

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

March 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)	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Morris Taylor, Florence (proxy) (audio)	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

1. Call to Order

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

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Wilhite said a new member from Phoenix, Melody Moss, is planning to replace Syd Anderson. David Beckel of Southwest Rock Products asked to speak.

Mr. Beckel said there are technical issues on gradation and PI testing of lime-treated base materials. He provided an example of a test that he and another testing company ran on a split sample that got very different results. He believes that the reason for the difference is that if the tests are performed until the water is “clear” it removes the lime treatment from the base materials. He said he has discussed the issue with testing labs, including the one in Mesa. He also asked for contacts with AASHTO. Chair Wilhite said the committee could return to discuss this issue during the general discussion portion of the meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the February 4, 2015 meeting minutes. Dan Nissen moved to accept the minutes as written. Warren White 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 reminded the committee that he plans to work on the case in April or May.

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

Update the specifications preservative seals. Jeff Benedict provided a new handout at the meeting of the revised Section 718. He said all the information in red was new or revised. He noted that many of the tests were switched to AASHTO, but he thinks they can be switched back to ASTM. The case will be discussed further at the next Asphalt Working Group meeting. There were no comments from the committee.

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 handed out a revision to Section 336. He said several of the comments related to modifications that would need to be done to Detail 200. Peter Kandaris asked what changes were made since the 2/20/15 revision that was provided in the packet. Mr. Herz responded that in Section 336.2.1 he changed the reference to painting with a light coat of asphalt cement to tack coat. He also clarified that the third paragraph of this subsection was referring to widening and extensions of the streets.

Mr. Kandaris asked how changes to Section 336.2.2 affected Detail 200. Mr. Herz said a detail is needed to show an option for milling. Jim Badowich commented that Avondale had problems trying to save the remnant piece when trying a similar method. He said the milling operation tore it out. He suggested that anything less than 4' should be taken out. Greg Groneberg agreed with Mr. Badowich, although they thought 6' wide replacements should work.

Mr. Herz said Section 336.2.4.1 paragraph (G) now refers to Detail 201. Mr. Kandaris asked to clarify which detail it should refer to, and Mr. Herz said it normally would be Type B but the type of edge replacement would depend on agency requirements. Mr. Kandaris also had questions about Section 336.2.4 Adjustments, and Section 336.4 Measurements. He said that 336.2 previously addressed adjustments for slurry and chip seal. Mr. Herz suggested such adjustments be dealt with in the chip seal section. He also clarified that the green text is used to show moved items, but that in the current handout all strikethroughs were hidden to make it easier to read.

Jim Badowich commented on the reference to paving length on page 336-3, saying he thought a maximum of 600 foot lengths were too small. Avondale commonly allows twice that amount or even 1/3 mile at a time. Several other agencies commented that they have supplements allowing longer distances. Rod Ramos said the distance is often that between intersections. Jami Erickson said Phoenix often uses temporary patches of cold mix if it is to be paved soon. Mr. Badowich said he did not consider it an empty trench if it has been backfilled but not yet paved. Julie Christoph said Mesa did enforce the 600 foot standard for work done in downtown Mesa where many small businesses needed access and political issues required streets to be opened quickly. Bob Herz asked if instead of a set distance it would make more sense to require a time limit. Peter Kandaris also wondered if time was more critical than distance, and suggested the length could be determined by the project, but have a default time in the spec.

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

Provide specifications for materials and methods of Asphalt Stamping. Jeff Benedict said he got support and information from asphalt stamping suppliers. He said contractors have been adding a second acrylic seal coat after the paint, which doubles the warranty to two years. He asked members if they thought this should be added as a default in the spec. Mark Ivanich

asked how you could tell if it fails. Mr. Benedict said he thought if the paint flaked off, it would be considered a failure. Rod Ramos said a more common problem is tracking, and sealing helps reduce this problem. Gregory Arrington said Youngtown has used the sealer and it helps keep the paint from wearing due to traffic. Mr. Benedict said the case would be on the agenda for discussion at the next Asphalt Working Group meeting.

New Cases for 2015

8. Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

One new miscellaneous correction was introduced at the meeting – to update the notes in Detail 225.

Bob Herz said the current Detail 225 had the parenthesis messed up in the notes. After investigating further he said the concrete working stress should be noted as (f_c) and the terminal serviceability index should be (P_t).

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 had not received any comments since the last meeting, and asked for comments from the committee. Seeing none he said he requested that it be on the agenda for a vote during the last meeting. Chair Wilhite said he would entertain a motion. Bob Herz moved and Gregory Arrington seconded a motion to accept Case 15-02 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 15 yes, 0 no, 1 abstained, and 1 not present.

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 said the revised version that was distributed in the packet highlighted the changes. He said the 8” lift now applied to mechanically tamped compaction – the two foot lifts would still be allowed for compaction wheels, since the equipment manufacturer specifies lifts 2’-5’. He said this case incorporated comments from the Water/Sewer Working Group. Peter Kandarlis said it still had to meet compaction requirements. Tom Wilhite suggested language to clarify the two foot limit was for compaction wheels only.

There was discussion among the members on how the language regarding compaction wheels could be more specific so other types of “compaction wheels” are not used. Mr. Kandarlis said they have sheepsfoot compaction wheels. Arvid Veidmark said he didn’t want people to confuse it with a self-propelled unit. The final language agreed upon was “excavator or backhoe mounted sheepsfoot compaction wheels.”

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 said the updated version of Section 602 provided in the agenda packet has the latest updates from the Water/Sewer Working Group. The ASTM and API references have been updated, as well as the wall thickness. Some rewriting was done in Section 602.3 paragraphs 1, 2 and 5. Bob Herz asked if it was standard practice to stencil on the outside of the casing. Mr. Veidmark said that this was an addition to the spec to allow verification of materials on site. He discussed this with suppliers who previously did not apply stencils to rolled casing. He said this helped tighten up the specifications and allow inspectors to see the materials meet spec. He also confirmed that the stencils are painted on. Jim Badowich asked if he thought the case was ready for a vote. Mr. Veidmark said he thought so, if there were no further comments. Chair Wilhite said he would schedule it for possible action at the next meeting.

12. Case 15-05: Revise Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and Add New Reclaimed Valve Box Detail.

Revise Section 616.2 Materials to reference appropriate sections and create new detail. Warren White introduced a new case to add a reclaimed water valve box detail to MAG. The draft case has language from Chandler's supplement as well as the installation detail and square valve box cover. He asked what the committee thought may be the appropriate place and number for the detail. Several suggestions were provided including the 400s and 500s sections as well adding a sheet to the existing 391-X valve box details. Mark Ivanich said that Glendale uses round valve box covers for reclaimed as well. Bob Herz said MAG's current spec requires that it is a different shape. Mr. Ivanich asked Warren White if he knew what the County health department required. Mr. White said he would check this as well as what is required by state law. Jim Badowich said they use square boxes in Avondale. Warren White said in Chandler they require the concrete collars regardless of where it is installed. He said the case would be discussed at the next Water/Sewer working group.

13. Case 15-06: Delete or Update Section 744 ABS TRUSS PIPE AND FITTINGS..

Determine if material is still used and if the specification needs revision or should be deleted. Bob Herz introduced a new case to delete or update Section 744. He said the current ASTM referenced has been obsolete since 1988. He asked if anyone was still using ABS Truss Pipe. If not, then he suggested the deleting it entirely from MAG. If agencies are still using it, the spec would need to remove all references to ASTM D1788 and be made consistent with ASTM D2680 for ABS and PVC composite sewer piping. He asked members to check with their organization to see if it is still in use. Jim Badowich said if it is still used but not in the right-of-way it could go in the Outside ROW document.

14. Case 15-07: Revisions to Concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces.

Make revisions to Detail 225 and Section 342. Warren White discussed a potential new case that would provide options for pavers that are in non-travel areas such as raised medians. The handout he provided included Chandler's detail as well as one from Glendale and language from the City of Phoenix supplement. He suggested modifying Section 342 and Detail 225. Tom Wilhite said it would be good to show the header where the pavers transition from paved to non-paved areas. Jim Badowich said they also have a supplement and saw no reason to have a concrete base under pavers in the median. Mr. White asked for thoughts on what to use instead. Half-sack slurry was a preferred material. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has used a layer of asphalt that worked well. There was also discussion on the different sizes of bricks – 60mm and 80mm. The larger size typically is used for traffic areas. Mr. Ramos said private contractors often use silica sand.

Kristin Tytler asked what other cities have for bull nose requirements. Options discussed included stamped asphalt and monolithic bull noses. Seeing interest in the case, Mr. White decided to make it an official submission (Case 15-07).

15. 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, February 19, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. They looked at 600 series cases from last year and asked for feedback on them. The group also began looking at changes to Detail 200 suggested by Case 14-12. There was also discussion on lift requirements in Case 15-03 as previously discussed. The working group reviewed Section 602 as well as a proposed new Section 608 for Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). Mr. Wilhite asked if utility companies had been involved or reviewed the proposed HDD specification. Mr. Badowich said they had a representative from AZUCA attend, but that he also wanted to get feedback from utilities. Arvid Veidmark said he planned to present the draft supplement to the utility companies as soon as it was ready to be submitted as a case. Mr. Wilhite suggested getting their feedback prior to submitting it to the committee.

Mr. Badowich continued his report. He said they are reviewing Section 611 Testing and hope to update the flushing requirements. Jami Erickson said Phoenix is concerned about contractors using laundry bleach that may have additives or brands from the dollar stores that may be inappropriate for proper flushing. Jim Badowich agreed and said they also need to deal with dechlorination. He said there was also some discussion on reclaimed water issues. The next meeting is planned for March 19, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

b. Asphalt/Materials Working Groups

Jeff Benedict said the group met on Thursday, February 26, 2015 at noon at the ARPA office. He said due to having the meeting on the fourth Thursday, the report was provided during the meeting rather than in the packet. He said they are getting traction on Section 718 and will be taking comments and making revisions. The group worked with Bob Herz on the pavement removal revisions (Case 14-12), and support it. He said an update to the asphalt stamping case is also coming.

Jeff Benedict said the next meeting is planned for March 26, 2015 at noon at the ARPA office, and they do serve lunch.

c. Concrete Working Group

Jeff Hearne said the group continued discussing pervious concrete and had a couple representatives in attendance that had experience with it. He said the current plan is to use revised specifications from the California Greenbook as a guide to help develop basic installation (600) and material (700) specs for review at the next meeting. He mentioned some applications such as on-street parking and tree bases. The group also discussed concrete mix submittal requirements. Currently suppliers prepare yearly submittals to Phoenix of standard mixes. A sample report was shown at the meeting. Mr. Hearne said they are planning to create a list of what should be in the submittal, similar for what is shown for asphalt mixes. He also said he is looking for an expert in pervious concrete to give a presentation at a future committee meeting.

Tom Wilhite asked about drainage requirements of pervious concrete and how it affects the sub-base. Mr. Hearne responded that the design can be quite involved depending on its use and water drainage and/or underground reservoir. He added that maintenance should also be considered as part of the project. Peter Kandarlis said this should be part of the design of the system. Mr. Wilhite asked if there were any details in the Greenbook. Jeff Hearne said no, but that he was willing to review potential details. He added that Scottsdale and Glendale have had experience with pervious concrete. Mark Ivanich said their park and ride lot has performed well. Mr. Hearne said their current thought was to create a more basic specification to get it started and then it could be further refined down the road. He said they would next meet after the other working groups on March 26.

16. General Discussion

Chair Wilhite reopened discussion on the issue brought up by Mr. Beckel regarding testing procedures for lime-treated AB. Jeff Benedict said the asphalt working group did not get any direction from the committee to focus on this issue. Rod Ramos said although the committee has been presented with a problem, typically they also would be looking for a solution. He asked if there was a proposed specification to present to the working group. Mr. Beckel said he wants to help get something together. He said other states such as Wisconsin have modified the

test procedure AASHTO requires by changing the acceptable water color. Greg Groneberg said there is no modified procedure in AASHTO. Rod Ramos asked how you can determine the “opaqueness” of the water using an objective method. Mark Ivanich asked if ADOT had a spec. They do not. Peter Kandarlis said that testing labs need to be part of the discussion, and often they have representatives at the working group meetings.

Gordon Tyus said that John Gallagher from ASTM was going to be at the MAG offices March 12, 2015 at 11:30 a.m. Mr. Gallagher will provide more information on the ASTM Compass website, especially some of the new training options available. If anyone is interested in attending the meeting please contact Mr. Tyus.

Peter Kandarlis announced that he is an officer for the GEO-Institute in Arizona. He said the group available to review geotech related issues. He also announced an upcoming meeting of the Geo-Institute, Arizona Chapter. The cost is only \$15 for government employees and includes dinner. The guest speaker is Matthew Silveston. P.E., with Terracon’s Charleston South Carolina office. He will be giving a presentation on drilled shaft foundation integrity testing using Thermal Integrity Test methods. The meeting is March 11, 2025 at 6:15 at Macayo’s Restaurant, 300 S. Ash Avenue, Tempe. Please contact Mr. Kandarlis for more information.

17. Future Agenda Items:

None were suggested.

18. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.