

ANSI/APA PRR-410 Ballot #2 (Closed April 12, 2010, 2010)
Summary of Comments and Proposed Responses

May 13, 2010

Page 1 of 3

Item	Ballot		
2	<p>Revise section 3.2.6 as follows:</p> <p><i>Rim Board</i> – A continuously supported, full-depth structural element developed for use with a wood floor or roof assembly <u>performing a similar role as starter or end joist in lumber floor/roof assemblies</u> and installed in a <u>load bearing wall or non-load bearing wall perpendicular or parallel</u> to the joist framing to transfer horizontal (shear) and vertical (compression) loads, provide attachment for diaphragm sheathing, siding and/or exterior deck ledgers, and provide lateral support to floor or roof joists or rafters.</p> <p>Rationale: Clarification based on comments from last ballot.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Ehrlich	Aw/C	<p>Suggest revising as follows:</p> <p>Rim Board – A continuously supported, full-depth structural element developed for use <u>within</u> a wood floor or roof assembly <u>and</u> performing a similar role as <u>a</u> starter or end joist <u>in lumber floor/roof assemblies and</u> Installed in a load bearing wall or non-load bearing wall perpendicular or parallel to the joist framing to transfer horizontal (shear) and vertical (compression) loads, provide attachment for diaphragm sheathing, siding and/or exterior deck ledgers, and provide lateral support to floor or roof joists or rafters.</p>	<p>Editorial revised as follows:</p> <p>Rim Board – A continuously supported, full-depth structural element developed for use <u>with</u>in a wood floor or roof assembly <u>and</u> performing a similar role as <u>a</u> starter or end joist <u>in lumber floor/roof assemblies and when</u> installed... (no change).</p>
Smart	Aw/C	Editorial: Need to add the word “a” between the words “as” and “starter”	Editorial
Item	Ballot		
3	<p>Revise Section 4.3 as follows:</p> <p>Depth - Plus 1/8 inch (3.2 mm) or minus 0 inch (measured to 1/32 inch or 0.79 mm) <u>for structural-use panel or structural composite lumber rim boards. Structural glued-laminated timber rim board shall be manufactured at a moisture content and depth to ensure that it meets these same tolerances over a range of application moisture contents of 5 and 16%</u></p> <p>Rationale: Clarify the depth tolerance for structural glued laminated timber.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Lewis	Neg (Neg withdrawn - tabulated as Aw/C)	<p>This seems like it will result in excluding glulam as rimboard but that does not seem compatible with the standard either. This section is on depth tolerance at time of manufacture, giving tolerances of +1/8 in./-0, and the new sentence requires glulam to meet these same tolerances over a range of applications at 5-16% MC. This would mean that the depth with the given changes in MC cannot vary by more than 1/8”, but that is not reasonable for glulam over 11% MC range unless it is limited to 8 inch depth or so. I also don’t understand why SCL is not similarly treated, since it would often show changes in depth exceeding 1/8 inch for similar changes in MC. I am guessing part of the problem is the 5-16% MC range is overly large, but maybe this issue would be best addressed with guidance to limit the application of rimboard with I-joist systems to that which has similar shrink/swell characteristics, at least once depth exceeds some threshold.</p>	<p>The practical depth for glulam rimboard is 11-7/8” or less due to the vertical load capacity limitation. If this changes in the future, revisions to the standard could be considered.</p>
Ehrlich	Aw/C	<p>Suggest revising as follows:</p> <p>Structural glued-laminated timber rim board shall be manufactured at a moisture content and depth to ensure that it meets these same tolerances over a range of application moisture contents <u>from</u> of 5% <u>to</u> and 16%</p>	<p>Editorial. Suggested changes will be incorporated.</p>

ANSI/APA PRR-410 Ballot #2 (Closed April 12, 2010, 2010)
Summary of Comments and Proposed Responses

May 13, 2010

Page 2 of 3

Item	Ballot		
7	<p>Revise Section 6.2.1.2, the Note after Section 6.4.1.1, and Section 6.4.1.3 as follows:</p> <p>6.2.1.2 Dimensions for each component...(no change). The sill plate shall be 2x4 spruce-pine-fir (SPF) <u>with a specific gravity of no greater than 0.45 (i.e., 0.42 + 0.03) and complying</u> with grading standards referenced in the <u>applicable building</u> code. The specific gravity of the SPF should be reported.</p> <p><i>Note: This test method is not intended <u>for bolt or lag screw installation with multiple washer spacers between the head of the lag screw and the ledger.</u></i></p> <p>6.4.1.3 The ledger shall be 2x6 spruce-pine-fir (SPF) <u>with a specific gravity of no greater than 0.45 (i.e., 0.42 + 0.03) and complying</u> with grading standards referenced in the <u>applicable building</u> code. The specific gravity of the SPF should be reported.</p> <p>Rationale: Establish the upper bound specific gravity for lumber used in testing for consistency with the published value. Also clarify the note for bolt or lag screw installed with stacked washers, which is no longer recommended by the industry.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Lewis	Aw/C	The limitation on SG is appropriate but why to a value greater than average for the species if the intent is to assure that it be representative and the relevant properties are correlated to density? I think this is in recognition of the logistics of specimen preparation, but a better way to address it is to specify an adjustment so as to permit use of denser than specified material but with the requirement that results then be reduced (using same relationship as in the NDS). This permits use of denser material when that makes sense (or if inadvertent) while still addressing the material variation.	This section is intended for product qualification. The suggested approach may be used by the manufacturer and certification body, if so chosen. No action.
Smart	Aw/C	To my knowledge, all of the provisions of Section 6.4 deal strictly with 1/2" lag screw deck ledger connections. Thus, it is fairly clear that bolts are outside the scope of this section. In order to avoid confusion, I would recommend removing the words "bolt or" from the note under Section 6.4.1.1.	Editorial. Will remove the wording of "for bolt or" in the non-mandatory note.
Item	Ballot		
8	<p>Revise Section 6.2.1.3 as follows:</p> <p>6.2.1.3 Nailing schedules...(no change). Nails used for the assembly shall be in conformance with the sizes specified in <u>ASTM F 1667 for the U.S. and CSA B111 for Canada.</u></p> <p>Rationale: Reference the fastener standard in Canada.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Lewis	Aw/C	Seems like "the sizes specified in" should be deleted, as Table 4 specifies the sizes so these standards are just for other issues (tolerances etc...)	Editorial. Will delete "the sizes specified in" in this paragraph.
Item	Ballot		
10	<p>Revise Section 6.3.4 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.4 The buckling capacity for rim boards made with SCL and glulam shall be calculated in accordance with the National Design Specification for Wood construction (NDS) using the appropriate axial compressive stress and bending modulus of elasticity in the perpendicular to the rim board length direction, <u>as tested in accordance with ASTM D 3501 and D 198, respectively.</u> The buckling length...(no change).</p> <p>Rationale: Clarify the referenced standards for obtaining the properties used in the theoretical calculations for rim board buckling capacities.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Lewis	Aw/C	I think more guidance is needed in section 6.3.4 as it references the NDS for a buckling calc that the	NDS equations should be used for

ANSI/APA PRR-410 Ballot #2 (Closed April 12, 2010, 2010)
Summary of Comments and Proposed Responses

May 13, 2010

Page 3 of 3

		NDS does not give.	calculating the vertical load capacities. No action.
Item	Ballot		
12	<p>a) Revise Footnote C to Table A1 as follows:</p> <p>H = the horizontal (shear) load transfer capacity based on <u>the</u> attachment schedule specified in this standard. <u>This capacity represents the total of the lateral loads transferred through the rim board by both the floor sheathing and wall plate above the floor sheathing.</u> H is based....(no change)</p> <p>b) Revise Footnote C to Table A1A as follows:</p> <p>H = the factored horizontal (shear) load transfer resistance based on <u>the</u> attachment schedule specified in this standard. <u>This capacity represents the total of the lateral loads transferred through the rim board by both the floor sheathing and wall plate above the floor sheathing.</u></p> <p>Rationale: Clarification based on comments from last ballot.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Di Lenardo	Aw/C	Note 1: Table A1A is based on testing with the bottom plate and fasteners transferring the load from the shearwall above as per Figure 1A, so statement (b) is correct. However Table A1 and Figure 1 <u>do not</u> include the bottom plate & shearwall fasteners. Is it appropriate to make the same statement above in (a)?	The qualification results will be conservative. No action.
Item	Ballot		
13	<p>Add the ASD to LSD conversion, which has been published in the CCMC Rim Board Technical Guide for year in a new non-mandatory Appendix B (see wording attached to this ballot below). Also revise Footnote a to Table A1A as follows to provide a reference to Appendix B:</p> <p>^(a) These design values are applicable standard-term load duration and permitted to be adjusted for other load durations in accordance with the applicable <u>building</u> code. <u>Factors for ASD to LSD conversion are shown in Appendix B.</u></p> <p>Rationale: The added appendix provides useful information for conversion from ASD to LSD.</p>		
Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Bao	Aw/C	In Equations B1-3, B2-3 and B2-4, the sizes of the fonts do not seem to be consistent. Please check and make them consistent in the final version.	Editorial. Will make the correction when the standard is published.
Lewis	Aw/C	Seems like there should be something here for LRFD as well, or at least something to avoid confusion between LSD and LRFD.	Will consider this suggestion in future revisions. No action.