

***EA07-23, Section 2308.3.2, Figure 2308.3.2(1)&(2), 2308.12.6
as relates to: OSSC10-44 (Previously Approved by Committee)***

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Rice [mailto:RRICE@co.josephine.or.us]

Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2009 9:02 PM

To: Robert Rice; richard.rogers@state.or.us

Subject: Re: SEAO's Comments

Richard,

The question that has been raised by SEAO is one that has been discussed over the last 3 years since my proposal has been on the table at the national level.

It was my thought (from an engineering background) that the details and blocking requirements that I was proposing would be req'd for the entire wall line to transfer the plf diaphragm forces to the top plate that, in turn, transfers to the entire wall line. The result of three years of, sometimes heated, debate was that historically it has been successful w/o it.

The ICC proposal that was approved in Minn. Last Fall was not clear if it meant the whole wall line or not. This year Gary Erlich (NAHB) is proposing a mod. to say it's just at the braced panels. With his support from the wood components industry (assuming they can provide reasonable proof) I'm not inclined to fight the issue.

Regarding the issue of stability within the trussed system, the truss industry (in Minn.) Made it very clear that the truss system is the responsibility of the truss designer and they take responsibility for that.

It was further clarified (in the latest ICC hearings that all my proposal is addressing is the lateral diaphragm forces from wind/seismic that are NOT covered in truss designers work. The structural stability of the roof structure is their job.

I have three years worth of emails and other dialog that I could share if needed to explain and show how I got to where I'm at.

I proposed what I did for Oregon because I want it to match (for the next three years) what's going to be in the National codes due to input from others.

The current proposal is a National consensus. There will always be those that think the code is too strict and others that think it's not strict enough. That's how we get a fair and balanced code as a minimum standard.

I can not be at the meeting tomorrow to explain all this in person. If there are further questions, I respectfully would ask that the topic be tabled so I can gather info (and confer w/ stakeholders nationally) and present it at a future date even though I know time is running out for the committee's work.

Please share this with the committee and if they have any questions they can email me.

Thanks,

Robert Rice