

UNIFORMITY MEETING
Thursday April 13th, 2017
_St Francis _
9:00 am
AGENDA

Topics #1 From Jeremy Wells – Can a new or existing deck that is attached to a house & has a code compliant set of steps to grade also have a slide for kids from the walking surface of the deck to grade accessed though the guard rail? _Yes. However, all safety provisions must be provided (no openings greater than 4”, guard rail must either be continuous over opening of posts on either side of opening to support guardrail system). Also, if the slide was on the plans document these safety requirements during the plan review and when doing the final inspection documents the slides existence as part of your inspection notes. Although the code may not require a gate of some kind it would be a very good suggestion. You may also suggest the home owner contract their homeowners insurance company about the slide.

#2 _From Nick Henly, Isanti Building Official - A siding permit is pulled to do repair work (storm damage, etc.). If the existing dwelling has no water-resistive barrier, or the barrier under the siding section being repaired needs replacement- how many of you require that all the siding is removed and water barrier added/replaced? And does anybody have any qualifiers for their regulations? (Example-say 25% or more of the siding is damaged then all must be removed and barrier replaced/installed?) Would you limit the requirement to the damaged/repair side only? Using the 25% rule as Mr. Henly suggests if a good starting point – that is one side of the entire house (25%) is damage and is going to be repaired, then a permit would be required and a WRB should be added if none existing before. However, if just a spot repair of one side of the house, the committee felt a permit would not be required nor the WRB in that small of an area would be justified.

#3 **_Section 424 of the 2012 IB (2015 MSBC) Childrens Play Structures – 424.1 Item 6 – plastic materials or plastic covered materials must meet ASTM Standard E1354 for heat produced when burning. However, no plastic material available for play structures (or a lot of other materials) can meet this standard at this time. Would this be considered “Technically Infeasible?” _The committee felt that “Technically Infeasible” would not be the correct term to be used for this situation. However, it does create a dilemma; What can you do when there is not product available that meets this requirement? Even the State Fire Marshal commented on this question where they suggested to increase fire suppression water volume to an existing system (if it existing) to provide better fire protection to that area. Also, I checked with ICC and was told that while the 2015 MSBC indicates this requirement is new, this requirement has been in the code at least since the 2006 IBC and just moved to this new Section and is still in the 2015 IBC. They also told me that a group representing fire departments proposed this change some years ago and has been in the code ever sense. It would appear their concern was the burning plastic not only for indoor play structures but plastics used in any indoor area in public buildings.**

In the city where I am the building official, the fire marshal & I met with the director of the community center where their play structure is being replaced and decided that we would allow this new plastic materials that while not meeting all the requirements of the code, they would do the following; follow the state fire marshal’s suggestion and require a higher volume of water to the fire suppression system along with reconfiguring the sprinkler coverage to match the new playground structure, to add more smoke detection in all of the ventilation system building wide, if possible use the existing RTU servicing this area exclusively as an exhaust system or install a separate exhaust system that would activate when smoke is detected it’s ductwork while shutting down all other units in the building to control the movement of the smoke and making sure there are two exists out of the controlled area the play structure is in. We also had them check with the building’s insurance carrier and to speak with the city attorney.

While this may seem like preparing for the worst case scenario, as code officials that is what we have to do.

Further discussion items. _ Additional 3rd party evaluation services company **Progressive Engineering Inc (PIE) www.p-e-i.com replaces CCPP 0108 report covering Fideron Decking, Horizon (aka Home Depot Sanctuary), Tropics decking & Veranda Decking. They are AC174 certified.**

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE
Association of Minnesota Building Officials

**This information is for other inspectors to have an additional resource to add to
ICC_ESR reports and CCRR (Architectural Testing).**

**Next Meeting
May 11th 2017**

New Hope

If anyone is in disagreement with any items noted in this agenda, they should forward their comments to Geven Rabe or Gerry Proulx– Co-Chairman of the Uniformity of Inspections Committee within 14 days. If no comments are received or noted, the contents of this agenda then become part of the permanent records.