

**AGENDA**  
**ACI SUBCOMMITTEE 562-0F**

**ACI Spring 2015 Convention**  
**Kansas City, MI**

**Saturday, April 11, 2015**  
**6-9 pm M-JAY MCSHANN A**

1. Call to Order
2. Self-Introductions and Membership Update
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Comments review from ballot closing 8 April 2015 (attached)
5. Adjournment

No.	Reviewer Initials	Page No.	Line No.	G/E/P/S	Comment	Committee Response
1.	TDM	13	22	E	<p>A question was posed from R. Edelson regarding the ICRI 310 provision that "all corrosion and damage be removed", and our 562 clause commentary indicates that this is not always advisable/prudent. Recommend that the Code language make the intent of the provision clearer:</p> <p><i>"When evaluating long-term durability and strength of a member within different repair strategies, the effect of existing reinforcement corrosion or concrete damage that is not removed and becomes encapsulated within new repair materials and not removed within new repair materials shall be considered."</i></p>	Will address see # 10
2.	TDM	18	15	P	<p>Ideally reference the strength requirements as well, akin to 318- Chap 19 (and still 318-Ch 4).</p> <p>After "...intended to" write "meet the strength requirements of Chapter 7, ..."</p> <p>This suggestion mates with similar ideas for Chapter 7. 318 integrates the loads with the durability requirements overtly, while 562 is more subtle.</p>	<p>Accepted – see proposed change.</p> <p>Added strength.</p> <p>Now reads “strength, safety and serviceability requirements ...”</p>
3.	GRS	18	16	E	Before “durable” add “are”	Accepted
4.	TDM	18	16	E	<p>After "durable within the service environment", insert "for the design service life"....</p> <p>It occurs to me that the concept of service life has been mentioned too quietly in this section.</p>	Accepted
5.	PDM	18	19	S	Change “safety and serviceability requirements” to read “safety requirements and serviceability objectives”	No change – see #4.

**Primary (P)** comments identify technical issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; **General (G)** comments identify issues general to the entire document that the committee must address before publication of the document; **Editorial (E)** comments identify editorial issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; and **Secondary (S)** comments identify technical or editorial issues that should be addressed either in this document or the next revision of the document.

No.	Reviewer Initials	Page No.	Line No.	G/E/P/S	Comment	Committee Response
6.	PDM	19	5	S	Determination of the cause of degradation should be the first step in my opinion. Change “the cause of degradation should be addressed” to read “the causes of degradation should be determined”	No change.
7.	GRS	20	24	E	1.4.2 is correct	Okay. No change
8.	KC	20	25	E	Change “The licensed design professional should review anchorage and development requirements when alternative methods of corrosion protection are used” To “When alternative methods of corrosion protection are used, anchorage and development requirements should be reviewed.”	Accepted.  Also similar change in 8.2.2C.
9.	JHP	20	21 and 24	P	After “1.4.2” add “if required by jurisdictional authority” Why would you have to go through procedure in 1.4.2 to add an anti-carbonation coating to a structure which is essentially a paint to protect against carbonation? This type of product is often used in potentially high carbonation situations prior to the onset of corrosion. An example would be on older structures in close proximity to train tracks as a precaution. I don’t understand why we are making it mandatory to get approval from a review board unless it is required by the jurisdictional authority. I would agree if it was provided for fire protection but not for durability issues.	Suggest non-persuasive.  Do not want any material being applied unless some group approves.
10.	KEK	22	1	E	Consider rewording 8.4.2 to say:  8.4.2 – The effect of reinforcement corrosion products, that are not removed during the repair process, on the durability of the repair shall be considered.	Accepted

**Primary (P)** comments identify technical issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; **General (G)** comments identify issues general to the entire document that the committee must address before publication of the document; **Editorial (E)** comments identify editorial issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; and **Secondary (S)** comments identify technical or editorial issues that should be addressed either in this document or the next revision of the document.

No.	Reviewer Initials	Page No.	Line No.	G/E/P/S	Comment	Committee Response
11.	KEK	22	3	E	<p>Consider rewording commentary to say:</p> <p>In concrete repairs with reinforcing steel corrosion, sufficient concrete should be removed to allow for the new repair materials to completely encapsulate the existing reinforcement. The reinforcing steel should also be cleaned to remove corrosion products. ICRI No. 310.1R provides guidelines on removal of damaged concrete and cleaning of reinforcing steel.</p> <p>In some situations, due to congestion of steel reinforcement, access limitations, load considerations, or other factors, it is not possible to remove all corrosion products from the steel reinforcement. Situations also exist where corroding reinforcement that cannot be adequately cleaned or repaired is encapsulated with new repair materials.</p> <p>The effects of encapsulating uncleaned reinforcing on the long-term durability of the repaired structure should be considered in these situations.</p>	Adopted change
12.	KC	22	20	E	<p>Add “and”</p> <p>Situations exist where corroding reinforcement that cannot be adequately cleaned or repaired <b>and</b> is encapsulated with new repair materials</p>	No change.
13.	GRS	23	12	E	Change “design basis code” to “design-basis criteria”	Okay.
14.	Kahn	623	12	e	Insert “the” before “design basis code”	No change – already there. Change made in commentary to 8.4.4C
15.	TDM	25	2	E	Insert reference to ACI 515.1R (Fred's protective coatings	What is reference?

**Primary (P)** comments identify technical issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; **General (G)** comments identify issues general to the entire document that the committee must address before publication of the document; **Editorial (E)** comments identify editorial issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; and **Secondary (S)** comments identify technical or editorial issues that should be addressed either in this document or the next revision of the document.

**Ballot Close Date:** April 9, 2015 Chapter 8  
**Document Title:** ACI 562: Code Requirements for Evaluation, Repair and Rehabilitation of Concrete Buildings and Commentary

No.	Reviewer Initials	Page No.	Line No.	G/E/P/S	Comment	Committee Response
					doc...)	

**Primary (P)** comments identify technical issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; **General (G)** comments identify issues general to the entire document that the committee must address before publication of the document; **Editorial (E)** comments identify editorial issues that the committee must address before publication of the document; and **Secondary (S)** comments identify technical or editorial issues that should be addressed either in this document or the next revision of the document.