AGENDA

TAC Specifications Committee

Pointe South Mountain Resort
East Court 3B
Wednesday, October 30, 2002
7:00 to 10:00 AM
Phoenix, AZ

Voting Members:
Nicholas J. Carino, Chair and TAC Contact
Todd R. Watson, Secretary (Non-voting)
Jon B. Ardahl
William L. Barringer
William C. Bretnall
Jeffrey W. Coleman
D. Gene Daniel

I. Leon Glassgold
Ronald L. Hollrah
Alfred L. Kaufman, Jr.
W. Calvin McCall
Myles A. (Tony) Murray
Aimee Pergalsky
Arthur T. Weiss, Jr.

Associate Members Present:
Karl J. Bakke
James R. Baty
Daniel P. Dorfmueler
Sidney Freedman

Kenneth G. Kazanis
William H. Oliver, Jr.
Robert J. Ryan
Michael S. Stenko

1. Call to Order and Introduction of Members and Visitors

1.1 Approval of Minutes

ACTION: Does TSC approve the Minutes of the 2002 spring meeting in Detroit?

1.2 Membership Report

The current TSC roster is shown as Exhibit 1. Members are asked to review the roster and inform Secretary Watson of any corrections.
2. Revision of ACI Specification Manual (ASpM)

Background: Proposed changes to the 2000 *ACI Specification Manual (ASpM)* were finalized at TSC’s Spring 2002 meeting in Detroit. Chair Carino incorporated those changes and submitted the revised *ASpM* for TAC review at their summer meeting in Bar Harbor, Maine, July 2002.

2.1 Results of TAC Review

TAC approved the revisions to the *ASpM*, subject to satisfactory response to TAC comments. TAC’s review comments, along with proposed TSC responses to those comments, are shown in Exhibit 2.1.

REPORT: Chair Carino will report on the major changes made in response to the TAC review.

2.2 No-Protest Consent of the Proposed ACI Specification Manual (ASpM)

As a result of the changes made in response to the TAC review, a revised version of the *ASpM* was sent to the committee on September 19, 2002 for a 30-day no protest consent.

REPORT: Chair Carino is asked to report on any comments received.

ACTION: Does TSC approve the changes made in response to the TAC review?

2.3 Remaining Issues

2.3.1 New Business Items from TAC Review

Chair Carino will summarize new business items resulting from TAC’s review of the *ASpM*. A punch list has been created to keep track of new items for the future revision to the *ASpM* (Exhibit 2.3.1)

ACTION: Is any TSC action required?

2.3.2 Defining Different Specification Formats in the ACI Specification Manual (ASpM)

Tony Murray submitted the following comment with TSC Ballot 01-1: “The manual fails to define the different specification formats, i.e., 1) product, 2) prescription, 3) performance, or if any of these formats would be rejected.”

At the Dallas meeting, Art Weiss reported that he had some language/definitions for these terms that he would forward to Chair Carino for further consideration. TSC members felt that this item was more than a matter of just adding definitions and requested that it be placed on the agenda for discussion of a section of explanation.
ACTION: Chair Carino is asked to lead the discussion on defining different specifications in the ASpM.

ACTION: Is any TSC action required?

2.3.3 Format for Presenting Performance Criteria

Tony Murray also submitted the following comment on Section 3, Part 2: “There is an absence of a suggested format for presenting performance criteria.” TSC asked that this item also be placed on the Detroit Agenda for further consideration as New Business.

REPORT: Tony Murray is asked to lead discussion on the need for a suggested format for presenting performance criteria.

ACTION: Does TSC approve a suggested format?

2.3.4 Structured Format for Checklists

At the Philadelphia meeting, Chair Carino brought up the question of whether the ASpM should include a more structured format for items in the optional requirements checklist. ACI 301 is considering the following:

- Statement of requirement;
- Guidance to specifier; and
- References

ACTION: Should the ASpM be revised to recommend a structured format for checklist items?

3. TSC Membership and Status of Specifications

Background: TSC members are assigned as liaisons to ACI committees known to be working on or planning to work on a specification. Associate members also are appointed to TSC from specification writing committees. Exhibit 3 is a report of ACI specification activities and current membership assignments.

ACTION: TSC Liaison and Associate Members are asked to report their respective committees’ activities and discuss any actions required of TSC.

Committee 117: Liaison Tony Murray. Associate Member Karl Bakke.

NOTE: At their July 2002 meeting, TAC reviewed and approved the 117 Tolerances specification, subject to the committee responding adequately to TAC’s review comments.

Committee 301: Liaison Jon Ardahl.
Committee 303: Liaison Alfred Kauman. Associate Member Dan Dorfmueller.
Committee 305: Liaison Aimee Pergalsky. Associate Member Robert Ryan.
Committee 306: Liaison Aimee Pergalsky. Associate Member Robert Ryan.
Committee 308: Liaison Aimee Pergalsky.
Committee 330: Liaison Art Weiss. Associate Member Ken Kazanis.
Committee 336: Liaison Art Weiss. Associate Member Billy Oliver.
Committee 346: Liaison Alfred Kaufman.
Committee 347: Request for a specification pending.
Committee 350: Liaison Jon Ardahl.
Committee 423: Liaison Gene Daniel
Committee 503: Liaison Tony Murray.

NOTE: “Specification for Crack Repair by Epoxy Injection” from Committee 503 has been submitted for TAC review at their Fall 2002 meeting in Phoenix.

Committee 506: Liaison Jon Ardahl.
Committee 530: Liaison pending committee decision on future of specification.
Committee 533: Liaison Art Weiss. Associate Member Sidney Freedman.
Committee 548: Liaison Art Weiss. Associate Member Mike Stenko.
Committee 551: Liaison Alfred Kaufman. Associate Member Jim Baty.

4. Specification Review

Within the last year, TSC members reviewed draft specifications by Committees 503 and 548. In addition, comments were provided to Committee 330 regarding responses to their TAC review.

4.1 TAC Review of New ACI 503 Specification on Crack Repair by Epoxy Injection

TAC will review the new ACI 503 at the fall meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, and TSC members were asked to review the specification as part of the TAC review.

ACTION: Chair Carino is asked to lead discussion.
4.2  **ACI 551 — Tilt-up Construction**

Before the Detroit meeting, Committee 551 (Tilt-up Construction) submitted a draft of their reference specification. Kaufman and Carino were to provide 551 with review comments.

**ACTION:** Al Kaufman is asked to report.

4.3  **ACI 533 — Precast Panels**

Item 3, Committee 533, of the Detroit Minutes, states:

“Sidney Freedman attended the TSC meeting and reported that Committee 533 was writing a specification on precast panels; however, TSC was not aware of it. Freedman reported that the committee has been working on the specification for a number of years. Chair Carino recommended someone on the committee familiarize themselves with the Specification Manual. Freedman said he would e-mail the specification to Art Weiss, who will then review it and give TSC and Committee 533 input. Weiss will format the specification to comply with *ASpM*. Weiss will be the TSC liaison to the committee. Freedman agreed to be an associate member of TSC to represent Committee 533. Secretary Watson will notify the chair of Committee 533 of the arrangement with Weiss and Freedman, and of the need for TAC approval to develop the specification.”

**ACTION:** Art Weiss and Todd Watson are asked to report.

5.  **Requests for New Specifications**

Staff has received no new requests.

6.  **Planning**

6.1  **TSC Mission**

The approved TSC mission is: “Assist the technical committees in preparing and maintaining specifications in the correct format and language, and manage specification development by the Institute.”

The goals for 2002 are:

- Submit revised *ACI Specification Manual* to TAC review
- Maintain ACI Specification activity database
- Review draft specifications in a timely manner
- Continue development of plans for resolving conflicts in specifications
- Initiate work on “ACI Specification Policy”
• Continue development of materials for Specification Training Workshop
• Review voting membership

ACTION: Is any TSC action required?

7.0 ACI Specification Policy

7.1 Background

TAC has delegated to TSC the authority to manage specification development by the
Institute. According to the TSC procedures, this involves the following activities:

• Review committee requests to begin the development of new specifications;
• Identify needs for new specifications; and
• Eliminate conflicts among ACI Specifications.

Revisions to the TCM and ASpM will put into effect the procedure for ACI committees to
follow before beginning work on a proposed specification, addressing the first item.
Items 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 of this agenda address the second item. Item 7.5 of this agenda
addresses the third item.

7.2 Review of TSC Ballot

Before the Dallas convention, Fall 2001, TSC began addressing the issue of conflicts
between ACI 301 and other ACI specifications. One of these conflicts involved ACI 303
on architectural concrete. At that time, Chair Carino asked 301 Chair McCall and 303
Chair Dorfmueller to appoint a joint task force to develop recommendations for resolving
the 301/303 jurisdictional conflict.

Before the Detroit meeting, TAC Chair Dolan asked Carino to develop a draft ACI policy
to solve the current problem of overlap between ACI 301 and other ACI Specifications.
ACI 301 has five core provisions: general, formwork, reinforcement, concrete mixtures,
and constructing. In addition to the five core provisions, the committee has several
special concretes: lightweight, mass, architectural, shrinkage compensating, and precast.

As a short-term solution, Dan Dorfmueller reported that Committees 303 and 301 have
conferred and are trying to resolve the conflicts. Committee 301 will have several
members from Committee 303 look at Chapter 6 to make some improvements, and
Committee 301 will reballot the chapter based on 303’s suggestions. Next, Committee
303 will ballot their specification before the fall convention in Phoenix with the goal that
they will no longer duplicate provisions in 301. If, however, there is information that
Committee 303 feels should be in their specification, the committee will change it and
put it in their specification in a way that there is no conflict with the 301 specification.
The goal of this agreement is to keep constituents out of the courtroom over conflicts.
Calvin McCall agreed with the plan.

On the more general issue of coordinating 301 with all of the other relevant
specifications, Chair Carino proposed that the five core provisions remain in ACI 301 as
Sections 1-5, and the other sections be broken out as single-item specifications that would be produced by other committees and referenced by ACI 301. Calvin McCall spoke in favor of the opposite action, which is to have ACI 301 contain all of the sections with information provided to 301 by the relevant committee.

A letter ballot was mailed on May 13, 2002, with a canvassing date of June 7, 2002. The ballot asked TSC members to choose one of two options for future coordination of ACI specifications in support of ACI 318. The options were:

- Make ACI 301 the only specification.
- Reduce the scope of ACI 301 to core provisions and prepare additional specifications to support the core provisions.

The ballot results were 7 for Option 1, 1 for Option 2, and 5 no returns. A summary of the comments is shown in Exhibit 7.2.

7.3 Review TAC summer meeting discussion

The ballot summary was forwarded to TAC who reviewed the issue at their July 2002 meeting. TAC’s ruling, shown in Exhibit 7.3, was that ACI 301 should be organized following Option 1 of the ballot (“Make ACI 301 the only specification for structural concrete designed according to ACI 318. All related single-item specifications [303.1, 306.1, 308.1] would be withdrawn, and their contents added to an enhanced ACI 301. The membership of Committee 301 would include voting members from the expert committees that would provide support to Committee 301.”). In addition, Committee 301 should form subcommittees that are joint with the related technical committees. TAC assigned TSC the task of organizing and moderating a workshop of all the affected committees. The workshop’s goal will be to define how Committee 301 and the related expert committees will work together. TAC expects that the arrangement with each expert committee may vary.

ACTION: Chair Carino is asked to report.

7.4 Planning for Specification Committee Chairs Workshop

Per Agenda Item 7.3, TSC is asked to organize a workshop for the 2003 spring convention in Vancouver.

ACTION: TSC is asked to develop an implementation plan, including informing the affected committee chairs for the workshop to be held in Vancouver.

7.5 Conflicts in ACI Specifications

For the Detroit meeting, staff performed an initial analysis of technical conflicts among ACI’s various specifications, plus the ACI 318-02 Code. The review was performed by comparing the table of contents of all of the specifications; any sections that seemed likely to have overlapping topics were compared for conflicts. As such, this analysis is an initial attempt to locate conflicts among ACI’s specifications. Other conflicts are probable. The results of that review are shown in Agenda Exhibit 7.5.
TSC members were asked to identify other conflicts and submit them to Secretary Watson to be added to the report, which will be used to track conflicts.

ACTION: Secretary Watson is asked to report.

7.6 Specification Needs/Computerization of ACI Specifications

ACI Staff and ACI 301 Chair McCall have been discussing the idea of preparing an “active” computer-based specification that can be tailored to a specific project and included directly in the project specifications.

In December 2001, Carino, McCall, and TAC Secretary Daniel Falconer met with ARCOM, the contractor that has developed the MASTERSPEC software for preparing project specifications.

On September 24, 2002, Jim Shilstone e-mailed Chair Carino on this issue (see Exhibit 7.6).

ACTION: ACI 301 Chair McCall and TAC Secretary Falconer are asked to lead the discussion. Should ACI be considering software products to supplement current specifications? What are the needs of the users and what kind of product would meet user’s needs?

8. Workshop on Specification Writing

At the San Diego (March 2000) meeting, Art Weiss proposed the development of presentation materials for a training workshop on writing specifications. Chair Carino asked Art Weiss to prepare an outline of the workshop for discussion at the Philadelphia meeting.

Weiss gave a handout in Philadelphia showing a draft outline of the session and the presentation, which will focus on how to write an ACI specification and how it relates to a project specification. At the Dallas meeting there was insufficient time to discuss further progress on the planning for this workshop.

Weiss reported on the status of this workshop in Detroit. He will present the workshop information using a PowerPoint presentation. The final presentation is essentially ready as long as the ASPM doesn’t change too much. Weiss will have a session moderator; however, the presentation will be broken into modules. Weiss suggested a session from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm, preferably at a fall convention. Weiss still needs volunteers to present the modules. TSC members agreed to volunteer once they have had a chance to review the modules. Aimee Pergalsky agreed to work with Art Weiss on the format of the presentations; they plan to distribute a final draft to TSC members for comment.

ACTION: Art Weiss is asked to report.
9. CI Article

**Background:** At the 1999 Fall Convention, Aimee Pergalsky agreed to write a short article (“press release”) for Concrete International about TSC’s rules and mission.

Pergalsky reported at the Philadelphia meeting that she would submit the article after the new *ASpM* is published. The article will include information on: TSC’s mission and goals; TSC’s operations; balance of committee memberships; the procedures committees must follow in developing a specification, such as a proposal to TAC that will be reviewed by TSC, liaison memberships with TSC, and reporting progress to TSC; and types of specifications.

At the summer 2002 TAC meeting, it was suggested that an article be prepared for CI on TAC plans for specifications (see 7.3 of this agenda).

**REPORT:** Ms. Pergalsky is asked to provide any additional information.

**ACTION:** When will a draft of the article be prepared and who will assist in reviewing it?

10. New Business

10.1 Identification of Needed Specifications

As mentioned in Item 7, one of the functions of TSC is to assist the Institute in identifying specifications that are needed by the industry and that could be prepared by ACI Committees. Up until now TSC has not addressed this issue.

**ACTION:** Chair Carino is asked to lead a discussion of how TSC can go about identifying needed specifications.

11. Next Meeting

The next TSC meeting will be held on Wednesday morning at the 2002 Spring Convention in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

12. Adjournment

**EXHIBITS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 1</td>
<td>TSC Roster with Contact and Assignment Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2.1</td>
<td>TSC Response to TAC Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2.3.1</td>
<td><em>ASpM</em> Punch List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3</td>
<td>ACI Specifications Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 7.2</td>
<td>Ballot summary: Coordination of ACI specifications with ACI 301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 7.3 — Item 10.2.4, TAC Minutes, Bar Harbor, Maine, July 2002
Exhibit 7.5 — Technical conflicts in ACI Specifications
Exhibit 7.6 — Specification Needs/Computerization of ACI Specifications

Copies:

Terence C. Holland, President, ACI
José M. Izquierdo, Vice President, ACI
Anthony E. Fiorato, Vice President, ACI
Daniel L. Baker, Ex-Officio, ACI
William R. Tolley, Executive Vice President, ACI
Om P. Dixit, Chair, ACI-TAC
Daniel W. Falconer, Secretary, ACI-TAC