

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

March 6, 2013

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)
* Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage	Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Tom Condit, Gilbert	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
* Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair
* Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear	Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro
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 Kanzleamar, Contech

1. Call to Order

Chairman Thomas Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

Chairman Wilhite opened the call to the audience. No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the February 6, 2013 meeting minutes. Mr. Herz 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. Wildlife Crossing Mitigation Measures Presentation

Scott Sprague of the Arizona Game and Fish Department provided a short presentation on highway-related mitigation projects to allow wildlife to safely cross transportation infrastructure. His presentation provided examples of measures to help protect wildlife ecosystems, reduce vehicle accidents and improve safety, and meet federal requirements for protected species such as the desert tortoise.

Some examples provided during the presentation included: using fencing to keep animals off the roads, and designing crossing areas either at grade for low traffic areas, underneath through culverts, or using an overpass. Details showing types of fencing, cattle guards, and other details were provided including a wildlife ramp to allow animals an area to safely get off the roadway. In one case a 97% reduction in vehicle accidents with wildlife was shown when fencing was used.

Bob Herz asked which animals were of concern in Maricopa County. Mr. Sprague said there were big-horn sheep, mule deer, mountain lions, and a few bears as well as the desert tortoise.

Rod Ramos asked if there were design guidelines available. Mr. Sprague said there were guidelines for fencing, bridges and culverts available (he brought a few copies on CD) as well as information from a Pima County research report. He also described Habimaps, an online mapping tool for locating animal habitats in Arizona. He noted that the desert tortoise was the only federally protected species in Maricopa County. He showed a slide with a short fence to direct the tortoises to a culvert as a sample mitigation measure.

Jim Badowich asked if they worked with ADOT. Mr. Sprague said ADOT was a big partner and that they have become more interested in wildlife especially with regards to safety and liability issues.

Chair Wilhite thanked him for his presentation.

Review of 2012 Carry Forward Cases

5. Case 12-12: Steel Reinforced Polyethylene Pipe

Add new Section 739 for Steel Reinforced Polyethylene (SRPE) Pipe. Sponsor Rod Ramos handed out a new version of Section 739 based on comments received through the committee and water/sewer working group meetings. The handout included a copy of existing Section 738 to use as a comparison and show how the new specification was modeled on it. Mr. Ramos said although trenching and installation specs are still being revised by the working group, he believed the material specification could go ahead as planned and use the existing installation specifications in the meantime.

Bob Herz noted the difference between the ASTM minimum pressure rating for joints of 10.8 psi compared to the material spec of 15 psi. John Kanzleamar of Contech said this pipe could meet a higher rating. Mr. Herz suggested changing the spec to the minimum so that it was not specific to a particular brand or manufacturer. Jim Badowich asked if it could be used for irrigation and Mr. Kanzleamar said that it could and often is. Bob Draper said he suggested removing the reference to “low pressure” because it was vague and undefined. Rod Ramos said the engineers would look at the material characteristics and decide if an application was appropriate.

Tom Wilhite asked if SRPE could be used to repair flood irrigation pipe and also asked about coupling it to existing pipes. Mr. Kanzleamar said that custom couplings are available depending on the type of pipe. Bill Davis said you must use a water stop with concrete pipe transitions. He noted that Section 739.2.4 references the water stop. Mr. Wilhite also asked about the required cover material. John Kanzleamar said it can depend on whether there is a live load or not. Typically a minimum of 12” to the bottom of pavement is required, but this was a design issue.

Jim Badowich commented that the proposed spec allows a maximum pipe diameter of 120” – currently the same as HDPE, but that ADOT currently only allows up to 60”. AASHTO also only has approved up to 60”, although the ASTM spec is at 120”. Rod Ramos said agencies can always limit the size if they want. Jim Badowich said the trench table widths being revised in Section 603 will show up to 120”. He said the spec may need to be updated to reference installation specs in 610, 615 and 618. Mr. Kanzleamar suggested referencing 603 and updating 603 to reference the other installation specs as appropriate.

New 2012 Cases

6. Case 13-01 A-G: Miscellaneous Corrections

Three new corrections were added to the case.

F) Delete non-existent reference located within Section 795 Landscape Material.

Bob Herz submitted this update which was provided in the packet. In the revision to the materials section in the 2012 revision, decomposed granite was removed. This case removes the reference to old section.

G) Revise Section 107.4 to change the Arizona Revised Statue reference 41-846 to 41-865.

Mr. Herz handed out another correction relating to Section 107.4 Archaeological Reports. His research showed the correct reference should be to ARS 41-865.

H) Remove the word “AND” in the title of Section 725 so it reads “PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE”

Jeff Herne noticed this error, and a handout was provided during the meeting. Since Mr. Herz previously handed out an update, the letter “H” was assigned to this case.

7. Case 13-02: Revision to Section 337 CRACK SEALING

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz handed out a new update with his changes highlighted in yellow. One of the issues brought up was the change in the range for crack sizes back to 1/4” – 1” rather than the proposed change of 1/8” to 1-1/2”. Instead he added language that for 1/4” cracks, the contractor would continue sealing the crack down to 1/8” in size, and would notify the engineer of any cracks greater than 1”. He also highlighted the difference between MCDOTs viscosity heating requirement of 380 degrees F rather than the existing 400 degrees F. Since the material is applied at 380 degrees, MCDOT believes the testing should be done at the same temperature. Jeff Benedict said the Asphalt working group recommended keeping the existing temperature. Mr. Herz said a disadvantage is that the material may cost more from the manufacturer, but the advantage is you would know it will work at the temperature at which the material is being applied. Finally, Mr. Herz said Section 337.7 Measurement was updated to list several methods to allow the agency to pick the method of payment they preferred.

8. Case 13-03: Revision to Section 321.8.6 ASPHALT CONCRETE OVERLAY

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz handed out a new update with his changes highlighted in yellow. He said he addressed the issue of when tack coating is used for dust control. Brian Gallimore brought up the issue of adjustments to manholes including pre-lowering them before milling for the overlay. He pointed out that this is the section where adjustments are called out and suggested to add update it while the case was open. Mr. Herz asked Mr. Gallimore to submit language he would like to include.

9. Case 13-04: Revision to Detail 120 SURVEY MARKER

Revise detail to prevent installation of survey markers that do not comply with requirements of state law. Bob Herz presented an updated Detail 120: Survey Marker based on feedback from the previous meeting. The chamfer was removed from the Type B detail, and Note 7 was added to describe when the chamfer was needed. Note 8 added that the year must also be stamped on the cap. Jim Badowich described an example of placing the marker in the medium where it would not match the asphalt/base materials that were shown on the detail. Mr. Herz said the Type B detail illustrates a typical installation, but does not specifically call out the asphalt or

base materials specifically. Tom Wilhite said Tempe uses and would like to keep the Type C option. Mr. Herz proposed voting on the case next month.

10. Case 13-05: New Section 740 Polypropylene Pipe and Fittings for Gravity Storm Drain and Sanitary Sewer

Propose new material section for Polypropylene Pipe material. Warren White said the proposed polypropylene pipe material is on a similar path as the proposed Section 379 SRPE case. While the working group is continuing to make updates to the trenching and installation specification, the materials spec can be reviewed and updated as necessary to be in sync. Bill Davis said they were continuing rewriting the flexible pipe sections in the working group, but would be happy to take any questions about the proposed pipe material.

Bob Herz asked why the thermoplastic welding was deleted in one section but not another. Mr. Davis said he would review it. Paul Nebeker began a short discussion on thermal welding applications of different types of plastic pipe materials. There was also some discussion on the differences of corrugated, solid wall and smooth exterior types of plastic pipe.

11. Case 13-06: Change Title of Part 600 to Include Storm Drain

Update Title of Part 600. Jami Erickson of Phoenix presented this change to allow them to remove it from their supplement. Members suggested adding Irrigation to the list to make it even more complete. The consensus of the committee was to make this a separate case rather than add it to the miscellaneous corrections case.

12. Potential Cases for 2013

Warren White asked if anyone was considering using PVC for water mains that were not under the street. Several members questioned whether we should consider PVC material at all. Others suggested that it may be appropriate for the Outside ROW group to review. Scottsdale, Mesa and Phoenix do not allow PVC pipe. Jim Badowich said you can't use mechanical joints on PVC because it places pressure points on it, so support must be provided by thrust blocks. Peter Kandarlis said it is used for irrigation purposes.

Another issue brought up was whether Asbestos-cement water pipe (ACP) should be included in MAG since it is no longer available. One thought was to leave it for maintenance only, especially information for connection and removal procedures. Craig Sharp said Flagstaff requires removal all the way back to a coupling for repairs. It was also proposed to remove Section 752 Asbestos-cement Water Pipe and Fittings from the MAG standards. Valley Metro and Phoenix have removed it from their specifications. Harvey Estrada of Valley Metro agreed to sponsor a case regarding ACP.

Peter Kandarlis said he planned to sponsor a case updating the curb, sidewalk and gutter specs.

Jim Badowich said the polywrap dimensions table needed to be updated and said a case to revise them should be coming soon from the water/sewer group.

13. Working Group Reports

Chairman Wilhite asked for reports from the working groups. He asked the working group chairs to provide him a paragraph on the topics of the next working group meetings, so he could send a timely email notice.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met February 19th at 1:30 at the MAG office. (Notes included in packet.) He said the group discussed manhole details and were planning to take out the adjustment detail and move it to the streets (200) area. Revised and new details would include the precast manhole sections, precast base, and cast in place base. He said the group discussed the best place for precast base specifications. Mr. Herz suggested adding it to Section 505 for precast structures. Mr. Badowich handed out a table showing the relationship of pipe types, trenching and installation specifications and what sections the group was working on. He thanked the industry representatives for their work on draft revisions. He hoped to have cases ready in a couple months. Another issue to be addressed by the group was revisions to the testing and flushing sections. The next meeting is scheduled for March 19th at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said he didn't have anything to add that wasn't discussed earlier other than the next meeting is scheduled for March 21st at noon at the ARPA offices. Mr. Wilhite asked if he had a list of issues that would be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Benedict said he would provide them to him, and also work to plan ahead for additional meetings.

c. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore said they discussed breaking Section 309 into two separate specifications, one for lime stabilization and one for lime modification, since they were two different processes. He said several manufacturers were planning to attend the next meeting, and asked if the agency members had any issues regarding lime specifications to please attend. The next materials working group meeting will follow the asphalt meeting on March 21st.

d. **Concrete Working Groups**

Jeff Hearne said they planned to get Section 340 Curb, Sidewalks and Gutters ready to present as a new case and also planned to continue work revising Section 324 Portland Cement Concrete Street Paving. He also discussed a handout announcing the Arizona Concrete Pavement Tech Day on March 14, 2013. He said ADOT along with FHWA and ACPA would be giving presentations and showing results of a long term pavement performance test. The event included presentations, lunch and a review of the tests in the field.

The next meeting of the working group is scheduled for February 21st at ARPA beginning around 1:30 p.m.

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

Peter Kandaris said he met on February 26th with an industry representative from ADS, and was planning the next meeting for Tuesday, March 26th at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG offices. His plan is to review sections of the proposed outside ROW document and update existing MAG sections as required with minor changes. He said he does need help and requested assistance from members. Warren White asked if he received landscaping information. Mr. Kandaris said he did and could work with Mr. Gallimore and the materials group for misc. items such as landscaping not covered by the other working groups.

14. General Discussion

Chairman Wilhite asked for general discussion items. None were voiced by the committee. Mr. Tyus said he had no further updates.

15. Future Agenda Items

Chairman Wilhite asked for general discussion items. None were voiced by the committee.

16. Adjournment:

The chair adjourned the meeting at 3:23 p.m.