

From: rebachmanse@aol.com [mailto:rebackmanse@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2008 9:48 AM
To: Brian Gerber
Cc: rohamburger@sgh.com; jrossberg@asce.org
Subject: Re: To late submit comment on "Seismic Issues in ICC-ES Evaluation Services Reports"?

Brian,

I have neither the time nor the energy to make 35 copies and send them to you. So I will provide my comments to you directly in this email and you can do however you want.

I think ICC Evaluation Services has gone down a slippery slope when it decided to provide R values for the narrow premanufactured shear walls. I then things got worse when they decided on the R values of AAC. The real issue is not the R values, it is height limits and restrictions. As you will find, height limits and restrictions in the UBC, IBC and ASCE 7 have always been decided by the collective wisdom and judgment of the Seismology committee or the NEHRP Provisions Update Committee who are not under any pressure to approve values of R or height limits and restrictions of a system because of financial reasons. In a few rare occasions, the Structural Committee of the ICC also has exercised judgment but this been almost always with the support of FEMA's Code Resource Committee. In my opinion, the ICC Evaluation Services does not possess either the technical expertise or the independence from financial pressures to make these judgments. Best I understand they are currently doing this by equivalency with similar structural systems but again I do not have the expertise or the independence.

The new ATC-63 methodology provides an objective procedure for determining the R values, height limits and restrictions and should be used for all new structural systems including peer review or the new system should be brought to NEHRP Provisions Update Committee for consideration with appropriate documentation. I strongly urge the ICC Evaluation Services not to do an end run around this established process because of complaints from suppliers of being too slow or too costly. If ICC Evaluation Services decides to proceed in this manner anyway, it could easily result in seismic code anarchy (everyone doing their own thing) with inconsistent determination of R factors, height limits and restrictions which I believe could greatly decrease the seismic safety of new buildings in the United States. I don't think ICC Evaluation Services wants this responsibility or liability.

Best Regards,

Bob Bachman

Chair of the SEAOC Seismology Committee 1994 - 1997 (when the 1997 UBC Seismic Provisions were developed) and

Chair of the ASCE 7 Seismic Task Committee 2000 - 2005 (when the ASCE 7-02 and ASCE 7-05 Seismic Provisions were developed) and currently Vice Chair of the ASCE 7 main committee.

26451 Ambia
Mission Viejo
CA 92692

May 21, 2008

Kurt Stochlia, C.E.
ICC Evaluation Service, Inc.
5360 Workman Mill Rd.
Whittier, CA 90601

Subject: Status of Seismic Issues Relating to Lateral-force-resisting Products Covered in ICC-ES Evaluation Service Reports

Category: Testing Methods: Displacement Loading Protocol

Dear Sir:

This letter is in response to ICC-ES staff memos of April 1 and April 3, 2008, and the May 13, 2008 letter from Ron Hamburger. It is written with respect to the interests of the Ultimate Stakeholders, the persons who buy, own, rent or enter buildings using products covered by ICC-ES reports. The writer is independent of all industry proponents.

I have no discussion of the hamburger letter other than the introduction of Figure 2. This figure compares the behavior of two different element specimen types using different testing protocols. In my opinion, Figure 2 may mislead ICC-ES. The apparent differences in the element behaviors indicated by Figure 2 may be due more to the test methods than the responses of the elements.

I refer you to my previous letters and again to "Cyclic Response of Woodframe Shearwalls: Loading Protocol and Rate Of Loading Effects. CUREE Task 1.3.1, Kip Gatto, Chia-Ming Uang." This CUREE Testing demonstrated significant behavior differences between identical specimens of wood walls due to different testing protocols.

Steve Pryor, in his letter of March 07, 2008 also discusses the differences in specimen behavior due to different testing procedures.

I take no side in wood versus steel, or any other product. I am concerned with the testing methods.

Testing protocols that are representative of actual earthquake conditions must be used to assess specimens. I have previously listed the CUREE protocol restrictions. It is imperative that the impacts of testing protocols be fully understood for Light-Frame elements, and that a protocol specifically for providing data for inclusion in the ICC code be developed. Such a protocol may not presently be in use, and considering Steve Prior's comments, a single protocol may not be adequate. The protocol issue has been with us since before 1999. To this date there has been no complete and open discussion of this issue, let alone any agreement. ICC-ES would do well the sponsor such a discussion.

When a representative protocol is agreed upon, all Light-Frame specimens must be independently assessed using the same rules.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Signed by Graeme Dick, S.E.

Copy: Brian Gerber, S.E., Peter Bahlo, C.E., Nick Horeczko, C.E.