

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

March 7, 2012

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	* Javier Setovich, Peoria
Scott Zipprich, Buckeye	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Warren White, Chandler	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Lance Calvert, El Mirage	* Marc Palichuk, Queen Creek
Greg Crossman, Gilbert	Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Chair	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Vice Chair
Bob Herz, MCDOT	* Jim Fox, Youngtown
Bob Draper, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
* Tony Braun, NUCA	Peter Kandaris, SRP
* Kwigs Bowen, NUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Brian Gallimore, AGC	
* Adrian Green, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Jerry Copeland, Gerald R. Copeland, P.E.  
Jason Jackson, Oldcastle Precast  
Doug Laquey, Fisher Industries  
Jerre Mills, Regional Pavement Maintenance  
Gary Wallenberg, TetraTech

1. Call to Order

Chairman Troy Tobiasson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No public comment was provided.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the February 1, 2012 meeting minutes. Jason Mahkovtz 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.

**Review of 2011 Carry Forward Cases**

4. Case 11-02 – Safety Edge Detail

*Add an Asphalt Pavement Safety Edge option to Detail 201.* Bob Herz handed out a revised detail drawing dated 3/2012 that added notes and titles to the overlay detail drawings. He said they still haven't built it yet, so he was not sure how will they work. A test project is planned for this summer. Brian Gallimore asked about the saw cut note on the Type B detail. Mr. Herz said the saw cut was for roads that had an irregular edge, in order to straighten it before adding the safety edge overlay. Troy Tobiasson asked him to clarify the use of each type. Bob Herz said the Type A detail is for overlaying an existing road that has the Maricopa thickened edge. Type B is for roads without the thickened edge, which may have an irregular or raveled edge. Type C was for new construction, in which a typical Maricopa thickened edge base course is finished with the new safety edge course. Mr. Tobiasson asked to have titles added to the drawing to clarify the types. Rod Ramos asked if it mattered how Type B was cut. Brian Gallimore said he would discuss options to trim the edge, such as with the blade or milling in addition to saw cutting, with working group members. Mr. Herz said he was open to options as long as you can get a vertical straight line. Mark asked why there was information about pay items for the shoulder on the drawing. Greg Crossman suggested removing it since not all agencies have it as a separate pay item. Tom Wilhite asked if the text in Section 321 matched the detail. Mr. Herz said that the section is compatible with the drawing.

5. Case 11-03 – Replace Cadmium Plated Bolts.

*Replace cadmium plated bolts referenced in Section 610.13 with zinc plated bolts as described in ASTM-B633.* Paul Nebeker said that this case was discussed at the Water/Sewer working group, and that Javier Setovich of Peoria volunteered to work on updating this section. Jim Badowich said the case was looking at other things that may need to change, such as the grade of the bolts. The goal is to specify materials used today, to make zinc the default, but also have other options such as stainless steel used by Phoenix. Gordon Tyus said notes from the Water/Sewer meeting in the packet summarize on the group's discussion.

6. Case 11-12 – Modifications to Regulatory Requirements, MAG 107

*Add references to Arizona native plant requirements and update references to state statutes.* Mr. Kandarlis said this case was discussed at the last outside right-of-way meeting. Since contractors must follow all state statutes, the revised version removed references to all specific laws, and made more general reference to follow all laws, ordinances, regulations, orders and decrees. The section has been reduced to two paragraphs. Warren White said his agency would like to review the change. Mr. Kandarlis said it is pretty consistent with most city agreements.

7. Case 11-14: Update Fire Hydrant Details

*Update Detail 360-1, and add Wet Barrel Option (360-2) and Details (360-3).* Scott Zipprich said he did not have updated details yet, but that the case was discussed during the water/sewer meeting. He did not receive any comments from the committee. Mr. Zipprich said he planned to update the details based on red-lines and comments from the working group, bring them for review at the next Water/Sewer meeting, and then within a month or two have final drawings ready for review by the full committee, and a possible vote soon after that.

8. Case 11-16: Modify Section 415: Steel Flexible Metal Guardrail

*Update Section 415 based on the Maricopa County Supplement. Reference New Details.* Peter Kandarlis said the latest version references MCDOT guardrail details instead of ADOT details. Basically, it is now pretty much the MCDOT 415 supplement. He noted that it references MAG Detail 135-4, which has been removed so Mr. Kandarlis suggested referencing the MUTCD instead. Warren White asked about end treatments. Mr. Kandarlis said they are not included, but have never been in MAG. Mr. Herz said they have a single source approved, and specifications in supplemental Section 416. Mr. Kandarlis said the end treatments need to be specified by the agency (this note could be added to the specifications), and suggested a possible new future case if they were to be included in the MAG specs. Rod Ramos asked about the curb shown on Detail 3002. Mr. Herz said it has not been a problem for them, and is used to help direct water run-off.

9. Case 11-18: Update Section 350: Removal of Existing Improvements

*Add language in Section 350.2 for utility removal, and payment requirements.* Mr. Kandarlis said he added reference to the blue stake requirements, and added language to clarify abandonments must be shown on plans; otherwise existing utilities must be removed. He asked for review and additional comments.

10. Case 11-21: Add new Section 623: Special Bedding for Mainline Storm Drain Pipe

*Incorporate City of Phoenix supplement 623 into the MAG standards.* Syd Anderson said he missed the last working group meeting. Jim Badowich said at the working group meeting, they discussed the differences between flexible and rigid pipe, and recommended having separate backfill requirements for each. Mr. Anderson said he preferred just one, stating that they have used the slurry technique for both types of pipe, and it has worked well. Jami Erickson said that you may have a separate issue about where you place the pipe, since flexible pipe is designed to allow a certain amount of deflection, it may not be appropriate under roadway or structures. The term mainline pipe could refer to both pipe under the street or in landscaped areas. Mr. Anderson said there were different requirements depending on if it was outside the roadway. He said this issue began with failure of metal pipe, and since using slurry, they have not had settlement problems. He clarified that for concrete pipe the slurry was only required to the springline. Peter Kandaris said there are different design methods for installing rigid and flexible pipe. Paul Nebeker said the flexible pipe companies don't have data on the use of slurry around their pipe. He also noted that the pipe ribs themselves allow for infiltration or water. Greg Crossman said using the ASTM specifications a certain amount of deflection is allowed. Jami Erickson said she did not know if using slurry could damage the structure of flexible pipe. Jim Badowich said Bill Davis was going to provide a presentation at the next Water/Sewer working group meeting of their recommended installation procedures.

11. Case 11-30: Update Section 702: Base Material and Section 310 Untreated Base Course

*Update Section 702: Base Material. Revise for current standards.* Brian Gallimore handed out a final revised version of Section 310 that included revisions based on comments received from Glendale. The case also included revisions to Section 702. Mr. Gallimore said he felt it was ready for a vote. Syd Anderson asked if the wet or dry test method was used. The sponsors replied that Method A, specified in table 702 is the wet method. Mr. Gallimore moved, and Syd Anderson seconded a motion to approved Case 11-30. A voice vote of agency members was taken. The motion passed, 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 4 not present.

**New 2012 Cases**

12. Case 12-01: Miscellaneous Corrections

*Remove extra space Section 108.9.* Bob Draper noted that a typographic error in the new edition of the specifications changed the word "incompleted" to "in completed" which also changed the meaning. This correction was added to the case as part B.

13. Case 12-02: Asphalt Concrete Low Traffic Gyration Levels

*Modify Section 710 Asphalt Concrete to include low traffic gyration level specifications.* Jeff Benedict said a new handout changed one of the referenced test methods based on feedback from suppliers at the last Asphalt working group meeting. Under mix design requirements,

part 6, the reference to AASHTO T-28 was changed to ASTM D4867 for dry tensile strength. This reference would also be updated under part 6 in Table 710-3 and 710-4 as well. He said this testing method was faster, because it didn't require the freeze/thaw portion of the test, and easier to replicate for retesting. Warren White also noted there was a typo, in which the word "traffic" needed to be spelled correctly. Mr. Benedict said he would be making changes, and proposed to vote on the case at the next meeting.

#### 14. Case 12-03: Revisions to Detail 250-2 DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES

*Update Sidewalk Widths to 4' in Detail 250-2 Driveway Entrances.* Bob Herz provided an updated drawing with additional redlines to reduce the amount of concrete paving, and still meet the ADA four foot width requirement. Tom Wilhite suggested making it more compact by making the travel lane parallel to the slope edge line of the ramp. Bob Draper agreed he would like it more compact. Troy Tobiasson said the constructability of the detail should be considered, such as where to place the expansion joints, etc. Syd Anderson says Phoenix has a detail that he will bring to the next meeting. Jim Badowich asked members to check their supplements and bring them in so they can be incorporated in the changed detail. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has a detail that adds 5' to each side of the driveway entrance, and they have two different options.

#### 15. Case 12-04: Revisions to Section 317: Asphalt Milling

*Revise Asphalt Milling to address dust control measures on milled surfaces open to traffic.* Jeff Benedict introduced this new case based on previous discussions about Phoenix using a tack coat to reduce dust on milled surfaces for a short period before the new surface is installed. Language was added to apply a tack coat per Section 329. Syd Anderson said Phoenix used half the normal amount of tack coat on the milled surface to control dust on a street nearby an ADEQ air quality monitor, then applied the second coating prior to final asphalt paving. Chair Tobiasson asked what a "short" period of time was. Mr. Benedict said typically the milling takes longer than paving, so there are times when the paving may not be completed the same day, but typically is finished the following day. Rod Ramos asked if this included edge milling. Mr. Anderson said anything that can cause dust to be airborne can be a problem, and can be helped with this method. Mr. Ramos asked about using it on residential streets. Syd Anderson didn't recommend it, and said Phoenix used it on arterial streets that needed to be opened to traffic. There was also discussion about using water to keep the dust down, but Syd Anderson said they tried that, and found that it dried too quickly in the summer to successfully abate the dust problems. Jim Badowich worried that there may be problems of trackout onto residential driveways. He also suggested making a separate section. Mr. Badowich also believed that it should not be a separate pay item, but included in the bid price, so it would be up to the contractor to have the necessary tack material available. He said he would send comments in writing to the sponsors.

#### 16. Other Potential Cases

Chair Tobiasson asked if members had any new or potential cases. Scott Zipprich brought up the topic of providing ramps at the vertical curbs at T-Intersections. He said they have used

Phoenix detail 1244 Driveway/Sidewalk Ramp Combo, but asked about the placement of the detectable warning domes on midblock ramp details. He also commented that adding the ramps can be difficult because they can affect driveway entrances, especially on narrow lots. He also noted that to get the recommended slope you may need six foot ramps and another five feet behind them for the landing. One suggestion was to require a pedestrian access plan prior to approving a plat, so these issues would be taken into consideration prior to finalizing lot lines. The ADA requirements may affect the development layout.

Tom Wilhite asked about options where sidewalk walls or buildings are next to the sidewalk. Warren White said Chandler had a detail the depressed the sidewalk instead of moving the path behind the driveway opening. Members suggested making a new case for that type of detail since the alley entrance details have been removed from MAG.

## 17. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson asked for reports from the working groups.

### a. **Water/Sewer Issues Working Group**

Jim Badowich said the group met on February 20<sup>th</sup>, and that there was a standing room only turnout. Much of the discussion was about the cases discussed earlier in the meeting, and was summarized in the meeting notes included in the packet. In addition to the current cases, he said Scott Zipprich has developed a set of cast in place manhole base specifications for Buckeye, which could be case to add as an option in MAG. He reminded members of the presentation Bill Davis was preparing for flexible pipe installation. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 20<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

### b. **Specifications and Details Outside the Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said they met after the water/sewer group meeting where they discussed revisions to the three cases previously reviewed earlier in the meeting. He said he would like to begin working on new cases as well as getting back to it's original purpose of reviewing specs for outside the right-of-way. The next meeting will follow the Water/Sewer group on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

### c. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the group worked on the cases previously described. In addition they have begun developing a RAP specification they hope to bring forward this year. They have also been reviewing Section 321 for determining compaction requirements, and also possibly a new specification for Warm Mix may be possible. The next meeting is scheduled for March 21<sup>st</sup> at Noon at the ARPA office. Lunch will be provided.

### d. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore had left the meeting, but Mr. Benedict said they would follow the Asphalt working group's next meeting. Notes from the February meeting were in the packet.

e. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said notes from the February 20<sup>th</sup> meeting were included in the agenda packet that list sections that are under review. Some cases may go into next year. He said the masonry guild has agreed to review the sections on block and masonry work, and that an industry group was working on developing specifications for pervious concrete construction. They also will be reviewing technician certification requirements. Mr. Hearne did not expect a case on this until sometime next year. The next meeting is scheduled for March 21<sup>st</sup> at 1:30 p.m. at the ARPA office.

18. Staff Reports

Gordon Tyus said MAG hosted an ADA workshop in the Ironwood room last Wednesday. Speakers from the FHWA and ADOT presented a general overview of ADA requirements. He said several members of the committee attended. Scott Zipprich said it was good, but was hoping for more clear direction. Greg Crossman agreed. Mr. Tobiasson said it they summarized a two day workshop into a couple hours. He mentioned that a representative from Peoria said they had developed dual ramp details, and were planning to submit them as a case to MAG in the future.

19. Open General Discussion

Tom Wilhite asked to add an agenda item for a future meeting to discuss a five-year work plan to review the MAG specifications. He said the discussion at the last meeting of a check list to determine what sections have been updated or reviewed, could be expanded to create a plan on systematically reviewing the specifications.

Scott Zipprich said he would like to make it easier for users to send in their corrections or comments on the MAG specification. Mr. Tyus said the MAG website does allow users to send feedback on any page, and that he did receive comments in this manner, that have been brought forward to the chair and committee as issues, but that a more descriptive link could be added. Others commented that in the past an engineering association did have an advisory member on the committee. Mr. Kandarlis suggested that he may be able to fill that roll, since he soon will not be SRP's representative.

20. Adjournment:

Mr. Tobiasson adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.