

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

April 3, 2013

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
Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage
Tom Condit, Gilbert
Mark Ivanich, Glendale
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear
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, Chair
* Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro
* Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA
Slade Ottney, NUCA
Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy)
Brian Gallimore, AGC
Adrian Green, AGC

Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Peter Kandarlis, Independent (Audio)
Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Jacob Rodriguez, SRP

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Dan Currence, ADS
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 March 6, 2013 meeting minutes. Troy Tobiasson 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.

Review of 2012 Carry Forward Cases

4. Case 12-12: Steel Reinforced Polyethylene Pipe

Add new Section 739 for Steel Reinforced Polyethylene (SRPE) Pipe. Sponsor Rod Ramos reviewed the revised version of Section 739 based on comments received. The changes were shown in red and included changing the pressure requirements to 10.8 psi to match the minimum ASTM standards. Mr. Ramos said language was added to address the joint welding issue. He said he also had available alternate wording allowing up to 1.5 times the allowable pressure rating may be used in certain circumstances. Jim Badowich liked the additional language; however, Mr. Herz thought it was a design, not a construction issue. Jason Mahkoltz agreed. Mr. Badowich said the additional language may be useful so inspectors know when to check for higher pressure.

Mr. Herz had several questions and suggestions based on his review of the draft and comparison to ASTM standards. He asked if there should be a minimum stiffness for the pipe when used in right-of-way applications. He also wondered how it would be affected by the backfill specifications. He noted the steel strength of 80,000 psi exceeds the ASTM minimum of 20,000 psi. Mr. Herz also had questions about how the cell classification of 335464C was determined. He wanted to make sure that the specifications were not written to exclude other manufacturers. Mr. Ramos was concerned that lowering all standards to the ASTM minimums may allow inferior products to be used that have not been tested in the field, and do not match the higher quality products they currently accept.

Bob Herz also asked if water stops and clamp gaskets section and other construction-related specifications should be moved out of the material spec and into the installation spec. Antonio Hernandez said the water-stops and clamps were used specifically for this type of material, and he thought it was appropriate that they be included. Jim Badowich commented that the water/sewer working group was working on rewriting the installation specification, but were trying to make them generic for all flexible pipe, so it may make more sense to leave

specifications that pertained to a particular material type in the material section. Mr. Herz suggested some of the language could be removed since it references the ASTM standard which covers its use. Finally, he had questions about the certification section and if the following section was redundant.

John Kanzlemer of Contech, helped draft the case in the working group and explained the rationale for some of the choices made. He also said the draft was based on the existing Section 738 for HDPE, and so the subsections reflected this. He also said the proposed specifications were based on existing materials currently used. Mr. Kanzlemer agreed to work with Bob Herz to answer his questions and incorporate changes in a future revision.

New 2012 Cases

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

One new correction was added to the case.

I) Section 108.8 Correction: Change “or” to “and” in the first line.

Bob Herz submitted this revision to clarify that both workmanship **and** materials were covered.

Peter Kandarlis suggested a correction to the detail drawings index page, but Mr. Herz said it was already covered in a new case he submitted.

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

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz highlighted the difference between MCDOT’s viscosity heating requirement of 380 degrees F and the existing 400 degrees F. He asked if any members wanted to change it to MCDOT’s standard or leave it as is. The members preferred to keep the current standard. Jason Mahkovtz suggested a couple minor typographic corrections. Mr. Herz said he would put together a final version and would like to vote on it at the next meeting.

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

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz said there were no changes since the last meeting. Brian Gallimore asked about adding the language for pre-lowering the manholes before doing an overlay. Mr. Herz said the lowering is done before milling and suggested that the language was more appropriate for Section 345. Mr. Gallimore said they could change 345 instead. Mr. Benedict said the working group would look into updating Section 345 and the details for a future case. Mr. Herz said he would make the final revisions and would like to vote on the case at the next meeting.

8. 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. He revised Note 2 on the

detail to remove “WHEN LOCATED IN PAVEMENT” since they are not always in pavement, and added “AND AT OTHER POINTS AS SHOWN ON PLANS.” Rod Ramos said he remembered a preference of showing on the TYPE ‘B’ detail with half of it not in pavement, since that was an option. Bob Herz said he would make that change to the drawing and asked to vote on the case at the next meeting.

9. 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. Sponsor Warren White handed out a new version of Section 740 based on comments received, which included a few minor corrections to the version included in the packet. Mr. White reviewed the changes which were outlined on the cover sheet of the case. He said the updated version he passed out fixed a typo and incorporated a reference to Section 603 for construction.

Rod Ramos suggested he review Mr. Herz’s comments on the previous Case 12-12 since 740 and 739 were similar in nature. He agreed and said they planned to coordinate within the water/sewer working group to keep the related cases in sync.

10. Case 13-06: Change Title of Part 600 to Include Storm Drain and Irrigation

Update Title of Part 600. Jami Erickson of Phoenix said they considered changing the title to include Underground Utilities, but decided to just add irrigation in addition to storm drain to describe Part 600 more thoroughly. The final title would read: WATER, SEWER, STORM DRAIN AND IRRIGATION. She said she would like to vote on the case next month.

11. Case 13-07: Revisions to Detail 201 ASPHALT PAVEMENT EDGE DETAILS

Correct miscellaneous errors and change the Type B thickened edge depth dimension from “8 inch minimum” to “8 inches”. Bob Herz introduced this case to make minor corrections to Detail 201. It would remove an unnecessary dimension, remove the min. note from another, and correct the title on the index page to match the current title of the detail drawing. Peter Kandaris asked if the dimension should have tolerances. Mr. Herz said no, they would be determined by the asphalt tolerances. He asked the group to look it over and provide him feedback.

12. Case 13-08: Revision to Section 321.8.8 Thickened Edge.

Eliminate references to ‘base course’ to clarify the surface being referenced. Mr. Herz introduced another new case to clarify that the thickened edge related to the asphalt pavement, not just the base course. Mr. Gallimore asked for clarification on the first sentence that stated, “the Contractor shall submit for the Engineer’s approval construction procedures to be used for placement and compaction of the thickened edge,” since the following two paragraphs already direct the contractor on how to do it. Mr. Herz suggested it could be for other reasons such as method of compaction. Mr. Ramos said contractors normally are not asked this. Bob Herz agreed with Mr. Ramos and asked for additional feedback from contractors and agencies.

13. Case 13-09: Revision to Section 321 Asphalt Penalty Tables

Raise penalties in tables based on City of Mesa supplement. Bob Draper of Mesa introduced a new case to revise asphalt penalty tables that would help create an incentive for contractors to complete acceptable work. This was brought to the committee based on a recommendation from the asphalt working group, and was based on the supplement used by the city of Mesa. Mr. Draper highlighted the main changes including Tables 321-4, 321-5 and 321-8. Both the original and proposed tables were included in the draft. He said they basically raised the penalties around 50-100%. He said Mesa also added a paragraph on the bottom of page 321-8.

Bob Herz noted that the bottom of Table 321-4 required removal and asked if that meant there was no longer an engineering analysis (AE). He said yes, in Mesa they do not allow an AE.

Brian Gallimore asked about a related topic concerning when the warranty period started on a job. He said that some agencies do not begin the warranty until job completion, even though the pavement may have been completed and in use for several years prior. Mr. Draper said in Mesa the warranty begins upon acceptance, and they inspect project before the year warranty expires. Mr. Gallimore countered that they often have had to wait a few years before a project was accepted, especially in subdivisions. Mr. Badowich said in Avondale they go by when a permit for the type of work is completed, not by completion of the entire project, but he noted cities practices are all different.

Bob Draper said discussions would continue in the asphalt working group, and members were invited to attend. Tom Wilhite asked if the penalties should be indexed to the CPI. Mr. Draper thought that may be a good idea, and also mentioned there was some talk of including incentives for higher quality work. Jim Badowich suggested Table 321-8 be ordered from low to high to match the existing tables. Troy Tobiasson said they should consider increased maintenance costs.

14. Case 13-10: Revision to Section 301.7 (Subgrade Preparation) MEASUREMENT

Add subgrade preparation measurement for graded non-surfaced driveways. Bob Herz introduced a new case to clarify measurement on non-paved surfaces such as driveways and dirt roads, that would also clarify payment for earth graded roads. Jim Badowich said they were not allowed to build dirt roads. Bob Herz noted that the entire county is not within the PM-10 air quality nonattainment area, and there are still many dirt roads within the county. He asked members to let him know if they have any problems with the proposed changes.

15. Potential Cases for 2013

Chairman Wilhite asked the committee if they had any other new or potential cases, and reminded them that July was the last month to submit new cases for 2013.

Peter Kandarlis said he planned to sponsor a case updating the curb, sidewalk and gutter specs in Section 340. He was incorporating some final comments he received from Maricopa County and hoped to introduce it at the May committee meeting.

Jim Badowich said they may have an update to the jacking and tunneling specifications come out of the water/sewer working group. He said potential changes included using bulkheads on the ends or filling the void with pea-gravel rather than grout. Mr. Draper said Mesa has some specifications, Ms. Erickson said Phoenix has some details. Peter Kandaris said SRP also has some specifications.

16. Working Group Reports

Chairman Wilhite asked for reports from the working groups.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met March 19th at 1:30 at the MAG office. (Notes included in packet.) He said in addition to the cases discussed previously, the group was provided a demonstration of a HDPE pipe bevel that claimed to reduce corrosion exposure and protect pipe during installation. He said the manufacturers were still working on getting AWWA approval. Jami Erickson said Phoenix is looking to it as a bevel to ease construction. Paul Nebeker said he was also aware of the product, but wondered since it took up space in the pipe, if it would have an effect on the pipe connections and deflection. The next meeting is scheduled for April 23rd at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the group met March 21st at noon at the ARPA offices. (Notes included in packet.) Mr. Benedict said he appreciated the good attendance and participation. Most of the cases discussed during the working group meeting were previously discussed; however he did say they would take a look at Section 345 and Detail 422. He said they are also finishing a draft for polymer asphalt to be added to existing Section 711. The next meeting is scheduled for April 25th at 12:00 p.m. at the ARPA office.

c. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore said he was unable to attend the last materials working group meeting; however, he understood that the consensus of the group was to incorporate both lime stabilization and modification within Section 309, so this would continue to be revised. The next meeting would follow the asphalt group as usual.

d. **Concrete Working Groups**

Jeff Hearne said, as Mr. Kandaris previously mentioned, Section 340 Curb, Sidewalks and Gutters should ready to present as a new case. They also continued work revising Section 324 Portland Cement Concrete Street Paving. He said some ASTM references no longer existed and needed to be updated. Warren White said he would like to forward the directional ramps that Chandler has been working on. He said they were used mainly on arterial streets, but they were having issues regarding previously approved projects in requiring the new ramps. The next meeting of the working group is scheduled for April 25th at ARPA following the materials working group at around 1:30 p.m.

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

Peter Kandarlis (via audio conference) said the group met on March 26th and reviewed the meeting notes provided to members. He said he would like to get a little more participation, so the next meeting is scheduled for May 1st, an hour before the regular committee meeting. He encouraged members to come early. He said Jacob Rodriguez volunteered to help review the 300 Sections, but that a couple more volunteers were needed to review sections and revise them as needed for outside ROW uses. He said it typically only took a few minutes per section. Mr. Kandarlis also encouraged vendors to submit new specifications for materials typically used outside the right-of-way. Finally he asked members to review their supplements for sections that could be incorporated into the document. He planned to prepare a draft for review by the committee later in the year.

17. General Discussion

Chairman Wilhite asked for general discussion items. Bob Draper said he would not be able to attend the July 3rd meeting and asked if others had a problem with attendance and suggested moving it to the following week. Mr. Tyus said he would look into the schedule, but thought it would be okay if the committee desired to change dates.

Gordon Tyus provided an update on the new ASTM portal implementation. He provided a handout that listed the two main options for connecting to the new ASTM portal (either by IP address or Java applet), as well as the ASTM representative's contact information. He described the testing he did setting it up at MAG, and told them about some of the limitations, such as not being able to access the portal through MAG's site, or being able to log-in remotely via user name and password which is currently allowed. He asked the members to find the list of users within their agency that required portal access, and also asked them to contact their IT department to help coordinate implementation of the new access methods. He said Jill Walters from ASTM would be contacting them soon to begin making the new portal available.

Mr. Wilhite said Mr. Tyus ordered a copy of the Southern California Greenbook that would be available as a peer reference when reviewing cases. Mr. Tyus confirmed that a single, hardcopy was purchased.

18. Future Agenda Items

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

19. Adjournment:

The chair adjourned the meeting at 3:21 p.m.