

Pre-ANSI/APA PRS 610.1 Ballot #4 (Closed April 19, 2013)

Summary of Comments and Proposed Responses (PE = Persuasive Editorial; PS = Persuasive Substantial; NA = No Action; TBD = To Be Determined)

April 20, 2013

Page 1 of 2

Voter	Vote	Comments	Proposed Responses
Item 1	Approval	of ANSI/APA PRS 610.1-201x	
Krivchuk	Neg	Editorially delete the word "a" and delete the comma after the word "transverse" in the first sentence of Section 1.2.	
Krivchuk	Neg	Add the phrase "equally and uniformly" to the second sentence of Section 1.3 to read "...with vertical loads applied <u>equally and uniformly</u> to both facings at the top of the SIPs." I acknowledge that the axial compression load tests of the SIPs are required to be conducted with an slightly offset load, but this offset load condition is considered to represent an "accidental" offset in the loads, not to justify eccentrically loaded panels. Also, this section of the document is describing the intended end-use of the product, not the test conditions.	
Ehrlich	Aw/C	Section 1.5 - I believe the intent here is that the SIPs should be continuously fastened to the top and bottom plates at whatever standard nail spacing is required. But, the "continuously supported" language could theoretically be taken to imply that the facings should actually bear directly on the slab or foundation wall below the SIP. Consider editorial revision to clarify.	
Bregulla	Aw/C	Editorial/ technical: Section 2: There is reference to surface spread of flame testing (reaction to fire, i.e. surface burning), should there also be reference to fire resistance testing?	
Krivchuk	Neg	Editorially add the word "total" or "overall" prior to the word "panel" in the sentence of Section 4.1.	
Krivchuk	Neg	Editorially revise the spelling of the word "measure" to "measured" in the last sentence of Section 4.2	
Krivchuk	Neg	Editorially revise the word "value" to "values" in the first sentence of footnote a of Table 3, footnote b of Table 4 and footnote c of Table 5.	
Krivchuk	Neg	Since Table 3 identifies the number of specimens, editorially footnotes b, c and d could be revised with the deletion of the phrase "3-" from each of these three footnotes.	
Di Lenardo	Aw/C	Editorial: Correction to referenced articles so that core materials are properly qualified under Empirical Method. 5.2 Method B (Empirical Full-Scale Test Method) SIPs shall be permitted to be qualified based on empirical full-scale SIP tests specified in this section. When using this qualification method, core materials, facings, and adhesives shall meet the following requirements. (a) Core materials shall meet the requirements specified in Sections 5.1.2.2 ¹ and 5.1.2.3 ² and shall be characterized in accordance with the test methods of ASTM C578 in the U.S., CAN/ULC-S701 in Canada, or Table 1.	
Krivchuk	Neg	In the previous ballot, I questioned the reduction in the minimum transverse load test requirements in Table 4 from values specified in a previous draft. The response was that the test values were adjusted to account for a revised support condition for the transverse load test specimens. My question is whether the values currently in the document (which are reduced values from the values in an earlier version) are consistent with the values utilized to develop the load-span tables in the 2012 IRC for SIP wall panels. If they aren't the same, then the document will not be consistent with the basis for the IRC. Will a code change be developed to reduce the IRC load span tables?	
Bregulla	Aw/C	Editorial/ completeness: Section 8: Periodic re-evaluation: In line with ISO 17065 recommendations? Other? Which?	
Krivchuk	Neg	Figure B4 contains two significantly different drawings for the transverse load test setup. My understanding is that the bottom drawing is to be deleted from the document. If it is not to be deleted, then I disagree with the inclusion of this drawing, because the support condition at the left end of the drawing creates a moment resistant condition that will give artificially exaggerated transverse load test results.	
Krivchuk	Neg	The transverse load test setup (setups?) in Figure B4 should be revised to permit relative displacement of facers of the tested SIPs to occur each end of the test specimen. As currently depicted in the drawings, the support device each end of the specimens can artificially restrain the movement of the SIP facings, resulting in artificially exaggerated transverse load test results. Please note that I also made this comment in the last ballot, to which neither of the two transverse load test setups in the currently balloted document permit in-plane relative displacement of the panel facers.	

Krivchuk	Neg	<p>In the previous ballot, I questioned the increase in the deflection limit for the racking shear load test requirements in Table 4 from the limit specified in a previous draft. The response did not address my comment. As a result, my comment remains. What is the basis for the increase in the deflection limit for the racking shear test from the limit that appeared in an earlier version of the document? The racking shear test setup depicted in Figure B6 includes a wood sill plate (equal in width to the overall thickness of the SIP) which is not the same as the support condition required at the bottom of assemblies tested in accordance ASTM E72. The inclusion of this wood sill plate will reduce the movement of the tested assembly, since the facers will bear on the wood sill plate and racking of the facers of the SIPs will be reduced. As a result, it appears that the deflection limit should be decreased from that in a previous version of the document, not increased as specified in the currently balloted version. I would propose that the deflection limit be changed back to the 0.125 inch limit specified in an earlier version of the document for 8 foot high tested assemblies.</p>	
Krivchuk	Neg	<p>Figure B6 contains two significantly different drawings for the racking shear load test setup. My understanding is that the second drawing is to be deleted from the document. If it is not to be deleted, then I disagree with the inclusion of this drawing, because the drawing does not include sufficient detail to properly place the devices to be used to measure the movements.</p>	