

**AGENDA**

**PTI DC-10 Slab-on-Ground Committee**

Thursday, October 6, 2016

1:00 PM - 5:00 PM

Hilton Tucson El Conquistador Golf & Tennis Resort

**Voting Members Present (x of 15)**

Brian Juedes, Chair	Felten Group, Inc.
Dean Read, Vice Chair	MLAW Forensics, Inc.
John Bryant	Bryant Consultants, Inc.
Dan Buck	Suncoast Post-Tension, Ltd.
Ken Douglass	Eric L. Davis Engineering
Peter Fleming	Geotechnical Testing & Inspections
Jack Graves, Jr.	Builders Post-Tension
Don Illingworth	Don Illingworth & Associates, Inc.
Harley Nethken	Tech-Con Systems, Inc.
Dan Overton	Engineering Analytics, Inc.
Homer Parker, Jr	Parker Engineering, LLC
Paul Patridge	PPT, Inc.
Don Shaheen	DPIS Engineering
Tami Spicer	Strand Systems Engineering, Inc.
Ryne Stoker	Geotek, Inc.
Theodore Neff, NV	PTI Staff
Amy Dowell, NV	PTI Staff

**Visitors Present**

**ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST / THIS MEETING**

Item #	Subject	Action	Responsible	Deadline / Completed
	User Guide	Example Problems	DC-10A	Ready to ballot in subcommittee after meeting?
	User Guide	SOG User Guide Chapters 13-20 and part of 8 – complete draft	DC-10B	
	Evaluation Guidelines	Ballot resolution of negatives	TG/Staff	Ballot 1603 to resolve negatives from previous ballot

Agenda Item	Expected Outcome / Actions Taken
<b>A. General</b> A.1 Call to Order A.2 Introductions A.3 Committee Roster / Changes A.4 PTI Antitrust Policy A.5 Committee Annual Report	A.3 No changes to the roster  A.5 Review the Committee Annual Report and amend as necessary.
<b>B. Agenda &amp; Minutes</b> B.1 Approval of Agenda  B.2 Approval of Minutes from 4/24/16 and 6/6/16 (Meeting ballot required)	B.2 Vote on Minutes approval Motion / Second: Name / Name <b>Result: X-X-X (Y-N-A)</b>
<b>C. Actions Taken Between Meetings</b> C.1 Letter Ballots (1603)  C.2 Web Meetings (6/9/2016)	C.1 Ballot DC-10-1603 – Resolution of negatives on Ballot 1602 - Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations  C.2 TG meeting to discuss resolution to Evaluation Guidelines Ballot 1602
<b>D. Subcommittee Reports</b> D.1 DC-10A D.2 DC-10B D.3 DC-10D	
<b>1. Action Item 1: (Construction and Maintenance Manual)</b> 1.1 TAB Review 1.2 Ballot	1.1 Respond to TAB comments (Exhibit 1.1) 1.2 Ballot needed as last step to respond to TAB comments
<b>2. Action Item 2: (Evaluation Guidelines)</b> 2.1 Ballot Review 2.2 Resolve Negatives	2.1 Review results of Ballot 1603 (Exhibit 2.1) 2.1 Resolve negatives from Ballot 1603
<b>3. Action Item 3: (SOG User Guide)</b> 3.1 Update on Structural Section 3.2 Update on Geotechnical Section	3.1 Outline schedule for balloting of structural chapters  3.2 Outline schedule for balloting of geotechnical chapters
<b>E. New Business</b> E.1 SOG webinar development	E.1 Identify section leaders and develop anticipated schedule

Agenda Item	Expected Outcome / Actions Taken
<b>F. <u>Next Meeting</u></b> 2016 PTI Convention – Atlanta, GA, April 30- May 3, 2017 <b>Web Meetings:</b>	
<b>F. <u>Adjourn</u></b>	

**AGENDA / MEETING EXHIBITS**

Exhibit #	Subject
Roster / A.4	Sign-In Sheet / PTI Anti-Trust Policy
A.5	Committee Annual Report Draft, Subcommittee Annual Report Drafts
B.2	Meeting Minutes from 4/25/16 and 6/9/2016
1.1	TAB Comments on Construction and Maintenance Manual
2.1	Ballot 1603 Summary – Evaluation Guidelines

At a meeting on October 8, 1980, the Board of Directors first discussed the Institute's status and policies regarding compliance with antitrust laws. After review of both the internal and external compliance procedures, the following resolution was approved:

*"The staff, officers, directors and members of the Post-Tensioning Institute are reminded that they are required to comply with the spirit and specific requirements of the antitrust laws on all activities within the scope of, and related to, the official functions of PTI. Further, this restated position, along with appropriate explanatory material, should be placed in all meeting folders/books periodically, beginning with the 8th of October meeting of PTI."*

On July 24, 2012 and again on October 7, 2015, the Executive Committee authorized Legal Counsel to review and update this Policy Statement in the perspective of the Department of Justice Business Review Letter of July 30, 1997 and current case law. As a continuing guide for your participation in PTI's meetings, please review and continue to adhere to the following "Legal Limitation on Discussions at PTI Meetings."

### LEGAL LIMITATION ON DISCUSSIONS AT PTI MEETINGS AND EVENTS

A free exchange of ideas on matters of mutual interest to the members is necessary for the success of all meetings. Indeed, such an exchange of views is essential to the successful operation of every trade association and the law specifically allows legitimate exchange of views pertaining to, e.g., quality control, safety, building design and construction integrity, etc.

It is not the purpose of this memorandum to discourage the exploration in depth of any matters of legitimate concern to meeting participants. Nevertheless, to ignore certain antitrust ground rules, either through ignorance or otherwise, is to create a civil and criminal hazard businessmen simply cannot afford.

It is for these reasons that PTI provides you with a reminder that certain areas of formal and informal communication between competitors or between manufacturers and their suppliers and customers must be avoided, as posing potential antitrust problems.

The Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act comprise the basic federal antitrust laws, which set forth the broad areas of conduct considered illegal as restraints of trade. In general, agreements or understandings between competitors that operate as an impediment to free and open competition are forbidden. Federal antitrust prohibitions forbid any "agreement or understanding...to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce." An important point to keep in mind is that communications and discussions between competitors or between sellers and customers, about matters which may be considered anti-competitive, often comprise the evidence from which courts infer antitrust violations. ***It is the policy of the Post-Tensioning Institute that such agreements, understandings or communications shall not be tolerated at any formal or informal meetings or social events of the Institute.***

The general prohibitions contained in the federal antitrust laws, have been particularized in the form of a series of consent decrees, originally entered against a number of member companies of various trade associations and the associations themselves. It is important to note that these laws not only apply to PTI members, but also to PTI itself. Often trade associations have been and are presently co-defendants in cases brought by the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC"). Recently, the FTC has stated: "*Because trade associations are by their nature collaborations among competitors, the Commission and courts have long been concerned with anti-competitive restraints imposed by such organizations under the guise of codes of conduct. Competing for customers, cutting prices, and recruiting employees are hallmarks of vigorous competition. Agreements among competitors not to engage in these activities injure consumers by increasing prices and reducing quality and choice.*" Similar "codes" or policies and requirements that encourage directly or indirectly members' unlawful activity are strictly forbidden by PTI in the course of its business with its members.

## **SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES AND PRACTICES PROHIBITED**

### **AT ALL PTI MEETINGS AND EVENTS:**

Included in activities and practices which are forbidden, and are contrary to the policy of the Institute, both under the general antitrust laws and the consent decrees, subject to the said Business Review Letter, are the following:

Agreeing to allocate markets, customers or suppliers among competitors, classify certain customers or suppliers being entitled to preferential treatment by manufacturers, and establish geographic trading areas.

Participating in any plan designed to induce any manufacturer or distributor to sell or refrain from selling, or discriminate in favor of, or against any particular customer or class of customers.

Agreeing in any manner to fix or otherwise establish bids, prices (including price increases, decreases, standardization or stabilization), profits, costs, contract terms affecting price (such as discounts and credit terms), etc. because, e.g. prices were too low, with the exception of certain resale pricing agreements between manufacturers and retailers or distributors.

Agreeing in any manner to limit or restrict the quality of products to be produced (e.g., restrictions on selling coated strand to certain customers).

Participating in any plan which has the effect of discriminating against, or excluding competitors, suppliers or customers.

These examples are provided to guide you in your discussions during formal and informal PTI meetings and social events. If the occasion arises, more specific advice will be provided by legal counsel, who is required by Article IV, Section 7 of the PTI By-Laws to be present at all meetings of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee.

**Committee** DC-10: Slab-on-Ground Committee

**Chair** Brian Juedes

**Date** 9/1/16

1. List the progress on goals of your committee during last year:

2015-2016 Goal	Progress

2. List at least three goals for the upcoming year. Note – all goals are subject to CAB/TAB Approval:

2016/2017 Goals (New documents, revisions of documents, convention presentations or sessions, PTI Journal case studies, research proposals, PT Treasures or Technical Papers, etc.)	Tasks Champion / Expected Completion Date
1 DC10.2-xx: SOG Construction and Maintenance Manual	Chair/ Winter 2016
2 DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations	Chair/ Spring 2017
3 DC10.1-xx: SOG User Guide	Subcommittee Chairs / Committee Chair Summer 2017 TAB Review
4 DC10.5-12: Standard Requirements for Design and Analysis of Shallow Post-Tensioned Concrete Foundations on Expansive Soils – update	TBD / TBD
5 Develop webinar module content for SOG Structural and Geotechnical design	TBD/ End of year 2017

3. Report detailed progress on already approved document revisions / new documents / technical sessions / PTI Journal Contributions / certification program development, etc.:

Title	Progress in Last 12 Months	Task Champion / Expected Completion Date
DC10.2-xx: SOG Construction and Maintenance Manual	TAB Review currently in progress	Chair/ Winter 2016
DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations	TG has drafted resolution to all negatives from the last ballot. Committee is balloting the resolution (ballot ends before Tucson meeting) Should be ready for TAB review after Tucson meeting	Chair/ Spring 2017
DC10.1-xx: SOG User Guide	Start balloting of Structural Chapters Fall 2016 Schedule WM to resolve negatives  Geotechnical Chapters expected to be drafted and ready for DC-10 balloting after Fall meeting	Subcommittee Chairs / Committee Chair Summer 2017 TAB Review

4. List new and updated documents you expect to submit to TAB/CAB for review in the next 12 months:

Document Title	Document Champion / Expected Completion Date
DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations	Chair/ Spring 2017
DC10.1-xx: SOG User Guide	Subcommittee Chairs / Committee Chair Summer 2017 TAB Review

5. List any liaisons or scope conflicts with other committees in PTI or other organizations:

6. List anything you need from PTI Staff:

Please return to: Miroslav Vejvoda  
E-mail: [miroslav.vejvoda@post-tensioning.org](mailto:miroslav.vejvoda@post-tensioning.org)

**PTI DC-10 Slab-on-Ground TG  
Web Meeting  
Draft Resolution of Negatives on Ballot 1602-Evaluation Guidelines  
for the Performance of SOG Foundations**

**June 9, 2016, 11:00 AM – 12:20 PM EST**

---

Members Present:

Brian Juedes, Jack Graves, Don Illingworth, Homer Parker, Dean Read, Tami Spicer

Staff Present:

Amy Dowell

**The draft resolutions (Attachment A) were discussed.**

It is general consensus in this TG that a face to face meeting is needed to come to consensus on major issues such as the performance criteria and other factors which impact the mitigation recommendations of the LDP.

This meeting is scheduled for June 22, 2016 at Strand System Engineering's Dallas area office.



<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

**Ballot Summary:**

Ballot Item	Yes	No	Abs/No Vote	Meets ½ Rule	Meets 2/3 Rule	Item Passes	Voting Participation
1.0	9	3	3	Y	Y		Number of voting members: 15  Ballots not received from: Fleming, Nethken, Stoker
4.3.4	8	4	3	Y	Y		
5.2	8	4	3	Y	Y		
5.3	12	0	3	Y	Y		
5.3.1	8	4	3	Y	Y		
5.3.2	9	3	3	Y	Y		
5.3.3	12	0	3	Y	Y		
5.4	9	3	3	Y	Y		
6.0	11	1	3	Y	Y		
6.1	7	5	3	N	N		
6.2	10	2	3	Y	Y		
6.3	7	5	3	N	N		

**Voting: Y – Approve; Y-E – Approve with Editorial Comment –N – Negative; A – Abstain.**

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

<b>Voting Members /Section</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>4.3.4</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.3.1</b>	<b>5.3.2</b>	<b>5.3.3</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>
Juedes	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y-E	Y	Y	Y	N	Y-E	Y
Read	N	N	N	Y-E	N	N		N		N	N	Y
Bryant	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Buck	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Douglass	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y-E	Y
Fleming												
Graves	Y-E	Y-E	Y	Y	Y	Y-E	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Illingworth	Y	Y	Y-E	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nethken												
Overton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Parker	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y-E
Patridge	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shaheen	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Spicer	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stoker												

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

Item	Name	Chapter / Page / Line	Vote: Y / Y-E / N / A*	Y=Affirmative Y-E=Affirmative with Comment N=Negative (must include reason)	Comment Resolution
1	Overton	All	Y	I approve all sections.	
2	Patridge	All	Y	I approve all sections.	
3	Spicer	All	Y	I approve all sections.	
4	Bryant	1.0 / 3 / 1-3	N	Change Heave is the partially recoverable increase in volume (vertical and lateral) of expansive soil due to the presence of excess moisture.  <u>Change to:</u> Heave is the vertical component of expansion due to increase in soil volume as a result of a reduction in soil suction in an unsaturated expansive clay soil.	<u>No change</u>
5	Graves	1.0 / 3 / 1-3	Y-E	Page 3, Line 2: change “although” to “but” Page 3, Line 3: Add – “for reference” to the end of sentence	
6	Read	1.0 / 3 / 1-3	N	We say it is not “intended” to do something, then we say we do it later in the report.  Change to: While this document is not intended to provide a comprehensive discussion of the causes or mitigation of foundation movement, a brief overview of causes and mitigation of foundation movement is provided in Section 6.2.	
7	Parker	1.0 / 3 / 13		Y – if comments in 6.2 are non persuasive or N- if 6.2 is persuasive	<u>Address in 6.2 – no change</u>
8	Parker	4.3.4 / 15 / 5	N	Assuming an implied precision using an assumption that is not easily or economically proved. How often do you check that reference points or benchmarks remain constant elevation??  Delete “with a high level of confidence, provided ....surveys”	<u>Change as proposed</u>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

9	Read	4.3.4 / 15 / 3-6	N	<p>In second sentence, we use “estimate” and “high level of confidence.” I think this is misleading. A time-change elevation plan also doesn’t estimate the foundation movement over the time. It compares the elevations on the dates of the surveys. The foundation movement may have been or may not have been greater between surveys. We don’t know since surveys are “snap shots in time.”</p> <p>Delete “with a high level of confidence.”                  Change second sentence to: A time-change elevation plan can be used to estimate the foundation elevation difference between two distinct elevation surveys, ...”                  Also need to add:                  “This change may not represent the maximum elevation change in the time elapsed between surveys.</p>	<u>Accept as proposed</u>
10	Douglass	4.3.4 / 8	N	Add “,but not always accurate” after the word practice	<u>Nonpersuasive 7-0-1, no change</u>
11	Parker	4.3.4 / 9	Y-E	<p>Not worth dwelling on but related to construction tolerance state.</p> <p>Insert “near” in front of level</p>	
12	Parker	4.3.4 / 16 / 1-4	N	<p>Word smithing to say what is implied and what is missing, if you do collect additional information to form a basis for as-built conditions would that not improve your confidence of actual movement?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Should read “ There is an inherent danger in assuming a level condition for the original shape of the foundation due to the varying construction tolerances (as-built tolerances) that are known to vary by among many factors such as geography, size and/or shape of the foundation.”</p> <p>“When making an inference about as-built shape, it is imperative that the LDP collect other data, among other things, framing measurements to support the basis for the inference of shape”.</p>	<u>10-1-0 Nonpersuasive</u>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

13	Read	4.3.4 / 16 / 1-8	N	<p>This section is not as clear or completed as it needs to be.</p> <p>Change to: Since no foundation is poured perfectly flat, some initial elevation differential is likely to have existed at the time of concrete placement. It is commonly assumed that a foundation could have been placed with up to 1.5 inches of vertical elevation differential between the highest and lowest points, excluding built-in steps and sloped areas. The construction tolerance may vary by geographical location, size of foundation, shape of foundation and type of foundation.</p> <p>Using actual as-built-floor elevations instead of assumed as-built floor elevations can result in larger or smaller time-change elevations. Therefore, when assumed as-built floor elevations are used, the LDP may choose to use a range of values for the estimated foundation movement to account for the possible range of as-built foundation surface shapes.</p>	<p><u>Accept as proposed – replace lines 1-8</u> <u>11-0-0</u></p>
14	Graves	4.3.4 / 15 / 1 to 16 / 8	Y-E	<p>Page 15, Line 9: Add- “even though foundations are typically not built in a level condition due to acceptable construction tolerance standards” at end of sentence</p> <p>Page 16, Line 6: Change “confidence” to “accuracy” – This is consistent with language on Page 30, Line 1</p>	
15	Shaheen	4.3.4 / 16/5	N	<p>If there is no initial elevations, it is not time change elevation plan by definition (See Page 15 lines 2-3)</p> <p>Delete “time change” change “a” to “an”</p>	<p><u>Withdrawn – no change</u></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

16	Read	5.1 / 17	N	<p>We should not accept a “black and white” line regarding foundation performance. Doing so would be a great disservice to both the owners and the builders. We make the performance “gray” when the criteria are exceeded but not when it is less (except for free standing masonry veneer). This is disingenuous.</p> <p>Add: If curvature less than 1/360 or 0.28% has resulted in structural distress, significant finishing material distress, reversed slope in garages or porch floors or significant functional distress, the performance of the foundation can be considered to be unacceptable.</p>	<p><u>Becomes editorial to match section 6.2</u></p> <p>- <u>Copy from item 64</u></p>
17	Parker	5.2 / 18 / 4	N	<p>1% slopes or larger are perceptible to just about anyone, especially occupants with hip, knee, or ankle damage. I don’t think we need to be “trained” inspector to see the marble running down the floor. Who supplies the certification of training anyway? Isn’t this introducing more terminology?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete” “to the trained inspector”</p>	<p><u>Combine and accept as persuasive 11-0-0</u></p>
18	Read	5.2 / 18/4-5	N	<p>Most building occupants will notice floor slopes of 1% or greater. Trained inspectors can notice slopes at lower levels of slope.</p> <p>Change to: Floor slopes cause by global tilt of 1% or greater are usually noticeable by building occupants.</p>	
19	Douglass	5.2 / 18/5	N	<p>Delete the word “excessive”</p> <p>Delete the word “excessive” Need to generally discuss the intent of 5.2. Define allowable tilt, excessive tilt and their relationship to functional and structural distress?</p>	

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

20	Read	5.2 / 18/9-11	N	<p>Disagree with wording</p> <p>Change: Where masonry veneer distress consistent with that caused by tilt is present, the LDP should adopt a lower limit on tilt as determined by the Abatement for Dangerous Buildings code. Where a potential loss of structural integrity of the masonry veneer by tilt is demonstrated by calculations, the conclusions must be consistent with the physical evidence.</p>	<p><u>Vote nonpersuasive but remove “freestanding” from line 9</u></p> <p><u>6-3-2 - Passes</u></p>
21	Douglass	5.2 / 18/9-11	N	<p>Not clear on how masonry COG is calculated, this statement would require an example to clarify, is masonry determined to be free standing if it is properly fastened with ties?</p> <p>Delete lines 9-11</p>	<p><u>withdrawn</u></p>
22	Read	5.2 / 18/13-14	N	<p>As with masonry, stud walls and other vertical support members of the superstructure can rotate resulting in unsafe conditions. The LDP needs to be able to use a lower limit on tilt for these conditions.</p> <p>Add: Where structural or cosmetic distress consistent with that caused by tilt is present, the LDP should adopt a lower limit on tilt as determined by the Abatement for Dangerous Buildings code. Where a potential loss of structural integrity is demonstrated by calculations, the conclusions must be consistent with the physical evidence.</p>	<p><u>Non Persuasive (NP):</u></p> <p><u>Non typical condition that can be addressed by LDP as required. We reference LDP has final say 5 times in this document (Page 3/Line 12, 16/6, 18/10, 27/13 &amp; 30/1).</u></p> <p><u>We also feel it is not wise to reference the Abatement ... Document.</u></p>
23	Douglass	5.2 / 18/15	N	<p>Ghosting doors in most cases are not an indication of “excessive” tilt.</p> <p>Delete line 15 if don’t delete “excessive” in line 5</p>	<p><u>NP:</u></p> <p><u>We state “in some cases” so it is not all ghosting doors.</u></p>
24	Douglass	5.2 / 18/16-18	N	<p>Not clear if the intent is to define excessive tilt as structural or functional distress? Confusing to introduce the notion of potential structural distress below 1%</p> <p>See comment on lines 19-21</p> <p>Delete lines 16-18</p>	<p><u>NP (same for #24, 25, 26 &amp; 28)</u></p> <p><u>LDP has final discretion</u></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

25	Read	5.2 / 18/16-18	Y-E	Disagree with wording  Change to: Although structural distress will commonly not occur until the tilt greatly exceeds 1 percent, occupants may notice a decreased functionality of the building as a result of tilt.	<a href="#">Disagree:</a> <a href="#">OK as written</a>
26	Parker	5.2 / 18 / 19	N	<p>The tilt value used in this document is from the Texas Section ASCE guidelines and its related cousin the FPA, both documents lack a basis for tilt. I am not sold it has anything to do with perception of floor slopes by an inspector for basis. I however believe that the height of the structure’s wall between foundation and next supported element or top should factor into what is an accepted allowance:</p> <p>Some construction (especially upper end homes) have wall heights greatly exceed 9 feet in overall un-braced wall height, experiencing a blank 1% slope puts the center of gravity of the wall system past the middle 1/3 and fits the definition of a “Dangerous Wall” under the Dangerous Building and Abatement code.</p> <p>I believe Dean brought up masonry walls under the last meeting, etc. The issue is that tilt is not measured by a single numerical value but is a function of the allowable geometry of the structure constructed on the foundation.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: “PTI recommends that tilt from foundation movement, measured from edge to edge of the foundation should be such as to be able to maintain the center gravity of load bearing walls and/or masonry wall to be within the middle 1/3 of the base support of the wall. Global rotation that causes the center gravity violation is considered excessive and potentially dangerous. “</p>	<p><a href="#">NP (same for #24, 25, 26 &amp; 28):</a> <a href="#">LDP has discretion to address and again we do not want to introduce the Abatement ... document</a></p>



<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

27	Parker	5.2 / 18 / 20	N	<p>“measured from edge to edge” is incorrect as it is missing the qualifier of length. Edge to edge – 2 feet or 30 feet... This will fix inconsistency in use of definition in multiple locations of the documents.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution “ length over which the tilt is computed edge to edge has to be equal to or greater than width of the foundation”</p>	<p><u>NP:</u> <u>See # 30 below</u></p>
28	Douglass	5.2. / 18/19-21	N	<p>Appears the statement is trying to define excessive tilt and relate it to functional distress.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Define excessive tilt as &gt; 1%, state it is functional. Delete any reference to “PTI recommends”. Should consider keeping the definition to allowable and excluding excessive?</p>	<p><u>NP Same #24, 25, 26 &amp; 28):</u></p>
29	Illingworth	5.2 / 18 / 20	Y-E	<p>Tilt should not be cap.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p>
30	Juedes	5.2 / 18 / 20	N	<p>“edge to edge of foundation” does not prevent a tilt measurement from a corner to a mid-side. A tilt calculation from a corner to a mid-side most likely includes some bending deflection, which we do not want.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Tilt should only be calculated across the full width, full length or diagonal of the foundation. Even then it is possible that some bending deflection is included. Tilt is a planar measurement and as such requires that more than one corner be displaced.</p>	<p><u>Persuasive (P):</u> <u>Add first sentence ONLY and change “should” to “shall”</u></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

31	Read	5.2 / 18/21	N	<p>We should not accept a “black and white” line regarding foundation performance. Doing so would be a great disservice to both the owners and the builders. We make the performance “gray” when the criteria are exceeded but not when it is less (except for free standing masonry veneer). This is disingenuous.</p> <p>Add: If tilt less than 1/100 or 1.0% has resulted in structural distress, reversed slope in garages or porch floors, instability of masonry veneer or significant functional distress, the performance of the foundation <del>can</del> could be considered to be unacceptable.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u>  <a href="#">It is not “black &amp; white” we give the LDP discretion as noted above in #22</a></p>
32	Read	5.3 / 19/3	Y-E	<p>Disagree with wording</p> <p>Change to: computing curvature and tilt.</p>	<p><u>Agree</u></p>
33	Juedes	5.3.1 / 19 / 7	N	<p>“or width of the foundation, whichever is less” does not properly address edge lift across the back of the home.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Data points separated by at least 20 feet.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u>  <a href="#">Leave at 25'</a></p>
34	Parker	5.3.1 / 19 / 7	N	<p>Not consistent with the definition in 5.1 “which ever less” does not appear in 5.1. I think that the one in 5.1 is incorrect but since I can’t fix 5.1, then I object to the conflicting definition.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix 5.1 definition to simplify problem</p>	<p><u>P:</u>  <a href="#">Keep 25’ and modify definition as follows:</a>  <a href="#">Current: “If a prior floor level survey is not available, an assumed foundation surface shape may be used as the baseline elevations.”</a>  <a href="#">Proposed: “ If the original as-built survey is not available, an assumed original foundation surface shape shall be used as the baseline elevations.”</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

35	Read	5.3.1 / 19/7	N	<p>This conflicts with the definition in 5.1. What is the width of the foundation for an “L” shaped or odd shaped house?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Make definition of match 5.1</p>	<p><u>P:</u>  <a href="#">See above #30 &amp; 34 above and delete “or the width of the foundation, which ever less.”</a></p>
36	Parker	5.3.1 / 19 / 9	N	<p>Point 2’s location or intent to pick the location of Point 2 is undefined. Is it the intent to locate the largest deviation, between 1 and 3? Per the definition in line 9 point 2 can be taken any distance, including 0.01” away from Point 1 and the deflection will never violate. Could get two different results from variation in section the location of Point 2</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Point 2’s minimum/maximum distance needs clarification to prevent misuse.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u>  <a href="#">See # 37 below</a></p>
37	Read	5.3.1 / 19/9	N	<p>Point 2 is not collinear. It may be in the same plan but it is not on the same line. Also point 2 should be defined as being at the maximum distance from the profile line and the line between 1 and 2.</p> <p>Change to: Point 2 = the point along the profile the greatest distance from the straight line drawn between points 1 and 3.</p>	<p><u>P:</u></p>
38	Juedes	5.3.1 / 19 / 10	N	<p>“straight line drawn between points 1 &amp; 3” is not accurate for evaluating edge lift only.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Under edge lift only (no tilt), the straight line should be horizontal.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u>  <a href="#">Brian needs to explain,?</a></p>
39	Parker	5.3.1 / 19 / 13	N	<p>Not a big fan of expressing a %curvature. %allowable curvature makes more sense as the comparison will still have to be made. It’s introducing unnecessary terminology.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete or change to %curvature = measured curvature / allowable curvature</p>	<p><u>NP:</u>  <a href="#">We feel this OK as is</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

40	Parker	5.3.1 / 19 / 15	N	Not consistent with the definition in 5.2.	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">No resolution given.</a>
41	Read	5.3.1 / 19/15	N	Inconsistent with the definition in 5.2. What is the width of the foundation for an “L” shaped house?  Proposed Resolution: Delete “by at least the width of the foundation”	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">See #30</a>
42	Parker	5.3.1 / 19 /19	N	Not necessary and confusing with definition in 5.2, with allowable express in %	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Ok as is</a>
43	Parker	5.3.1 / 20 / 1-6	Y-E	Fix per agreed definition as noted above.  Proposed Resolution: Delete	<a href="#">Disagree</a>
44	Juedes	5.3.1 / 20 / 6	N	“edge to edge of foundation” does not prevent a tilt measurement from a corner to a mid-side. A tilt calculation from a corner to a mid-side most likely includes some bending deflection, which we do not want.  Proposed Resolution: The length of the line should be the length of the curvature. Tilt should only be calculated across the full width, full length or diagonal of the foundation. Even then it is possible that some bending deflection is included. Tilt is a planar measurement and as such requires that more than one corner be displaced.	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">See #30</a>
45	Douglass	5.3.1 / 20/8	N	Need to add other method of extracting elevations  Proposed Resolution: Add, “or can be extracted directly from elevation survey measurements	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">Add to line 8</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

46	Read	5.3.2 / 21/1	N	<p>Why is point 2 not at the greatest distance from the straight line between 1 and 3? Graph needs distance gridlines and values. Why is profile a double line? We are representing the top of slab which would be a single line. The committee needs to be given an opportunity to review the detail before publication.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Detail needs to be fixed.</p>	<p><u>P:</u> <a href="#">DI is modifying example illustrations</a></p>
47	Parker	Graph	Y-E	<p>Have to ADD another item (E) that a deviation from horizontal is not a deflection should be shown for the whole profile in addition to a sub-profile. Too many 'experts' use this definition to indicate violation of L/360. Should have picture here to show that this is not the proper way to compute deflection but should apply Tilt criteria. Yes D and E are the same but easier for a juror to understand if we show the whole section also</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Help out your LDP save court costs, put it in writing that that is not a valid interpretation of curvature criteria from horizontal by showing the whole length of section.</p>	<p><a href="#">DI is modifying example illustrations</a></p>
48	Douglass	5.3.2 / 21 / 4	N	<p>The word allowable is never used in 5.2</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix 5.2 and then fix this</p>	<p><u>P:</u> <a href="#">Omit "allowable" &amp; see #30 revision</a></p>
49	Juedes	5.3.2 / 21	Y-E	<p>Need more examples</p>	<p><u>Agree:</u> <a href="#">Feel a new Tech Note be developed with additional examples</a></p>
50	Juedes	5.3.2 / 21 and 22	Y-E	<p>Example D is not always "Wrong"</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: If <math>L_c</math> is 30 feet, but the length of the foundation is 90 feet and there is no tilt. Then Example D is correct for edge lift only bending.</p>	<p><a href="#">DI is modifying example illustrations</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

51	Graves	5.3.2 / 21	Y-E	<p>Page 21, Examples: Add 0.0” to the right end of datum line on all examples</p> <p>Page 21, Examples: Recommend we draft additional examples for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assuming as-built condition of max out of level tilt of 1%. Keep 0.00” level line shown for reference, show as-built tilt line as datum line and area in between shaded. Have two examples for as-built tilt in both directions</li> <li>2. Assuming as-built condition of max allowed curvature of L/360 (0.28%). Keep 0.00” level line shown for reference, show as-built curvature line as datum line and area in between shaded. Have two examples for as built curvature in both directions</li> <li>3. Assuming as-built condition of max out of level tilt of 1% and max allowed curvature L/360 (0.28%). Keep 0.00” level line shown for reference, show as-built tilt and curvature line as datum line and area in between shaded. Have two examples for as-built tilt and curvature in both directions</li> </ol>	<p><u>Agree:</u></p> <p><a href="#">Feel a new Tech Note be developed with additional examples</a></p>
52	Parker	5.3.2 / 21 / 4	N	<p>Variation in definition of tilt, yet again.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix definition earlier or change here</p>	<p><u>P:</u></p> <p><a href="#">Resolved in # 30 &amp; #48 above</a></p>
53	Parker	5.3.2 / 22 / 3	N	<p>Shouldn't % be % of allowable tilt instead, easier for the client to understand?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Opinion</p>	<p><u>NP:</u></p> <p><a href="#">OK as is</a></p>
54	Douglass	5.3.2 / 22 / 9	N	<p>Should add the distance to the middle elevation</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Curvature changes with respect to d distance to middle point when s using FPA calculation worksheet</p>	<p><u>NP:</u></p> <p><a href="#">Not necessary &amp; see DI revised example illustrations</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

55	Parker	5.3.2 / 22 / 9	Y-E	The data in Table 5.3.2-1 does not match the figure in Graph. Not able to check the table for accuracy.  Proposed Resolution: Table doesn't match graphs.	<a href="#">Agree:</a> <a href="#">DI to revise example illustrations</a>
56	Read	5.3.2 / 22/9	N	Numbers in table do not match numbers on graphs. Also where did Y1, Y2 and Y3 come from? I assume Y2 is Point 2. If so Y2 has an elevation of 1.4” Graph shows top of slab (?) greater than 1.5”. Since there are no distance grid lines on Graph numbers can’t be checked.  Proposed Resolution: Detail and table need to be fixed.	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">DI to revise example illustrations</a>
57	Parker	5.3.2 / 22 / 10	N	Example C shows 1/468 or from table 5.3.2-1 0.21%<-- now if you computed as a function of the allowable you would have 77% of allowable instead of 0.21% of nothing. Where Examples A and B would be 140% and 120% of allowable.  Proposed Resolution: I think that we should simplify the meaning of the numerics.	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">DI to revise example illustrations</a>
58	Read	5.3.3 / 22/18 to 23/6	Y	Agreed. This section should be deleted in its entirety.	<a href="#">Agree</a>
59	Douglass	5.4 / 24	N	Sample calculation in the same format as examples should be added for each of three contour figures	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">DI to include in revised example illustrations</a>
60	Parker	5.4	N	I personally don’t think that the examples convey “how to use ‘time change’ for the purpose of computations”. Isn’t that the purpose of the design example?	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Not a vote, but an opinion &amp; question - no resolution</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

61	Read	5.4 / 24/1 25/2 26/2	N	<p>Section 5.1 expresses the curvature in terms of 1/X or % but example has it in inches. In Section 5.3.1 c is a vertical distance. Not a curvature. The committee needs to be given an opportunity to review the detail before publication.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Express actual curvature in 1/x or % format. Don't call it "Allowable Curvature". Refer to it as "Recommended Curvature Limit" Need note about assumes as-built conditions was flat.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u> <a href="#">OK as voted in previous sections</a></p>
62	Parker	6.0 / 27 / 2	N	<p>First line -&gt; "This document proposes one commonly used method of evaluating the performance of a concrete slab-on-ground foundation, but in no ways limits the means and methods of a LDP to evaluation the performance of the foundation using other reasonable methods."</p>	<p><u>NP:</u> <a href="#">That is a given as the sentence clearly states "a method"</a></p>
63	Juedes	6.1 / 27 / 6	N	<p>"edge to edge" for curvature is too limiting</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: See above</p>	<p><u>P:</u> <a href="#">Take out and see #30 above</a></p>
64	Read	6.1 / 27/6	N	<p>We should not accept a "black and white" line regarding foundation performance. Doing so would be a great disservice to both the owners and the builders. We make the performance "gray" when the criteria are exceeded but not when it is less. This is disingenuous.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Add: If curvature less than 1/360 or 0.28% has resulted in structural distress, significant finishing material distress, reversed slope in garages or porch floors or significant functional distress, the performance of the foundation can be considered to be unacceptable.</p>	<p><u>NP:</u> <a href="#">See #30 &amp; #31</a></p> <p><a href="#">Change as modified – 10-0-0</a></p> <p><a href="#">Change in Chapter 5</a></p>



<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

65	Parker	6.1 / 27 / 5-7	N	<p>Not consistent with all the above ‘uses’ of definitions. I’ll withdraw negative if all the times the definition is applied, it is applied the same way. Edge to Edge has to have a minimum distance.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix</p>	<p><a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">See #30</a></p>
66	Read	6.1 / 27/8	N	<p>We should not accept a “black and white” line regarding foundation performance. Doing so would be a great disservice to both the owners and the builders. We make the performance “gray” when the criteria are exceeded but not when it is less (except for free standing masonry veneer). This is disingenuous.</p> <p>Add: If tilt less than 1/100 or 1.0% has resulted in structural distress, reversed slope in garages or porch floors, instability of masonry veneer or significant functional distress, the performance of the foundation can be considered to be unacceptable.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">See #22 &amp; #30</a></p>
67	Shaheen	6.1 / 27/9	N	<p>Wording inconsistent with other sections. (See Page 29 line 5)</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete “needs to” Insert “should”</p>	<p><a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">Change</a></p>
68	Douglass	6.1 / 27/10-11	N	<p>“deficiency in foundation performance” has not been defined</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete starting with the word “otherwise”</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Fine as is</a></p>
69	Parker	6.1 / 27 / 13	N	<p>Masonry is not the only basis for determination of a lower allowable tilt value.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">No resolution</a> <a href="#">See #22</a></p>
70	Douglass	6.1 / 27/15-16	Y-E	<p>What criteria should be applied to “non” time change elevation plans?</p>	<p><a href="#">Disagree:</a> <a href="#">Always a time change</a></p>
71	Read	6.1 / 27/15 to 27-16	N	<p>I think I know what it is trying to say: Two surveys are necessary even if one is “assumed.” Why does it need to be complicated. Obviously if there is only one survey, it is assumed.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete sentence</p>	<p><a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">See new definition (#34)</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

72	Parker	6.1 / 27 / 15-16	N	<p>Object to “extracted from time-change elevation plans” – has no basis if we are allowed to use assumed level condition earlier, then this has no meaning. Does this not conflict with TEXASCE Type A guidelines?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Object to “extracted from time-change elevation plans” – has no basis if we are allowed to use assumed level condition earlier, then this has no meaning. Does this not conflict with TEXASCE Type A guidelines?</p>	<p><a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">See new definition (#34)</a></p>
73	Parker	6.1 / 27 / 17-18	N	<p>Object “less subjectively when ”-&gt; delete -&gt;change to “one means for”</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a></p>
74	Read	6.1 / 27/17 to 27/18	N	<p>Evaluating a foundation’s performance is very subjective. It is not “black and white.”</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Delete sentence.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP</a> <a href="#">See # 66</a></p>
75	Read	6.1 / 27/19 to 27/14	N	<p>Why is this in the “Summary or Conclusion”? While it may be useful information, this is the wrong place for it.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Move to Section 1</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">OK where it is – location is not critical</a></p>
76	Read	6.1 / 27/24 to 27/25	N	<p>Disagree with wording. Not all shallow foundations are on ground.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Change to: Shallow foundations typically respond to volume change of the soils in the upper soil stratum.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Intent of this document is clear</a></p>
77	Read	6.1 / 27/25 to 28/2	N	<p>Disagree with wording</p> <p>Change to: In some instances, soil volume changes are not detected or detrimental because they are small or are sufficiently uniform through the foundation footprint or the foundation has sufficient strength and stiffness to respond to the volume change without causing distress.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Not needed</a></p>
78	Parker	6.2	N	<p>Not necessary to this Chapter Summary and Conclusion. Maybe should considered placing in Chapter 1.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Intent of this document is clear</a></p>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

79	Read	6.2 / 28/2 to 28/4	N	Disagree with wording  Change to: However, when the soil volume change is large or non-uniform or the foundation does not have sufficient strength and stiffness detrimental movement, the soil volume change will likely be detected and detrimental.	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a>
80	Read	6.2 / 28/8 to 11	N	Disagree with wording  Change to: The most practical way to mitigate foundation movement is to construct the foundation based on an adequate geotechnical investigation and properly designed foundation. Reducing the soil volume change can also limit the foundation movement. The soil volume change can be limited by ....”	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">Good editorial change</a>
81	Douglass	6.2 / 28/9	Y-E	Add the word “site” at end of line 9	<a href="#">See #80 above</a>
82	Juedes	6.2 / 28 / 10	Y-E	Add “soil moisture control”	<a href="#">See # 80 above</a>
83	Parker	6.3	Y-E	This section should have been earlier in the work and should have prefaced the work in Chapter 5.	<a href="#">Disagree</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

84	Parker	6.3 / 28 / 1	Y-E	<p>Insert: “A certain amount of seasonal differential foundation movement has been incorporated into the design of a slab-on-ground foundation system. This means that even a properly performing foundation system reacting to rapid changes in external environmental/geological conditions may contribute strain to the superstructure that it may otherwise be unable to handle without creating minor cosmetic distress to that superstructure’s architectural finish(es). This condition is not a malfunction of “design” of the foundation.” Assessment at this level of distress can often be performed with visual assessments.</p> <p>There are many causes for foundation movement that are non-design related as iterated in lines 12-18 below in more detail or within the designer’s means to control. The method presented in Chapter 5 is one commonly used method to evaluate the performance of the foundation for those conditions that are clearly not within the boundaries of customary seasonal differential movement for the geographical location; or, are so graphic in scale that the foundation is obviously failing in performance.</p>	<a href="#">Disagree</a>
85	Read	6.3 / 28/18	N	<p>We need to include that some foundation movement and corresponding distress should be expected on foundation on expansive soils.</p> <p>Add: All foundations on expansive soils are expected to move as a result of soil volume change. This expected movement may be sufficient to cause finishing material or functional distress. The design procedures for slab-on-ground foundation assume some movement will occur. The design procedures will result in foundation’s with sufficient strength and stiffness to limit, not prevent, this movement.</p>	<a href="#">P: Insert</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>		<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>			Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

86	Parker	6.3 / 29 / 1	N	<p>Introduction to evaluation is lacking, here is where we summarize and conclude.</p> <p>Insert: Foundations are rarely constructed as a perfectly flat surface, which is a common misconception of the public. It is common to find that a foundation may have a surface flatness tolerance within the range of +/- 3/4-inch or less in deviation, however, there are some foundations that are poured that exceed this range of expectation for various construction related reasons.</p> <p>These deviations from a flat surface are normal and common to residential construction and vary due among other things such as geography, climate conditions at time of pour, etc . Further these surface deviations do not indicate anything other than the original surface of the concrete.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a></p>
87	Douglass	6.3 / 29/5	Y-E	Replace the word “within” with “herein”	<a href="#">Agree</a>
88	Read	6.3 / 29/7	N	<p>It is disingenuous to say the foundation performance can be acceptable if it exceeds criteria if there is no distress but not to say the performance can be unacceptable if it is less than criteria if there is significant distress.</p> <p>Add: When the performance criteria contained within are not exceeded but there is structure distress or significant cosmetic distress or functional distress, the foundation can be considered to not be performing acceptably.</p>	<p><a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">Already covered in other sections</a></p>
89	Buck	6.3 / 29 / 7-11	N	Lines 7 to 11 – Why can we not keep these sentences, these are factors that the reader should consider.	<a href="#">Dan Withdrew this negative at LB meeting</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>	<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>		Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

90	Graves	6.3 / 29 / 7/8	N	<p>Page 29, Line 7 &amp; 8: Leave in this first sentence.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Leave it in as it is a fact and the reader should be advised of this fact and understand this is the norm over the life time of a house.</p>	<a href="#">P:</a>
91	Read	6.3 / 28/15 to 31/20	N	<p>While I agree with the general intent, this section needs a lot or work to improve consistency and completeness.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Modify as a committee.</p>	<a href="#">NP:</a>
92	Parker	6.3 / 29 / 19	N	<p>Not sure a foundation is constructed with curvature or tilt. Curvature and tilt is response of deformation of the structure in response to soils support conditions. It is true that a foundation may not be perfectly flat and may have issues with the construction but is a poorly poured foundation with large curvature a failure? Or low quality control?</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: Fix by using above introduction.</p>	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">Change “without any curvature or tilt” to “level”</a>
93	Parker	6.3 / 29 / 19-24	Y-E	<p>Consider revising 29:19 to 30:3</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: “The LDP will evaluate the site conditions to make an assessment as to evidence in the framing that may otherwise give witness to the original surface of the concrete. This assessment may serve to improve the modeling of the “as-constructed” shape of the foundation system.”</p>	<a href="#">Disagree:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a>
94	Graves	6.3 / 29 / 20-21	Y-E	<p>Page 29, Line 20 and 21: Change “as-constructed” to “as-built”. This is consistent with language on page 16, line 7.</p>	<a href="#">Agree</a>
95	Graves	6.3 / 30 / 8	Y-E	<p>Page 30, Line 8: Change “seasons” to “seasonal weather cycles”</p>	<a href="#">Agree</a>

<b>PTI Committee: DC-10 – Slab-on-Ground Committee</b>		<b>Ballot: DC-10-1602</b>	Ballot Start Date:	March 17, 2016
<b>Document Title: PTI DC10.8-xx: Evaluation Guidelines for the Performance of SOG Foundations – unresolved sections</b>			Ballot End Date:	April 17, 2016

96	Douglass	6.3 / 29/12-13	N	As stated context implies foundation design can cause distress, foundation stress may be the result of inadequate foundation design but it cannot cause the distress  Proposed Resolution: Delete “other” in line 15, delete “outside the foundation” in line 15, delete “design” in line 16, insert “such as” before improper in line 16	<a href="#">P:</a> <a href="#">Change as noted</a>
97	Douglass	6.3 / 30/11	Y-E	Add the sentence “This introduces additional inaccuracies in assumptions of as-built conditions.”	<a href="#">Disagree:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a>
98	Douglass	6.3 / 30/22	N	Shouldn’t “acceptable” or “excessive” movement be linked to structural damage to structural members of the structure, not just distress?  Proposed Resolution: Add the phrase “damage to structural components,”	<a href="#">NP:</a> <a href="#">OK as is</a>
99	Juedes	6.3 / 31/19	Y-E	Strike “excessive”	<a href="#">Agree</a>
100	Douglass	6.3 / 31/20	N	Tilt cannot be related to structural design  Proposed Resolution: Delete the word “typically”. design	<a href="#">P:</a>

## PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board

Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review

Comment #	Page #	Line #	Comment: G / T / E*	G = General T = Technical E = Editorial Comment	Comment Response
1	1	13	E	strand in <b>an</b> exterior	
2	1	14	E	Makes more sense just to say: watertight <b>like</b> an encapsulated .....	
3	2	9	E	Suggest changing to exterior <b>surface</b> of	
4	2	9	E	Add comma after case	
5	3	11	E	Provide reference for the PTI Document	
6	3	12	E	that <b>have become</b> available	
7	3	33	E	support bars, <b>other tendons or other embedded steel items</b> (referring to stud rails)	
8	3	36	E	Cannot be <b>currently</b> considered accepted by PTI. (This gives folks some hope that PTI may come up with some acceptable guidelines for this scenario)	
9	3	36	N	Add a sentence along the lines of: the repair procedure for the specific repair has to be approved by the LDP	
10	4	9	N	Should we not specify the liquid product (s) (just like we have mentioned the types of tapes)	
11	4	33	N	Is there a need to specify the length of overlap (like in the other instances) – am not sure what it needs to be for a heat-shrink case. Is it 3 inches	
12	5	7-10	E	Why are we saying “recommended” to have tendons complying with PTI specs and fabricated at a PTI certified plant? Suggest change sentence to say: Unbonded tendon systems fabrication procedures <b>should</b> conform to PTI specs etc... and should be fabricated at PTI certified plant. This is to be consistent with language on P111-L21	
13	8	20	E	Delete word “initial”	
14	9	4	E	Change Appendix B to Appendix C	
15	19	7	E	Add decimal equivalent for ¾ inches	



## PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board

Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review

Comment #	Page #	Line #	Comment: G / T / E*	G = General T = Technical E = Editorial Comment	Comment Response
16	19	8	E	Should a particular Section be defined (in this case 8.3.1) when we are referring to the latest edition of a particular document? In subsequent referenced documents this section number may change.	
17	23	7	E	Replace “construction documents” with “installation drawings”	
18	24	4	E	Replace “construction drawings” with “installation drawings” (Global)	
19	25	4	E	For more clarity, indicate also in the figure which one is the correct and incorrect way to apply PT coating on the pocket former.	
20	25		E	Fig. 5.3 needs clarification, maybe have “acceptable” and “unacceptable”	
21	25	5	E	I think a big red “X” should be placed over the pocket former shown on the left side of the photo	
22	25	8	E	Change “pocket former recess” to “stressing pocket”	
23	26	2	E	In the drawings change “Stressing End Anchor” to “Stressing Anchorage” 3 locations	
24	26	7	E	Begin “section” with a capital “S”	
25	26	9	E	Change “foundation construction documents” to “installation drawings” (Global)	
26	27	5	E	Delete reference to Fig. 5.4	
27	27	7	E	Add metric equivalent for ¾ inches	
28	27	11	E	Add metric equivalents to the drawing and delete “end” between fixed and anchor. Also add “age” after anchor in the drawing	
29	28	12	E	Make changes to the drawing per directions shown in the 2 previous comments	
30	28	13	E	Change “stressing anchor” to “stressing anchorage” (Global)	
31	31	2	E	Add metric equivalents to the drawing and delete “end” between fixed and anchor. Also add “age” after anchor in the drawing	
32	31	6	E	Add metric equivalent for 54 inches	
33	32	4	E	Add metric equivalent for 6 inches	
34	32	8	E	Add metric equivalents to the drawing	
35	33	2	E	Change 1219mm to equivalent meter	
36	33	6	E	Add metric equivalents to drawing	

## PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board

Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review

Comment #	Page #	Line #	Comment: G / T / E*	Comment	Comment Response
37	34	2	E	Add metric equivalents to drawing	
38	34	6	E	I could not find Fig. 5.14	
39	35	2	E	Add metric equivalents to drawing	
40	35	4	E	Change 1219mm to meters	
41	36	3	E	Add metric equivalent to drawing	
42	36	4-11	E	Change font	
43	37	3	E	Add metric equivalents to drawing (Global)	
44	38	3	E	Add metric equivalent to drawing	
45	39	10	E	Change “tendon tail” to “strand tail”	
46	40	2	E	Change “fixed-end” to “fixed anchorage”	
47	40	3	E	Change “tension” to “stress”	
48	40	4	T	33 kips is 146 kN and NOT 228 MPa	
49	41	17	E	Change 519 to 5.19	
50	45	10-15	T	<p>The long narrow strip is only one of the casting methods for industrial SOG; plus often we have pt in both directions. I think this section is limiting the extent of PT. Plus the scope of this document as defined P4-L5 is for “residential and light commercial”</p> <p>Suggest deleting this section or reword to state that: there are many ways of casting and finishing commercial and industrial applications, PTI DC10.7-83: Post-Tensioned Commercial and Industrial Floors gives details and examples on such SOG applications. This is not a general rule but to give a guidance in cases where long narrow strips are used and PT is used in the longitudinal direction only, reinforcing in the short direction etc...</p>	
51	49	1	E	Add metric equivalent for 6 inches	
52	55	9	E	Add period after “...prior to stressing”.	
53	56	17	E	Replace word “effecting” with “affecting”.	
54	56	22-23	E	Add metric equivalents for 42 inches (meters) and 4 inches (mm)	
55	57	20	E	Add “jack” before “cylinder”	

## PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board

Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review

Comment #	Page #	Line #	Comment: G / T / E*	G = General T = Technical E = Editorial Comment	Comment Response
56	58	9	E	Change “strand” to “tendon tail”	
57	58	10	E	Delete “s” at the end of “markings”	
58	58	4	E	Fig.8.1 is confusing. Suggest adding a picture of the jack direction as well	
59	58	12	E	Add “an” before “accurate”	
60	59	2	E	Change “tendons” to “tendon tails”	
61	59	9-13	E	See comment on P113.	
62	61	3	E	Change “forward” to “toward the concrete slab”	
63	61	10	E	Revise “Start the pump <i>and stop it when the specified stressing pressure...</i> ”	
64	61	13	E	What is manual seating?	
65	61	16	E	Change “correct” to “specified”	
66	62	1	E	Change “forward” to “away from the concrete slab”	
67	63	2	E	On page 62 it stated “...10 percent...” On this line it states “...10%...” Need to change one or the other and make it global	
68	63	14	E	Add ± before ¼ in.	
69	63	15	E	Change “design engineer” to “LDP”	
70	65	13	T	Are measuring tapes not allowed? Suggest changing to: fixed or folding rulers are more effective than measuring tapes in achieving accuracy in measuring elongations	
71	65	15	E	Change “double” to “two” to be consistent	
72	66	5	E	Change “pulls” to “stressing” to be consistent	
73	73	15	E	Add “an” after “otherwise”	
74	74	2	E	Add equivalent metric dimensions on the drawing	
75	74	9	E	Change “double” to “two” to be consistent	
76	75	4	E	Add “...in the <i>tendon tail</i> strand”	
77	75	18	N	Define or specify length for short tendons. Did not see that specified anywhere in the document.  Revise to following: This measured elongation should compare within ±10 percent of the calculated elongation or ±¼ in. (6 mm)	

## PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board

Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review

Comment #	Page #	Line #	Comment: G / T / E*	G = General T = Technical E = Editorial Comment	Comment Response
				for short tendons ( <b>usually tendons less than 30 to 35 ft. in length</b> )	
78	78	4	E	Replace “pocket former recesses” to “stressing pockets”	
79	78	13	E	Add equivalent metric dimensions and delete “end” after stressing and add “ages” to anchor in the figure	
80	79	12	E	Add equivalent metric dimensions and delete “end” after stressing and add “ages” to anchor in both figures	
81	80	10 & 11	E	Change “Pocket Former Recesses” with “Stressing Pockets” (Global)	
82	81	1	E	“low-shrinkage repair mortar” should be replaced with the wording used in the FAQ or Technical paper which addressed filling stressing pockets	
83	81	2	E	Add “d” after “use”	
84	81	14	E	Add “to” after “possible”	
85	84	2	E	Fig. 11.1 is one of many figures in the document that have low resolution and small font. It will be good to update	
86	84	16	E	Change “end” to “anchorage”	
87	85	17	E	Revise sentence “...hold because they <i>are not</i> fully seated	
88	86	14	E	Delete “split” in front of “troubleshooting anchor” (Global)	
89	90	22	E	Replace “beyond” with “into”. I think as it reads now, stressing beyond the yield strength will also fail or break the strand. Being stressed into the yield strength typically should not break the strand.	
90	91	7	E	Add at the end of the sentence “Sparks created from flame cutting can also damage the strand”	
91	96	8	E	Add equivalent metric dimension to the 4 inches	
92	99	15	E	Replace “ram” with “jack”	
93	113	7	T	Why is it minimum 3 days? Suggest changing sentence to: Stressing should occur when the concrete strength is reached typically between 3 and 10 days	
94	113	11	N	Note that this is no longer required per ACI 318-11 onwards. This can be deleted.	

**PTI Committee: TAB – Technical Advisory Board****Document Title: DC-10 Construction and Maintenance Manual – TAB Review**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Page #</b>	<b>Line #</b>	<b>Comment: G / T / E*</b>	<b>G = General T = Technical E = Editorial</b> <b>Comment</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
95	114	1	E	Replace “pocket former void” with “stressing pockets”	
96	114	19	E	Change to: The reinforcement “and the strands” not displaced	
97	115	2	E	Replace “records” with “documentation	
98	115	7	E	Change “1.8mm” to “1.8 m”	
99	115	9	E	Add equivalent metric measurement to 10 ft	
100	116		E	Sketches are not readable and there are clouds on the plan view that should be deleted	
101	116	2	E	The clouds for typical fixed anchorage, tendon identification and typical stressing anchorage need to be moved to their required location. Arrows at tendons (typ.) need to be moved to point to the tendons.	
102	116	3	E	Change all references to “strands” be changed to “tendons” at all 6 sections	
103	117	2	E	Replace “end” with “anchorage”	
104	119	1	N	Is the Appendix required? Can they not refer to the PTT document?  If it still remains here, I think there needs to be a reference to the PTT Document (it has descriptions with pictures)	
105	119	1	E	There seem to be a lot of definitions listed below that are not used in the document. If they are not used in the document, they should be deleted. I have referenced a few below. Some new terms used in the document do not have PTT definitions. Definitions need to be developed and approved by TAB to be inserted into the PTT and this document.	
106	119	10	E	In the document the term used is “breakouts”. I am not sure if the PTT has a definition for “breakout”. The definition here is “blowout” but I do not think “blowout” was used in the document. Need to revise something here	
107	119	12	E	Is “bursting steel” used in the document? If not, this should be deleted as it would not apply	