

Fire Protection

Please be careful to place proper caveats in your discussion of fire protection on steel. The phrase “unnecessary paint and fire coatings” might well be misinterpreted. In June 2004, NIST informed us that Tower 1 = 103 minutes = 1.5 inches of spray on. Tower 2 = 56 minutes = 0.5 inches of spray on. You may draw your own conclusions, but caution is in order when lumping “paint” and “fire coatings” in one category. All best wishes in your work.

*David J. Thomas, P.E.
Fairfax Co. Fire Prevention Division
Fairfax, VA*

Editor's Note: Thanks for the words of caution. The recent editorial was intended as a reminder that we have exceptional building codes in the U.S. Exceeding those building code requirements should be done with good intent—not simply because it's easier.

CASE 962-D

Your July comments regarding CASE 962-D and your entire August column are just what a sublet detailer in the trenches seeks in its leaders in the “War on Contract Documents.” We are a dedicated bunch but are fatigued by the battle. As I consider that your “suggestions” should be required reading (and accepted) by design professionals, I can only reminisce of the days when it wasn't necessary. Thanks for leading the charge!

*Lee Parrish, President
Shop Graphics, Inc.
Cornelius, NC*

August Cover Photo

As an AISC member company, I and all the other members of our company are somewhat bewildered as to why MSC chose the specific photo featured on the August 2004 cover. Strictly speaking from an engineering standpoint, the connection leaves much to be desired. At best, it shows questionable connection configurations and barely passable workmanship. For a magazine that is supposed to be a primary tool for the advancement of the use of steel in construction, this photo does not exemplify the best that our industry can produce.

The trained eye can determine at least three possible visual weld criteria errors:

- The unequal weld size in the beam web to column web connection.
- Pitting of the brace gusset weld to the column web.
- Possible overbuild of the column flange weld.

Why the weld is located in this particular location is also questionable, considering the restraint of the location. Additionally, there is one glaring workmanship criteria rejection (the fillet weld out of plane transition of the tube to the moment plate). The fact that the moment plates are wider than the column flange also creates the potential for local stress increases and weld crack initiation. From an engineering perspective, this is generally unacceptable and is a situation best avoided.

What amazes me is that there seem to be better pictures of architecturally exposed structural steel (Springfield, MO ballpark, pages 33 and 35) in this same issue. I know that the concert venue in AISC's back yard is also a project of high stature. It, therefore, may have warranted a cover shot for the magazine.



I know AESS construction includes sealing the material to avoid corrosion problems, which at times leads to somewhat unsightly appearances, but surely a better representative photo could have been chosen. I am not trying to be overly critical, but in my opinion, this photo does not do our industry justice, nor does it promote our industry correctly. The photo, at best, was a questionable choice for a cover.

*Eugene Grossi Jr., P.E.
Samuel Grossi & Sons, Inc.
Bensalem, PA*