

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM
(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 4/22/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IEBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: Tables 506.1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Change in occupancy hazard categories

Code or rule section to be changed: Tables 506.1

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).
Table 506.1
- 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.

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.

TABLE 506.1 LIFE SAFETY AND FIRE RISK

RELATIVE HAZARD	OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATIONS ^a
1 (Highest Hazard)	H, I-2, I-3
2	A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4
3	A-5; E; I-1; R-1; R-2; I-4
4	R-3; R-4, M
5	B; F-1, S-1, IRC-1 , <u>IRC-2</u> IRC-3
6	F-2; S-2, IRC-2 <u>IRC-1</u> ,
7 (Lowest Hazard)	U, IRC-4

a. IRC-1, IRC-2 IRC-3 + IRC-4 occupancy classifications are included only to determine relative hazard level where residential structures are converted to nonresidential uses in a change of occupancy. See part 1300.0070, subpart 12b, for occupancy classifications.

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

NO

Need and Reason

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

This change relocates IRC -1 to risk category 6 and IRC-2 to risk category 5

This more appropriately aligns the risk categories of IRC occupancies.

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

This will more accurately align the relative hazards of these structures

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 continued inaccurate classification of risk.

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

no

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

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: C. Scott Anderson

Date: 4/22/24

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

Model Code: 2024 IEBC

Telephone number: 612-246-7303

Code or Rule Section: Tables 1011.5
1011.6 + 1011.7

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Minneapolis

Topic of proposal: Change in occupancy
hazard categories

Code or rule section to be changed: Tables 1011.5, 1011.6 + 1011.7

Intended for Technical Advisory Group (“TAG”):

General Information

Yes No

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

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
Tables 1011.5, 1011.6 + 1011.7

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.

TABLE 1011.5 MEANS OF EGRESS HAZARD CATEGORIES

RELATIVE HAZARD	OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATIONS ^a
1 (Highest Hazard)	H
2	I-2; I-3; I-4
3	A; E; I-1; M; R-1; R-2; R-4, Condition 2
4	B; F-1; R-3; R-4, Condition 1; S-1, <u>IRC-1, IRC-2, IRC-3</u>
5 (Lowest Hazard)	F-2; S-2; U, <u>IRC-4</u>

a. IRC-1, IRC-2 IRC-3 + IRC-4 occupancy classifications are included only to determine relative hazard level where residential structures are converted to nonresidential uses in a change of occupancy. See part 1300.0070, subpart 12b, for occupancy classifications.

TABLE 1011.6 HEIGHTS AND AREAS HAZARD CATEGORIES

RELATIVE HAZARD	OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATIONS ^a
1 (Highest Hazard)	H
2	A-1; A-2; A-3; A-4; I; R-1; R-2; R-4, Condition 2
3	E; F-1; S-1; M
4 (Lowest Hazard)	B; F-2; S-2; A-5; R-3; R-4, Condition 1; U, <u>IRC-1, IRC-2, IRC-3, IRC-4</u>

a. IRC-1, IRC-2 IRC-3 + IRC-4 occupancy classifications are included only to determine relative hazard level where residential structures are converted to nonresidential uses in a change of occupancy. See part 1300.0070, subpart 12b, for occupancy classifications.

TABLE 1011.7 EXPOSURE OF EXTERIOR WALLS HAZARD CATEGORIES

RELATIVE HAZARD	OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION ^a
1 (Highest Hazard)	H
2	F-1; M; S-1
3	A; B; E; I; R
4 (Lowest Hazard)	F-2; S-2; U, <u>IRC-1, IRC-2, IRC-3, IRC-4</u>

a. IRC-1, IRC-2 IRC-3 + IRC-4 occupancy classifications are included only to determine relative hazard level where residential structures are converted to nonresidential uses in a change of occupancy. See part 1300.0070, subpart 12b, for occupancy classifications.

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

NO

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)
The conversion from 1309 construction to 1305 construction is not addressed in these tables so determining what the relative hazards are is difficult. This is even more complicated since 1309 occupancies are included in table 501 and all are of a lower hazard than the 1305 R occupancies.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
This will reduce confusion as to the relative hazards when converting 1309 to 1305 occupancies
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 continued disagreement between code officials and designers as to how this code provision is to be applied.

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

no

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

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Jerry Backlund

Date: 05/23/2024

Email address: jbacklund@hastingsmn.gov

Model Code: MN Rules 1311 MN CCEB

Telephone number: 6515003481

Code or Rule Section: 1311.0020 Subp 9

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: AMBO

Topic of proposal:

Code or rule section to be changed: 1311.0020 Subp 9

Intended for Technical Advisory Group (“TAG”): Chapter 1311 MN Conservation Code for Existing Buildings

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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).
1311.0020 Subp. 9

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).
1311.0020 Subp. 9

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.

1311.0020 REFERENCES TO OTHER INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL CODES

Subp. 9 Residential Code. References to the “residential code” or the “International Residential Code” ~~do not apply and are deleted.~~ ,”IRC” in this code refer to Minnesota Rules Chapter 1309

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
Yes MN Chapter 1309 of the 2024 Model code Chapter 3 Building planning

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)
The struck out language in the 2020 MN CCEB created issues as other references else where that mention the International Residential Code were not amended and therefore created orphan code language
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Provides clarity by not having orphan language. Ties the IRC and the MN CCEB together better as the CCEB is also helpful for the older housing stock.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
No 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.
No cost change
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
No increase 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 change in cost.

Regulatory Analysis

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

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. The CCEB when used can help to lower 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 be considered by the TAG.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM
(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Clayton A Talbot

Date: 5/21/2024

Email address: talbo047@umn.edu

Telephone number: 612-626-2783

Model Code: 2024 IEBC (proposed 2024 Minnesota Conservation Code for Existing Buildings)

Code or Rule Section: 1311.0020

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: University of Minnesota Building Code Department

Topic of proposal: Reference to applicable of Minnesota Fire Code Rules 7511

Code or rule section to be changed: Rule.

Intended for Technical Advisory Group (“TAG”): 1311/2024 IEBC Changes Technical Advisory Group

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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).
NO

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

1311.0020 REFERENCES TO OTHER INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL CODES.

delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
NO

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
NO

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

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

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.

1311.0020 REFERENCES TO OTHER INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL CODES. Subp. 3

Fire code References to the "*International Fire Code*" ~~do not apply and are deleted.~~

References to International Fire Code or IFC in this code mean the Minnesota State Fire Code, Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7511, and adopted pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 326B.02.

References to the "International Fire Code" in this code mean the Minnesota State Fire Code, Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7511, and adopted pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 326B.02.

3. 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.)

Reference is needed for the Minnesota Fire Code, Chapter 7511 because the fire code is mentioned periodically throughout the IEBC (MN Conservation Code for Existing Buildings).

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

The MN Conservation Code for Existing Buildings cannot be effectively administered without the ability to utilize the Minnesota Fire Code when necessary.

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
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.
NA
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.
NA
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 Departments, Fire Department, DLI, Minnesota State Fire Code, & Design Professionals
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?

Deleting the Minnesota State Fire makes administrating

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: The information you provide in this code change proposal form is considered Public Data and used by the TAG to consider your proposed modification to the code. Any code change proposal form submitted to DLI may be reviewed at public TAG meetings and used by department staff and the Office of Administrative Hearings to justify the need and reasonableness of any proposed rule draft subject to administrative review and is available to the public.

****Note: Incomplete forms will be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms will be accepted and considered by the TAG. The submitter may be asked to provide additional information in support of the proposed code change.

