

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

June 4, 2003

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

David Fern, Chandler	* Keith Kesti, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
* Pat Thurman, Glendale	* Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
* David Ramirez, Goodyear	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Ted Collins, MCDOT	Brett Huskey, Surprise
* Steven Borst, MCESD	James Bond, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Brian Gallimore, AGC	* Tom Domizi, NUCA
* Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP
Paul Nebeker, NUCA	* Sean Goris, ACEA
Jeff Benedict, ARPA	John Ashley, ACA
* Baird Fullerton, ACEC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Joe Phillips, Maricopa County Dept. of Trans.	Tom Kmetz, City of Mesa
Robert Herz, Maricopa County Dept. of Trans.	Peggy Brown, City of Phoenix
Jennifer Brown, Federal Highway Adm.	Bruce Eaton, City of Phoenix
Dennis G. Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Adm.	R. A. Goemaat, City of Chandler
Dale Phelan, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.	Pete Boris, City of Chandler
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.	Bill Naugle, On-Direct
Michael E. Hook, Hanson Pipe & Products.	Herb Hacker, Stantec Consulting
Stan Trussur, Arizona Rock Products Assoc.	
Trevor M. Skro, CenterLine Supply West	

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of March 5, 2003. Paul Nebeker noted that he attended the meeting where the minutes reflected otherwise. Jeff Van Skike introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes with the one exception. Mark Weir seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. Presentation on ADA Requirements:

Jennifer Brown of the Federal Highway Administration addressed the committee regarding truncated domes. She started the presentation with a history of curb ramps and the steps leading up to the truncated dome requirement. Ms. Brown answered a number of questions asked by the committee. A summary of the question/answers are as follows: The truncated domes apply to all projects, federally and locally funded. The ADA laws are a part of the Civil Rights Laws and are enforced equally to all types of work. Based on information provided in the October 2002 meeting of the Access Board, the Board is conducting additional research or studies on the issue of truncated domes. Ms. Brown was not aware of any further research or studies by the Access Board. She will research the subject and return with her findings. Normally, a cost analysis is conducted by the Government prior to the implementation of a law. Ms. Brown was not aware of any studies. Even though the web site for the ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities is not complete (curb ramps), there are ample guide lines to provide adequate direction for the installation of the domes, such as: March 2003 Technical Assistance Memo. The agencies will need to enforce and defend the domes per the laws and other directives as provided by the Access Board. The only remaining items that are not resolved are small in nature, such as dimensions, patterns, etc.

4. 2002 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 02-03 - Corrections for Asphalt Concrete Deficiencies:** At the onset of this case Joe Phillips intended to correct a handful of items, e.g., air voids, density, more defined penalties for substandard work, etc. The current case has completed his objectives. He did not intend to rewrite the complete section. If any member wanted further changes, Joe will need the changes submitted in written format. Jeff Benedict informed the committee that ARPA and AGC have formed a subcommittee for rewriting Section 321.6, and they should be complete with their work before the next meeting. Jeff would like the committee to consider the revised case.
- b. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** There was no discussion on this case however, the comments provided by Joe Phillips on Case 02-03 apply to this case as well. Joe will be revising the Marshal Mix Design to a 50-blow test.
- c. **Case 02-14 - Section 738.5 - Third Party Certification for HDPE:** Rod Ramos submitted a revised case for the Committee's review and final comments. The revised case is the composite of all comments received. Rod provided a short discussion on the changes in the case.
- d. **Case 02-15/17 - Sections 603.2 and 601.1 - Trench Width:** See discussion in Case 02-14.
- e. **Case 02-16 - Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation:** See discussion in Case 02-14.

- f. **Case 02-18 - Section Bedding by Water Consolidation:** Rod Ramos submitted a revised case for the Committee's review and final comments. The revised case is the composite of all comments received. Rod provided a short discussion on the changes in the case. Paul Nebeker stated that the 8-inch lifts are seldom followed in the field and that adequate compaction can be obtained. Also, Paul stated that there is a wide variance between agencies on the handling of the compaction in the pipe zone. Peter Kandaris suggested a generic specification that if the contractor can achieve the compaction requirements, the 8-inch lift can be waved. However, the pipe manufacturers would not agree to that wording. Peter will work on some different wording and submit it to Rod.
- g. **Case 02-20 - Section 601.2.2.1 Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes:** Rod Ramos submitted a revised case for the Committee's review and final comments. The revised case is the composite of all comments received. Rod provided a short discussion on the changes in the case.

5. 2003 Cases

- a. **Case 03-01A - Miscellaneous Bloopers:** There was no discussion on this case.
- b. **Case 03-03 - Details 252, 253 and 254 - Bus Bays:** Rod Ramos provided copies of the City of Scottsdale bus bays for consideration and the committee's review. Rod discussed some of the differences between Scottsdale's detail and that of Phoenix. Ted Collins noted that the decorative sidewalk surface will not be in the new detail. Also, Doug Davis noted several differences between the Mesa Detail and that of Scottsdale and Phoenix. A key difference was the 8-foot wide sidewalk. This extra width provides for movement of pedestrian traffic with that of the persons waiting for the bus. Tom Kmetz, noted that 8-foot was also required to provide ample space for wheel chairs to maneuver onto bus ramps.
- c. **Case 03-04 - Section 718 - Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete:** Jeff Benedict noted that some of the tests required in the specification are quite expensive and questioned the need for such tests. Doug Davis stated that some of these tests were critical and are necessary. Doug also noted that some of the special tests will not be needed on a regular basis. Peter Kandaris noted that Type C was skipped. This could be confusing. To clarify the deletion of Type C, the wording such as "Type C: Not used." will need to be included in the description of the types of seals.

6. New Cases:

- a. No new cases were submitted.

7. General Discussion:

- a. Ted Collins asked the members how they are controlling cracking in valley gutters and driveway entrances. None of the members increased the strength of the concrete to control the cracking. When needed most members required a thicker (8-inch) entrance.

8. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.