443 Lafayette Road N.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
www.dli.mn.gov

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY

(651) 284-5005
1-800-DIAL-DLI
TTY: (651) 297-4198

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM
FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES
(This form must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Scott Qualle, AMBO, James Williamette, Karen Linner

Email address: scott@mnspect.com

Telephone number: 952-442-7520 Approved with Friendly amendments by committee

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: Self

Proposed Code Change - Language

1300.0160 Subp. 6.

Exception: The following modifications to the master plan are not considered to be significant modifications, according to Minnesota Statutes, section ~~16B.61~~326B.106, and are permitted for dwelling units and their accessory structures built to the International Residential Code, and residential occupancies built to the International Building Code that are three stories or less in height and their accessory structures:
(a) foundation ~~types to include~~ styles of walkout, lookout, and full basement;
~~(b)~~ (b) Alternative foundation materials shall be approved by the building official ~~to include poured~~[JW1] ~~concrete, masonry units, and wood;~~
~~(c) garage dimensions;~~
~~(d)~~ (c) ~~r~~Roof design changed by a revised truss plan approved by the building official;
~~(e) bays or cantilevered floor areas~~;
~~(f) decks and porches; and~~
~~(g)~~ .(d) ~~o~~Other[JW2] modifications approved by the building official;

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

The statute only indicates that: "The commissioner shall develop rules addressing the plan review fee assessed to similar buildings without significant modifications . . ."

The differences in foundation types articulated in exception "A" are not "insignificant modifications". Structural changes between foundation types can result in significant additional loading calculations to verify load paths and load transmittal to the foundation.

In the case of both garages and decks/porches, the situation has already arisen where a contractor has submitted a "master" plan for a deck or garage, and then submitted a completely different garage or deck plan, expecting/demanding that the plan review be fixed at 25% based on the existing language of the Rule.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

There is no cost effect to the process from this recommended change.

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).

   ☐ 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).

1300.0160 Subpart 6, Exceptions a, c, f

   ☐ 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?

   Permit Applicants

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