

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

(This form must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: **Tim Manz**

Email address: **tim.manz@minneapolismn.gov**

Telephone number: **612-673-3726**

1346, IMC #8

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: **MN Chapter of ASHRAE**

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).

Replace Table 603.4 of the 2012 IMC with the following table (leave Section 603.4 unchanged):

**TABLE 603.4
 DUCT CONSTRUCTION MINIMUM SHEET METAL
 THICKNESSES FOR SINGLE DWELLING UNITS**

DUCT SIZE	GALVANIZED		APPROXIMATE ALUMINUM B&S GAGE
	Minimum thickness (inches)	Equivalent galvanized gage no.	
Round ducts and enclosed rectangular ducts			
14" or less	0.013	30	26
Over 14"	0.016	28	24
Exposed rectangular ducts			
14" or less	0.016	28	24
Over 14"	0.019	26	22

For SI: 1 inch = 25.4 mm.

Note: Should be underlined but it is copied from the current MR 1346.

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 it has considered all aspects of the proposal. (You may provide the need and reason (electronically) on a separate attached sheet).

This proposed amendment contains the requirements of the current MR 1346, which allows 30 gage galvanized duct to be used in residential duct applications of 14 inches diameter round duct or smaller, or 14 inches dimension enclosed rectangular duct or smaller. This is the industry standard for single family dwellings and it would create a hardship for the manufacturers of these prefabricated sheet metal components to require a minimum of 28 gage as specified in the 2012 IMC. Also, the MN Chapter of ASHRAE is not aware of any research or evidence in the industry that 30 gage is inadequate for these applications.

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).

Since it has the same result as language in the current mechanical code, there are no cost implications.

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 603.4

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.

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?

None.

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.