

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

(This form must be submitted electronically)

**IRC-65, Tables R302.1(1) & R302.1(2)**

*Author/requestor:* Richard Lockrem

*Email address:* rich.lockrem@state.mn.us

*Telephone number:* 651.284.5868

*Firm/Association affiliation, if any:* DLI

### Proposed Code Change - Language

Please provide your proposed code change in strikeout/underline format. Provide the *specific* language you would like to see changed, with new words underlined and words to be deleted should be ~~stricken~~. Also, state whether the language contained in your proposal is from a code book or from an amendment currently found in Minnesota Rule. (You may provide the language (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

**TABLE R302.1(1) EXTERIOR WALLS**

EXTERIOR WALL ELEMENT		MINIMUM FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING	MINIMUM FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE
Walls	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour—tested in accordance with ASTM E 119 or UL 263 with exposure from both sides	< 5 feet
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	≥ 5 feet
Projections	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour on the underside <sup>a</sup>	≥ 2 feet to < 5 feet
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	≥ 5 feet
Openings in walls	Not allowed	N/A	< 3 feet
	25% maximum of wall area	0 hours	3 feet
	Unlimited	0 hours	5 feet
Penetrations	All	Comply with <a href="#">Section R302.4</a>	< 5 feet
		None required	5 feet

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

N/A = Not Applicable.

<sup>a</sup> 1 hour on the underside equates to one layer of 5/8” type X gypsum sheathing. Openings are not allowed

**TABLE R302.1(2) EXTERIOR WALLS—DWELLINGS WITH FIRE SPRINKLERS**

EXTERIOR WALL ELEMENT		MINIMUM FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING	MINIMUM FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE
Walls	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour—tested in accordance with ASTM E 119 or UL 263 with exposure from the outside	0 feet
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	3 feet <sup>a</sup>
Projections	Fire-resistance rated	1 hour on the underside <sup>a</sup>	2 feet <sup>a</sup>
	Not fire-resistance rated	0 hours	3 feet
Openings in walls	Not allowed	N/A	< 3 feet
	Unlimited	0 hours	3 feet <sup>a</sup>
Penetrations	All	Comply with <a href="#">Section R302.4</a>	< 3 feet
		None required	3 feet <sup>a</sup>

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

N/A = Not Applicable

~~a. For residential subdivisions where all dwellings are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler systems installed in accordance with [Section P2904](#), the fire separation distance for nonrated exterior walls and rated projections shall be permitted to be reduced to 0 feet, and unlimited unprotected openings and penetrations shall be permitted, where the adjoining lot provides an open setback yard that is 6 feet or more in width on the opposite side of the property line.~~

<sup>a</sup> 1 hour on the underside equates to one layer of 5/8” type X gypsum sheathing. Openings are not allowed

**Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason**

Please provide a thorough explanation of the need for this change and why this proposed code change is a reasonable change. During the rulemaking process, the Agency must defend the need and reasonableness of all its proposed changes. The Agency must submit evidence that is has considered all aspects of the proposal. (You may provide the need and reason (electronically) on a separate attached sheet).

The proposal requests the addition of footnote “a” to Table R302.1(1) titled “EXTERIOR WALLS”. This footnote had also been amended into the 2007 MSBC for Table R302.1 for the 2006 IRC. A previous code change proposal (IRC-2, R302) requested the 2007 MSBC amendment be deleted in its entirety due to significant changes between the 2006 and 2012 IRC code documents. The footnote was added to the 2007 MSBC to enable uniform code enforcement regarding the requirement for a one-hour fire-resistance on the

underside of projections for projections less than two feet from the lot line. It is reasonable to include this previous footnote into Table R302.1(1) of the 2012 IRC.

The proposal also requests the addition of footnote “a” to Table R302.1(2) titled “EXTERIOR WALLS-DWELLINGS WITH FIRE-SPRINKLERS”. This footnote had also been amended into the 2007 MSBC for Table R302.1 of the 2006 IRC and is applicable to Table R302.1(2) which is new in the 2012 IRC. A previous code change proposal (IRC-5, Table R302.1(2)) requested that footnote “a” of Table R302.1(2) in the 2012 IRC be deleted in its entirety due to the lack of definition of the term “subdivision” used in the footnote. The proposed new footnote “a” is reasonable to enable uniform code enforcement when using either Table R302.1(1) or Table R302.1(2) regarding the required one-hour fire-resistance on the underside of projections for projections less than two feet from the lot line. It is reasonable to include these proposed footnotes into Table R302.1(1) and Table R302.1(2) the 2012 IRC.

### **Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis**

Please consider whether this proposed code change will increase/decrease costs or indicate that it will not have any cost implications and explain how it will not. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset somehow by a life safety or other benefit? If so, please explain. Are there any cost increases/decreases to enforce or comply with this proposed code change? If so, please explain. (You may provide the cost/benefit analysis (electronically) on a separate, attached sheet).

There will be no additional costs related to the approval of the proposed amendment.

### **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).  
Table R320.1(1) and Table R302.1(2)

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).  
MR 1309.0202 subpart 2

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.

NO.

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?

Parties affected are, building officials, contractors and designers. There are no new requirements created by the proposal.

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