

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

Page 1 of 10

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY OF THE MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

September 24, 2015

Detailed information about each case is provided on the 2015 Specs and Details Cases Under Consideration page on the MAG website.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>

Most case files include a cover memo listing the purpose of each case and proposed changes. The final version of the working cases are posted, which often include the strike-through changes and other discussion points.

Further discussion on the cases is available in the committee meeting minutes which are posted separately for each meeting. Links can be found on the Standard Specifications & Details Committee page.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Committees/Committee.asp?CMSID=1055>

Final summary materials for review of the 2016 Revision to the 2015 Edition of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction manual including detailed attendance and voting records are posted on the Specifications & Details Public Works Directors Review Deadline page.

<http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=8225>



2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
	CARRY FORWARD CASES FROM 2014						
14-03	Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details. Revisions to Section 415 and/or inclusion of MCDOT guardrail details.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	01/08/2014	Withdrawn	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Maricopa County is planning to change to 31” high (instead of 28”) guardrails, based on a recommendation from FHWA. This Midwest Guardrail System has splice points located between posts. It is still a strong post system, but with the splice points located between the posts the W-beam is less prone to tearing. The new 31” high guardrail system will be used for new installations. Existing 28” high guardrail will remain in place and be maintained; no retrofitting is needed or planned.</p> <p>Since MAG currently refers to the County details, once the County adopts new details, MAG would need to either update the specifications to match the County details, or add the existing County details into the MAG details. At this time, the County has not completed the specifications and details for this new system of guardrails, so the case was withdrawn in 2015.</p>						
14-06	Case 14-06: Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete, and Section 334.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	02/05/2014 09/01/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	11 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>This case updates Section 718 PRESERVATIVE SEAL FOR ASPHALT CONCRETE to include the most common type of sealants currently in use, and updates the specifications and testing requirements for them as appropriate. This case was reviewed by the Asphalt Working Group and received input from industry experts and manufacturers.</p> <p>Table 718-1 was thoroughly updated with current ASTM testing procedures. A new “Type E” polymer modified rejuvenating emulsion (PMRE) was added to the list of allowable products. There was discussion about adding a new subsection for seal coating, but it was decided to address this in a later revision. The case also added the “Type E” option in Section 334, as well as fixing a reference back to Section 718.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
14-12	Case 14-12: Proposed revisions to Sections 336, 321.10.3, 601.2.7 and Detail 200-1 and 200-2. Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	06/04/2014 05/18/2015	Approved 08/05/2015	13 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed revisions to Sections 336.3 and 336.4 to add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips. Revisions were also made in Sections 321, 601 and Details 200-1 and 200-2. Some discussion included concerns that it may require contractors to determine design issues in the roadway. There was also concern about increasing the amount and cost of pavement replacement. Revisions made to the case during 2015 addressed these issues and also:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified location restrictions for full depth longitudinal joints for asphalt pavement widening and for asphalt pavement trench repairs. 2. Defined a vertically offset joint as an alternative for full depth sawed joint. Added an offset joint section view on Detail 200-1. 3. Added pavement removal requirements when replacing existing curb or gutter. 4. Added requirement for asphalt pavement edge replacement to have a safety edge or thickened edge constructed per Detail 201 except when the asphalt edge abuts a concrete curb or gutter. 5. Required trenching into portland cement concrete pavement, sidewalk, or other concrete flatwork to require complete joint to joint replacement of damaged panels. Type C Trench Repair in Detail 200-1 was deleted. 6. Adjusted the measurement for trench surface replacement to include the extra area required to eliminate narrow edge remnants and to move full depth asphalt cuts outside of defined lane wheel paths. 						
14-17	Case 14-17: Create New Section 322 Decorative Asphalt Placement. Provide specifications for materials and methods.	Materials WG	Brian Gallimore	07/09/2014 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	11 0 1	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed creating a new SECTION 322 DECORATIVE ASPHALT. The specification was based on supplements from Gilbert and Scottsdale for Asphalt Stamping. The title was changed to include decorative asphalt coloring without stamping. The case was reviewed by the Asphalt Working Group and several agencies including Maricopa County. The material specifications for the asphalt surfacing system properties (Table 322-1) were updated to include ASTM testing specification requirements. A clear coat sealant is typically used and was included in the specification. The committee also wanted to include a two year warranty from flaking, wearing and defects.</p> <p>During the meeting prior to voting on the case, the committee updated the language including changing “bid” to “contract documents” and other minor updates for clarification. These changes are listed in the 09/02/2015 committee meeting minutes.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
	NEW CASES FOR 2015						
15-01	<p>Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections:</p> <p>A. Add omitted text to Section 735.1. Text was approved by Case 14-07 and merged into Case 13-15. Both cases were approved in 2014.</p> <p>B. Revise “OA” to Quality Assurance and “OC” to Quality Control in Section 710.</p> <p>C. Update notes in Detail 225.</p> <p>D. Correct Titles in Detail 270. Update section view.</p> <p>E. Remove a conflict between specification Section 206 and Section 601.</p> <p>F. Replace ‘Section 712’ with ‘Section 718’ in the third paragraph of Section 334.3.</p> <p>G: Correct Title of Section 345 to read: ADJUSTING FRAMES, COVERS AND VALVE BOXES</p>	MCDOT	Bob Herz	02/05/2014 08/24/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	The Miscellaneous Corrections case compiles minor updates due to typos, drafting errors, incorrect references, spelling, formatting and incomplete updates that were made in previous cases. The updates A-G were approved; however, changes to Detail 225 were superseded by revisions made in Case 15-07.						
15-02	Case 15-02: Adjust Fence Requirements to Reference ASTM F1043. Revise Section 772, Table 771-1 and Detail 145.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	01/07/2015	Approved 03/04/2015	15 0 1	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to adjust fence requirements to reference ASTM F1043 Standard Specification for Strength and Protective Coatings on Steel Industrial Fence Framework. The following revisions were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detail 145: Revise Note 1 to read as follows: Posts and rails shall be 1.90 inch outside diameter high strength heavy industrial steel pipe conforming to ASTM F1043 Material Group IA-2 (2.72 lb/ft, minimum yield strength = 50 ksi) or Material Group IC galvanized after forming (2.28 lb/ft, minimum yield strength = 50 ksi). 2. Specification Section 771 GALVANIZING: Modify Table 771-1 by adding ASTM F1043 groups IA and IC to the row for Steel Pipe – Rails and Post. 3. Section 772 CHAIN LINK FENCE: Revise the material requirements identified in 772.2 POSTS, RAILS AND BRACES. 						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-03	Case 15-03: Revise Section 601.4.5 trench final backfill placement requirements.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	02/04/2015 07/16/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to revise trench final backfill placement requirement of loose non-compacted material from two feet to layers not exceeding twelve inches in depth, and require agency approval for depths greater than 12.” It also added CLSM and granular material to the listing of acceptable materials for final backfill as presently shown on Detail 200-1. In Section 601.4.8, identification of the testing procedures required to determine the percent passing the 200 sieve was added.</p> <p>Initially the case identified types of compaction equipment that could vary the size of the layers, but during discussion it was determined that it would be best to allow the Engineer discretion rather than try and capture it in the specification. The final wording for the backfill placement requirement was:</p> <p>“Final backfill shall be placed in horizontal layers not more than twelve inches in depth before compaction. With Agency approval an increase in the loose non-compacted lift depth may be obtained for a project based on specific equipment, methods, and soil conditions. For approval of an increase of the loose non-compacted lift depth, the Contractor shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Agency that the required density shall be obtained using the Contractor identified equipment and methods. The loose lift height shall not be more than can be compacted to the required density with the equipment and methods being used.”</p>						
15-04	Case 15-04: Revise Section 602 Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing. Update ASTM references for casing material and add minimum casing wall thickness.	Water/Sewer WG	Arvid Veidmark	02/04/2015 02/24/2015	Approved 04/08/2015	13 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Case 14-04 was developed and reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group. Revisions to Section 602 included the following: The ASTM and API references have been updated, as well as the wall thickness for casing, as now shown in Table 602-1. Some rewriting was done in Section 602.3 paragraphs 1, 2 and 5 (see below). Requiring stenciling of the materials on the outside of the casing was an addition to the spec to allow easier verification on site.</p> <p>The following specs were added under Section 602.3 TRENCHLESS OPERATION:</p> <p>“The contractor shall submit a procedure detailing the trenchless installation method selected from 602.1 to be used for the project, if a geotechnical report is not available in the contract documents, the contractor shall define the soil limitation for the method selected.” “Survey of the bore alignment shall be taken prior to the installation of steel casing and taken after the installation of steel casing and shall be presented to the engineer.” “Unexpected loose soil conditions that do not accommodate the method submitted by the contractor, (horizontal earth auger boring, hand tunneling or pipe ramming), shall be brought to the agency attention to determine further course of action. Contractor shall stop boring until an alternative method is mutually agreed on.”</p> <p>Payment requirements were also clarified with the addition of this statement: "Payment for steel casing does not include payment for the carrier pipe, a separate payment will be made for the carrier pipe and any required testing of the carrier pipe."</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE
15-05	Case 15-05: Proposed Revisions to Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and NEW Reclaimed Valve Box detail.	Chandler	Warren White	03/04/2015 06/24/2015	Carry Forward	0 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
Summary	<p>A draft Detail 270-2, based on the City of Chandler supplement, was developed that used a square valve box for reclaimed water to differentiate it from round ones used for potable water. The draft detail was reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group as well as the main committee. The sponsor also reached out to a current manufacturer to get feedback and current shop drawings to help revise the draft detail. It was determined that the entire box was cast, and did not have machined surfaces. There was also discussion on labeling the box as “NON-POTABLE” rather than “RECLAIMED WATER.”</p> <p>Some agencies use the round valve box, but painted purple in order to distinguish it from normal boxes. Any new detail would also need to be appropriately referenced in Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction.</p> <p>Since the detail was still under review, the sponsor elected to carry the case forward for further work in 2016.</p>					
15-06	Case 15-06: Delete 744 ABS TRUSS PIPE AND FITTINGS.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	03/04/2015	Approved 05/06/2015	12 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of the case was to remove as an obsolete specification if MAG agencies no longer use or allow this type of pipe. Section 744.3.2 Material references ASTM D1788 which was withdrawn in 1988. Options presented were:</p> <p>1: Delete Section 744 in its entirety. Section 744 is only referenced in the Index. Since the specification has not been valid since 1988, it likely has not been be used in recent years and is no longer needed.</p> <p>2: Update the specification to delete references ASTM D1788 and be consistent with ASTM D2680 Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) and Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Composite Sewer Piping. The current version of ASTM D2680 includes material requirements for both ABS and PVC used for Truss Pipe and Fittings.</p> <p>Since no agency was still using ABS Truss Pipe, option 1 was selected and it was approved to delete Section 744 in its entirety.</p>					

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-07	Case 15-07: Revisions to Concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces, Section 342 and Detail 225.	Chandler	Warren White	03/04/2015 08/06/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The case proposed revisions to Detail 225 Concrete Pavers to depict pavers/decorative concrete on ABC for raised medians or other non-traffic areas. A revised detail was presented that incorporated pavers in raised median areas using a modified Chandler supplement. The new raised median section shows ABC base material rather than a concrete base required for traffic areas. The drawing also added details for contraction and expansion joints. The title of the drawing was changed to “INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS.”</p> <p>The case also made revisions to Section 342.3 Construction Standards, and other parts of Section 342 including retitling it as INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVER INSTALLATIONS. The type and size of pavers was updated in 342.2.4 Concrete Pavers to allow 60mm pavers in non-traffic areas. References for expansion joint filler and joint sealant were also updated. Under Construction Procedures, the required subgrade now references Section 301, and base course references 310. Also revised were the paragraphs on expansion joints, construction joints, and concrete pavers. Finally, subsection 324.4 MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT was split into two sections: MEASUREMENT and PAYMENT, with the later expanded to include information payment for pavers in non-traffic areas.</p>						
15-08	Case 15-08: Revisions to clarify Table 710-4 to eliminate misinterpretation of Criteria 8.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	04/08/2015	Approved 06/03/2015	14 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of Case 15-08 was to eliminate misinterpretation of Criteria 8 in Table 710-4. The way the current table is formatted, some readers believed that 3/8 inch mix and 1/2 inch mix are required to be designed for Low Traffic only and that 3/4 inch mix is required to be designed for High Traffic only. To clarify the specification it was proposed to relocate item 8 (Number of Gyration) as a new table in Section 710.3.2.2 prior to the existing Table 710-4. This new Table 710-4, requires renumbering the existing one as Table 710-5, and correcting all references to it.</p> <p>This case primarily addresses a formatting issue to clarify the intent, rather than making any actual changes to the requirements.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-09	Case 15-09: Miscellaneous revisions to Section 321: PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	04/22/2015 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The primary purpose for this case was to remove the placement temperature table and replace it with simple minimum placement temperature of 265 °F. The existing table was too complex and difficult to implement. The current approach can result in required minimum mix temperature changing multiple times during the day depending on environmental and weather conditions. This could result in mix being rejected which was produced at the plant based on original project conditions, but then change during transport. Also, temperature measuring devices being used on underlying base (infrared guns) are only accurate to approximately ± 20°F, potentially resulting in incorrect mix temperature being required.</p> <p>Several other parts of Section 321 were also updated as summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 321.10.2 - Added and/or revised wording for binder content and laboratory air voids to indicate that Contractor must obtain the approval of the Engineer to perform additional coring to determine the limits or extent of a deficiency. • 321.10.4 - Added and/or revised wording for pavement thickness to incorporate MCDOT sponsored changes approved by Asphalt Working Group. • 321.10.5.2- Added wording to indicate that acceptable in-place air voids must fall within a range; i.e. there is both a lower and upper limit. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted note from Table 321-5 related to in-place air voids since this table is intended to address laboratory air voids only. • 321.10.5.2- Revised wording for additional coring to correctly reflect intent of verifying a deficient in place air void test result. • 321.10.5.2- Added and/or revised wording to indicate that Contractor must obtain the approval of the Engineer to perform additional coring to determine the limits or extent of a deficiency. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted note from Table 321-8 and moved information into table itself to improve clarity. • 321.10.5.2- Deleted parentheses, space, and colon from heading of column 3 of Table 321-8 to match formatting in rest of Section 321. 						
15-10	Case 15-10: Add subsection 321.10.5.3 “Rehabilitation Work” into the MAG Specifications.	Materials WG	Brain Gallimore	06/03/2015 07/23/2015	Carry Forward	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Agencies have been specifying edge mill and overlay projects without requiring repair of substandard base (when encountered) due to funding issues. Currently, industry is being held to same standards on spot removals and edge mill/overlays as new construction over optimal base materials.</p> <p>A proposed new subsection 321.10.5.3 for Rehabilitation Work would allow for some relief on asphalt density when provisions for reworking substandard bases (removals) or existing asphalts (overlays) to meet Section 310 or Section 321 for overlays, are missing from bid documents or scope of work.</p> <p>Agencies were concerned that this could be used by contractors as an excuse for not meeting the current requirements when the status of the base material is unknown. The sponsor wished to develop clearer language and gather feedback from industry and agencies, so the case will be carried forward to 2016.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-11	Case 15-11: Incorporate revisions to Section 717, “Mix Design Requirements” into the MAG Specifications.	Asphalt WG	Jeff Benedict	06/03/2015 07/28/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>In 717.3.1 The case added clarification (in 717.3.1) regarding the mineral admixture calculation as prescribed under the Arizona Test Method 832. Currently admixtures are incorporated as a percentage of the total aggregate when submitting new designs and are approved as such. That is the admixture is seen as a percentage of the aggregate (totals 100%). The Arizona Test Method 832 is an ADOT method requiring admixtures to be back calculated after the aggregates are determined (totals 101 – 102% and must be back calculated to 100% proportionately by each percentage of contributing aggregates to the mix)</p> <p>For the MAG specification, it was clarified that the admixture was included in the total aggregates. The title of Table 717-3 added “WITH MINERAL ADMIXTURE.” And the following sentences were added under 717.3 MIX DESIGN REQUIREMENT: “(1) Mineral admixture shall be considered part of the total weight of aggregate and all combined specific gravity and combined absorption calculations for aggregates and mineral admixture will be done in accordance with Asphalt Institute’s Manual MS-2. (2) Course aggregate shall be separated from the fine aggregate on the #8 sieve.”</p> <p>The sieve size for Table 717-1 GRADATION REQUIREMENTS OF CRUMB RUBBER was also adjusted as needed.</p>						
15-12	Case 15-12: New Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.	Water/Sewer WG	Arvid Veidmark	06/03/2015 08/25/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>A new Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING (HDD) was developed to address this commonly used practice for which MAG currently has no specifications. The draft specification began with the sponsor getting assistance from an ASU engineering professor, and went through many revisions that were reviewed by the Water/Sewer Working Group, AZUCA and several utility companies including SW Gas and Cox Communications. The case was also thoroughly reviewed by Maricopa County, and received additional comments from the Specs and Details Committee.</p> <p>The proposed specification provides a description, definition of terms, and a Figure 608-1 that illustrates a typical HDD layout. The specification divides the types of HDD based on the size of the project, with different submittal requirements determined by the size of job as shown in Table 608-1. The vast majority of projects in the MAG region would fall under the “small” category that would require agency approved plans, personnel qualifications, bore data and as-builts. Additional submittal requirements for medium and large projects are shown in Table 608-2. Typical construction methods are outlined in 608.5 CONSTRUCTION and include information on the drilling equipment, guidance system and drilling fluid system, and the actual directional drilling operation.</p> <p>The operation includes first the drilling of a pilot hole, and then typically a reamer to enlarge the hole for the conduit, which is then pulled through. A minimum separation of 1’ for existing underground utilities is specified. During committee discussion, it was determined that additional separation would be required depending on the type of utility, so TABLE 608-3 was added to clarify these requirements.</p> <p>The final parts of the new specification included MEASUREMENT and PAYMENT requirements.</p>						

2015 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO MAG SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS

(Updated information can be found on the website: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1055&CMSID2=7154>)

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	MEMBER	SUBMITTAL DATE Last Revision	VOTE DATE	VOTE	
15-13	Case 15-13: Add text to Section 725.6 to identify what to include in a concrete mix design submittal.	Concrete WG	Jeff Hearne	06/03/2015	Carry Forward	0 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>Currently asphalt mix designs have specific requirements for mix design submittals. This case clarifies what should be included in a concrete mix design submittal in a similar way. A second paragraph was added under 725.6 MIX DESIGN PROPORTIONAING that stated: “A concrete mix design submittal shall include the mix identification number and the applicable proportions, weights, and quantities of individual materials incorporated into the mix including the size and source of concrete aggregates, the type and source of cement and fly ash or SCM, and the brand and designation of chemical admixtures or other additives.”</p> <p>The case also revised when modifications to the mix design do not require a new mix design submittal/approval in the sentence below: “(1) Modifications which do not result in batch target weights for the fine aggregate or combined coarse aggregates changing by more than 10 percent from the original approved mix design.”</p> <p>The proposed percentage was changed from 5 percent to 10 percent. To research this last proposed change further, the case sponsor requested to carry forward the case to 2016.</p>						
15-14	Case 15-14: Revise Sections 321 and 325 to coordinate overlay work requirements.	MCDOT	Bob Herz	06/03/2015 09/02/2015	Approved 09/02/2015	12 0 0	Yes No Abstain
Summary	<p>The purpose of this case is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate overlay work requirements within Sections 321 and 325. • Clarify measurement and payment for work associated with the construction of Safety Edges. • Eliminate the 10% overrun penalty for pavements less than 2.5 inches in thickness (overlays). • Add measurement and payment sections for Safety Edge Preparation for overlay projects that require construction of a safety edge when none exists. <p>This required updates to Section 321 for the Asphalt Concrete Overlay (321.8.6), Measurement (321.12) and Payment (321.13).</p> <p>It also made updates to Section 325. The first paragraph of 325.7.1 Surface Preparation now states, “The provisions for preparation of pavement surfaces in Section 321.8.6 (Asphalt Concrete Overlay) shall apply to ARAC overlays. Placement, compaction, and surface smoothness shall be as specified in this section.”</p> <p>325.7.2 Placing and Construction Methods added the reference for Safety Edges, “Safety edge construction when required shall comply with Section 321.8.9.”</p> <p>It also provides for the measurement and payment of Safety Edges in subsections 325.11 and 325.12 respectively.</p>						