

## 1305 Rule – 2003 IBC Advisory Committee Meeting Summary *From (Second) December 8, 2003 Meeting*

---

- Our second IBC Advisory committee meeting was called to order at 9:15 AM on December 8, 2003. There were twelve advisory committee members/alternates present, including the two Building Codes and Standards Division (BCSD) staff. There were also three other persons present for the meeting. Introductions of those persons present were made.
- BCSD Staff reviewed the chapters of the code that the committee is responsible for and discussed some of the issues relating the state's consideration of adopting IBC chapter 11, the ANSI Standard and provisions from 1341. Coordination on this issue could be very complex as 1341 (Minnesota's Accessibility Code) is a statewide code, where the IBC only applies in those areas of the state where the State Building Code is adopted. The committee reviewed the following existing Minnesota State Building Code amendments and compared current/existing language with the 2003 IBC. Discussion ensued as follows:
  - **1305.0011 Replacement Chapters. [Modify as required]** This section needs to be changed to reflect accessibility code conditions, based on the final outcome how the 1341 rule will be modified.
  - **1305.0021 References to other International Code Council codes. [Modify as required]** This section needs to be modified to include a new 2003 IBC reference to the *International Existing Building Code*. Since the state is not going to adopt this manual, a reference to Subpart 12 (new) needs to be added to the list – referencing the 1311 Rule and the *Minnesota State Building Conservation Code* (GREBB). In addition the initial general statement needs to be modified to reflect “12” subparts rather than 11.
  - **1305.0201 General.** 2000 IBC Section 201.4. **[No change necessary]**
  - **1305.0202 Definitions.** 2000 IBC Section 202 **[No change necessary]**
  - **1305.0302 Classification.** 2000 IBC Section 302.3.3. **[Renumbered to 2003 IBC Section 302.3.2 exception #2 or to footnote f of Table 302.3.2 for I-4, E, R-3]** The committee discussed how to best apply this amendment. It could either be placed under Table 302.3.3 as a number of additional footnotes, or it could be maintained as part of this initial language in 302.3.2. The committee generally recommended that the language be maintained in the body of the code rather than as an amendment to the table. The amendment is necessary due to existing statutory language that mandates no separation between a church building and a child or adult day care center. The State Fire Marshals' office is to review commentary and provide feedback on this issue. Keep in code and modify language as required.

- **1305.0310 Group R Occupancies.** 2000 IBC Section 310.1. **[Modify]** This section only needs modification for new language pertaining to “transient” or non-transient” conditions found in the 2003 IBC. This amendment is again mandated by an existing state statute that states that a bed and breakfast having five (5) or fewer rooms are classified as an “R-3 occupancy. The intent is so that such uses can be operated in a single family dwelling – as regulated by the IRC. Code changes will only reflect new terminology brought into the code by the 2003 IBC. Also re-title section properly.
- **1305.0402 Covered Mall Buildings. Subpart 1.** 2000 IBC Section 402.7.3. **[Renumbered to 2003 IBC Section 402.7.4]** No change to the current code language necessary, except for renumbering to new 2003 IBC format. Keep in code.
- **1305.0402 Covered Mall Buildings. Subpart 2.** 2000 IBC Section 402.8.1. **[Delete]** This code amendment is no longer necessary because new 2003 IBC language incorporates what the existing amendment already says. The amendment is no longer necessary.
- **1305.0403 High-Rise Buildings.** 2000 IBC Section 403.13. **[Renumbered to 2003 IBC Section 403.15]** Post Fire Smoke Exhaust Systems. The intent of this amendment was discussed/debated amongst committee members. BCSD Staff provided a history of how this amendment was added to the MSBC. This came by recommendation of the State Fire Chiefs Code Committee in their review of the 2000 IBC and 2000 IFC. Due to the fact that all smoke control provisions were removed from high rise buildings, they deemed it necessary to have a “post” smoke exhaust system for a number of reasons. Some of those reasons were: by adding a system like this, the fire department saves time on scene, the system provides for a means to keep firefighters off the roof of a building (safety), it provides for means to remove smoke without cutting or damaging the building and by having a system like this, the fire department has a better ability to keep smoke from affecting other portions of a building that were not involved in the incident. It also allows for the building to be placed back in operation sooner. This same provision was added to the covered mall building section of the code. Both sections refer one to MSBC 1305.0912 for design conditions of the system. Discussion ensued regarding the code requirements from MSBC 1305.0912, or lack thereof. Committee members were concerned that section 912 did not provide for enough direction to determine exactly what was acceptable to meet the requirement. Clarification was provided on how this amendment evolved from a very prescriptive provision to a more “performance” type of provision to allow different fire departments to maintain flexibility in the way they attack an incident (based on response time, manpower, fire-sprinklers, etc.). Upon conclusion, the committee did not make any recommendation for change to this amendment. It was pointed out that the fire code committee will also be re-reviewing this amendment and they may propose an additional change to this item. This amendment will remain in the code.
- **1305.0404 Atriums.** 2000 IBC Section 404.4. **[Add same language to 2003 IBC Section 404.4 Exception2]** This amendment is similar to the high-rise smoke

exhaust item discussed above. It applies only to those covered mall building defined as covered malls and to those covered malls that do not require a full smoke control system pursuant to IBC 909. Again, only a post smoke exhaust system is required under these provisions. This amendment will remain in the code.

- **1305.0406 Motor Vehicle-Related Occupancies.** 2000 IBC Section 406.3.8. **[Update to new language “exit stairways”]** No code change, just a modification to update language per IBC.
- **1305.0407 Group I-2 Occupancies.** 2000 IBC Section 407.2.1. **[Update to new language “where the following criteria are met”]** No code change, just modification to update language per IBC.
- **1305.0408 Group I-3 Occupancies. Subpart 1.** 2000 IBC Section 408.6. **[No change necessary]** Keep same code language.
- **1305.0408 Group I-3 Occupancies. Subpart 2.** 2000 IBC Section 408.9. **[No change necessary]** Keep same code language.
- **1305.0414 Hazardous Materials.** 2000 IBC Section 414.2.3 & 414.2.5. **[No change necessary]** Committee discussed history of amendments. No code changes necessary. Keep as is.
- **1305.0419 Group E Occupancies.** 2000 IBC Section 419. **[No change necessary]** Discussed history of this amendment. This amendment is a result of a state statute and must be maintained in the code. It only applies to “school buildings.” The original statute was placed in the code by the Legislature to actually “loosen-up” code provisions found in the old model UBC codes. Now, as a result of it being mandatory state statute language, it makes the IBC codes “more restrictive” than actual current code language. The committee agreed that building code language and building code amendments should be maintained at the State Agency level of government along with appropriate technical and local jurisdictional input rather than at the Legislative levels of government. This amendment will stay in the code as is.
- **1305.0501 General.** 2000 IBC Section 501.1. **[No change necessary]** This provision is also found in MN Rule 1311 for existing buildings. It was placed in this section to remind designers/code officials of this provision when adding on to an existing building (in case they did not go to MN Rule 1311). Provision will remain as is in code.
- **1305.0507 Unlimited Area Buildings.** 2000 IBC Section 507.4. **[Modify as/if necessary.]** Staff provided a history of this provision. Provision is similar to the mall property line provision. Language may be modified by staff somehow to include I-2/B occupancies as it is very common today for hospitals to be connected to a clinic with both being on separate properties having separate owners. Language will remain in code with possible modification.

- **IBC section 508.2, Item 5.** The committee spent some time discussing IBC section 508.2, Item 5 which is part of a special provision section for constructing Group A, B, R and S-2 occupancies with a 3-hour slab at the separation of the garage and the building above. BCSD staff noted that most designers and code officials seem to be improperly applying the condition. When tracked, Item 5 of this section leads one to IBC Table 503 for the allowable building height, which is 50-feet. Table 503 however, does not then track one to section 504.2 for an increase in height due to sprinkling. Without proper tracking language, a height increase for sprinklers should not be applied. In addition, when measuring the height of the building as required by code, the measurement must be taken from the finished grade plane, not the 3-hour horizontal floor slab or the level of fire department access. The maximum height of a building (as defined) under this provision is 50-feet. Most individuals seem to be allowing for the height increase due to sprinklers however, which is wrong. BCSD staff asked the committee if they think the Division is improperly interpreting the provision. The committee agreed with staff's interpretation and agreed that most people were improperly applying the condition - if allowing for a height increase under this section of the code. BCSD staff asked if this section of the code should be amended somehow. **Committee consensus was that an amendment should not be included.** They determined that it may be a matter of providing better education on the issue and/or for working towards a code change at the national level for clarification purposes.
- **IBC section 308.4.** An issue relating to I-3 occupancies was brought to the attention of the committee. IBC section 308.4 states that an "I-3" is any occupancy inhabited by five (5) or more persons who are under restraint or security....." (more or less). At issue is the "five" occupants. The question was posed, "What is the occupancy classification of a building or space that is locked and has only 4 occupants?" Chapter 10 of the IBC prevents locking of any kind, unless the building or space is an I-3, or unless it qualifies for the delayed action type of locking hardware – which they do not install on cell or holding room doors. The committee agreed that an amendment should be proposed to clarify this condition. General consensus was that the space would still be classified as an "I-3" because it is "locked up." In most instances however, these conditions occur in larger group "B" occupancies such as police stations and court facilities. Under those conditions, the space gets treated as an "I," but it is normally less than 10% of the major occupancy, so it gets classified as accessory to the major occupancy that it is contained in. The issue is that this is done everywhere in the state (< 5 occupants and locked doors), but it is done in violation of the code. The proponent contends that the code should be changed to legitimize what actually happens in this state and every other state in the nation. The committee agreed. **The proponent was directed to submit a code change proposal for future committee consideration.**
- **IBC section 410.6.** BCSD staff raised a concern over the current definition of "stages" in IBC section 410.6. Under the old UBC code, the definition of a stage allowed for some trivial backdrops, a curtain and overhead lighting. The new

definition (found in section 410) however, is much more restrictive. If a proposed situation includes overhead lights or a single curtain, it must now be defined as a “stage.” Under this condition, the code requires many other very restrictive and costly requirements for construction of this area of the building. The committee discussed the differences between the IBC/UBC stage definitions and how these provisions are being applied. **It was determined that some form of clarification may be warranted, but that State Fire Marshals Division should be consulted for additional input. The issue was tabled for further consideration by both the BCSD and the SFM.**

- **Next Meeting.** At the next advisory committee meeting we will be covering IBC Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 and all current 1305 amendments to those sections of the code. It was determined that there may be substantial discussion relating to some of the topics in Chapter 7. After further consideration, the committee agreed and determined that one meeting may not be adequate (during the holiday season) to work through all the issues. After some discussion, the committee determined that additional time (for chapters 7 & 9) needed to be allotted at the January 12, 2004 meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM. **The next meeting is set for December 22, 2003 at 9:00 AM here at the BCSD office.**

**Members present:**

**Bob James, Minnesota State Fire Chiefs Association  
Jon Swanson, State Fire Marshal Agency  
Mike Post, Minnesota Fire Marshals Association  
Steve Fichtel, AIA MN  
Roger Larson, AIA MN  
Pat Higgins, AMBO  
Kathi Osmonson, AMBO  
Rick Breeze, AMBO  
Frank Berg, AMBO  
Ed Solvedt, BOMA  
Paul Heimkes, BCSD  
Jerry Norman, BCSD**

**Members Absent:**

**Minnesota Insurance Federation  
Minnesota Multi-Housing Association  
Minnesota Retailers Association**