

TS 4b Meeting Summary for 2014 Semi-Annual Webinar

Meeting Date:	February 20, 2014	
Items approved by the TS for Subcommittee Ballot:		
Standard Designation	Summary of Action Items	Subcommittee Only or Concurrent?
M 167	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike McGough is going to talk with Dr. McGrath to ask for his opinion on whether or not to incorporate Note 2 into Table 2. 	
M36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair will work with publications group to make sure Notes are in sequential order prior to publication. A mistake was made with the ballot. The intent is not to have Section 1.3 in the scope unless a pipe joint specification is put in Section 9. Motion to remove and publish without this section in the standard due to oversight on the Chair's part: Motion made by NY, seconded by NH. Motion passed. Section 1.3 will be removed and the revised standard will be sent to the publications staff. 	
M278	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the changes in Section 3.4 and Section 3.5 and those related to external and internal material balloted and not publish these revisions this year because the definitions were not clear. Opposed states: None, motion passes. The standard will be put back to what was published in the 2013 AASHTO materials book. 	
Task Force Updates		
Task Force Name	Task Force Updates	Names of TF Members
TS 2013-01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The members of the task force: Bill Trolinger (TN), Bill Bailey (VA), Alan Rawson (NH), Chris Peoples (NC) discussed with Mike McGough (NCSPA) what was needed to place a test method for a watertight joint into M36. Mike McGough suggested a visit to a corrugated metal plant (CMP) to demonstrate the proposed test procedure to the task force. A visit to Lane Enterprises in Dublin, VA was completed with Mike McGough in the December. Bill Bailey and Chris Peoples attended this demonstration. Two 2 ½ foot sections of 24 inch metal pipe with end plates welded on to the ends of each section were joined together with a neoprene band underneath a 12 inch flat metal band. The flat metal band was tightened and held in place with three lugs. The water pressure gauge read 10.8 psi. The seams of the CMP away from the joined area were also welded. This demonstration showed the joint would 	

	<p>hold (be watertight) at this pressure. The pressure was backed off and all of the water was drained from the pipes. The pipes were reassembled again using a neoprene sleeve/band and a fully corrugated metal band tightened and held in place with three lugs. The water was turn on and the pressure cranked back up again to 10.8 psi for 10 minutes, no leaks were observed. Mike McGough has video of this if you want to see this video. This video can be provided at the annual SOM meeting. The testing was performed in the straight alignment. The Deflection alignment was not completed on this assembly. This facility is not set up to do the deflection test. The NCSA is working with a test facility to set up a deflection test.</p>	
<p>TS 2013-02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This task force was put together to incorporate a water tight joint test from M36 into PP 63. An acceptable water tight joint test was not prepared in time for the SOM ballot. All pipe industries will be invited to participate in a review of PP63 once an acceptable water tight joint test method for CMP has been incorporated into M36. 	
<p>Other Action Items</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FL: Mario Paredes will prepare a research needs statement (RNS). This RNS will be taken to the SOM meeting this summer and the chair will see if the TS will support this research. • PA: AASHTO M294-Wall Buckling: There has been language added regarding buckling, which can be interpreted in several different ways. PA would like this language cleaned up so there isn't room for interpretation. External buckling can be defined by a decrease in load-carrying capacity using a load-deflection curve and the equation in section 9.2.1 when conducting a pipe stiffness test or by observation with the unaided eye. The standard allows these two different interpretations. Section 3.4 is where the definition is. Buckling was observed in the outer corrugated wall in PA when a pipe stiffness test was performed on a Type S pipe. Type S pipe has an outer corrugated pipe wall and a smooth inner liner. In some places in the standard, the liner is called "inner wall" and in other places "inner liner". So is Wall buckling the outer corrugated wall or does it have to be both the outer wall and inner wall/liner? Section 7.5 states that there shall be no evidence of wall buckling, cracking, splitting, delamination, or buckling as defined by a decrease or downward deviation in load-deflection curve when tested in accordance with Section 9.2. Section 9.2 has similar language. PA will put together a package of photos and some test results for the TS to review. PA pointed out that Section 4.1.2, Type S is defined as the outer corrugated pipe wall and smooth inner liner, while Section 7.2.2 has –wall thickness- the inner wall. These are a few discrepancies in the standard. PA considers the outer wall buckling a visual buckling failure. The pipe manufacturer does not consider this a failure and cites the fact that there is no decrease in load as determined by the equation in Section 9.2.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair: The TS will review the package from PA and the wording in M 294 and make sure the language provides one interpretation, not several interpretations. 		