



CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Karen Gridley

Date: 3/14/2024

Email address: karen.gridley@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC

Telephone number: 652-284-5877

Code or Rule Section: 1103.2.17 (new)

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: CCLD

Topic of proposal: Reinstate 1341 Amendment

Code or rule section to be changed: MN 1341, add new section 1103.2.17

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1341

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 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).
No

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.
Yes

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.

1103.2.17 Live/Work Units. Live/Work units within a dwelling unit or sleeping unit occupied as the residence of the proprietor are not required to comply with this chapter.

Or:

1103.2.17 Live/Work Units. Live/Work units are not required to comply with this chapter.

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 proposed code change is necessary to reinstate the exemption previously included in 1341 for clarity and to harmonize with MN 1305 Section 419 which deletes Live/Work units because they are governed by local zoning ordinances, not by building code. Local zoning ordinances determine if a homeowner is permitted to operate a business within their primary residence. Business ownership and operation is not regulated by building code. Therefore it is not appropriate to include Accessibility requirements in the Accessibility Code since the Accessibility Code is a chapter within the Building Code.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The proposed change is reasonable in order to harmonize MN 1341 with Section 419 in MN 1305
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
This exemption previously existed in the 2015 and earlier MN Accessibility Codes in order to harmonize with the Building Code deletion, but was inadvertently deleted in the 2020 code cycle due to ICC relocating and renumbering requirements related to Live/Work units.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
No cost change. The proposed change clarifies the intent of the code that is already being enforced in the intended manner.
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?
Residential home industry such as single family homes, condos, townhomes and apartment units.
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 known alternatives or alternate suggestions.
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?
Probable costs of not adopting the code change include excessive cost to homeowners to modify their homes for accessibility where the code does not otherwise require it, and the consequences are that it can cause enforcement overreach because building code does not regulate business ownership or operation within their primary place of residence.
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.
The Federal ADA, under the 2010 ADA Standards requires small businesses open to the public within a person's home to be accessible. So even though the building code cannot regulate it, the Federal ADA can cover these types of operations. Homeowners who have a small business within their home open to the public would be obligated to comply with the Federal ADA on their own.

***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: Karen Gridley

Date: 3/15/2024

Email address: karen.gridley@state.mn.us

Model Code: 2024 IBC, and ANSI A117.1

Telephone number: 651-284-5877

Code or Rule Section: IBC 1107 and A117.1 Section 502.11

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: CCLD Topic of proposal: Motor-Vehicle-Related Facilities: EVCS

Code or rule section to be changed: 1107 and 502.11

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1341

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

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

Yes. change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).

This would change IBC Section 1107 Motor-Vehicle-Related Facilities

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).

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

This would add the new language developed in the Electric Vehicle Charging Station TAG for Accessible EVCS

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

Yes. Statute 326B.106 Sec. 31 Subd. 16, and 326B.103 Subd 6a, 6b, 6c Definitions. In May of 2023 the state legislature enacted legislation to add to the state building code a minimum number of EV charging facilities in new commercial and multi-family housing structures that provide on-site parking facilities. A TAG was established to draft the code requirements in order to implement the legislation, which includes Accessibility requirements related to Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations. [The proposed language being submitted for the 2026 MN1341 rulemaking is the result of the language developed for the Electric Vehicle Charging Station TAG, which should be relocated from the draft Energy Code to the Accessibility Code.](#)

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.

**SECTION 1107
MOTOR-VEHICLE-RELATED FACILITIES**

1107.1 General. Electrical vehicle charging stations shall comply with Section 1107.2 [and ANSI A117.1 Section 502.11](#). Fuel-dispensing systems shall comply with Section 1107.3.

1107.2 Electrical vehicle charging stations. Electrical vehicle charging stations shall comply with Sections 1107.2.1 ~~and 1107.2.2~~

Exceptions:

- ~~1. Electrical vehicle charging stations provided to serve Group R-3 and R-4 occupancies are not required to comply with this section.~~
2. Electrical vehicle charging stations used exclusively by buses, trucks, other delivery vehicles, law enforcement vehicles and motor pools are not required to comply with this section.

1107.2.1 Number of accessible vehicle spaces. ~~Not less than 5 percent of vehicle spaces on the site served by electrical vehicle charging systems, but not fewer than one for each type of electrical vehicle charging system, shall be accessible.~~ [Where Electric Vehicle Service Equipment is installed in on-site parking facilities, Accessible EVSE-Installed Spaces shall be provided in compliance with Table 1107.2.1 and comply with the accessibility requirements of ANSI A117.1 Section 502.11.](#)

[Where an EVSE-Installed Space is not provided but EV-Capable spaces are provided, and the parking facility has 5 or more parking spaces, Accessible EV-Capable Space shall be provided in compliance with Table 1107.2.1 The accessible EV-Capable Space is permitted to be adjacent to an accessible parking space and access aisle.](#)

Table 1107.2.1
Number of Accessible Vehicle Spaces

<u>EVSE-Installed Accessible Space Requirements</u>	<u>EVSE-Capable Accessible Space Requirements</u>
---	---

<u>Total number of Parking Spaces (including EV spaces)</u>	<u>Minimum number of EVSE-Installed Spaces</u>	<u>Minimum number of EVSE-Capable Spaces</u>
<u>5-25</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>26-150</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>151-500</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>501+</u>	<u>2 + 5 percent of the total number of spaces above 500</u>	<u>2 + 5 percent of the total number of spaces above 500</u>

~~1107.2.2 Vehicle Space Size. Accessible vehicle spaces shall comply with the requirements for a van accessible parking space that is 132 inches (3350 mm) minimum in width with an adjoining access aisle that is 60 inches (1525 mm) minimum in width.~~

1107.3 Fuel-dispensing systems. Fuel-dispensing systems shall ~~be accessible.~~ comply with ANSI A117.1 Section 309.

(The following language is to be located in the ANSI A117.1 portion of the MN Accessibility Code, Section 502.11.)

502.11 Electrical vehicle charging stations shall comply with Section 502.11.

502.11.1 Vehicle Space Size. Accessible vehicle charging spaces shall be 132 inches (11 feet) minimum wide and 240 inches (20 feet) minimum long.

Exceptions:

1. Where the drive aisle behind the accessible vehicle charging space is striped in a similar manner as the access aisle for the full width of the parking stall and the adjacent access aisle, the parking stall length may be reduced to not less than 18 feet.
2. Where a minimum 4-foot-wide accessible route is provided at the head end of the parking stall, at the same level as the parking surface, and equipped with barriers to prevent vehicles from encroaching into the required space, the parking stall may be reduced to not less than 18 feet.

502.11.2 Vehicle Space Marking. Accessible vehicle charging spaces shall be marked to define the width. Where vehicle spaces are marked with lines, the width measurements of vehicle spaces and adjacent access aisles shall be made from the centerline of the markings.

Exception: Where vehicle spaces or access aisles are not adjacent to another vehicle space or access aisle, measurements shall be permitted to include the full width of the line defining the vehicle space or access aisle.

502.11.3 Access Aisle. Accessible vehicle charging spaces shall have an adjoining access aisle complying with Section 502.11.3.

502.11.3.1 Location. Access aisles shall adjoin an accessible route. Two vehicle charging spaces shall be permitted to share a common access aisle. Access aisles shall not overlap with the vehicular way. Vehicle charging spaces shall be permitted to have access aisles placed on either side of the vehicle charging space.

502.11.3.2 Width. Access Aisles serving accessible vehicle charging spaces shall be 60 inches minimum in width.

502.11.3.3 Length. Access aisles shall extend the full length of the vehicle charging space they serve.

502.11.3.4 Marking. Access aisles shall be marked so as to discourage parking in them and be provided with the designation “no parking.” The “no parking” designation shall be provided on a vertically posted sign centered at the head end of the access aisle a maximum of 96 inches from the head of the access aisle. Where access aisles are marked with lines, the width measurements of access aisles and adjacent vehicle charging spaces shall be made from the centerline of the markings.

Exceptions:

1. A vertically posted sign indicating no parking shall not be required where the sign would obstruct a curb ramp or accessible pedestrian route. In this case, the no parking designation shall be provided on the surface of the access aisle.
2. A vertically posted sign indicating no parking shall not be required where parking spaces and access aisles are enclosed or otherwise protected from the elements. In this case, the no parking designation shall be provided on the surface of the access aisle.
3. Where access aisles or vehicle spaces are not adjacent to another access aisle or vehicle space, measurements shall be permitted to include the full width of the line defining the access aisle or parking space.

502.11.4 Encroachment. The access aisle shall be free and clear of all obstructions.

Exception: Equipment and other obstructions are permissible within 30 inches of the head-end and foot-end of the access aisle provided that obstructions do not encroach the minimum width of an accessible route or impede access to charging equipment.

502.11.5 Ground Surface. Accessible vehicle charging spaces and access aisles shall be stable, firm and of slip resistant materials, and shall have surface slopes not steeper than 1:48. Access aisles shall be at the same level as the accessible vehicle charging spaces they serve.

502.11.6 Identification. Accessible EVSE-Installed Spaces shall be identified by a sign that includes the phrases “Designed for Disability Access” along with “Please be courteous.” The words shall be permitted to be either on separate signs or placed together on a single sign. Signs shall be vertically posted and be within 12 inches of the centerline of the width of the space at the head end of the accessible vehicle charging space a maximum of 96 inches (2440 mm) from the head of the parking space, and be mounted 60 inches (1525 mm) minimum and 66 inches (1676 mm) maximum above the floor of the parking space, measured to the bottom of the lowest sign.

Exceptions:

1. A vertically posted sign shall not be required where the sign would obstruct a curb ramp or accessible pedestrian route. In this case, the designation shall be provided on the surface of the Accessible vehicle charging space.
2. A vertically posted sign shall not be required where vehicle spaces and access aisles are enclosed or otherwise protected from the elements. In this case, the designation shall be provided on the surface of the accessible vehicle charging space.

3. Parallel vehicle charging spaces shall have a vertically posted sign located on the side, at the head end of the parking space.

4. Accessible signage not required where only one EVSE charging facility is provided.

502.11.7 Accessible route. An accessible route complying with Chapter 4 of the Minnesota Accessibility Code shall be provided that connects the access aisles serving Accessible vehicle charging stalls to the clear floor or ground space at the accessible EVSE charger, and from the clear floor or ground space at EVSE charger to an accessible building entrance within the same site. Where EVSE charging stations are within covered or enclosed parking structures a minimum vertical clearance of 98 inches shall be maintained throughout the vehicular route to the accessible vehicle charging space and access aisle.

Exception: In installations on existing sites where it is technically infeasible to provide a fully compliant accessible route to an accessible building entrance due to existing site constraints, an accessible route to an accessible building entrance shall be provided to the maximum extent technically feasible.

502.11.8 Operable parts. Operable parts on EVSE chargers including, but not limited to, the connector, card readers, electronic user interfaces, switches and buttons including the emergency start/stop button shall comply with Sections 502.11.8.

502.11.8.1 Clear Floor Space. A clear floor space complying with A117.1 Section 305 of the Minnesota Accessibility Code shall be provided on the user interface side of the equipment.

502.11.8.2 Height. Operable parts shall be placed within one or more of the reach ranges specified in Section 308 of the Minnesota Accessibility Code. The height to the operable parts shall be measured from the surface of the clear floor space adjacent to the user interface side of the equipment.

502.11.9 Charging Cables. The EVSE shall include design features that prevent cable slack from accumulating on the ground.

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.)
2. **The MN state legislature enacted legislation to add to the state building code a minimum number of EV charging facilities in new commercial and multi-family housing structures that provide on-site parking facilities, which will includes Accessibility requirements related to Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations because per MN Accessibility Code Scoping Section 1103.1, Sites, facilities, elements and spaces shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities.**
3. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
It is reasonable because it ensures a minimum number of electrical vehicle charging stations in on-site parking facilities will be accessible to individuals with disabilities.
4. What other factors should the TAG consider?

The draft proposed language is taken from the draft guidelines prepared by the U.S. Access Board, and also aligns with guidelines published by the MN Pollution Control Agency in partnership with MN DOT and MN Department of Administration. The previous MN guidelines were drafted in effort to support the Governor's goals that 20% of the vehicles on the roads in MN will be EV's by 2030, and to ensure that the EV charging stations provided to meet this goal have a minimum level of accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

There will be a cost increase due to adding electric vehicle charging stations in general to a site, however that cost is due to the new language in the draft Energy Code, not due to the accessibility criteria proposed for the MN Accessibility Code. There may be minor costs associated with this draft Accessibility criteria to include curb ramps connecting the access aisle to the charging equipment location and to the Accessible route.

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.

Any increased cost will be offset by the benefit of increasing safe means of access to the EVCS for persons with disabilities to participate fully in the community.

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

Government units, land developers, landlords of multi-family housing and businesses will bear the cost to include Accessibility features at EVCS.

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?

Government units, land developers, landlords of multi-family housing and businesses.

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.

The alternative is the original model code language which does not provide guidelines for quantity or design of the accessibility features that need to be in place in order for the spaces to function properly for persons with disabilities.

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?

The consequences of not adopting this code change is lack of uniform enforcement, or no enforcement at all.

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.

The draft proposed language is taken from the draft guidelines prepared by the U.S. Access Board, and also aligns with guidelines published by the MN Pollution Control Agency in partnership with MN DOT and MN Department of Administration. The previous MN guidelines were drafted in effort to support the Governor's goals that 20% of the vehicles on the roads in MN will be EV's by 2030, and to ensure that the EV charging stations provided to meet this goal have a minimum level of accessibility for persons with disabilities.

***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: Karen Gridley

Date: 4/4/2024

Email address: karen.gridley@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC

Telephone number: 652-284-5877

Code or Rule Section: 1109.2 Assembly Area Seating (new)

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: CCLD and maintain MN 1341 Section 1108.2.

Topic of proposal: Accept model code language

Code or rule section to be changed: MN 1341, Section 1108.2

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1341

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 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).

Yes, It will change a portion of the model code Section 1109.2 with an existing MN Amendment.

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

Yes, It will add model language within a MN Amendment. 1341 Subp. 7 Section 1108.2

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.

Yes. Adds new language not found in MN 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.

1109.2 Assembly area seating. A *building* , room or space used for assembly purposes with *fixed seating, bleachers , grandstands or folding and telescopic seating* shall comply with **Sections 1109.2.1 through 1109.2.5.** A *building, room, or space, or lawn seating* used for assembly purposes with *nonfixed seating* shall comply with **Section 1109.2.6.** Assistive listening systems shall comply with **Section 1109.2.7.** Performance areas viewed from assembly seating areas shall comply with **Section 1109.2.8.** Dining areas shall comply with **Section 1109.2.9.**

(**note:** green text = new model code language. Orange = current model language to incorporate within current MN amendment. Purple = current 1341 amendment language.)

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 proposed code change is necessary to reinstate the language for bleachers, grandstands and telescopic seating that was removed from the previous model code, creating confusion. The intent was to still require those features to be part of this requirement. The change to the MN amendment is also necessary to clarify that lawn seating is a space that is intended to be covered by the nonfixed seating requirement to have an accessible route leading to the area, such as in built environments such as amphitheatres and outdoor concert areas. The model code language has included “lawn seating” in their language for multiple code cycles so not including it in the MN language implies that MN deleted it or does not require lawn seating to be on an accessible route, which is incorrect. Incorporating “Lawn Seating” within the MN Rule language clarifies the intent.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The proposed change is reasonable in order to harmonize MN 1341 with the model code, the Federal ADA and the original intent of the code.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
This bleacher language previously existed in the 2015 and earlier MN Accessibility Codes. The lawn seating language has been part of the model code language and is needed within the 1341 amendment language for clarification that these areas are also intended to be covered by the code.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

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

No cost change. The proposed change clarifies the intent of the code that is already being enforced in the intended manner.

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?
Government units such as parks and recreation entities and schools, land developers, entertainment venue owners and operators.
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 known alternatives or alternate suggestions.
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?
The consequence of not adopting the code change is inconsistent enforcement due to misinterpretation of the language.
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.
The Federal ADA, under the 2010 ADA Standards has similar requirements.

***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: Karen Gridley

Date: 4/4/2024

Email address: karen.gridley@state.mn.us

Model Code: IBC

Telephone number: 652-284-5877

Code or Rule Section: 1112 Signage

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: CCLD with minor amendments.

Topic of proposal: Accept model code language

Code or rule section to be changed: MN 1341, Section 1111

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1341

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).

Yes, It will change a portion of the model code Section 1112 with portions of the MN Amendment in 1341 Subp. 9 Section 1111

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

Yes, It will substantially replace MN amendment 1341 Subp.9 Section 1111, while maintaining only a small portion of the MN amendment language.

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

Yes. Some portions of the model code language must be deleted or changed to align with other MN rules.

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

Yes.

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

Yes. Adds new language not found in MN 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.

(Note: blue = Model code. Red strikeout = model code. Purple = MN 1341 existing amendment incorporated within model code.)

Strike out all of MN Rule 1341 Section 1111 and replace with the following model code language, with slight modifications to re-incorporate a few of the MN 1341 amendments that weren't covered by the new model code language.

SECTION 1112

SIGNAGE

1112.1 Signs. Required accessible elements shall be identified by the International Symbol of Accessibility at the following locations.

1. Accessible parking spaces required by Section **1106.2**.
Exception: Where the total number of parking spaces provided is four or less, identification of accessible parking spaces is not required.
2. Accessible parking spaces required by Section **1106.3**
Exception: In Group I-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 *facilities*, where parking spaces are assigned to specific *dwelling units* or *sleeping units*, identification of accessible parking spaces is not required.
3. Accessible passenger loading zones.
4. Accessible toilet or bathing rooms where not all toilet or bathing rooms are *accessible*.
5. Accessible entrances where not all entrances are accessible.
6. Accessible checkout aisles where not all aisles are accessible. The sign, where provided, shall be above the checkout aisle in the same location as the checkout aisle number or type of checkout identification.
7. Accessible dressing, fitting and locker rooms where not all such rooms are accessible.
8. *Accessible areas of refuge* in accordance with Section **1009.9**.
9. Exterior areas for assisted rescue in accordance with Section **1009.9**.
10. In recreational *facilities*, lockers that are required to be accessible in accordance with Section **1110.12**.

1112.2 Signs identifying toilet rooms, or bathing rooms, locker rooms, dressing rooms or fitting rooms.

Signs ~~required in Section 403.4 of the International Plumbing Code~~ identifying toilet rooms, ~~and~~ bathing rooms, locker rooms, dressing rooms, or fitting rooms, shall be visual characters, raised characters and braille complying with ICC A117.1. Where pictograms are provided as designations ~~for toilet rooms and bathing rooms~~, the pictograms shall have visual characters, raised characters and braille complying with ICC A117.1.

1112.3 Directional signage. Directional signage indicating the route to the nearest like accessible element shall be provided at the following locations. These directional signs shall include the International Symbol of Accessibility and sign characters shall meet the visual character requirements in accordance with ICC A117.1.

1. Inaccessible *building* entrances.
2. Inaccessible public toilets and bathing *facilities*.
3. Elevators not serving an *accessible route*.
4. At each separate-sex toilet and bathing room indicating the location of the nearest family/assisted use toilet or bathing room where provided in accordance with Section **1110.2.1**.

5. At *exits* and *exit stairways* serving a required accessible space, but not providing an *approved accessible means of egress*, signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1009.10**.
6. Where drinking fountains for *persons* using wheelchairs and drinking fountains for standing *persons* are not located adjacent to each other, directional signage shall be provided indicating the location of the other drinking fountains.

1112.4 Other signs. Signage indicating special accessibility provisions shall be provided as shown.

1. Each assembly area required to comply with **Section 1109.2.7** shall provide a sign notifying patrons of the availability of assistive listening systems. The sign shall comply with ICC A117.1 requirements for visual characters and include the International Symbol of Access for Hearing Loss.

Exception: Where ticket offices or windows are provided, signs are not required at each assembly area provided that signs are displayed at each ticket office or window informing patrons of the availability of assistive listening systems.

2. At each door to an area of refuge providing direct access to a stairway, exterior area for assisted rescue, exit stairway, exit passageway, or exit discharge, signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1013.4**.

3. At *areas of refuge*, signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1009.11**.

4. At exterior areas for assisted rescue, signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1009.11**.

5. At two-way communication systems, signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1009.8.2**.

6. In *interior exit stairways* and *ramps*, floor level signage shall be provided in accordance with **Section 1023.9**.

7. ~~Signs identifying the type of access provided on amusement rides required to be accessible by Section 1111.4.8 shall be provided at entries to queues and waiting lines. In addition, At amusement rides where accessible unload areas also serve as accessible load areas, signs indicating the location of the accessible load and unload areas shall be provided at entries to queues and waiting lines. These directional sign characters shall meet the visual character requirements in accordance with ICC A117.1.~~

8. Where signages is provided with instructions for the operation of exit doors the signage shall comply with ICC A117.1 requirements for visual characters.

1112.5 Variable message signs. Where provided in the locations in **Sections 1112.5.1 and 1112.5.2**, variable message signs shall comply with the variable message sign requirements of ICC A117.1.

1112.5.1 Transportation facilities. Where provided in transportation *facilities*, variable message signs conveying transportation-related information shall comply with **Section 1112.5**.

1112.5.2 Emergency shelters. Where provided in *buildings* that are designated as emergency shelters, variable message signs conveying emergency-related information shall comply with **Section 1112.5**.

Exception: Where equivalent information is provided in an audible manner, variable message signs are not required to comply with ICC A117.1.

1112.6 Designations. Where provided, interior and exterior signs identifying permanent rooms and spaces shall be visual characters, raised characters and braille complying with ICC A117.1. Where pictograms are provided as designations of interior rooms and spaces, the pictograms shall have visual characters, raised characters and braille complying with ICC A117.1.

Exceptions:

1. Exterior signs that are not located at the door to the space they serve are not required to comply.
2. *Building* directories, menus, seat and row designations in assembly areas, occupant names, *building* addresses and company names and logos are not required to comply.
3. Signs in parking *facilities* are not required to comply.
4. Temporary (7 days or less) signs are not required to comply.

5. In detention and correctional *facilities*, signs not located in public areas are not required to comply.

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 proposed code change is necessary because the model code language now includes nearly all of what we've had in our MN amendment for the entirety of MN Section 1111. It is no longer necessary to maintain the entire MN amendment because the model code now covers everything but a few items.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
The proposed change is reasonable in order to harmonize MN 1341 with the model code, the Federal ADA and the original intent of the code.
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 cost change. The proposed change provides clarification to previously unclear amendment language.
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 owners and operators, designers, and the signage industry.

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 known alternatives or alternate suggestions.

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?

The consequence of not adopting the code change is inconsistent enforcement due to misinterpretation of the language.

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.

The Federal ADA, under the 2010 ADA Standards has similar requirements.

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