

NOTES OF THE MINNESOTA STATE BUILDING CODE
STRUCTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
5th Structural Meeting 2/19/04

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Oswell, Ron LaMere, , Jim Fallon, Frank Berg, , Mark Joslyn, Jeff Murray, Mike Lederle, Dan Kelsey, Rudy Rudina, , Doug Whitney, Harry Menk, Ron Shaffer, Harvey Harvela, Marlin Grant, Ross Turner, Mike Lederle

Chapter 16 IBC 2003

Dan Kelsey asked if there were any comments on the changes to the chapter.

Mike Lederle pointed out a change in live load for parking . This is in Table 1607.1 and requires 40 lbs/sq.ft. It was also mentioned to look at the notes for table 1607.1. Mike also inquired about the status of the amendment regarding the 1/8" per foot slope on roofs. Dan Kelsey checked with the 1305-committee chairs and their response was that it was not changing.

Ron LaMere brought up changes in snow loading 1608.3.4. This is rain on snow surcharge. Dan Kelsey spoke regarding this also being in ASCE 7.

Dan Kelsey mentioned the ground snow load and will not change the amendment.

Dan Kelsey asked Rudy Rudina if the crane amendments have changed and Rudy replied that the amendments are still accurate.

Craig Oswell commented on soil lateral load 1610.1. This provision seems more conservative.

Chapter 16 is acceptable to the committee with exception to the previous amended changes.

Chapter 3 IRC 2003

Dan Kelsey pointed out the change in Table R301.2(1) ground snow load. He explained the rationale of how the figures were determined with about a 30% increase. To paraphrase use the ground snow load for the roof snow load. This is an increase in cost and if to be accepted by the division must show justification. Dan Kelsey proposed to keep the method for roof snow load and change the language in the table to read roof snow load instead of ground snow load. Dan K proposed Jim Fallon 2nd

Proposed Amendments

Dan Kelsey spoke, outside of his position as chair, regarding the language on the use of design professionals. Does not think it is appropriate in the code. Discussion revolved around Doug Whitney bringing up the practice of lumberyards sizing structural members and not meeting engineering standards. Harvey Harvala pointed to section R301.1 engineered design and believes a professional if designed should do it.

Mark Joslyn explained the residential committee is looking for guidance from the structural committee regarding the design of trusses.

Dan Kelsey asked for a subgroup to propose an amendment on the truss issue.

Rudy Rudina pointed out a statement in chapter 1 regarding (R106.1) design professionals. Dan Kelsey explained the division deleted chapter 1 and replaced it with MSBC 1300 with the same type of language regarding design professionals.

Dan Kelsey read Proposal IRC-19. This proposal asked to change the grade of reinforcing in residential construction from grade 60 to grade 40. The rationale was that it was difficult to work with, to bend and to cut. Underlying reason may be cost of reinforcing.

Craig Oswell studied the tables and stated that if this proposal was accepted then the corresponding Tables would have to be changed. Ron La Mere moved to deny the proposal. Mike Lederle 2nd The committee voted to not accept the proposal.

Proposal IRC-11 was read. This proposal wants to delete the conventional foundation construction table. The rationale is that between the IRC tables and this table there is much confusion. Craig O. stated the provisions in the IRC tables should cover the requirements without having to use the additions table from the conventional foundation construction table. Ron LaMere feels the conventional table is not longer needed. Frank Berg pointed out that the items in the conventional table do not meet engineering requirements and the IRC table does meet engineering. Most people on the committee feel it is time to retire the conventional table. Marlin Grant would like to see the conventional table remain in the code. There was much confusion on the wording on to whether voting for the proposal meant for or against. There will be a small cost increase to each foundation system. Marlin Grant moved to decline the proposal and Frank Berg 2nd .The committee voted 5 to 4 to accept the proposal and delete the conventional foundation table.

Proposal IRC 10 is the reintroduction of a modified table for plain concrete /masonry walls. Mark Joslyn is the person proposing this table and did not use engineering. Craig O. stated that he calculated this and pasted round the results. He stated that he is not saying that this table will not work but it does not meet engineering for masonry walls. The concrete walls do meet engineering. Discussion centered around how could this table be accepted. Mark J accepted a friendly amendment from the committee modifying the table in the IRC to delete the max height of the wall 5 & 6 feet only and all that portion of the table. Marlin G moved to accept and Doug W. 2nd committee accepted. This table is in the IRC 2003 modified to delete the portion for 7,8,& 9 foot height.

Proposal IRC –20

Mark J. Proposed a table showing cantilevered concrete /masonry walls . Discussion started with Dan K asking if the wall was tied with to the footing with dowels? Is the table that was provided using dowels? The committee does need something on the order of what was presented. This table is a good start . The proposal was tabled until next meeting. Dan K has volunteered to be the person that will review all comments regarding this issue. He will forward all comments to Mark J. Ron L commented on the fact that the design of cantilevered walls must also include the footing.

Dan K read a list of topics to be considered next meeting including IRC –20, lap splices & more.

Mark J read proposal IRC 21 which would raise the frost footing depth from 60” to 48” in the northern region. Ron S made a motion to deny Ron L 2nd committee did not accept proposal.

Report to be progressive.

Recorder : Jim Fallon