



# CALIFORNIA COUNCIL OF TESTING AND INSPECTION AGENCIES

**Meeting Minutes  
June 28, 2007  
Four Points Sheraton Hotel  
5115 Hopyard Road  
Pleasanton, California**

## **General Business Meeting**

1. Call to Order – Elizabeth Levi
  - a. The meeting was called to order by Elizabeth Levi at 3:05pm
2. Approval of Minutes.
  - a. Approved as amended.
  - b. Future minutes will be outlined per the meeting agenda.

Bob Joakimson	ISI
Jim Auser	ENGEO
Mike Parker	TEI
David Chippero	Terrsearch
Jim Backman	CEL
Dan Inferrera	Kleinfelder
Elizabeth Levi	BSK
Dan Cherrier	BSK
Terry Eglan	TEI
Osama El-Fiky	Condor Earth Tech.

3. Financial Report
  - a. See Attached
4. Committee Reports
  - a. ICC/ Local Jurisdictions – No Report.
  - b. ASTM – ASK LIZ
  - c. SEAONC CQA – They are working on a book for Structural Engineers. No action on “Blue Book” at this time.
  - d. DSA – Education Committee meeting discussed the DSA Academy and classes for DSA Special Inspectors. The Committee discussed how many would attend if the classes were mandatory versus voluntary. There was discussion about the special inspectors not knowing the California Code.
  - e. ACI – No Report.
  - f. Membership – Smith-Emery was voted in as our newest member firm.
  - g. Code Change – Discussed how to more clearly show changes to the code.
  - h. Newsletter – Next newsletter should be out for the August meeting. Still need input.
  - i. Internal Auditing – Next one is C-157, length change of concrete.
  - j. ASFE RO – CCTIA is part of the steering committee on foundations.
  - k. Standards and Practices – No Report.
  - l. Education – No Report.
  - m. FAQ’s – ACI certification FAQ sent to Miki for posting to website. Discussed FAQ 10.032, load testing of anchors, and veneer testing.
  - n. Website – No Report



## CALIFORNIA COUNCIL OF TESTING AND INSPECTION AGENCIES

### 5. Old Business

- a. Blue Book sponsorships – Postponed until next month.
- b. CCTIA Southern CA – DSA Roundtable – Southern California now wants to attend. Eric France offered his space for the Roundtable in Southern California.

### 6. New Business

- a. Meeting Dates/Location – Already established.
- b. 2008 Annual Business Meeting – Treasure Island in Las Vegas.
- c. DSA is hiring new personnel to perform unannounced audits of site and labs.
- d. Elizabeth announced that Gary Balbi passed away this week.

### 7. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at
- b. Next meeting – July 26, 2007, Four Points – Sheraton - Pleasanton

**ASTM C09 Committee on Concrete**  
**Meeting Notes by Jeffrey Cannon**  
Norfolk, VA  
June 26-27, 2007

1. A proposed insertion of a note in C 31 that stated that ACI 318-08 requires at least two 6" x 12" cylinders and three 4" x 8" cylinders be averaged for acceptance testing was defeated by negative votes that were found persuasive. It was successfully argued that the inclusion of the ACI reference was not appropriate in this standard because C 31 is a "Standard Practice" of how to make test specimens and is not a "Standard Specification". Also, ACI does not currently require these quantities of test specimens, but may (and probably will) in the future. Inclusion of a future reference is not appropriate.
2. There appears to be great confusion and uncertainty over the number of compression test specimens that should be averaged to make one acceptance test. Many people who attended this ASTM conference are also ACI members, and there does not appear to be universal agreement on this topic. Numerous senior members of the ASTM C09 committee, who are also prominent in ACI, questioned the need to have three 4" x 8" cylinders. This includes Nicholas Carino, Chairman of the C09 Committee, and Anthony Fiorato, past President of ASTM International and past Chairman of the Board of CTL-Group. Also, ASTM C 94 only requires two specimens to be tested.

A presentation was made by CCRL of data obtained from concrete proficiency samples No. 127 and 128, where labs were allowed to cast and test 4" x 8" specimens as well as 6" x 12" specimens. This data showed that there was a slight increase in scatter of averaged data for the 4" x 8" specimens as compared to the 6" x 12" specimens, but individual specimen data was not provided. The individual specimen data will be provided to ASTM for analysis.

3. CCRL was directed to allow labs to cast and test 4" x 8" compression specimens in lieu of 6" x 12" specimens in the future. It was not mandated, but the impression was that three 4" x 8" specimens would be required instead of the two 6" x 12" specimens that have been customary for this proficiency sample program.
4. Goals were set for revisions to Section 6 of C 1077. These are:
  - a. "Simplify the requirements by reducing the redundancy between sections."
  - b. "Remove the names of certifications and certification agencies."
  - c. "Establish appropriate criteria for technician certification and technician certification programs, so that C 1077 can serve as the single reference related to technician certification for all C 1077 standards, without further requirements in these standards."
5. A task force was formed to review the QSM sections of C 1077, E 329, and other standards to harmonize the requirements.

6. A new C09.98 subcommittee ballot item will be coming soon that will require all concrete test labs accredited to C 1077 to perform C 39, C 138, C 143, C 173, and C 231 tests on all proficiency samples. Also, all aggregate test labs accredited to C 1077 will be required to perform C 127, C 128, and C 136 tests on all proficiency samples. This is being proposed so that test labs will not be able to perform a single test (or just a few) and call themselves “CCRL Approved” for testing concrete and/or aggregates.
7. The accuracy of measuring, calculating, and reporting test results in C 138 (yield, unit weight, and air content of fresh concrete) is being increased.
8. Work is being done to standardize terminology, equipment, and procedures between C 31, C 138, C 143, C 172, C 173, C 231, and C 1064.
9. Minor text changes in C 192, Section 5.4 (making concrete specimens in the lab) relating to oversized aggregate in concrete were approved. The ability to hand-pick oversize aggregate was removed because Section 6.3 already requires aggregates to be screened before the materials are weighed for a trial batch, therefore no oversize material should be present. There was considerable discussion of this because Section 6.3 is not well worded regarding this, and some “interpretation” of the text may be needed. Also, people discussed the need for the old language when the lab is only confirming a mix design and not creating the design from scratch.
10. Proposed language changes to C 470 (single-use molds) was withdrawn because of mass confusion of the intent and differing interpretations of the new language. Expect this to be re-balloted in the future, and/or a new standard being created for multiple-use disposable molds. The contention is that single-use molds should only be used one time, not several as is customary by numerous labs around the country.
11. Revisions of text, and Table 1, of C 1231 (unbonded caps) was approved. Revised specifications for neoprene pad cap retainers were approved.

**ASTM E36 Committee on Conformity Assessment**  
**Meeting Notes by Jeffrey Cannon**  
Norfolk, VA  
June 25-26, 2007

1. ASTM E 329-07 was published in January.
2. A ballot item to remove the names of ACI, NICET, ASNT, AWS, and ICC from Sections 6.2.2., 6.2.3, and 6.2.4 of ASTM E 329, and include the sentence “Certification by independent, qualified organizations that have an applicable certification program to the task being performed is required.” was withdrawn for additional work and will be re-balloted. It is believed that, due to recent ASTM Committee on Standards (COS) actions, removal of the names of the certification agencies must be done. If E36 does not remove them willingly, COS will probably require that they be removed by editorial action. This ballot item was withdrawn for re-work, and will be re-balloted. It was felt that the new sentence is not sufficient to describe an acceptable certification agency, and the term “independent, qualified organizations” needs to be better defined. There is dispute over this term due to differences in interpretation. Some people, such as PSI and some state DOT’s, want to be able to use in-house certification personnel to administer tests and provide certifications if they can prove that these certifying people are sufficiently separated from the individuals being tested so as not to create a possible conflict of interest. Other people think the certifying people should be completed separate and work for a company/agency that has no affiliation to the people being tested and certified.
3. A proposal to circumvent the COS rulings on removing lists of certifying and accrediting agencies from E 329 was proposed. This would be accomplished by inserting the names of publications that outline certification and accreditation systems. Examples of this are:
  - a. “Visual weld inspection shall be performed by a certified inspector. These requirements are met by meeting the requirements published as an American National Standard in the American Welding Society’s *QC-1 Standard for AWS Certification of Welding Inspectors*.”
  - b. “Bolting and erection inspection shall be performed by a certified inspector with at least one year of documented bolting and erection inspection experience. The requirements can be met by meeting the requirements published by the International Code Council’s *ICC National Certification Examination Program – Bulletin for Code Professionals*.”

This proposal was removed for revision and may be re-balloted. Some individuals felt this was just deflecting the problems associated with “lists” in the standard, would create more confusion, and would be challenged in the same way the current lists are being challenged, just by a different group of parties/individuals.

4. The deletion from E 329, Section 9.4.1 of “Guide E 994 can be used to evaluate the credentials, qualifications, and operation of the accreditation authority.” was approved to move to main committee ballot. E 994 is a withdrawn standard and is no longer being used.
5. The following note (which would follow Section 9.4.1) was approved to go to main committee ballot.

“Note 2 - There are recognized accrediting bodies that are available to assess agencies to a range of requirements including ANS/ISO/IEC 17025:2005, “*General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories*” and ANS/ISO/IEC 17020:1998, “*General criteria for the operation of various types of bodies performing inspection*”. Please note that ASTM E36 is considering a revision to Standard E 329 that would require the agency to demonstrate its competence to perform the required tests and/or inspections by meeting the requirements of Specification E 329 through accreditation in the fields of its operations to ANS/ISO/IEC 17025 and/or ANS/ISO/IEC 17020 by an accrediting body that meets the requirements of ANS/ISO/IEC 17011:2004, “*Conformity assessment – General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies*”, and has obtained signatory status with the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) and/or the International Accreditation Forum (IAF).”

If this note is approved by the main committee an article will be published in ASTM’s *Standardization News* magazine that explains what this note means, and the future intentions of the committee with regards to this topic.

6. A ballot item authored by Jay Ponce (City of Portland, OR) to add wood inspection items in E 329 was withdrawn because a large number of negative votes were submitted by wood industry-related people who claimed the new requirements were either inappropriate for this standard, were impossible to perform, or were outside the typical scope of wood inspections. Mr. Ponce may elect to re-write this section, but he was not at the meeting so the future of these E 329 changes are uncertain.
7. A proposed new standard on terminology related to personnel certification will be balloted to the E36.20 subcommittee. This is being written to remove this terminology from E 1187 so that that standard will relate only to laboratory accreditation.
8. E 1187 will be balloted to revise and re-activate this standard. This standard had been withdrawn because of inactivity.
9. An outline and/or draft version of a new standard will be written to address the process for personnel certification. A tentative suggested title is “Standard Guide for Certification and/or Credentialing Construction Materials Testing and Inspection Personnel”.

10. E 329 leaves some specific criteria up to other individual standards to include/discuss, while other specific criteria are included in E 329. A task force was set up to look into making E 329 cover only general criteria and “force” other committees to address and maintain the specific criteria for their respective disciplines.
  - a. Examples of areas in E 329 that only contain general criteria are the soils and concrete sections. D 3740 contains the specific criteria for soils testing/inspection and C 1077 contains the specifics for concrete testing.
  - b. Examples of areas in E 329 that contain specific criteria are the steel and wood (if added) sections. No other standard addresses specifics for these areas, so the E36 Committee has been “forced” to include specific criteria for these in E 329.