



ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

Author/requestor: Bruce Nelson
Email address: bruce.nelson@state.mn.us
Telephone number: 651-297-2313
Firm/Association affiliation, if any: Minn. Dept. of Commerce

1323, CE-54

Proposed Code Change - Language

IECC is amended by amending section C408.2 to read:

C408.2 Mechanical system commissioning and completion requirements. Prior to passing the final mechanical inspection, ~~the registered design professional shall provide evidence of mechanical systems commissioning and completion in accordance with the provisions of this section~~ must be provided.

~~Construction document notes shall clearly indicate provision for commissioning and completion requirements in accordance with this section and are permitted to refer to specifications for further requirements.~~ *(reminder of section unchanged)*

C408.2.1 Commissioning plan. A commissioning plan shall be ~~developed by a registered design professional of approved agency~~ provided and shall include the following items: *(reminder of section unchanged)*

C408.2.4 Preliminary commissioning report. A preliminary report of commissioning test procedures and results shall be completed and certified by ~~the a qualified registered design professional or approved agency~~ and provided to the building owner. *(reminder of section unchanged)*

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

Changes are needed in the IECC because:

1. The Minnesota building code has long avoided identifying who is to perform any particular task. Rather, the code clearly identifies what is required to be done and leaves the assignment of who performs the task up to the permit applicant.
2. Section C408 is complete without the second sentence of 408.2. The sentence seems to be trying to restate the commissioning plan, which is covered in C408.2.1. To avoid contradiction it should be deleted.
3. The term “approved agency” is unclear and may lead to non-uniform enforcement.
4. In C408.2.4 the term “design professional” is unduly restrictive and not consistent with current practice.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

The proposal will remove restrictions in the existing language and thus decrease costs without detracting from its benefits.

Other Factors to Consider Related to Proposed Code Change

1. Is this proposed code change meant to:

change language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).
IECC C408.2.

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

delete language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).

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

neither; this language will be new language, not found in the code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by a Minnesota Statute or new legislation? If so, please provide the citation to the Statute or legislation.
3. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a published code book or of an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
4. Will this proposed code change impact other parts of the Minnesota State Building Code? If so, please list the affected parts of the Minnesota State Building Code.
Commercial building developers will have more flexibility.
5. Who are the parties affected or segments of industry affected by this proposed code change?
6. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
7. Are you aware of any federal requirement or regulation related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the regulation or requirement.
No.