

Rogers Richard

From: Nilles, David [david.nilles@ci.portland.or.us]
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2009 8:52 AM
To: 'Eric Watson'; bmgp@qwestoffice.net; Ray Miller Home Office Email; Doug Meltzer; Nabil Taha; DAVE DEHARPPORT; Sampson, Jed; Johnathan Balkema; RAVI MAHAJAN; Raymond Miller; Eric 'Schmidt; TIM RIPPEY; Sean Blaire; MCCONNELL Vicki; Kumar, Amit; Thomas, Eric; David Gilroy; Stu Albright
Cc: Greg Munsell; Richard S. Rogers; jimriemensr15
Subject: RE: Request for SEAO's Review - 3 Items.

- Substantive Code Change – New section 1614 addressing strength requirements for High Rise construction. *Are there any problems in adopting this new section?* (See attached Section 1614)

I have no issues with this.

- Significant Code Changes – Chapter 18 is a complete re-write. (See attached excerpt addressing the chapter 18 changes)

I have no issues with this.

- Existing Oregon Amendments: (See attached revised New Proposal OSSC10-44)
 - Section 2308.3.2 and Figures 2308.3.2(1) & (2). Roof diaphragm transfer through blocking. *Is the Oregon amendment still necessary?*

No, the previous Oregon amendment does not appear necessary. I also think we need to weight in on the proposed modifications to this section shown in the Final Draft of proposal 10-44 that was attached. In the Final Draft of 10-44 I oppose exception 1 to 2308.3.2.2 (Top plate connection) which would allow the blocking to not be the full height of the trusses, the blocking should extend to the roof sheathing as currently required, this provides a much better connection between roof and walls.

In the Final Draft of 10-44 I oppose exception 2 which would not require blocking at all in certain situations, this does not provide a good connection between diaphragm and walls and can be unstable even for gravity loads as there is no resistance to rollover of the framing. Not requiring blocking is also contradictory of the requirements that all joists/rafters ect. have blocking at their bearing points i.e. the wall (sections 2308.8.5, 2308.10.6.

In the Final Draft of 10-44 Figure 2308.3.2(2) indicates that the blocking panels need not extend to the roof sheathing. If blocking panels are used they should be full height to provide a solid connection between roof and wall as required currently (Figure 2308.3.2(2).

- Section 2308.12.3 – Irregular structure designation where floor or roof diaphragm is not connected to or laterally supported by braced wall lines. *Is the Oregon amendment still necessary?*

No, the previous Oregon amendment of this section does not appear required.

David Nilles P.E., S.E.
Structural Engineer
City of Portland