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
### Committee Response

1. **TDM 13 22 E**  
   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:  
   
   "*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.*"  
   
   Will address see # 10

2. **TDM 18 15 P**  
   Ideally reference the strength requirements as well, akin to 318- Chap 19 (and still 318-Ch 4).  
   
   After "...intended to" write "meet the strength requirements of Chapter 7, ..."  
   
   This suggestion mates with similar ideas for Chapter 7. 318 integrates the loads with the durability requirements overtly, while 562 is more subtle.  
   
   Accepted – see proposed change.  
   
   Added strength.  
   
   Now reads “strength, safety and serviceability requirements ...”

3. **GRS 18 16 E**  
   Before “durable” add “are”  
   
   Accepted

4. **TDM 18 16 E**  
   After "durable within the service environment", insert "for the design service life"....  
   
   It occurs to me that the concept of service life has been mentioned too quietly in this section.  
   
   Accepted

5. **PDM 18 19 S**  
   Change "safety and serviceability requirements” to read “safety requirements and serviceability objectives”  
   
   No change – see #4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reviewer Initials</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>G/E/P/S</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>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”</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.4.2 is correct</td>
<td>Okay. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>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.”</td>
<td>Accepted. Also similar change in 8.2.2C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>JHP</td>
<td>20 21 and 24</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Suggest non-persuasive. Do not want any material being applied unless some group approves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>KEK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
<table>
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<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
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<th>Comment</th>
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</tr>
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</table>
| 11. | KEK      | 22       | 3        | E       | Consider rewording commentary to say:  
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.  

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.  
The effects of encapsulating uncleaned reinforcing on the  
long-term durability of the repaired structure should be  
considered in these situations. | Adopted change |
| 12. | KC       | 22       | 20       | E       | Add “and”  
Situations exist where corroding reinforcement that cannot  
be adequately cleaned or repaired and is encapsulated with  
new repair materials | 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.
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<td>doc...)</td>
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</table>

**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.