CALIFORNIA COUNCIL OF TESTING AND INSPECTION AGENCIES

May 25, 2017
Hilton Stockton
2323 Grand Canal Blvd.
Stockton, CA 95207

Minutes - General Business Meeting

1. Call to Order – Mark Hahle
   a. Time
      - *The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by President Mark Hahle.*
   b. Self-introductions
      - *The following members and guests were in attendance:*

Dan Allopenna (Consolidated Engineering Labs)
John Atkinson (Holdrege & Kull)
Jim Auser (BSK Associates)
Kent Brandon (DSA)
Jeffry Cannon (Youngdahl Consulting Group)
Tim Casey (Construction Testing Services)
Dave Chippero (Testing Engineers, Inc.)
Miki Craig (CCTIA)
Terry Egland (Testing Engineers, Inc.)
Eric France (DSA)
Mark Hahle (Ninyo & Moore)
Greg Leroy (Consolidated Engineering Labs)
Chris Pollack (Kleinfelder)
Tim Rodriguez (BSK Associates)
Colin Stock (Testing Engineers, Inc.)
Wilson Ye (Consolidated Engineering Labs)

2. Program – DSA Roundtable
   Guest Speakers – Eric France, Lab Program Administration; Kent Brandon

- *President Hahle introduced Mr. France, who is well known to all in attendance. Mr. France introduced Mr. Kent Brandon, who has been involved with the Lab Program for about three years, assisted with its transference to Box, and processes submittal reviews.*

- *Mr. France led off the discussion focusing on the extensive modifications underway with the Interpretation of Regulations (IR's). The purpose of this effort was to take the entire catalog of the old 17-series and bring it up to date with the new code.*

- *Revisions to IR's that will affect CCTIA members:*
  - *IR 17-2 NDT*

Section 5 – Clarifies equipment and custody of the equipment, which now requires that any equipment used must be owned, maintained, and operated by the Lab of Record
(Commentary: Noted some firms that are selling "a bill of goods", most notably in SoCal, so were trying to address the problem)

- Q (Egland) Does this mean a firm must ship its equipment to a subcontractor if the work is being done out of the area?
- A (France) No, but LOR must subcontract to another DSA-accepted firm in the area

- Q (Atkinson) – Given that an employee purchased $8,000 of new equipment, but H&K calibrates and maintains it, does this situation satisfy the IR requirements?
- A (France) – No, it does not satisfy the IR.

- Q (Chippero) – Pertaining to bleacher fabrication, is the LOR required to contract with an already established firm working with the fabricator?
- A (France) – Talk to the DSA Field Engineer in advance of work commencing to work out options that will work out the best for the lab and the district.

- Q (Atkinson) – If necessary in emergency situations, is rental equipment from repair/calibration vendors acceptable to use while LOR's equipment is being repaired?
- A (France) – It would be acceptable provided the equipment is from a reliable source and calibrated per lab's NDT procedures.

- IR 17-3 Structural Welding

Canadian Welding Bureau (CWB) Level 2 or Level 3 certificate holders will have full reciprocity in US and for fabrication in Canadian shops; there were also a few changes pertaining to reporting

- IR 17-4 Basis for Structural Tests and Special Inspections - deleted

- IR 17-5 Structural Testing Laboratory Responsibilities - deleted

- IR 17-6 Structural Special Inspector Duties and Responsibilities

To be deleted, but part will be incorporated into a new IR that will clearly detail what is required to be contained in a special inspection report

- IR 17-8 Sampling and Testing of HSB's

Standard has recently changed significantly so have included reference to F3125 which turn A-325's and A-490's into grades; some editorial clean-up; and established frequency of sampling to increments of 1,600 units

- IR 17-9 HSB Inspection

Mainly pointers and editorial clean-up

- IR 17-10 ITS Rebar

Revisions to plug the holes pertaining to precut bars many in CCTIA have been complaining about; draft was reviewed by a group of engineering managers; clearly states precut bars are unacceptable and cause default to unidentified material sampling frequency requirements

- Q (Cannon) – Noted a rash of issues where the inspector goes to the fabricator, watches the bars being cut, but the mill certs also handed over do not match. Stressed this is not happening in just one plant, but all of them. Problem has intensified in the last six months.
- A (France) – Please provide in brief note so he can follow up with CRSI Executive Director, Jose Mendoza.

Separated concrete construction from the masonry construction as each had different sampling requirements, now both included in same IR with same requirements.

Included paragraph that requires lab, upon receipt of a set of bars, to devise a system to tag and identify both bars, which will be carried through the testing process, and allow the two bars to be rejoined prior to disposal (recycling) until removed from the premises. The purpose is to be able to confirm to retrieve both bars (paired sample), if needed, and confirm the bends were actually performed.

- Q (Chippero) – Precut bars are a bigger issue than DSA is aware. Some plants threaten to complain testing agency is holding up production and claim potential job delays.

- A (France) – Will discuss with CRSI again. Noted fabricators were present around the table when this IR was revised, and expressed full cooperation.

- IR 17-11 Threaded Steel Rod Anchor Bolts

Addresses the anchor rod sampling and testing debacle; some attendees indicated their firms were already using it.

- *New documents in the pipeline:*

- IR 22-xx Buckling Restraint Brace Frame Special Inspection

Seeing more and more of it in use. DSA did not have an IR that addressed design criteria or QC/QA expectations in the plant. A San Diego structural engineer has been working on the design side, and has created a draft IR that is very detailed. Mr. France was asked to get involved to help address the code-required material identification, welding inspection, and testing. He met with the top engineers of both fabricators to work out how to approach the inspection aspects (which have been problematic in the plants). He and Mr. Brandon put together a field trip to the fabricators, including several structural engineers. The outreach was successful in determining strengths and weaknesses in respect to quality control. The IR is almost ready for initial review, approaches these elements similarly to the fabrication of bleachers, and will allow fabricators to obtain DSA pre-acceptance to fabricate the components without special inspection if its QC program meets the required level. Mr. France is expecting a lot of questions and modifications during the initial review of the IR, and noted that if special inspection was required, there is a long laundry list of what it would entail. As the IR is not yet complete, Mr. France recommends any agency working on a project where these components will be provided follow DSA approved document requirements, DSA form 103 and, if questions exist, contact the local Field Engineer to establish special inspection and testing requirements during the fabrication process.

- IR XX Concrete Batch Plant Inspections

DSA was able to keep the amendment during the last code cycle. It need for an IR was obvious to make it really clear what the training and qualifications are, as well as the duties of the batch plant inspector.

- Q (Egland) – Is DSA adding any more exceptions?
- A (France) – No, not that I am aware of.

- Q (Egland) - Architects are checking both boxes (periodic and continuous) for batch plant inspection on the DSA 103's, and leave it up to the LOR to decide. What should the lab do?
- A (France) – Kick it back, or request the Field Engineer to sort it out.

- C (Chippero) – Some Project Inspectors are afraid to approach the DSA Field Engineer, so will instruct the lab (needlessly) to provide continuous inspection.
- R (France) – That's not the right approach. Raise it with the Field Engineer – that is always an option.
- C (Egland) – Some Field Engineer's do not want to talk to the testing agency, and require the Project Inspector to address all issues.
- R (France) – He will pass this up the food chain, as he knows Chet (Widom) would want a higher level of communication than that.

- C (Chippero) – I have been told there is a hierarchy – the Field Engineer talks to the Project Inspector, and the Project Inspector talks to the lab.
- R (France) – That's going to inhibit the project at every level. Chet (Widom) believes in better communication continuously and wants to work together to get things done. It is not the position of the Field Engineer to refuse communication with the testing agency.

- *General Questions and Answers*
  - *Light Pole Fabrication*

- Q (Egland) – Field Engineer has told Project Inspector he has to have a DSA 292 from the LOR's subcontractor (Byerly) for welding inspections performed during fabrication of light posts that are from the fabricator's stockpile. He (Egland) believes that if anything is required, the request should be for a DSA 291, which his firm would hold in its records to assure its subcontractor performed the work required.
- A (France) – He supports that wholeheartedly. There is a reason we specifically noted on the form that the DSA 292 is only for special inspectors hired directly by the District.

- Q (Egland) – Is DSA looking at a pre-approval process for light pole fabricators as with the buckling restraint braced frame fabricators?
- A (France) – There are some difficulties, but DSA is looking into a policy document that would address longitudinal seam welds only, specific to a manufacturer. It would not cover all the components of the light.

  - *Rat Slabs*

- Q (Egland) – Are rat slabs considered structural, and would they require batch plant inspection
- A (France) – He would not think so. That type of fill would fall under "means and methods".

- Q (Egland) – So on the DSA 152, Section 1B, is there anything that would require special inspection or testing? We were recently required to provide an Interim Verified Report (IVR) for concrete batch plant inspection for a rat slab.
- A (France) – He's pretty sure PR 1301 is very clear on this, no one can request an IVR for a singular block. IVR's or VR's can only be requested for a Section. If the work (in this case the rat slab) is not clearly detailed in the approved plans and specifications, it is not part of the lab's scope.

- *Kalwall Skylights (Manchester New Hampshire)*

Mr. France described an issue where the skylights for a particular project were fabricated without welding inspection for some minor components, which resulted in the job being held up for three or four months. He visited their plant recently and was impressed with their quality system. The problem wrapped around a small aluminum hub into which small pieces of pipe were J-groove welded to pin the compression ring in the center of the skylight. He suggests if a lab comes across one of these projects, there is a group in Manchester that can assist with welding inspections, and knows what the reporting requirements are. Kalwall is aware it must put holds in place so the inspections may be properly performed. Mr. France is hoping things will become more automated, thereby eliminating the need for unnecessary load testing at the site.

- *Auger Cast Piles*
  DSA is working on a Form 60. Mr. France believes it is almost complete.

- *Shotcrete Inspector Exam*
  Mr. France has been involved in the maintenance of the DSA exam process for many years, and did the last update about two and a half years ago. DSA put a committee together, issued a contract to ICC to develop a program, and provided ICC with all the work already done. They had a couple of meetings to polish off and validate the questions, and then set the cut scores. ICC's Doug Hatch indicates the exam will go live August 1st. DSA owns the test, but ICC will administer it. The certification will be available worldwide, but it is based on Title 24 so may not be much interest outside California. There is an application and prerequisite process, including current ICC Reinforced Concrete certification. The fee structure will be similar to the current Title 24 masonry certification. Member Terry Egland remarked it would be nice if the certification would show on ICC's inspector certification ID card. Mr. France replied he thought it an excellent idea, and would pursue the possibility with ICC. He went to say he thought the renewal requirement would be 3 or 4 years (to coincide with code cycles?), but was not sure about the specifics – possibly would require full re-exam plus CEUs. The exam has sixty questions, is open book, and must be completed within two hours.

- *Reporting Concrete Compression Test Results*
  This topic has come up many times, and specifically relates to which box to check ("meets" or "does not meet") when the 28-day test does not meet the f'c specified, but does reach strength at 56-days. Mr. France felt the scenario was easily remedied. If the Structural Engineer submitted a CCD allowing the 56-day result, that would clear the non-compliance. If no CCD was issued, the result remains a non-compliance – even through the IVR or final VR process. Mr. France reminded the attendees that a "test" includes two 6x12 specimens or three 4x8s. There was extensive discussion about the merits/problems of holding one of the two or three 28-day specimens for 56-day testing, including the fact that the missing specimen(s) created a situation where the "test" was no longer valid (as it pertains to the Standards). If the required number of cylinders were not available for 56-day testing, a non-compliance has still been created requiring the Structural Engineer to resolve with a CCD anyway.

  - Q (Egland) - Does the Field Engineer have the authority to approve a CCD on site, or is it submitted to a DSA office for processing
  - A (France) – It would most likely go through plan review personnel.

  - Q (Allopenna) – Given the low break scenario under discussion, who is responsible for uploading the CCD to Box or getting a copy to the testing agency?
  - A (France) - Mr. France was unsure, but would inquire about the process.

- *Geotechnical Responsibility on a Design-Build Project*
  Member Tim Casey presented the following scenario:

  A geotechnical engineer was on board with the general contractor for a design-build project. During the construction phase, the LOR assumed the soils work (observation and testing), but the design-build team continued to retain the original geotech. Who is considered the GEOR and responsible for the completed project?

Mr. France responded that if a DSA-109 had been completed, the new geotechnical engineer would be responsible and should be directing the work; if not, the original engineer would remain responsible. If the original geotech remains involved and causes problems or confusion on the site, Mr. France suggested elevating the problem to the Field Engineer. He provided some of the history behind DSA instituting the 109 process, and offered some examples of problem projects and success stories.

- *Accessibility of DSA 103 in Box*

  Member Casey noted the frequent delays or failure by the project architects to upload the DSA 103's to Box. He requested Mr. France pass the word along that many architects are not following the process. Mr. France noted DSA is still getting complaints that architects are slow to complete the form to allow testing agency access. He confirmed DSA is working on the problem. He also confirmed the Box process now requires all reports be uploaded, but cautioned that regulations still require the lab to provide copies of the reports to the code-specified designees. He recommends sending a nice little note at beginning of the job to everyone asking if Box meets their need, thereby getting distribution protocols settled in the very beginning.

- *Status of Legacy Projects*

  Prompted by Member Egland's inquiry, Mr. France indicated he did not know how many legacy projects remained outstanding at this time, or what action, if any, was being taken. He has not heard that there are huge problems, and suggested the testing agencies set limits as to what they were willing to address and/or provide. Member Egland described a job of 16 portables where there was no inspection or testing, and the District was attempting to get it closed out with DSA. He said a Project Inspector was hired, reviewed what documentation was available, and just signed off on all the buildings. Mr. France replied, "That's a little scary!" Mr. Egland noted the same Project inspector brought in a piece of rebar (or shipped it with the lab's courier) and said it was from XYZ job. Mr. France reiterated this does not comply with administrative code requirements, but for minor work, the DSA Field Engineer may provide something in writing (CCD, email) to allow the Project Inspector to sample material.

- *Clarifications vs. Change Orders*

  Member Dave Chippero presented a situation where the architect might miss a detail, or the structural steel shop cannot fabricate to the detail provided. The fabricator prepares an RFI, and the architect provides a sketch for "clarification". Mr. France recommended talking to the Field Engineer for resolution whether the clarification is sufficient or a CCD is required. He also suggested providing a note to the Project Inspector as a courtesy, and request he put pressure on the Field Engineer to make a determination.

- *Summary of Youngdahl's Grout Specimen Comparison Study*

  Mr. France inquired about Director Jeffry Cannon's grout study previously discussed at the CCTIA meeting in November, 2016. Director Cannon described background of how the project came about, and graciously volunteered to provide a pdf of the charted results for upload and access on the CCTIA website.

- *Laboratory Evaluation and Accreditation Program*

  DSA will be reviewing the program in the next couple of years, and will revamp it accordingly. Member Egland noted the program may be affected by a ballot item removing reciprocity between E329 and C1077. Mr. France assured attendees he would keep the group posted on any possible affect of the changes to the lab program.

3. Adjournment
   a. Time
      - *There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m. by President Hahle.*
   b. Next meeting
      - *The next meeting will be June 22, 2017, and will be a Zoom web conference.*

Respectfully submitted,
Miki Craig
Executive Secretary