

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

August 4, 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
Jeff Benedict, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP
Tony Braun, NUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy)	Mike Smith, ARPA
Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Arturo Chavarria, Hanson Pipe
Ann Seiden, Southwest Gas
Kevin Thompson, Southwest Gas

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jesse Gonzales called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the July 7, 2010 meeting minutes. Bob Herz introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Jesse Gonzales seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2009 Cases (old cases)

a. Case 09-14 – Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance: *Revise Details 231, 232, 233 and 234 to obtain compliance with ADA requirements.* Bob Herz explained the new details 235-1 through 235-5 would replace details 231, 232, 233 and 234. He also explained minor corrections to the details including updating a dimension of the sidewalk width to 5' on 235-1 and removing a note on 235-3, replacing it with the dimension 'L'. Rod Ramos suggested rather than making the L_{\min} (subscript) in the tables to just put the minimum in parenthesis L (min) for clarity. Mr. Herz said these updates and other minor drafting corrections would be made to the details, and proposed to vote on the case at the next meeting.

b. 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 said he began drafting some changes based on feedback from the last Water/Pipe Working Group meeting to move parts of Section 611 into 610. Most of the concerns on pipe handling that prompted the case were addressed in the first subsections of 611 (Disinfecting Water Mains). There was discussion on whether there was enough time to complete and review these changes in time for a vote at the next meeting. Case sponsor Tom Wilhite expressed his preference to vote on the case as it currently stands, and have other changes proposed as a new case in 2011. Members agreed to vote on the case at the September meeting.

4. 2010 Cases (new cases)

c. Case 10-01 – Miscellaneous Bloopers: *Correct typographic errors.* Mr. Herz said he had no new bloopers this month, and asked if other members had any to add. Seeing no additions to the blooper cases, he proposed voting on all of them at the next meeting.

d. 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 dated 08/04/10 with final revisions to Sections 355 and 708 based on feedback received from Maricopa County. Jim Badowich asked about backfill requirements because the section view of Detail 212 allowed three options. Peter Kandaris that (Type B Only) could be added after the native soil and ABC backfill materials on the section view. Also it was noted that a 6" thickness dimension was needed. Tom Wilhite asked if CLSM slurry could be an option for the type B keyhole repair. There was discussion of the keyhole method, the epoxy

used, and the preference to use the native soil as part of the current process and technology. Members discussed other uses of the keyhole technology such as pothole repair, and making sure that all uses met the compaction requirements. Peter Kandarlis explained that a sonic sensor is used to test compaction. Bob Herz suggested adding a requirement that contractors provide the compaction documentation. Members discussed how to best allow agencies to specify different backfill options. Section 355.3.2 currently states “If mechanical compaction is not successful, the Contractor shall use ½ sack CLSM in accordance with Section 728.” Paul Nebeker said this type of language is a red flag for contractors. Rod Ramos agreed and Mr. Wilhite suggested to strike “successful” and replace it with “used.” There was also discussion about the moisture content requirements for native soil backfill. Michael Smith noted that it requires soil to be within 3 percent of optimum moisture content, but it does not provide any specifications to determine optimum moisture content. Due to extensive discussion and several proposed revisions, Warren White agreed to postpone a vote on the case until September. Revisions to the specifications and detail would be prepared for review in advance of the next meeting.

e. 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.* Peter Kandarlis said he has not received any comments, but hoped to receive some from Maricopa County. Mr. Herz said he would try to provide comments, time allowing. Mr. Kandarlis said most of the changes were just reorganizing and making the specifications consistent with the details. He proposed to vote on the case at the September meeting.

f. Case 10-05 – Revise FOREWORD: *Clarify use of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works document.* No comments or updates were submitted.

g. Case 10-08 – Revise Section 717 Asphalt Rubber. *Revise Section 717 ASPHALT-RUBBER to obtain a uniform specification.* Bob Herz said he planned to continue this case forward into 2011. Syd Anderson provided feedback and said Phoenix would continue to work with Maricopa County on this issue. Jeff Benedict supplied Maricopa County with asphalt rubber specifications from PAG, although Mr. Herz mentioned did not prefer the method they used.

h. Case 10-09 – Revise Safety Rail Detail 145. *Adjust Detail 145 to comply with AASHTO pedestrian loading requirements.* Mr. Herz said rather than adjust the spacing of the railing to meet the AASHTO requirements for bridge railing as previously proposed, he would keep the safety rail as is, but exclude it from use as bridge railing. He suggested adding a note 7. SAFETY RAIL IS NOT COMPLIANT WITH AASHTO BRIDGE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS AND IS NOT TO BE USED AS A PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE RAIL. He explained that AASHTO requires 50 lbs/linear ft loading for bridges, whereas the building code requires just 20 lbs/ft for other uses. Questions were raised as to whether box culverts would be considered bridges. Rod Ramos said he did not like the language “is not compliant.” It was agreed to strike that portion of the note so that it read 7. SAFETY RAIL IS NOT TO BE USED AS A

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE RAIL. Bob Herz proposed changing Note 1 to use Grade B steel pipe rather than Grade A. He said he would make these changes to the detail, and proposed to vote on the case at the next meeting.

i. 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. Jason Mahkovtz provided a copy of the City of Surprise Pavement Marker detail for comparison. Bob Herz said that one difference was that Surprise had markers closer to the center lines, but he felt that location could interfere with striping work. He said that cities would need to check with their fire departments to know specific requirements. Mr. Herz said he would like to vote on the case at the next meeting.

j. Case 10-11 – Revise Detail 110 – Plan Symbols. *Update and expand graphic standards to have plans be more uniform among MAG agencies.* Mr. Herz said no changes were made. Peter Kandarlis said SRP would be having an internal meeting on their standard symbols soon, and could provide feedback. Mr. Herz suggested a tentative vote at the next meeting.

k. 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.* Rod Ramos provided handouts that showed sample details and specifications for shallow depth conduit installation. He recognized that the specifications and details provided would need much revision, but wanted to begin the discussion of the use of this technology. He said the intent was for use in residential areas. He described Scottsdale's experience with this process on a private road in the McDowell Mountain Ranch development. The details showed a preferred location for the micro-trench. He further described the process of making a saw cut, installing the conduit and filling the trench with a slurry grout, and capping with an asphalt sealant. The committee discussed the depth requirements, and noted that most agencies currently do not allow utilities at a shallow depth. Mr. Ramos said he also wanted to investigate this method for repairing large transverse cracks. Peter Kandarlis described testing of this method at SRP, but said they typically did not have use for it. Members questioned how the grout was applied in the cut. Mr. Ramos said it was pumped into the void. He also said Paradise Valley used this option on a project. Tom Wilhite asked about splices and junctions. Rod Ramos said the utilities were dropped out of the street and placed in a junction structure.

l. 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 provided additional revisions to the case. He noted that with the changes, Section 765 was no longer necessary and should be removed entirely. He also said that there were a few other references to rubber gaskets in the MAG specifications that would be updated. Peter Kandarlis said the revisions are consistent with what SRP

uses. Mr. Tobiasson said he would have an updated final version for the next agenda packet, and proposes to call for a vote on the case next month.

5. General Discussion:

Blue-Stake Paint Requirements

Warren White of Chandler asked if other members had problems with contractors using paint that was not water-based—making it difficult to remove, especially from porous concrete. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has also had problems with this issue, including instances where contractors would use black paint to cover-up prior paint rather than remove it. Members stated that the blue-stake requirements put out by the Corporation Commission require the use of water-based paint, so this may be an enforcement issue.

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

Mr. Kandaris provided an update on work done during the July 27th meeting. He said the group completed the piping section, describing the process of reviewing existing MAG specifications and details. He said the next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday August 24 at 1:30 p.m. at the ARPA office. The topic will be concrete flatwork and pavement. It will include asphalt pavements, sidewalks and most concrete work except structures. He encouraged participation by agency members and also vendors, who can provide the group with possible new materials or processes that are applicable to areas outside the right-of-way. Mr. Kandaris said going through the list was 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.

Water/Pipe Working Group Update

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 19 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Palo Verde room.

ASTM Portal

Gordon Tyus said all committee members have been sent a username and password to begin using the ASTM portal. He also said that the MAG IT department is currently testing an application to allow general access through a portal on the MAG web server. Several committee members provided positive comments on their recent use of the service. Mr. Tyus said that the portal page would allow users to register as super-users, but that in the meantime he would work with members to set-up additional super-users. He also asked members to provide contacts with public works officials at other MAG member agencies (that do not have representatives on the committee) so that these agencies can also take advantage of the service.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.