

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM
(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 6/13/24 Revised 7/8/24 9/19/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1809.5.1 +
1010.1.5

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

Code or rule section to be changed: 1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

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 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 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). 1809.5.1
- 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.
1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

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.

1809.5.1 Frost protection at ~~required exits.~~ exterior landings

Frost protection shall be provided at exterior landings for all ~~required~~ exterior doors used for egress purposes ~~exits~~ with outward-swinging doors. ~~Frost protection shall only be required to the extent necessary to ensure the unobstructed opening of the required exit doors.~~

Add new section

1010.1.5.1 Landings at Exterior Exit Doors

Frost protection in accordance with 1809.5 shall be provided at exterior landings for at all exterior doors used for egress purposes with outward swinging doors.

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 1809.5.1 is relocated to 1010.5 as it is addressing landings and it is more likely that this requirement will be identified here than in the foundations section.

The word "required" has been removed because all exit doors need to be safe. Section 1010.1 requires that all doors provided for egress purposes in excess of those required for egress are required to meet the requirements of chapter 10. Therefore, frost protection should also be extended to all doors provided for egress purposes.

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

It addresses a life safety issue unique to cold weather climates.

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. Structures are required to have foundations. A stoop or landing is a structure per the IBC definition.

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?
Egress doors could become unusable during cold weather conditions thus trapping people inside a structure.
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 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:* 6/13/24 Revised 7/8/24 9/19/24

Email address: c.scott.anderson@minneapolismn.gov *Model Code:* 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303 *Code or Rule Section:* 1809.5 +
1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis *Topic of proposal:* 1805.9 + 1809.5.1 +
1010.1.5

Code or rule section to be changed: 1805.9 + 1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

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 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 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). 1809.5 + 1809.5.1
- 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.
1809.5 + 1809.5.1 + 1010.1.5

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.

1809.5 Frost protection.

Except where otherwise protected from frost, foundations and other permanent supports of *buildings* and *structures* shall be protected from frost by one or more of the following methods:

1. ~~Extending below the frost line of the locality.~~ Constructed in accordance with 1303.1600.
2. Constructing in accordance with ASCE 32.
3. Erecting on solid rock.

~~**Exception:** Freestanding buildings constructed in accordance with Minnesota Rules, Chapter 1303, shall not be required to be protected.~~

Exception: Free-standing *buildings* meeting all of the following conditions shall not be required to be protected:

1. ~~Assigned to Risk Category I.~~ Classified as group U occupancy
2. Area of ~~600~~ 1,000 square feet (56 m²) or less for *light-frame construction* or 400 square feet (37 m²) or less for other than *light-frame construction*.
3. Eave height of 10 feet (3048 mm) or less.

Shallow foundation shall not bear on frozen soil unless such frozen condition is of a permanent character.

103.1600 subp 2

~~**Exception:** Slab on grade construction may be placed on any soil except peat or muck for detached one-story private garage, carport, and shed buildings not larger than 1,000 square feet (92.9 m²).~~

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 Mn amendment referencing to chapter 1303 should be deleted.

The model code language provides more clear language and addresses more options. There is a reference in 1300.1600 to soils under slab on grade buildings that I believe is intended to address a size limit for these structures so I have modified the model code language to match up with the current Mn allowance of 1,000 s.f. but only for light frame construction.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It addresses a life safety issue unique to cold weather climates.

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. Structures are required to have foundations. A stoop or landing is a structure per the IBC definition.

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?

Egress doors could become unusable during cold weather conditions thus trapping people inside a structure.

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 instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms can considered by the TAG.