

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

July 11, 2012

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Jim Badowich, Avondale | * Javier Setovich, Peoria |
| Craig Sharp, Buckeye (proxy) | 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 Kandarlis, Independent |
| Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy) | Paul R. Nebeker, Independent |
| Brian Gallimore, AGC | |
| Adrian Green, AGC | |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Arturo Chavarria, Hanson Pipe and Precast
Bob Erdman, Cutler Repaving
Mike Hook, ACPA
Kelly Kokesh, ADS
Jerre Mills, Regional Pavement
Karl Rockwell, MCDOT
Mike Weinberg, Contech

1. Call to Order

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

2. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the May 2, 2012 meeting minutes. Greg Crossman introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Rod Ramos seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

4. Membership

Peter Kandarlis, no longer representing SRP, submitted a letter requesting to be approved as an independent member so he could continue to participate on the committee. His membership was sponsored by Bob Herz of Maricopa County, who moved to appoint Mr. Kandarlis as an independent advisory member, and by Rod Ramos of Scottsdale, who seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Review of 2011 Carry Forward Cases

5. Case 11-02 – Safety Edge Detail

Add an Asphalt Pavement Safety Edge option to Detail 201. Bob Herz said he hasn't made any addition progress, but will continue working on the case this year. Rod Ramos asked if the county has used this new process yet. Mr. Herz said no, although some safety edges have been made using a strike-off plate. Mr. Gallimore said the strike-off plate does not meet the new federal specifications. He noted that he has used new equipment able to create the 30 degree slope, and provide proper compaction, on a project on U.S. 60. Mr. Herz asked him the width and depth of the equipment creating the safety edge. Since it was purchased, Mr. Gallimore said he was unsure of the size, only that it provided the proper angle.

6. 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. Jim Badowich described the latest revision (provided at the meeting) that he created and vetted through the water/sewer working group. He thanked Matt Savage from Ferguson for assistance. The top half of the page showed the existing spec, on the bottom the proposed revisions. He said the size of the pipe did not matter, so references to it were removed. For hex bolts the intent was to make zinc plating the default, while providing stainless steel and cadmium as options. He researched the ASTM references for all these options. The requirements for T-head bolts for mechanical joints were also included.

There was some discussion whether “Cor-ten” should be referenced, since it is a brand name, but also commonly used to reference these types of high-strength steel allow bolts.

Bob Herz suggested removing the reference to the Engineer or Governing Agency at the end of part 1, since the specs always imply this. Peter Kandaris suggested, and Mr. Badowich agreed to do some final word-smithing of the specification at next week’s water/sewer working group meeting. The final update would be provided in the agenda packet with the intent of voting on the case at the next meeting.

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

Update references to state statutes and regulatory requirements. Peter Kandaris discussed a revised version (provided at the meeting) that incorporated comments from the city of Phoenix and Maricopa County. A condensed version of the specification showing the final language was provided. It also showed two areas with slightly different language based on the county’s comments. Mr. Kandaris asked for the committee’s direction to resolve them. Bob Herz noted that MCDOT’s recommended language which provides an indemnify clause, is the same as that currently in MAG, and he recommended that it stay. Other members agreed to use this option. The second question had to deal with language regarding permits. Jami Erickson said the City of Phoenix wanted to add language making the contractor responsible for maintaining and closing the permits, since they have had problems with developers who did not properly renew or close permits. Greg Crossman said they also had concerns about closing permits. Members discussed how the language may affect permits taken out by the city, and how permit fees are charged. Mr. Wilhite said Tempe has a line item for permits. Phoenix did for development plans, but not for others. Greg Crossman suggested it be reworded so contractors would not be responsible for agency permits. Troy Tobiasson said any contract language will override MAG anyway. Overall, members agreed to use the Phoenix language. Mr. Kandaris said he would create a final update and called for a vote on the case at the next meeting.

8. Case 11-14: Update Fire Hydrant Details

Update Detail 360-1, and add Wet Barrel Option (360-2) and Details (360-3). Craig Sharp said the revised details in the packet were based on revisions hashed out during the June water/sewer working group meeting. He asked members to do a final review, so they could be voted on at the August meeting. Jim Badowich highlighted some of the changes, including the minimum clearing of 36” based on the NFPA-24 code. Agencies that wanted a larger clearance would have to provide a supplement. Jason Mahkovtz suggested combining notes 5 and 6 on detail 360-3. Jami Erickson asked to have revision dates updated so she would know what the latest version was. Paul Nebeker questioned note 11 on detail 360-2 about two-port hydrants. Jim Badowich said that the wet-barrel hydrants for residential use that they have installed in Avondale do have only two ports. Craig Sharp asked for comments so he can provide final updated details with the intent to vote on the case at the next meeting.

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

Update Section 415 based on the Maricopa County Supplement. Reference New Details. Peter Kandarlis provided an updated case at the meeting; however, he said he would need to make a few more revisions based on recent feedback from Maricopa County. Mr. Kandarlis asked for feedback on references to the county details. Rod Ramos suggested that maybe they should be included in MAG. Bob Herz said they are planning to make more revisions to the details this year. Mr. Kandarlis suggested just referencing them for now, and possibly having a new case next year that incorporates the county details after they have been updated.

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

Add language in Section 350.2 for utility removal, and payment requirements. Mr. Kandarlis provided an update at the meeting that incorporated additional wording from MCDOT. The county recommended deletion of the paragraph stating, “Utilities shall not be abandoned in place below new structures that are part of the work. In all other cases, any in-place utility abandonment shall be allowed if abandonment is noted on the plans. Otherwise abandoned utilities shall be removed.”

Peter Kandarlis said this language was added at the request of Salt River Project, and asked the preference of the committee. Some members questioned what was meant by a structure, and would it apply to both major and minor structures. Jami Erickson gave the example of old water lines that were grouted and left in place, since they were under existing lines. She said abandonments could be approved on a case-by-case basis on the approved plans. Greg Crossman asked what the default would be – abandon or remove? Mr. Kandarlis said he would continue to update the case based on committee feedback.

11. 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 that the case had grown in scope while being discussed in the working groups, and requested that the case be withdrawn, so that a new case could be proposed next year. Jim Badowich said the discussion on the case in the working group expanded to include having new specifications based on whether the installation is for rigid or flexible conduit. He said he thinks the slurry could be an option available to agencies, but that other trench and fill systems should be clarified as well. Jami Erickson asked if anyone besides Phoenix used the slurry backfill. Bob Herz said the county requires it for HDPE. Jim Badowich said they have used it on a recent project. Chair Tobiasson agreed to the request to withdraw the case and asked the water/sewer working group to continue to work on options for different installation systems for rigid and flexible pipe.

New 2012 Cases

12. Case 12-01: Miscellaneous Corrections

No new cases or revisions were suggested.

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

Update Sidewalk Widths to 4' in Detail 250-2 Driveway Entrances. Bob Herz said he had no changes, but hoped to get back to it to provide an update at the next meeting.

14. 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 said there were no comments or changes. He asked members to review the final draft and called for a vote on it next month.

15. Case 12-05: Modifications to Table 711-1

Revise Paving Asphalt Performance Grading System Requirements. Jeff Benedict said he incorporated the MCDOT comment on creep stiffness. That was on only change since April. Since the case was initially scheduled for a vote during the June meeting that was cancelled, he said it was ready for a vote. A motion to approve the case as submitted was made by Rod Ramos. Warren White seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The case was approved 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained, 4 not present.

16. Case 12-06: New Detail 249: Modified Entrance

Create a new entrance detail meeting ADA requirements for straight sidewalks. Warren White provided an updated Alley Entrance Detail 260. It added a note 5: 6" SINGLE CURB PER MAG DETAIL 222, TYPE B. Syd Anderson suggested changing Note 1 to CLASS "A" CONCRETE to be consistent with other details. Warren White asked members if Note 5 should be optional. Tom Wilhite described a retrofitting application with curbing. Mr. White asked if the detail should be shown with or without curbing. Rod Ramos suggested a split plan view to show both. Mr. White said he would continue with revisions.

17. Case 12-07: Revisions to Section 332.6: Protection of Uncured Surface

Add language to include a work plan for uncured slurry protection. Jami Erickson said the handout included a change to Section 332.6 with new text that came out of the working groups stating, "Adequate means shall be provided by the Contractor to protect the uncured product. Any damage done to the product shall be repaired at the Contractor's expense." She said Phoenix is fine with this revision, and asked for a vote on the case at the August meeting.

18. Case 12-08: Section 611: Disinfecting Water Mains – Addition of Refreshing Plans

Modify Section 611.17 to include a “Keep Fresh Plan” to assure safe water quality. Jami Erickson said there are no changes currently but she was planning to work on it.

19. Case 12-09: ASTM Updates

A. *Update ASTM references to steel standards in Section 770.* Peter Kandarlis said he did not have any new ASTM updates this year, and suggested the committee go ahead and vote on the case as scheduled. Rod Ramos moved and Bob Draper seconded the motion to approved Case 12-09 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained, 4 not present.

20. Case 12-10: Revisions to Section 505.6.3 Bridge Deck Joint Assemblies

Revise Section 505.6.3 and add updated welding requirements in part (7). Bob Herz introduced this case to eliminate one of the county supplements. It makes updates to the section noted above and adds language for the latest welding code. Troy Tobiasson asked if MCDOT did any joint repairs. Mr. Herz replied that he didn't know for sure what repairs have been done. He asked members to review the case and provide any comments.

21. Case 12-11: Reclaimed/Recycled Materials

Address the use of reclaimed and/or recycled materials along with proper reference adjustments to their respective corresponding sections. Brian Gallimore introduced a new case to add options for reclaimed/recycled materials to MAG sections 701, 702, 710 and 728. The case was developed jointly by the asphalt, materials and concrete working groups. The latest version dated July 9 was provided at the meeting, and incorporated some feedback from the city of Goodyear. The case introduces definitions for reclaimed concrete material and reclaimed asphalt material in section 701. It adds material descriptions for them in section 702, revisions for their use in RAP, section 710 and CLSM, section 728. Mr. Gallimore said it is a change in how MAG handles recycled materials, but the specs are based on language from ADOT and a City of Phoenix Sky Harbor project. He explained the recycled materials would still need to meet the standards of virgin materials. Mr. Gallimore described projects on Grand Avenue and parking lots at the Cardinals stadium that used recycled materials successfully.

Bob Draper asked about their use in asphalt. Adrian Green explained that any recycled material would still need to meet the same requirements, and that they adjust mix design appropriately. They do analytic comparisons based on amounts of old and virgin materials. Mr. Draper was also concerned about foreign materials such as rebar. Mr. Green said they don't want to feed rebar through their crusher either, and that the specification noted it had to be substantially free of debris. There was some question as to what substantially free meant, but he noted that it still has to meet PI and gradation requirements. He said fines are controlled during the process and material is inspected as it comes in.

Peter Kandarlis noted fines can have a huge impact on CLSM mixes. Jim Badowich asked about mix design criteria. Jeff Benedict said a reference for mix design was added to Section 710. Questions arose as to whether Section 709 Recycled Asphalt Paving would be necessary given these changes. Mr. Benedict agreed that Section 709 needs to be revised or possibly removed.

The terms recycled, reclaimed and salvaged were discussed. Jeff Hearne explained that MAG currently uses recycled, ASHTO uses reclaimed and ADOT uses salvaged, but they all refer to the same type of material. Committee members also debated whether to break the case into multiple cases or keep it all together. Mr. Hearne said the working groups debated this as well, but decided to put them all together since they are interrelated. Bob Draper he wanted to look at it as a whole. Jim Badowich, however, thought that there would be much more work to complete the asphalt revisions and suggested they be separated out, since the others are more commonly used and accepted. As a compromise, the case would remain together, but with subparts A) for 701 and 702 (materials) B) for 709 and 710 (asphalt) and C) for 728 CLSM.

22. Case 12-12: Steel Reinforced Polyethylene Pipe

Add new Section 739 for Steel Reinforced Polyethylene (SRPE) Pipe. Rod Ramos introduced a new case that would add SRPE as a new type of pipe material. The case (provided during the meeting to the committee) revises existing Section 738 HDPE to show what differences were needed for SRPE pipe. Since there were quite a few changes including different ASTM references, a new section was proposed. Jim Badowich said representatives from Contech attended the last working group meeting, and can help develop the installation specifications for flexible conduit.

23. General Discussion

Chairman Tobiasson opened the discussion on detectable warnings that was on the agenda for the June meeting. He said he received a question about when warnings should be installed on depressed sidewalks ramps for driveway openings such as the one proposed in case 12-06. Rod Ramos said in Scottsdale generally they are not included for ramp-type driveways, but are on return type driveways. The amount of traffic can determine if they are needed. Ramps and detectable warnings are used for different purposes. Ramps are for wheelchairs, whereas warnings are to notify visually impaired people they are entering a traffic area. Jim Badowich asked if other cities have had developers unclear as to whether detectable warnings need to be provided in the right-of-way, since they are no longer required in private areas such as parking lots. Mr. Herz noted there are different standards for ADA not in the roadway and ADA standards for right-of-way areas. Peter Kandarlis said there can be confusion on what are access areas. Troy Tobiasson said ADOT provided a presentation at MAG a couple months ago.

24. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson asked for reports from the working groups.

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

Jim Badowich said they met June 19th and had good turn-out. The meeting focused mainly on wrapping up cases 11-03 and 11-14. He said the group plans to work on revised manhole details, and adding a precast base option based on Buckeye's standards. Discussion on pipe trenching and bedding, as well as revisiting flushing are planned. He said the next meeting is scheduled for July 17th at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

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

The group did not meet in June.

c. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the asphalt, materials and concrete working groups met on June 28th and focused much of the time on preparing the recycled materials case presented during the meeting. They also helped with Phoenix's case 12-07. He said the next meeting is planned for August 23rd at noon at the ARPA office.

d. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore said the three groups basically worked together on the RAP case. He added that there was discussion about revisiting Section 309 Lime Stabilization, since the originator of the original MAG section thought the revision might create confusion between modifying and stabilizing soil. He also said there was discussion about the confusion of terms for bedding and pipe foundation. Although foundation is defined as the material under the pipe, many times it is commonly referred to as the term bedding, which is defined differently, as 1' above the pipe. Sometimes these terms can conflict. It was suggested to create a cross section to help define the foundation/bedding zone. Brian Gallimore suggested the water/sewer group may want to consider this. The next materials working group meeting follows the asphalt working group at about 1:00 p.m.

e. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said two other items planned for work include revisions to curb and gutter and directional sidewalk ramp details. He said he is waiting on revisions from Peoria to make their ramps more like MAG detail drawings, and samples from the city of Phoenix. He noted that Peoria's details are large and use a lot of concrete. The next meeting will follow the August 23rd asphalt working group at 1:30 p.m. at the ARPA office.

25. Adjournment:

Mr. Tobiasson adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.