

## 1305 Rule – 2003 IBC Advisory Committee Meeting Summary *From (Ninth) March 22, 2004 Meeting*

---

- Our Ninth IBC Advisory Committee meeting was called to order on Monday, March 22, 2004 at 9:05 AM. There were ten committee members/alternates present, including two BCSD staff members. There were also three other guests present for the meeting.
- **Committee Updates:** Jerry Norman, Committee Chair, provided a brief summary of where the committee was at in the process of reviewing the MSBC and 2003 IBC. He also updated Committee members on the status and on-going's of other MSBC advisory committee's. The 1311 (Existing Building/Conservation Code) committee has determined that they are going to stay with the Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings (GREB) Code. They will be analyzing the existing rule and GREB code to recommend updates and/or corrections to the document(s). Their committee is just getting started though, so there is not much to report on yet (they have met twice so far). The Accessibility Code Advisory Committee (1341 Rule) has had a number of meetings and is close to finishing up with their recommended updates to MN Rule 1341. The state will be adopting Chapter 11 of the 2003 IBC and ANSI Standard A117.1 – Accessibility Code. The intent [of the Division] is to have the compilation bound into a single manual that will make up the Minnesota State Accessibility Code, MN Rule 1341. The Structural Advisory Committee is also close to completing their agenda. They will be making recommendations for updates to structural aspects of both the 2003 IBC and IRC. Jon Nisja updated the committee on the status of the Fire Code Advisory Committee. They have had one meeting so far.
- **Proposal: Add to IBC Table 302.1.1 Incidental Use Separations.** A proposal was submitted to add electrical equipment room separations to the table. The NEC mandates rated separations for transformer rooms and electrical equipment rooms (under certain circumstances) and it was thought that designers should find separation requirements for such rooms on this table rather than relying on their electrical engineers for guidance. The committee discussed the fire-rating provisions of the NEC. They also discussed hardware references for these same rooms/spaces. Committee members agreed that a reference would be nice; but they also determined that an amendment (to the IBC) should not be incorporated. After much debate, the proponent decided to withdraw the code change proposal.  
**[Proposal withdrawn. No action required/taken.]**
- **Proposal: Add IBC Section 1014.7 Electrical equipment room.** This proposal was submitted to add provisions for requiring two exits from electrical equipment rooms when the room exceeds 1200 amps – for consistency with the NEC requirements. The intent was to provide for some direction and guidance up front rather than relying on the electrician and/or electrical engineer, or running into the problem after it is built in the field. This item relates to the discussion from the first

proposal. The committee had similar thoughts on the idea and even recommended some friendly amendments to the proposal. After further debate however, a vote was taken and the proposal was defeated. [**Proposal denied.**]

- **Proposal: Modify IBC section 1007.1. Accessible means of egress required.** A proposal was submitted to add an exception to section 1007.1 for required accessible means of egress. The proposal essentially states that an accessible means of egress would not be required in buildings that are sprinkled throughout. After some discussion, it was determined that the provision already exists and that the change was not necessary. [**Proposal withdrawn. No action taken/required.**]
  
- **Proposal: IBC Sections 202, 415.2, 716.5.2, 716.5.3.1 and 716.5.4.** Tim Manz, University of Minnesota Mechanical Inspector, submitted this proposal. The intent of the proposal was to make necessary changes to the IBC to reflect what had been successfully done under the UBC for requirements for exhausted enclosures and the elimination of smoke/fire dampers in these elements. Five separate amendments (sections) were incorporated into one proposal. They would be broken down however, as follows:
  - **Proposal: Section 202 Definitions:** Move the definition of exhausted enclosure from section 415.2 to the general definition section of 202. Committee members identified that if (each) these changes were approved, similar amendments would need to be made to the State Fire Code, because it is formatted in the same way. [**Proposal denied.**]
  
  - **Proposal: Section 716.5.2 Fire barriers:** Add two new exceptions (Numbers 4 and 5). The proposal would add two exceptions/conditions to the fire damper requirements for laboratory hood ducts penetrating fire barriers. [**Proposal denied.**]
  
  - **Proposal: Section 716.5.3.1 Penetrations of shaft enclosures:** (Add two new exceptions (Numbers 4 and 5). This proposal would add two exceptions/conditions to the fire and smoke damper requirements for laboratory hood ducts penetrating shaft enclosures. One exception would recognize exhausted enclosure ducts installed in accordance with NFPA 45 and one would recognize exhausted enclosure ducts constructed of 26-gage steel. Committee members asked questions about NFPA 45 and what it specifically required. Most members were not familiar with NFPA 45 whatsoever. Mr. Manz and Mr. Norman attempted to explain provisions of NFPA 45 and the common problems the agencies see with regard to these installations. There was specific opposition to the 5<sup>th</sup> exception with would allow for 26 gage duct to be used. After some debate, a friendly amendment was proposed – to drop exception number 5 (26 gage steel duct exception) and stick with just exception number 4 which allowed for NFPA 45 installations. A committee vote was taken and the friendly amendment condition was approved. [**Proposal approved with modifications.**]

- **Proposal: Section 716.5.4 Fire partitions.** (Add two new exceptions (Numbers 3 and 4). This proposal would add two exceptions/conditions to the fire damper requirements for laboratory hood ducts penetrating fire partitions. One exception would recognize exhausted enclosure ducts installed in accordance with NFPA 45 and one would recognize exhausted enclosure ducts constructed of 26-gage steel. This proposal is similar to the one submitted for fire barriers. This proposal was withdrawn. **[Proposal withdrawn. No action taken/required.]**
  
- **Proposal: Section 716.6.1 Through penetrations.** The intent of the proposal was to allow for the installation of a single smoke/fire damper at rated floor assembly duct penetrations in two-story I-2 and I-3 occupancies. The proponent, Mr. Roger Larson, explained that the code requires a shaft in all “I” occupancies – for every floor duct penetration. Once a shaft is installed, smoke/fire dampers are required at each duct entrance and exit from the shaft assembly. As such, in a two-story building, ducts penetrating the floor assembly are required to have “two” smoke/fire dampers, one going into the shaft and one leaving the shaft at the upper level. This proposal would allow for the installation of a single smoke/fire damper at the floor penetration in a two-story building. Committee members discussed this provisions relationship to the “shaft” requirements of section 707. There was confusion as to whether an amendment needed to be added to 707.2 to accomplish what the proponent wanted. After some debate, the proponent decided to withdraw the proposal for further modification. He will resubmit the proposal at the next meeting. **[Proposal withdrawn. No action taken/required.]**
  
- **Proposal: Section 2702.1.2 Emergency and standby power definitions.** (Add a definition of what these words mean on the code itself.) The code references one to NFPA 110 and 111 for emergency and standby power requirements. Under this provision, added language would be inserted to identify exactly what emergency and standby power mean as well as the type and classification for each. A committee member pointed out that the proposal numbering is incorrect and that it would need to be inserted at 2702.1.1 rather than as proposed. After some review of the NEC and other IBC code requirements, it was determined that there was no need for the provision. Committee members agreed that it would’ve been nice to have all the initiating requirements in chapter 27, rather than scattered throughout the IBC/NEC. Committee members also identified that the same provision are found in the IFC, so coordination would be required if any amendment was approved. It was also pointed out that the IFC applies to both new and existing buildings and if the amendment were to be approved, the new provisions would need to be applied to existing installations. After further discussion, the proponent withdrew the code change. **[Proposal withdrawn. No action taken/required.]**
  
- **Proposal: Section 407.8 and 2702.2.20 Standby power requirements.** (Two separate amendments in one package.) The intent of the provision was to provide for direction when installing standby power for fire alarm systems and motor driven fire pumps. Committee members pointed out that this requirement would be more

restrictive than NFPA 20 (fire pump installations) and other state codes. Committee members also discussed the standby power provisions for I-2 occupancies (next item). I-2 occupancies seem to “always” be constructed with standby power – with or without specific code language (in the IBC). Committee members thought that the Life Safety Code might mandate the provision already. After a lengthy deliberation, the proponent withdrew the proposal for both items. **[Both proposals withdrawn. No action taken/required on either section.]**

- **Proposal: Section 716.2.3 Emergency generators and fire pumps.** (Add new section.) The intent of the proposal is to prohibit the installation of fusible link devices on fire dampers installed in/on ventilation ducts providing make up air for emergency generators or fire pumps. The committee started to discuss this item, but the proponent withdrew it from consideration before action could be taken. **[Proposal withdrawn. No action taken/required.]**
- **Next Meeting:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 PM. There are still a few outstanding code change proposals that the committee didn’t get to; therefore, another meeting will be required. The next IBC AC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 15th, 2004 at 9:00 AM at the BCSD offices.
- **IBC AC Sunset** – The 2003 IBC Advisory Committee will sunset after the April 15th 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**  
**Kathi Osmonson, AMBO**

**Absent:**

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