



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

IRC-142, R602.10.11

Author/requestor: Karen Linner

Email address: Karenl@bamn.org

Telephone number: 651-269-0944

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: Builders Association of Minnesota

Proposed Code Change - Language

IRC Section R602.10.11 is amended to read as follows:

R602.10.11 Cripple wall bracing.

Cripple walls shall be constructed in accordance with Section R602.9 and braced in accordance with this section. Cripple walls shall be braced with the length and method of bracing used for the wall above in accordance with Tables R602.10.3(1) and R602.10.3(3), and the applicable adjustment factors in Table R602.10.3(2) or R602.10.3(4), respectively, except that the length of cripple wall bracing shall be multiplied by a factor of 1.15. ~~The distance between adjacent edges of braced wall panels shall be reduced from 20 feet (6096 mm) to 14 feet (4267 mm).~~

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

This code change is needed because the deleted sentence increases the cost of construction without providing a life safety benefit in Minnesota's seismic zone.

The purpose of this amendment is to correct an error made in correlating the 2012 braced wall provisions. The reduction in spacing between braced wall panels in a cripple wall originated from cripple wall failures observed in seismic events such as the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Working through the ICC Ad-Hoc Committee on Wall Bracing, NAHB developed a proposal for the 2009/2010 Code Development Cycle that reorganized the cripple wall bracing provisions and removed the spacing reduction for low-seismic areas. The proposal was approved at the Public Hearings and ratified by the consent agenda vote at the Final Action Hearings. Unfortunately, a separate effort by the Ad-Hoc Committee to correlate their comprehensive reorganization of the wall bracing section with a modification made by the IRC-Building/Energy Committee inadvertently resulted in the spacing reduction being reinstated for low-seismic areas. This amendment corrects that oversight and restores the original intent of the cripple wall proposal.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

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).
2012 International Residential Code, Section R602.10.11

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).

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?

Homeowners, building code officials, builders0

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