



IBC Model Code Adoption Project

STAKEHOLDER INPUT PROCESS

PHASE 1 –Input Form - Example

This example is intended to illustrate the kinds of information DSA seeks from stakeholders, as well as demonstrating the proper filling in of the form. This example is based on either the on-line or downloadable form. It is not an exact duplication of either form.

DSA PHASE 1 Template # 21-39

Located in
2001 CBC

2001 California Building Code (Title 24), Part 2

Chapter 21A – Masonry

Section - TABLES

Subsection(s) TABLE 21A-R

Section 1
Stakeholder
Recommends

Please select one of the following choices and explain in section 2

- Retain Amendment unchanged
- Retain Amendments with changes –Your proposed language must be in **strikeout and underline** format. Enter your proposed language below.
- Repeal
- No Recommendation

You may provide additional information, including suggested language changes, in electronic format by clicking here

BROWSE

Section 2
Nine Point
Criteria

Please answer each of the following regarding the current amendment, based on the California Building Standards Law Nine Point Criteria:

For information on the Nine Point Criteria, go to the [Guidelines](#) instruction screen.

NOTE: Points 2, 8 and 9 are not listed as they are DSA administrative functions.

The form will accept up to 1000 characters (unlimited for the Downloadable version) for each point.

Point 1

It conflicts, overlaps or duplicates the IBC or its referenced standards

- YES
- No
- No Position

Explain your answer below:

>Point 1 Commentary

Ref. Std. ACI 530-05 does not allow empirical height to thickness ratios for structures in seismic design categories D, E or F. The ACI Std. requires that wall designs be based on specific stress or strength limits, and deflection limits.

Point 3

It is required by the public interest (health, safety or welfare)

- YES
- No
- No Position

Explain your answer below:

> Point 3 Commentary

I am not aware of any data substantiating that the empirical height to thickness ratios listed in the current table meet safety objectives.

Point 4	It is fair, and is not arbitrary or capricious <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No Position Explain your answer below:
----------------	--

> **Point 4 Commentary**

Empirical height to thickness ratios are arbitrary criteria when compared to today's design methodologies, which allow for more predictable performance based on specific structural design materials. I am not aware of any data substantiating that the empirical height to thickness ratios listed in the current table meet performance objectives.

Point 5	It shows a favorable ratio of cost to benefit <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No Position Explain your answer below:
----------------	---

> **Point 5 Commentary**

The Ref. Std. provisions gives latitude to meet performance objectives in different ways (e.g. high strength masonry, wall support conditions, special reinforcement), with associated cost benefits.

Point 6	It is clear and objective <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Position Explain your answer below:
----------------	---

> **Point 6 Commentary**

While the table itself is quite clear, the empirical limits do not seem to be objective criteria.

Point 7	It fills a need due to inadequacy of the IBC or its referenced standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scope of IBC or referenced standard <u>does not</u> address specific aspects for construction within DSA's jurisdiction. <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> No Position • IBC model code or referenced standard <u>does not</u> fulfill statutory performance objectives for buildings within DSA's jurisdiction <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> No Position Explain your answers below:
----------------	---

> **Point 7 Commentary**

Ref. Std. provisions, in conjunction with the IBC and ASCE 7-05 specifically address masonry wall design criteria for public school and essential services occupancies. ACI Std. provisions have been successfully utilized in model codes for the past 20 years, and were based on extensive testing programs.

Section 3 Views Represent	You must answer the following before submitting your comments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> My responses represent my views as an individual <input type="checkbox"/> A consensus of members of an organization I represent Name of organization (please use acronyms where possible)
-------------------------------------	---

You must hit the Submit button for your input to be entered into the DSA data base.

In order for the system to accept your input, Sections 1 and 3 must both have been completed.