Minutes - General Business Meeting

1. Call to Order – Ross Esfandiari
   a. Time
      • The meeting was called to order at 3:17 p.m. by President Ross Esfandiari.
   b. Self-introductions
      • The following members were in attendance:
        - Jim Auer (BSK Associates)
        - Jim Backman (Consolidated Engineering Labs)
        - Tim Casey (Construction Testing Services)
        - Cliff Craig (Structure Materials Group)
        - Miki Craig (CCTIA)
        - Terry Egland (Testing Engineers, Inc.)
        - Osama El-Fiky (Signet Testing Labs)
        - Ross Esfandiari (RES Engineers, Inc.)
        - Tim Rodriguez (BSK Associates)
        - Colin Stock (Terracon Consultants, Inc.)

2. Approval of Minutes
   a. November 19, 2015
      • The minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Financial Report
   a. Income Statement (handout)
      • Executive Secretary Miki Craig provided a copy of the Income Statement through November 30, 2015,
        evidencing receipts totaling $13,685.00 and expenses of $10,025.96, leaving net reserves of $3,659.04.
   b. Balance of Account
      • The balance of the checking account at November 30th was $13,020.07. To date, fifteen firms have paid dues
        for 2016, and twelve registrants have paid for the 2016 Annual Business Meeting. These payments will be held
        for deposit until January in order to include in the appropriate fiscal year.

4. Committee Reports
   a. ASTM – Jeffry Cannon, Liaison
      • Member Terry Egland reported a ballot is out adding the verification of wall thickness and diameter
        measurements (top and bottom) to the slump cones calibration requirements. It appears this item has
        sufficient support to pass, as there is no current specification for this.
      • He noted shotcrete test panels are under review for coring age and moisture conditions. The committee is
        also reconsidering panel dimensions, form requirements, and the requirements for obtaining cores.
      • Rounding out his report of interesting committee activities, Member Egland noted a new specification
        addressing the use of drones in veneer inspections in under development.
   b. SEAONC CQA – Terry Egland, Liaison (handouts)
      • Liaison Terry Egland recommended CCTIA discuss its affiliation with the CQA Committee to more clearly
        define the relationship. At the committee meeting the previous evening, the CQA members agreed to an
        informal relationship with Cal Council. CCTIA members present today agreed to maintain its informal
        relationship to cooperate, assist, and support with FAQs and other CQA committee efforts.
      • Liaison Egland reported the committee received some informal responses from AWS on some recent welding
        FAQs. He provided a copy of an email prepared by Mr. Mark Gilligan, outlining recent organizational
        concerns. AWS, ASME, and others are including disclaimers specifying responses to FAQs are not an official
        position of the organization or any of its published materials.
The CQA Committee is working on four FAQs. The prequalified joint issue pertaining to column splices is almost complete. Where appropriate, Liaison Egland is giving credit to CCTIA by noting its responding member’s affiliation. Copies of FAQs 10.003, 10.004, and 10.005 were provided.

Liaison Egland reported ICC is requiring placement of an ad in the back of the Special Inspection and Structural Observation guideline in order to grant copyright approval. The CQA Committee has responded with a reluctant approval to advertise a seismic publication with which SEAONC is affiliated.

SEAONC Member Art Dell will be giving a mini-seminar on the Chapter 17 changes in the 2013 CBC sometime in February. Details of location and time are still being worked out.

c. DSA – Augie Smarkel, Liaison
   • No report

d. Membership – Jim Backman/Mike Parker, Co-Chairs
   • No activity

e. Education – Elizabeth Clarke, Chair
   • No report

f. FAQ’s – Terry Egland, Chair
   • Chair Egland recommended this committee be disbanded, as most activity was now addressed in the CQA report. He explained he is working on obtaining approval for CCTIA to publish completed FAQs on its website as they are now being issued by SEAONC. It was noted CCTIA might have to change its webpage to links if permission was not granted. Discussion ensued whether or not to maintain this committee for questions that clearly were within CCTIA’s purview, and should be handled by this organization without CQA committee involvement. Member Colin Stock volunteered to chair CCTIA’s FAQ Committee.

g. Programs – Elizabeth Clarke, Chair
   • Discussion revolved around potential guest speakers for the Annual Business Meeting. Executive Secretary Craig was instructed to ascertain if CMACN Executive Director would be available and interested.

5. Old Business

a. 2016 Annual Business Meeting – Miki Craig
   • Executive Secretary Craig reported thirteen attendees have registered to date, which means rooms remain for up to three more members and/or guests. The attrition clause of the contract, if exercised, will release two of those rooms.

b. Nominations for 2016 Officers and Directors – Ross Esfandiari
   • Upon confirmation of the proposed slate (noted below), President Esfandiari declared the nominations closed, and directed Executive Secretary Craig to begin the balloting process.

   | President          | Tim Rodriguez (BSK Associates) |
   | Vice President     | Mark Hahle (Ninyo & Moore)    |
   | Secretary/Treasurer| Tim Casey (Construction Testing Services) |
   | Director (2 years)| Elizabeth Clarke (Structure Groups) |
   | Director (2 years)| Colin Stock (Terracon Consultants, Inc.) |
   | Director (1 year) | Jim Backman (Consolidated Engineering Labs) |
   | Director (1 year) | Terry Egland (Testing Engineers, Inc.) |

c. Caltrans Joint Training Program – Miki Craig
   • Following up on discussions noted earlier in the year, Executive Secretary Craig reported Caltrans has hired California State University, Long Beach to act as the third-party administrator of the program. The transition is still on track to begin in the spring of 2016.
6. Adjournment
   a. Time
      • There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m. by President Ross Esfandiari.
   b. Next meeting
      • The next meeting will be the Annual Business Meeting on February 6, 2016, at The Linq in Las Vegas, NV.

Respectfully submitted,
Miki Craig
Executive Secretary
## CCTIA
### Operating Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Initiation Revenues</td>
<td>$13,650.00</td>
<td>$16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM Registrations</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM Sponsorships</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Meeting Guest Registrations</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$13,685.00</td>
<td>$17,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsley Award Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM Expenses</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Meetings</td>
<td>$9,898.96</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S I Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary &amp; Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes &amp; Licenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$10,025.96</td>
<td>22,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Reserves/(Losses)**

- **$3,659.04**
- **($4,690)**

---

Year-to-Date Through
November 30, 2015
During the meeting I mentioned ASME v. Hydrolevel. This was a classic antitrust case that all professional societies should be aware of. [http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=17278533460016120612&q=%22456+U.S.+556+(1982)%22&hl=en&as_sdtt=2003](http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=17278533460016120612&q=%22456+U.S.+556+(1982)%22&hl=en&as_sdtt=2003)

As a result many professional organizations have adopted official policies to differentiate between a representative of the organization expressing an opinion and the organization taking an official position. We saw this reflected in the position from AWS.

This is something that both SEAONC and CCTIA should be sensitive to. The disclaimer on the FAQ's should probably include a statement that any responses do not reflect official SEAONC policy but rather reflect the consensus of the CQA Committee membership that produced the response.

SEAONC has a policy that all communication to the outside world must be vetted by the SEAONC Board. I do not know what policies CCTIA may have. Something that is posted on the SEAONC Web site or in the newsletter that was passed through the Board contact who is also the SEAONC president probably gives us sufficient political cover.

I am supportive of recognizing the joint SEAONC and CCTIA nature of the committee. Still I can envision difficulties in obtaining official approvals from both organizations. There may be issues where the two organizations respectfully agree to disagree. If this becomes a concern I have some ideas. For now I think the focus should be on recognizing the working relationship and giving credit.

Mark Gilligan SE
mark@gilligan.name
(510)-548-8029
FAQ 10.003

PREQUALIFIED COLUMN SPLICE

Q Does anyone have an opinion on whether this would be a pre-qualified joint per AWS (American Welding Society) D1.1? Note there is only a weld access hole in the top tier column, and thus the backing bar does not actually lap past the joint. D1.1 is silent on the actual width of backing. All of the pre-qualified joints with backing shown in the Figures 3.3 and 3.4 show the backing lapping past the joint in butt joints (see prequalified joint B-U4a from Figure 3.4 shown below), but no minimum dimension is ever shown or discussed. In a Tee joint the backing of course stops right at the edge of the joint, but there is continuous base metal along that edge in that case. In the configuration shown below, except at the column web there is nothing behind the intersection of the corners of the backing and the bottom tier column flange.

Submitted by Art Dell P.E. in San Francisco, California

A Informal Response Submitted by Andrew Davis

"This does not constitute an official position of the American Welding Society or the D1 Committee on Structural Welding"

The code is silent on minimum edge overlap of backing. However, no overlap is not permitted. The overlap should be at least the thickness of the backing bar.

I am told that accepted practice would be to put a weld access hole in the lower shaft web and center the backing. One could also cut a tight notch in the backing to “swallow” the web and center the rest of the backing bar at the root opening (see sketch below). However, the EOR (Engineer of Record) should review and approve this approach.

The joint as shown above is not prequalified.

Andrew Davis is the Director, International Activities with AWS American Welding Society. He can be reached at adavis@aws.org

Prequalified Joint B-U4a from Figure 3.4

Published by SEAONC
FAQ 10.004

WELDING INSPECTION OF TEMPORARY ERECTION/BRACING AIDE

Q On a school project the DSE (District Structural Engineer) issued a non-compliance report stating that we did not provide welding inspection during the welding of temporary erection/bracing aides. The temporary aides were not shown on the approved drawing. The DSE’s concern was that since we did not provide welding inspection including verifying any required preheat, the welding might have damaged the integrity of the structural members. While the DSE had a valid concern does the code require temporary welding to be inspected the same as permanent welding?

Response Submitted by Mike Clarke

This happens quite often during the erection of a steel building and is typically guide aides for the setting and connecting of column splices between floors. It also takes place at the perimeter of the buildings at each floor level when a ring is welded to the exterior column to retain the safety cables for fall prevention. There are two things to think about here. First, I believe that the DSE’s concern wasn’t the amount of heat input but rather the fact there were not properly preheated in accordance with any WPS (Welding Procedure Specification) or the AWS (American Welding Society) D1.1 at a minimum. The second item is that the D1.1 does not state that temporary welds do not require inspection. AWS D1.1 states that temporary welds are subject to the same WPS requirements as the final welds. That statement in itself requires the inspector to check that the WPS requirements are met i.e. the welder is certified, the amps, volts and other essential variables are followed including preheat. If the member was a thicker section that requires 150 or 225 degree preheat and the preheating was not performed this could cause some delayed cracking issues in the future even if the temporary welds are removed and ground flush with the base metal. Tack welds are very small and will cool almost instantly due to their small size and are very prone to cracking. One fact that I constantly need to point out to other project inspectors, special inspectors, contractors and especially welding shops is that the special inspector must be present during fabrication including the tack welding of parts. Most shops will begin fabrication and tack pieces together prior to the special inspector being present, this is not allowed, especially on a school project with DSA (Division of State Architect) oversight.

Mike Clarke is President of Structure Consultants, an AWS Certified Welding Inspector and a member of CCTIA. He can be reached at mike@structureconsultants.com

Published: XXXX

Got a question?
Send it to Q&A, SEAONC/CCTIA, 2811 Teagarden St., San Leandro, Ca. 94577 or email terry@testing-engineers.com
SPECIAL INSPECTION FOR R-3 SHEAR WALL

Q  Does a 4 in. and 12 in. nailing pattern for R-3 construction (Dwellings, including lodging houses; and congregate residences and large family day-care homes) require Special Inspection for wind resistance as specified in CBC 1705.10.1?

Submitted by David Knell, wilsonknell@gmail.com

Response Submitted by Tim Hart, S.E.

A  It depends on how the building was designed. Many R-3 buildings are designed using the California Residential Code rather than the California Building Code, in which case the provisions of Chapter 17 (including wood special inspections) would not apply. In addition, wood structures that are designed per the conventional light frame provisions in Section 2308 of the California Building Code (as some R-3 buildings are) are also exempt from special inspections. There is an additional exemption from seismic special inspections in CBC Section 1705.11 for one and two family detached dwellings with no more than 2 stories and no structural irregularities. R-3 buildings could be one of these as well. Note that there is not a similar exemption for the other special inspections required for wood construction, including those required for buildings in high wind areas in CBC Section 1705.10. Finally, there are the exemptions in CBC Sections 1705.10 and 1705.11 for buildings in low wind areas and buildings with Seismic Design Categories of A or B.

If the building is not exempt from special inspection per these provisions, then special inspection of the shear wall would be required. The exemption for nail spacing is for shear walls and diaphragms with nail spacing greater than 4 inches. The special inspection would include more than just the 4 inch nailing. It would also include the wall sheathing, the anchor bolts, the holdowns, the chords and collectors in the wall, and the connections to the floor and roof diaphragms.

Tim Hart is Civil/Structural Engineer at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and a registered Structural Engineer in California. He can be reached at thart@lbl.gov

Got a question?
Send it to Q&A, SEASONC/CCTIA, 2811 Teagarden St., San Leandro, Ca. 94577 or email terry@testing-engineers.com

This is the author's opinion, not necessarily that of SEASONC or CCTIA