

Correspondence



Dear Editor:

The news article in the December issue of MSC, "California Building Standards Commission Ignores Own Experts' Recommendation to Adopt the International Building Code," is published as a news item, but includes words like "unnecessary step backward," which express an opinion and makes it more of an editorial. I would like to know whose opinion is being expressed.

I don't have a strong opinion on which code we should use here in California, but I disagree with the idea that keeping the 1997 UBC seismic provisions is moving backwards. At the very least, it is remaining stationary. This assumes that the 2000 IBC is a step forward. I feel that this is a debatable point.

Also, the 1998 California Building Code (based on the 1997 UBC) incorporates many lessons learned from the Northridge earthquake, contrary to an implication in the article/editorial.

This may just be a case of bad semantics, but in general I believe that news and editorials should be clearly defined.

*Jeffrey E. Haight, S.E.
Ehlen & Spiess, Inc. Structural
Engineers
Santa Barbara, CA*

Since this may be of interest to some of your readers, I would appreciate it if you would mention our report in your next publication.

*Peter J. Maranian, Co-Chair
SEAOSC-Steel Ad Hoc Committee*

Dear Editor:

I was interested to learn in the December 2000 issue of *Modern Steel Construction* that AISC will be having a series of seminars on Steel Buildings in Seismic Regions relating to FEMA 350 and 353.

Our committee has been reviewing FEMA 350 and its earlier drafts over the last several months. We have produced an Interim report on FEMA 350, which can be obtained from the Structural Engineers Association of Southern California's (SEAOSC's) web site www.seaint.org.