

ACI Committee 349, Subcommittee 2 Meeting Agenda

This is to remind you that the Subcommittee 2 of the ACI 349 will meet at Parlor 515 at Sheraton in San Diego, CA at 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM on Monday, March 27, 2000. Please check again in San Diego for the time and place of this and the full 349 committee meetings.

A proposed Agenda for the meeting follows.

I am not able to attend the meeting in San Diego. Gunnar has kindly agreed to chair the subcommittee meeting, and report to the full 349 committee on our behalf. I thank him for the same and request your continued cooperation.

If, for any reason, you cannot make it to the San Diego meetings please communicate with Gunnar and me to let us know your views on the items on the agenda, or any other items for consideration.

thank you.

joshi

AGENDA for Subcommittee 2 of ACI 349 on March 27, 2000

1. ACI 349-1R : to delete, revise or re-approve, specific changes for consideration.
See Note # 1.
2. Status of ACI 349/349R-97, Chapters 7-11, 13-19, 21 and Appendices A, C, D & E.
See Note # 2.
3. 349-5R.
4. Writing for a research proposal (for thermal, and for fragility). Any volunteers??
5. An inquiry on an interpretation of 349.
See Note # 3.
6. Other

Notes:

1

My past e-mails, beginning about September 1999, have attempted to explain the situation. From the email responses received (from subcommittee 2 members and some others from 349), everybody except Gunnar are in agreement with the two-pronged approach - the short and the long term . That is, most concur with its re-approval as an INTERIM arrangement. Richard Orr, for example, states, "The commentary should address how to evaluate the results of the analysis".

To reiterate, there is not much debate about specific items in the report being wrong, unsafe or unconservative, but rather on how the report has been or may be used.

What is possible, I believe, is that we should add a lead-in "paragraph" as a commentary which emphasizes, more than it currently does, that the report provides simplified analytical tools, and does not address issues such as loading combinations, design criteria and the design "process". I am, of course, prepared to work on such editorial "paragraph" if there is a consensus that this approach is possible.

ACI Committee 349, Subcommittee 2 Meeting Agenda

Please remember that professional committees such as 349 have to reach consensus, sometimes counter to individual preferences. For the latter to be meaningful, one must provide logical reasons why things are not acceptable. I have not seen nor heard such reasoning for not reapproving the report - with "editorial" changes.

Chuck Zalesiak's Agenda for ACI 349 meetings provides clearly the required schedule(s) for this (obviously this matter is urgent) and other items on the subcommittee agenda.

2

I have received initial input(s) on most Chapters from the subcommittee members. One has not been received and some of those received are "incomplete".

I plan to compile them and send to the subcommittee first, and then with our consensus, send it on to the full committee. We should not start balloting on it until the 349-99 (or -00) is formally approved and "out".

I have not seen major "technical" issues requiring resolution. For example: a. Chapter 18: 318-99 sections 18.14 (Design of anchorage zones for monostrand or single 5/8 in diameter bar tendons) and 18.15 (Design of anchorage zones for multistrand tendons) are proposed to be not "applicable" and hence deleted because : one, they are for simple structures, and two, they come from AASHTO or Highway requirements.

We have to remember that the fact that an item is not "generally" used in nuclear safety related concrete structures does not assure that it is never used in the nuclear safety related concrete structures, and thus may still be included.

b. Chapter 21: It is proposed to delete the word "Special" from the title for 21.6 "Special reinforced concrete structural walls and coupling beams".

As much as possible we should follow the "notation", including phraseology, of 318, unless there are compelling reasons for doing so.

3

The question was/is whether provisions of Chapter 21 (349) are triggered by something specific other than the fact that it is a nuclear safety related concrete structure. Can there be a relief in the requirements of Chapter 21 if the structure is shown to remain "elastic" for 1.4 times the SSE?