

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM
(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: **Kyle Thrapp**

Date: **1/18/25**

Email address: **kyle@mcmonigal.com**

Model Code: **2024 IRC**

Telephone number: **612-331-1244**

Code or Rule Section: **R315.5.2.2**

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: **McMonigal Architects**

Code or rule section to be changed: **R315.5.2.2 Treads and Risers (Sleeping Loft Egress)**

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): **1309 Residential Code 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 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 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).
R315.5.2.2 Treads and Risers (Sleeping Lofts)

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.
Strike entire section: R315.5.2.2 Treads and Risers
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.)
See page 4.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
-Removes possible dangerous egress condition from sleeping lofts.
-Even with this proposed change, code will still allow for:
1) Code compliant stair, 2) Ships ladder, 3) Alternating tread device, 4) Ladder
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
N/A

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
N/A
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.
N/A
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
N/A
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
N/A
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
N/A

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Public has safer egress from sleeping lofts.

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.
N/A

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?
N/A

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

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

R315.5.2.2 Treads and Risers (Sleeping Lofts)

Math explained:

Riser height is between 7" and 12" high. Tread depths using the provided formula are as follows:

7"H risers, 10 11/16"D treads

$$7" \times \frac{4}{3} = 9 \frac{5}{16}"$$

$$20" - 9 \frac{5}{16}" = 10 \frac{11}{16}" \text{D treads}$$

33 degree incline

8"H risers, 9 5/16"D treads

$$8" \times \frac{4}{3} = 10 \frac{11}{16}"$$

$$20" - 10 \frac{11}{16}" = 9 \frac{5}{16}" \text{D treads}$$

41 degree incline

9"H risers, 8"D treads

$$9" \times \frac{4}{3} = 12"$$

$$20" - 12" = 8" \text{D treads}$$

48 degree incline

10"H risers, 6 11/16"D treads

$$10" \times \frac{4}{3} = 13 \frac{5}{16}" \text{, } 20" - 13 \frac{5}{16}" = 6 \frac{11}{16}" \text{D treads}$$

56 degree incline

11"H riser, 5 5/16"D treads

$$11" \times \frac{4}{3} = 14 \frac{11}{16}" \text{, } 20" - 14 \frac{11}{16}" = 5 \frac{5}{16}" \text{D treads}$$

64 degree incline

12"H riser, 4"D treads

$$12" \times \frac{4}{3} = 16" \text{, } 20" - 16" = 4" \text{D treads}$$

72 degree incline

- "Shall be" means tread depths must be exactly those dimensions. Standard industry products do not typically come in those dimensions. Tolerances and rounding up or down are not addressed.
- These are steep and dangerous conditions for stairs. Handrails are only required to be on one side; compared to a ships ladder (similar incline and width) requires handrails on both sides.
- For perspective, Chichen Itza (Mayan temple) has incredibly steep-feeling stairs, and those are only 45 degree incline.
- With all the acceptable design options for egress from sleeping lofts:
1) Code compliant stair, 2) Ships ladder, 3) Alternating tread device, 4) Ladder, this section should be eliminated.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Chris Rosival

Date: 12/26/2024

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

Model Code: 2024 IRC

Telephone number: 651-284-5510

Code or Rule Section: R302.4

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Code or rule section to be changed: 2024 IRC Section R302.4

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).
R302.4

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.

R302.4 Dwelling unit rated penetrations. Penetrations of wall or floor-ceiling assemblies required to be fire-resistance rated in accordance with Section R302.2 or R302.3 shall be protected in accordance with this section. A forced air duct system shall not penetrate the walls, floors or ceilings separating dwelling units.

R302.4.1 Through penetrations. Through penetrations of fire-resistance-rated wall or floor assemblies shall comply with Section R302.4.1.1 or R302.4.1.2.

Exceptions:

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.

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.)
M1602.2 has language that does not allow forced air ducts systems to be installed in two-family dwellings.

[MP] DUCT SYSTEM. A continuous passageway for the transmission of air that, in addition to ducts, includes duct fittings, dampers, plenums, fans and accessory air-handling equipment and appliances. For the definition applicable in Chapter 11, see Section N1101.6

[RB] DWELLING UNIT. A single unit providing complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation. For the definition applicable in Chapter 11, see Section N1101.6. For the definition applicable in Chapter 24, see Section G2403.

M1602.2 Return air openings. Return air openings for heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems shall comply with all of the following:

10. Return air from one dwelling unit shall not be discharged into another dwelling unit.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
This will keep ducts from penetrating separation walls in two-family dwellings
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.

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.
none
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.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
IRC builders, contractors and installers
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.
3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.

***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: John Taylor

Date: 11-5-2024

Email address: jtaylor@cityoflakeelmo.gov

Model Code: MN IRC

Telephone number: 651-491-4723

Code or Rule Section: R310.1 Emergency
Escape and Rescue Openings

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Topic of proposal: Added language

Code or rule section to be changed: R310.1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1309 Residential Building Code

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 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).

R310.1 Emergency Escape and Rescue Openings

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.

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. See attached

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.

R311.1 Means of egress

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 will create more uniformity with administrating and inspections.

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

Clearly clarifies that the opening created is what is being inspected and not the way a door or window swings or operates.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

Too many times I have heard inspectors say that egress windows must swing out but there isn't this type of wording in the section.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible. N/A, simply clarification

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

N/A

Regulatory Analysis

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

Building Inspection, insure a more uniform Interpretation of this section and section R311.1

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 on first question. They might suggest a shorter sentence.

No, currently the word "openings" can mean several things and this is open for multiple interpretations

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?
This could leave some homeowners with high installation cost if a community only does final inspections and the inspector says the window needs to swing out and must be replaced.
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.

I am not aware.

***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.

R310.1 Emergency escape and rescue opening required. Basements, habitable attics, and every sleeping room shall have not less than one operable emergency escape and rescue opening. Where basements contain one or more sleeping rooms, an emergency egress and window opening shall be required in each sleeping room, but not be required in adjoining areas of the basement. Emergency escape and rescue openings shall open directly into a public way, or to a yard or court that opens to a public way regardless of the way the door/window swings or operates to create the opening.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: John Taylor

Date: 11-5-2024

Email address: jtaylor@cityoflakeelmo.gov

Model Code: MN IRC

Telephone number: 651-491-4723

Code or Rule Section: R311.1 Means of egress

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Topic of proposal: Added Language

Code or rule section to be changed: R311.1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1309 Residential Building Code

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 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).

R311.1 Means of egress

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.

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. See attached
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.
R310.1 Emergency Escape and Rescue Openings

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 will create more uniformity with administrating and inspections.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Clearly clarifies that the opening created is what is being inspected and not the way a door swings.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
Too many times I have heard inspectors say that egress windows must swing out but there isn't this type of wording in R310.1 subsection. This will mirror the language that is requested in another code changet o clarify that section.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible. N/A, simply clarification
2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.
N/A
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
N/A
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
N/A
5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed \$25,000 for any one small business or small city ([Minn. Stat. § 14.127](#))? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.
N/A

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Building Inspection, insure a more uniform Interpretation of this section and section R310.1

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 on first question They might suggest a shorter sentence.

No, currently the word "openings" can mean several things and this is open for multiple interpretations

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?
This could leave some homeowners with high installation cost if a community only does final inspections and the inspector says the door needs to swing out and must be replaced.
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.

I am not aware.

***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.

R311.1 Means of Egress. Dwellings shall be provided with a means of egress in accordance with this section. The means of egress shall provide a continuous and unobstructed path of vertical and horizontal egress travel from all portions of the dwelling to the required egress door without requiring travel through a garage. The required egress door shall open directly shall open directly into a public way, or to a yard or court that opens to a public way regardless of the way the door swings to create the opening.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: **C. Scott Anderson**

Date: **9/19/24**

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

Model Code: **2024 IRC**

Telephone number: **612-246-7303**

Code or Rule Section: **R318.5.1**

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: **City of Minneapolis**

Topic of proposal: **footing frost protection and Means of egress door**

Code or rule section to be changed: **R318.5.1**

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes No

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

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s). **R318.5.1**
- change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).
- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
R318.5.1

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.

Add new section

R318.5.1 Landing, deck, balcony and stair construction at required egress door.

Exterior landings, decks, balconies, stairs and similar facilities shall be supported on footings protected from frost by one or more of the following methods:

1. Extending below the frost line in accordance with 1303.1600.
2. Erecting on solid rock.
3. Other approved methods of frost protection

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 additional text clarifies the need for frost protection of the landing at the required egress door. Other doors

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

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

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

None

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

This is an editorial change and should not impact the cost of construction.

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?
Potential conflicts in code requirements and possible miss application of frost protection requirements.
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: [Greg Olson](#)

Date: [11/19/24](#)

Email address: golson@proedresource.com

Model Code: [MN IRC](#)

Telephone number: 651-301-2107

Code or Rule Section: [R319.4.3](#)

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: [SEMCO](#)

Topic of proposal: [Added language](#)

Code or rule section to be changed: [R319.4.3](#)

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 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.

[R319.4.3 Drainage](#)

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.

R319.4.3 Drainage. Area wells shall be designed for proper drainage by connecting to the building's foundation drainage system required by Section R405.1 or by an approved alternative method.

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 allows the building official and owner/contractor to explore alternative methods for drainage when existing house does not have an installed foundation drainage system.

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

This allows the building official and owner/contractor to explore alternative methods for drainage when existing house does not have an installed foundation drainage system.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

This addition is consistent with the 2020 Residential Code.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

As this language is in the current code, there should be no increase or decrease in cost.

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.

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.

As this language is in the current code, there should be no increase or decrease in cost.

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?

None, as it is the current language.

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

The referenced R405.1 section discusses what is acceptable for draining the whole foundation. If the existing house was not constructed with foundation drainage the current language of R319.4.3 does not address what to do other than requiring it to be connected to the required drainage, which does not exist. Adding the current language addresses this by providing the option of an alternative approved method.

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?

As written, there is no way for an existing house without foundation drainage to comply unless it complies with the exception to R319.4.3 regarding well-drained soil or sand-gravel mixtures.

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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Nathan Weber

Date: 11/14/2024

Email address: nweber@cityofdetroitlakes.com

Model Code: 2024 IRC

Telephone number: 218-846-7136

Code or Rule Section: R319.5

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Topic of proposal: Emergency Escape Replacement Window

Code or rule section to be changed: R319.5

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):

General Information

Yes **No**

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota? | <input 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).
R319.5

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).
R319.5

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

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.

R319.5 Replacement window for emergency escape and rescue openings. Replacement for emergency escape and rescue openings installed in buildings meeting the scope of this code shall be exempt from Sections 319.2 and 319.4.4, provided that the replacement window meets the following conditions:

1. The replacement window is the manufacturer's largest standard size window that will fit within the existing frame or existing rough opening. The replacement window shall be permitted to be of the same operating style as the existing window as long as it does not reduce the clear opening width or height by more than 2" or a style that provides for an equal or greater window opening than the existing window.
 2. The replacement window is not part of a change of occupancy.
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.)
Will prevent contractors/suppliers from significantly reducing emergency escape and rescue openings.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
Yes
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.
Potential cost increase
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.
Maintains the same level of Life, Health and Safety the home currently has.
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.
Contractor will pass any potential costs to homeowner
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.
I do not believe it will

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?
Building inspectors, Window replacement 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
An individual opposed would like to see it left as is.

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?
Potential loss of life because someone is unable to evacuate a building in an emergency

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.