NOTES OF THE MINNESOTA STATE BUILDING CODE STRUCTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

6th Structural Meeting 03/25/04

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Dan Kelsey, Mike Lederle, Richard Scaumacher, Harry D. Menk, Tom Stoneburner, John Carrol, Ross W. Turner, Ron LaMere, Olen Bigelow, Harvey H. Harvala, Dennis Hurst, Frank Berg, Dan Murphy, Rex Swanson, Craig Oswell, Mark Joslyn, Rudy Rudina, Doug Whitney

Introductions – Dan Kelsey started the meeting by going around the room and having everyone in attendance introduce themselves.

Simplified Wind Proposal - After Introductions Dan Kelsey opened the floor to the members of the Council of American Structural Engineers of Minnesota, (C.A.S.E), to discuss their Simplified Wind Proposal.

Ross Turner started by explaining how C.A.S.E conducted their research in an attempt to simplify the code language to allow for more practical use and be less scientific. After finishing their research they had presented their simplified wind proposal to the C.A.S.E management where they received it with unanimous endorsement. The C.A.S.E. representatives explained that the proposal does have some limitations that must be met before using. Some of these limitations were:

1) The maximum mean roof height is 60'-0".
2) The building width must be less than the building height.
3) Building structure shape must not contain any irregularities.

After a short discussion members of the Structural Advisory Committee, (S.A.C) thanked the members of C.A.S.E for their extensive research, hard work and initiative shown.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Simplified Wind Proposal and a unanimous vote to accept the proposal followed.

Lap Splices -

Dan then turned the table over to Olene Bigelow to Discuss the issue of lap splices in masonry construction.

For the sake of those who were not in attendance at earlier meetings, Olene gave a brief explanation of the concerns and history of lap splices in masonry construction.

Olene indicated that in masonry construction, the lap lengths that must be used in the current code could get extremely long as larger bar sizes are used. She explained that when the original research was done the area's of problem were not discussed until the after the time of adoption of the code.

Olene said that Art Scholts, members of S.A.C and herself tried to come up with a temporary fix for this issue until the provision could be repaired at the National level. She proposed to delete sections 2107.2.3 – 2107.2.6., thus allowing the Masonry Structural Joint Committee, (MSJC) to be used instead.

S.A.C members agreed but at this point did not see any impact for deleting section 2707.2.3. Olene agreed to research whether or not this section would have an impact.

Parking Ramp Loads:

The next discussion was relating to how in parking ramps a 50psf design load was in place with the IBC 2000 code. The code allowed for a live load reduction which with the 30psf. The proposed code, the IBC 2003 has changed the parking ramp design live load to 40psf, with the alternate design method that load can be reduced to as low as 24 psf, which is unacceptable. Dan Kelsey did research on this issue and found out that that the using the alternate design method through section 1607.9.2 was overlooked thus an oversight by the National Committee. The

conversation was whether to use the language from the 2006 IBC, which is in its final stage of approval. This would allow us to take advantage of code language from the next code cycle and would stay with the 50 psf live loading.

Corrosive Environments: The meeting then moved forward to talk about how the Minnesota State Building Code, (MSBC), requires a 1.5" cover and that some codes are using strong language indicating that 2" minimum cover would be required. This topic was going to be further researched and discussed.

Engineer/Architect Seals: Next, from the previous meeting on the repetitive wording in the IRC stating "…not required to bear the seal of architect or engineer responsible for the design…" this language was of concern to members of S.A.C.

The discussion was relating to what types of drawings and design should have a Minnesota licensed Engineer seal and what shouldn't and whether or not we are adequately conveying this in the code. Dan brought up as to how the code can be misleading and may give the false impression to a Building Official that they would not have the opportunity to request a certified Engineer seal.

Craig Oswell mentioned that this may be an education issue to Building Officials and that first and foremost in order to determine what is the best approach to handle we should find out how many times the "questionable" language is actually in the code.

Doug Witney agreed to find out how many times the questionable language was in the code. Dan Kelsey said he would try to find out where the language in the code originated from in hopes of finding out the intent. IF required once this is done a small group can be put together to try come up with a solution for the problem whether it be change the language in the code, delete the language or anything else required.

Blocking Requirements
For ICF's -

The conversation was on how on foundation walls parallel to floor framing blocking is required in the first two spaces. The code does not address anything for ICF construction.

The committee all agreed that some language should be in the code it was just a matter of finding the best way to accomplish. Dan Kelsey agreed to come up with ideas.

Prior to adjourning the meeting, Dan Kelsey mentioned that for the next code Cycle we now have the ability to create an online forum where we can talk about issues during the periods between meetings in hopes that the meeting could be more productive or at least more to the point.

Many members agreed, there was however talk that something like that may be overwhelming. Members agreed to think about the idea and discuss at a later meeting.

Meeting was then adjourned.

(Next scheduled meeting - April 22, 2004)