

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

Dan Nissen, Peoria (proxy)
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
Tony Braun, 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 Kanzlemer, Contech
Mike Hook (ACPA)
Arvid Veidmark (Specialized Services Co.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman Thomas Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The chair then introduced a future new member from Peoria, Mr. Dan Nissan. Mr. Nissan introduced himself and said he would be replacing Mr. Setovich as Peoria's representative.

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 April 3, 2013 meeting minutes. While they were being reviewed Mr. Wilhite passed around a copy of the Southern California Greenbook. Bob 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.

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 last month's comments. The case had a memo prepared by Mr. Kanzlemer that outlined the changes. Most of the suggestions were incorporated in the revised draft. The case maintained wording that exceeds ASTM minimum requirements in four areas: Galvanized pipe, 80,000 psi vs. 20,305 psi for steel tensile strength, 335464C for cell classification and steel reinforced bell and spigot joints. Mr. Ramos said he discussed these items with the manufacturer and would like to see them retained in the spec so that agencies are not delivered substandard materials which they have not tested in the field.

Rod Ramos then went through the document highlighting other changes including:

- Adding ASTM F2562 reference in Table 1.
- Gaskets and water stops were updated to reference ASTM.
- The lower ASTM required pressure of 10.8 psi was retained.
- Terminology for electrofusion was changed to thermal weld.
- Added certification standards to match the other comments addressed.

Bob Herz asked why galvanizing was required when it was secondary protection, since if the plastic was cut through it would likely scratch the galvanized area as well. Mr. Ramos said it was incidental protection. Mr. Herz thought that if it was specified, the amount or thickness of galvanization should be included. Mr. Kanzlemer said he could get that information.

Paul Nebeker noticed that in Section 739.7 the reference to rubber gaskets should be changed to "elastomeric" to be consistent. Mr. Herz said language should be added to insure the

material is protected during installation, by adding “installed” to the listing in the first sentence of Section 739.7. Bob Draper had a question about the reference to 1.5 times the pressure rating for the pipe. He thought this could confuse people into using it for other than low pressure rated applications. Mr. Ramos agreed that the line could be deleted, which would then require the design engineer to determine if the pipe can be used for other applications.

Peter Kandarlis asked if the non-shrink grout specified in 739.3.3 needed a grout strength specification. Paul Nebeker said that most grout sold now does have a rating on the packaging. He also noted that concrete to plastic collars usually were not a problem. Mr. Ramos said he would modify the case based on comments and proposed to vote on it next month.

New 2012 Cases

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

No new corrections were added and there was no further discussion on this case.

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

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz asked for any additional comments. Seeing none, he moved to accept the case as presented. Troy Tobiasson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 2 not present. Case 13-02 was approved.

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

Obtain compatibility with Maricopa County requirements. Bob Herz asked for any additional comments. Seeing none, he moved to accept the case as presented. Rod Ramos seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 2 not present. Case 13-03 was approved.

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 said the Type ‘B’ detail was updated to show both asphalt and ground installation methods in the section view. Seeing no further comments, Mr. Herz moved to accept the case as presented. Bob Draper seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 2 not present. Case 13-04 was approved.

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 described the updated version of the case that was provided in the meeting addendum. He reminded the committee that the section was based on the existing Section 738 HDPE pipe and the updated Section 740 incorporated many of the same changes as described for Section 739

in Case 12-12. He thanked representatives from ADS and the water/sewer working group for assistance. Mr. White described the updated areas summarized in the bulleted list on the cover sheet for the case. These included:

- Incorporated references to installation specs in 603, 615, and 618.
- Updated specs for gaskets and water stops to reflect ASTM standards.
- Updated certification subsection to reflect ASTM requirements.
- Removed section on Dimensions and Tolerances.
- Corrected errors in the Markings subsection.
- Made other deletions and corrections as per comments.

Mr. White noted that (PP) is the industry standard abbreviation for Polypropylene Pipe. Bob Herz said the second paragraph in the general section could be deleted because it is a given. Tom Wilhite suggested using commas in the first paragraph to reduce the confusing number of parenthesis. Bob Draper noted that the reference to rubber gasket in 740.7 should be changed to elastomeric to be consistent. Bob Draper suggested adding “installed” to the listing in the first sentence of Section 740.7.

Jim Badowich had a comment on a job in Avondale where they are using solid wall HDPE with mechanical adapters and fusion welding. He suggested there may be a need for an additional specification for this method since none currently exists in MAG.

Bill Davis said that reference to thermal welding was removed from 740 since it is not part of the pipe material. Jim Badowich noticed that a reference to thermal welding was still shown on the top of page 2.

Mr. White said he would make the additional revisions and would like to vote on the case at the next meeting.

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

Update Title of Part 600. Case sponsor Jami Erickson was not in attendance, however, Syd Anderson of Phoenix delivered the message that she would still like to vote on the case this month. The final title would read: WATER, SEWER, STORM DRAIN AND IRRIGATION. With no additional comment, Syd Anderson moved to accept the case as presented. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 3 not present. Case 13-06 was approved.

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 said this detail was updated to make the thickened edge 8” exactly, instead of 8” minimum to avoid additional payment for asphalt that is not necessary. Brian Galimore said that an 8” thickness would require two lifts, and it would make it difficult to construct and compact a small 4” thick trench. He said he would like to talk to contractors to see about the best method of constructing the edge without using a thicker dimension of asphalt. Mark Ivanich asked how you could test it anyway. Mr. Herz said they do

not test anything within 12” of the edge, but he does want the contractor to make a compactive effort on the edge. He asked members to send him their comments because he would like to vote on the case at the next meeting.

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 explained that this case covered the written specifications on the thickened edge revisions of the detail in Case 13-07. There are a couple deletions he would like to make and asked members to review the case and get back to him if they have any issues.

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

Raise penalties in tables based on City of Mesa supplement. Bob Draper said he was unable to attend the last asphalt working group meeting where the case was discussed; however, he did announce that they planned a few supplemental meetings on the issue before the next working group meeting. The case would continue to be addressed at the working group level and the results of the discussions will be presented at a future meeting.

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

Add subgrade preparation measurement for graded non-surfaced driveways. Bob Herz asked for comments. Brian Gallimore asked about subgrade prep tests. Tom Wilhite questioned what was meant by traveled area, and there was suggestions to call it unsurfaced driveway areas or unpaved roads. Mr. Wilhite suggested the area for subgrade preparation can be identified on the plans.

15. Case 13-11: Delete Section 737 ASBESTOS-CEMENT PIPE AND FITTINGS FOR STORM DRAIN AND SANITARY SEWER

Delete Section 737 and references to it. Bob Herz introduced a new case that was included in the agenda packet to prevent the use of asbestos-cement pipe and fittings for storm drain and sanitary sewer installations. In addition to deleting Section 737, the reference to it in Section 604 would also need to be removed.

Peter Kandarlis said this was reviewed previously and was not deleted because of the need to repair existing water lines. Mr. Herz noted that this case focused on just storm drain and sewer, and that removing its use in water lines would be a separate case. He suggested MAG may want to develop a spec for ACP removal. Jim Badowich said the water/sewer working group did discuss deleting it entirely except for repairs. Harvey Estrada volunteered to work on a specification for removal of asbestos-concrete pipe since Valley Metro has had experience removing this material. Antonio Hernandez said they often just abandon it in place. Bob Herz said if it is abandoned you may have problems if you dig through it. Mr. Hernandez said they do keep a record on the as-builts to locate the abandoned pipe.

Since the case is a pretty straight-forward deletion of a material no longer used, Mr. Herz proposed to vote on the case at the next meeting.

16. Case 13-12: Revisions to Section 340: Concrete Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk, Sidewalk Ramps, Driveway and Alley Entrance

Incorporate agency supplements and update Section 340 to current practice. Peter Kandarlis introduced a new case from the concrete working group. Major changes include: a new subgrade preparation subsection, addition of curing requirements, a new deficiencies subsection, and expansion of measurement and payment sections to provide more clarity and payment options for removal/replacement. The section was also reorganized to flow in a manner that more closely follows the construction process. Mr. Kandarlis explained the document mark-up to identify new, changed and deleted sections, and said a color version was available online. He hoped that these proposed changes would also help reduce agency supplements.

Tom Wilhite asked about using the specs in development projects and issues such as ADA cross slope requirements tying in to existing sidewalks. Mr. Kandarlis said ADA requirements can be updated and repair of ramps is also an issue. Harvey Estrada said Valley Metro had requests to make driveways accessible when doing light rail projects. Rod Ramos considered this more of a design issue, and falls back on the agency/owner to meet ADA standards.

Jim Badowich asked if the radius of joints was included. Members believed this information is provided on the sidewalk details.

17. Case 13-13: Revisions to Section 415 Flexible Metal Guardrail

The purpose was to allow use of either 8"x8" or 6"x8" wood posts for continuous guardrails, and delete reference to manufacturer's recommendations. Bob Herz introduced a new case to make minor revisions the guardrail post specifications in Section 415 and make them consistent along the length of the guardrail. Rod Ramos asked about the post orientation and Mr. Herz said it is shown on the detail drawings.

18. Case 13-14: Revisions to Section 711 Paving Asphalt

Revise Section 711 to update AASHTO references and add a new polymer modified section. Jeff Benedict introduced a new case coming out of the asphalt working group. He said the AASHTO test references in Table 711-1 were updated since the current references are to provisional AASHTO specs that no longer exist. He said these tests were reviewed by manufacturers. Mr. Benedict also explained a new table 711-2 that provided specifications for two polymer modified materials.

Bob Draper asked why AASHTO was used rather than ASTM. Bob Herz commented that since this is a type of highway material it makes sense to use the highway specifications.

Mr. Benedict asked members to review the case and provide him feedback.

19. Case 13-15: Revisions to MAG Sections 603, 615 and 618 for Flexible Pipe.

Update pipe installation requirements to allow for flexible pipe types. Warren White introduced a new case out of the water/sewer working group that made revisions to Sections 603, 615 and 618 to allow the proper installation of new flexible pipe materials such as those discussed in cases 12-12 and 13-05. Section 603 originally focused on HDPE pipe. This was revised to allow for a series of different types of flexible pipe. The trench width tables were updated to meet ASTM requirements. Mr. White summarized the changes included in the cover letter and the table showing the interrelated changes needed throughout the water/sewer specifications. He thanked representatives from ADS and Contech for their assistance and presented the case to allow agencies to review the proposal and provide feedback.

Mr. White said a separate but related issue of updating Detail 200 also needed to be addressed to make the terminology consistent with the revisions and industry standards.

Jim Badowich quickly summarized the process the water/sewer working group used to develop the case, and also introduced the issue of testing – including the use of laser testing. He asked members for feedback on testing issues and said the case would be continued to be discussed in the working group meetings. Mr. Wilhite thanked Mr. White and all those who helped develop the case.

20. Case 13-16: Revision to Section 602; Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing

Retitle and revise Section 602 to match current industry standards. Jim Badowich introduced a new case to thoroughly revise Section 602 based on feedback during the water/sewer working group meetings. Arvid Veidmark, a contractor specializing in this area, provided assistance revising the specification to meet industry practice. It removed obsolete processes, including the required use of grout. Instead, the casing could use spacers and could be filled with pea gravel and sealed with bulkheads. This would allow the pipe to be removed in the future if required.

Bob Draper asked about other trenchless methods. Mr. Veidmark said the spec focused on dry, rather than wet boring methods. Peter Kandaris said this section did not focus on directional boring either, although that is a specification that may need to be added to MAG in the future.

There was discussion of allowing different types of pipe/utilities rather than just water and sewer. There was a consensus to change the title to Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing, since the utilities going in the cases do not affect the casing installation. There was some discussion about using different materials for casing, although they tend to be exceptions in today's practice.

21. Case 13-17: Revision to Section 430.4 DECOMPOSED GRANITE AREA

Eliminate placement of polyethylene below decomposed granite. Bob Herz introduced a new case to delete reference to requiring polyethylene plastic in Section 430.4. He asked members to review it this month and send him comments.

22. Potential Cases for 2013

Other than the cases submitted during the meeting, no additional potential cases were discussed.

23. Working Group Reports

Chairman Wilhite asked for reports from the working groups.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met April 23rd at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office. He summarized the issues shown in the meeting notes. The group will continue to review active cases, as well as work on manhole details and water flushing and testing. The next meeting is scheduled for May 21st at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the group met April 25th at noon at the ARPA offices. (Notes included in addendum.) Mr. Benedict said in addition to reviewing active cases they are planning to introduce a new case on utilities adjustment. The next meeting is scheduled for May 23rd at 12:00 p.m. at the ARPA office.

c. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore said the group extensively discussed Section 309 for Lime Stabilization, with a case expected in the future. He said he is also working on updating Section 345 dealing with adjustments, as well as revising the adjustments detail. He asked Jim Badowich about the brick manhole on the current detail. Mr. Badowich confirmed that the entire detail could be deleted, and that bricks would only be used for adjustments. The next meeting would follow the asphalt group as usual.

d. **Concrete Working Groups**

Jeff Hearne said the meeting notes were included in the addendum. He said the group is planning to continue work revising the Portland Cement Concrete Paving (PCCP) section including determining the correct compressive strength requirements. He said he reviewed several studies comparing the compressive and flexible strengths, and wanted to simplify the process to allow compressive strength as the default. He said they also want to review Section 729 on Joint Materials and since the current spec references ASTM requirements that no longer exist. The next meeting of the working group is scheduled for May 21st at ARPA following the materials working group at 1:30 p.m.

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

Peter Kandaris said the group met just before the committee meeting, so notes would be forthcoming. He summarized the process of reviewing the specifications and said he had a few volunteers lined up to help. Mr. Kandaris said he would be reviewing the 200s section, while Jacob Rodriguez and Jeff Benedict would assist with the 300s section. Brian Gallimore said he would help find experts to review the landscaping sections, and that Jeff Hearne knew people who could review masonry standards. Mr. Kandaris said he still needs assistance from someone in the water/sewer area. The next meeting will be on June 5th at 12:30 p.m. prior to the regular committee meeting.

24. General Discussion

Chairman Wilhite asked for general discussion items. Jim Badowich said there were a few copies of various details relating to the new case on trenchless installation for those interested.

Gordon Tyus asked members about their experience updating their agency's ASTM access.

25. Future Agenda Items

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

26. Adjournment:

The chair adjourned the meeting at 3:44 p.m.