

# ACI COMMITTEE 132: RESPONSIBILITY IN CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION

**Sunday, 4:00–5:30 pm.**

**21 October 2021**

**Virtual Meeting**

Jim Casilio called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

## **Attendance:**

**Members:** Julie Buffenbarger, Jim Casilio, Ned Cleland, Jeff Coleman, Jim Harris, Cecil Jones, Colin Lobo, Calvin McCall, Todd Olsheiser, Mike Schneider, Dave VanOcker, Michele Wilson, Chad Hensley

**Associate Member:** Guillermo Loayza

**Visitors:** Kerry Sutton (Staff); Samhar Hoz (ICC) Siamek Fakhryee, Steve Szoke, Ali Abu Yosef, Kathy Rai, Richard Meininger, Daniel Witter, Jonathon Kozlo

**Excused Absences:**

**Unexcused Absences:** Boyd Clark, Bill Klorman, Kevin MacDonald, Woody Vogt

## **Minutes of the Last Meeting:**

The meeting minutes of September 1, 2021 will be posted on an administrative web ballot in the future.

## **Old Business:**

### **1) Documents**

#### **a) Tech Note: Responsibility for Care of Test Specimens for Acceptance of Concrete**

The Technote is finished and will undergo TAC review on November 8, 2021. After receiving TAC comments, the committee must respond to comments. Colin is prepared for this review.

#### **b) Responsibility in Repair**

##### **i) Resolution of Negatives**

Negatives were resolved in the September 1, 2021, meeting or addressed prior. The outstanding negatives from Woody Vogt were addressed by Dave VanOcker and Woody approved these changes.

Dave VanOcker stated that he appreciated all the comments and input on the document. He believes it is a well-rounded, comprehensive document for Responsibility in the Rehabilitation of Concrete.

Dave acknowledged support from Gene Stevens, Pete Barlow, Larry Church, Keith Kesner for their assistance on the document. Jim Casilio stated he will also thank these individuals for their efforts.

The deadline for submission to TAC is Dec 1, 2021, for a February TAC review. The committee is hopeful on positive feedback from TAC.

c) **Update to Existing Guide**

The existing guide is due for a rewrite. Committee will address several areas, including items from 318, 301, etc.

The question of how the update will be done was discussed. The new TAC partial revision will provide additional shelf life to our current document.

It was suggested that additional people should provide feedback on the document. For example, “What needs to be added”.

Colin suggested that persons should be delegated for each section and that the document be divided amongst the expertise on the committee with additional expertise from others. Retaining initial persons who wrote the original sections will allow moving the document forward more expediently. Jim asked that members of the committee please volunteer for sections and contact him. Colin, Julie and Todd volunteered to tackle the concrete supplier section.

The rewrite of the document will begin in 2022.

These notes were added from previous minutes from the October 25, 2020 Fall Virtual Meeting on the rewriting of the document.

- i) Should it be sent to other committees, or should it be written without feedback from 301 and 318?
  - (1) Does anyone have examples of issues with problems from 132R-14
  - (2) Buffenbarger stated that there is insufficient awareness of the document, and it should be referenced in other ACI documents.
- ii) Chapter 14 – Jeff Coleman
  - (1) 5.1 and 5.6 do cover what the license design professional should do.
  - (2) Specify...as such
  - (3) Prescriptive or performance criteria?
  - (4) What should be added?
  - (5) What should be in the project documents? Provide a list of items that should be included.
  - (6) Some are obvious, and others not obvious. May provide some clarification to the design profession.
  - (7) Blanket statements need to be removed from specifications. E.g., All concrete should be air entrained except those noted.
- iii) Checklist – Michelle Wilson will cross-reference between 318 and 301. What is required? For example – exposure class. If it is not clear, who is responsible if the document does not show enough detail or comply with conditions?

2) **Discussion of Potential Seminar/ Session/ Hot Topics and Format**

a) **There are several formats which could be used for a Session including: Four (4) brief presentations with panel discussion.**

i) **The following topics were brought forward for potential sessions**

(1) **Cracking**

(a) **Who is responsible for Cracking?**

(i) **Discussion by group**

Mike Schneider – This is a great topic from a contractor perspective and is pertinent to many users.

Calvin McCall. – Who is responsible? When the questions is further investigated many issues arise. For example, the concrete producer is being blamed. Concrete strengths are too high and too brittle in tensile strength. R/M producer blamed for cracking. Seeing these issue being out of hand due to litigation.

It was suggested that three stakeholders should be assembled for the panel: 1) R/M producer, 2) Contractor, 3) Legal (Chapter 4 in Jeff Coleman's book discusses issues and he should be on the panel.)

It was suggested that a cement manufacture also be included. For example, thermal cracking on a slab.

Another topic could be the cement industry introducing Portland-limestone cement and the use of ASTM C595 1L cements. Will this lead to lower concrete strengths? What will be the performance issues of PLC in real world? The clinker is ground finer. Will this increase drying shrinkage? There are many moving pieces to this puzzle.

All members agreed that it is vital to get the information out to the public and it is an issue that the committee should tackle. It is not always anyone's fault. Sometimes it just happens.

If a "Hot Topics" format is used, a session could be done more quickly than having mini or full sessions. Chad suggested that perhaps several topics would be viable to the public and several sessions should be held. A session allows more time for an informative session and potentially the most education potential. Three presentations could discuss 1) Focus on who is responsible for the cracking? 2) Specification may be causing the issue. 3) Possibility that all parties on site meet the site requirements and cracking still occurs.

Jim will try to assemble a format. It was suggested that an article also be submitted at the end of the session so that the information is not lost.

A Motion to adjourn at 5:30 was made by Julie and seconded by Mike Schneider.