

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

August 7, 2013

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

- | | |
|--|---|
| * Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair
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
* 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
Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy)
Daniel Hernandez, NUCA (proxy)
Adrian Green, AGC
Brian Gallimore, 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

Brandon Gallimore, Metro Engineering and Survey
Jared Dusha, Contech
Art Glover, FCDMC
Mike Hook, ACPA
Arvid Veidmark, Specialized Services Co. (part of meeting)
Stew Waller, Rinker

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

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

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the July 10, 2013 meeting minutes. Jami Erickson noted a change in the minutes for Case 13-20. Where it says “most subdivisions do not have section plans for water lines”, she said to change “section” to “profile”. Dan Nissen introduced a motion to accept the minutes with Ms. Erickson’s correction. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

4. ASTM Update

Jim Thomas of ASTM was present to provide information about the organizations new e-training systems. He said they acquired e-tech, a training company, and ASTM has begun producing videos and training materials for completing ASTM test methods correctly. He showed part of a video documenting the correct method to complete a concrete test (ASTM C231). He said four topics have been completed with 5-6 more coming out soon. He told the committee that he was available for questions and could provide more information on their e-learning systems.

New 2013 Cases

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

No new correction cases were added. Rod Ramos moved to accept Case 13-01 as presented. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

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

Eliminate references to ‘base course’ to clarify the surface being referenced. Bob Herz said there had been no changes since the last meeting. He asked if there were any questions and seeing none, he moved to vote on the case. Rod Ramos seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

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

Raise penalties in tables based on City of Mesa supplement. Bob Draper handed out a new version based on discussions during the previous asphalt working group meetings. Based on these discussions, final revisions to the penalty tables in Section 321 were proposed. Changes

were made to Tables 321-4, 321-5 and 321-8. The penalties in Table 321-4 (Asphalt Binder) were not changed, but the table was reformatted to be consistent with the other revised tables by showing the percentage above and below the permitted range. Mr. Herz asked to change where it listed “Full Payment” to read “No Corrective Action.” Mr. Draper agreed to make the revision, and then went on to describe the changes in Table 321-5 (Laboratory Voids). It was similar to the existing table, except the dollar values of the penalties were doubled. He said this would not have a 100% cost recovery, but it would provide incentives to the contractor, and allow some cost recovery to deal with future street maintenance. Mr. Herz asked that the text “per 321.10.6” be removed after the EA at the bottom of the table.

Bob Draper discussed the changes to Table 321-8 (Pavement Density). The table also shows penalties in percentages above and below the acceptable range, and the penalties have increased. One major difference was that removal was required at greater than 10% air voids (rather than the current 11%). Jeff Benedict commented that he thought that if the in-place voids came out at 8.1%, contractor may dispute the penalty. He warned this could be a point of contention. Bob Herz again recommended changing “Full Payment” to “No Corrective Action” in the table. Brian Gallimore asked if a resurfacing lift was 1 ½ inches, if it would fall under the requirements of this table. Bob Draper said it excludes overlays using rubberized asphalt since they fall under a different section. Troy Tobiasson asked if the 1 ½ inches was the nominal thickness, wondering if it fell under the 1 ½ inches shown in the table if it would be excluded. Mr. Draper said the 1 ½ inches is the design thickness, so the nominal pavement thickness would not matter. He said he would make the recommended revisions, get them to the members and would like to plan to vote on the case at the next meeting.

8. 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 reviewed the changes to the case that was included in the packet, as well as discussed comments received from Maricopa County and the concrete industry. He said besides general clean up of language there were three issues that needed more discussion: how to determine swelling soils, surface treatments when finishing, and contraction joints. For determining swelling soils, he found three main methods: by percentage of fines, by plasticity index, and by liquid limits. Based on a consensus of his research, he proposed using limits of 20% fines (which is what the county uses) and created a table to determine marginally expansive and expansive soils based on the plasticity index and liquid limit. (Table 340-1) Bob Herz submitted a revised table and described how it breaks the process down into determining if it is a potentially expansive soil first, and then doing a swell test to determine if it is expansive. Mr. Kandarlis asked the committee if it had a preference into which method to use. Other members were trying to clarify what the remedy should be if the soil was determined expansive. The text was not clear on whether the 6” of soil should be removed. Jeff Hearne felt the table and text conflicted. He also recommended using a soil report first (if available) to determine if alternative corrective actions could be taken. Antonio Hernandez said typically the sidewalks will fail before the curb and gutter. Brian Gallimore asked if expansive soils were part of the quality assurance. Mr. Herz said yes, the agency typically does the testing.

Jeff Hearne touched on the single page revision he submitted, and noted that the revision should be moved from the curing section up to 340.3.1 where it discusses finishing.

Mr. Kandaris then discussed the issue of joints and spacing. Mr. Herz suggested removing the sidewalk plan view from Detail 230 and just describing it in Section 340.4. He proposed additional revisions to the notes on the detail as well. Detail 221 may also need revisions. Troy Tobiasson asked if the depth for stamps of the letters could be specified as 1/8" – 1/4" in Section 340.3.7. Peter Kandaris said he would work with the concrete working group to address all these issues and have a revised draft out prior to the next meeting to review, so it could be voted on during the September meeting.

9. 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 said the final version of Section 711 that was provided by Bob Herz improved the format of the document and tables. The only major change was adding an alternative product in Table 711-2 that did not have solubility test requirements. Bob Herz asked agencies to review the change. Bob Draper moved to accept the case as presented. Rod Ramos seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

10. 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 said no changes have been made, but there has been a lot of thought and discussion on the best method of organizing the changes. Three potential options have been reviewed. One would be to use Sections 601 and 603 for the trench and final backfill requirements, but move the initial backfill requirements to the installation sections 610, 615, and 618 as appropriate. The second option would leave it as is. A third option was taking everything out of the installation specs and putting it in 601 and/or 603 as appropriate. Mr. White said they would be getting feedback at the working group and he hoped to have an updated version for the next meeting. He also mentioned that the revised drafts would include the new terminology for the trench cross-section as shown on the revised Detail 200.

Peter Kandaris said he provided a handout of prior work done on updating Detail 200 trench backfill options, but said it would likely be a separate case sometime next year. Bob Herz said that if the bedding definition changes are made, Detail 212 would also need to be updated since it shows bedding 6" above the pipe. Warren White said testing sections also need to be updated.

Troy Tobiasson suggested moving all the testing into Section 611. He is continuing to revise Section 610, and thinks it makes sense to move the testing into 611 because the tests are done at the same time. Having a separate testing spec would allow any of the pipe installation methods to reference whatever testing is required. Other members thought this should be considered.

Mr. White noticed that jacking pipe is referenced in Section 618 and wondered if the revised Section 602 could be referenced instead.

Jami Erickson commented that some of the new flexible pipe materials have been approved prior to the installation specifications being updated, so she advised any members using them to make sure and have clear installation requirements in their special provisions.

Mr. Wilhite asked Mr. White if he thought it would make sense to withdraw the case now and resubmit it when they have a roadmap determined. Other members pointed out that it can be carried forward, so the sponsor decided not to withdraw it at this point. Peter Kandarlis said the table in the case materials provided a good outline, and it was just a matter of beginning to move things around and updating them. He encouraged continued development of the case.

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

Retitle and revise Section 602 to match current industry standards. Sponsor Jim Badowich was not present, however Bob Herz had provided comments on the case. His suggestions as well as comments from Arvid Veidmark were shown in the draft file included in the packet. Mr. Herz described his comments regarding the work time constraints being covered by Section 108.5. Jami Erickson said this was discussed during the water/sewer working group meeting, and she thought the group would be okay removing it. Warren White thought that in the first sentence it should add other uses such as storm water lines. Other examples were provided including irrigation, gas lines, etc. Ms. Erickson suggested changing the text to “wet or dry utilities.” Troy Tobiasson had questions about the welding specifications. Were certified welders required? Did the field welding require testing? Jami Erickson said the case can be updated at the next working group meeting, and she believed it could be ready for a vote at the next meeting.

12. Case 13-19: Revisions to Section 345 - Adjusting Frames, Covers, Valve Boxes, and Water Meter Boxes.

Add the process of lowing and update the section for current practices. Brian Gallimore handed out a new version at the meeting that incorporated comments from Bob Herz and Craig Sharp. In addition to making clarifications, it removed the requirement for rebar in the concrete collar, since he got feedback that not both rebar and scoring were needed. Mr. Hernandez said El Mirage uses the rebar because they have had problems with the collars cracking through. Peter Kandarlis suggested if rebar is added, to do engineering calculations to determine its usefulness. The City of Phoenix also uses the rebar in a supplemental detail. Mr. Gallimore said he could add language to make it optional based on agency requirements.

Warren White asked about adjustments to survey monuments. Mr. Gallimore said a surveyor typically resets the markers. Mr. Gallimore was also asked by Mr. Tobiasson to remove “MAG AA” in reference to the concrete and call it “class AA.” Mr. Gallimore said he would make the final changes and would like to vote on the case next time.

13. Case 13-20: Make Section 610 Hydrostatic Test Methods consistent with AWWA C600-10.

Update MAG Test Methods to match AWWA standards. Troy Tobiasson noted a correction in the last sentence of 610.4 to refer to Section 610 rather than 601. Bob Herz had a couple minor corrections – a typo of “valued” to be changed to “valved” in the second paragraph of Section 610.19, and removing the “-07” suffix from the AWWA 900 reference so it will stay up-to-date. He also asked where he could get the AWWA standards. Mr. Draper said he would be able to provide a copy for him. With no additional comments, Mr. Tobiasson moved to accept the case with the changes noted above. Craig Sharp seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion passed: 11 yes, 0 no, 2 abstaining, 3 not present.

14. Case 13-21: Create a new Section 742 Pre Cast Manhole Bases. Add detail drawings for construction and installation.

Create a new section and details for pre-cast manhole bases. Craig Sharp said there had not been any changes yet. Bob Herz asked what the ASHTO 1120 loading requirements were in Section 742.1. Mr. Sharp said could get back to him and that they were continuing to work on these cases at the working group.

15. Case 13-22: Update Sections 625 and 775 to remove references to the use of bricks in manholes and remove references to manhole steps.

Update Sections 625 Manhole Construction to remove references to the use of bricks and manhole steps. Also remove these references in Section 775 Brick and Concrete Masonry Units. Craig Sharp said that they are working on revising the manhole details, including those for cast-in-place bases. Currently they are revising CAD drawings to remove the bricks and steps to match the specification changes, but are at the same time trying to update the details to current industry standards based on revisions Jim Badowich presented during the last water/sewer working group. He expected to have updates for the next meeting.

16. Case 13-23: Update and Revise Section 309 – Lime Stabilization or Modification of Subgrade.

Clarify use of lime for stabilization and modification purposes. Brian Gallimore said he incorporated comments from the city of Phoenix. Mr. Herz said the lime industry representatives were not present at the last working group meeting he attended. He said the county has concerns about hazardous materials including the use of dry lime on the job site. He needed more information before voting on the case. Brian Gallimore said he would contact Jon Shi at the county to address their concerns. He said he also will contact the industry representatives to attend the next working group meeting, but unless additional changes are required, he felt the current version is the final agreed specification, and would like to plan a vote on the case at the September meeting.

17. Case 13-24: Update Detail 270 Frame and Cover.

Make the depth of the cover 4”, remove the chain attachment, and make drafting corrections to Detail 270. Bob Herz said the case was unchanged, other than final revised Details 270 and

391-1 were provided in the packet. He said these details match the type of valve box covers they are currently using. Jami Erickson said that Phoenix has a supplement that has already removed the chain; however, ironically they are using covers with the chains in an area where they have had problems with theft. She said she was supportive of the case regardless.

The issue of rebar in the concrete collars came up again; however, Mr. Herz said it is not used currently in MAG, so he thinks it should be left off. He asked the committee to be prepared to vote on the case next month.

18. Case 13-25: Revise Section 729 Expansion Joint Filler.

Delete out of date specifications, and reference current active ASTM standards. Jeff Hearne said a final revised version of the specification was included in the packet, which basically trims it down to three paragraphs referencing existing specifications. It includes the changes recommended by Maricopa County. He proposed voting on the case next month.

19. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for the working group reports.

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

The meeting notes from the July 23rd meeting were included in the packet. Jim Badowich was not present, but Warren White said most of what was discussed during the working group meeting was covered earlier in the case discussions. One exception was a presentation by Armorcast on proposed polymer/concrete meter boxes. He said Chandler is considering them, and it may be a case next year. Jami Erickson said the next meeting is planned for August 20th at 1:30 in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt Working Group**

Jeff Benedict said the next asphalt working group meeting is planned for noon on August 22nd, but it will be held at AGC office. Mr. Hearne provided the address: 1825 W. Adams, Phoenix. Mr. Benedict said it will be the last meeting of the year. They plan to address the permit-work in Section 321 next year.

c. **Materials Working Group**

Brian Gallimore left the meeting earlier, but Mr. Green assured that they would finalize the lime specification and the specifications for adjusting manholes with plans to vote on them at the next committee meeting. The materials meeting would follow the asphalt working group.

d. **Concrete Working Groups**

Jeff Hearne said the meeting notes were included in the package. He said they would make the final changes to Section 340 and get them to the members prior to the next committee meeting. The next concrete working group meeting is scheduled to follow the materials working group on August 22nd at AGC.

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

Peter Kandaris said he met with members before the committee meeting. His goal was to have a draft roadmap of what would be included in the document. He suspected that it would be an addition to the current specifications, and could include outside right-of-way supplements such as those for trash receptacles, storage tanks, trails, bike racks, etc. Bob Herz said MCDOT has a paper on *Guidelines for Writing Specifications* on their website that can be of value for those creating new specifications. Mr. Kandaris said the group would continue to meet with the goal of having a draft document next year. The next meeting would be at 1:00 p.m. before the next committee meeting on September 4.

20. General Discussion

Chair Wilhite asked for general discussion items. He then asked if any members had experience with modifications for water harvesting. Mr. Ramos said Scottsdale is looking at proposals that included such things as pipes through curbs allowing water to flow to trees, and also rooftop collection techniques. Dan Nissen said Peoria is working on revisions to their landscaping code to address these issues. Mr. Wilhite said Tucson has some details, and he also mentioned the use of pervious concrete.

Arvid Veidmark asked about the status of Case 13-16 since he was late coming to the meeting. Jamie Erickson said it would be discussed at the next working group meeting.

21. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 3:39 p.m.