

11:03 am Tuesday 18 April, 2023

Gean Na Amer Concrete Pipe Association

Jamie Lienberger - Lienberger and Associates

Dave Badgely – Badgely and Associates

Kent Carlson - NCPI

Tim Bako VP SPinello Co

John Miller – City of San Diego,

Jensen Lee- City of San Diego

Jackie Jacques – Seikisu

Jacob Monroe – ADS

Mark Giljum – LACSD

David Savant – EJ

Bryan Miko – ADS

Aidan Rajswing - TPG

Raffie Yeereemina - AGC EGC

Alan Chui – COLA Design Standard

Caleb Shen – TPG

Rob Huning – COLA Design Standard

Gerado De La Cerda

Motion – DB, Second JJ/JL passing March Meeting minutes,

GN: JL get the comment stricken, from the February Minutes

Announcements and correspondence related to KC minimal size change to 328UM.

GN: open house, meetings, etc

JJ: No Dig will be in Portland OR April 30, 2023 – then Monday thru Wednesday of this year, first one in three years come on out and see every one.

West coast Chapter of NES is working more to engage students more in the Trenchless industry, students more involved , grads, under grads and post grads. Finding curriculum is limited and would like to get them to the projects to see real world events and see more industry support.

DB: in March we had the NV state conference. WE are in San Diego for the CWEA and in August in Vegas for the tri state conference.

GN: Cal trans and Greenbook, Greenbook retention ping pong back and forth – from cal trans and Greenbook – it goes back and forth to see if there will be support and how it will go for highway construction, if there is anything substantial it will be talked about at the main committee meeting – if there is an update I will bring that to you at the next meeting.

Dickie Fernandez – OCSD

GN: Old business changes

312, 323 at the Editorial discussed last week – is there an update?

328, 329, 330 and 331,

Then part 5

At last month into the weeds – more time allotted to the new items on the books to talk about .

WE will discuss the new things first

331 UM 11 month warranty Anthony Howard main committee meeting express some concern, Raffie, also expressed some concerns.

KC: can you read the concerns? GN: from AH, LACSD is worried it will create a bigger problem (his words) this suggested change is a bit redundant, it is implied and adding a footnote draws attention to it, recap and framing this for the group.

KC: I recall from last meeting the concern about redundancy – page 21 work shall be warranty – for 1 year, KC reads this section – all warranties implied or expressed, shall be assigned and in writing. There is a warranty if not satisfactory – page 438 11 month warranty – coatings peeled, leakage, pipe line things failed, etc, didn't meet standards, there is no redundancy because there is nothing that covers this 11 month warranty inspection,

GN: the other place that mentions it – KC - Page 419 table.

GN: for clay pipe they include this and think this is included,

KC: page 419 at the bottom of the page deflection testing, I do not see another listing for the tests

Oh my bad – page 414

KC What is the 11 month warranty inspection? IT just says inspection and that can be interpreted as anything

JM: that could be interpreted as anything KC what is the equitable test for rigid pipe?

KC: for rigid pipe there is pressure test and CCTV, inspections while on deck before installation, haunching before being installed, rigid pipe does not deflect so we are outside the requirements for this. Clay and concrete should not even be here,

JM: you are correct thermos plastic and plastic pipe are designed to deflect, good compaction, a pipe will not deflect past the intended deflection.

If we are introducing inside pipe testing for plastic pipe are you asking for the same for inside rigid pipe?

KC: over the years Greenbook has been diluted, barrel deflection, when an installed pipe is over deflected this would be a concern to the end user, the 11 month warranty does not tell you when it shall be performed, 30 days is way too soon for a test of compaction on pipe deflection,

Final settlement does not happen in 30 days – it takes longer.

There was a deletion from greenbook – 2009 no states 30 days .

The majority of densification takes place long after 30 days and up to 1 year.

JM: compactive efforts around the pipe happen within those 30 days – the 30 days allows for settlement and consolidation.

Again if you are asking this for Flexible pipe are you going to ask for this on Rigid pipe as well???

KC: no this is apples and oranges and not the same – in your professional opinion is 30 days sufficient to get the long term deflection on pipe?

JM: I say yes it is.

BM: to KC you say this does not impact rigid pipe, but compaction will affect it

KC: do you believe that flexible pipes are more susceptible to deflection than rigid pipe?

BM: 30 days is a reasonable amount of time for a deflection test.

GN: love this dialogue.

DF: please introduce themselves Jacob Monroe – ADS, regional Eng, CA eng

GN: Since I chair this meeting, I am going to ask the Agencies to speak up in matters like this, it's a materials item. I want the voting members to speak up if there is an opinion that they want to add or comments they want to make in conjunction with the 11 month warranty inspection

RR: I heard COLA was sponsoring this, what is their comments? Agencies will say this and this is why we have an issue etc I have made multiple requests to make use of plastic pipe and I have been told no,

AC: Edward is not here, and I do not have the information to comment on this,

KC: lets postpone this and have EA come in and comment

DF: who with COLA said they did not have information and I will not support a change that the sponsor does not show up and be here on regular basis.

AC: send me an email on history and I will get with Edward on this

GN: KC sent and email to EA and cc AC on this –

KC ok and I can bring in an expert on this but he is stuck at a ASTM committee meeting.

DF: invite him, the more information the better.,

GN: 330 UM Mandrel change

KC: can we do change 329 first

GN, changes 330 and 329 are related we can discuss together and vote separately

KC: TABLE 307.8.3.2

GN: intro – KC giving a change, mandrel diameters on this table are incorrect when looking at the mandrel, OD from Greenbook, they are wrong, the numbers are in error – the errors in the diameter of the mandrels are wrong, I was looking at past editions of the Greenbook, back to 2012 – strange change in the mandrel size that did not correspond to the ASTM or the Greenbook.

KC: explaining the table and the errors on this table, 6” pipe, and a 5% deflection

In 2012 – it is higher than allowed and in 2015 the size mandrel was reduced, I checked the ASTM standards and between 2012 and 2015 there was no changes made to the ASTM, do not know who allowed these changes in the Greenbook.

Talking to a few folks on the committees there are no call outs, there are different from manufacturer to manufacturer, They will then calculate the deflection and you can then know the size of the mandrel accordingly. Not sure where these numbers came from, they do not have any correlation, column C and D, this needs to be fixed in Editorial.

Does it need a vote, if someone finds an error – can it just be fixed in editorial?

KC: if anyone knows why this change – let me know.

GN: I do not know, when this was brought up- I do believe this is an editorial error and can be corrected.

GN: I will send out the table industry folks, please look at this and get back to us, the changes may have happened without a change request.

KC: include my email address and I can share the paperwork standards ASTM etc that I have

GN: table this til next month I will send it out via email.

GC: ok KC on to change 330

GN: this change 330 – 9 legged to 18 legged mandrel KC is suggesting an even numbered legged mandrel for proper testing of pipe. KC is on a working group with ASTM about this, we heard back negative comments from industry folks, some things that KC shared an over deflected pipe would still pass thru a flexible pipe that is over deflected

KC: OD shall be measured prior to the pull. This is a change in the language. And the underlined part is an addition to d.) KC: should have minimum diameter along the entire length of the pipe.

DB: all the mandrels I have ever seen tweak down a bit on the end to avoid an offset,

KC DB you are talking about the leading edge, (DB comments to agreement)

KC: could change it to the full length of the measuring area of the mandrel.

GN: you are going to revise item d.)?

KC: shows mandrel and what DB was talking about that the radius is not the measurement of the mandrel

RR to GN I want to hear from the sponsoring agencies on this and what is driving this change?

Irvine water, and everyone uses the old standard and here we are trying to change a standard and we are driving to a more stringent standard, and I want to hear and know what is driving these issues and changes and I go back to our charter. (reads Charter -)

KC: happy to postpone – but a showing the concern with the COLA – this is a 9 leg mandrel ASTM D3034, this one measure 5% deflection or SDR 35- reads mandrel of 9 and 18 legged mandrel.,

ASTM d3034 5.455” 5% 9 leg mandrel matches out side, and is loose in the middle of the example.

This is the concern that a 9 legged mandrel is not giving an accurate reading and the current 5% deflection is really 7%

The 18 legged mandrel is a true 5% deflection reading, the 18 leg mandrel will pull thru the pipe debris thru the legs

KC: happy to table, talk to EA and get back to the committee

RR: I would be happy to hear from COLA and hear their response.

KC: discussing recap of the 9 leg vs 18 leg mandrel, we need to encourage technology. Laser tech in 2018 shows old school mandrels do not measure correctly. Technology has improved, products need to improve also more legs will increase accuracy. Greenbook standard and reputation would be improved, and used nationwide, usually it piggy backs off of ASTMs, this would make Greenbook cutting edge.,

JJ: question, I want to ask is this just being driven by 1 agency? Or is industry standard? Is this for all pipe or just plastic pipe?

KC: right now deflection is only done on thermo - plastic or flexible pipe, I have reached out to several manufacturers of the mandrels and they would be happy to make the 18 leg mandrel when asked for.

JJ: get concerned when competitors ask for and drive changes when it affects my company, I would like to see the COLA and other agencies speaking out and speaking up, white book, brown book silver book is for agencies to add to their spec outside of greenbook,

KC because these standards were already written, all you have to do is ask for a work order, GN and I were told we needed a sponsor, this was wrong information. I would not confuse COLA with having a problem we talked to EA and asked if he would sponsor our changes, he said he would and I did not need a sponsor –

JJ: this is a big enough change all the voting members should speak to this, all this should be germane to public works,

KC: career prototype machining, etc, I discovered the 9 leg mandrel was wrong and has nothing to do with the agency or any agency.

JM: we have worked thru the math, the math we are doing the geometry we are doing on the 6" pipe and see if the groups numbers are the same, we think there is .1 10th 1/100th of an inch variable.

Does change 329UM should be corrected. How much do those affect what your discussing here?

KC: amt of variance on the mandrel I have not done testing on 12, or 16 leg mandrels.

The newly proposed changes to the charge do not change the inaccuracy of the 9 leg mandrel.

GN, tradition is to have a voting member sponsor a change, I say it is important, so we will do it that way –

GN: we have two more changes –

All of KC changes being tabled til MAY

GN barrel deflection from storm drain from 6.5% to 5%, last months meeting I was asked to provide support – I claimed their ADS table was faulty and this is what I showed to COLA, and my info is from ASHTO, ASTM and Cal Trans,

Cal trans section 64 plastic pipe – 5%

ASHTO M294 - bridge design section 7. Clearly call out 5%.

Mandrels are discussed here and the committee should read this

If you exceed 5%, use an Eng and evaluate at 7% should be replaced,

ASHTO 2020 5% is acceptable 7% needs eval and anything about 7.5% needs replacing

COLA – structural design is greater, and the brown book is 3%, COLA will support 5% for greenbook purposes.

JM: is reducing this from 6.5% to 5% is this saying replacement or eval with engineer?

GN: greenbook does not go into the what you do if there is greater – just want to make a minimal change in greenbook, I cannot speak on behalf of the agencies here, they can refer to an ASHTO document, I am changing this to go with an agency norm,

JM: greenbook uses the wording “nominal” 1.5% difference, you will have 6.5% of nominal or 5% of actual.

GN: I hear you with your fancy math and I am just referencing what ASHTO and CALTRANS are saying, We can throw math and spreadsheets at one another, but I am not going to do that.

KC: what ASTM what ties to this ?

GN: ASTM D2321 they do not define deflection limit, they are deferring to the Eng or the specification, there is not ASTM about deflection limits

JM: supports use of removing nominal -

BM: words matter as long as it consistent, matching ASHTO language.

BM: not an imperfection or defect,

GN; pipe is manufactured with a smaller end or

BM: should workshop this

Tabled til MAY –

Change 284 -

KC: submitted recommended

All I am saying is look at it.

When the state gave recommendations, agencies should take a look at it

JJ: isn't it the agencies job to look after this?

KC: keep up with the industry rather than a knee jerk reaction.,

GN: JJ JL and DB Coordinate a time and get it out.,

12:54PM

MAY 16th

Need to go

