

1305 Rule – 2003 IBC Advisory Committee Meeting Summary *From (Eighth) March 8, 2004 Meeting*

- Our Eighth IBC Advisory Committee meeting was called to order on Monday, March 8, 2004 at 9:15 AM. There were ten committee members/alternates present, including two BCSD staff members. There were also four other guests present for the meeting.
- **IBC Table 1005.1.** The first proposal reviewed was a proposed modification to IBC Table 1005.1 for determining required exit width – with and without sprinkler systems. Essentially, the proposal removed all exit width factors found under the “with fire sprinkler system” from the table and deleted them entirely, leaving only those factors for buildings without fire sprinklers. The proponent, Mr. Nisja, presented his rationale (found in his written sonar) and identified a number of example situations where there is insufficient exit width in corridors and stair enclosures, even when designed to the correct minimum code standards. Mr. Nisja noted that, unlike the .2 and .3 exit width factors, there is no scientific basis for the reduced exit width factors other than simply relating them to the building being sprinkled and allowing for a reduction. Mr. Higgins followed up by stating that a duplicate proposal was submitted at a past ICC national code change hearing and the proposal not disapproved for lack of statistical support. The same item however, has apparently been resubmitted for consideration in the 2006 IBC. Discussion ensued regarding minimum code standards and the designers responsibility to recognize potential issues like this and make corridors and stairs larger based on the clients actual needs rather than minimum code criteria. The committee chair, Jerry Norman, noted that the responsibility of the advisory committee was to review the model code and existing MSBC 1305 for conditions or situations that are unique to Minnesota. He identified that this subject may not be of the type that is significant to Minnesota. The committee determined that if the item is approved for the 2006 IBC, it should be considered as an amendment for inclusion in the next MSBC. The committee voted to support the proposal if approved for inclusion in the 2006 IBC. If it is not approved at the national level, it should not be added as an amendment. The committee directed staff to follow-up after the national code hearings in Overland and proceed with the proposal based on the outcome of the hearing. **[Proposal initially denied, but if approved at Overland, it should be added as a state MSBC amendment.]**
- **MSBC 1305.0011.** The next item for review was a proposal submitted by Mr. Nisja for an amendment to MSBC 1305.0011 to add a new Subpart 6 to the 1305.0011 section. The provision is specific to group I-3 occupancies only. It provision would incorporate the ANSI/NFPA Life Safety 101 Code as an incorporated reference standard and would require I-3 occupancies to be constructed to this standard (not the MSBC/IBC). Mr. Nisja outlined the rationale (in the sonar) for the proposal. The basis for the provision is that most - if not all - new detention and correction facilities (I-3) are designed to NFPA 101 for

accreditation through the American Correctional Association (ACA) or American Jail Association (AJA). Prisons designed to hold Federal prisoners must also be designed to meet NFPA 101. Under present conditions, group I-3 occupancies must comply with both codes, the State Building Code and NFPA 101. Mr. Nisja included information on associated costs for the application of this code and followed up with some information on necessary education for code officials. Discussion ensued regarding the differences between the two codes (IBC/NFPA 101) and the items that NFPA 101 does not address for building construction. The idea of “one-stop-shopping” for the application of codes and standards was discussed and supported by AIA member Roger Larson. Legislative mandates for state licensing, state code review and coordination between state agencies was identified as a potential problem if this provision were to be incorporated without necessary changes at state agency levels. After some further discussion, a committee vote was taken. The proposal failed. **[Proposal denied.]**

- **MSBC 1305.0011.** The next item for review was a proposal also submitted by Mr. Nisja for an amendment to MSBC 1305.0011 to add a new Subpart 5 to the 1305.0011 section. The provision is specific to group I-2 occupancies only. It provision would incorporate the ANSI/NFPA Life Safety 101 Code as an incorporated reference standard and would require I-3 occupancies to be constructed to this standard (not the MSBC/IBC). This item and the rationale for its proposal is similar to the item above for I-3 occupancies. The committee briefly discussed the proposal and identified similar issues to that of the proposal for the I-3 occupancies (above proposal). A committee vote was taken and the proposal was denied. **[Proposal denied.]**
- **MSBC 1305.0021.** A proposal was submitted to change the title of the section of MSBC 1305.0021 to read as follows: “References to other Codes.” This would replace existing language that states: “References to Other International Code Council Codes.” This is a simple title change to the code section. Mr. Heimkes addresses the concern and intent of the original rule language. The global references to other “T” codes found in the IBC had to be changed so that proper Minnesota State Rules/Codes were identified. Each subpart found in this section specifically references an “T” code that has been replaced by a MN Rule. The section also provides direction for uses when trying to identify what codes are actually applicable. Mr. Nisja stated that the IFC contains references to “other” codes that are not necessarily “T” code and as such, this same global reference needs to be changed to reflect that condition. The committee took action to approve the proposal without a show of hands vote. **[Proposal approved.]**
- **IBC 707.2.** A proposal to modify and delete some of the prerequisites of exception 7 of IBC section 707.2 was submitted for consideration. The intent of the code change was to modify the shaft requirements to allow buildings to have the first two floors open to one another (without stair enclosures). Mr. Norman identified that in IBC section 1019, the code has already been modified to do just so. After further committee discussion and research, it was determined that there was really no need

for the amendment because the 2003 IBC code had already been changed to satisfy the proponent's original concept. The proponent withdrew the proposal. No committee action required. **[Proposal withdrawn.]**

- **IBC 1007.1.** A proposal to add an exception to IBC section 1004.1 for accessible means of egress was submitted by Mr. Dave Leighly, BWBR Architects. Mr. Leighly however, could not be in attendance due to a personal issue, which took him out of the state. Without proper representation, it was determined that the issue would be tabled until the March 22, 2004 meeting. Mr. Leighly will be contacted and notified of the agenda so he can be present. **[Proposal Tabled]**
- **IBC 705.2.** This proposal had been discussed at a previous IBC AC meeting and had been tabled for further input by the Fire Code Committee. The proposal was to be reconsidered at this meeting. The proposal was initially submitted to generate comments/ideas on the intent of the code and/or the required expectations of the provision for structural stability of fire-walls. Mr. Nisja informed committee members of discussions that had taken place at the fire code advisory committee. Committee members again discussed the philosophical idea of when and why fire-wall are so restrictive in this manner. After a short discussion, the committee determined that the fire wall concept (along with its' construction prerequisites) were of a nature that should be "left alone." Education should be emphasized to achieve uniformity and consistency within the state. The original proponent, Mr. Norman, then withdrew his proposal; therefore, no committee action was necessary. **[Proposal withdrawn.]**
- **NFPA 5000 Building Code Presentation.** Mr. Russell Sanders, the Central Regional Manager for the National Fire Protection Association requested an opportunity to address the Advisory Committee on the NFPA 5000 model building code (and companion codes commonly referred to as C3 codes). Mr. Sanders presented information on the current status of municipalities that have adopted the C3 codes, the advantages of the C3 codes and the support that NFPA provides. Mr. Sanders also expressed disappointment on the states decision to adopt the IBC without a thorough comparison between the IBC and NFPA 5000.
- **Next Meeting:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM. Because there are a few outstanding code change proposals that the committee did not get to, another meeting will be required. The next IBC AC meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 22, 2004 at 9:00 AM at the BCSD offices.
 - **IBC AC Sunset** – The 2003 IBC Advisory Committee will sunset after the March 22nd 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
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
Kathi Osmonson, AMBO