

MARVIN FEEDBACK

From: David McDonald (Warroad) <DavidMc@marvin.com>
Sent: Monday, February 3, 2025 4:37 PM
To: Spuckler, Amanda (DLI) <amanda.spuckler@state.mn.us>
Subject: (Marvin - Info for Replacement Window Tabled Code Change Proposal): MN Residential TAG

Good afternoon MN Residential TAG members,

I'm sorry but I had a busy last week of meetings and travel and wanted to send this to you ahead of the meeting. I thought I had until Wednesday this week but see it is scheduled for Tuesday. Based upon the information on the Tag website – I am planning to email this information to Amanda Spuckler with the hopes she can share this.

Here is what I will focus my comments on from the 2024 IRC and most importantly, the requirements in Section R319.5 and the two additional requirements in R319.5 (1).

2024 IRC:

R319.5 Replacement windows for emergency escape and rescue openings. INSIGHTS

Replacement *for emergency escape and rescue openings* installed in *buildings meeting the scope of this code shall be exempt* from Sections R319.2 and R319.4.4, *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 or a style that provides for an equal or greater window opening area than the existing window*.
2. The replacement window is not part of a *change of occupancy*.

INSIGHTS (2)

Code Change Details Hearing Videos

If you meet the requirements in R319.5 (1), the applicant is exempt from the minimum dimension requirements in Section R319.2 and there should be no questions or additional points made about 'egress hardware', etc. Exempt if the replacement window meets –

- **'manufacturer's largest standard size window that will fit within the existing frame OR existing rough opening'**
- **'shall be permitted to be on the same operating style as the existing window OR a stile that provides for an equal or greater window opening area than the existing window'**

If so, then if the replacement window is determined to meet the 2 requirements above, that replacement window is exempt from EERO minimum dimension requirements:

R319.2 Emergency escape and rescue openings.

Emergency escape and rescue openings shall have minimum dimensions in accordance with Sections R319.2.1 through R319.2.4.

I don't think that one picture provided demonstrates a clear need for the existing Code to be changed and I think that after looking it closer, I felt like I had more questions, such as:

- What operator type was the existing window?
 - If it was a single hung/double hung or glider – I am fairly confident that the casement replacement window has an equal to or greater window opening area that what previously existed.
- If the contractor/window installer was questioned about Code compliance, did they have an opportunity to prove that their replacement window had an 'equal to or greater window opening area than the existing window'?

However, if the code change proposer had more information maybe this could be discussed further.

The Code also provides some leeway to the type of product designed and offered by the manufacturer (**manufacturer's largest standard size window**) which was chosen by the architect, builder, or homeowner. It is very possible that the example in the photographs allowed the consumer to go from a slider/glider product (perhaps dual pane), to a casement which is more efficient than the other operator types but also perhaps upgrade to tripane performance. If you zoom in on the photograph, that may be a tripane product but I'm not totally sure as it could be a reflection in the photograph.

If the product meets the following 2 requirements – you cannot even get into the questions of EERO, 'egress hardware', etc. since that replacement product would be exempt.

- **manufacturer's largest standard size window that will fit within the existing frame OR existing rough opening'**

'shall be permitted to be on the same operating style as the existing window OR a stile that provides for an equal or greater window opening area than the existing window'

Maybe some of these website will provide some additional information for consideration. I could not find that these cities or others have to go into greater detail for replacement windows, other than referencing the existing Code requirements.

City of Hutchinson: [Microsoft Word - Residential Window Replacement Information.doc](#)

City of Arden Hills: [Egress Windows | Arden Hills, MN - Official Website](#)

City of Eagan: [Handout_Windows2023.pdf](#)

I do think that the main issue regarding establishing the new requirement will result in requiring much more detailed replacement window handout, replacement window permit application information or require more inspections for replacement windows than what is typically needed. I'm not sure that most cities feel this way because I have had so few questions on this issue in my 10.5 years with Marvin.

I am opposed to the Code change as presented.

I hope to be on the call and perhaps can answer some additional questions, if needed.

Thanks

David McDonald | Code and Regulatory Affairs
218-242-4150 | marvin.com



ANDERSEN FEEDBACK

From: Johnson, Michael <MichaelAJohnson@AndersenCorp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 10:41 AM
To: Spuckler, Amanda (DLI) <amanda.spuckler@state.mn.us>
Subject: Andersen Windows Feedback - Residential TAG CCP to R319.5

Amanda,

Can you please forward this to the appropriate people on the Residential TAG? We ran out of time in the 1/22 meeting to discuss this CCP, so the topic was tabled. I thought it was being tabled until the next session (today – 2/4) and I was prepared to speak, but then they said they were waiting on written submissions/responses? Here is the proposed language change from Nathan Weber’s CCP (underlined language is what’s proposed to add):

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.

Below are the key points I had planned on speaking to:

- Thanks for the opportunity to respond!
- While I appreciate the concern that led to the CCP, I think it’s trying to implement a solution in search of a problem...and I also worry about creating additional hurdles for homeowners to replace existing windows with more efficient products.
- Some brief history:
 - Well over a decade ago, my predecessor Mark Mikkelson worked closely with folks to get the current language into MN code. The concept of a dimensional limit was raised at that time too. It was considered, debated, and ultimately *not* adopted in favor of the language already in the code.
 - It’s also worth noting that this language was added to the IRC model code in the 2015 cycle, and has remained (unchanged) ever since. This means that at a national level there have been no concerns with this wording and no changes were made during the 2018 IRC code cycle, the 2021 code cycle, the 2024 code cycle, and (as far as I’m aware) there is no active move to amend this section in

the current 2027 IRC code cycle.

- This is a clear indication that the current code language is working.
- Furthermore, the inclusion of a dimensional limit would only raise numerous questions and complications that would all need to be addressed in code.
- Lastly, I would argue that if the existing code language is followed under item #1, there shouldn't be situations where these openings are "significantly" reduced (as raised in the CCP).
- We recommend that the current language be retained and unamended.
- If there are desires to better communicate this language (or educate) code officials, that would be fine. Perhaps a white paper could be distributed. Another option might be to include a copy of this code language with permits associated with this kind of replacement work (if it isn't already). That way, contractors, installers, homeowners, and code officials should have a clear understanding of what's required for replacement fenestration in these openings.

I happy to respond to questions as well – just send them my way.

Thanks!

MICHAEL JOHNSON
MANAGER
CODE & REGULATORY AFFAIRS
ANDERSEN CORPORATION

