

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM
FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES
(This form must be submitted electronically)

IRC-106, R703.6.4

Author/requestor: Steven Pedracine
Email address: steve@mnlath-plaster.com
Telephone number: 763-757-6572
Firm/Association affiliation, if any: Minnesota Lath and Plaster Bureau

Proposed Code Change - Language

R703.6.4 Application. Each coat shall be kept in a moist condition for at least 48 hours prior to application of the next coat.

Exception: Applications installed in accordance with ASTM C926. The second coat is permitted to be applied as soon as the first coat has attained sufficient rigidity to receive the second coat.

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

The underscored is reasonable because it acknowledges a procedure already in practice by the plastering industry and it eliminates any ambiguity as a result of the reference to ASTM C 926. The underscored text was taken directly from section 2512.8 of the 2006 International Building Code. Historically it has been a recognized practice in the Uniform Building Code and it is also recognized by ASTM C 926:

“7.2.1.2 The first (scratch) coat shall become sufficiently rigid to support the application of the second (brown) coat without damage to the monolithic continuity of the first(scratch) coat or its key.
7.2.2 The second (brown) coat shall be applied with sufficient material and pressure to ensure tight contact with the first (scratch) coat and to bring the combined thickness of the base coat to the nominal thickness shown in Table 1.”

The Minnesota Lath and Plaster Bureau as well as the Northwest Wall and Ceiling Bureau et.al. recommend this procedure sometimes called the “double-back” method because it ensures a more intimate bond between the successive applications of the plaster and provides for a more uniform and better curing of the basecoat (the combined application of the first and second coat).

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

This proposal will speed up the process of construction by two days and allow for scaffolding to be taken down sooner. As a result this proposal will reduce the cost of construction

Other Factors to Consider Related to Proposed Code Change

1. Is this proposed code change meant to:

change language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).
IRC section R703.6.4

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

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

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

neither; this language will be new language, not found in the code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by a Minnesota Statute or new legislation? If so, please provide the citation to the Statute or legislation.
No

3. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a published code book or of an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.
Yes. Section R703.6.5

4. Will this proposed code change impact other parts of the Minnesota State Building Code? If so, please list the affected parts of the Minnesota State Building Code.
No

5. Who are the parties affected or segments of industry affected by this proposed code change?
Code officials, contractors, building owners

6. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
No

7. Are you aware of any federal requirement or regulation related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the regulation or requirement.
No

IRC 703.6.4 SONAR Draft 12-20-11