

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

March 5, 2014

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair	Dan Nissen, Peoria
Craig Sharp, Buckeye (proxy)	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Warren White, Chandler	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage	* Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
* Wayne Costa, Florence	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Tom Condit, Gilbert	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair
Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro (audio)
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Gregory Arrington, Youngtown
* Bob Draper, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA	Peter Kandarlis, Independent
* Mike Sanders, AZUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Adrian Green, AGC	Jacob Rodriguez, SRP
* Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Arturo Chavarria, Hanson  
Mike Hook, ACPA  
Dan Shaffer, Surprise  
Stew Waller, Rinker

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Jason Mahkovtz announced that he would be leaving Surprise to go to work for the City of Buckeye. He introduced Dan Shaffer, who would be Surprise's new representative on the committee. Chair Wilhite welcomed Mr. Shaffer.

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 February 5, 2014 meeting minutes. Jason Mahkovtz introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mark Ivanich seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

**Carry Forward 2013 Cases**

4. Case 13-15: Revisions to MAG Sections 601, 603, 615 and 618 for Flexible Pipe. Updates to Details 200-1 and 200-2.

*Update pipe installation requirements to allow for flexible pipe types.* Warren White said that he was unable to attend the last water/sewer working group so the case was unchanged from last month; however, the updated draft versions of Section 601 and Section 603 were posted on the MAG website so those interested can review and provide comments. The revisions are available here: <http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=5594>

He said that in his discussion with Mr. Tyus, the working group thought that it would be good to provide the committee with a full packet that included the latest versions of all revisions including Sections 615 and 618. Jami Erickson said she was planning to create a case for a new Section 611 that consolidated all of the testing requirements into one section. Mr. White said that the case also included the revisions to the terminology on Details 200-1 and 200-2. Mr. Herz asked if the case could be broken up into smaller pieces. Warren White said he believed the changes were all interdependent and would need to be approved together.

Arvid Veidmark said he was working on a new Section 607 for boring that would replace the existing subsection 618.4. Jim Badowich said he hoped to pull together everything after the next working group meeting to present to the committee. He also commented that the initial case for Section 611 would not have many changes, but he hoped to revisit, update and add testing procedures to it (such as laser testing) next year. He noted that Rod Godwin of Goodyear was working on updating the water testing in Section 610.

5. Case 13-21: Create a new Section 742 Pre Cast Manhole Bases. Add detail drawings for construction and installation. Update existing manhole details.

*Update specifications and details for pre-cast manhole bases and other corrections.* Craig Sharp handed out the latest version of Section 742, and referred to the revised detail drawings included in the agenda packet. He directed the group to first look at Detail 420-1: Pre-cast Concrete Sewer Manhole. Mr. Sharp explained that the detail consolidated some of the existing details, and asked for comments.

Bob Herz asked if the detail for the cast-in-place base was removed. Mr. Sharp explained that Detail 420-1 still showed the cast-in-place base as the default, but would allow the pre-cast base (Detail 420-2) as an option. Mr. Herz also noticed that the dimension and notes for the adjusting rings changed to include the frame and cover and suggested that there be a minimum dimension. Troy Tobiasson suggested a minimum of 12" was needed. Bob Herz asked if MAG should switch to a minimum 30" manhole. Mark Ivanich said Glendale doesn't install smaller ones since a ladder and worker cannot fit in the smaller sized manholes. Jim Badowich said he is not ready to eliminate the smaller size, which is still used for developments and shallow manholes. Paul Nebeker said he uses a 36" cone for new construction.

Bob Herz asked what seal is used on the adjustment rings. Mr. Sharp said he would add a note. Bob Herz also suggested that Note 9 be deleted since the use of a flat top would be specified by the engineer. He said the type of reinforcement should also be noted. Jeff Hearne said Note 2 is redundant since the use of low alkali cement is already required in Section 725. Mr. Herz said the periods in M.H. should be removed to use the standard abbreviation.

For Detail 420-2, there was a question on whether there was a conflict between specifying MAG "AA" 4000 psi concrete and ASTM C478. Bob Herz asked why clay pipe is specified and if it was clay, he thought it should be vitrified. It was suggested to combine Notes 1 and 13.

Jeff Hearne said Note 5 was not clear as to whether #57 rock had to be compacted, or if just ABC needed to be. Rearranging the order would help clarify the note. There was further discussion on the use of crushed rock or ABC. Paul Nebeker said he would use the #57 rock because trying to compact ABC had safety concerns. Several members agreed that the rock was preferable. Adrian Green said the word "crushed" should be removed because not all #57 rock is crushed, but also screened. Mark Ivanich said the ABC should be compacted using the standard proctor instead of relative density.

Bob Herz asked how you would handle different pipe sizes relative to Note 9. Tom Wilhite asked if a default coating should be specified (in Note 12) to avoid supplements. Mr. Badowich thought it should be per agency requirements since no one method was used by all cities, but if there was a common choice, like spray coating, he could try to word-smith it to include a default. Peter Kandaric said that he thought updates to the sections on painting and coatings were needed—then you could refer to what you wanted. Troy Tobiasson had a question about the ASTM reference for the rubber gasket and said he would review the ASTM specs.

Bob Herz asked why there were such tight tolerances on Section A-A. Craig Sharp said they are manufactured, but would check to see if a greater tolerance was acceptable.

On Detail 421, Bob Herz noticed a typo where a note should be changed from I.C. to I.D. He also asked what adjustment detail should be used. Craig Sharp said that for 99% of the installations the standard Detail 422 would work. If not, an engineer would need to review it. Mr. Herz asked what the dashed lined around the pipe on the detail represented. Mr. Sharp wasn't sure, and thought it could be removed. Arvid Veidmark noticed that the right side keyway was below the left side, and it should be raised so it is even on the drawing.

Mark Ivanich asked if using pre-cast bases required pump around for installation on existing systems, and if so would they really be used. Other responded that they did, but that for new developments they are useful and can be installed more quickly. Mr. Badowich said they are used in California, Flagstaff, and were used at the Phoenix International Raceway in Avondale. He said Buckeye also uses them, and their experience has been useful in developing the case.

On Detail 422 Manhole Adjustment and Cover, Bob Herz noticed that the notes for the spacers and mortar requirements had been removed. Mr. Sharp said that metal spacers are no longer used, but he would check on other requirements. Mr. Herz asked if Note 1 was necessary since the adjustment requirements would be spelled out in the contract documents. Mr. Mahkovtz noticed a typo in the note on the bottom left – it should say “PREPARATION”.

There was some discussion about how to show the detail for areas both in pavement and outside of paved areas. Outside areas varied, sometimes the manhole would need to be below grade, such as in shoulders so they are not hit by equipment, but other times they would be above grade, such as in retention basins as explained by Jami Erickson.

Mr. Sharp said he would take all the comments and corrections and make updates to the details.

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

Craig Sharp handed out updated specifications for Case 13-22. Jeff Hearne asked if the mortar Section 776 was needed if bricks were no longer used. Bob Herz said mortar could still be used for other applications such as adjustment rings.

Mr. Hearne said there seemed to be a conflict between the specifications requiring Class A concrete, while some details required Class AA. Mr. Sharp said he would look into it, and asked members to review the specs and send him comments.

## New Cases for 2014

### 7. Case 14-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

- A. Change "transverse" to "longitudinal" in Section 321.8.2.
- B. No new corrections cases were introduced

### 8. Case 14-02: Revisions to Section 405 Monuments and Detail 120.

*Update specifications to match current details and requirements.* Mr. Herz asked if any agencies used the precast monuments mentioned in the first paragraph of Section 405.3. Since no one said they did, he planned to remove the reference. He also asked if anyone was using the Type "C" monument on Detail 120. Craig Sharp said that they did use it once last year, but he personally doesn't like to use it. He said he would check to see if there was any objection to removing it. Mr. Herz asked members to check to see if it also could be removed.

### 9. Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details.

*Make revisions to Section 415 and/or include guardrail details in MAG.* Bob Herz said there were no changes since the last meeting.

### 10. Case 14-04: Revision to Detail 552 Concrete Cut-off Walls.

*Move cut-off walls away from roadway edge and delete design related notes.* Bob Herz said a new Detail 552 was provided in the packet. It changed the title and incorporated other discussion items from the previous meeting. He asked members to review the detail and give him feedback.

### 11. Case 14-05: Revisions to Section 324 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement (PCCP).

*Use compressive rather than tensile strength tests, modernize and reorganize section as needed.* Jeff Hearne said a revised version in the packet updated Section 324.2.1 per the request of Maricopa County. A reference to Class AA concrete was added in the first paragraph and the second paragraph was deleted. The rest of the case remained unchanged.

### 12. Case 14-06: Revisions to Section 718 Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete.

*Update the specifications for the Type C preservative seal.* Jeff Benedict said he received comments during the last asphalt working group meeting, and will have an updated version next month. He said some of the tests currently listed don't apply to all materials, so the table will need to be updated.

### 13. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for reports from the working group chairs.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met on February 18<sup>th</sup> and that notes from the meeting were included in the packet. He said the manhole cases were previously covered, but one new issue discussed at the meeting was whether MAG should address vacuum testing. Mr. Tobiasson said he thought it started due to a state statute, which has since been repealed. Mr. Badowich said there were ASTM specifications, but they were for testing before backfill, which seemed impracticable to implement. Jami Erickson said Phoenix does still do the vacuum test after backfilling. Bob Herz suggested keeping it as a supplement since most agencies didn't require the test. Mr. Tobiasson said once the manhole is coated the test was irrelevant.

Mr. Badowich said the group also discussed the problem of not getting adequate flow for flushing from a 2" line, and suggested creating a table for the minimum flushing size based on the velocity needed. Mr. Tobiasson thought AWWA had a table that could be referenced.

Mr. Veidmark said in addition to a new Section 607, he is also working on a new Section 608 for directional boring of dry utilities. Jim Badowich said Avondale uses directional boring for dry utilities such as ITS conduit and street signals.

b. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said the group met on February 20<sup>th</sup>, and that a copy of the meeting notes was in the packet. He said they were continuing to work on revising Section 321 in regards to work on the permit side, and on specifications for warm mix in Sections 321 and 710.

Jim Badowich asked what he meant by 'permit work.' Mr. Benedict said for private developments they needed to focus on how it is different than other construction and what corrective actions are needed. He wanted to fix any problems when the paving was done, rather than when the development was completed.

Since Brain Gallimore wasn't present, Mr. Benedict said Mr. Gallimore was looking into the issue of street printing, and had a supplement from Gilbert that they were using as an example.

Jeff Benedict said the next asphalt/materials working group meeting is planned for March 20<sup>th</sup> at the ARPA office at noon.

c. **Concrete Working Group**

The concrete working group followed the Asphalt/Materials working group meeting on February 20<sup>th</sup> and notes from the meeting were provided. Mr. Hearne said that they are continuing to work on Sections 725 and 324. In addition the group is working with the City of Phoenix revisions to 340 in its supplement.

Mr. Hearne said the next Concrete working group meeting would follow the Asphalt/Materials group on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

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

Peter Kandaris provided a survey about what members thought should be included in the Outside ROW manual and asked them to complete it and send it to him. He asked Mr. Tyus to distribute it online so that it could be filled out electronically and emailed back to him. He noted the list included items to be worked on by other groups, such as pervious concrete, and also specifications already done by SRP and in agency supplements. He planned to continue collaborating via email rather than schedule new meetings.

14. General Discussion

Tom Wilhite said that he would not be able to attend the next meeting, and thanked Jim Badowich in advance for chairing the meeting in his absence.

Gordon Tyus announced that MAG is sponsoring the 2014 Desert Peaks Awards, and said that if any member had a regional project that they were proud of, to consider nominating it for the award. Entry forms were available at the meeting, and electronic forms are available on the MAG website at: <http://www.azmag.gov/Projects/Project.asp?CMSID=1083>

Bob Herz asked if MAG was interested on specifications regarding substantial versus final completion, since Maricopa County was currently revising their supplement. Jami Erickson said Phoenix is using partial approvals on the light rail projects. Harvey Estrada described how they were used.

Mr. Nebeker said he would like to see the changes in MAG because for development work he doesn't get his retention back until final approval, which may be long after his job is completed.

Members said these issues are often addressed in project development requirements.

15. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and approved. The meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.