

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

July 9, 2014

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair | Julie Christoph, Mesa |
| Craig Sharp, Buckeye | Dan Nissen, Peoria |
| * Warren White, Chandler | Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.) |
| Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage | Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water) |
| Morris Taylor, Florence (proxy, audio) | Roy Herrington, Scottsdale (proxy) |
| Tom Condit, Gilbert | Dan Shaffer, Surprise |
| Mark Ivanich, Glendale | Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair |
| * Tom Vassalo, Goodyear | Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro (proxy) |
| Karl Rockwell, MCDOT (proxy) | Gregory Arrington, Youngtown |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Jeff Benedict, ARPA | Jeff Hearne, ARPA |
| * Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA | Peter Kandarlis, Independent (audio) |
| 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 Pipe

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:32 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 June 4, 2014 meeting minutes. Dan Shafer said his first name was incorrectly shown as “Bob” in item 5. Jim Badowich introduced a motion to accept the minutes with the correction noted. Dan Shafer 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 101, 601, 603, 615 and 618 for Rigid and Flexible Pipe. Updates to Details 200-1 and 200-2.

Update pipe installation requirements. Warren White was not present, but did brief Jim Badowich on the updates contained in the agenda packet. Mr. Badowich provided a summary of the latest update. He said there were no changes to the definition section, but several updates were made to Section 601 including:

- Came to agreement on trench widths
- Changed maximum lifts from 4’ to 2’
- Now require minimum 95% compaction in Table 601-2
- Allows jetting with restrictions

Mr. Badowich said there was more discussion about the definition of granular material. Now it references MAG ABC in Section 702. Although the current granular fill definition references sieve and P.I. requirements, he felt it was still pretty wide-open and asked the committee for feedback. Mr. Badowich said the changes to Section 603 mirror those in 601, and that their haven’t been any changes to the details since the last submission, but they will follow the ASTM definitions for such things as bedding, springline, initial backfill and final backfill. He said the working group would be reviewing the case and planned to have a final version for review next month, with a vote planned for September.

Julie Christoph had a few comments. First she said that since detail 200-1 refers to detail 200-2, it would also need to be updated. Mr. Badowich confirmed that it would be. Secondly, she had concerns about the use of recycled materials being allowed as backfill. She said Mesa has had problems with contractors using construction waste material, which didn’t allow for good compaction. She said that the current MAG spec (Section 702) does allow for recycled materials.

Jeff Hearne said that the MAG spec purposely allows for recycled materials as long as they are less than 5% of the materials and meet all the requirements for MAG ABC. He felt that this was actually a good use for recycled materials, and that they still must be approved by the agency engineer.

Julie Christoph also said that she felt the fill materials should be the same all around the pipe. Jim Badowich explained that they can be (if the agency specs it that way), but may not necessarily need to be. He gave the example of a concrete pipe for a storm drain that may only need to have granular fill up to the springline for that application. He said the group wanted to provide enough flexibility in the spec so that it will work for most agencies.

Syd Anderson said that Phoenix uses an approved vendor list for backfill materials, and if they have problems, then it is removed from the list. Jeff Hearne commented that agencies can put concrete guidelines in their project specifications. Jim Badowich said one of the goals of the committee is to reduce agency supplements. Jeff Benedict said he agreed that a better definition for granular fill should be an item for a future review.

5. Case 13-21: Create a new Section 742 Pre Cast Manholes. 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 said he updated Section 742.2 based on a comment from Jeff Hearne. He said he received no comments on the revised 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 said after discussion in the working group some agencies such as Phoenix still use bricks for repairs and adjustments, so it was decided to leave the specifications in. Jim Badowich said this was a bit of a reversal, but would only be for rehabbing old structures, not for new construction. Mr. Sharp said the following language was added to 625 and 775. "If allowed by the contracting agency, brick may be used for maintenance and adjustment of the existing sanitary sewer manholes or rings and covers."

Mr. Sharp said he felt both cases were ready, and asked for final comments, with a plan to put them both on the agenda for action at the next meeting.

New Cases for 2014

7. Case 14-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

Two new correction cases were introduced.

- A. Change "*transverse*" to "*longitudinal*" in Section 321.8.2.
- B. In section 739.1, delete the extra occurrence of the word 'Pipe'.
- C. Delete "OR BRICK" from the title of Section 342.

8. Case 14-03: Updates to Guardrail Details.

Make revisions to Section 415 and/or include guardrail details in MAG. Karl Rockwell, filling in for Bob Herz, said he would defer the case until next month.

9. 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 he received final comments from Bob Herz and handed out a revision that he felt addressed MCDOT's concerns. The changes were outlined in the cover menu. One change was to remove Section 324.2.2 Concrete Materials since they are defined in the ASTM standards, and it would create a conflict. There was also a clarification in the pavement thickness section regarding smoothness, and several minor typographic corrections. He suggested postponing the vote until next month so people at Maricopa County would have a chance to review the final changes.

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

Update the specifications for the Type C preservative seal. Jeff Benedict said this case will be carried forward until next year, because additional work needed to be done in the working group.

11. Case 14-10: Include Language to Allow Use of Warm Mix Asphalt.

Update Sections 321 and 710. Jeff Benedict said there were a few very minor corrections and asked for comments. He asked member to do a final review and prepare to vote on the case at the next meeting.

12. Case 14-11: Delete the use of Asbestos-Cement Pipe in Valve Box Installations.

Replace ACP with PVC C900 pipe in Detail 391-2 and make associated drawing changes to Details 391-1 and 392. Also update Section 610.7. Gordon Tyus said that Bob Herz sent him updated detail drawings 391-1, 391-2 and 392 based on the previous redlined ones, and that the updated case was at their place. The committee began reviewing the details and provided several comments. One was that the base of the valve box installation on Type B is precast and part of the unit. This needed to be identified, so contractors didn't think this needed to be cast-in-place. Paul Nebeker said it was designed to help keep the valve box clean and also keep it from splitting. (So that it doesn't sit on the bonnet of the valve.) Antonio Hernandez commented that it also keeps the valve box straight.

Another comment was that Detail 391-2 has options for both 8" and 12" C-900 PVC risers. The group thought it should only allow 8" which is the standard size. Craig Sharp said he felt the Type C detail should show the concrete collar in unpaved areas as well. Several members agreed saying that it help make them easier to find and protects them from damage. Mark Ivanich said Glendale still has a lot Type C boxes in resident's yards, and wouldn't want to use

a collar in those applications. Karl Rockwell said he would take these comments back and review them with Bob Herz when he returns.

13. Case 14-12: Proposed Revisions to Sections 336.3 and 336.4.

Add pavement removal criteria to prevent full depth pavement cuts from being located within a lane wheel path and to prevent creation of narrow pavement edge strips. Bob Herz was not available for comment, but Jeff Benedict said the case was discussed at the working group, and there was no consensus on the current language. Brian Gallimore said that although he agreed with the intent of trying to keep cuts out of the wheel path, the current language would make 2' cuts for sidewalk/curb work now need to be 4' wide. Jim Badowich said he thought trying to determine the wheel path will be difficult, especially with changes such as Complete Streets guidelines that may change the width and use of lanes for pedestrians and bicyclists. He said Avondale requires a minimum of 4' cuts because that is the size of the rollers, and they are more concerned about getting good compaction.

Karl Rockwell said he worked up a diagram to help determine where you could make cuts based on the wheel paths, but Jim Badowich said he felt determining the location of wheel paths on so many different kinds of streets may be a futile exercise. Jeff Benedict said he will get with Bob Herz, and continue working on the case in future working group meetings.

14. Case 14-13: Revisions to Section 321. Incorporate MCDOT Supplements.

Incorporate MCDOT enhancements to Section 321 PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT into the MAG Specifications. Jeff Benedict said from an industry viewpoint there was little disagreement with the proposed changes except in the acceptance portion. He didn't think the case was quite ready for a vote and suggested that it go back to the working group for additional review. Brian Gallimore said it also added the same wheel path language that they think needs to be revisited.

15. Case 14-14: Consolidate all testing requirements in a new Section 611.

Create a new Section 611 and update existing specifications to delete testing specs and refer to the appropriate information in new Section 611. Jami Erickson said she received no additional comments other than the one from Bob Herz, that any changes to Section 610 need to be incorporated in Section 611. She suggested one more round of review, with a vote planned for the following month.

16. Case 14-15: Updates and revisions to Section 610.

Move Hydrostatic Testing from Section 610 to Section 611, update Table 610-1 to be consistent with AWWA, place Section 610 into sequential order. Jim Badowich said the primary purpose of this case was to delete the testing section that was going into Section 611. There were a few other minor updates, but he said more revisions would need to wait until next year. He suggested this case also be reviewed again next month with a vote planned in September.

New Cases

17. Case 14-16: Revision to Section 310 - Placement of Construction of Aggregate Base Course.

Change rock correction method to be consistent with Section 301. Brian Gallimore introduced a case to change the rock correction method in 310.3 to ARIZ-227C to be consistent with Section 301.

18. Case 14-17: Create New Section 322 - Asphalt Stamping.

Provide specifications for materials and methods of Asphalt Stamping. Brian Gallimore submitted a case that is based on the Asphalt Stamping supplement from Gilbert. He said he recently took photos and video of the process if anyone is interested in seeing it. Jeff Benedict said this would be a new section.

19. Case 14-18: Revise Terminology in Section 340.

Change all occurrences of the term “sidewalk ramp” in section 340 to “curb ramp” to prevent confusion. Bob Herz submitted a new case to help clarify a question that Jim Badowich proposed to him to help determine how to determine payments for ramps and curbs. He wanted to know when to stop measuring the curb based on the apron area. Why isn't the curb included in the apron cost since it is all integrated in the product?

Karl Rockwell said they measure and pay for the curb ramp area, just like they do for driveway ramps. Roy Herrington from Scottsdale said they use thicker concrete in the ramps. Antonio Hernandez said they pay for the ramp as a unit (including the domes). He felt that contractor should figure out the square footage of the ramp. Karl Rockwell described how MCDOT figures out they pay items.

20. Case 14-19: Revisions to Section 325 and 717.

Add provisions for terminal-blended asphalt-rubber binder (ARB). Brian Gallimore submitted a new case that included a handout that listed the proposed revisions. He asked members to begin reviewing it, and said additional review at the working group was also planned.

21. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for reports from the working group chairs.

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

Mr. Badowich said the group met on June 17th. In addition to the cases discussed, the group is working on a new Section 608 for Horizontal Directional Drilling that is planned as a case next year. Mr. Badowich said the next meeting is scheduled for July 22nd at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said the notes from the previous meeting are in the packet, and are more detailed to allow Mr. Herz to get feedback on his cases that were discussed. The next asphalt/materials working group meeting won't be until August 21st. There is no meeting in July. Brian Gallimore said the materials group would meet after the asphalt meeting.

c. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said they would also meet on August 21st, but hoped that the Case 14-05 will have been completed by then.

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

Peter Kandaris, via audio, said he hoped to attend working group meetings and begin working on the Outside Right-of-Way draft document once his schedule opens up a bit.

22. General Discussion

Gordon Tyus said that he received feedback from MAG's street committee from the Chandler representative who was concerned about the MAG details meeting new ADA requirements. He said since neither Warren White, who discussed this with the Chandler Street Committee rep, and Bob Herz, who submitted most of the revisions for ADA related cases, were not present it may make sense to make the item an agenda item for future discussion.

Tom Wilhite agreed that this could be a future agenda item, and asked members if they had any other potential agenda items.

23. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.