

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

October 6, 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
Patrick Holmes, NUCA (proxy)	* Mike Smith, ARPA
Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Al Field, Field & Associates
Amanda McGennis, AGC

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jesse Gonzales called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the September 1, 2010 meeting minutes. Warren White introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Tom Wilhite seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2010 Cases (new cases)

a. 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 Kandaris went over the changes to Section 336 based on comments received from Maricopa County and the City of Chandler. Specifically, the first sentence of 336.2.4.1 was recommended to be deleted by the county because it had conflicts with other sections, and was covered by Table 710-1. Committee members agreed to this deletion and other changes in this section dealing with the thickness of the surface courses which were also covered in Table 710-1. Maricopa County also recommended deleting the last sentence of part (C) under this same section regarding the timing of surface course replacement. Members also concurred on this change. Mr. Kandaris said that Chandler recommended reducing the length from 600 feet to 300 feet in the sentence “For cuts greater than 600 feet in length the entire area shall be slurry seal coated in accordance with Section 332 or as otherwise specified.” There were no objections to this change. In Section 336.4 (B) it was recommended to revise the last sentence to match the 48” size of the T-Top repair as shown on Detail 200-1. Also under Payment (Section 336.5) it was recommended to add a sentence noting that payment should include the cost of replacing pavement markings. Tom Wilhite asked if payment for valve adjustments should also be added, but the consensus of the committee was to make that a separate pay item. Other changes to Section 336 were recommended to be postponed and taken up in a new case next year. These included clarifying wording and intent throughout, addressing temporary pavement replacement requirements, and to review the use of ‘portland cement concrete pavement (PCCP)’ terminology in section 336, 324, and Detail 200-1. Mr. Kandaris moved to approve Case 10-03 with the changes discussed and agreed upon. The motion was seconded by Bob Herz. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

b. Case 10-05 – Revise FOREWORD: *Clarify use of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works document.* No comments or updates were submitted. Case to be continued in 2011.

c. Case 10-08 – Revise Section 717 Asphalt Rubber. *Revise Section 717 ASPHALT-RUBBER to obtain a uniform specification.* No comments or updates were submitted. Case to be continued in 2011.

d. Case 10-11 – Revise Detail 110 – Plan Symbols. *Update and expand graphic standards to have plans be more uniform among MAG agencies.* Bob Herz said Details

110-1 and 110-2 had been updated. To address concerns of members requesting labels on the symbols, Mr. Herz said he added Note 2 to Detail 110-1, stating, "ADD LABELS TO PLAN SYMBOLS AS NEEDED FOR CLARITY." He also said that on Detail 110-2, the JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARY (OPTION 2) line should be shown as a grey line, and that it may need to be adjusted slightly lighter to ensure that copiers and faxes do not fill in the line. Mr. Tyus said he would make sure the line appeared properly in printed versions of the book. Mr. Herz moved to accept Case 10-11. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gonzales. Seeing no further discussion a roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

e. 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.* No comments or updates were submitted. Case to be continued in 2011.

4. General Discussion:

Nominations for 2011 Chair and Vice Chair

According to MAG policy, the Vice Chair is promoted to Chair and any other member can submit a letter of interest to the MAG Executive Committee to serve as the new Vice Chair. In this case, Troy Tobiasson has agreed to serve as Chair beginning January 2011. Mr. Gonzales asked if any member would like to volunteer to serve as Vice Chair. Mr. Tyus said he had not received any letters of interest to date. Letters of application are due to the MAG Executive Committee by November 1st. East-side representatives are encouraged to apply to help achieve a geographic balance. The final appointments are made by the MAG Executive Committee during their November meeting, and if no one volunteers, a member will be appointed by the Executive Committee.

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

Mr. Kandaris gave a report of the *MAG Uniform Specifications Outside of Right-of-Way Working Group*. It included updates discussed during the September 28 meeting, and a preview of work to be done. He explained that the group had gone through most of the MAG Specifications and Details determining their applicability outside the right of way. He said during the next meeting of the group (scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on October 28 at the ARPA offices) they should finish the remaining sections, including concrete and masonry structures and other miscellaneous specs and details that should go pretty quickly. He said he intended to have a report ready in January summarizing the findings of the working group during the past year. Mr. Kandaris said the plan for next year's meetings will be to actually update the specifications that need changes, and write new specifications as needed, with a goal of having a document ready for the committee to discuss during the 2012 session. He also explained that as the working group went through the specifications, they made notes on areas of the MAG book that may require updates, or sections and details that may be obsolete and possibly removed. He plans to provide a list of possible case work for the committee to review next year.

Scott Zipprich said the on-site specifications manual would also be a great place for city supplements that may not have been in the right-of-way. An example given was the underground storage details developed by Chandler. He said the supplements could help provide much of the content for the new manual.

Mr. Kandarlis also asked members who have been contacted by vendors to let them know about the working group meetings and offer vendors the opportunity to write specifications for products used on site. Members agreed that any specifications from vendors must be general in nature. Jeff Hearne suggested the working groups continue the previous practice of having technicians from the agencies participating in their areas of expertise. He said this helped the working groups get early input from the agencies, and also helped agencies communicate the changes with their committee representative and provide feedback throughout development of the specifications.

Next Year's Cases

Troy Tobiasson asked members to be prepared to set aside time not just to come to the meetings, but to work on cases and/or be involved in working groups. He stressed the importance of everyone contributing, since it is anticipated that a large workload of cases will be coming in the next session – based on continuing cases and feedback from the working group. Several members have discussed creating a new revision of the specifications book for 2012. Mr. Tyus said that a new version would also help clean the decks of 12 years of update packets, and help ensure everyone has the latest specifications.

Jesse Gonzales mentioned the Blue Ribbon Panel Infrastructure Working Group was still recommending the state develop specifications for reclaimed water. He said he would provide his work on Section 616 for MAG to continue to work on. He said that PAG and CAAG only supplement and refer to the MAG specifications.

MAG Website and ASTM Portal

Gordon Tyus announced that MAG has a new website at www.azmag.gov. He said future meetings, agendas and cases will be posted on the new site, but the old site will be available for about a year. He also said the ASTM portal was working and provided members with an instruction sheet that included the web address, user name and password to log on.

ARRA Project Submissions

Amanda McGinnis of AGC was asked by Chairman Gonzales to present information on ARRA project submissions and working with the ADOT review process. She said there was a large backup at the West Valley lab due in part to bid packages using mismatching specifications. She said there was a need for more universal standards. For example projects may specify MAG specs with a City of Phoenix Mix specs and gradation using ADOT standards, but the testing methods are not the same for each, making it very difficult for the lab. It requires administrators call and ask engineers at the cities to try and marry them together, often requiring a change order. She also noted that ARRA projects are reviewed by FHWA, who require a paper trail for any change order they receive. Peter Kandarlis said engineers typically deal with the material not always considering that different specifications

require different tests. Ms. McGinnis urged members to be more consistent in how the projects are specified in the future.

Production Ranges and Mix Designs

Troy Tobiasson noted that production ranges do not necessarily fall within mix designs. He described a mix design he had to reject because its range was outside the target range based on Sections 710 and 321. Scott Zipprich described an example of a project that couldn't get compaction even though it was an approved mix design. Tom Wilhite said maybe MAG should provide an order of acceptance to help clarify how to manage these kinds of problems. Jeff Benedict said people reviewing and creating mix designs need experience. Members noted that often mix designs are slightly changed which can affect other properties. Brian Gallimore described the difficulty faced by contractors who are held at fault for not meeting compaction requirements even though they are told what mix to use and how to apply it. Members thought it would be good to have historical data on mixes.

5. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.