

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

February 4, 2015

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.)
Bryce Christo, El Mirage (proxy)	Cathy Pompa, Phoenix (Water)(proxy)
* Wayne Costa, Florence	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Tom Condit, Gilbert	Kristin Tytler, Surprise
* Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair
* Tom Vassallo, Goodyear	* Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

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

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

David Beckel, Southwest Rock Products
Anturo Chavarria, Hanson
Stew Waller, Rinker

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Wilhite welcomed Cathy Pompa as a proxy for Jami Erickson of Phoenix. There were no requests to speak from the audience.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the January 7, 2015 meeting minutes. Rod Ramos moved to accept the minutes as written. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Carry Forward 2014 Cases

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

Make revisions to Section 415 and/or include guardrail details in MAG. Mr. Herz said as noted in the minutes, he plans to work on the case in April.

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

Update the specifications for the Type C preservative seal. Jeff Benedict said the case was discussed at the Asphalt Working Group meeting. He called attention to a handout on Section 718 that was provided in the packet as part of the working group report. It summarized the current status of the case and the recommendations to revise the spec including adding seal coat specifications.

6. Case 14-12: Proposed Revisions to Sections 336, 321.10.3, 601.2.7 and Detail 200-1.

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 reviewed the case and discussed the comments he made to get committee feedback.

For his first comment in Section 336.1, Mr. Herz recommended deleting Type C trench repair from Detail 200-1. He said he believed there should be a complete joint to joint replacement. Jim Badowich said he supported this change. Mr. Herz clarified that this includes all concrete flatwork. Rod Ramos asked about possibility of dowelling the pavement. Mr. Herz responded that the agency can always approve other options. Peter Kandaris asked if we really wanted to delete the detail. Rod Ramos said the existing PCCP thickness is not shown correctly on the existing detail. Paul Nebeker described some problems that could arise if trenching through concrete paving, especially if it is at an angle—it could cause a lot of expensive concrete replacement. He suggested updating the Type C detail to note the joint to joint replacement and other options such as dowelling, if they are available. Bob Herz said the Type C detail may still

be useful for driveways. Tom Wilhite asked if there was a minimum thickness required to dowel the pavement. Mr. Herz said at least 6” is needed to get clearance for the rebar and ground.

Mr. Herz said the second comment was for Section 336.2.2, which asked if any agency requires a longer distance prior to the elimination of the seal coat requirement. Agency members responded no.

His third comment was for Section 336.2.4.1 (E) Mr. Herz wanted to know if there was any problem using existing equipment on 6’ to 8’ replacement widths. Members didn’t feel it was an issue.

For comment four, Mr. Herz said that for thick pavements, the contractor could use two layers with staggered edges (typically done in the milling process), but some of the details on 200-1 would need to be adjusted to allow this option. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has a detail for the offset milled joint where it is milled out an extra foot. Paul Nebeker said that a 1 foot overlap would be better than 6” due to the irregularity of trenches. Mr. Herz suggested converting a supplemental detail into a MAG detail. Several other members said they had supplemental details, and Peter Kandarlis said he would review the material he had when updating 200-1 a few years ago.

Mr. Herz explained that comment five also referenced the Type C detail on 200-1, and comment six was to simply delete a sentence that didn’t seem to provide much meaning. Members agreed.

The last comment discussed had to do with how the trench size was calculated. Currently it requires the width to be rounded to the nearest foot, but depending on the trench width, this could change the calculation quite a bit due to rounding error. Mr. Herz asked if there was a more appropriate measurement. Jim Badowich suggested measuring the actual trench and then rounding up to get the final result. Members agreed this was a better method.

Finally, Bob Herz said he added a new paragraph to the end of Section 321.10.3 dealing with longitudinal joints.

He also responded to a question from Rod Ramos on how the wheel path is defined. It is described in the second paragraph on page 336-4.

Warren White asked about keeping cuts out of the bike lane. Mr. Herz responded that they are except in the case where pavement replacement cuts 2’ from the curb are allowed for curb and gutter replacement. Mr. Herz will reexamine the specification to ensure full depth joints are not located within designated bike lanes.

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

Provide specifications for materials and methods of Asphalt Stamping. Brian Gallimore said that after reaching out to contractors who do this work, much of the specifications in the draft,

which were based on a Gilbert supplement, are out of date. He plans to start fresh and work on the new Section 322 at the next working group meeting. Mr. Herz asked if he planned to withdraw and resubmit the case. Mr. Gallimore responded that he believes he can get the revised information ready soon, so that it would not be necessary.

New Cases for 2015

8. Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

Two new miscellaneous corrections were introduced at the meeting.

- A. Add omitted text to Section 735.1. Text was approved by Case 14-07 and merged into Case 13-15. Both cases were approved in 2014.
- B. Revise “OA” to Quality Assurance and “OC” to Quality Control in Section 710.

Bob Herz provided two minor updates (A and B above) that he thinks should be corrected.

9. Case 15-02: Proposed Revisions to Section 772, Table 771-1 and Detail 145.

Adjust fence requirements to reference ASTM F1043 Standard Specification for Strength and Protective Coatings on Steel Industrial Fence Framework. Bob Herz said he added two rows to Table 711-1 that reference ASTM F1043. He noted that Detail 145 would also need to be updated. Other changes were made to Section 772 that changed the ASTM references for the fence framework. These changes were brought to his attention by fence suppliers. He thought the case was pretty straight-forward and proposed to vote on it at the next meeting.

10. Case 15-03: Revise Section 601.4.5 Trench Final Backfill.

Change backfill placement requirement from 2 feet maximum lifts to layers not exceeding eight inches in depth. Bob Herz submitted a new case to reduce the maximum lift depth from 2’ (currently in MAG) to 8”. He said the current practice is 8” lifts, and this thickness is noted in several other places in the MAG specifications. It is also used by ADOT, and the AASHTO standard is now down to 6”. Paul Nebeker said he thought a 2’ lift would work if you were using ABC, but he didn’t know anyone doing it. Tom Wilhite asked if verbage should be added for CLSM trench backfill. Bob Herz said he could add language to identify that these requirements are for mechanically compacted materials. Warren White said the working group had discussions on this last year and reduced it from 4’ to 2’. Jim Badowich said this could be a problem in subdivisions. Paul Nebeker reminded members that any changes to MAG specs can have unintended consequences on private development that rely on them.

11. Case 15-04: Revise Section 602 Trenchless Installation of Steel Casing.

Update ASTM references for casing material and add minimum casing wall thickness. Arvid Veidmark introduced a new case from the Water/Sewer working group to update Section 602. He said that the existing material requirements reference out-of-date ASTM specs. The revised section provides updated material references based on AWS qualified materials. There are

new ASTM references for steel that is rolled into casing, and also American Petroleum Institute (API) specifications for pipe. This would allow the use of excise pipe to be used as casing, which in some cases may be superior and less expensive. The main purpose of the case is to bring it to conform to current industry practice.

Tom Wilhite asked how the casing was identified on the site. Mr. Veidmark said rolled casing has the MDR number on the plate, but that all the information about the casing material is part of the submittal package.

Peter Kandarlis said there needed to be submittals subsection that specified what needed to be submitted. Mr. Veidmark asked for potential language. Jeff Hearne said similar language for steel pipe was shown in Section 759.3, and he may want to refer to it as an example.

Other changes to Section 602 included a table with the minimum wall thickness. Warren White asked if the shop drawings typically called out the casing materials. Mr. Veidmark said they typically do. He said the case would be reviewed further at the next working group meeting.

Tom Wilhite brought up an issue with a project in Tempe where the soil was caving in and asked if the case could account for poor soil in subsurface areas. Arvid Veidmark said if they are hand tunneling, and it caves in, then grout can be pumped in to change the conditions.

Bob Herz said it depends on the existing conditions. If they change, this would be handled by a change order. Arvid Veidmark said the geotech report drives the application based on soil type, and that it needed to be checked at the depth of the planned bore. Mr. Kandarlis said he thought a geotech report was a good idea. Jim Badowich said he would like to add something about if the soil conditions change it needs to be brought to the attention of the agency. He also suggested it may be a good idea to have a survey before and after the operation to see if any heaving or settlement occurred.

12. 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 Thursday, January 15, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. and had a couple new attendees. Besides the cases already discussed, the group discussed possibly expanding the testing section for flushing, and discussed requiring a larger diameter flushing valve for larger diameter pipe. The group also reviewed a proposed new Section 608 on Horizontal Directional Drilling. They planned to review it again, and possibly submit a case at the next meeting. He said Bob Herz suggested getting rid of ABS Truss Pipe. The next meeting is planned for February 19, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

b. Asphalt/Materials Working Groups

Jeff Benedict said the group met on Thursday, January 22, 2015 at noon at the ARPA office. The items of discussion were shown on the meeting notes. Mr. Benedict brought attention to comments brought up during the open discussion on the issue of testing lime treated ABC. He said an email from David Beckel of Southwest Rock Products was provided in the packet that summarized concerns he had with how it is tested. Mr. Benedict said Section 702 is written with native ABC material in mind and refers to AASHTO specifications for testing, which do not make any adjustments to the procedure for lime-treated material. He asked if any agency used the material and if they wanted the working group to address the issue.

Brian Gallimore said he thinks lime treated ABC is used quite often in the valley and if it meets the current testing requirements, than in most cases it can be used. Jim Badowich said Avondale doesn't want lime treated material near metal pipe, and only allows it in the roadway base. Peter Kandararis at SRP they used it extensively on unsurfaced roads.

Chair Wilhite asked if there were any comments from the audience and guest David Beckel addressed the committee about his concerns. He said testing for gradation and PI were inconsistent according to the AASHOT requirements. He gave an example where lime treated ABC was watered extensively in order for the water to appear "clear" but by doing so essentially washed away the treated material. He suggested changing the language as was done in other states to "reasonably clear" or "straw colored" in order to avoid this problem of disintegrating the clays the lime treated. Mr. Beckel also felt that local testing labs did not always correctly follow the AASHTO testing standards for wet prep P.I. testing. He said these issues should be addressed because lime treated AB is different than native materials.

Jeff Benedict said the next meeting was planned for February 26, 2015 at noon at the ARPA office. Mr. Wilhite asked Mr. Gallimore if he had anything to add from the materials group. Mr. Gallimore said they would be working on Section 322 Asphalt Stamping, as previously discussed.

c. Concrete Working Group

Jeff Hearne said the group began discussing pervious concrete. In addition to the meeting notes, he said materials about pervious concrete, its applications, maintenance, and sample specifications are in a packet posted on the MAG website. He asked how detailed a spec would be needed for MAG, since pervious concrete works as a complete system and all the parts need to be designed together such as subgrade and water infiltration requirements in addition to the pavement requirements. Tom Wilhite asked if this was something the committee wanted a presentation on. Mr. Hearne said he could see if he could find someone to present an overview to the committee. Bob Herz said he would like to take a look at Section 725 regarding the mix design submittal process. Mr. Hearne said they would next meet after the other working groups on February 26.

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

Peter Kandaris said he had some health issues to deal with in the next couple months, but expected to start up again in April.

13. General Discussion

Gordon Tyus provided a staff report on ADA training and the ASTM portal. He said the Arizona Local Technical Assistance Program had training workshops on the Design and Construction of ADA facilities on April 5 and October 14. The workshops are free to agency members and would be more thorough than a presentation during the committee meeting.

Check their website: <http://www.azltap.org/>

He also noted that John Gallagher from ASTM was going to be in Phoenix March 12, 2015. Mr. Gallagher wanted to provide more information on the ASTM Compass website, especially some of the new training options available. If anyone is interested in meeting on March 12th please contact Mr. Tyus.

Bob Herz asked other members if they, like MCDOT, require conduits for underground dry utilities. Peter Kandaris said electrical utilities must be in conduit. Paul Nebeker said phone lines often use a small orange inter-duct. Rod Ramos said they have had some experience with microtrenching in private streets. Scottsdale created the detail as part of their Google fiber submittal. He said he will bring in their detail.

Jim Badowich asked if there was any need to move the July 1, meeting to July 8. Most members were fine with either date, but Julie Christoph said she could not attend on the eighth. It was decided not to change the meeting date, but leave it as July 1st.

Gordon Tyus demonstrated how to sign up for the email delivery notices on the MAG website. He said he uses this method to send out mass emails whenever new meetings, agendas and other updates are posted, and encouraged members to use the service.

14. Future Agenda Items:

Bob Herz said Section 616 notes a different type of valve box and cover for reclaimed water valves. He asked if agencies already have a detail, and if so, would they would consider adding it to MAG. He also thought that Detail 263 Wing Type Alley Entrance may need to be updated to be ADA compliant. He said the detail reference the back of the sidewalk. Finally, Mr. Herz also noted that there were errors in Note 5 of Detail 225 that should be reviewed and corrected.

15. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.