

UNIFORMITY MEETING
Thursday March 9th, 2017
Blaine City Hall
9:00 am
AGENDA

Topics #1 From Denise Sandberg - How do your cities document the accessible seating for assembly use establishments? **_This should be verified at plan review. Then verified at final/CO inspection.**

_Section 1108.29, Dining and drinking areas, require all interior and exterior floor areas be accessible (then it notes some minor exceptions). 1108.2.9.1 requires that the dining surfaces be distributed throughout the facility. Looking at both provisions together I think the key is if there is a bar and a restaurant, each will need accessible seating, otherwise it's hard to argue that the seating is distributed throughout. When outdoor seating is also provided, some seating would need to be provided outside also. **If they were compliant at time of final inspection, if in the future they change things without a permit then it would not be the city's problem.**

#2 From Dave Swan - How many gas lines are allowed to be inside of an air vent? (see attached photo) (Photo is really multiple gas lines entering into a gooseneck vent which is actually a combination of roof penetrations for these gas lines as well as the passive ventilation for the electric room below)



_Would this be considered a duct or plenum? In this description the committee does not feel this is a duct or plenum. So the number of gas lines does not matter as long as it does not restrict air flow. This was an existing condition and is not as supply for air in or out. _____

#3 _ From Gerry Proulx - Is anyone allowing the use of Diamond Piers for structures beyond open decks? Per the current and previous ESR Report for Diamond Pier, under "Use" the report does say covered decks and accessory structures per the definition in the IRC. _Yes – covered decks or an accessory building. However, there is a question of whether they can be used for 3 season porches or additions – check the ESR report of approved uses. _____

Further discussion items. _ From Geven Rabe – In the 2015 Minnesota State Building Code is there a conflict in defining "Adult Day Care" - between calling it an "E" or an I-4" occupancy? _If you read through the code book looking at the sections addressing what would be classified as an "Adult Day care" it would say it is an I (see IBC Section 8.6 Institutional Group I-4, day care facilities). _____

_However, an architect submitting plans says it the fire code and MDH (Minnesota Department of Health) which licenses the facility say it is an "E" occupancy. If you look in the IBC under Section 305.1 Educational Group E, it does not fit the use for "Adult Daycare." _____

_So, normally if there is a conflict within the code does not the most restrictive prevail? The only thing that changes between the two occupancy types is the occupant load thus exiting requirements. The "E" occupancy for the proposed space is 60. For the "I-4" its 23. And should this be allowed to be an "E" at all by definition. _____

_Although this seems to be a conflict within the code as it turns out after talking to Jerry Norman at the state, this seems to be one of the only instances in the code where a table (table 302.2 Care Facilities) prevails over the code language. I had never hear of this before although Jerry Norman assures me it was announced in classes presented by the DOLI about code changes in the 2015 State Code. According to Mr. Norman, this change was made to bring the IBC more in line with the Fire Code and MDH. _____

Next Meeting

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE
Association of Minnesota Building Officials

April 13th 2017

St. Francis

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.