

STRUCTURAL BUILDING COMPONENTS MAGAZINE (FORMERLY WOODWORDS)

September/October 1999

Letters from Our Readers:



Dear Kirk,

I just wanted to let you know how pleased we are with the "NEW" *WOODWORDS*. The information and substance of the publication has taken a healthy notch up which, you can be assured, has not gone unnoticed. All of your people at *WOODWORDS* deserve a hearty congratulations for their shining achievement!

Sincerely,

Jerry Koskovich, President, The Koskovich Company
Rochester, Minnesota

P.S. Our Marketing Coordinator, Linda Rauch, wants me to underscore how much better our ads look in the new *WOODWORDS*, compared to the old. She also wants me to thank you and your staff for your professional, always-helpful handling of our account. It's sincerely appreciated—by all of us.

Kirk,

I was very impressed with the June/July *WOODWORDS* magazine. The editorial response to the previous article on "optimization" and the balance of judgment and analysis (i.e. knowing the limitations of analysis) was very interesting. More importantly, this reflects WTCA's interest in the kind of issues that are very important to builders, designers, and, ultimately, consumers. There were many other tidbits of information and thoughts published that made the complete reading quite useful and reflective on some important issues facing the design/construction industry as a whole. I believe that we (WTCA and NAHB-RC) are heading to a practical blend of design/build where judgment from field/test/design experience is reasonably blended with limitations in analysis. This reflects the "proper" balance of design. I agree with the editorial commentor that our education system has failed to bring this type of experience to that table for those who have not sought it themselves or who have not had the good fortune of working

from the ground-up to gain an understanding of buildings, construction, and design. While it is impossible to quantify "proper balance" in terms of weighing judgment vs. analysis, it is important for all engineers to understand that judgment and analysis are equally important and neither should be "found guilty until proven innocent."

Thanks,

Jay Crandell, P.E., NAHB Research Center
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Kirk,

I had to write to tell you that in my opinion the June/July 1999 issue of *WOODWORDS* is the best to date. The additional color adds so much to the quality content which this issue has plenty of. It's been a long while since I've spent as much time with an industry publication as I did with this one.

Thanks,

Ray Noonan, Cascade Manufacturing Co.
Cascade, Iowa

Just received the June/July issue. It's outstanding. I'm very impressed by the new design and overall look. In fact, you've put the onus on your advertisers to improve the appearance of their ads. Also, kudos for the www.woodwords.com web site. It's clean, easy to navigate and informative. Congratulations to all involved.

Don Kitzmiller, Alpine Engineered Products
Pompano Beach, Florida

Kirk,

Orchids to you and the others on the team for the June/July issue of *WOODWORDS*. This is without doubt the best issue yet. I know, it is mostly technical, but for an engineer, it is very interesting. My congratulations for a splendid job.

John Meeks, P.E., Consulting Engineer
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

I really enjoyed the June/July issue of *WOODWORDS*. The improvement is dramatic, and the section on the IRC/IBC code development was especially well done.

However, in the FAQ regarding truss repairs, you did not mention anything about the possible damage to a truss that can result after the web(s) have been cut, and the truss is allowed to creep or deflect in its damaged state prior to repair. Isn't this a real concern, especially since lumber and plate damage is frequently invisible? I realize it is impractical to assume the removal or replacement of a damaged or modified truss, and that you referred the writer to professional assistance. I just have been asked this question so many times before, and I have seen truss designers and engineers treat it like it was a truss in its pre-erected state for the repair drawing. What do you think—is it a valid or realistic concern?

SCH

Dear SCH,

Thanks you for your comments regarding the June/July issue of WOODWORDS and the FAQ. You raise an important point that is sometimes overlooked when developing a repair for a damaged truss that has been subjected to in-service loads. Because the force distribution within the members of the damaged truss will be different than what was assumed in the original truss design, it is possible that members and joints located away from the damaged area might become overstressed. This could result in damage to these areas, which would also require a repair. A thorough visual inspection does not completely guarantee that all damage will be detected; however, it offers considerably better assurance than if no inspection is done at all.

[SBC HOME PAGE](#)

Copyright © 1999 by Truss Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. For permission to reprint materials from SBC Magazine, call 608/310-6706 or email editor@sbcmag.info.

The mission of Structural Building Components Magazine (SBC) is to increase the knowledge of and to promote the common interests of those engaged in manufacturing and distributing of structural building components to ensure growth and continuity, and to be the information conduit by staying abreast of leading-edge issues. SBC will take a leadership role on behalf of the component industry in disseminating technical and marketplace information, and will maintain advisory committees consisting of the most knowledgeable professionals in the industry. The opinions expressed in SBC are those of the authors and those quoted solely, and are not necessarily the opinions of any of the affiliated associations (SBCC, WTCA, SCDA & STCA).