade where a walk-out basement condition exists. The intent of the section is that there is free and uninhibited egress from care providing spaces. If the means of egress is from the underground side of a walk-out basement condition or significantly above grade, there may be stairs to negotiate with day care children, slowing egress.

A pointer was added to make it clear that only the rooms where the children 2 ½ years or less of age are cared for or occupied would need to comply with these provisions.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The requirement is already in code. A Minnesota amendment negates the condition for existing buildings, but should be required for daycare even in existing buildings because the classification as an E occupancy eliminates the requirement for a sprinkler system for facilities under 12,000 square feet.

3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?

None.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.

There should be no cost change because the condition is already required by IBC 1009.1. Including the language here is a clarification for uniformity.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.

N/A

3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, schools, places of worship, daycare facilities.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Daycare facilities without protective sprinkler systems located above or below grade where children do not have ease of access to safety in emergency conditions like fire.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz, Britt McAdamis, Ryan Rehn Date: 7/18/2022 updated 7/17/2024

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 310.4.2 Lodging House

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IBC and IBC/IFC Coordination

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process?

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
IBC Section 310.4.2 Lodging house
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

(2024 IBC) 310.4.2 Lodging houses. *Owner*-occupied *lodging houses* Lodging houses with five or fewer *guest rooms* shall be constructed in accordance with this code or the *International Residential Code*, ~~provided that facilities constructed using the *International Residential Code* are protected by an automatic sprinkler system is installed in accordance with Section P2904 of the *International Residential Code*.~~

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?

It is necessary to delete the last sentence as automatic residential fire sprinklers are addressed for lodging houses under the Minnesota Rule part 1309.0313 and automatic sprinkler systems for lodging houses are addressed under Minnesota Rule part 1305.0903.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change should proceed in conjunction with consistency in sprinkler requirements between the Minnesota Residential Code and Minnesota Building Code.

3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.

Proposed change will clarify and potentially decrease costs for a building.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.

N/A

3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?

Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners/ home owners.

2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued confusion over requirements specific to using Minnesota Residential Code scoped buildings verses using Minnesota Building Code requirements for transient use.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 5/30/2024

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 406.2.7 Electric Vehicle Charging & IBC 2704

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
MBC 406.2.7 Electric Vehicle Charging.

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

MBC 202 Definitions
MBC 2704 Electric Vehicle Charging

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

202 Definitions Add the following:

DIRECT CURRENT FAST CHARGING (DCFC) ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT (EVSE): “Direct current fast charging (DCFC) electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE)” means equipment capable of fast charging on a 100 amp or higher 480V AC three-phase branch circuit. AC power is converted into a controlled DC voltage and current within the EVSE that will then directly charge the electric vehicle.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV): A passenger motor vehicle for on-road use that is powered by an electric motor drawing current from a building electrical service, EVSE, a rechargeable storage battery, a fuel cell, a photovoltaic array, or another source of electric current. EV includes battery electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles but does not include electric bicycles.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) CAPABLE SPACE: “Electric Vehicle (EV) capable space” means a designated automobile parking space for which there is sufficient electrical capacity available and installed on premises to supply EVSE that provides at a minimum Level 2 charging. An EV-Capable space has electrical infrastructure, including but not limited to portions of raceways, cables, and conduits, and panelboard or other electrical distribution space necessary for the future installation of a Level 2 electric vehicle charging station.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) CHARGING STATION. “Electric vehicle (EV) charging station” means a designated automobile parking space that has a dedicated connection for charging an electric vehicle using Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE).

ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) READY SPACE: “Electric Vehicle (EV) ready space” means a designated automobile parking space that has sufficient electrical capacity installed in the space by means of a branch circuit or other means permitted by the Minnesota Electrical Code and capable of supporting the installation of an electric vehicle charging station providing at a minimum Level 2 charging.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT (EVSE): Electrical circuitry and equipment dedicated to EV charging including conductors, connectors, attachment accoutrements, personnel protection, power outlets, apparatus and equipment installed for connecting an electric vehicle to premise wiring for the purposes of charging, power export, or bidirectional current flow.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT (EVSE) INSTALLED SPACE: “Electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) installed space” means a parking space provided with EVSE equipment that at a minimum provides Level 2 charging. For purposes of this chapter “EVSE-installed space” has the same meaning as “electric vehicle charging station.”

LEVEL 2 CHARGING EQUIPMENT. “Level 2 charging equipment” means EVSE charging equipment supplied by not less than 30 amps at 208/240 volts single-phase.

PARKING FACILITIES. “Parking facilities” means parking lots, garages, ramps, or decks within or adjacent to buildings that are used for parking passenger motor vehicles.

PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLE. “Passenger motor vehicle” means any motor vehicle that is not a commercial motor vehicle.

406.2.7 Electric vehicle charging stations and systems. Electric vehicle charging facilities shall be installed in accordance with this section.

406.2.7.1 Scoping. In each location where parking facilities are provided, the number of parking spaces equipped as EVSE-Installed Space, EV-Ready Space, and EV-Capable Space shall be provided in accordance with this section. Where more than one parking facility is

provided on a site, EVSE-Installed, EV-Ready, and EV-Capable spaces shall be calculated using the aggregate number of parking stalls provided. Fractions shall be rounded up to the next higher whole number. EVSE-Installed, EV-Ready, and EV-Capable Spaces are permitted to be allocated across the gross parking area provided the allocation complies with the accessibility requirements of section 406.2.7.5.

Exception: Exclusively residential structures with four or fewer dwelling units shall only be required to provide a conduit from the electrical panel to one parking space.

406.2.7.2 Installed Spaces Exceeding Minimums. EVSE-Installed Spaces that exceed the minimum number of required EVSE-Installed Spaces may be used to satisfy requirements of EV-Ready and EV-Capable Spaces. Installed EV-Capable Spaces that exceed the minimum number of required EV-Capable Spaces may be used to satisfy requirements of EV-Ready Spaces.

406.2.7.3 Identification. EVSE-Installed Spaces shall be identified by permanent signage reading “Electric Vehicle Charging.” A permanent and visible label shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the service panel to identify each panel space reserved for future EVSE as required for EV-Capable and EV-Ready Spaces. Raceway termination points for EV-Capable and EV-Ready Spaces shall be labeled as reserved for EVSE Equipment.

406.2.7.4 Number of Dedicated Parking Spaces. EVSE-Installed Spaces, EV-Ready Spaces and EV-Capable Spaces shall be provided in quantities in accordance with Table 406.2.7.4. Where the calculation of percent served results in a fractional parking space, it shall round up to the next whole number.

Exception: Where EVSE-Installed, EV-Ready, and EV-Capable spaces are provided in accordance with section 2704.2.

Total Number of Parking Spaces (including charging spaces)	EVSE-Installed	EV-Ready	EV-Capable
5-25	0	0	2 ^a
26-50	2	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
51-75	3	2	11
76-100	4	3	15
101-150	6	5	23
151-200	8	6	30
201-300	12	9	45
301-400	15	11	62
401-500	20	15	75
501+	20 + 2% of the total number of spaces above 500	15 + 1.5% of the total number of spaces above 500	75 + 7% of the total number of spaces above 500

- a. A minimum of one EV-Capable Space shall comply with the accessibility requirements of sections 406.2.7.5 and is permitted to be adjacent to an accessible parking space.

406.2.7.4.1 EV-Capable Spaces. Each EV-Capable Space used to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4 shall comply with Section 2704.1.1.

406.2.7.4.2 EV-Ready Spaces. Each branch circuit, or other means permitted by the Minnesota Electrical Code, serving EV-Ready Spaces used to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4 shall comply with Section 2704.1.2.

406.2.7.4.3 EVSE-Installed Spaces. An installed EVSE with multiple charging plug connections is permitted to serve the same number of EVSE-Installed spaces as charging plug connections. Each EVSE installed to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4, serving either a single EVSE-Installed Space or multiple EVSE-Installed Spaces, shall comply with section 2704.1.3.

406.2.7.5 Accessibility. Where parking is provided, accessible EVSE-Installed Spaces and accessible EV-Capable Spaces shall be provided in compliance with the Minnesota Accessibility Code Scoping Section 1107 and Technical Section A117.1 502.11.

ADD:

2704 Electric vehicle charging stations and systems.

2704.1 General. Where provided, electric vehicle charging systems shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70. Electric vehicle charging system equipment shall be *listed* and *labeled* in accordance with UL 2202. Electric vehicle supply equipment shall be *listed* and *labeled* in accordance with UL 2594. Installations shall be in accordance with this section.

2704.1.1 EV-Capable Spaces. Each EV-Capable Space used to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4 shall comply with the following:

1. A raceway or cable assembly shall be installed between a junction box or outlet located within 3 feet (914mm) of the EV-Capable Space and electrical distribution equipment where the route of the raceway or cable assembly is located underground, or within a wall assembly or ceiling assembly.
2. Installed raceway or cable assembly shall be sized and rated to supply a minimum circuit capacity in accordance with Section 2704.4
3. The electrical distribution equipment to which the raceway or cable assembly connects shall have dedicated space for an overcurrent protection device and electrical capacity to supply a calculated load in accordance with Section 2704.4.
4. The junction box or outlet and the electrical distribution equipment directory shall be marked “For electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE).”

2704.1.2 EV-Ready Spaces. Each branch circuit, or other means permitted by the Minnesota Electrical Code, serving EV-Ready Spaces used to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4 shall comply with the following:

1. Terminate at an outlet or junction box located within 3 feet (914 mm) of each EV-Ready Space it serves.
2. Have a minimum system and circuit capacity in accordance with 2704.4.
3. The electrical distribution equipment directory shall designate the branch circuit as “For electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE)” and the outlet or enclosure shall be marked “For electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE).”

2704.1.3 EVSE-Installed Spaces. An installed EVSE with multiple charging plug connections is permitted to serve the same number of EVSE-Installed spaces as charging plug connections. Each EVSE

installed to meet the requirements of Section 406.2.7.4, serving either a single EVSE-Installed Space or multiple EVSE-Installed Spaces, shall comply with the following:

1. Have minimum system and circuit capacity in accordance with Section 2704.4.
2. Have a nameplate rating not less than 7.2 kVA.
3. Be located within 3 feet (914 mm) of each EVSE-Installed Space it serves.
4. Be installed in accordance with the equipment manufacturers recommended instructions.

2704.2 Alternative Compliance Power Allocation Method. The alternative power allocation method shall be permitted as an alternative to the requirements of section 2704.1. The total power in kVA shall be determined based on the number of parking spaces in accordance with Table 2704.2. EV charging provided using the alternative power allocation method shall include the following:

1. Any kVA combination of EV-Capable Spaces, EV-Ready Spaces, Level 2 charging equipment, or Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) equipment;
2. The total kVA utilized for EVSE-Installed Level 2 or DCFC spaces shall meet or exceed the minimum required by Table 2704.2; and
3. At least one space but not fewer than 25 percent of the total available parking spaces shall be provided with Level 2 charging.

Table 2704.2 Alternative Compliance Power Allocation		
Total number of parking spaces	Total Minimum kVA required in any combination of EVSE-Installed Level 2^a, or DCFC, EV-Ready, or EV-Capable at 7.2 kVA	Minimum required kVA for EVSE-Installed Level 2 or DCFC Spaces^b
5-25	14.4	0
26-50	93.6	23.4
51-75	115.2	28.8
76-100	158.4	39.6
101-150	244.8	61.2
151-200	316.8	79.2
201-300	475.2	118.8
301-400	633.6	158.4
401-500	792	198
501+	10.5% of the total number of spaces above 500 x 7.2 + 792	2% of the total number of spaces above 500 x 7.2 + 198

a. Level 2 EVSE has minimum nameplate rating of 7.2 kVA.

2704.3 Electric power supply. The building electrical service shall supply electricity to EV-Capable, EV-Ready, and EVSE-Installed Spaces located in parking ramps, parking garages, or other parking facility constructed in accordance with Minnesota Rules, chapter 1305. The electricity is permitted to be supplied from a source other than the building electrical service for EV-Capable, EV-Ready, and EVSE-Installed Spaces located in parking lots.

2704.4 System and circuit capacity. The system and circuit capacity shall comply with this section.

2704.4.1 Circuits for electric vehicle charging. The service panel shall provide sufficient capacity and space to accommodate the circuit and over-current protective device for each EVSE-Installed, EV-Ready and EV-Capable Space. Circuits for EVSE-Installed, EV-Ready and EV-Capable Spaces shall have no other outlets. Termination points for EV-Ready and EV-Capable Spaces shall be located where proposed future equipment for such purposes is intended to be installed.

2704.4.2 System Capacity. The electrical distribution equipment supplying the branch circuits serving each EV-Capable Space, EV-Ready Space, and EVSE-Installed Space shall have a calculated load of 7.2 kVA or the nameplate rating of the equipment whichever is larger, for each EV-Capable Space, EV-Ready Space, and EVSE-Installed Space.

2704.4.3 Circuit Capacity. The branch circuit serving each EV-Capable Space, EV-Ready Space, and EVSE-Installed Space shall have a rated capacity not less than 30 amperes at 208/240-volt capacity or the nameplate rating of the equipment, whichever is larger.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
Yes, changes current Minnesota Rule 1305, Section 408.9.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
There is a legislative mandate to include electric vehicle charging requirements for parking associated with buildings.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The proposed makes provisions for installed EV charging ability for anticipated need within the next three years, ready capacity which only requires the final equipment installation to meet anticipated demand in 2030 and electrical capacity to meet projected demand in 2035.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
There has already been a TAG convened to craft this specific proposed language. The change is moving it into the building code rather than incorporating it into the energy code. It is more appropriate that scoping comes from the building code because the focus is not building energy conservation.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
Proposed changes will increase construction costs.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
The added scope increasing construction costs uses the most conservative projections for electric vehicle utilization over the next ten years.
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has

less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No. Other than positional verification, the verification of electrical provisions will be done exclusively by state employees.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Electrical inspectors, building owners and building tenants.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
DLI violation of state statute for not incorporating electric vehicle charging requirements into the state building code.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/26/2022 updated 7/15/2024

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 406.5.7 Means of Egress

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
MBC 406.5.7 Means of Egress

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

(2020 MBC) 406.5.7 Means of egress. Where persons other than parking attendants are permitted, open parking garages shall meet the *means of egress* requirements of Chapter 10. Where no persons other than parking attendants are permitted, there shall be on each level, 36-inch (914mm) doors entering not less than two 36-inch (914mm) wide exit stairways separated by not less than 1/3 the greatest diagonal distance of each floor plate. Lifts shall be permitted to be installed for use of employees only, provided that they are completely enclosed by noncombustible materials.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
To ensure that there are two viable means of egress from any location in the parking structure. Current code language would allow a separated double helix exit stairway to suffice, satisfying the letter of the code, but effectively only providing one means of egress.

The last sentence addressing lifts is picked up from the 2024 UBC language and carried forward as written.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It provides clarity for other basic tenants of the code, like exit separation, which are implied by requiring two exit stairways, but not explicitly identified. Travel distance to those exit stairways is still technically unlimited.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
If travel distance should be limited. If sprinklers should be required when using this provision.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change. This is a very rarely used provision and the code change is more of a clarification.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, commercial parking building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
May be leveraging of the amendment to construct a parking facility with unsafe exiting conditions even if only open to employees/ parking attendants.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 8/31/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 410.5.3.6 Technical production area: guards

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
IBC 410.5.3.6 Technical production area guards

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

410.5.3.6 Technical production area guards. Guards shall be provided at all technical production areas where walking surfaces are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a fall hazard greater than 30 inches (762 mm) in vertical drop. Guards shall be designed such that a 21 inch (533 mm) diameter sphere shall not pass through. Guards may be partially demountable or removable in order to access and install technical equipment.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
The section is very specific to technical production areas and means of egress is specifically addressed, but guards are not. The implication is that in this specific application, no guard protection is required. Technical production areas are often high in a space and very dark. Guards are necessary to protect the safety of the technical production team, which may include students in schools.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Application is consistent with guard protection required at other working locations in the building code such as factories and locations where workers are accessing other types of equipment.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
Yes. Since guards are not currently required, the material and installation cost for guards along technical production areas will increase the cost of construction.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
Yes. Technical production areas in theaters, playhouses, convention centers and similar venues tend to be very high and fall hazards great. The technical production areas are typically poorly lit so that they are not obtrusive to patrons. Guards will prevent the injury and potentially death of workers on catwalks and in fly galleries.
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Potential falls of workers in technical production areas which may include students in these types of spaces located in schools.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/28/2022 updated 7/15/2024

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 423.5.1 Storm Shelter Required Occupant Capacity

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
IBC 423.5.1 Required Occupant Capacity

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Option 1:

423.5.1 Design occupant capacity. The required design occupant capacity of the storm shelter shall include all of the buildings on the site and shall be the total occupant load of the classrooms, vocational rooms and offices in the Group E occupancy.

Exceptions:

1. Where approved by the building official, the actual number of occupants for whom each occupied space, floor or building is designed, although less than that determined by occupant load calculation, shall be permitted to be used in the determination of the required design occupant capacity for the storm shelter.
2. Where a new building is being added on an existing Group E site, and where the new building is not of sufficient size to accommodate the required design occupant capacity of the *storm shelter* for all of the buildings on site, the ~~storm shelter shall accommodate not less than the required occupant capacity for the new building~~ new building shall be constructed as a storm shelter.
3. Where approved by the *building official*, the required design occupant capacity of the shelter shall be permitted to be reduced by the design occupant capacity of any existing *storm shelters on the site.*

Option 2:

423.5.1 Design occupant capacity. The required design occupant capacity of the storm shelter shall include all of the buildings on the site and shall be the total occupant load of the classrooms, vocational rooms and offices in the Group E occupancy.

Exceptions:

1. Where approved by the building official, the actual number of occupants for whom each occupied space, floor or building is designed, although less than that determined by occupant load calculation, shall be permitted to be used in the determination of the required design occupant capacity for the storm shelter.
2. Where a new building is being added on an existing Group E site, and where the new building is not of sufficient size to accommodate the required design occupant capacity of the *storm shelter* for all of the buildings on site, the *storm shelter* shall accommodate not less than the ~~required occupant capacity for the new building~~ number of occupants in the new building requiring storm sheltering.
3. Where approved by the *building official*, the required design occupant capacity of the shelter shall be permitted to be reduced by the design occupant capacity of any existing *storm shelters on the site.*

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
The model code lacks clear scoping for new buildings on existing school sites. The intent of the code is to provide storm sheltering for all site occupants. This will never happen if new construction only has to accommodate the occupant load of the new work. There is confusion when the new building is not large enough to construct a storm shelter for the entire site.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Option 1: The intent of the code is to provide storm sheltering for the entire site. The new building will not be required to be made larger merely to accommodate storm sheltering, but it shall maximize the storm sheltering within the new program spaces provided.

Option 2: Requiring an entire new structure to be constructed as a storm shelter causes undue financial hardship on projects. The new construction will need to only accommodate storm sheltering for the newly added occupants to the site. The existing conditions in other buildings are no worse than they were prior to the construction of the new building, and therefore will remain as "existing non-conforming."
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed change will not increase construction costs. DLI/CCLD has first jurisdiction over schools and has interpreted that new construction which cannot provide storm sheltering for the entire site must be constructed completely as storm shelter to its greatest capacity within the program requirements for primary use.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, public and private schools in the southern half of the state.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued confusion and frustration over storm shelter capacity requirements resulting in compromised budgets for public school projects.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/27/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC Table 506.2 Allowable Area Factor

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC Table 506.2 Allowable Area Factor

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Occ Class	Sprink	Type of Construction											
		Type I		Type II		Type III		Type IV				Type V	
		A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	C	HT	A	B
R-3	NS	UL	UL	24,000	16,000	24,000	16,000	61,500	41,000	25,625	20,500	12,000	7,000
	S13D												
	S13R												
	S1												
	SM												
				96,000	64,000	96,000	64,000	246,000	164,000	102,500	82,000	48,000	28,000
				72,000	48,000	72,000	48,000	184,500	123,000	76,875	61,500	36,000	21,000

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?

Minnesota amends the model code to not require sprinkling in R-3 occupancies. The model code presupposes that all residential occupancies are sprinkled, so the unlimited area allowance for R-3 is reasonable. But, in Minnesota, because R-3 is not required to be sprinkled, limits need to be placed on building size so that the fire load does not exceed that which fire fighters can reasonable manage.

Also, IBC 706.1.1 Exception 2 allows for the elimination of firewalls between buildings even when lot-lines exist as long as the building meets the requirements for unlimited height and area. If an R-3 dwelling unit can exist on a single lot with multiple R-3 units behind and to each side, and the allowable area is unlimited, then this creates a condition for an infinite number of single-family attached homes open on one side with no sprinkler system and no fire wall separations.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposal repeats the same allowable area limits for R-1, R-2, and R-4 occupancies for each construction type and sprinkler scenario.

3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.

The proposed will increase construction costs for very large single-family and two-family dwellings that are not for private use. These uses may include supervised living facilities, assisted living, hospice and congregate residences among others.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.

The cost is readily offset by the increase in safety by the addition of sprinkler systems for very large structures.

3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Mis-use of the R-3 occupancy classification in order to avoid sprinkling buildings that would otherwise be required to be sprinkled.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 8/18/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 602.3 Type III Construction

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
IBC 602.3 Type III

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

602.3 Type III. Type III construction is that type of construction in which the exterior walls are of non-combustible materials and the interior building elements are of any material permitted by this code. Fire-retardant-treated wood framing and sheathing complying with Section 2303.2 shall be permitted within exterior wall assemblies of a 2-hour rating or less. Construction to the exterior side of exterior walls shall be non-combustible.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
Because Section 602.3 Type III construction requires the exterior walls to be non-combustible and allows the interior of the building to be constructed of any materials allowed by the code, exterior construction other than that specific to exterior walls themselves such as exterior decks, and exterior exit stairways is not addressed.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The exterior walls are intended to provide fire protection from building to building and to provide vertical integrity under fire conditions. If other exterior building components are contributing to a fire, it diminishes the protection afforded from building to building and also compromises the exterior wall by having fuel on both sides.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change. This is already a reasonable interpretation but has been cause for arguments between building officials and designers.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?

Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.

2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
Non-uniform code enforcement and having some Type III buildings constructed with combustible exterior construction including decks and exterior stairways that compromise the building safety.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/10/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 705.2.1 705.2.2, 705.2.4, 705.2.5

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Combustible projections

Code or rule section to be changed: 705.2.1 705.2.2, 705.2.4, 705.2.5

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes No

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

705.7.1

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

705.2.1 Types I and II construction.

Projections from walls of Type I or II construction shall be of noncombustible materials or combustible materials as allowed by Sections ~~705.2.3.1 and~~ 705.2.4 and 705.2.5.

705.2.2 Type III, IV or V construction.

Projections from walls of Type III, IV or V construction shall be of any *approved* material. Balconies and similar projections of combustible construction shall comply with section 705.2.4

~~705.2.3.1~~ 705.2.4 Combustible Balconies and similar projections.

Balconies and similar projections of combustible construction other than *fire-retardant-treated wood* shall be *fire-resistance* rated where required by Table 601 for floor construction or shall be of heavy timber construction in accordance with Section 2304.11. Wood structural elements not complying with Table 2301.11 shall not be permitted for balconies and similar projections on buildings of type IV-A, IV-B or IV-C construction. The aggregate length of the projections shall not exceed 50 percent of the *building's* perimeter on each floor.

Exceptions:

1. On *building* of Types I and II construction, three *stories* or less above *grade plane*, *fire-retardant-treated wood* shall be permitted for balconies, porches, decks and exterior *stairways* not used as required exits.
2. Untreated *wood and plastic composites* that comply with ASTM D7032 and Section 2612 are permitted for pickets, rails and similar *guard* components that are limited to 42 inches (1067 mm) in height.
3. Balconies and similar projections on *buildings* of Types III, IV-HT and V construction shall be permitted to be of Type V construction and shall not be required to have a *fire-resistance rating* where sprinkler protection is extended to these areas.
4. Where sprinkler protection is extended to the balcony areas, the aggregate length of the balcony on each floor shall not be limited.
5. On buildings of Types IV-A or IV-B construction three stories or less above grade plane and type IV-C construction not classified as high rise, non-fire resistance rated heavy timber building elements shall be permitted for balconies, porches, decks and exterior stairways not used as required exits.

~~705.2.4~~ 705.2.5 Bay and oriel windows.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

YES The following sections need to revise references from 705.2.3.1 to 705.2.4

Section 603.1, items 13 and 19

Section 705.2.1

Section 705.2.3 Item 5

Chapter 35 (ASTM D7032)

Fire code section 903.3.1.2.1 and IBC code section 903.3.1.2.1

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

Based on hierarchal reading of the code sections, it could easily be interpreted that section 705.2.3.1 only applies when the FSD is 5 feet or less. Moving combustible projection to its own section removes this potential misinterpretation.

The text changes clarify requirements for where protected construction is required as well as in the new type IV construction types.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Clarifies the code requirements for balconies of combustible construction
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
Change is mostly editorial and should not effect the cost of construction
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.
No cost change
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
NA
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change could result in misapplication of code requirements for combustible projections
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/27/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 705.6 Exterior Walls- Structural Stability

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC 705.6 Exterior Walls- Structural Stability

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~-words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

705.6 Structural stability. Interior structural elements that brace the exterior wall but that are not located within the plane of the exterior wall shall have the minimum fire-resistance rating required by Table 601 for that structural element. Structural elements that brace the exterior wall but are located outside of the exterior wall or within the plane of the exterior wall shall have a minimum fire resistance rating required in Tables 601 and Table 705.5 for the exterior wall.

Exception: Interior structural elements that brace the exterior wall and penetrate the exterior wall shall have the minimum fire-resistance rating as required by Table 601 for that structural element if the bracing element is designed to collapse without compromising the vertical load-bearing capacity of the exterior wall.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
There is non-uniform interpretation of this section with regards to the construction of Type III exterior bearing walls and the direct bearing of structural members on the exterior wall.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The most restrictive interpretation of the model code language will require that floors in Type III construction that bear directly on exterior walls (not through a ledger) must be rated not less than 2-hours. The Supporting Construction provisions of IBC 711.3 require the opposite supporting side of floor/ceiling assemblies that bear directly on and brace exterior walls to also be 2-hour fire resistance rated.

If the exterior wall serves as bearing for the roof but not for an intermediate floor, the intermediate floor may brace the wall but that intermediate floor would only be required to be fire-resistance rated to the level that Table 601 required it to be so. In Type III-A construction, that would only be one-hour and in Type III-B construction, no rating would be required at all for this bracing member.

It is therefore reasonable that if the interior bracing member (floor) fails, even if the floor bears on the wall, that if the vertical carrying capacity of the exterior wall can remain intact and elements included in the stability of that exterior wall are consistent with the construction materials and fire resistance rating of the exterior wall, that the intent of the code is satisfied and the condition is equivalent to the scenario immediately above.

3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed will decrease construction costs by allowing intermediate floor/ceiling assemblies to be rated per the interior elements requirements only and not match those of the exterior walls when the exterior walls have vertical stability should a floor collapse.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.

N/A

3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.
5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued widespread mis-interpretation of allowances for bearing walls where exterior walls are required to be fire-resistance rated.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/9/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 705.7.1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 705.7.1

Code or rule section to be changed: 705.7.1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
705.7.1

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

705.7.1 Floor assemblies supporting exterior walls in Type III, IV and V construction.

In Type III, IV and V construction where a portion of a floor assembly within the plane of the exterior wall supports gravity loads from an exterior wall, the fire-resistance rating of provided by the portion of the floor assembly that supports the exterior wall shall be not less than the fire-resistance rating required for the exterior wall in Table 601. The fire-resistance rating provided by the portion of the floor assembly supporting and within the plane of the exterior wall shall be permitted to include the contribution of the ceiling membrane when considering exposure to fire from the inside. Where a floor assembly supports gravity loads from an *exterior wall*, the *building elements* of the floor construction within the plane of the *exterior wall*, including but not limited to rim joists, rim boards and blocking, shall be in accordance with the requirements for interior *building elements* of ~~Type III~~ the applicable type of construction.

705.7.2 Supporting Construction The supporting construction for an exterior wall shall have a fire-resistance rating as required by section 704.1.1.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
NO

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

Section 705.7.1 was added to the 2024 code to address platform construction in type III construction. The same conditions will also be present in types IV and V construction so they should also be included in this code section. Section 705.7.2 is added to point to section 704.1.1 so that the supporting construction requirements are not missed. The supporting construction text has been removed from 705.7.1

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Clarifies the code requirements and includes a new pointer to ensure that supporting construction requirements are not missed.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
Change is editorial in nature and should not result in a cost increase.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.
No cost change
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
NA
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change could result in reduced protections for supporting construction related to exterior walls.
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/29/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 709.4.2 Smoke Barriers at Elevator Lobbies

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
 - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
IBC 709.4.2 Smoke Barrier walls enclosing areas of refuge or elevator lobbies
 - change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
 - delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
 - delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
 - add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

709.4.2 Smoke-barrier walls enclosing areas of refuge or elevator lobbies. Smoke-barrier walls used to enclose areas of refuge in accordance with Section 1009.6.4, or to enclose elevator lobbies in accordance with Section 405.4.3, 3007.6.2, or 3008.6.2, shall form an effective membrane enclosure that terminates at a ~~fire barrier wall having a fire resistance rating not less than 1 hour,~~ another smoke barrier wall, horizontal smoke barrier, underside of a roof deck or an outside exterior wall. A smoke and draft control door assembly as specified in Section 716.2.2.1.1 shall not be required at each elevator hoistway door ~~where protected by an elevator lobby, at each exit door opening into a protected lobby opening.~~ A smoke and draft control door assembly as specified in Section 716.2.2.1.1 shall not be required ~~or at each exit doorways~~ between an area of refuge and the exit enclosure. Areas of refuge shall be separated from the elevator hoistway by a smoke barrier.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
 - A. Smoke barrier construction should not terminate at a fire barrier because a fire barrier is not required to be constructed to resist the passage of smoke. Terminating at a fire barrier potentially compromises the smoke compartment protection.
 - B. Horizontal smoke barriers, and roof decks are added as acceptable termination locations for smoke barrier walls and “outside walls” is changed to “exterior walls” which is a defined term.
 - C. The model code language in the last sentence is confusing and easily mis-interpreted.
 - D. The last sentence is added to clarify that an area of refuge, which is intended to be a safe place to wait for rescue, must be separated from the elevator hoistway by a smoke barrier to ensure that the area of refuge habitability is not compromised by smoke during a fire.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
 - A. Fire barriers are deleted and multiple types of smoke and fire resistant construction are added as acceptable termination points for smoke barrier walls.
 - B. The last sentence is deconstructed for clarity without material change to the requirement. The first part of the sentence eliminates the requirement for smoke control at the elevator shaft door by allowing the elevator lobby to function as the smoke control protection for the building story from the elevator shaft. The second sentence is created from the second half of the model code last sentence to clarify that areas of refuge don't need to be separated from exit enclosures with smoke protection, largely because the exit enclosures provide a very high level of protection and are unlikely to be compromised by smoke. Note that the model code does not eliminate the requirement for fire protection between an area of refuge and an exit enclosure.
 - C. The last sentence is added for clarity. Then intent of an area of refuge is to provide a location that will protect the occupant from fire and smoke within the building while they wait for rescue. If there is not smoke separation between the elevator lobby and the hoistway, then the area of refuge is easily compromised with smoke from the elevator shaft.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed would cause no change to construction costs.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Exterior walls in close proximity to property lines where the wall is required to be fire-resistance rated will have breaches at penetrations that can compromise the integrity of the wall.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No

8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/26/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2018

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 713.13 Waste and Linen Chutes

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC 713.13 Waste and linen chutes and incinerator rooms, Exception

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

713.13 Waste and linen chutes and incinerator rooms. Waste and linen chutes shall comply with the provisions of NFPA 82, Chapter 6 and shall meet the requirements of Sections 712 and 713.13.1 through 713.13.6. Incinerator rooms shall meet the provisions of Sections 713.13.4 through 713.13.5.

Exceptions:

1. Chutes serving and contained within a single dwelling unit.
2. Linen chutes and trash chutes shall not be required to be open to the atmosphere as required by NFPA 82, section 5.2.2.4.3. Chutes shall be provided with vents having a free area not less than 3 1/2 % the size of the chute cross section with an absolute minimum size of 0.5 square feet of free area. Vents shall be provided with gravity dampers to allow air to enter the shaft from the building exterior. Chutes shall not be used for room exhaust.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
 - a. The 2012 Minnesota Mechanical Code had a similar exception eliminating the requirement for waste and linen chutes to be open to the atmosphere per NFPA 82. The exception was eliminated in the 2018 code cycle because it occurred in a section specific to ductwork. Chutes are not ductwork and the exception was mis-placed. The work at that time was not coordinated with the building code update and the exception was lost.
 - b. Minnesota's very cold climate causes significant problems with open atmosphere chutes. Fire sprinkler systems can freeze, cold air is introduced into the depths of the building in interior locations not designed to handle the condensation that will occur, resulting in moisture damage and microbial growth.
 - c. The previous amendment did not include any specific venting requirements. Venting is still required to ensure that the chutes do not become readily clogged. Items falling through the shaft cause negative air pressure above the falling items. If there is not ventilation relief, the falling items will slow in the shaft and can stop and cause blockages. Venting requirements introduced are based upon the same ventilation requirements for dumbwaiters which cause the same type of air pressure differential. Gravity dampers are required to ensure that when ventilation air is not needed, that chute is not open to the exterior air and potentially freezing sprinklers, etc.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

It allows for chute functioning while keeping chutes within the climate-controlled environment of the building so that they do not freeze or cause condensation damage in cold weather conditions.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?

If there is an actual need for an open vent at the top of these chutes in the event of a fire. Open atmosphere chutes create a chimney effect and can contribute to the propagation of fire.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
No cost change. The cost for the additional gravity damper is offset by costs to mitigate the affects of sub-zero air in the sprinkled shaft.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Continued need for building officials to approve code modifications to allow chutes that are not open to the atmosphere for their full size resulting in plan approval delays and increased permit fees. Mandatory installation of open-atmosphere chutes throughout the state where there is no building official to approve a code modification.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.

No

8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 7/29/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 714.4 Fire-resistance-rated walls

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
MBC 714.4 Fire-resistance-rated walls

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

714.4 Fire-resistance-rated walls. Penetrations into or through walls required to be rated by Table 602, fire walls, fire barriers, smoke barrier walls, and fire partitions shall comply with Sections 714.4.1 through 714.4.3. Penetrations in smoke barrier walls shall also comply with Section 714.5.4.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
Walls required to be rated by Table 602 are for the same purpose as fire barriers but are not specifically called out in this section as requiring protection.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Because the fire barrier function is similar, it is reasonable that the protection requirements for penetrations would also be similar.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
Opening requirements are different, duct and air transfer openings are different.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed would cause no change to construction costs.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?

No

4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?

None.

6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?

Exterior walls in close proximity to property lines where the wall is required to be fire-resistance rated will have breaches at penetrations that can compromise the integrity of the wall.

7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.

No

8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/8/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 714.5.2

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 714.5.2

Code or rule section to be changed: 714.5.2

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
714.5.2

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strike through~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

714.5.2 Membrane penetrations.

Penetrations of membranes that are part of a *horizontal assembly* shall comply with Section 714.5.1.1 or 714.5.1.2. Where floor/ceiling assemblies are required to have a *fire-resistance rating*, recessed fixtures shall be installed such that the required *fire resistance* will not be reduced.

Exceptions:

1. *Membrane penetrations* by steel, ferrous or copper conduits, pipes, tubes or vents, or concrete or masonry items where the *annular space* is protected either in accordance with Section 714.5.1 or to prevent the free passage of flame and the products of combustion. The aggregate area of the openings through the membrane shall not exceed 100 square inches (64 500 mm²) in any 100 square feet (9.3 m²) of ceiling area in assemblies tested without penetrations.
2. Ceiling *membrane penetrations* of maximum 2-hour *horizontal assemblies* by steel electrical boxes that do not exceed 16 square inches (10 323 mm²) in area, provided that the aggregate area of such penetrations does not exceed 100 square inches (44 500 mm²) in any 100 square feet (9.29 m²) of ceiling area, and the *annular space* between the ceiling membrane and the box does not exceed $\frac{1}{8}$ inch (3.2 mm).
3. *Membrane penetrations* by electrical boxes of any size or type, that have been *listed* as part of an opening protective material system for use in *horizontal assemblies* and are installed in accordance with the instructions included in the listing.
4. *Membrane penetrations* by *listed* electrical boxes of any material, provided that such boxes have been tested for use in fire- resistance-rated assemblies and are installed in accordance with the instructions included in the listing. The *annular space* between the ceiling membrane and the box shall not exceed $\frac{1}{8}$ inch (3.2 mm) unless *listed* otherwise.
5. The *annular space* created by the penetration of a fire sprinkler, provided that it is covered by a metal escutcheon plate.
6. Noncombustible items that are cast into concrete building elements and that do not penetrate both top and bottom surfaces of the element.
7. The ceiling membrane of a maximum 2-hour fire-resistance-rated *horizontal assembly* is permitted to be interrupted with the double 2x wood top plate of a wall assembly that is sheathed with *Type X gypsum wallboard*, provided that all penetrating items through the double top plates are protected in accordance with Section 714.5.1.1 or 714.5.1.2 and the ceiling membrane is tight to the top plates.
8. The ceiling membrane of a maximum 1-hour fire-resistance-rated horizontal assembly is permitted to be interrupted with a single 2x wood top plate of a wall assembly that is sheathed with Type X gypsum wallboard, provided that all penetrating items through the top plate are protected in accordance with Section 714.5.1.1 or 714.5.1.2 and the ceiling membrane is tight to the top plates.
- ~~8.9.~~ Ceiling *membrane penetrations* by *listed* luminaires (light fixtures) or by luminaires protected with *listed* materials, which have been tested for use in fire-resistance-rated assemblies and are installed in accordance with the instructions included in the listing.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

Current code language requires a double top plate but does not describe what the top plates are to be. Two 1x top plates could be acceptable. This change clarifies that they must be 2x in exception 7. Exception 8 is added to allow for single top plate wall construction that is often used to address the flex requirements in truss floor assemblies.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Clarifies the code requirement for a 2x minimum materials.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.

Change is editorial in nature and should not result in a cost increase

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.

NA

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials

2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

No

3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?

Not adopting this change could result in compromised integrity of the floor ceiling membrane and the addition exception allows for additional options for rated membrane penetrations.

4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.

This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/8/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 714.5.4

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 714.5.4

Code or rule section to be changed: 714.5.4

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
714.5.4

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

714.5.4 Penetrations in smoke barriers.

Penetrations in *smoke barriers* shall be protected by an *approved through-penetration firestop system* installed and tested in accordance with the requirements of UL 1479 for air leakage. The *L rating* of the system measured at 0.30 inch of water (74.7 Pa) in both the ambient temperature and elevated temperature tests shall meet one ~~not exceed either~~ of the following:

1. A maximum 5.0 cfm per square foot ($0.025 \text{ m}^3/\text{s} \times \text{m}^2$) of penetration opening for each *through-penetration firestop system*.
2. A maximum total cumulative leakage of 50 cfm ($0.024 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) for all through-penetration firestop systems within any 100 square feet (9.3 m^2) of wall area, or floor area.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

NO

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

This change clarifies that only one of the two criteria need to be met. Also clarifies the extent of the leakage requirements for each of the criteria.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

This section can be confusing and could be interpreted as requiring compliance with both

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.

Change is editorial in nature and should not result in a cost increase

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.

NA

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change results in allowing louvers in these egress components.
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/8/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 716.2.2.3.2 Louvers

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 716.2.2.3.2 Louvers

Code or rule section to be changed: 716.2.2.3.2 Louvers

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
716.2.2.3.2 Louvers

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

716.2.2.3.2 Louvers. Louvers are prohibited in fire door assemblies in interior exit stairways and ramps and exit passageways

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

The IBC currently requires many doors to interior exit stairways and ramps and exit passageways to comply with Section 716 Opening protectives. Section 716 requires opening protectives to comply with NFPA 80 Standard for Fire Doors and Opening Protectives. There are louvers listed and labeled to NFPA 80. Thus, louvers are currently permitted in fire door assemblies in interior exit stairways and ramps and exit passageways (except where Section 1023.12 refers to Sections 403.5.4, 405.7.2 or 412.2.2.1).

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

Louvers, even if listed should not be allowed in these means of egress components.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.

Depending on the design this could reduce the cost of construction.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.

NA

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change results in allowing louvers in these egress components.
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 8/11/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 716.2.6 Fire door hardware and closures

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
IBC 716.2.6.1 Door Closing

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

IBC 716.2.6.1 Door Closing. Fire doors shall be latching and self- ~~or automatic~~-closing in accordance with this section.

Exceptions:

1. Fire doors located in common walls separating dwelling units or sleeping units in Group R-1 shall be permitted without automatic- or self-closing devices.
 2. The elevator car doors and the associated elevator hoistway doors at the floor level designated for recall in accordance with Section 3003.2 shall be permitted to remain open during Phase I emergency recall operation, but shall be self-closing during non-emergency operations.
 3. Fire doors not installed in a control area fire barrier or laboratory suite fire barrier may be automatic-closing in accordance with this section.
 4. Fire doors installed in a control area fire barrier or laboratory suite fire barrier may be automatic-closing in accordance with this section when the automatic closing system is equipped to detect smoke, hazardous gases, toxic gasses, and corrosive gasses associated with the control area containment.
 5. Fire doors required solely for compliance with ICC 500 shall not be required to be self-closing or automatic-closing.
4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
Doors in control area fire barrier separation walls and laboratory suite fire barrier separation walls are intended to protect against toxic, corrosive, and hazardous gasses which may not be detected by standard smoke detection.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It is reasonable that automatic-closing doors should have the capacity to detect all hazards, corrosives and toxins that could migrate through open doors intended to provide protection to other areas of the building.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed would only increase construction costs for building uses containing hazardous, corrosive, or toxic gasses, and only to the extent of providing detection necessary to ensure safety if doors in the containment area perimeter are held open.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
Yes, control area containment of hazardous, toxic, or corrosive gasses during an accidental leak will add greatly to the safety of occupants in adjacent spaces.
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No

4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Accidental releases of hazardous, corrosive, or toxic gasses will not be contained in control areas designed for their containment if automatic-closing doors are installed which are not able to detect the hazard.
7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.
No
8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Greg Metz

Date: 8/11/2022

Email address: greg.metz@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC 2024

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

IBC 716.2.6.6 Smoke-activated doors

Code or rule section to be changed: MR 1305

General Information

Yes **No**

- A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? Yes No
- B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? Yes No
- C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? Yes No
- D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? Yes No
- E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? Yes No
- F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? Yes No

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
 - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
IBC 716.2.6.6 Smoke-activated doors.
 - change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
 - delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
 - delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
 - add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikeout~~ words proposed to be deleted. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

IBC 716.2.6.6 Smoke activated doors. Automatic-closing doors installed in the following locations, except where associated with Control Areas, Laboratory Suites, or Elevator Lobbies, shall be permitted to have hold-open devices. Doors shall automatically close by the actuation of smoke detector installed in accordance with Section 907.3 or by loss of power to the smoke detector or hold-open device. Doors that are automatic-closing by smoke detection shall not have more than a 10-second delay before the door starts to close after the smoke detector is actuated. Automatic-closing doors that protect openings installed in the following locations shall comply with this section:

1. In walls that separate incidental uses in accordance with Section 509.4.
 2. In fire walls in accordance with Section 706.8
 3. In fire barriers in accordance with Section 707.6
 4. In fire partitions in accordance with Section 708.6
 5. In smoke barriers in accordance with Section 709.5
 6. In smoke partitions in accordance with Section 710.5.2.3
 7. In shaft enclosures in accordance with Section 713.7
 8. In waste and linen chutes, discharge openings and access and discharge rooms in accordance with Section 713.13. Loading doors installed in waste and linen chutes shall meet the requirements of Sections 716.2.6.1 and 716.2.6.3.
4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
No.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed?
Doors in control area fire barrier separation walls and laboratory suite fire barrier separation walls are intended to protect against toxic, corrosive, and hazardous gasses which may not be detected by standard smoke detection.

Doors at elevator lobbies will also mitigate stack effect pressurization of buildings. Stack effect pressurization is the major contributor to air infiltration in buildings four stories and taller in height. Air infiltration is detrimental to indoor air quality and heating energy conservation.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
At Control Area and Laboratory Suite locations, it is reasonable that automatic-closing doors should have the capacity to detect all hazards, corrosives and toxins that could migrate through open doors intended to provide protection to other areas of the building. Detecting smoke is not enough, and hazards can change without the need for a new building permit.

Requiring that elevator lobby doors are normally closed effectively compartmentalizes tall buildings into the equivalent of multiple single-story buildings that are stacked. The pressurization due to stack effect is minimized, indoor air quality preserved, and energy efficiency optimized, just by making sure that doors are kept closed when not in use.
3. What other considerations should the TAG consider?
None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain.
The proposed would not increase construction costs. The proposed eliminates an option to allow a more expensive equipment installation for purposes of convenience. The proposed change would eliminate the option to include the added expense.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain.
N/A
3. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
4. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Engineers, Construction Contractors, Building Officials and Inspectors, Fire Officials, building owners.
2. What are the probable costs to the agency and to any other State agencies of implementing and enforcing of the proposed rule? Is there an anticipated effect on state revenues?
None
3. Are there less costly intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule?
No
4. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

The proposed change is the lowest impact option with the potential to produce desired results.

5. What are the probable costs of complying with the proposed rule, including the portion of the total costs that will be borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of governmental units, businesses, or individuals?
None.
6. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the proposed rule, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Where applied to Control Areas and Laboratory suites: Accidental releases of hazardous, corrosive, or toxic gasses will not be contained in control areas designed for their containment if automatic-closing doors are installed which are not able to detect the hazard.

Where applied to elevator lobbies: Suboptimization of energy conservation measures and continued indoor air quality issues.

7. Are you aware of any federal regulation or federal requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed rule and the federal regulation or requirement.

No

8. Please include an assessment of the cumulative effect of the rule with other federal and state regulations related to the specific purpose of the rule.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/8/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: Table 722.1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Table 722.1

Code or rule section to be changed: Table 722.1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
Table 722.1

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

722.1 General.

The provisions of this section contain procedures by which the *fire resistance* of specific materials or combinations of materials is established by calculations. These procedures apply only to the information contained in this section and shall not be otherwise used. The calculated *fire resistance* of specific materials or combinations of materials shall be established by one of the following:

1. *Concrete ,concrete masonry and clay masonry assemblies shall be permitted in accordance with ACI 216.1/TMS 0216.*
 2. *Precast and precast, prestressed concrete assemblies shall be permitted in accordance with PCI 124.*
 3. *Steel assemblies shall be permitted in accordance with Chapter 5 of ASCE 29.*
 4. *Exposed wood members and wood decking shall be permitted in accordance with Chapter 16 of ANSI/AWC NDS.*
 5. *Wood members and assemblies shall be permitted in accordance with ANSI/AWC FDS.*
4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

No

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

Added to the ANSI/AWC Fire Design Specification (FDS) for Wood Construction, which includes provisions for fire design of wood members (both protected and unprotected), wood assemblies including calculation of structural fire resistance, thermal separation and burn-through prevention, and protection of connections that are not addressed in the AWC National Design Specification (NDS) for Wood Construction (ANSI/AWC NDS).

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Provides an additional approved resource for calculating fire resistance.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
This is an editorial change and should not impact the cost of construction.
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
NA
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials
2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
Not adopting this change restriction options unnecessarily
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 5/8/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: Table 722.7.1 (1)

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Table 722.7.1 (1)

Code or rule section to be changed: Table 722.7.1 (1)

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
Table 722.7.1 (1)

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

TABLE 722.7.1(1) PROTECTION REQUIRED FROM NONCOMBUSTIBLE COVERING MATERIAL

REQUIRED FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING OF BUILDING ELEMENT PER TABLE 601 AND TABLE 705.5 (hours)	MINIMUM PROTECTION REQUIRED FROM NONCOMBUSTIBLE PROTECTION (minutes)
1	40
<u>1-1/2</u>	<u>60</u>
2	80
3 or more	120

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

NO

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)

Table 601 requires a 1-1/2 hour fire-resistance rating on roofs in Type IV-A buildings. However, that option was not originally provided in this table, nor was a footnote provided to the table permitting interpolation between rows. Because of that, there could be confusion as to how much non-combustible protection was required in these situations. The minimum non-combustible protection required in Table 722.7.1(1) is based on 2/3 of the required fire-resistance rating in Table 601 and Table 705.5.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

Clarifies the requirement of the code.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.

This is an editorial change and should not impact the cost of construction.

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

No cost change

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.

NA

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

No

5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

No

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?

Architects, Contractors, Developers, Building Owners, Contractors, Building Officials

2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

No

3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?

Not adopting this change could result in confusion as to what hourly rating and protection is required at type IV-A construction.

4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.

This change was adopted by the ICC egress committee at the April 2024 Code Action Hearings. Regardless of the ICC actions this is a significant improvement to the current code language.

***Note: Incomplete forms may be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can be considered by the TAG.