

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

July 7, 2010

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	Mike Samer, Mesa
Scott Zipprich, Buckeye	Jesse Gonzales, Peoria, Chairman
Warren White, Chandler	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
* Dennis Teller, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Edgar Medina, Gilbert	Mark Palichuk, Queen Creek
Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale	* Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Vice Chairman	* Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Shimin Li, Maricopa County (Envir. Div.)	Tom Wilhite, Tempe
Bob Herz, MCDOT	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

* John Ashley, ACA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Amanda McGennis, AGC (proxy)	Yvonne Martinez, SRP (proxy)
Kwigs Bowen, NUCA	* Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Tony Braun, NUCA	Mike Smith, ARPA
* Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Bill Davis, NUCA
Brian Schram, Rinker Materials
Ann Seiden, Southwest Gas

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jesse Gonzales called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the June 2, 2010 meeting minutes. Jesse Gonzales noted a misspelling of “committed” in the last sentence on Case 09-15. Warren White introduced a motion to accept the minutes with the correction noted by Mr. Gonzales. Tom Kaczmarowski seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2009 Cases (old cases)

a. Case 09-13 – ADA-Compliant Dual Sidewalk Ramps: *Develop ADA-compliant details for 35-foot and 20-foot corner radius dual sidewalk ramps.* Case sponsor, Jesse Gonzales, withdrew the case for consideration with the intention reintroducing it in the future when he has more time to devote to it. He also suggested a working group on this issue may be appropriate.

b. Case 09-14 – Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance: *Revise Details 231, 232, 233 and 234 to obtain compliance with ADA requirements.* Bob Herz passed out revised detail drawings with all the ramp details renumbered (235-1 through 235-5) to simplify the references to different ramp options. Mr. Herz asked if the committee had any preference on how sidewalks wider than 5’ would be brought into the ramp – either by moving the sidewalk closer to the curb as shown on detail 235-1, or moving the sidewalk back to be even with the end of the ramp. He asked members to send him any additional comments.

c. Case 09-15 – Revisions to Section 610.4 for Water Line Handling: *Modify Section 610.4 to clarify water line pipe protection measures at the job site prior to placement (during storage or staging) to help prevent contamination.* Chairman Gonzales asked case sponsor Tom Wilhite if he thought it was ready for a vote in August. Mr. Wilhite said he had no further changes but was waiting for feedback from the Water/Pipe working group. Vice-chair Troy Tobiasson said they discussed this as a priority issue for the working group to address. Mr. Tyus advised that since this case was introduced in 2009, time was running out on it, and suggested that if additional changes could not be completed this year, the case could be withdrawn and reintroduced later, or the language as now submitted could be voted on, with a new case to be submitted in the future to address additional changes, if needed.

4. 2010 Cases (new cases)

d. Case 10-01 – Miscellaneous Bloopers: *Correct typographic errors.* Bob Herz provided a new blooper case (10-01f) to correct typographic errors in Table 702-1. Mr. Herz suggested leaving the case open in case additional errors were found.

e. Case 10-02 – Utility Pothole Repair: *Revise and add keyhole repair to Detail 212 and add new Sections 355 and 708.* Warren White provided a handout with revisions to

Sections 355 and 708 based on feedback received from Maricopa County. Since the revisions were fairly extensive, Mr. White proposed postponing the vote until next month, and asked for feedback from members. Mr. Herz commented that notes in Detail 212 should be consistent with the CLSM specifications.

f. Case 10-03 – Modify Section 336 Pavement Matching and Surfacing Replacement: *Revise Section 336 to be in conformance with changes made last year to Detail 200-1 and Detail 200-2.* Yvonne Martinez, substituting for Peter Kandaris, asked for additional comments. During the June meeting, Mr. Kandaris suggested a vote during the August meeting.

g. Case 10-05 – Revise FOREWORD: *Clarify use of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works document.* Jesse Gonzales provided updated versions of the Foreword to the MAG Specifications, and also a Foreword for the proposed specifications for outside the right-of-way. Mr. Gonzales confirmed that both were considered part of this case, and asked for comments from the committee.

h. Case 10-06 – Revise Controlled Low Strength Materials (CLSM) Specifications: *Update the CLSM specifications in Sections 604 and 728 to match current industry standards.* Jeff Hearne of ARPA said the latest version was provided in the agenda packet, and made only minor changes from the previous month, which was to include language about rejecting ready-mix concrete without approval in both sections. Mr. Hearne said he was ready for a vote on the case. Mr. Gonzales moved, and Mr. Herz seconded the motion to approve Case 10-06 for adoption into the MAG Specifications and Details. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

i. Case 10-07 – Revise Detail 230 – Sidewalks to change minimum from 4’ to 5’: *Revise the minimum sidewalk width to match the minimum ADA requirements for two wheel chairs to pass, and to allow a wheel chair to u-turn.* Bob Herz asked if there were any comments on the case. Syd Anderson of Phoenix said that they intended to keep 4’ as a minimum sidewalk width, and that if the case passed they would use a supplement to keep Phoenix at 4’ because they have right-of-way issues in parts of the city. Mike Samer of Mesa said they also want to keep the 4’ minimum. Bob Herz said that 5’ minimum sidewalks were required to meet ADA requirements unless the sidewalk was periodically widened to allow wheelchairs to pass each other. Mr. Samer said Mesa did use this option. Bob Herz said many jurisdictions that use the MAG specifications, may not be aware that the detail currently in MAG does not meet ADA, and thought that it should be at least 5’ minimum because it would satisfy ADA without additional modifications. Members also discussed right-of-way issues, and said that 5’ sidewalks do fit inside the typical 50’ ROW, including parkways, but they could also be affected by local zoning requirements. Mr. Herz moved, and Mr. Tobiasson seconded the motion to approve Case 10-07 for adoption into the MAG Specifications and Details. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 9 yes, 3 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

j. Case 10-08 – Revise Section 717 Asphalt Rubber. *Revise Section 717 ASPHALT-RUBBER to obtain a uniform specification.* Bob Herz said he had no changes from the previous month, but was planning to incorporate feedback from Jeff Benedict of ARPA and was waiting for comments from other jurisdictions. Syd Anderson said he would provide comments from Phoenix by the next meeting. Mr. Herz asked for additional comments from any of the jurisdictions using rubberized asphalt.

k. Case 10-09 – Revise Safety Rail Detail 145. *Adjust Detail 145 to comply with AASHTO pedestrian loading requirements.* Mr. Herz said he had received a request to keep the safety rail as is, but exclude it from use as bridge railing. It was suggested that a note be added to the detail limiting its use. Scott Zipprich said that the railing does not meet UBC building code requirements, which means it cannot be used at a fire exit, or where building codes require a railing at a 42” or greater drop in elevation. Mr. Zipprich said he would also check on its use between lots at different elevations. Mr. Herz said the railing was on box culverts and headwalls. Additional comments were requested.

l. Case 10-10 – Proposed New Detail 122 – Pavement Marker for Fire Hydrants. *The new detail would standardize placement of fire hydrant markers and enhance public safety.* Bob Herz asked if members had comments on placement of the hydrant markers. He explained that they were not placed on the center lines to avoid conflicts with striping. Jami Erickson said the Phoenix fire department doesn’t use them because they are not replaced after street resurfacing. Mr. Herz said he thought the detail was needed so jurisdictions like Maricopa County would know where to replace them after street work.

m. Case 10-11 – Revise Detail 110 – Plan Symbols. *Update and expand graphic standards to have plans be more uniform among MAG agencies.* Mr. Herz asked if there were any symbols the committee did not like, or should not be included. In response to a question on how to distinguish between existing and proposed symbols, Mr. Tyus said the Symbols Working Group discussed using either screened or dashed symbols for existing symbols as determined by current jurisdiction practice. Mr. Herz said that he didn’t think the ‘A’ POLE W/TRAFFIC SIGNAL HEAD was necessary and planned to remove it since traffic symbols are more specialized.

n. Case 10-12 – New Section 361 – Shallow Depth Fiber Optic Micro-Conduit Installation. *Provide specifications for the installation of underground fiber optic micro-conduit telecommunications facilities within the public right-of-way.* The sponsor, Rod Ramos, was not present to answer questions about the case. Bob Herz said Maricopa County does not like this draft specification because it does not meet their minimum depth requirements. Other members had similar issues and recalled problems with shallow depth cable installations in the past.

o. Case 10-13 – Revisions to Subsection 618.2 and Section 765 Regarding Rubber Gaskets. *Revise RCP joint specifications to be consistent from section to section and to be consistent with industry standards as commonly accepted amongst agencies in the region.* Troy Tobiasson of Goodyear introduced this new case to correct inconsistencies between 50% and 60% rubber requirements of gaskets. He said manufacturers do not

make gaskets with 60% rubber, and suggested the specifications be modified to reference national specifications such as ASTM C 443. Bob Herz suggested that for street work AASHTO specifications may be more appropriate. Brian Schram of Rinker Materials assisted Mr. Tobiasson in developing the case and was present to provide information on current practice in the industry. Mr. Herz, Mr. Schram and Mr. Tobiasson said they would get together after the meeting to clarify and mark-up suggested changes, and submit them at the next meeting.

5. General Discussion:

Specifications and Details Outside the Right-of-Way Working Group Update

Yvonne Martinez relayed that Mr. Kandarlis was sorry that he was unable to attend the June 29th working group meeting, but proposed the next meeting of the working group be scheduled for Tuesday, July 27th at 1:30 at the ARPA office. Jeff Hearne said he would check with ARPA to reserve the space. Jesse Gonzales said he filled in for Peter Kandarlis at the last meeting using the check list Mr. Kandarlis provided as a guide. Mr. Gonzales said the list was very helpful in not only determining if a detail or specification applied outside the right-of-way, but also if it needed to be revised or removed from the MAG Specifications and Details book.

Water/Pipe Working Group Update

Troy Tobiasson gave a brief summary of the June 16th meeting and asked if there was a better meeting day so more people could attend. By process of elimination Thursdays were determined to be the best day for members to participate. The working group meetings would then be scheduled for the third Thursday of the month, which for the next meeting would be July 22nd at 10:00 at the MAG office. Jami Ericson said Larry Smith or Lucy Graham would attend from Phoenix. Shimin Li of Maricopa County would try to attend along with Mr. Tobiasson, Mr. Badowich, Mr. Zipprich, Mr. Gonzales and a representative from NUCA.

Reclaimed Water

Jesse Gonzales said he has been participating in a working group of the state blue-ribbon panel on water sustainability that focused on the retrofit and infrastructure of reclaimed water systems. He explained that the working group identified a goal of bringing reclaimed water specifications and regulations to a state-wide level, and that this could cause local municipalities to lose their ability to manage their reclaimed water facilities and infrastructure. He said he was asked to attend the next meeting of the MAG intergovs to explain the situation. Gordon Tyus said the intergovs were supplied a list of the committee membership, so they may be contacting you about this issue. Other related issues discussed included permits required by the County Health department for use of reclaimed water, and the use of reclaimed water in concrete mixes.

ASTM Portal

Gordon Tyus said that since we are in the new fiscal year, funding for this project was available, and he was looking for guidance from the committee to move forward. Amanda

McGinnis asked if advisory members serving on the committee also had access. Mr. Tyus believed the current proposal by ASTM did not include access by advisory members, but only member agencies, but that he would check with ASTM to see if some accommodation could be made for advisory members currently on the committee. Mr. Gonzales proposed a motion to recommend that MAG implement the ASTM Portal project. Mr. Tobiasson seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.