



[Home](#) > [Committees](#) > [Ballots Closed](#)

Ballots Closed

318-0A - General, Concrete, and Construction

[Return to Ballots Home](#)

THIS BALLOT IS OPEN.

Type: Technical Letter Ballot
Ballot Title: A01-2015
ID: 5742
Description: Instructions for Sub A Ballot A01-2015, 8 March - 8 April 2015

1. First, thanks to those of you who have stepped up and prepared proposals for this ballot.
2. Remember to use the ballot comment form. A copy of the form is attached to the email and is also available on the ACI ballot site.
3. I have changed the comment form slightly. Rather than referring to the individual CA proposals as "items," the column on the form is now labeled "CA number". Most of you entered the CA number rather than the item number on the last ballot.
4. All of the ballot items have been combined into a single PDF file. This file is attached to the email and is also available on the ACI ballot site.
5. Here is what we are balloting:

CA 150, second ballot
CA 155, first ballot
CA 158, second ballot
CA 161, first ballot
CA 162, second ballot
CA 165, first ballot
CA 169, second ballot
CA 171, first ballot
6. For the proposals shown as a second ballot, the comments from the previous ballot and the responses follow the ballot item in the file. Negatives were addressed but not necessarily formally resolved. I expect that we will be in a position to finalize some of these proposals during the Kansas City meeting.
7. I know that some of you had problems uploading your comment files for the last ballot. If you run into issues on this ballot, please let me know and I will get staff involved to resolve the problems.
8. There is very little time between the end of the ballot period and the KC meeting. Please try to get your comments in early so I have time to compile the results. Pretend that the closing date is 1 March. Remember, those of you who are responsible for a proposal on this ballot will need to resolve comments before the meeting.

Terry

Attached File (Optional): [Sub A ballot A01-2015](#)

Attached File 2 (Optional): [A01-2015 ballot comment form](#)



[TOP](#)

Attached File 3**(Optional):****Project:****Start Date:** 3/8/2015**End Date:** 4/8/2015**BALLOT ITEMS**

Sort Order	Item Description
1	CA 150, second ballot See ballot file Attached File:
2	CA 155, first ballot See ballot file Attached File:
3	CA 158, second ballot See ballot file Attached File:
4	CA 161, first ballot See ballot file Attached File:
5	CA 162, second ballot See ballot file Attached File:
6	CA 165, first ballot See ballot file Attached File:
7	CA 169, second ballot See ballot file Attached File:
8	CA 171, first ballot See ballot file Attached File:

[Download all ballot description + item description files as zip file](#)

**VOTING MEMBERS:**

Item #	Member Name	Aff.	Aff. w/ Com.	Neg.	Abs.	Not Retd.	Comments	Attached Files
CA 150, second ballot								
See ballot file								
1	Becker,Roger			X			see attached comment file. Becker A01-2015 Ballot Comment Form.doc	Comment
	Browning,Dean	X						
	Carino,Nicholas			X			See attached file.	
	Fiorato,Anthony			X			See attached file.	
	Gleich,Harry		X				see attached comment file. A01-2015 Gleich commentsdoc.doc	Comment
	Hanskat,Charles	X						
	Holland,Terence	X						
	Hooton,R Doug	X						
	Hover,Kenneth		X				See attached	
	Juenger,Maria	X						
	Klorman,William	X						
	Lobo,Colin			X			comment file attached Lobo Comment Form A01-15.doc	Comment
	Malits,Frank	X						
	Meyer,Fred	X						
	Suprenant,Bruce	X						
	Weiss,W Jason	X						
CA 155, first ballot								
See ballot file								
2	Becker,Roger	X						
	Browning,Dean		X				see attached comment file. A01-2015-1 Ballot Comment Form - Dean Browning.doc	Comment
	Carino,Nicholas		X				See attached file.	
	Fiorato,Anthony	X						
	Gleich,Harry	X						
	Hanskat,Charles	X						
	Holland,Terence	X						
	Hooton,R Doug	X						
	Hover,Kenneth	X						
	Juenger,Maria	X						
	Klorman,William	X						
	Lobo,Colin	X						
	Malits,Frank	X						
	Meyer,Fred	X						
	Suprenant,Bruce	X						
	Weiss,W Jason		X				Attached A01-2015 Ballot Comment Form-Weiss.doc	Comment

CA 158, second ballot							
See ballot file							
3	Becker,Roger	X					
	Browning,Dean	X					
	Carino,Nicholas			X			See attached file.
	Fiorato,Anthony	X					
	Gleich,Harry	X					
	Hanskat,Charles	X					
	Holland,Terence	X					
	Hooton,R Doug	X					
	Hover,Kenneth	X					
	Juenger,Maria	X					
	Klorman,William	X					
	Lobo,Colin	X					
	Malits,Frank	X					
	Meyer,Fred	X					
	Suprenant,Bruce	X					
	Weiss,W Jason		X				Attached to 2
CA 161, first ballot							
See ballot file							
4	Becker,Roger		X				See CA 150
	Browning,Dean			X			See CA 155 for comment
	Carino,Nicholas			X			See attached file.
	Fiorato,Anthony			X			See attached file.
	Gleich,Harry	X					
	Hanskat,Charles		X				See attached file
	Holland,Terence	X					
	Hooton,R Doug	X					
	Hover,Kenneth		X				See attached
	Juenger,Maria	X					
	Klorman,William	X					
	Lobo,Colin			X			file attached with 150
	Malits,Frank			X			see attached file malits 301_ballot_response_template-lb_11-02.doc
	Meyer,Fred	X					
	Suprenant,Bruce	X					
	Weiss,W Jason	X					
CA 162, second ballot							
See ballot file							
5	Becker,Roger	X					TOP
	Browning,Dean	X					
	Carino,Nicholas	X					

	Fiorato,Anthony	X						
	Gleich,Harry	X						
	Hanskat,Charles	X						
	Holland,Terence	X						
	Hooton,R Doug	X						
	Hover,Kenneth	X						
	Juenger,Maria	X						
	Klorman,William	X						
	Lobo,Colin	X						
	Malits,Frank	X						
	Meyer,Fred	X						
	Suprenant,Bruce	X						
	Weiss,W Jason	X						

CA 165, first ballot

See ballot file

6	Becker,Roger	X						
	Browning,Dean	X						
	Carino,Nicholas	X						
	Fiorato,Anthony		X				See attached file.	
	Gleich,Harry		X				see comment form from 150	
	Hanskat,Charles	X						
	Holland,Terence	X						
	Hooton,R Doug	X						
	Hover,Kenneth		X				See attached	
	Juenger,Maria	X						
	Klorman,William	X						
	Lobo,Colin	X						
	Malits,Frank	X						
	Meyer,Fred	X						
	Suprenant,Bruce	X						
	Weiss,W Jason	X						

CA 169, second ballot

See ballot file

7	Becker,Roger	X						
	Browning,Dean	X						
	Carino,Nicholas			X			See attached file.	
	Fiorato,Anthony			X			See attached file.	
	Gleich,Harry	X						
	Hanskat,Charles	X						
	Holland,Terence	X						
	Hooton,R Doug	X						
	Hover,Kenneth	X						

	Juenger, Maria	X						
	Klorman, William	X						
	Lobo, Colin		X				comment file attached with 150	
	Malits, Frank	X						
	Meyer, Fred	X						
	Suprenant, Bruce	X						
	Weiss, W Jason		X				Attached to 2	
CA 171, first ballot								
See ballot file								
8	Becker, Roger	X						
	Browning, Dean		X				See CA 155 for comment	
	Carino, Nicholas			X			See attached file. A01-2015 Ballot Comments Carino.doc	Comment
	Fiorato, Anthony			X			See attached file. 04_06_15 Fiorato A01-2015 Ballot Comment Form.doc	Comment
	Gleich, Harry	X						
	Hanskat, Charles	X						
	Holland, Terence	X						
	Hooton, R Doug	X						
	Hover, Kenneth		X				See attached.	
	Juenger, Maria	X						
	Klorman, William	X						
	Lobo, Colin	X						
	Malits, Frank	X						
	Meyer, Fred		X				The attachment applies to CA161, but is being posted here based on system problems and guidance from Terry on 30 March. A01-2015 Ballot Comment Form (Meyer).docx	Comment
	Suprenant, Bruce	X						
	Weiss, W Jason	X						

PRELIMINARY VOTING SUMMARY

There are 16 committee members eligible to vote.

Passage of an item requires resolution of any negative votes. Passage of an item also requires that the number of affirmative votes be at least that given by the 1/2 and 2/3 rules. Please refer to the ACI Technical Committee Manual for additional information on balloting procedures.

Item #	Affirmative	Affirmative with Comments	Negative	Abstain	Not Returned	The 1/2 Rule	The 2/3 Rule
1	10	2	4	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
2	13	3	0	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
3	14	1	1	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
4	8	3	5	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
5	16	0	0	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
6	13	3	0	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
7	12	2	2	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets
8	11	3	2	0	0	Item Meets	Item Meets

[Download results and comment files as zip file](#)

[Return to Ballots Home](#)

- [ACI Home](#)
- [Contact us](#)
- [News](#)
- [Career Center](#)

Browse by Industry Role...

- [Engineers](#)
- [Educators & Researchers](#)
- [Contractors](#)
- [Students](#)

Tools

- [Concrete Terminology](#)
- [ACI Concrete Specification Center](#)
- [318 Information](#)
- [Troubleshooting Surface Imperfections](#)
- [Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Concrete International Product Guide](#)



[Copyright](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Media Room](#)
[Sitemap](#)



Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 10, Y/C: 2, N: 4, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
1.	Carino	150		Y/C	In the Table on the first page of the ballot, CA162 should be changed to CA150
2.	Lobo	150		N	<p>Even though this change supports the concrete producer, I am of the opinion the mixture is proportioned to meet an average strength level that has less than a 1 in 100 probability of meeting the strength acceptance criteria, which should be absolute (100%) criteria with the associated recourse when strength tests fail to comply. I also support Nick's notion that this is about strength and not mixture proportions. But changing that will get this more convoluted.</p> <p>But if we go along with this concept, this has no force in effect until this is clearly stated in 26.12.3. This section is only dealing with submittals and the concepts on strength acceptance criteria cannot be addressed here.</p> <p>I also have a concern about the practical application of 99% strength acceptance criteria. If in the chronological order that strength tests are received, and if we have 10 results, with one set or one individual test that fails, do we move on with the expectation that this occurrence was the 1 possible occurrence of 100? We have to take steps ASAP to make sure we don't continue to violate the acceptance criteria.</p>
3.	Weiss	150		Y	
4.	Lobo	150	10	Y/C	There has to be the words "strength tests" in (3)
5.	Fiorato	150	10	N	For clarity, the proposed wording in Section 26.4.3.1(a)(3) should make reference to "26.12.3.1(b)," the specific Code section that contains the acceptance criteria.
6.	Gleich	150	10	C	I think it should say no less than 1 in 100 why would we care if the failure rate was 1 in 500
7.	Carino	150	18	Y/C	Add "strength" in front of "tests".
8.	Becker	150	19	N	26.12.3 should be 26.12.3.1(b) to be consistent with "either"
9.	Lobo	150	20	N	Don't feel that the state of confusion needs to be stated. This commentary does not belong here. It should be in 26.12.3 when the acceptance criteria are revised.
10.	Carino	150	26	N	<p>I don't know that the change in line 18 "clearly states that the requirement is for concrete acceptance." The requirement is that concrete shall be proportioned so that there is no more than a 1 % of failing to meet the criteria. So to me this is a requirement for selecting mixture proportions. The commentary to 26.12.3 discusses that it is acceptable to have an occasional failure (1 out 100 tests) to meet the criteria.</p> <p>My suggested wording for the last sentence:</p>

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
					"The current wording states clearly that concrete proportioned to meet the requirements of the Code may occasionally fail to meet the acceptance criteria of 26.12.3. See R 26.12.3 for additional discussion."
11.	Lobo	150	40	Y/C	I think "concrete mixture proportions" should be change to "average strength of the proposed concrete mixture"
12.	Carino	150	42	N	Strength records are not for documenting concrete mixture proportions, they are for documenting the characteristics (slump, air content, strength) of the concrete. Revise as follows: "Strength test records used for establishing <u>mixture proportions</u> and documenting concrete mixture <u>characteristics</u> proportions shall not be more than 24 months old."
13.	Hover	150	49	Y/C	I vote affirmative on the proposal. My comment is in regard to the 24- month time period in line 40, which as I understand it, is not being balloted. My concern is that data that are 24 months old may be irrelevant given the strong likelihood of changes in suppliers and sources of all materials over that time period, and a reasonable likelihood of significant changes in plant, equipment, and personnel. If we knew that no such changes had taken place over the last 24 months, and we had some evidence to confirm such, then I would be comfortable with two-year-old data.
14.	Lobo	150	60	N	The second sentence belongs with 26.12.3
15.	Carino	150	62	Y/C	I don't think one "follows" requirements; "satisfying", "meeting" or "conforming to" would be better. Revise as follows: " <u>Satisfying</u> Following the requirements ..."
16.	Becker	150	63	N	26.12.3 should be 26.12.3.1(b)

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 13, Y/C: 3, N: 0, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
17.	Hover	155		Y	
18.	Lobo	155		Y	
19.	Weiss	155		Y/C	While this may be a fine change I think 213 should be asked to have the committee examine this, perform literature review or research to improve this moving forward
20.	Carino	155	10	Y/C	Indicate that this is the third paragraph of R19.2.4
21.	Browning	155	10	C	May want to consider adding at the beginning – “R19.2.4 – Third paragraph” for clarity.
22.	Carino	155	20	Y/C	Add "that" after "indicate". I assume this is part of the previous paragraph.

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 14, Y/C: 1, N: 1, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
23.	Hover	158		Y	
24.	Carino	158		N	In regard to the response to my comment on the previous ballot: I understand that notes to tables are mandatory and are part of the Code. Notes should be used to clarify some aspect of the table. In this case, we are explaining alternative ways of establishing the chloride content of concrete. We have three paragraphs of Commentary about chloride limits, yet the Code side is blank. It would be better to have a Code provision "Chloride Limits for Exposure Class C." to go along with the Commentary. The provision would deal with alternative ways to demonstrate compliance with the chloride limits. I am voting negative again so that my concern can be discussed at a meeting.
25.	Lobo	158		Y	
26.	Weiss	158		Y/C	Fine with the suggested correction, this will change however moving forward hopefully when we look at more sustainable mixture practices with chloride based on SCM
27.	Carino	158	19	Y/C	It seems to me that we need another sentence to state that the measured water-soluble chloride content of the concrete shall meet the requirements of the table.
28.	Carino	158	25	N	It needs to be explained that these methods may give very different results if the aggregate contains non water-soluble chlorides. Can we give more guidance on which of these is preferred?

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 7, Y/C: 4, N: 5, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
29.	Fiorato	161	0 Back ground	Y/C	Editorial: The first sentence of the third paragraph of the “Background of Proposed Change” does not read correctly. Is it supposed to read “Public comment 327 raises the question that 26.4.2.1 (a) (6) does not itemize specific situations in which chloride ions does not need to be monitored,...”?
30.	Hover	161		Y/C	In regard to the commentary wording, it is almost textbook in nature, and it might be better if we merely referenced ACI 222. I suggest: ACI 222.3R-03 Design and Construction Practices to Mitigate Corrosion of Reinforcement in Concrete Structures Section 3.5—Embedded metals other than reinforcing steel
31.	Weiss	161		Y	
32.	Lobo	161	10	N	I suggest this be deleted and replaced with: The Code does not state chloride limits for concrete materials. Limits on chloride ion concentration in concrete are given in 19.3.2.1
33.	Fiorato	161	10	N	What is “any concrete with potential for corrosion of reinforcement”? Does it include Exposure Class C0? Was the old 26.4.1.3.1(b), and prior Codes, trying to say we needed chloride ion limits that are different than those in 19.3.2.1? If not, could we delete it entirely because 19.3.2.1 must be met? Alternatively could we revise it to read: “(b) Mixing water, including that portion of mixing water contributed in the form of free moisture on aggregates, shall not contain chloride ions that result

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

					in concrete exceeding the limits given in 19.3.2.1.”?
34.	Carino	161	13	Y/C	I think we need to refer to a "concrete member" because concrete by itself is not susceptible to corrosion. Also, the word "when" is being used incorrectly. Revise as follows: "Mixing water, including that portion of mixing water contributed in the form of free moisture on aggregates, shall not contain deleterious amounts of chloride ion when used for any concrete <u>used in members</u> with potential for corrosion of reinforcement.
35.	Malits	161	13	N	Concern is for both reinforcing and any metallic embedments...suggest “potential for corrosion of reinforcing or embedments.”
36.	Lobo	161	20	N	Delete this section
37.	Fiorato	161	20	N	If the alternative wording proposed for Line 10 is accepted, then the new sentence proposed for the second paragraph of R26.4.1.3 would not be necessary.
38.	Carino	161	21	Y/C	The first word should be changed to "Chlorides" because that is what we are talking about.
39.	Carino	161	24	Y/C	The word "Specific" is not needed.
40.	Lobo	161	30	N	I suggest this be deleted and replaced with: The chloride ion content of chemical admixtures shall be documented.
41.	Fiorato	161	30	N	<p>What is “any concrete with potential for corrosion of reinforcement”? Does it include Exposure Class C0?</p> <p>The old 26.4.1.3.1(c), as well as prior Codes, provided specific requirements for corrosion protection that are different from (in addition to?) those in 19.3.2.1. They gave explicit instances where calcium chloride, etc., should not be used. This was not meant to cover “any concrete with potential for corrosion of reinforcement.” It was meant for the three cases explicitly listed.</p> <p>Are we saying that if limits in 19.3.2.1 are met, we do not need these other restrictions on the use of calcium chloride? If this is the case, then should the wording be: “(c) Concrete containing calcium chloride or admixtures containing chloride from sources other than impurities in admixture ingredients shall comply with the chloride ion limits in 19.3.2.1.”?</p>
42.	Carino	161	32	Y/C	Same comment as for line 13. Revise as follows: "Calcium chloride or admixtures containing chloride from sources other than impurities in admixture ingredients shall not be used in any concrete <u>used in members</u> with potential for corrosion of reinforcement."
43.	Malits	161	32	N	Delete “any” – not necessary; add “embedments” same as Item 1 above

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

44.	Carino	161	36	N	The sentence seems to be missing words. Also it should read "For members in Exposure Category C..."
45.	Malits	161	36	N	This added sentence is awkward. All concrete is assigned a "C" exposure class, whether it be C0, C1 or C2. Suggest instead using the same sentence presented in line 64.
46.	Browning	161	50	N	I would leave R26.4.1.4.1(c) in admixtures (lines 40 & 50) to explain what is meant by " <u>concrete with potential for corrosion of reinforcement</u> ", but add a pointer in prestress provision, 26.10 to R26.4.1.4.1(c). Or, do not make the underline/strike-through change in line 30.
47.	Lobo	161	50	Y	I support deleting this commentary
48.	Fiorato	161	50	N	See comment on Line 30. If no change is made to R26.4.1.4.1(c), then this Commentary material should not be moved. If the Committee agrees to the changes proposed in CA161, then the material should be moved to the relevant sections in Chapter 19.
49.	Hanskat	161	50	Y/C	Agree it should be moved to Chapter 19
50.	Carino	161	54	Y/C	I agree that some of this information should be worked into the Commentary in Chapter 19.
51.	Malits	161	54	Y/C	I agree with deleting this language from this section, but also agree the wording is valuable and should be moved to a more appropriate place.
52.	Meyer	161	54	C	A possible location for the inclusion of lines 40-53 would be R19.3.2 under "Chloride limits for Exposure Category C:", p. 322. My recommendation is to place the lines there.
53.	Becker	161	54	C	Move to Ch19
54.	Carino	161	60	N	This is a repeat of what was presented previously in lines 21-25.
55.	Lobo	161	60	N	I suggest this language be used instead: The Code does not state chloride limits for concrete materials. Limits on chloride ion concentration in concrete are given in 19.3.2.1
56.	Fiorato	161	60	N	Should this wording be in the relevant sections in Chapter 19?
57.	Lobo	161	70	Y/C	Possibly simplify: (5) Applicable air content for Exposure Category F from 19.3.3.1
58.	Lobo	161	80	Y/C	Possibly simplify: (6) Applicable chloride ion limits in concrete for Exposure Category C from 19.3.2.1 (7) Applicable cementitious materials for Exposure Category S from 19.3.2.1
59.	Malits	161	89	N	Add reference to applicable section to be consistent with other locations: "cementitious materials from 19.3.2.1 based upon"

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 16, Y/C: 6, N: 6, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
60.	Hover	162		Y	
61.	Carino	162			Approve no comments
62.	Lobo	162		Y	
63.	Weiss	162	20& 30	Y	

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 13, Y/C: 3, N: 0, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
64.	Carino	165			Approve no comments
65.	Lobo	165		Y	
66.	Weiss	165		Y	
67.	Hover	165		Y/C	<p>I vote affirmative on the proposal.</p> <p>My comment is in regard to the stated Reason for Change, i.e., “Include provisions to make designers aware that one must account for unique load redistribution...”</p> <p>If the intent of the word “designers” is the LDP, then I do not think our change is enough, as there are all kinds of load redistributions and allowances for movement that the LDP has to not only be aware of, but also build-in to the design. We do not want the contractors to suddenly be responsible for cracks or loss of prestress force, or both, because the designer failed to anticipate these effects.</p> <p>But, I am assuming here that “formwork designers” are intended by our use of the word “designers,” in which case I think our change is good. If this assumption is correct, we should clear this up in the Reason for Change before it goes back to 318.</p>
68.	Fiorato	165	10	Y/C	Editorial: Change “stressing of post-tensioned reinforcement” to “tensioning of prestressing reinforcement” to be consistent with ACI 318 terminology (See Chapter 2).
69.	Gleich	165	10	C	I don’t agree with removing the words “ without damage to member”

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 12, Y/C: 2, N: 2, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
70.	Carino	169		N	I think the proposal is more complicated than it needs to be. I don't see a difference between the first case and the third case. Class 0 is used if the exposure category "is benign" or if "only minimum requirements apply." Revise as follows: "A classification of 0 is assigned if only minimum requirements apply or if the exposure severity has negligible effect (is benign) –or the exposure category does not apply to the member beyond minimum requirements. If I am wrong, then there needs to greater distinction between the first and third case.
71.	Lobo	169		Y/C	The revision is benign – does nothing.
72.	Hover	169		Y	
73.	Weiss	169	10& 20	Y/c	While I still believe exposure is exposure and constituents are constituents ... I do not have great heartburn for clarification if this helps folks understand that durability is important
74.	Fiorato	169	20	N	Does this mean “plain concrete” must meet the “minimum requirements” of Exposure Class C0? Plain concrete is defined as having no reinforcement or an amount of reinforcement that is less than Code minimum requirements. Do we need to be explicit in the Commentary for Exposure Class C0 and say any concrete that contains reinforcement? Or do we exclude plain concrete?

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

Y: 12, Y/C: 2, N: 2, A: 0

No.	Name	CA #	Line #	Y, Y/C or N	Comment
75.	Lobo	171		Y	
76.	Hover	171		Y/C	<p>I vote affirmative on the proposal.</p> <p>Even if the measured strength of the concrete is stronger than 5000 psi, the designer will not be counting on it. This is fully analogous to 22.6.3.1 which sets a limit of 10,000 psi for the strength of the concrete that one can assume in design for shear in 2-way slabs, regardless of the actual measured strength of the concrete.</p> <p>22.6.3.1 The value of $\sqrt{f'_c}$ used to calculate v_c for two-way shear shall not exceed 100 psi.</p>
77.	Browning	171	10	C	Is there a way to reference the Curt Decker research? It would be best if we could add the Curt Deck reference and location prior to sending this to 318M to help support our position that greater than 5000psi is not a problem since so little prior research has been done on this topic?
78.	Fiorato	171	10	N	I concur with the change, but the wording sounds like a mandatory Code provision in the Commentary. Suggest rewording to read: "This 5000 psi limit is not intended to be applied to fcm."
79.	Weiss	171	10	Y	
80.	Carino	171	15	N	The notation f_{cm} is used in reference to laboratory testing to develop the relationship between splitting tensile strength and average compressive strength of the concrete. Here we are talking about the strength of the concrete delivered in the field to meet the specified strength. So I don't think we should use this notation. The intent of what we are trying to say is that the strength of the concrete delivered to the site can exceed 5000 psi to the level needed to ensure a high likelihood of meeting the acceptance criteria. If we say the 5000 psi limit does not apply to the measured strength, we would allow LW concrete to be used with a much higher strength than needed to meet a specified strength of 5000 psi. For example, we are saying a concrete with 8000 psi measured strength would be OK. In the mixture submittal there will be information on the strength level of the LW concrete that will be supplied to meet the specified strength. So I think we need more words to explain the intent. Revise as follows: "The limit of 5000 psi applies to the

Including: Becker, Browning, Carino, Fiorato, Gleich, Hanskat, Hover, Lobo, Malits, Meyer, Weiss

					specified strength. For a specified strength of 5000 psi, the average strength of the concrete delivered to meet the acceptance criteria will be greater than 5000 psi as documented in the mixture submittal."
--	--	--	--	--	---