

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

August 1, 2012

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale
Craig Sharp, Buckeye (proxy)
Warren White, Chandler
Greg Crossman, Gilbert
Mark Ivanich, Glendale
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Chair
Bob Herz, MCDOT
Bob Draper, Mesa

* Javier Setovich, Peoria
Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Vice Chair
* Jim Fox, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA
* Tony Braun, NUCA
Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy)
Brian Gallimore, AGC
Adrian Green, AGC

Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Peter Kandaris, Independent
Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Jacob Rodriguez, SRP

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Mike Hook, ACPA
John Kanzlemaz, Contech
Kelly Kokesh, ADS
John Shi, MCDOT

1. Call to Order

Chairman Troy Tobiasson called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the July 11, 2012 meeting minutes. Greg Crossman introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

4. 2013 Chair and Vice Chair

Chairman Tobiasson noted that the current vice chair, Tom Wilhite will be promoted to chair in 2013, but that the committee will need a new vice chair to fill the vacant position, preferably from the west side of the region. Jim Badowich may be interested and would be checking with his coworkers in Avondale. Any other interested members were encouraged to speak with the chair and/or submit letters of interest.

Review of 2011 Carry Forward Cases

Chair Tobiasson said in order to accommodate a request by Peter Kandaris, who had to leave early for another meeting, the cases sponsored by Mr. Kandaris would be heard first.

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

Update references to state statutes and regulatory requirements. Peter Kandaris said he modified the second paragraph based on comments from Maricopa County. Bob Herz suggested the sentence should be moved up to be part of the first paragraph. Mr. Kandaris also said he made some changes to the second paragraph under 107.2 PERMITS. Bob Herz had additional suggested changes including modifying “will attempt to obtain the required permits” to “may obtain some of the required permits.” He also had suggestions about changing the language on maintaining and closing permits, since some permits are transferred, not closed by the contractor. Jami Erickson of Phoenix said they want the contractors to be responsible for closing the permits, since they have had problems with them not being closed properly. Ms. Erickson agreed to review the proposed language changes by MCDOT to make sure Phoenix’s issues are addressed. Mr. Kandaris said he would continue to work with the members on a final revision with plans to vote on the case at the next committee meeting.

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

Update Section 415 based on the Maricopa County Supplement. Reference MCDOT Details. Peter Kandaris provided an updated case at the meeting that incorporated comments from Maricopa County. He noted, however, that there was an inconsistency in references to the nested guardrail in Section 415.3. Mr. Herz said the information needed was on the guardrail details, rather than in the specification. Mr. Kandaris said the specs should then reference those details. Brian Gallimore asked what temporary overnight barriers would be acceptable. Peter Kandaris said at one time he had references to standard specifications for them, and that text could be added back in. Bob Herz agreed that it should be added and gave an example of a water-filled barrier that could be used. There was also discussion about the AASHTO MASH level 3 standard. Mr. Herz noted that a level 2 standard was acceptable for low speed roads. Mr. Kandaris said he would make the noted revisions and called for a vote at the next meeting.

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

Add language in Section 350.2 for utility removal, and payment requirements. Mr. Kandaris provided an updated case in the packet to address comments from the last meeting. He noted the changes included cleaning up the second item under “350.2.1 Utilities.” Bob Herz asked for clarification on where and how abandonments are noted on plans. Brian Gallimore said typically the design plans say when to abandon in place. Jami Erickson said the contractor should make notes and redlines to record the information needed for as-built plans. Bob Herz suggested deleting the second paragraph of 350.2.2. Mr. Kandaris was fine with the change. Mr. Herz also suggested changing the wording “alternate methods” to “locations” when referencing saw-cutting and Section 336. Mr. Kandaris said he would prepare an updated version and would like to vote on the case at the September meeting.

8. Case 11-02 – Safety Edge Detail

Add an Asphalt Pavement Safety Edge option to Detail 201, update Section 321.8. Bob Herz handed out a revised version of the written specifications (Section 321.8.8 and Section 321.8.9) to go along with the updated detail drawing that was provided in the packet. He said he modified Section 321.8.9 to form the angle with respect to the adjacent roadway surface rather than the horizontal plane. Brian Gallimore asked how the roadway was to be fixed if the safety edge shape is not fully formed. Members suggested several methods of repair, depending on what and how much had to be fixed. Mr. Herz said he felt it should be left open to allow the contractor to fix it in the way deemed most appropriate for the situation. Mr. Gallimore said he also could get more specific language to replace the term “special device” based on actual devices approved by FHWA. Mr. Herz then asked for comments on Detail 201. Tom Wilhite suggested adding the note, “unpaved shoulder recompacted to 95%” on sections ‘A’ and ‘B’ as well. Brian Gallimore agreed and Bob Herz was okay with the change, although he thought it was covered in the written specifications. Mr. Herz agreed to make the final revisions and called for a vote at the next meeting.

9. 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 said the latest version of the case incorporated comments from the county; however, he thought that the reference to AWWA C111 should remain. Bob Herz asked what information it provided since the revised case includes ASTM references. Although the reference to AWWA is very general, the committee saw no harm leaving it in since it was in the original text. Mr. Badowich said he would get with Jami Erickson to check the AWWA reference and make final revisions with a vote planned for September. Troy Tobiasson noted that the case does address the cadmium plating issue and that other issues could be addressed in future cases.

10. 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 included the minor corrections noted at the last committee meeting. It was also reviewed during the July water/sewer meeting. Bob Herz suggested a few minor corrections including changing note 7 to read “No valves are to be **located** in curb.” Discussion about situations when valves do end up in the curb or gutter followed; however, members thought as a default for new construction, note 7 should be included. Mr. Herz also suggested removing references to MAG since all references by default are to the MAG specifications, and to add the word “acceptance” to the end of Note 10. Finally, he said the note for the second concrete pad should say “alternate location for concrete pad...” No changes were proposed for detail 360-3. Jami Erickson moved to accept Case 11-14 with the changes as discussed. Jim Badowich seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed. 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

New 2012 Cases

11. Case 12-01: Miscellaneous Corrections

No new cases or revisions were suggested. Mr. Tobiasson said he would leave the case open, and asked members to plan to vote on it during the September meeting.

12. 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 detail drawing at the meeting that adjusted note #2 to match Tempe's detail. It also adjusted the driveway entrance width to accommodate widening, and fixed the dimensions. Bob Draper asked why there was a 1' dimension from the beginning of the warp to the expansion joint. Mr. Herz explained that the expansion joint had to be moved a foot to keep the joint perpendicular to the sidewalk, and still keep a minimum 4' width for the entire path. (He noted that the 4' width is the minimum allowed under the proposed ADA standards.) With no further comments, Mr. Herz proposed to vote on the case during the next meeting.

13. 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. Bob Herz reviewed some changes he would like to see made. They included removing references to MAG and changing “shall” to “may, when authorized by the engineer.” He also requested that the text be reorganized a bit, moving the payment information under Section 317.3 MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT. He also suggested adding information clarifying that the contractor shall be responsible for the clean-up of any track-out. Tom Wilhite said he would like to review the final changes in writing before voting. Mr. Benedict agreed to make the changes and provide them to Mr. Tyus for distribution. He agreed to postpone the vote until the September meeting.

14. 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 during the meeting and also noted photos showing an installation were provided in the packet. The new Detail 260 showed two types, A-without curb, and B-with curb. Other revisions were made based on comments from the previous meeting. Bob Herz said he believed Note 3 should be referencing Section 340 instead of 390. Mr. White clarified that Note 5 is referring to the optional curb on the left side of the Type B view. Jason Mahkovtz and Greg Crossman suggested showing the concrete pad at the top of the driveway entrance. Members discussed the length of the curb and pad, and decided that it should be shown on the plans since it would depend on the site. It was also determined that the pad was to be Type A concrete as, but that the slope did not need to be specified since it was not part of the pedestrian walkway. Bob Draper noted that this detail could be used for other entrances besides alleyways. It was suggested to show the track-out pad in Section A-A view as well. Finally, there was discussion about transitioning from existing sidewalks, including those larger and smaller. For smaller sidewalks such as those 4’ wide, members suggested adding the transition to one the side of the detail, like what was done in a previous curb ramp details. Mr. White said he would incorporate the improvements and have a final detail prepared for a vote at the next meeting.

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

Add language to include a work plan for uncured slurry protection. Jeff Hearne said there had been no comments or changes since last month. Jami Erickson moved to accept Case 12-07 as presented. Greg Crossman seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed. 10 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 3 not present.

16. 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 she wished to withdraw the case from consideration, but will continue to work on the issue at the water/sewer working group. Jim Badowich noted that he would like to address the issue in a more comprehensive way that included revising the flushing and testing specifications as well.

17. 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 said he had not received any comments since the last meeting, and proposed to vote on the case at the next committee meeting.

18. 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. Jeff Hearne provided updated handouts during the meeting that broke the case down into individual components A) for materials, B) for asphalt and C) for CLSM. He then proceeded to summarize the changes in each. Case 12-11A included revisions to Sections 701, 702, and a small change in Section 310. It primarily defines the recycled materials in the aggregate and base materials sections. Mr. Hearne clarified for Mr. Draper that a note was deleted so the specification will include all materials, not just virgin materials. He also said that the AASHTO M319 is more specific to recycled concrete than ASTM specs, and matched the industry standards that allow a max of 50% for concrete but up to 100% for RAP.

Case 12-11B focused on incorporating reclaimed materials into Section 710 ASPHALT PAVEMENT. Jeff Benedict said that by doing so, it would eliminate the need for Sections 709 and 719, which are badly out of date and would be deleted. Keeping with the current terminology, the Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP) section was added in as 710.2.3. (Following sections were renumbered.) Bob Draper asked why the AASHTO specifications were changed to ASTM in Tables 710-3 and 710-4. Adrian Green explained that the ASTM tests for freezing were simpler and the expanded ones in AASHTO were not needed for our climate. Mr. Benedict noted that some ASTM changes were already approved as part of Case 12-02, and they were just using the latest approved version of 710.

Case 12-11C broke out the changes for CLSM. Brian Gallimore worked to incorporate supplements from the City of Phoenix to incorporate recycled materials for use in CLSM in Section 728.2. Jeff Hearne noted that No. 57 aggregate would still be the default. He also said Note 2 for Table 718-1 clarified that types of ready-mixed structural concrete or grout shall not be used.

Members felt that Parts A and C were pretty straight forward, but that the RAP section would probably require more discussion. Jim Badowich asked if contractors were ready to produce the RAP as described. Adrian Green and Brian Gallimore said they have been producing and using recycled materials for years, and that this specification update corresponds to current industry practice. Some recent projects include U.S. 60 for ADOT, private jobs, paving at Sky Harbor Airport, and work in Pinal County. When asked about the cost savings, Mr. Green said that it depends on the materials used, but that using recycled materials can actually produce a better quality product, since there is additional binder material in the mix.

The sponsors noted that parts B and C were dependent on part A being approved first, but otherwise, they could separate votes. Mr. Benedict said they have an asphalt working group meeting scheduled for August 23rd. He asked for additional feedback and proposed to vote on all three parts at the next meeting. Chairman Tobiasson thanked them for their work on the case, and said he would add it to the schedule for a vote. If additional time is needed to complete the case, it can be determined if an October meeting is necessary, but if possible, he hoped to wrap up the cases next month.

19. Case 12-12: Steel Reinforced Polyethylene Pipe

Add new Section 739 for Steel Reinforced Polyethylene (SRPE) Pipe. Sponsor Rod Ramos was not present however Jim Badowich provided an overview of the discussion of the case during the July water/sewer working group meeting. He suggested keeping the case as a separate material case rather than updating all the existing sections that currently reference HDPE pipe. In the future, Mr. Badowich anticipated that Section 603 for installation of HDPE may be revised to become for general for the installation of all flexible pipe. He said the trench widths in 601 also needed to be updated. Industry representative John Kanzlemaz of Contech was in the audience and said he was working with other pipe suppliers to make necessary changes for future revisions. Greg Crossman asked if adding a reference to Section 603 made sense in the interim to provide some guidance for installation. Bill Davis said they also need to update the trench detail terminology to better match industry conventions. Bob Draper said he reviewed the proposed specification thoroughly, but did have several comments. He noted that the method of specifying classes of pipe stiffness is different than HDPE, and can be confusing because Class 1 is 50 psi, whereas Class 2 is 32 psi – opposite of what you might expect. He said the stiffness is also determined by pipe diameter. Another clarification needed was if all joints have gaskets, and the tests required. Field tests should probably not be included in the material specification. Mr. Tobiasson suggested Mr. Kanzlemaz meet with the case sponsor Rod Ramos to try and make the necessary updates for a possible vote in September. If additional work is required the case may need to be held over for next year.

20. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson asked for reports from the working groups.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met July 17th and he summarized some of the discussions not previously discussed on specific cases. (Notes were included in the agenda packet.) He said they were planning to have a presentation on manholes and precast bases by the manufacturers. Troy Tobiasson mentioned that he would like to see a review of liner adhesion methods and testing. Mr. Badowich said they wouldn't be meeting in August, so the next meeting is scheduled for September 18th at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

b. Asphalt, Materials and Concrete Working Groups

Jeff Benedict said they did meet in July, and worked on revising the recycled materials case. The next joint meeting of these working groups is planned for August 23rd, beginning at noon at the ARPA office.

21. General Discussion

Mr. Tyus said the ASTM web portal subscription was renewed for another year, and encouraged members to continue to take advantage of the service. He also said if anyone currently not using it would like to sign-up, to please contact him.

22. Adjournment:

Mr. Tobiasson adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m.