ANSI A190.1-2017 (Recirculation Ballot 2017-1-R1)

**Ballot issue date: 11/27/2016 Ballot closing date: 12/28/2016**

**Ballot Instructions (Please read):**

1. This is a recirculation ballot to **Ballot 2017-1**, which was issued on 9/15/16 and closed 10/17/16. This recirculation ballot affords all members of the Committee an opportunity to respond, reaffirm, or change their vote.
2. Ballot 2017-1-08 (i.e., Item 8) was ruled by a committee letter ballot issued 10/24/16 and closed 11/26/16 as non-persuasive with a 27:2:0 vote (the minimum requirement is 2/3 returned votes from voting members, excluding abstention). However, ANSI requires the Item be recirculated even though the original ballot remain unchanged.
3. If this recirculation ballot do not affect your previous vote on this item, you can either confirm your vote by returning this ballot or do nothing (your previous vote will be considered as your vote on this recirculation ballot). However, it is encouraged that you return this ballot to avoid any ambiguity.
4. If this recirculation ballot do affect your vote on this item, you must cast your new vote by returning this ballot. A written explanation and proposed resolution is not required if you vote Negative or Affirmative-with-Comment. If you would like to provide comments, please use the comment form.
5. Please return your ballot by e-mail to [borjen.yeh@apawood.org](mailto:borjen.yeh@apawood.org).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Committee Member Name | | Signature (not required with e-mail) | | Date |

**Ballot** (Aff = affirmative; Aw/C = affirmative with comment; Neg = negative; Abst = abstention)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Description | Aff | Aw/C | Neg | Abst |
| 2017-1-08-R1 | Section 3.2.2 (Recirculated ballot) |  |  |  |  |

**Ballot Comment Form for ANSI A190.1-2017**

**(Recirculation Ballot 2017-1-R1)**

NOT Required for Negative or Affirmative-with-Comment

**Please attach this page to the e-mail ballot return**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Comments |
| 2017-1-08-R1 |  |

**Ballot Item 2017-1-08-R1 (Previous 2017-1-08):** (Recirculation Ballot)

Revise “appearance grade” to “appearance classification” as proposed throughout this standard

**Rationale:** The wording of “Grades” is usually associated with structural requirements, such as “Grade Combination” in Section 3.2 or “visual-grade and mechanical-grade lumber.” However, appearance is simply non-structural aesthetic characteristics of glulam. Therefore, it is suggested that the wording of “appearance grade” be changed to “appearance classification” throughout this standard to avoid confusion.

**Explanation of the Recirculation Ballot:**

The original item, as shown below, was balloted and closed 10/17/16 with the following votes:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Last Name | First Name | Item 8 |
| Akula | Deepareddy | Aff |
| Beineke | Larry | Aff |
| Browder | Robert | Aff |
| Cheung | Kevin | Abst |
| Devisser | Don | Aff |
| Douglas | Brad | Aw/C |
| Drake | Kerlin | Aff |
| Gareis | Bill | Aff |
| Gilham | Paul | Aff |
| Goff | Ron | Aff |
| Gould | Bill | Aff |
| Grigsby | Bill | Aff |
| Griswold | Jim | Aff |
| Howard | Jon | Aff |
| Hucke | Doug | NR |
| Jennings | Jessica | Aff |
| Kumar | Jeet | Aff |
| Lane | Mike | Aff |
| Levy | Patrick | Aff |
| Olson | Jeff | Aff |
| Pearson | Victor | Aff |
| Rammer | Douglas | Aff |
| Rhude | Andreas | Neg |
| Robak | Glen | Aff |
| Stochlia | Kurt | Aff |
| Tolley | Brian | Aff |
| Van Cott | Leif | Aff |
| Vanek | Lane | Aff |
| Vogt | Jim | Aff |
| Whelan | Chris | NR |
| Williamson | Tom | Aff |
| Yeh | B.J. | Aff |
| Zhou | Larry | Aff |

The only negative vote by Mr. Rhude was as follows:

## *There is no confusion in the market with designers, end users (consumers), and manufacturers of the appearance "grade" term. AITC appearance "grade" terminology has been utilized in the structural glued laminated timber industry since approximately 1957. No one, in my 43 years of experience, has ever confused "appearance grade" with the grade of lumber going into the manufacture of glued laminated timber or grade combinations. The solution is not to change the word "grade" to "classification."*

The ExSub reviewed the comments from Mr. Rhude and offered the following comments:

1. *Grade is a term that typically relates to structural properties of wood products and I have had a number of designers ask if the appearance grade influences the design values.  By referring to it as an appearance classification then this potential confusion is avoided.*
2. *Over the years some customers have ordered Architectural grade “because it is stronger than Industrial grade”….And they sometimes ask how much stronger is the Premium grade.  It minimizes the confusion if customers are offered an array of appearance Classifications separate from strength grades, i.e., layup combinations.*
3. *I have personally been involved with confusion from customers with appearance grades and strengths.  Just because it’s been that way since 1957 doesn’t make it right.*

In the end, the ExSub unanimously recommended the negative vote be ruled non-persuasive because multiple committee members have testified in that the use of the term of “grade” has resulted in confusion based on their professional experience and that the proposed changes in the ballot are beneficial to avoid such confusion.

The committee upheld the ExSub’s non-persuasive recommendation by a committee letter ballot issued 10/24/16 and closed 11/26/16 with a 27:2:0 vote (the minimum requirement is 2/3 returned votes from voting members, excluding abstention). As a result, the original ballot remains unchanged for this recirculation ballot, as shown below. However, due to the negative vote, the ANSI regulations require this item be recirculated to the entire committee to afford all committee members an opportunity to respond, reaffirm, or change their vote.

If this recirculation ballot do not affect your previous vote on this item, you can either confirm your vote by returning this ballot or do nothing (your previous vote as shown above will be considered as your vote on this recirculation ballot). However, it is encouraged that you return this ballot to avoid any ambiguity.

If this recirculation ballot do affect your vote on this item, you must cast your new vote by returning this ballot. A written explanation and proposed resolution is not required if you vote Negative or Affirmative-with-Comment. If you would like to provide comments, please use the comment form.

Notations for Revision: Inserted Text New Text

Deleted Text ~~Old Text~~

**Ballot (Same as the original ballot):**

1. Scope

(second para)

This Standard describes minimum requirements for the production of structural glued laminated timber, including size tolerances, grade combinations, lumber, adhesives, appearance ~~grades~~ classifications, and manufacture.

8. Wood inserts are permitted to be used to meet appearance ~~grades~~ classifications requirements.

1. Appearance ~~Grades~~ Classifications

Glued laminated timber shall be finished to a Framing, Industrial, Architectural or Premium ~~grade~~ classification unless otherwise agreed upon by buyer and seller.

* 1. Framing Appearance ~~Grade~~ Classification
  2. Industrial Appearance ~~Grade~~ Classification
  3. Architectural Appearance ~~Grade~~ Classification
  4. Premium Appearance ~~Grade~~ Classification

12.3.7 Appearance ~~grade~~ classification

13.1(f) Appearance ~~grade~~ classification