

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

July 1, 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
Jason Richardson, Chandler (proxy)	Rob Duvall, Phoenix (Streets) (proxy)
Ruben Aguilar, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Wayne Costa, Florence	* Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Tom Condit, Gilbert	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 (audio)
* 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

Michael Stall, Cox Communications

1. Call to Order

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

Mr. Wilhite introduced Dave Mobley who was filling in for Krisin Tytler of Surprise, Jason Richardson, filling in for Warren White of Chandler and Rob Duvall, substituting for Melody Moss of Phoenix.

2. Call to the Audience

Michael Stall of Cox Communication submitted a card to speak on Case 15-12. He agreed to speak on the issue when the case was heard.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the June 3, 2015 meeting minutes. Craig Sharp moved to accept the minutes as written. Dan Nissen 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, and has redlined them. He hopes to have details to submit at the next meeting.

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

Jeff Benedict said nothing has changed since the last meeting. He said they were still looking for an alternate test for the viscosity for the one test currently using Kreb units. He said they tried using the Brookfield testing method but had variable results as the material's viscosity climbs over time. They are still looking for another test because the current test cannot be done in Arizona. Bob Herz said formatting changes to the table also need to be made. Mr. Benedict said he would work on a final version for the next meeting.

6. Case 14-12: Proposed Revisions to Sections 336, 321.10.3, 601.2.7, 601.2.10 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

only change to this case was a spelling correction on Note 9 of Detail 200-1. This was handed out at the meeting. He asked for any questions or comments. Seeing none, he proposed to vote on the case at the next meeting.

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

Greg Groneberg said a new version was not ready for this meeting, but he did describe some of the changes that were discussed during the working group meeting. The title of the section would be changed to “Decorative Asphalt” since the coloring process can be done separate from the stamping process. He also received more info on specifications for the clear coat section. The spec will also make the clear coat optional, not mandatory. He said there was also discussion about language stating it be “tire mark resistant.” There was a concern that this was open to interpretation as to whether it meant no tire marks at all, or traffic resistance, etc. Mr. Groneberg asked the committee for their thoughts, but no one had a good alternative.

Mr. Herz had several comments on the indented portion of Section 322.1 regarding the qualifications of the contractor. He felt this put an undue restriction on new companies resulting in reduced competition. He also noted that it focused on the stamping aspect of the work, but would not be applicable for the surface coloring portion of the specification. He thought that this should be a performance spec and wants it to be deleted. Brian Gallimore described reasons why you would want experienced contractors doing this type of specialized work and problems they’ve had in the past. Craig Sharp asked about someone starting a new company that had experience with a previous company. Bob Herz gave as an example an experienced out-of-state company that wanted to begin work in Arizona. Jeff Hearn said they had a certification requirement in the draft pervious concrete spec since for specialty work you want contractors that are experienced. Mr. Herz also discussed the requirements of the supervisor and asked why both were required. Mr. Gallimore said these requirements came from the existing specifications used by Gilbert and Scottsdale. Mr. Herz suggested that these qualification requirements should be part of the special provisions for a project and not in the MAG specifications.

Mark Ivanich asked how inspectors can know when the job is done correctly and what happens if it isn’t. Brian Gallimore said you can check things such as the stamping depth, and if done incorrectly it is repaved and redone.

Bob Herz asked about the text that stated “mock-ups may be required.” He wanted to know how it would be paid for. Jim Badowich said they had mock-ups done for one of their jobs and the cost was incidental to the cost of the project. Jeff Benedict agreed that it typically was and gave an example of a logo. Tom Wilhite agreed with Bob Herz that any mock-ups should be paid for and addressed in the measurement section. Mr. Herz also thought the requirements described during the “on-site prebid meeting” would be covered under the current Section 102.4.

Craig Sharp asked why, for the surfacing coat, it specified to have four passes and a thickness. Mr. Groneberg thought the four passes was to ensure the material was not applied too thickly, but agreed that it would be better to use the manufacturer's recommended application method.

Finally, Mr. Groneberg said he found no similar specs in the Greenbook, but was still investigating if Los Angeles has their own specification. He said he would take these comments back and make revisions.

New Cases for 2015

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

D. Change title to Detail 270. Bob Herz handed out a change to Detail 270 to change the title to GRADE ADJUSTMENT. He also suggested changing the note referring to "8" CONCRETE PIPE" TO "8" RISER PIPE" since the riser pipe can also be made of plastic. Mark Ivanich clarified what he suggested for a title at the last meeting – not to shorten the title to "GRADE ADJUSTMENT" but just move it to the front so the title was "GRADE ADJUSTMENT FOR FRAME AND COVER." Mr. Herz said he would make the changes. There also seemed to be concurrence to revise the grade adjustment detail to show adjustment configuration for unpaved areas, the same as depicted in Detail 291.

E. Correct reference for manhole backfill requirements. Bob Herz provided a new correction to eliminate conflicting specifications for manhole backfill requirements contained in Sections 206 and 601. The requirements in Section 206 are to remain. Adjustments were to remove the last sentence of the first paragraph of Section 601.2.6 the paragraph is meant to address excavation, not backfilling. Also changed is the reference in Section 625.3.1 for backfilling of manholes to reference Section 206 rather than 601, since the manhole is a structure and Section 601 is for backfilling trenches. The second page of the handout highlights the reasoning for why the change should be made.

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

Bob Herz said, based on comments, he changed "will" to "shall" and added that native material shall have a plasticity index not exceeding 15. This was added to make sure poor native soils were not used. Brian Gallimore commented that he didn't have a problem with the requirement for native soils 2' below the pavement, but did see a problem with deep and wide trenches, where if the native material doesn't meet the requirement, a huge amount of fill would need to be brought in, making it much more expensive. Jim Badowich said granular material may be used instead of native. Mr. Herz said there currently is no limitation on native material. He suggested requiring only the top several feet to meet the PI of 15. There was discussion on how much to allow and how far below finished grade. He said the county wants to use native if possible but wants it to be good material.

Craig Sharp said Buckeye had a problem with native materials that caused a \$30,000 change order. Brian Gallimore stated that if you have to haul in material it is much more expensive. He said the specs are used on the private side as well. Bob Herz said expansive soils may need to be treated (with lime as an example) before the subgrade is laid down. Jim Badowich suggested that the case be discussed further at the next working group meeting. Bob Herz asked if cities only use AB in streets. Mark Ivanich said that for deeper trenches they do use native material.

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

Warren White was not present; however, Jason Richardson said a detail from Neenah Foundry was provided as an example of the square box. Mr. Richardson asked if the committee thought the label on the lid should be changed from “RECLAIMED” to “NONPOTABLE.” Jim Badowich said the nonpotable label allowed more uses. Bob Herz noted the Neenah detail did not have machined surfaces and thought if they were not necessary it should be removed from the MAG detail. Mr. Ivanich asked about the concrete collar. He was assured that it would be on the MAG detail, and that the Neenah detail was just for manufacturing the box.

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

Jason Richardson said he had nothing to add for the case. Bob Herz said in Section 342.3.1 Subgrade, the subgrade needs tolerances depending on whether it is for AB or concrete, and they should reference Section 301 or Section 310 as appropriate. Mr. Herz said if provided a copy of the Word document for Section 342 he would provide suggested revisions.

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

Jeff Benedict and Bob Herz indicated that some changes are to be incorporated into the draft from the working group meeting. Don Cornelison is working on revisions but didn't get them back in time for the meeting.

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

Brian Gallimore said there currently are no changes, but there was discussion at the working group meeting on whether or not the change is needed because cities should repair the base before repaving, but he added, this does not always happen on maintenance jobs. One issue discussed is whether contractors would use this as an excuse as to why they did not get compaction. If the contractor does not get compaction how can he prove that the base caused the problem? Bob Herz said it needs a good definition of rehabilitation work, and when it will

apply. Brian Gallimore said it was for anything not new construction. The case would be discussed further at the next working group meeting.

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

Greg Groneberg said he received comments from the County. He has set up a meeting with John Shi at Maricopa County to go over the changes and expects changes to the table.

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

Arvid Veidmark was not present at the meeting to give an update. Mr. Michael Stall of Cox Communications provided suggested changes to the proposed specification. He asked that a new Section 608.4.10 be added that would move the last sentence from the current 608.4.8.9 along with the bullet points for “Rod/joint number” and “Pitch, roll and clock-face.” The rationale was that for small jobs these items created unneeded and expensive reporting requirements. Jim Badowich said he would take these comments back for review at the July 16 water/sewer working group meeting.

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

Jeff Hearne said there were no changes, but that there was some discussion about changing the aggregate variation from 5% to 10%. He said he was putting together some examples on when this may come to play and will present them at the next working group meeting. If agreement on this change can't be reached, it may come out and the case may focus solely on the mix design submittal requirements.

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

Bob Herz provided a revised handout to Case 15-14 at the meeting. The proposed change was to “Eliminate the 10% overrun penalty for pavements less than 2.5 inches in thickness.” His reasoning was that the standard paving tolerance for thickness of ¼ inch if on the high side would cause an overrun which exceeds the maximum 10% allowed, would not be detrimental to the pavement and the Contractor should not be penalized. Jeff Benedict said they discussed issues with a safety edge or thickened edge when done with an overlay. Brian Gallimore said people in the field have a problem calculating pavement quantities. He said there are also problems with the plan quantity versus how much is required, and the initial plans estimates often are also wrong. He noted as an example that Phoenix measures what the contractor has used. He also said that for safety edges the trench is not exactly 5” and the process used to make the safety edge often uses more material. Jim Badowich asked how it was paid. Mr. Herz said they pay per tonnage. Craig Sharp asked why the safety edge is not paid for by linear foot.

Mr. Gallimore agreed with this method, but Mr. Herz noted that the safety edge is created at the same time as the overlay paving so the asphalt tonnage would include the safety edge. Mr. Gallimore said they would continue reviewing it at the next working group meeting.

18. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for reports from the working group chairs.

a. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

The initial meeting of the group was held July 8 at 1:00. Bob Herz said notes from the meeting were provided in the packet. Gordon Tyus said in the notes there is a link to the meeting page where the presentation by Brandon Forrey and the existing city supplements have been posted. The next meeting is scheduled for July 13 at 1:00 in the MAG Cottonwood room.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met June 18, 2015. Arvid Veidmark was not present so there was not much discussion on Section 608. Mr. Badowich noted that the new proposed Detail 201 removed the existing Type C repair for concrete, and asked if anyone had a problem with it. Mr. Herz said it was removed because specification section 340 requires joint-to-joint replacement and joints in portland cement concrete pavement are not to be arbitrarily modified. He also discussed the detail showing a 6" milling offset to eliminate full depth vertical pavement cuts.

Mr. Badowich said they also discussed water testing and flushing requirements, and are reviewing the minimum orifice for flushing. He asked if members cared about the flushing methods when it still had to pass the tests. Mr. Herz said you also want enough velocity to flush out small rocks that can damage valves. Mr. Badowich discussed types of valves needed to meter the flushing and also noted problems draining the city water tanks if too much flushing is used. He said they were looking to update valve boxes to allow polymer concrete. Finally the group recommended that the Outside ROW document focus on backflow prevention details. The next Water/Sewer Working Group meeting is planned for July 16, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the MAG office.

c. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said he will review updates to Section 321 and have the changes ready for the agenda packet since the meeting is scheduled more than a week before the committee meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for July 23, 2015 at the APRA offices.

d. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said he discussed Section 725 and the draft pervious concrete specs. He passed out the park-and-ride pervious concrete specs used by Glendale. He said he was trying to get involvement from industry to help produce the new section. The next meeting will follow the Asphalt/Materials Working Group on July 23.

e. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandarlis was not present, but Mr. Benedict said that he attended the asphalt working group meeting, and they will provide time between asphalt and concrete in future meetings.

19. General Discussion

Tom Wilhite said he was meeting with Anne Reichman from the ASU Global Institute of Sustainability. They are interested in the MAG process and how “green” construction and materials could become MAG specification. The meeting is Thursday, July 2, 2015 at 2:30 at the MAG offices. He invited members who may be interested to also attend.

Gordon Tyus said he was approached by other MAG staff members on specs and details related issues. One was to add details to MAG for bus shelters, location, and pads, and to ensure ADA compatibility. Another was from the MAG Bicycle Committee on what MAG grate details should be used that are “bicycle safe.” Rob Duvall said he could send Phoenix’s detail.

Lance Webb of Mesa asked about promoting the Low Impact Development (LID) toolbox concepts and ideas. He said it created a rating system for grading a project and included some details.

20. Future Agenda Items

Tom Wilhite asked if there were any future agenda items the committee wanted to add. Mr. Tyus asked about presentations such as on Pervious Concrete. Mr. Hearne said he planned to provide one in January of next year. Dan Nisson asked about the presentation on horizontal directional drilling that Arvid Veidmark agreed to give. Mr. Tyus agreed that he volunteered to provide a presentation at the August meeting. Mr. Wilhite said to add it to the next agenda.

21. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.