

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
November 13, 2008
CHAMPLIN CITY HALL

In attendance: Dave Swan, Dave Ding, Gary Kirkeide, Gevin Rabe, Jesse Szykulski, Mike Fricke, Denise Sandberg, Jeff Fish, Paul Swett

1) Opening discussions:

- Mike Fricke brought up a question about the **Ice Barrier** requirement of **Section R905.2.7.1** and the application of this type of product during cold temperatures. Concerns are: ambient air temperature and sheathing surface moisture. Our committee felt there is virtually no ability of inspecting all applications, and that it is an installation and warranty issue for the installer to conform and apply appropriately.
- Jesse Szykulski then submitted his concern with an inspector overlooking the improper use of “starter” shingles on a ridge. Experience is that these shingles will crack in cold weather and allow moisture intrusion at those fractures.
- Discussion about creating more website involvement by members. One suggestion was to offer a raffle or some sort of prize for the participants each month. We also thought a handout made available to students in the B.I.T. program inviting them into the discussions would be valuable. We will look into having 10K Lakes provide a business card sized invitation which could be handed out at meetings, classes and in the field. Another good idea was to arrange a booth at the annual conferences (and other similar gatherings) in which all ICC committees could staff and present their activities and encourage participation.
- Jesse revealed an inconsistency in the **2006 IRC: Section R905.2.7.1 Ice Barrier**. *“In areas where there has been a history of ice forming along the eaves causing a backup of water is designated in **Table R301.2(1)**, an ice barrier that consists of . . .”* When one goes to this table it is discovered there may be an error in this amended section. The original ICC table had footnotes a-j and the publication of the amendment has only footnotes a-d. The concern is that footnote h that has the language referring to the ice barrier had been eliminated in error. Mike Fricke will inquire at the State offices. *See December questions on page 6 of this document.

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE

2) Discussed web forum questions of October.

OCTOBER 2008 QUESTION #1

A post and beam addition on a house is eight feet above grade and has area below that is open on three sides. The structure above meets the requirements of R602.10.1 Braced Wall Lines.

Is there a code section concerned with the lateral resistance of the supporting posts below?

POLL RESULTS

Yes	12	85%
No	2	14%

Total votes: 14

Uniform? YES

CONSENSUS: Committee agrees with contributing members that the code does address the lateral resistance sufficiently.

ACTION: NO ACTION.

Code references: R602.10.1 Braced Wall Lines.
R602.10.10 Design of Structural Elements.
R301.1.3 Engineered Design.

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 2008 QUESTION #2

R905.2.7.1 Ice Protection requires protection to “*extend from the lowest edges of all roof surfaces to a point at least 24 inches inside the exterior wall line of the building.*”

POLL RESULTS

Does this mean 24 inches inside the exterior wall line of the attic room?

Yes	3	14%
No	13	86%

Is the knee wall of a finished attic area an exterior wall?

Yes	5	31%
No	11	69%

Is the slanted ceiling an exterior wall?

Yes	1	7%
No	14	93%

Total votes: 47

Uniform? YES (all three questions)

CONSENSUS: Committee agrees with contributing members that the code does not provide information to assume the knee wall or the slanted ceiling are exterior walls.

ACTION: NO ACTION.

Code references: **R905.2.7.1 Ice Protection**

HUGE NOTE! I found this language in **R202**:

“EXTERIOR WALL. *An above-grade wall that defines the exterior boundaries of a building. Includes between-floor spandrels, peripheral edges of floors, **roof and basement knee walls**, dormer walls, gable end walls, walls enclosing a mansard roof and basement walls with an average below-gradewall area that is less than 50 percent of the total opaque and nonopaque area of that enclosing side.*”

*I think we need to re-think our response. (And our inspection viewpoint.)

OCTOBER 2008 QUESTION #3

Is it appropriate to use [Table R502.3.3\(1\) Cantilever Spans for Floor Joist Supporting Light-Frame Exterior Bearing Wall and Roof Only](#) for determining cantilevered spans of residential deck joists in plan review?

POLL RESULTS

Yes	4	33%
No	8	66%

Total votes: 12

Uniform? YES

CONSENSUS: The code does not address this specifically, but it seems widely used as an appropriate alternative. Members have seen engineered calculations that are nearly identical.

ACTION: Request State comment.
As this is the only prescriptive way in the codes to address the cantilevering of deck joist members, it is widely utilized. Other options are engineered design, wood span tables from manufacturers or possibly the National Design Specification for Wood Construction.

Code references: [Table R502.3.3\(1\) Cantilever Spans for Floor Joist Supporting Light-Frame Exterior Bearing Wall and Roof Only](#)

3) **Discuss November polling questions.**

Question #1

In IRC Chapter 903 Roof Assemblies, Section 1309.903.2.2 Kick out flashing / Diverter gives specific requirements for this type of flashing. **Section R907 Reroofing** does not.

Can you require kick out flashing on a reroof permit? **YES / NO**

Group comments: **Section R703.8** also provides directive for locations of flashings.

Question #2

If, in a window manufacturer's installation requirements there are no requirements to install any additional flashings other than those that are integral with the product, does **Section 1309.0703.8 Flashing** preside over those instructions? **YES / NO**

Group comments: Even if there is argument that **R703.8 Flashing** is applicable, **R613.1 Exterior Window and Doors** applies as it states: "...*windows and doors shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.*"

Question #3

Within our Administrative Section (IRC) it is stated "*the purpose of this code is to provide minimum requirements to safeguard the public safety...and safety to life and property from fire and other hazards...*"

If an application for permit is submitted and it is known the occupant is (or occupants are) hearing impaired, is it relevant to require the standard **Section R313 Smoke Alarms**? Or should special consideration be included into the codes for "special needs"?

Group comments: No.
A recommendation (not a requirement) is appropriate.

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE

4) **Develop December questions.**

Possible topics:

1. **Section R905.2.7 Ice Barrier** refers you to **Table R301.2(1)**.

QUESTION: Did the State's amendment to this table eliminate ice barrier in Minnesota?

2. Regarding the frequently discussed question of whether to require the installation of an egress window in an existing basement when work is performed to change the use of that level (such as storage space to habitable space); there are currently two conflicting answers to this question.

On the State of Minnesota DOLI website there is a current Division Opinion that states **NO**, while on the ICC website there is a current Interpretation that says **YES**.

Minnesota Division Opinion:

http://www.doli.state.mn.us/pdf/bc_opinion_division_2008_02_egress.pdf

ICC Interpretation:

http://www2.iccsafe.org/cs/committeeArea/pdf_file/RE_06_16_07.pdf

QUESTION: Which of these qualified documents prevails?

3. The term "noncombustible" is used heavily in the **IBC** (over 150 times!), but the definition of this word is nowhere to be found in that document. You can find it in the **IRC** and the **IMC**.

QUESTION: How do you approve "noncombustible" materials when there is no definition of it in the **IBC**?

Please send me your feedback on these, or propose another.

UNIFORMITY OF INSPECTIONS COMMITTEE

- 5) Gerry Proulx has volunteered to re-draw the July Question #1 Intervening Walls stair diagrams to create and submit the landing questions to the IRC Committee. Four drawings, four questions.
- 6) **Additional items for discussion?**
- Boiler damper vent recall - link on 10K Lakes website.
 - 2009 Uniformity Committee meeting calendar – bring your hosting choices to the next meeting.
 - WABO letter to ICC requesting investigation of code hearing voting.
 - Meeting reimbursement for committee meeting host.

**Next Meeting
December 11, 2008
ROSEVILLE CITY HALL
9 am**

Call or email Gerry Proulx to help determine live body count.

651 / 792 – 7084

gerry.proulx@ci.roseville.mn.us