



For office use only: Date Rec'd.

Log No.

Proposal No.

PUBLIC PROPOSAL FORM

FOR PUBLIC PROPOSALS ON THE ICC CODES AND STANDARDS

(PLEASE SEE SUBMITTAL RULES OF PROCEDURES - ALL SUBMITTALS MUST BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THESE PROCEDURES)

CLOSING DATE: All Proposals Must Be Received by the Announced Closing Date.

1) Indicate the format in which you would like to receive your Report of the Public Hearing (PRH), or Public Proposals Report (PPR):

Paper Electronic Download

(Note: A paper copy will not be sent to you if you have chosen to download the RPH or PPR from the ICC Web Site.)

2) **PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY: FORMS WILL BE RETURNED if they contain unreadable information.**

Name:	David R. Bonneville, SE				Date:	November 12, 2001
Jurisdiction/Company:						
Submitted on Behalf of:	NCSEA Seismic Committee					
Address:	c/o Degenkolb Engineers, 225 Bush St., Suite 1000					
City:	San Francisco	State:	CA	Zip +4:	94104-4207	
Phone:	415-392-6952	Ext:		Fax:	414-544-0783	

e-mail:	dbonneville@degenkolb.com
---------	---------------------------

3) ***Signature:** _____
*I hereby grant the International Code Council the nonexclusive, royalty-free rights, including nonexclusive, royalty-free rights in copyright in this Proposal and I understand that I acquire no rights in any publication of International Code Council (ICC), in which this Proposal in this or another similar analogous form is used. I hereby attest that I have the authority and I am empowered to grant this copyright release.

4) Indicate appropriate ICC Code associated with this Public Proposal – Please use Acronym: IBC _____
(See instructions for list of Names and Acronyms for the I-Codes & I-Standards):

5) Revision to: Section 1617.2.2, 1617.4.6.1 Table _____ Figure _____

6) **PROPOSAL** Revise as follows (check BOX and state proposed change):
 Revise as follows: Add new text as follows Delete and substitute as follows: Delete without Substitution:

Show the proposed NEW or REVISED or DELETED TEXT in legislative format: ~~Line through text to be deleted.~~ Underline text to be added.

Section 1617.2.2 (Seismic Design Categories D, E and F (Redundancy Coefficient) before the paragraph that reads, "For structures with vertical combinations ...," add:

The value, , shall be permitted to be taken equal to 1.0 in the following circumstances:

1. When calculating displacements for dynamic amplification of torsion in Section 1617.4.4.5.
2. When calculating deflections, drifts, and seismic shear forces related to Sections 1617.4.6.1 and 1617.4.6.2.
3. For design calculations required by Sections 1620, 1621, or 1622.
4. For evaluation of sliding, overturning and soil bearing at the soil-structure interface per Section 1616.1.
5. For proportioning of foundation elements (excluding connections between the foundation and superstructure elements).

Section 1617.4.6.1, delete without substitution: ~~When calculating drift, the redundancy coefficient, , shall be taken as 1.0.~~

PROPOSAL Continued (Attach additional sheets as necessary)

7) **SUPPORTING INFORMATION** (State purpose and reason, and provide substantiation to support proposed change):

Purpose: Clarify the intended scope and application of the redundancy provisions. After clarification in 1617.2.2, delete duplicate statement in 1617.4.6.1.

Reason: Current provisions are unclear as to the application of Section 1617.2 to design loads other than E. The redundancy provisions are intended to encourage multiple lines of resistance and to provide a measure of overstrength in certain structures.

As such, they are intended to apply to design load combinations for individual members, not to regularity and load path checks. In addition, they are intended to apply only to vertical elements of the seismic force resisting system, not to foundations, parts and portions of structures, or non-building structures. Although the current provisions correctly show δ as a component of E , designers and building officials have inconsistently applied δ to other code sections. By specifying that $\delta = 1.0$ for drift calculations, Section 1617.4.6.1 gives the mistaken impression that δ might be greater than 1.0 for checks of P-delta, overturning, etc. In lieu of specifying $\delta = 1.0$ in multiple Sections, the Proposal lists all of the circumstances in question together in Section 1617.2.2.

Note: δ should not necessarily be taken as 1.0 for diaphragms and diaphragm connections that transfer lateral forces in structures with plan irregularity Type 4 or vertical irregularity Type 4. However, Sections 1620.3 and 1620.4 already require a 25% increase in design forces for those conditions in SDC D, E, and F, and that increase is deemed sufficient.

Cost Impact: The Proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION Continued (Attach additional sheets as necessary)

PLEASE USE SEPARATE FORM FOR EACH PROPOSAL • SUBMITTAL IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT IS PREFERRED

(A 3 1/2" disk saved in WordPerfect 6.0, 8.0 or Microsoft word 97 accompanying the hard copy would be appreciated)

e-mail: lbrown@intlcode.org Phone: (703) 931-4533 x15 Fax: (703) 931-9128 or (703) 379-1546

Mail FORM and DISK to: ICC Program Manager, 5203 Leesburg Pike, Suite 600, Falls Church, VA 22041