

November 8th, 2018

Blaine

9:00 am

AGENDA

1. **Topic:** Discussion of after meter gas valves to be led by Fred Patch.

2. **Topic: IBC 703.7 Marking and Identification**

The 2015 Minnesota Commercial Code (703.7 Marking and identification.) requires that all walls with any sort of fire or smoke assembly must be physically marked and permanently identified as such. It then proceeds to suggest language, size details and locations for the markings. This is a relatively easy section to read and understand, and not a lot of trouble to implement and inspect. However, if faced with an existing building and fire/smoke assembly that is to be altered or expanded in part only, is the applicant required to mark as described only the isolated segments of wall impacted by the permitted work?

If the answer to this question is yes, then are we not setting up the possible scenario or indeed encouraging a future hole-basher to make holes where the previously existing assembly is not marked? If the signage is remote or out of site from the area I intend to make my holes, I may assume that I can make any hole I want and not provide any sort of protection even if I am aware of the markings at the other end of the wall or around the corner.

Can a case be made that it is perhaps better to leave an existing altered or revised wall unmarked and have the "hole technician", tenant, and owners defend the protective assembly as done in the past? The alternative seems to be that the entire wall must be marked on both sides from end to end at least for that wall regardless of the extent of the revision or additions for the permitted work. If this is the case, what if there were restrictions to access other spaces this wall travels through to install the signage?

Could we as a result have more unprotected penetrations than happened in the recent past?

3. **Smoke detection in RTU's IMC 606.2.1:**

We began discussing this topic in October and will address it in more detail now. When there are multiple Roof Top Units that are each less than 2000 CFM's but serve a single space, do they all need smoke detection/smoke shut down? The combined total is greater than 2000 CFMs, as they act as one large unit exceeding 2000 CFM. What if additional units are added, would the existing units need to be retroactively fitted with smoke detection/smoke shut down?

Next Meeting: December 13, 2018 at 9:00 am - Roseville

No meetings in January or February

Resume: March 21st at 9:00 am