

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: **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: 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? 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).
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.

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Nick Erickson

Date: 1/28/2025

Email address: nick@housingfirstmn.org

Model Code: IECC

Telephone number: 612-210-8332

Code or Rule Section: 1309

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: Housing First MN

Topic of proposal: Commissioning

Code or rule section to be changed: (1309) R325.8

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IECC

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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.

Installed heating, cooling and ventilation systems shall be performance-tested, in accordance with R.325.8 . Documentation of results must be submitted to the building official prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

NOTE THIS REQUIRES THE ADOPTION OF THE CORRELATION CODE CHANGE SUBMITTED

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.
Possible connection to the administrative portions. But that will need to be determined by technical staff.

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.)
Minnesota's home designs are becoming more complex, and homebuilders and their energy raters have reported that with the adoption of the 2024 IECC and beyond, performance path utilization will increase dramatically in MN. As Minnesota moves beyond the IECC standard through 2038, the performance path will be critical in achieving and consideration of affordability in the energy code.

With performance path adoption increasing, there will be less predictability in the home design and code officials will need to know that these homes are built in accordance with their design. Much of this work is already being done in conjunction with the energy rater during their work in the home.

This proposal not only

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
This ensures that the system is installed and functioning as designed; the rater is most qualified to address this issue.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
The amount of training and reinspections due to the proliferation of the performance path will place stress on the building officials and general contractors. This is the approach taken in several other markets and does function well. This language itself was inspired by Fort Collins.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
This would eliminate the need for one inspection trip, so this cost savings estimate would be dependent on cities adjusting their fees accordingly. As the rater is already onsite performing this work, it should not increase costs on this e

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.
Cost decrease, see above point 1.

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?
Homebuilders, Raters, Code 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?
Confusion as the performance path proliferates. Delays in permitting and inspections due to the varying approaches taken. Confusion around possible re-inspections and change orders caused by misinterpretation of the performance path design.

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:

Date:

Email address:

Model Code:

Telephone number:

Code or Rule Section:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Topic of proposal:

Code or rule section to be changed:

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

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

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: 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.