

Water/Sewer Working Group Meeting

Meeting Notes
March 18, 2014

Opening:

A meeting of the Specifications and Details Water/Sewer Working Group was called to order by chair Jim Badowich on March 18, 2014, at 1:35 p.m. in the MAG Cottonwood Room.

1. Introductions/Attendance

Tony Ayala (Avondale), Jim Badowich (Avondale), Arturo Chavarria (Hanson), Phil Gale (Geneva Polymer), Paul Nebeker (Pipe Right), Matt Rogers (ADS), Mike Sanders (AZUCA/Fishel), Gordon Tyus (MAG), Arvid Veidmark (Specialized Services), Stew Waller (Rinker), Warren White (Chandler)

2. Manhole Revisions/Update (Cases 13-21 and 13-22)

Craig Sharp was not present, so this item was not discussed in detail, however Jim Badowich did discuss the idea of whether to add manhole vacuum testing as a future MAG spec. He said that Troy Tobiasson from Goodyear thought the law requiring it was repealed. Paul Nebeker said the City of Phoenix still requires it. Warren White said he thought Chandler required it for manholes in arterials. Phil Gale thought it was a good test to find flaws. Paul Nebeker wanted clarification that the test was for sanitary sewers and not storm sewers. Mr. Badowich agreed and said he wanted to look at agency supplements to investigate the idea further.

Mr. Badowich also said he received a message from Jami Erickson, that she would not be able to attend, but that she is working on the new testing Section 611 that will be a consolidation of existing testing requirements.

3. Water Testing/Flushing

Rob Godwin was not present so this item was postponed for the next meeting.

4. Revisions to Rigid and Flexible Pipe Installation (Case 13-15)

Warren White provided a complete update packet for Case 13-15 that included revisions to Section 101: Definitions, updated Details 200-1 and 200-2 as well as the latest drafts of Sections 601, 603, 615 and 618. Most of the rest of the meeting was a thorough review of the changes and discussions about this case.

Mr. White first presented the new and changed definitions in Section 101. Mr. White explained that these definitions better match those used by ASTM. There was discussion clarifying what is meant by foundation, bedding, haunching, initial backfill and final backfill. Mr. Veidmark suggested being consistent with the terms Initial Backfill and Backfill (Initial) so that it would be easy to find in the definitions section. Mr. Tyus suggested cross referencing the terms.

Details 200-1 and 200-2 were updated to reflect the change in terminology. The major change to the drawing was the trench cross-section detail on 200-2. Mr. Badowich suggested moving the springline note so it wasn't confused with the haunching, and to remove the (typ) note. Mr.

Badowich said there may need to be more options for the different trench repair details on 200-1, but it would need to be a separate future case.

Next the group reviewed Section 601 in detail. Section 601.4 dealing with the foundation, bedding, and backfill of the trench was discussed at length to provide the correct terminology, a default material (such as granular material) or CLSM and there was also discussion about when native material can be used for final backfill. Mr. Nebeker said MAG AB (from Section 702) was typically used and wondered if it met the requirements for granular material. Members said they would check on this. Matt Rogers said that for flexible pipe, you could refer to ASTM requirements for different classes A, B, C, etc.

Attendees also discussed the compaction requirements for the bedding and backfill. It was thought to go back to requiring 95% compaction from 1 foot above the top of the pipe to the bottom of the trench as shown in Table 601-2. (This is what Phoenix now requires.) Mike Sanders and Paul Nebeker discussed the methods of construction for development and CIP work, whether the bedding should be loose or not, and newer methods of compaction that do not require 8" lifts. Changes and updates to section 601 were carefully recorded by Mr. White who will make updates prior to submitting the revision to the full committee.

Mr. White said that he would make the same kind of changes to Section 603 where relevant to keep them consistent, and asked if there were any other areas of 603 that needed changes. One subsection discussed was the CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION OF INSTALLATION PROCEDURES. Mr. Veidmark said he thought this was taken care of by the certification that contractors are required to have. Mr. Nebeker recalled that it was added to the spec because there was a problem with an HDPE installation years ago, and members at the time wanted more control over the contractor's installation methods. Mr. Badowich thought this could be used as a two edged sword and suggested removing it.

Next the group review Section 615: Sewer Line Construction. Mr. White noted that this would be much smaller now, and assumed that the testing requirements would be moved into the proposed Section 611 and referenced. Mr. Veidmark suggested for the Jacking Pipe subsection, adding a reference to 607 in addition to 602. There was also consensus to make the Measurement and Payment sections consistent in 615 and 618.

For Section 618: Storm Drain Construction, there were questions about whether the rubber gaskets and other materials referenced in 618.2, should be specific and included in the separate pipe materials sections such as 738. Also elastomeric gaskets are used rather than rubber. Mr. White agreed with this idea, but thought this may need to be tackled as a separate future case.

5. Jacking Tunneling and Boring

Arvid Veidmark handed out the latest draft (version 6) of Section 607. It included additional revisions from Bob Herz, and replaces part of Section 618. Matt Rogers asked why Class V pipe was required. Mr. Veidmark explained that this was jacking of the pipe itself not casing, and that extra strength was needed. He said Mr. Herz suggested this case be completed prior to the revisions to Section 618. Mr. Tyus agreed that it should be done prior or concurrently with

Case 13-15. Mr. Badowich said he would work with Mr. Veidmark and sponsor the case at the next committee meeting.

Mr. Veidmark then handed out a new potential case for a new Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING FOR 2" AND SMALLER WATER SERVICES. Mr. Badowich asked why it was limited to water, since agencies also use the technology for dry utilities such as for ITS and street signals. Mr. Veidmark said he thought the direction from the committee was to start with water services, but that other options could be added. Other materials besides copper were also discussed. Members were asked to review the draft and provide feedback. He was also going to have industry representatives provide feedback.

6. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Water/Sewer working group is scheduled for Tuesday, April 22nd at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.