

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

September 5, 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)
* 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	* Jacob Rodriguez, SRP
* Adrian Green, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Mike Hook, ACPA
John Kanzlemaz, Contech
Tom Kennedy
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 August 1, 2012 meeting minutes. Bob Herz introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Bob Draper seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

4. 2013 Chair and Vice Chair

Chairman Tobiasson announced that Jim Badowich has thrown in his name as a candidate for vice chair beginning next year, pending approval of his manager, and official appointment. Warren White moved and Tom Wilhite seconded a motion for the committee to recommend Mr. Badowich serve as vice chair beginning in 2013. 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, update Section 321.8. Bob Herz said the final update was included in the agenda packet, and asked if there were any comments. Rod Ramos questioned the 8” plus or minus dimension on the safety edge section, thinking it may be unclear how much leeway is allowed. Mr. Herz explained that the dimension varies depending on the roadway, but is based on achieving a 30 degree angle for the safety edge. Brian Gallimore suggested putting the 30 degree angle on detail drawing to match the written specifications. It was also suggested to make the 5” safety edge depth 5” min. Mr. Herz agreed to these changes, and moved to accept Case 11-02 with the changes noted. Mark Ivanich seconded the motion as amended. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed. 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

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 provided a final version of the case before the meeting. It was updated to reflect the changes noted at the last meeting by Maricopa County, with the exception of leaving in the reference to AWWA C111. He discussed this with Jami Erikson of Phoenix to make sure it met their needs as well. Mr. Herz noted that the comments he provided in August included removing the reference to cadmium bolts in

Section 505.6.3.3 (5). Since it was not in the handout provided during the meeting, he wanted to make sure it was included. Mr. Badowich agreed and moved to accept Case 12-03 based on the final handout, plus the change to Section 505 that was in the packet. Jami Erickson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

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

Update references to state statutes and regulatory requirements. Peter Kandaris said the final version included minor changes requested by MCDOT and Phoenix in the permit section. He read the final language for the committee. Mr. White noticed a typo in the second to last sentence where the word “closed” should read “close.” Mr. Herz moved to accept Case 11-12 with the spelling correction noted. The motion was seconded by Jami Erickson. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

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

Update Section 415 based on the Maricopa County Supplement. Reference MCDOT Details. Peter Kandaris said he worked with Bob Herz to make the case consistent with the latest revisions done by the county. Mr. Herz asked for the reference to specific national standards for temporary protective end treatments (Section 415.3.1) be removed and make it at the discretion of the engineer. Mr. Kandaris said he put those standards in based on comments from the last meeting, but that he was willing to take them back out if that was the consensus of the committee. Rod Ramos asked about the guardrail detail drawings. Mr. Kandaris said it currently is referencing MCDOT details. Mr. Ramos said that MAG typically doesn't reference other agency supplements and asked about adding them to the MAG document. Mr. Kandaris said that this option was discussed, but it was decided to allow MCDOT to finalize changes to the guardrail details. Next year there could be a new case if it was decided that it was preferable to include them in the MAG book. Mr. Ramos moved to accept Case 11-16, with the strike-out revision requested by Mr. Herz. Jim Badowich seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

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

Add language in Section 350.2 for utility removal, and payment requirements. Mr. Kandaris noted that Bob Herz helped him clean-up the final version included in the packet. He reviewed the changes with the committee, including revised wording in the second paragraph of Section 350.2.1 Utilities. Also the second paragraph of 350.2.2 was removed, and the third paragraph of Section 350.2.2 was revised. Brian Gallimore had a question on Section 350.4 PAYMENT. He thought it was unclear if payment was for all misc. items together, or each one separately, since it said “for each removal items.” To clarify that it was for all items together, the committee agreed to remove the aforementioned text. Warren White moved and Bob Herz seconded the motion to accept Case 11-18 with the changes noted. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

New 2012 Cases

10. Case 12-01A-D: Miscellaneous Corrections

Mr. Tobiasson asked if there were any updates or new corrections. Seeing none, Bob Draper moved and Warren White seconded the motion to accept Case 12-01 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

11. 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 revised detail drawing in the packet that updated the note to read "DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE WIDTH." Members questioned why the note for the sidewalk showed 1.5% slope on the section view but 2% max on the plan view. Mr. Herz explained that he didn't want to change the sidewalk detail requirement, which is 1.5%, but that a greater slope was needed to get the angled sections to match up from the curb to the sidewalk behind the ramp. To make it consistent, it was suggested to change Section A-A to note the slope as: 1.5% desirable, 2% max. Jim Badowich described a problem where ramps sloping down below street grade created a water run-off problem. To address this potential problem it was suggested to add note 14. "Elevation of top of driveway ramp shall be equal to or greater than normal curb elevation." Jim Badowich moved and Craig Sharp seconded the motion to accept Detail 250-2 with the revisions noted. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

12. 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 the final version reflected changes suggested by Mr. Wilhite at the last meeting. A minor edit to the revision was made during the meeting to add commas before and after the text "when authorized by the engineer" in the second paragraph of the revision. Mr. Benedict said the font was changed to highlight the revision, but would be the same in the final format. Bob Herz moved and Syd Anderson seconded the motion to accept Case 12-04 with the minor correction of adding the two commas. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

13. 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 that incorporated many changes suggested by MCDOT. Mr. Herz noted that Section A-A shows the thickness at 8", but does not show the same thickness for the curb and gutter. Tom Wilhite said that since the concrete thickness on the previous detail discussed was 9", he thought it should be 9" on this detail as well to be consistent. There was some discussion as to whether it should also be changed to class A concrete rather than class B, but it was decided to tackle that issue at a later date. Bob Herz said he would like to add a note 7, which is the same as note 1 on Detail 250-2: "Depressed curb shall be paid for at the contract unit price for the type of curb used at that location."

Brian Gallimore asked about payment the additional thickness required. Mr. Herz responded that he wanted the bid unit price to be the same to make it easier for agencies. Rod Ramos asked about labeling construction/control joints, to make sure cracking did not occur at the edge. It was suggested to add a note 8 to label the control joints. Several members had questions regarding the material used beyond the entrance. Mr. Herz said it could be asphalt, gravel, or other materials and not necessarily concrete. To make that more clear, he suggested removing the line and earth fill on the left side of Section A-A. Bob Draper moved and Rod Ramos seconded the motion to accept Case 12-06 with all the modifications to Detail 260 discussed. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

14. 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 handed out a final version of the case during the meeting. The changes were highlighted in yellow and included changing the word “by” to “in the presence of” in Section 505.6.3.3 (1), and deleting the second paragraph under Section 505.6.3.3 (6) regarding deck joint assemblies. Mr. Herz said the purpose of the case was to update the welding standards on the second page because the codes have changed. Mr. Wilhite noted that since Case 11-03 passed earlier and removed the reference to cadmium bolts in Section 505.6.3.3 (5), it should be struck here as well. Mr. Herz agreed and moved to accept Case 12-10 with the revisions noted. Bob Draper seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

15. 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. Final updates to the case were provided based on feedback from the August 1 committee meeting and the Asphalt/Materials working group meetings. The committee decided to discuss and vote on each of the individual components A) for materials, B) for asphalt and C) for CLSM separately.

Jeff Hearne discussed the changes to Case 12-11A first. He said updates were made to add “uniformly blended” and “prior approval of engineer.” Bob Draper said the ‘d’ should be removed from the word “recovered” in the first sentence of 701.5. Peter Kandaris suggested moving the second paragraph of 701.2 under the General Section 701.1. Another typographic error was to add a missing period at the end of 701.2.4.

For Section 702 Mr. Hearne said “uniform blend” was added again, and other minor corrections discussed during the working group meeting. Another change brought to his attention before the meeting was to change the word “shall” to “may” in the 4th and 5th paragraphs of 702.1 so that users would not be confused thinking they must use RAP. Bob Herz also suggested changing the language “shall be used” to “is primarily used” in 702.1.1 and 702.1.2. Bob Draper asked what was meant by “deep lifts” in this same sentence. To clarify meaning, the end of 702.1.2 was changed by striking “or deep lifts for backfill” and replacing it with “for fill.” There was discussion about the use of recycled materials as select

material. Brian Gallimore said they have used it for fill below ABC. Members agreed it was not to be used for backfill around pipes. When asked about compaction, Brian Gallimore explained that you typically need more water, but the lifts are still the same – typically 4”-6”. He said recycled materials would still have the same testing and installation requirements.

Jeff Hearne pointed out the new line for recycled concrete materials in Section 725.3. Bob Draper said he wanted a limit to the amount of recycled materials used in concrete. Jeff Hearne explained how it was limited by meeting the requirements for aggregates in Section 701. Finally, Mr. Hearne said no changes were made to Section 310 since the last meeting.

Bob Draper moved and Rod Ramos seconded the motion to approve Case 12-11A with the revisions noted during the meeting. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 10 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 3 not present.

Jeff Benedict discussed the changes to Case 12-11B for recycled asphalt. He said minor changes were made to Section 710 based on feedback. These included formatting in the tables including making the fractions the same font size, and adding to Section 710.3.1 (5) “The percentage of RAP and RAP binder being contributed to the total mix shall be included in the mix design report.” Bob Draper asked that language be added to Section 710.2.3 to make it clear that RAP cannot be used unless it is expressly allowed by the engineer. The wording “When allowed by the Engineer” was added to the beginning sentence in Section 710.2.3.

Rod Ramos commented that the percentages of RAP contributions seemed high and asked about the use in actual projects. Jeff Benedict said the 15% was based on AASHTO recommended amounts. Brian Gallimore said he used 25% in the base and 20% on the surface of the U.S. 60 project they did, and are using 30% for shoulders on a Sky Harbor project specified by the City of Phoenix. Mr. Benedict said the technology for using 30% works fine, although the actual amount used would be determined by the mix design requirements. Mr. Benedict noted that it has additional testing requirements. Syd Anderson suggested agencies work closely with suppliers and get info from the industry if they begin projects using RAP. Jeff Hearne reminded members that this case just adds the framework to allow the use of recycled materials. Brian Gallimore said ARPA/AGC is planning to put together a tour of a plant producing RAP the agency representatives are welcome to attend.

Rod Ramos moved and Mark Ivanich seconded the motion to approve Case 12-11B with the revisions noted during the meeting. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 10 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 3 not present.

Mr. Hearne said that no changes were made to Case 12-11C, the CLSM section, since the last meeting. This case would allow materials other than #57 aggregate to be used but he also noted the new text in 728.2 does include the requirement that it “is approved by the engineer.” Peter Kandarlis asked if it still had to meet gradation requirements, because a CLSM mix with all fines such as sand will not work. Mr. Hearne assured him that it still had to have the minimum of 40% of coarse aggregate, and that any recycled aggregate would need to meet the same gradation requirements. With that question resolved, Mark Ivanich

moved and Syd Anderson seconded the motion to approve Case 12-11C as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed, 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present.

16. Case 12-12: Steel Reinforced Polyethylene Pipe

Add new Section 739 for Steel Reinforced Polyethylene (SRPE) Pipe. Sponsor Rod Ramos said a cleaned up, final version incorporated feedback from the water/sewer working group. Syd Anderson asked about the installation specifications for the pipe. Mr. Ramos said the current case was just for the material, and that several other sections referring to HDPE pipe would need to be updated. He said if approved as-is, the pipe material could be specified in MAG, but the installation requirements would have to be part of the special provisions. Jim Badowich said the installation requirements were discussed at the working group, and it was thought that the requirements should be part of a larger revision to the specifications grouping rigid and flexible pipe separately so their installation procedures are correct for each material. Bob Herz noted that there were several installation requirements listed in Section 739 including the last paragraph of 739.1 and 739.3.2. Mr. Herz also noted that 739.6 Dimensions and Tolerances could be removed because the material is already specified. In Section 739.5 Mr. Herz said he wanted the contractor to deliver the certification, not the manufacturer. Syd Anderson said Phoenix requires independent testing rather than testing by the manufacturer.

John Kanzlemaz, of Contech, who helped develop the specification, said that the format and items included within followed the current HDPE material section 738. Rod Ramos said references to HDPE also are in Sections 601, 610 and 615. Jim Badowich said Section 603 for HDPE installation will likely be revised to be more inclusive for all flexible piping.

Due to the many issues brought up by committee members, and the on-going work for the installation specifications being done through the water/sewer working group process, Mr. Ramos suggested carrying forward this case to 2013. A consensus of members agreed.

17. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson asked for reports from the working groups.

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

Jim Badowich said the group did not meet in August but do have the next meeting scheduled for September 18th at 1:30 at the MAG office. He says they will continue to work on Case 12-12 and the installation requirements that go along with both rigid and flexible pipe.

b. **Asphalt, Materials and Concrete Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said meeting topics were covered in the written report. He said future topics will include the penalty table in Section 310, but noted the next working group meeting would likely not be until November. Jeff Hearne said he would begin looking at potential cases that were set aside, and planned to coordinate the meeting date in

November with the asphalt working group. Brian Gallimore said he would do the same but also wants to tackle the manhole adjustment details.

c. **Outside Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said he plans to get the group back to its original mandate of preparing specifications for the outside ROW area, now that the main MAG specifications have been more thoroughly updated.

18. General Discussion

Paul Nebeker complimented the committee on the good work done over the past couple years, and said he was impressed that the committee is taking a more progressive and forward looking view of the specifications. He was glad to see the committee was able to come together and unanimously approve so many cases.

Brian Gallimore thanked Troy Tobiasson for his service as chair, and for pressuring the working groups to complete their work on time.

Chair Tobiasson announced that an October meeting would not be necessary, and asked the committee about possible future agenda items for next year.

Warren White said that SRP is planning to give up their street lighting infrastructure, so agencies may have to take these over if they haven't already.

Mr. Tyus reminded case sponsors to please make the final changes to their cases as discussed in the meeting and get them to him as soon as possible so that he can begin making the updates to the MAG document. He also said that the next step in the review process was to submit a summary of cases and the update packet to the public works directors for review. He asked any members whose directors may have changed to please send him the updated contact information.

Seeing no further business, Mr. Tobiasson thanked the committee for their hard work during the year.

19. Adjournment:

The chair adjourned the meeting at 4:36 p.m.