

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES (This form must be submitted electronically)

IRC-78, R302.2

Author/requestor: Richard Lockrem

Email address: rich.lockrem@state.mn.us

Telephone number: 651.284.5868

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Proposed Code Change - Language

Please provide your proposed code change in strikeout/underline format. Provide the *specific* language you would like to see changed, with new words underlined and words to be deleted should be ~~stricken~~. Also, state whether the language contained in your proposal is from a code book or from an amendment currently found in Minnesota Rule. (You may provide the language (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

R302.2 Townhouses. Each townhouse shall be considered a separate building and shall be separated by fire resistance rated wall assemblies meeting the requirements of Section R302.1 for exterior walls.

Exception: A common 1-hour fire-resistance-rated wall assembly tested in accordance with ASTM E 119 or UL 263 is permitted for townhouses if such walls do not contain plumbing or mechanical equipment, ducts or vents in the cavity of the common wall. The wall shall be rated for fire exposure from both sides and shall extend to and be tight against exterior walls and the underside of the roof sheathing. Electrical installations shall be installed in accordance with ~~Chapters 34 through 43~~ Minnesota Rules, chapter 1315. Penetrations of electrical outlet boxes shall be in accordance with Section R302.4.

R302.2.1 Continuity. The fire-resistance-rated wall or assembly separating townhouses shall be continuous from the foundation to the underside of the roof sheathing, roof deck, or roof slab. The fire-resistance-rating shall extend the full length of the wall or assembly, including wall extensions through and separating attached enclosed accessory structures. Separation shall extend through enclosed soffits, overhangs, and similar projections.

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

Please provide a thorough explanation of the need for this change and why this proposed code change is a reasonable change. During the rulemaking process, the Agency must defend the need and reasonableness of all its proposed changes. The Agency must submit evidence that is

has considered all aspects of the proposal. (You may provide the need and reason (electronically) on a separate attached sheet).

The proposal requests amend some text items of the 2012 IRC Sections R302.2 – Townhouses and R302.2 - Continuity provisions.

It is proposed to delete the reference to “~~Chapters 34 through 43~~” and replace with **Minnesota Rules, chapter 1315** within the exception of Section R302.2. This revision merely clarifies that IRC Chapters 34 through 43 have not been adopted by the State of Minnesota and will be replaced by MR 1315 which adopts the National Electrical Code by reference.

The proposal further requests to revise the first sentence of Section R302.2.1 by adding the word “roof” preceding the reference to “deck” and “slab” for clarity. Section R302.2.1 is also being requested to add the last sentence; Separation shall extend through enclosed soffits, overhangs, and similar projections to further define the extent of fire-resistant-rated required at these construction features. These revisions were included in the 2007 MSBC provisions for the 2006 IRC Section R317.2.1 which has been renumbered in the 2012 IRC.

It seems reasonable to add the requested amended language to further define and explain the required fire-resistance-rated construction issues to enable more uniform code enforcement.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

Please consider whether this proposed code change will increase/decrease costs or indicate that it will not have any cost implications and explain how it will not. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset somehow by a life safety or other benefit? If so, please explain. Are there any cost increases/decreases to enforce or comply with this proposed code change? If so, please explain. (You may provide the cost/benefit analysis (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

There will no additional costs related to the approval of the proposed amendment.

Other Factors to Consider Related to Proposed Code Change

1. Is this proposed code change meant to:

change language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).
IRC Section R302.2.

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

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

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

neither; this language will be new language, not found in the code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by a Minnesota Statute or new legislation? If so, please provide the citation to the Statute or legislation.
NO.
3. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a published code book or of an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
NO.
4. Will this proposed code change impact other parts of the Minnesota State Building Code? If so, please list the affected parts of the Minnesota State Building Code.
NO.
5. Who are the parties affected or segments of industry affected by this proposed code change?
Parties affected are, building officials, contractors and designers.
6. 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.
NO.
7. Are you aware of any federal requirement or regulation related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the regulation or requirement.
NO.