

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Brian Stemwedel

Date: 11/7/2024/2024

Email address: Bstemwedel@goldenvalleymn.gov

Model Code: Fuel Gas Code

Telephone number: (612)275-1436

Code or Rule Section: 304.11 Guards.

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: AMBO

Topic of proposal: *delete exception, reference to standard*

Code or rule section to be changed: MN Mechanical Code: Section 304.11

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

[Chapter 3, Section 304.11 MN Mechanical Code](#)

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.

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.

304.11 Guards.

Guards shall be provided where various components that require service and roof hatch openings are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof, or grade below. The guard shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) beyond each end of components that require service and each end of the roof hatch parallel to the roof edge. The top of the guard shall be located not less than 42 inches (1067 mm) above the elevated surface adjacent to the guard. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a 21-inch-diameter (533 mm) sphere and shall comply with the loading requirements for guards specified in the International Building Code.

~~Exception: Guards are not required where fall arrest/restraint anchorage connector devices that comply with ANSI/ASSP Z359.1 are installed.~~

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, Referenced Standards. Propose removal of ANSI ANSI Z359.1 in Referenced Standards

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 average annual snowfall in Minnesota varies from 36 inches in the southwest to more than 70 inches along the Lake Superior "snow belt." (Source- MN DNR).
Roof anchors, given they must withstand a minimum static load of 5,000 lb. load, do not generally exceed 24" in height from the deck attachment point. Subtract the depth of insulation on many commercial roofs, and the height above the roof surface can be substantially less than 24". As MN has average snowfall depths ranging from 30 to over 70 inches annually in some locations, rooftop anchors are concealed and not accessible.
Guards are intrinsically safer, as you do not need additional equipment, or to 'tie off' to anchors to mitigate risk, especially in inclement weather or when anchors are concealed by ice and snow.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The deletion of the exception is a reasonable solution given that required anchors are not accessible during times when they are concealed by snow.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
The TAG should also consider that when the anchors are concealed, to expose them workers would need to expose themselves to the very risk the anchor system was installed to address.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
The cost of installing guards would be offset by the cost of the anchor system (which would not be installed).
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.
N/A
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
N/A
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
N/A
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.
N/A

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Contractors, Designers, Owners, Code 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?
Risk of serious injury or death
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.
No

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

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Brian Stemwedel

Date: 11/8/24

Email address: Bstemwedel@goldenvalleymn.gov

Model Code: IFGC

Telephone number: (612)275-1436

Code or Rule Section: 306.6 Guards.

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: AMBO

Topic of proposal: delete exception,
reference to standard

Code or rule section to be changed: IFGC Section 306.6

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

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 the climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

[Chapter 3, Section 306.6 MN Fuel Gas Code](#)

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.

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.

[M] 306.6 Guards.

Guards shall be provided where various components that require service and roof hatch openings are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof, or grade below. The guard shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) beyond each end of components that require service and each end of the roof hatch parallel to the roof edge. The top of the guard shall be located not less than 42 inches (1067 mm) above the elevated surface adjacent to the guard. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a 21-inch-diameter (533 mm) sphere and shall comply with the loading requirements for guards specified in the International Building Code.

~~Exception: Guards are not required where permanent fall arrest/restraint anchorage connector devices that comply with ANSI/ASSP Z359.1 are affixed for use during the entire lifetime of the roof covering. The devices shall be reevaluated for possible replacement when the entire roof covering is replaced. The devices shall be placed not more than 10 feet (3048 mm) on center along hip and ridge lines and placed not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from roof edges and the open sides of walking surfaces.~~

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, Referenced Standards. Propose removal of ANSI/ASSP Z359.1 in Referenced Standards

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 average annual snowfall in Minnesota varies from 36 inches in the southwest to more than 70 inches along the Lake Superior "snow belt." (Source- MN DNR).
Roof anchors, given they must withstand a minimum static load of 5,000 lb. load, do not generally exceed 24" in height from the deck attachment point. Subtract the depth of insulation on many commercial roofs, and the height above the roof surface can be substantially less than 24". As MN has average snowfall depths ranging from 30 to over 70 inches annually in some locations, rooftop anchors are concealed and not accessible.
Guards are intrinsically safer, as you do not need additional equipment, or to 'tie off' to anchors to mitigate risk, especially in inclement weather or when anchors are concealed by ice and snow.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The deletion of the exception is a reasonable solution given that required anchors are not accessible during times when they are concealed by snow.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
The TAG should also consider that when the anchors are concealed, to expose them for use, workers would need to subject themselves to the very risk the anchor system was installed to address.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
The cost of installing guards would be offset by the cost of the anchor system (which would not be installed).
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.
N/A
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
N/A
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
N/A
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.
N/A

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Contractors, Designers, Owners, Code 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?
Risk of serious injury or death
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.
No

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

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Staff

Date: 10-31-24

Email address: chris.rosival@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: 651-284-5510

Code or Rule Section: 501.3.1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Topic of the proposal: Exhaust equipment

Code or rule section to be changed: MN Mechanical Code 501.3.1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

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 in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
501.3.1

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.

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.

501.3.1 Location of exhaust outlets. The termination point of exhaust outlets and ducts discharging to the outdoors shall be located with the following minimum distances:

1. For ducts conveying explosive or flammable vapors, fumes or dusts: 30 feet (9144 mm) from property lines; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 6 feet (1829 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 30 feet (9144 mm) from combustible walls and operable openings into buildings that are in the direction of the exhaust discharge; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.

2. For other product-conveying outlets: 10 feet (3048 mm) from the property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.

3. For all environmental air exhaust: 3 feet (914 mm) from property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from operable openings, except where the exhaust opening is located not less than 1 foot (305 mm) above the gravity air intake opening into buildings for all occupancies other than Group U; and 10 feet (3048 mm) from mechanical air intakes. Such exhaust shall not be considered hazardous or noxious. Separation is not required between intake air openings and living space exhaust air openings of an individual dwelling unit or sleeping unit where a an approved factory-built intake/exhaust combination termination fitting is used to separate the air streams in accordance with the fan manufacturer's instructions.

4. Exhaust outlets serving structures in flood hazard areas shall be installed at or above the elevation required by Section 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment.

5. For specific systems, see the following sections:

5.1. Clothes dryer exhaust, Section 504.4.

5.2. Kitchen hoods and other kitchen exhaust equipment, **shall comply with Section 506.4.2, ASHRAE 154 and NFPA 96 as applicable. s 506.3.13, 506.4 and 506.5.**

5.3. Dust, stock and refuse conveying systems, Section 510.2.

5.4. Subslab soil exhaust systems, Section 511.4.

5.5. Smoke control systems, Section 512.10.3.

5.6. Refrigerant discharge, Section 1105.7.

5.7. Machinery room discharge, Section 1105.6.1.

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.)

This proposal changes model code language as the sections referenced are no longer in the code

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

The code change provides language needed to give direction for kitchen hoods and equipment code tracking.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

N/A

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

There will be no cost increase from our existing code.

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

Regulatory Analysis

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

Building owners, HVAC installers and jurisdictions.

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?

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.

N/A

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