

UNIFORMITY MEETING
Thursday July 13th, 2017
_New Brighton City Hall _
9:00 am
AGENDA

Topics #1 **_From Barry Riesch - Would you please tell me how you all are enforcing the basement egress window requirements for an existing _____ basement remodel? Do you require it when doing any work at all in an existing basement? _The only time an egress window would be required is when a when an addition with a full basement is being added or adding a sleeping room in an existing basement. (see further notes and DOLI division opinion below) _Section R310.1 Exceptions**

When altering basement space or finishes under a condition when no sleeping room(s) exist or are being introduced, an emergency escape opening would not be required to be added to an existing basement. A basement that doesn't currently have an emergency escape opening nor was required to have one from the code it was constructed under can be altered or finishes applied and not be provided with an escape opening provided no sleeping room is present or part of the project. Section 310 Emergency Escape and Rescue Openings R310.1 requires a compliant opening for newly constructed basement space and where a sleeping room is constructed in an existing basement. The exceptions from R310 requirements given do not and cannot be used and are not the source for this particular conclusion. The expectation for an escape opening even when a sleeping room is not present in an existing basement is difficult to resist as a requirement since it certainly would be required for any basement under current and recent codes. However the mere alteration or of the interior of a basement level does not trigger a change in the use or habitability that the space previously had. The refinement of finishes applied is not a cause for requiring compliance with R310.

This question has been addressed previously by the committee with the same result. Additionally there is a Division Opinion 2008-02 that explains this conclusion and was produced about the same time. You will find the commentary in the opinion very helpful and clear. While the opinion conclusion is based on the 2007 Minnesota State Building Code, the logic still

applies to our current code and has not been pulled or revised. _____

#2 From Andy Schreder - Is anyone allowing or accepting a "storm shelter" in a single family home that would not have emergency escape and rescue opening(s)? If using ICC/NSSA-500? This ICC document can be referred to when designing and building a storm shelter. _____

#3 From Jeff Pleski - While doing an insulation inspection on a new home I noticed a cold air return duct penetrating through the floor with only half of the annular space around the duct that was fire blocked according to R302.11, item #4. This requirement was in the code before the last code cycle went into effect on January 24, 2015 that required fire protection of floors, R501.3. _____

Since the current code requires 1/2-inch gypsum board applied to the underside of open web floor trusses in the lower level of an unfinished basement, is it really necessary to also fire block around the duct openings penetrating the floor especially when considering what the code allows for fire blocking material? I think 1/2-inch gypsum board on the underside of floor trusses provides better protection than fiberglass batts or approved foam. _____

I understand that if 2 X 10 or greater floor joists were used then fire protection of floors (R501.3) would not be required and in that case fire blocking around the annular space of a heat duct would be more of an issue. _____

In my opinion; there should be an exception to the fire blocking requirement of R302.11 item #4 when the floor assembly is protected according to R501.3. _____

No. These different and independent items address two separate things and both should apply. _____

#4 In A2 occupancy (example – fast food) where the occupant load requires an individual bathroom for each sex, with just one water closet each, can the existence of the two bathrooms both be "unisex" or must they be separate rooms labeled "male" and "female"? IBC Section 2902.20) There is nothing in the code that would prohibit these restrooms in this situation from being labeled "unisex".

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE
Association of Minnesota Building Officials

Further discussion items. _____

**Next Meeting
August 10th**

Minneapolis

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.