

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 4/23/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300.0030

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Purpose &
Application- Existing Buildings

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0030 Subp. 2. Application, Add Item D**

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 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.

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.

Subp. 2. Application.

- A. The State Building Code is the standard that applies statewide for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other structures of the type governed by the code, except as provided in Minnesota Statutes, section 326B.121. The State Building Code supersedes the building code of any municipality. The State Building Code does not apply to agricultural buildings except with respect to state inspections required or rulemaking authorized by Minnesota Statutes, sections 103F.141, 326B.36, and 326B.121, subdivision 1, paragraph (c), clause (2).
- B. The codes and standards referenced in a rule chapter are considered part of the requirements of the code to the prescribed extent of each reference. If differences occur between provisions of the code and referenced codes and standards, the provisions of the code apply.
- C. In the event that a new edition of the code is adopted after a permit has been issued, the edition of the code current at the time of permit application shall remain in effect throughout the work authorized by the permit.
- D. **Existing structures.** The legal occupancy of any *structure* existing on the date of adoption of this code shall be permitted to continue without change, except as otherwise specifically provided in this code.
1. **Buildings not previously occupied.** A *building* or portion of a *building* that has not been previously occupied or used for its intended purpose in accordance with the rules and laws in existence at the time of its completion shall comply with the provisions of this code as applicable, for new construction or with any current *permit* for such occupancy.
 2. **Buildings previously occupied.** The legal occupancy of any *building* existing on the date of adoption of this code shall be permitted to continue without change, except as otherwise specifically provided in this code or as is deemed necessary by the *building official* for the general safety and welfare of the occupants and 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. N/A

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.)

There is not clear direction on the treatment of existing buildings that have not been occupied yet, or how existing buildings are considered compliant if they were legally occupied under previous codes or prior to the establishment of the State Building Code.

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

The proposed change clarifies current undocumented policy and interpretation of Minnesota Rule 1311.

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.
No cost change.
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.
No. No cost change and no additional enforcement costs.
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?
Building owners and tenants, building officials, building inspectors, architects, engineers, construction contractors, developers.
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 better means. This is a clarifying change.
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?

No costs.
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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 4/23/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300.0130

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Purpose & Application- Existing Buildings

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0130 Subp. 1. Application, Add Item D**

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 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.

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 ~~strikethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

1300.0130 CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS.

Subpart 1. **Submittal documents.** Construction documents, special inspection and structural observation programs, and other data shall be submitted in one or more sets with each application for a permit.

Exception: The building official may waive the submission of construction documents and other data if the nature of the work applied for is such that reviewing of construction documents is not necessary to obtain compliance with the code.

The building officer may require plans or other data be prepared according to the rules of the Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Geoscience and Interior Design, chapter 1800, and Minnesota Statutes, sections 326.02 to 326.15, and other state laws relating to plan and specification preparation by occupational licenses. If special conditions exist, the building official may require additional construction documents to be prepared by a licensed design professional.

Subp. 2. ~~**Information on construction documents.** Construction documents shall be dimensioned and drawn upon suitable material. Electronic media documents are permitted to be submitted when approved by the building official. Construction documents shall be of sufficient clarity to indicate the location, nature, and extent of the work proposed and show in detail that it will conform to the code and relevant laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations, as determined by the building official.~~

Construction documents. *Construction documents shall be in accordance with Items A through E as follows:*

- Information on construction documents.** *Construction documents shall be dimensioned and drawn on suitable material. Electronic media documents are permitted to be submitted where approved by the building official. Construction documents shall be of sufficient clarity to indicate the location, nature and extent of the work proposed and show in detail that it will conform to the provisions of this code and relevant laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, as determined by the building official.*
- Fire protection system shop drawings.** *Shop drawings for the fire protection systems shall be submitted to indicate conformance to this code and the construction documents and shall be approved prior to the start of system installation. Shop drawings shall contain all information as required by the referenced installation standards in Chapter 9.*
- Means of egress.** *The construction documents shall show in sufficient detail the location, construction, size and character of all portions of the means of egress including the path of the exit discharge to the public way in compliance with the provisions of this code. In other than occupancies in Groups R-2, R-3, and I-1, the construction documents shall designate the number of occupants to be accommodated on every floor, and in all rooms and spaces.*
- Exterior wall envelope.** *Construction documents for all buildings shall describe the exterior wall envelope in sufficient detail to determine compliance with this code. The construction documents shall provide details of the exterior wall envelope as required, including flashing, intersections with dissimilar materials, corners, end details, control joints, intersections at roof, eaves or parapets, means of drainage, water-resistive barrier and details around openings. The construction documents shall include manufacturer's installation instructions that provide supporting documentation that the proposed penetration and opening details described in the construction documents maintain the*

weather resistance of the exterior wall envelope. The supporting documentation shall fully describe the exterior wall system that was tested, where applicable, as well as the test procedure used.

- E. Exterior balconies and elevated walking surfaces.** Where balconies or other elevated walking surfaces have weather-exposed surfaces, and the structural framing is protected by an impervious moisture barrier, the construction documents shall include details for all elements of the impervious moisture barrier system. The construction documents shall include manufacturer's installation instructions.

Subp. 3. **Manufacturer's installation instructions.** When required by the building official, manufacturer's installation instructions for construction equipment and components regulated by the code, shall be available on the job site at the time of inspection.

Subp. 4. **Site plan.** The construction documents submitted with the application for permit shall be accompanied by a site plan drawn to scale, showing the size and location of new construction and existing structures on the site, distances from lot lines, the established street grades, and the proposed finished grades, and it shall be drawn according to an accurate boundary line survey. In the case of demolition, the site plan shall show construction to be demolished and the location and size of existing structures and construction that are to remain on the site or plot. The building official may waive or modify the requirement for a site plan if the application for permit is for alteration or repair or when otherwise warranted.

Subp. 5. **Examination of documents.** The building official shall examine or cause to be examined the accompanying construction documents to ascertain whether the construction indicated and described complies with the requirements of the code and other pertinent laws and ordinances.

Subp. 6. **Approval of construction documents.**

A. If the building official issues a permit, the construction documents shall be approved in writing or by a stamp, stating "Reviewed for Code Compliance," dated, and signed by the building official or an authorized representative. One set of the construction documents that were reviewed shall be retained by the building official. The other set shall be returned to the applicant, kept at the site of the work, and open to inspection by the building official or an authorized representative.

B. Any code deficiencies identified by the building official during the plan review process for construction documents that are prepared by a design professional who is licensed or certified under Minnesota Statutes, sections 326.02 to 326.15, must be itemized by the building official through a comprehensive plan review letter only. Any code deficiencies identified by the building official during the plan review process for construction documents that are not prepared by a licensed or certified design professional may be marked directly on the document or itemized by the building official through a comprehensive plan review letter. The issuance of a permit based on construction documents and other data does not prevent the building official from requiring the correction of errors in the construction documents and other data. All sets of required construction documents, including the site copy, municipality copy, or inspector copy, must be marked identically by the building official, with one copy retained by the building official after construction is completed. Work regulated by the code must be installed according to the reviewed construction documents. Work that does not comply with approved construction documents must not proceed until the applicant submits changes that are approved by the building official.

Subp. 7. **Previous approvals.** The code in effect at the time of application shall be applicable.

Subp. 8. **Phased approval.** The building official may issue a permit for the construction of foundations or any other part of a building or structure before the construction documents for the whole building or structure have been submitted, provided that adequate information and detailed statements have been filed complying with pertinent requirements of the code. The holder of the permit for the foundation or other parts of a building or structure shall proceed at the holder's own risk with the building operation and without assurance that a permit for the entire structure will be granted. Structural designs may not be

deferred when requesting for footings and foundations permits. Mechanical, and Electrical systems designs may not be deferred when the building is required to comply with Minnesota Rules Chapters 1322 or 1323 Energy Codes.

[A] 107.2.6 Site plan. The *construction documents* submitted with the application for *permit* shall be accompanied by a site plan showing to scale the size and location of new construction and *existing structures* on the *site*, distances from *lot lines*, the established street grades and the proposed finished grades and, as applicable, *flood hazard areas*, *floodways*, and *design flood elevations*; and it shall be drawn in accordance with an accurate boundary line survey. In the case of demolition, the site plan shall show construction to be demolished and the location and size of *existing structures* and construction that are to remain on the *site* or plot. The *building official* is authorized to waive or modify the requirement for a site plan where the application for *permit* is for *alteration* or *repair* or where otherwise warranted.

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. N/A

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.)

There is not clear direction on the treatment of existing buildings that have not been occupied yet, or how existing buildings are considered compliant if they were legally occupied under previous codes or prior to the establishment of the State Building Code.

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

The proposed change clarifies current undocumented policy and interpretation of Minnesota Rule 1311.

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.
No cost change.
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.
No. No cost change and no additional enforcement costs.
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?
Building owners and tenants, building officials, building inspectors, architects, engineers, construction contractors, developers.
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 better means. This is a clarifying change.

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?

No costs.

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.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 3/26/2024
Revised 4/4/24
Revised 4/11/2024
Model Code: N/A

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Definition- Single family dwelling

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0070 Subp. 22a. Single family dwelling.**

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

<u>General Information</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
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.

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 ~~strikethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

~~Subp. 22a. **Single family dwelling.** “Single family dwelling” means that a single freestanding detached structure with one family of non-transient occupants containing occupiable space including spaces for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, toileting and bathing. The structure may include an attached garage space for storage of private passenger vehicles. The structure shall not contain uses with occupancy classifications listed in Minnesota Rule 1305.~~

Subp. 22a. **Single family dwelling.** “Single family dwelling” means a freestanding detached structure containing one dwelling unit and may include a garage. The structure shall not contain uses with occupancy classifications listed in Minnesota Rule 1305.

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.)

Single family dwelling is currently undefined. With the pressure to expand uses of single family dwellings to many functions other than housing one family in a detached structure, this definition for direct deferral to Minnesota Rule 1309 is needed.

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

This definition will clarify the scoping requirements for direct deferral to Minnesota Rule 1309. Other uses will be first deferred to Minnesota Rule 1305 where other criteria may be applied specific to the use, AND allowances may be made for construction of the building itself to be per Minnesota Rule 1309 by exception when applicable.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

- Fire separation requirements for buildings that end up ONLY being scoped to MR 1305.
- Handicap accessibility requirements for buildings scoped to MR 1305.
- Fire sprinkler system requirements for buildings scoped to MR 1305.
- Transient use requirements as a function of initial construction and developer intent vs. private property owners using their own private property for other occasional purposes.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

No cost change for what is normally scoped to Minnesota Rule 1309. There may be some increased costs for those who “push the envelope” of current code allowances.

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.

For projects that “push the envelope” of current code allowances, the increased costs may be in the form of providing handicap accessibility for intended transient use, providing fire protection from adjacent properties where buildings are constructed less than 10 feet from property lines, and providing sprinkler systems when transient use is intended and the home is over 4,500 square feet.

No anticipated cost increases for what is normally considered a single-family home.

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
Developers and property owners will bear the costs of these luxury facilities or investment properties.
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No. No cost change and no additional enforcement costs.
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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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.

Create another category within MR 1300 for IRC scoped buildings intended for use as hotels, and another category within MR 1300 for private mixed-use buildings.

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?

Consequences of not adopting the change will result in continued misinterpretation of code and mis-use of what was intended to be a simple allowance for small, inconsequential buildings.

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.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 3/29/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Revised: 4/11/2024

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Definition- Two family dwelling

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0070 Subp. 28. Two-family dwelling**

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 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.

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.

~~Subp. 28. **Two-family dwelling.** “Two-family dwelling” means a single freestanding detached structure containing two separate dwelling units for two families of non-transient occupants each dwelling unit containing occupiable spaces for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, toileting and bathing. The structure may include attached garage space for storage of private passenger vehicles. The structure shall not contain uses within occupancy classifications listed in Minnesota Rule 1305~~

Subp. 28. **Two-family dwelling.** “Two-family dwelling” means a freestanding detached structure containing two dwelling units and may include garages. The structure shall not contain uses with occupancy classifications listed in Minnesota Rule 1305.

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. N/A

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.)

There is currently no definition for two-family dwellings. Since this is a primary scoping provision, a definition is needed to clarify what is and is not in scope.

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

It essentially takes the definition for single-family dwelling and expands it to two families.

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.

No cost change.

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.

No. No cost change and no additional enforcement costs.

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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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?

Consequences of not adopting the change will result in continued mis-interpretation of code and mis-use of how townhouses are supposed to be constructed by blending requirements from both 1309 and 1305, especially regarding separation of utilities and division of buildings by property lines.

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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 3/29/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300.0120

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Permits-
Application for permit

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0120 Subp. 7. Application for permit**

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 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).
1300.0120, Subd. 7

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.

Subpart 7, **Application for permit.** To obtain a permit, the applicant shall file an application in writing either electronically or in hard copy on a form furnished by the Department of Building Safety for that purpose. The application shall:

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, N/A

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.)

There is confusion over how to measure retaining walls with regards to this exemption.

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

The critical measurement for retaining walls is to address the unbalanced lateral load on the wall. Where there is soil on both sides or there is no soil on either side, the lateral load contribution is zero and the hazard to public safety is minimal. The critical measurement is the actual change in grade, which is what this code change proposal addresses.

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.

No cost increase. This is merely a coordination effort requirement.

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 increase.

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

No cost increase.

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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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?

Continued misunderstanding of exemption criteria for retaining walls, and more retaining walls requiring permit than would be required under correct interpretation.

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.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 3/29/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Revised: 4/30/2024

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300.0120

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Application for Permit

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0130 Subp. 7. Add Item "I"**

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 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.

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.
 - I. ~~Be submitted by the person or coordinating entity responsible for execution and code compliance of the work.~~
The person, firm, or organization securing the permit is responsible for coordinating the work and ensuring code compliance for the work being performed.
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. N/A

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.)

 There is currently no definition for two-family dwellings. Since this is a primary scoping provision, a definition is needed to clarify what is and is not in scope.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

 It essentially takes the definition for single-family dwelling and expands it to two families.
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.
 No cost change.
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.
 No. No cost change and no additional enforcement costs.
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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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?

Continued confusion that building owners, and home owners should be applying for permits and then allowing contractors to do work on their behalf, and construction managers avoiding responsibility for code compliance in work coordination.

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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 3/29/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Revised: 4/30/2024

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1300.0120

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Permits- Work exempt from permit

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0120 Subp. 4.A (4) Work exempt from permit- Retaining walls**

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 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.
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.

MR 1300.0120, Subpart 4, Item A (4) shall be modified as follows:

(4) ~~retaining walls that are not over four feet (1,219 mm) in height measured from the bottom of the footing wall to the top of the wall~~ Retaining walls with over four feet (1,219mm) of vertical exposed face, unless supporting a surcharge or impounding Class I, II, or III-A liquids;

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, N/A

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.)

There is confusion over how to measure retaining walls with regards to this exemption.

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

The critical measurement for retaining walls is to address the unbalanced lateral load on the wall. Where there is soil on both sides or there is no soil on either side, the lateral load contribution is zero and the hazard to public safety is minimal. The critical measurement is the actual change in grade, which is what this code change proposal addresses. **Coordinated to match MR 1800.5900.**

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.

No cost increase. This is merely a coordination effort requirement.

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 increase.

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

No cost increase.

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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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?

Continued misunderstanding of exemption criteria for retaining walls, and more retaining walls requiring permit than would be required under correct interpretation.

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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Gregory Metz

Date: 4/9/2024

Email address: Greg.Metz@State.MN.US

Model Code: N/A

Telephone number: 651-284-5884

Code or Rule Section: MR 1302.0700,
Subpart 3

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI/CCLD

Topic of proposal: Plan Review- State
Bldg Official duties

Code or rule section to be changed: **1300.0700, Subp. 3. State building official's duties**

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 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).
1300.0700, Subp.3. **State building official's duties.**

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.

1302.0700 PLAN REVIEW.

Subpart 3. **State building official's duties.** The state building official or the official's agent shall review submittals and prepare written comments defining items not in compliance with the code. The written comments must be mailed conveyed to the submitting designer with copies to the municipal building official, when applicable, and the owner, and a copy must be kept on file by the state building official. The submitting designer shall respond to the review comments of the state building official within 14-30 days, describing the methods of correcting the errors or omissions in compliance with the comments of the state building official or the official's agent. Additional plan review fees may be charged per Minnesota Statute 326B.153 if the designer fails to submit corrected documents within 30 days receipt of corrections notification.

Authorization for construction must be granted when compliance with the requirements of the code is documented, permit applications are completed and permit fees are paid in full.

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, N/A

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.)
 - Modifications necessary allow for electronic submittals.
 - 14 days response time is insufficient for complex projects such as hospitals, prisons, nursing homes and the like.
 - More than a month from the primary plan review and the plan reviewer has reviewed enough other projects that the project in question is no longer fresh, and some re-review is necessary to refamiliarize with the work.
 - Clarification is necessary that payment of fees is part of a complete application.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
 - Technology has advanced such that electronic correspondence and documentation is commonplace.
 - 14 days is frequently not enough time for a designer to respond with a complete and correct design modification. Allowing for up to 45 days provides more tolerance in rule for designer response times.
 - Beyond 45 days, additional time is necessary to refamiliarize with plan review work. This takes time and merits compensation for that time as an additional service.
 - Without requiring payment of fees as a condition of authorization to proceed, the state will be required to provide services without fair and reasonable compensation.
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.
No cost increase. This is merely a coordination effort requirement.
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 increase.
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
No cost increase.
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, engineers, developers, home designers, builders, residential contractors.
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?

Confusion regarding incorrect references to statutes and rules sections. Confusion as to the legality of electronic applications and construction documents for review.
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.



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 4/16/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0220
Subp 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0220 Subp 1

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0220 Subp 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).
1300.0220 Subp 1

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.
1300.0220 Subp 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.

Subpart 1. Use and occupancy. No building or structure shall be used or occupied in whole or in part, and ~~no change in the existing occupancy classification of a building, structure, or portion of a building or structure~~ a change of occupancy shall not be made until the building official has issued a certificate of occupancy for the building or structure under this part. Issuance of a certificate of occupancy is not approval of a violation of the code or other ordinances of the municipality. Certificates presuming to give authority to violate or cancel the code or other ordinances of the municipality are not valid.

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes. New language more clearly defines the requirements
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes and more clearly defines the requirements.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.
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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/18/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0110
Subp 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0110 Subp 1

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0110 Subp 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).
1300.0110 Subp 1

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.
1300.0110 Subp 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 ~~strikethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subpart 1. General

The building official is authorized and directed to enforce the provisions of this code. The building official ~~has~~ shall have the authority to determine compliance with this code, to render interpretations of ~~the~~ this code and to adopt policies and procedures in order to clarify the application of ~~the~~ its provisions. ~~The~~ Such interpretations, policies and procedures shall be in compliance with the intent and purpose of this code and shall not have the effect of waiving requirements specifically provided for in ~~the~~ this code.

Where this code or a referenced standard requires equipment, materials, products or services to be listed and a listing standard is specified, the listing shall be based on the specified standard. Where a listing standard is not specified, the listing shall be based on an approved listing criteria. Listings shall be germane to the provision requiring the listing. Installation shall be in accordance with the listing and the manufacturer's instructions, and where required to verify compliance, the listing standard and manufacturer's instructions shall be made available to the building official.

To determine compliance with this code, the building official is authorized to require the owner or owner's authorized agent to provide a technical opinion and report.

A technical opinion and report shall be provided without charge to the jurisdiction.

The technical opinion and report shall be prepared by a qualified engineer, specialist, laboratory or specialty organization acceptable to the building official. The building official is authorized to require design submittals to be prepared by, and bear the stamp of, a registered design professional.

The technical opinion and report shall analyze the properties of the design, operation or use of the building or premises and the facilities and appurtenances situated thereon to identify and propose necessary recommendations.

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes. New language more provides more accurate and clear direction as to the duties of the building official
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes and more clearly defines the requirements.

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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.

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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/18/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0110
Subp 13

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0110 Subp 13

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0110 Subp 13

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).
1300.0110 Subp 13

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.
1300.0110 Subp 13

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.

Subp. 13. Alternative materials design and methods of construction and equipment.

The ~~provisions of this code is~~ are not intended to prevent the installation of any material or to prohibit any design or method of construction not specifically prescribed by the code, provided that any alternative has been ~~approved~~ approved.

An alternative material, design, or method of construction shall be ~~approved~~ approved where the ~~building official~~ building official finds that the proposed ~~design alternative~~ design alternative is satisfactory and complies with the intent of the provisions of this code, ~~and that the~~

An alternative material, design, or method of construction shall, or work offered is, for the purpose intended, at least not less than the equivalent of that prescribed in the this code with respect to all of the following, as applicable: in

1. quality,
2. strength,
3. effectiveness,
4. fire resistance,
5. durability,
6. safety other than fire resistance.

~~The details of any action granting or denying approval of an alternate shall be recorded and entered in the files of the Department of Building Safety. The permit applicant may request written documentation of the denial, including the reasons for the denial.~~

A request to use an alternative material, design or method of construction shall be submitted in writing to the building official for approval. Where the alternative material, design or method of construction is not approved, the building official shall respond in writing, stating the reasons the alternative was not approved.

The building official is authorized to require submittal of a peer review report in conjunction with a request to use an alternative material, design or method of construction, prepared by a peer reviewer that is approved by the building official. Such peer review shall be provided without charge to the jurisdiction

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes. New language more provides more accurate and clear direction as to the duties of the building official

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes and more clearly defines the requirements.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.

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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/18/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0110
Subp 15

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0110 Subp 15

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0110 Subp 15

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).
1300.0110 Subp 15
- 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.
1300.0110 Subp 15

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.

Subpart 15. Tests.

~~If Where there is insufficient evidence of compliance with the provision of this code, or evidence that a material or method does not conform to the requirements of the code, or in order to substantiate claims for alternative materials or methods, the ~~building official~~ building official shall have the authority to require tests as evidence of compliance to be made at no expense to the ~~municipality jurisdiction~~. Test methods shall be as specified in ~~the this code~~ or by other recognized test standards. In the absence of recognized and accepted test ~~methods standards~~, the ~~building official~~ building official shall approve the testing procedures. Tests shall be performed by ~~an approved agency~~ a party acceptable to the building official. Reports of the tests shall be retained by the building official.~~

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes. New language more provides more accurate and clear direction as to the testing procedures
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes and more clearly defines the requirements.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.
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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/16/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0030
Subp 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0030 Subp 1

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0030 Subp 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).
1300.0030 Subp 1
- 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.
1300.0030 Subp 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.

Subpart 1. Purpose. The purpose of this code is to establish minimum requirements to provide a reasonable level of ~~safeguard the public~~ health, safety, and general welfare through structural strength, means of egress ~~facilities~~, stability, sanitation, ~~adequate~~ light and ventilation, energy conservation, and a reasonable level of safety to life and property from fire and other hazards attributed to the built environment and to provide a reasonable level of safety to fire fighters and emergency responders during emergency operations

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.
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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/16/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0160
Subp 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.160 Subp 1

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0160 Subp 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).
1300.0160 Subp 1
- 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.
1300.0160 Subp 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.

Subpart 1. Purpose. The purpose of this code is to establish minimum requirements to provide a reasonable level of ~~safeguard the public~~ health, safety, and general welfare through structural strength, means of egress ~~facilities~~, stability, sanitation, ~~adequate~~ light and ventilation, energy conservation, and a reasonable level of safety to life and property from fire and other hazards attributed to the built environment and to provide a reasonable level of safety to fire fighters and emergency responders during emergency operations

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes.
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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

***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: 4/16/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: 1300.0130
Subp 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: 1300.0130 Subp 1

Code or rule section to be changed: 1300.0130 Subp 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).
1300.0130 Subp 1
- 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.
1300.0130 Subp 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.

Subpart 1. Submittal documents. Construction documents, special inspection and structural observation programs, and other data shall be submitted in ~~one~~ Two or more sets, or in a digital format where allowed by the bounding official, with each application for a permit

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.)
Revision of text to align with the 2024 model codes. Also this clarifies the minimum number of sets to be submitted and also allows for electronic submittal documents.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The revision brings consistency with the model codes. It also brings the requirement into alignment with current practices in many jurisdictions.
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 result in Minnesota being out of alignment with the model codes and as currently written does not allow for the use of digital plans.
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 is bringing the modifications from both the 2021 + 2024 model code language to Minnesota's code.

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