

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

June 3, 2015

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair	Lance Webb, Mesa (proxy)
Craig Sharp, Buckeye	Dan Nissen, Peoria
Warren White, Chandler	Melody Moss, Phoenix (Streets)
Ruben Aguilar, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Wayne Costa, Florence	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
James Humble, Gilbert (proxy)	David Mobley, Surprise (proxy)
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

Mike Molina, Oldcastle Precast

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

Mr. Wilhite introduced James Humble who was filling in for Tom Condit of Gilbert, and Lance Webb who was a proxy for Julie Christoph of Mesa.

2. Call to the Audience

There was no comment from the audience.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the May 6, 2015 meeting minutes. Dan Nissen moved to accept the minutes as written. Mark Ivanich 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 – Revisions to Section 415 and/or include Guardrail Details.

Bob Herz said MCDOT is currently working on the details.

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

Jeff Benedict said there was an update passed out at the meeting. A number of changes were made, primarily changing the AASHTO testing specs to ASTM. He noted there was still one AASHTO spec remaining. He expected one more change in 718-1 (Type C) to not use Kreb units. Warren White asked if they found if there was a maximum VOC's allowed. Mr. Benedict said that VOC's were so small that there isn't enough to measure or worry about.

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 said the case provided is in its complete form for review. He said that Peter Kandarlis helped him update the CAD drawings for Details 200-1 and 200-2. He said there were some changes to the text on the details as well. He asked members to take it back and see if there were any issues. Jeff Benedict commented that the asphalt working group didn't have any further comments. Mr.

Herz said he also submitted the case to the water/sewer working group for their review. He asked members to review it and send him comments.

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

A revision was passed out at the meeting that incorporated comments from the last meeting, and from Bob Herz. Greg Groneberg said changes included removing references to asphalt and brand names. He looked but did not find material specs for the clear coat. To address Julie Christoph's comment from the last meeting, the revision includes minimum and maximum values in Table 322-1. Jim Badowich asked whether UV will discolor the clear coat. He said they had problems with sealant on pavers turning black. Mr. Groneberg said this sealant is designed for this specific application and mainly helps avoid tracking. Scottsdale uses it, and Mr. Ramos said they didn't have problems with discoloration. Bob Herz asked if the clear coat material refers to any ASTM specs. Mr. Groneberg said he would try again to find more information on the clear coat material. Rod Ramos mentioned that they are doing a lot of painting without the stamping and wondered if it made sense to separate the specs. He said they stopped stamping after getting pushback on the size of the imprints. Mark Ivanich wanted to know if the paint/coating material was slippery when wet. Brian Gallimore said it maintained the texture of the asphalt and gave examples of several current projects, including bike lanes in Tempe. Rod Ramos said they were planning to paint bike lanes as well. Jeff Benedict asked if the title should be changed to address the painting section as well as stamping. Melody Moss suggested titling it Decorative Paving. Greg Groneberg said the spec is based on those from Gilbert and Scottsdale, which are the only cities with formal specifications.

New Cases for 2015

8. Case 15-01: Miscellaneous Corrections A-D.

D. New correction – change title to Detail 270. Bob Herz handed out a change to Detail 270 to change the title back to FRAME & COVER AND GRADE ADJUSTMENT, as it was in the past. He noted that the title of one of the details should also be updated. Warren White said he remembered changing the title recently because grade adjustments are also shown on Detail 391. Bob Herz said Detail 270 also includes survey monuments and water valves not shown on Detail 391. Mark Ivanich suggested rewording it to say Grade Adjustment first. Mr. Herz said he would make additional revisions and resubmit it for the next meeting.

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

Bob Herz discussed the latest version of the case that removed references to any specific equipment and set the maximum default loose lift thickness to 12". The text was changed to allow greater lift thicknesses if the contractor demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Engineer that the Contractor proposed methods and equipment will obtain the required compaction. The

contractor would need agency approval for lifts thicker than 12 inches. Peter Kandarlis suggested changing the term “non-compacted” to “loose” to be consistent with common terminology in the field. Tom Wilhite proposed changing “will” to “shall” in the third sentence of 601.4.5. There was a question of whether the last sentence in the first paragraph was still needed. Mr. Herz wanted to leave it to make it clear that compaction was required even if the lifts were 12” or less. The final draft removes any reference to “sheepsfoot” to avoid confusion. Mr. Herz asked members to email him any other suggestions.

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

Warren White said there was no update this month as he is waiting for comments from Neenah Foundry. He said he did update the line on the detail where it changes from square to round. Brian Gallimore said Rita Chihanik of Neenah said she would get comments to the working group. Bob Herz said the finishing marks should be pointing to the matching surfaces rather than the corner to make it clear which surface is to be finished. He suggested getting a casting diagram if possible to compare to the detail.

11. Case 15-07: Revisions to Concrete Paver Standards for Non-Traveled Surfaces, Detail 225 and Section 342.

Warren White said in the packet was an updated draft of Detail 225. It takes the current Detail 225 and adds in the lower right a detail for raised medians. It kept the curb options to show vertical or single curb. He asked the committee about the paver notes added in the top right. It was suggested to move these to the written specs, or regular notes as appropriate. Warren White asked about having a supply of extra pavers to allow for maintenance. It was suggested this may be part of the project special provisions, and recommended deleting the note.

Mark Ivanich asked if the pavers also have English units. Jim Badowich said they are specified by manufacturers as either 60 mm or 80 mm sizes. Mr. White said the written specs included the English sizes. Bob Herz said Section 342 needs to match what is on the details. He said not to call out for interlocking pavers if the detail doesn’t show them. He also noted that if you call out 60 mm pavers, the dimensions on the detail would need to change – the maximum sand would be exceeded otherwise. He also wondered if a minimum amount of sand was needed. Mark Ivanich said the minimum would be just what is required to make it level. Warren White said the specs have straight-edge requirements. He also asked members if they want to keep the concrete thickness at 9” and there was a consensus to keep it the same.

Tom Wilhite had questions on the concrete header size and width, and wondered if there had been any problems with traffic causing pavers to hit and crack the header. He said Tempe in the past had problems with pavers moving without headers. Rod Ramos said they have not had issues with the header cracking, and typically the concrete is poured monolithically. Jim Badowich wondered if the header could be larger at crosswalks. Mr. White noted this was

allowed in Note 5. It was suggested to refer to Note 5 specifically in the header callout on the detail.

12. Case 15-08: Revisions to clarify Table 710-4 to Eliminate Misinterpretation of Criteria 8.

Tom Wilhite noted that this item was on the agenda for action. Bob Herz asked if there were any comments. Seeing none he moved to approve Case 15-08 as presented. The motion was seconded by Rod Ramos. A roll call vote was taken. The motion was approved, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.

13. Case 15-09: Revisions to Section 321 Placement and Construction of Asphalt Concrete Pavement.

Jeff Benedict provided a revised handout to Case 15-09 at the meeting. The cover memo highlighted the major changes to Section 321. It mainly addressed changes to placement temperature and coring requirements. He asked members to please review it and bring any comments to the next Asphalt Working Group meeting.

14. Case 15-10: Add Subsection 321.10.5.3 “Rehabilitation Work” into the MAG Specifications.

Brian Gallimore introduced a new case to address requirements for rehabilitation work when the base materials are not replaced. It added a subsection 321.10.5.3 to allow for some relief on asphalt density when provisions for reworking substandard bases (removals) or existing asphalts (overlays) to meet Section 310 or Section 321 for overlays. Tom Wilhite asked if this could be merged with the previous case on Section 321 revisions. Mr. Gallimore said they are different issues and wants to keep them as separate cases. If anyone has problems with one issue or another it won't hold up approval on the other item. Peter Kandaris wondered if it belongs in the overlay section and planned to review it. Warren White asked if it could be simplified to overlays. Brian Gallimore said the intention is for it to apply to any rehab work without subgrade repair. Jim Badowich said they still want to recompact existing base. Mr. Gallimore said the City of Phoenix mix is 10% air voids even on new streets, and this is what they are asking for on rehab work. He noted that if you rework the subgrade then this new subsection would not apply. Jim Badowich said Phoenix mix is not a MAG mix. Mr. Gallimore agreed that the MAG spec is more stringent than the Phoenix spec, which is one reason he believes contractors should not be held to the same standards on rehab work. He asked members to bring comments to the next working group meeting.

15. Case 15-11: Incorporate revisions to Section 717, “Mix Design Requirements” into the MAG Specifications.

Greg Groneberg introduced a new case from the Asphalt Working Group to incorporate revisions to Section 717 for the mix design requirements. The change added clarification to the

mineral admixture calculation as prescribed under the Arizona Test Method 832. The revision states, "...with the exception that mineral admixture shall be considered part of the total weight of aggregate and pounds per cubic foot shall be calculated by using Asphalt Institute's Manual MS-2."

Bob Herz suggested not changing how it is done, just clarifying that the admixture is included as part of the total.

16. Case 15-12: New Section 608 HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILLING.

Arvid Veidmark introduced a new case from the Water/Sewer Working Group to propose a new Section 608 Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). He said the case has been gone through many revisions at the working group and received feedback from the local utility companies. He noted that a detail illustrating a typical HDD layout and cross-section was missing from the packet. Mr. Tyus said he could post it on the MAG website.

Tom Wilhite asked if there was a table of minimum utility clearances included in the spec. Mr. Veidmark said there wasn't a table, but a minimum separation of one foot was specified in Section 608.5.4 (sixth paragraph). Mr. Wilhite said Tempe requires a 6' min. horizontal clearance and 2' or more at every crossing in their permit requirements. He suggested finding what the requirements are for the agencies. Mr. Veidmark said the Arizona blue stake law requires potholing within 2' of existing utilities, and that typically the design is modified to be outside of the 2' minimum. The design can determine how close and how often potholes are made. Peter Kandaris said at SRP they often potholed prior to final design. Mr. Veidmark said the contractor must get the blue stake certificates.

Arvid Veidmark next explained how the drilling is done, typically with a bore hole 1.5 times the size of the final pipe to allow drilling mud to flow around it. Jim Badowich proposed giving a presentation on the process to the committee. Mr. Veidmark said he would be happy to, but that he would not be able to come to the July meeting, and proposed a presentation in August. Chair Wilhite said he could add a short (15 min.) presentation to the August meeting agenda.

Tom Wilhite also asked about what agencies should be looking for in dry utility installations. Would they get the driller log/as built etc? Mr. Veidmark said Southwest Gas and Century Link had concerns about documentation requirements because when they get a permit from the city, they may not know everything until the preconstruction meeting. They are relying on the contractor to meet MAG specifications. Jim Badowich said they have worked hard to get buy-in from the utility companies. He added Avondale is going to start requiring utilities provide them the as-builts. He said this option is already available, and that the utilities must still maintain their as-built files. He mentioned they are using them for agency IT and traffic control HDD projects.

There was discussion about the size and location of bore pits. Mr. Veidmark said Southwest Gas does not dictate where they are on the plans. The pits are often determined after potholing

and the final HDD layout is determined. He explained that for HDD, you typically have smaller entry and exit pits that are more like trenches. Mr. Wilhite said they also have them when they have to change directions or make splices. Bob Herz said it would make sense to reference Section 601 for pit excavation and backfill requirements. Mr. Veidmark said they will be discussing the case at the next Water/Sewer Working Group and asked member to provide comments.

17. Case 15-13: Add text to Section 725.6 to Identify what to Include in a Concrete Mix Design Submittal.

Jeff Hearne introduced a new case from the Concrete Working Group to create a list of what should be included in a concrete mix design submittal, similar to what is done in asphalt mixes. In addition to the list, he also proposed a revision to Sect 725.6 A (1) to change the amount aggregates could vary from 5% to 10% before a new mix design is required. He said ADOT is currently looking at going to 10% or changing to a combined grading similar to what is done for asphalt. He said this second option is already being done in commercial industry and construction. He thought the 10% would be a good first step to allow suppliers to make adjustments to the mix. Mr. Hearne explained that typically mix design submittals are done once a year. Mark Ivanich asked if they are required to provide a break history. Mr. Hearne said the City of Phoenix only asks for one if it is a new mix, but it typically is not needed. He thinks the MAG tables are over designed for strength requirements so there usually is not a problem. Peter Kandarlis said they typically require them for transmission foundations. Jeff Hearne said large projects normally have their own specifications. He noted Phoenix and Mesa now have a yearly submission process, and other agencies typically use the same mixes they approve.

18. Case 15-14: Revise Sections 321 and 325 to coordinate overlay work requirements.

Bob Herz submitted a new case to coordinate overlay work requirements within Sections 321 and 325 to clarify measurement and payment for work associated with the construction of safety edges. Maricopa County approved a change order to pay an extra fee for the safety edges on an asphalt-rubber paving job due to differing overlay specifications in sections 321 and 325.

19. 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, May 21, 2015. Most of the meeting was spent discussing the new case on horizontal directional drilling, but one new area of discussion was the use of concrete-polymer meter boxes. He believes the spec needs to be updated because the newer boxes have different dimensions. The next Water/Sewer Working Group meeting is planned for June 18, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

b. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Hearne said he covered for Jeff Benedict at the May 28th meeting, and the notes were handed out at the meeting that summarized the work done on all the cases. Jeff Benedict said the next meeting is scheduled for June 25th.

c. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said he discussed Section 725 already. The other item discussed was the pervious concrete specs. He has invited contractors that do this work to participate, but doesn't believe a case will be ready until next year.

d. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said that he will plan to come to other working group meetings to solicit help updating detail drawings. He is looking for people to mark them up so he can have his drafter make the CAD changes.

e. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White said the new group is having its kickoff meeting next Monday, June 6th at 1:00 p.m. at the MAG offices. Gordon Tyus said the Cottonwood room next door has been reserved. Mr. White said he is looking for someone from the contractor community to comment on constructability issues. There will be brainstorming on what is wanted and needed for sidewalk ramps.

20. General Discussion

Peter Kandaris said the Geotech Institute wants to look at the specs for Geotextiles. He said he would send out information about the next meeting presentation. Tom Wilhite said he would also plan for the HDD presentation in August. Arvid Veidmark said he would forward a draft presentation.

21. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.