

MEETING MINUTES FROM THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

April 4, 2012

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	Javier Setovich, Peoria
Craig Sharp, Buckeye (proxy)	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Warren White, Chandler	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Lance Calvert, El Mirage	* Marc Palichuk, Queen Creek
Greg Crossman, Gilbert	Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
* Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Chair	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Vice Chair
Bob Herz, MCDOT	* Jim Fox, Youngtown
* Bob Draper, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Doug Laquey, ARPA (proxy)
* James Hacket, NUCA (proxy)	Peter Kandaris, SRP
Kwigs Bowen, NUCA	* Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Bradley Gallimore, AGC (proxy)	
Brad Parker, AGC (proxy)	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Art Glover, Flood Control District of Maricopa County

1. Call to Order

Chairman Troy Tobiasson called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No public comment was provided.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the March 7, 2012 meeting minutes. Greg Crossman introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Warren White seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Review of 2011 Carry Forward Cases

4. Case 11-02 – Safety Edge Detail

Add an Asphalt Pavement Safety Edge option to Detail 201. Bob Herz handed out a revised detail drawing dated 4/4/2012. The revised detail dropped the specialized overlay option. He said that although there was discussion at the last meeting of removing the text about pay limit for subgrade preparation, MCDOT engineers would prefer to keep it in to ensure it is a separate pay item. The detail also added compaction requirements for the replacement shoulder. The overlay uses a saw-cut operation to even the edge. Mr. Herz said that if the width of the cut is greater than 1', the existing pavement would need to be repaired before applying the overlay. Jeff Benedict asked what material was used on the shoulder. Mr. Herz said it would be the existing material. There was discussion about whether the existing material would be able to meet the 95% compaction requirement. Mr. Herz said this is the same requirement for new shoulders, adding the existing material usually is pretty good. Mr. Laquey said it is difficult to get consistent compaction measurements on shoulders. It was suggested that the Type A detail be moved above the Type B in the layout, and that the detail number be corrected to 201.

5. Case 11-03 – Replace Cadmium Plated Bolts.

Replace cadmium plated bolts referenced in Section 610.13 with zinc plated bolts as described in ASTM-B633. Javier Setovich said he prepared a revised version of the case, which was discussed at the last water/sewer working group meeting. He said he expected revisions to be made at the next working group meeting, and then bringing it back to the full committee.

6. Case 11-12 – Modifications to Regulatory Requirements, MAG 107

Add references to Arizona native plant requirements and update references to state statutes. Mr. Kandarlis handed out a revised copy that added modifications to Section 107.2 (Item 2) based on a request from the City of Phoenix. Jami Erikson said Phoenix wants language to

make sure permits are not only obtained, but maintained and closed properly. There was discussion about the timing of different kinds of permits.

7. Case 11-14: Update Fire Hydrant Details

Update Detail 360-1, and add Wet Barrel Option (360-2) and Details (360-3). Craig Sharp, substituting for Scott Zipprich said they are making changes to redlined drawings and plan to bring them to the next water/sewer meeting. After review next month he suggested a possible vote at the following committee meeting.

8. Case 11-16: Modify Section 415: Steel Flexible Metal Guardrail

Update Section 415 based on the Maricopa County Supplement. Reference New Details. Peter Kandaris handed out a revision that added language about guardrail end treatments being determined by agency requirements. He asked members if they had any feedback regarding a preference on referencing MCDOT or ADOT details. He also said he had done some research into common options for temporary end treatments, since the referenced detail 135-4 no longer exists. Mr. Kandaris said sand and water barrels were common. Warren White said blunt-nosed collapsible types were also common. Mr. Kandaris said he would work on wording for these and come up with a default option using the MUTCD as a reference.

9. Case 11-18: Update Section 350: Removal of Existing Improvements

Add language in Section 350.2 for utility removal, and payment requirements. Mr. Kandaris said he did not receive any comments and would like to vote on it in June. Rod Ramos asked if the county was removing abandonments. Bob Herz was not sure, but several members said ADOT was. Tom Wilhite asked if the case should be reviewed by the AUCC (a utilities group). There was also discussion about whether to remove the ARS reference to the blue stake law, since they were being removed from section 170. Mr. Kandaris said he was asked previously to add it. Bob Herz recommended leaving it in. There was discussion about the requirements for showing abandonments on as-builts. Jami Erikson said many of the requirements are provided in the blue stake law. She said Phoenix's policies for as-builts depend on where in the city the project is located. For example in downtown, abandonments are not allowed, but they may be in outlying areas. Jim Badowich asked if MAG should develop specifications for as-builts. Tom Wilhite asked if it should include underground or surface or both, and if a working group should investigate it further. Warren White also asked about irrigation and landscaping. Recruiting a member or assistance from the AUCC was discussed.

10. Case 11-21: Add new Section 623: Special Bedding for Mainline Storm Drain Pipe

Incorporate City of Phoenix supplement 623 into the MAG standards. Since Syd Anderson had not arrived at the meeting yet, Jim Badowich said it could be discussed during the Water/Sewer Working Group report later.

New 2012 Cases

11. Case 12-01: Miscellaneous Corrections

Correct References on Detail 160. Gordon Tyus said that the packet included Detail 160 Chain Link Fence. He noted that there was a typo in the notes. It should refer to Section 772, not 722.

12. Case 12-02: Asphalt Concrete Low Traffic Gyration Levels

Modify Section 710 Asphalt Concrete to include low traffic gyration level specifications. Jeff Benedict provided new handout and asked Doug Laquey to describe the changes. Mr. Laquey said the case reduces the gyration levels for low volume traffic areas, and changed the testing requirements from AASHTO to ASTM. The reason for the change was the AASHTO testing added a freeze/thaw test that is not needed in our climate. This previously was removed using an exception, but switching to ASTM would not require the exception since it was not included. The ASTM test also has more leeway in the voids, which allows faster testing. Troy Tobiasson asked if the changes decreased gyrations. Mr. Laquey explained that it did for low volume roads because you can do back calculations to determine requirements. This allows greater binder content in low volume roads which helps reduce wear due to weather.

13. Case 12-03: Revisions to Detail 250-2 DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES

Update Sidewalk Widths to 4' in Detail 250-2 Driveway Entrances. Bob Herz provided an updated drawing with additional redlines to reduce the amount of concrete paving, and still meet the ADA four foot width requirement. The revised version made it more compact by making the travel lane parallel to the slope edge line of the ramp. This did create some irregular shapes and weird angles as the 5' sidewalk narrowed to 4' around the driveway entrance. Peter Kandarlis was not sure how the joints would work. Bob Herz said he would work with his drafters to draw up a cleaner version for the committee to review at the next meeting.

14. Case 12-04: Revisions to Section 317: Asphalt Milling

Revise Asphalt Milling to address dust control measures on milled surfaces open to traffic. Jeff Benedict said the new version addressed comments at the last meeting. He noted that the additional fog seal was incidental, and not a separate pay item. There was discussion about clarifying the wording so contractors would know this and that it was clear when this process would be used for dust control. Syd Anderson said this process has worked for Phoenix. Mr. Benedict asked if members had suggestions for word-smithing the final version, to please forward them to him. Syd Anderson suggested making final revisions during the next asphalt working group meeting. Mr. Benedict said any modifications would be included in the agenda packet so that it could be voted on during the May meeting.

15. Case 12-05: Modifications to Table 711-1

Revise Paving Asphalt Performance Grading System Requirements. Jeff Benedict introduced a new case with a handout that superseded the one included in the packet. It updates the testing requirements for paving asphalt in Table 711-1 from AASHTO tests to ASTM. Switching to the ASTM test would allow easier reference since members have access to the ASTM libraries online. Mr. Benedict said the ASTM and AASHTO tests currently are identical. Other changes included adding PG64-16 that is used extensively as both a regular binder and asphalt base for asphalt rubber; adding PG76-16 since it is used by ADOT; and deleting PG82 grade since it is not used or recommended for use in this climate. He also recommended deleting the direct tension test because unless you are using polymer-modified binders, if the dynamic shear and creep stiffness tests pass, the direct tension test always passes. Mr. Benedict said everything currently in MAG is not polymer-modified. Bob Herz suggested leaving the reference to the direct tension test, but noting that it is only used for polymer-modified asphalt. Mr. Benedict agreed to add back in and modify footnote 3.

16. Case 12-06: New Detail 249: Modified Entrance

Create a new entrance detail meeting ADA requirements for straight sidewalks. Warren White introduced a case to provide an ADA compliant detail for alley entrances based on one of Chandler's supplements. Bob Herz asked if there was a target slope since the grade of the street can have a big effect of the size of the ramps in order to keep the 1/12 max slope. He suggested adding the table from the other ramp details. Rod Ramos further discussed problems on hills and said special designs would be needed, and some limitation placed on when this detail could be used. Tom Wilhite suggested showing where the entrance matches the existing alley grade on the detail. Bob Herz said the walkway could be underwater when there is rain runoff. Rod Ramos suggested deleting the detectable warning strips, saying they are not typically used for driveways or alley entrances unless there is a lot of free-flowing traffic. He noted that they can also be broken by garbage trucks. Tom Wilhite recommended changing the width from 6' to 5' to be consistent with other sidewalk details. Bob Herz recommended changing the title to Alley Entrance and using the same number as the old detail it is replacing. (Note: was Detail 260.)

Mr. White also provided a directional sidewalk ramp detail for review as a possible future dual ramp case. Javier Setovich said Peoria has been installing dual ramps and would work with Mr. White on this issue. Bob Herz suggested transitioning from 6" curb to 4" curb which would allow for smaller ramps. He also noted that the triangular area near the detectable warning needs to be level, and can collect debris. Rod Ramos asked if the detectable warning had to be directional. Peter Kandariz suggested it be worked on by the concrete working group, since that group currently is working on the related Section 340.

17. Case 12-07: Revisions to Section 332.6: Protection of Uncured Surface

Add language to include a work plan for uncured slurry protection. Jami Erikson introduced a new case to add a work plan to Section 332.6 to prevent damage caused to the slurry seal by pedestrians, vehicles and other traffic. The revision would include the additional text, "A

work plan shall be submitted to the Engineer and the Owner providing uncured slurry protection details including the duration of protection, methods of protection and physical boundaries of the protective devices.” It was suggested to strike “and the Owner” since the engineer is the owner representative.

18. Case 12-08: Section 611: Disinfecting Water Mains – Addition of Refreshing Plans

Modify Section 611.17 to include a “Keep Fresh Plan” to assure safe water quality. Jami Erickson introduced this case to help keep water lines fresh after testing, but before final acceptance. New language would require contractors to turn over water in the lines every 10 days and to maintain permits and flushing logs. Javier Setovich said Peoria has extended water lines several times including for some unfinished subdivisions. She also said looped systems that keep the water circulating are less of a problem. When asked what size lines are at issue, Ms. Erickson said 16”-24” size typically.

19. Case 12-09: ASTM Updates

A. *Update ASTM references to steel standards in Section 770.* Peter Kandarlis introduced this case to continue updating ASTM specifications that were not completed in the 2012 edition. He researched the type of structural steel used in the region and recommended modifying Section 770.2 to include ASTM A36 for general purpose structural steel and ASTM A709 or A992 for high strength low-alloy structural steel. The handout included typical steel specifications used by a local supplier.

20. Other New and Potential Cases

Jami Erickson began to introduce two additional cases, but decided to work on them further in the water/sewer working group meetings before formally presenting them to the committee. The first was to add a sentence to Section 610.4 Construction Methods that states, “Pipe installation shall be completed as to not impose undue stress/forces to couplings, connections, supports, valves and instruments. Syd Anderson asked what was meant by “undue stress.” Ms. Erickson said she would take it to the working group for revisions and clearer specifications.

The second potential case Ms. Erickson introduced was to add Section 750.5 Mortar Lining Repair for ductile iron pipe. Bob Herz asked about tapping sleeves. Jami Erickson said this specification was for cut-ins. Other comments included researching and referencing ASTM or AWWA specifications, rather than manufacturer’s instructions. Jami Erickson said she would review and revise the language at the working group before introducing it as a case.

Troy Tobiasson said Detail 251: Return Type Driveways needs to be updated to be consistent with the changes made in Details 250-1 and 250-2. This includes using class A instead of class B concrete, and updating the charts and thickness to comply with class A use. Jim Badowich suggested changing the radius. Currently it shows a 10’ maximum, but Avondale typically uses a 20’ radius for return type driveways, and many other agencies have larger

ones as well. Peter Kandarlis said he could bring this up at his working group meeting, and would compare existing supplements.

21. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson asked for reports from the working groups.

a. **Water/Sewer Issues Working Group**

Jim Badowich said the group met on March 20th. He summarized the group's discussions on the cadmium bolt case, and the suggestion to modify for MAG precast manhole base details and specifications developed by Buckeye. (See notes provided in agenda packet.) He also described a presentation given by ADS on HDPE pipe installation, and noted that their requirements do not precisely match the MAG tables. Mr. Kandarlis said that since the pipe is designed for a 5% deflection, the presenters said they would supply information on the actual deflection, which would affect design under streets and structures. Mr. Badowich said there may need to be a separate set of specifications for flexible pipe installation and testing. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 17th at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

b. **Specifications and Details Outside the Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandarlis said they met after the water/sewer group meeting where they discussed revisions to the cases previously. He discussed some potential new cases including modification of the bollard detail (240) to provide a lockable option. He said Mesa and the flood control district have examples. Tom Wilhite said the group wanted to investigate updating the liquidated damages table, and perhaps provide a cost index adjustment. Mr. Kandarlis also said he was reviewing sign post supplements, and hoped to provide the most common options with a standardized detail. Finally, there was discussion at the working group about how to handle fire line valve installation. Tempe has a detail, but this may be more appropriate in an Outside ROW manual than the MAG specs. The next meeting will follow the Water/Sewer group on April 17th; however, future meetings will likely be at a different time.

c. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the group worked on the cases previously described as described in the meeting notes included in the packet. He asked Syd Anderson on the status of revisions to Section 321. Mr. Anderson said they wanted to clarify what the compaction targets are. The next meeting is scheduled for April 26th at Noon at the ARPA office. Lunch will be provided.

d. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore was not in attendance, so no update was provided.

e. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne was not in attendance; however, notes from the March 21st meeting were provided in the agenda packet. The next meeting will follow the April 26th asphalt working group at 1:30 p.m. at the ARPA office.

22. Open General Discussion

Jim Badowich asked if the low lead requirements case in the 2012 edition met the new standards and the phasing out of existing inventory. Jami Erikson said that it referenced the NSF requirements directly, so it should be fine as currently written.

There was a short discussion about unfinished subdivisions that have had waterlines put in, but were never completed. Jami Erikson said Phoenix is reviewing them, and if they add to their system they will take ownership. It depends on the system, because there has been much theft and damage. If the system is not completed, than future developers will have to reappear/replace it.

23. Adjournment:

Mr. Tobiasson adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.