

1305 Rule – 2003 IBC Advisory Committee Meeting Summary *From (Seventh) February 20, 2004 Meeting*

- Our Seventh IBC Advisory Committee meeting was called to order on Friday, February 20, 2004 at 9:15 AM. There were ten committee members/alternates present, including two BCSD staff members. There was also one other guest present for the meeting.
- The first item of discussion was a proposal to change the description of an I-3 occupancy. The proposal related to IBC section 308.4. This provision was discussed at a previous meeting, but there was no specific language to review at that time. The purpose of the provision was to identify what an “I-3” occupancy was if it had an occupant load of 5 or fewer persons. The point was made that the code seemingly does not allow for the locking of any occupancy unless it is an “I-3.” The question at hand was, “what is the occupancy classification of a space containing 5 or fewer persons when the doors are locked?” After some additional research, the committee surmised that the way the code tracks, any occupancy or space having an occupant load of 5 or fewer can be locked and be classified as the occupancy in which it is located - not an I-3. Those spaces could be group B, M, S, F, or any other occupancy and have locked doors - as long as the room or space had 5 or fewer persons. None of the committee members were comfortable with this condition, but it was determined that that was what the code stated. A number of locking examples were discussed, including holding rooms in retail centers and malls, sporting arenas (i.e., Excel Center), holding cells in court facilities and police stations that are classified as group B occupancies, and security rooms in schools or medical clinics. There was some discussion of the legal ramifications for taking someone into custody or into a holding condition and whether the code should be changed when state and federal laws already regulate the condition. After some debate, it was determined that the code was specifically written and intended to be applied that way. The committee determined that even for a seemingly insignificant code change, such as the one proposed, the effects would change the locking conditions of the code entirely. The committee determined that the proposal should be denied so that each local municipality could deal with locking on an individual basis. **[Proposal denied.]**
- The next item for review was the re-submittal of a proposal to amend IBC section 707.14.1 for an exception to required elevator lobbies at the first floor of a group B, M, R-1 or R-2 occupancy where the entire first floor was sprinkled with an NFPA 13 fire sprinkler system. This item had also been previously submitted but was tabled for a re-write based on a friendly amendment from the committee. The committee discussed options to the amendment and what the ramifications would be if approved. Examples of when it would and would not apply were given. After further discussion, a committee vote was taken. The result was 7 in favor, three against. The proposal was approved. **[Proposal approved.]**

- Another previous proposal was submitted for consideration. This one was an amendment to the first exception of IBC section 1008.1.2 to allow for sliding doors in “patient treatment rooms.” Under the IBC, sliding door provisions have changed so that they are not allowed in a hospital or clinic patient room setting. Sliding doors had always been allowed under previous Building and Fire Codes for these spaces. In addition, the MN Health Department, who administers the NFPA 101 - Life Safety Code on these types of licensed facilities - allows for their use. The proposal was specific to “patient treatment rooms” in that that terminology was added to the laundry list of where they could be used under exception 1. It was pointed out that the occupant load still had to be 10 or less and that in a rated wall installation, the doors may not work because they do not/may not meet the requirements for rated opening protectives in a rated wall condition. This exception would apply to both group B and group I occupancies (clinic and hospital occupancies). The proposal was approved. **[Proposal approved.]**
- Four proposed amendments to IBC Table 2902.1 were submitted. All were submitted as additional footnotes to correct inconsistencies in the way the State Plumbing Code and the State Building Code work. The IBC references the *International Plumbing Code* for some of this information. However, the State of Minnesota does not adopt the IPC, therefore, one cannot go there for this information. These footnotes will generally “fix” this tracking condition and provide for some direction in these instances. Three of the amendments relate to drinking fountains. One provides for an exemption from installing any drinking fountain if a building occupant load is less than 50 persons - in any occupancy. One provides for an exemption from drinking fountain requirements in restaurants. It also goes on to allow for a substitution for bottled water dispensers for up to 50% of the minimum number of required drinking fountains in other occupancies. And one proposal allows for a reduction of the required number of drinking fountains - of up to 50% in any occupancy - if water or other beverages are available. There was also a proposal to provide for direction when attempting to substitute urinals for waterclosets. The language found in the IPC was used for this condition. That allows for a maximum of 67%. Each item was briefly discussed and resulted in the tweaking of two of the proposals to the numbers indicated herein. Each proposal was voted upon and each was unanimously approved.
[Four Proposals. Each was approved – Four new footnotes to IBC Table 2902.1. Add footnotes h, i, j and k to table and list of footnotes.]
- **Next Meeting:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 8, 2004 at 9:00 AM at the BCSD offices.
 - **Agenda Items** - Members are to review all code change proposals that had been previously e-mailed out and be prepared to discuss the old agenda item proposal to amend the structural stability provisions for fire walls. Members should also review all current 1305 amendments to chapter 9 of the IBC and chapter 9 itself and if necessary, be prepared to offer proposals to the Fire Chiefs Fire Code Advisory Committee for their consideration.

Other code change proposals that are submitted to the BCSD will also be passed out for review, discussion and consideration. If you have any new code change proposals, they should be submitted to the Division as soon as possible, as we will be sun-setting the IBC Advisory Committee meetings after the March 8th meeting.

- **IBC AC Sunset** – The 2003 IBC Advisory Committee will sunset after the March 8th meeting. The committee will however, be retained and recalled after the Division receives all final IBC code change proposals from the Structural Advisory Committee, the 1341 Accessibility Code Advisory Committee and SFM/Fire Chiefs Fire Code Advisory Committee. The committee will then review all final IBC code change recommendations and make our own final recommendation on proposed 1305 Rule amendments to the State Building Official.

- **Committee Members Present/Absent:**

Present:

Mike Post, Minnesota Fire Marshals Association
Steve Fichtel, AIA MN
Paul Heimkes, BCSD
Jerry Norman, BCSD
Steve Thorp, AMBO
Kathi Osmonson, AMBO
Jon Nisja, State Fire Marshal
Roger Larson, AIA MN
Pat Higgins, AMBO
Frank Berg, AMBO

Absent:

Minnesota Insurance Federation
Minnesota Multi-Housing Association
Minnesota Retailers Association
Minnesota Fire Chiefs Association
Ed Solvedt, BOMA