

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

February 3, 2016

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

- |                                    |                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jim Badowich, Avondale, Chair      | Lance Webb, Mesa                    |
| * Craig Sharp, Buckeye             | Dan Nissen, Peoria                  |
| Warren White, Chandler, Vice Chair | * Leticia Vargas, Phoenix (Streets) |
| Nick Russo (audio)                 | Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)      |
| * Wayne Costa, Florence            | Rod Ramos, Scottsdale               |
| Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale         | David Mobley, Surprise (proxy)      |
| Tom Condit, Gilbert                | Tom Wilhite, Tempe                  |
| * Tom Vassallo, Goodyear           | * Jonathan Sorrell, Valley Metro    |
| Bob Herz, MCDOT                    | Gregory Arrington, Youngtown        |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- |                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Greg Groneberg, ARPA    | Brian Gallimore, AGC         |
| Jeff Hearne, ARPA       | Peter Kandarlis, Independent |
| * Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA | Paul R. Nebeker, Independent |
| Tom Brennan, AZUCA      | Christina Buckle, SRP        |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

- \* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Jim Anderson, Olson Precast Arizona  
Troy McGahey, New Horizon Sales

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Badowich was running late due to traffic so Vice Chair Warren White called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Vice Chair White asked for introductions of new members. Tom Brennan of Utility West introduced himself as AZUCA's new representative along with Arvid Veidmark (who was unable to attend). Tom Kaczmarowski said he is returning to the committee as Glendale's representative.

2. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair White announced the call to the audience. Jim Anderson of Olson Precast Arizona and Troy McGahey of New Horizon Sales introduced themselves.

3. Re-admittance of Advisory Members

In 2015, Jacob Rodriguez of Salt River Project (SRP) and Paul Nebeker (Independent) failed to meet the attendance requirements for advisory members. According to the committee bylaws, these advisory members are required to submit a letter, have member sponsorship, and a 2/3 vote of the committee for re-admittance. SRP submitted a letter requesting Christina Buckle as their new representative. Jim Badowich, having arrived at the meeting, resumed his place as chair on this agenda item. He agreed to sponsor SRP as did Bob Herz of Maricopa County. Mr. Kaczmarowski moved to reinstate SRP as an advisory member. Mr. Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote of the committee was taken. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Nebeker said he still needed to submit a letter, but expressed that we would like to continue to serve on the committee. Chair Badowich agreed to postpone action on Mr. Nebeker's membership until the next meeting.

Mr. Badowich also read a certificate of appreciation for former advisory member Jeff Benedict, who served for decades on the committee, and as chair of the Asphalt Working Group from 2008-2015.

4. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the January 6, 2016 meeting minutes. Peter Kandarlis noted that there was a typo in item 5 of the minutes. It should say "Don" instead of "Dan" Cornelison. Dan Nissen moved to accept the minutes with the correction as noted above. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

**Carry Forward 2015 Cases**

5. Case 15-05: Revise Section 616 Reclaimed Water Line Construction and Add New Reclaimed Valve Box Detail 270-2.

Warren White handed out a revised Detail 270-2 before the meeting. The detail updated the lettering to be raised 1/16" and added 2 lines on the section view where the square to round transition is made. Bob Herz asked how the transition was made, since it seemed unclear on the drawing. Tom Wilhite said typically it is like a plate at the bottom of the square box, with a round hole cut into it where the circular pipe meets. Jim Anderson of Olson Precast opened a sample shop drawing on his iPad to help illustrate one of their boxes. Rod Ramos noted that the top line of the section view should also be shown. Mr. White said he would review the section drafting.

Dan Nissen suggested the word "valve" be removed from the lid to be consistent with other existing boxes. Members agreed since the box may be used for things other than a valve. Mr. White asked Mr. Ramos if the "Nonpotable Water" lid also should remove the word "Valve." Mr. Ramos thought that would be fine. Jami Erickson asked if the box would have the concrete collar around it like existing boxes. Mr. White confirmed that it would. Lance Webb asked if it could have a deeper throat to help keep the lids from popping out. One suggestion was to make the depth dimension of 2-3/4" a minimum to allow for larger sizes. Paul Nebeker confirmed that reclaimed boxes are often used in the street.

6. Case 15-10: Add Subsection 321.10.5.3 "Rehabilitation Work" into the MAG Specifications.

Sponsor Brian Gallimore said that after much discussion with industry and within the working group, they have decided to withdraw this case from consideration. He said the group could not come to a consensus on the language because different owners are handling rehabilitation work cases differently. Contractors felt they were dealt with fairly by agencies working directly with them on a project level. Mr. Badowich agreed that often this kind of work is done on a case by case basis. Mr. Gallimore said it was also a challenge to write an acceptable specification that allowed for what would be considered deficient work on new construction.

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

Sponsor Jeff Hearne said he had nothing new, but was getting info together to answer some questions from Maricopa County.

## **New Cases for 2016**

8. Case 16-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

B. Bob Herz submitted a new addition to the Miscellaneous Corrections Case. On Detail 507 the arrowhead should continue down and point to the concrete encased area rather than stopping at the grade level.

Although not a part of the case for this year, Mr. Tyus noted that Rod Ramos found a formatting error on Table 710-5 where the plus or minus symbol before the .02 in row 2 was converted to the wrong characters. Mr. Tyus said they have corrected this typographic error in

the online version of the MAG specifications, but that the printed versions already received would need to make this correction in the book, or print out a replacement page. Mr. Herz reminded Mr. Tyus to be sure to include this revision in next year's update packet so that future printed updates would be correct.

9. Case 16-02: Add Section 106.2.1 Certificate of Compliance, add Section 106.2.2 Certificate of Analysis, and modify Section 717.2.1.2 Crumb Rubber.

Bob Herz said this case was discussed at the Asphalt/Materials Working Group meeting. The feedback he received from the working group was that many agencies do not need these certificates and suggested that they only be supplied when requested by the Engineer. Ms. Buckle asked what if the engineer is expecting the certificate, but doesn't get it.

Jeff Hearne said the working group suggested it be changed to "upon request" to help eliminate unnecessary paperwork. He said agencies could use the ADOT approved materials list. If not, cities would have to do all the same work themselves. He said some options were to: request a certificate, use a material on the ADOT list, or have it specifically approved by the engineer. He noted that agencies are not currently receiving certificates. Peter Kandaris said there are some materials that would require certificates because they are determined by the batch of materials used, rather than through an annual review.

Mr. Herz said the MAG specs still need to clarify what is included on a Certificate of Compliance and Certificate of Analysis, and that they need to look at sections of MAG where it makes sense to allow a request rather than require it. Jeff Hearn said that he would like the process to be more flexible, noting the ADOT uses a preapproved list and the suppliers go through a yearly process.

Mr. Herz said he would continue to work with the working group on this case, and expects a revision next month.

10. Case 16-03: Revision to Detail 251 RETURN TYPE DRIVEWAYS to adjust concrete thickness and concrete class for commercial and industrial driveways to match requirements shown on Detail 250.

Bob Herz passed out a revised Detail 251 that would change the concrete thickness from 6" to 9" for commercial and industrial driveways. One of the main changes to the drawing was showing the thickness differences for the residential and commercial driveways in the section view. He clarified for Mr. Gallimore that the 2' section noted on the detail was to be paid as curb and gutter, similar to Detail 240.

Warren White asked about the 10' maximum radius. He said they often use larger radii. Mr. Herz said he could remove the maximum and leave the minimum. Jim Badowich suggested removing the default radius minimum and just note it as in plans, since the dimension varies depending on the project. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has their own set of details for driveways. Bob Herz said he needed to also fix Note 1, since the initial line "Expansion joints

shall comply” was accidentally deleted. There were also questions about the 4’ dimension for expansion joint area. Mr. Herz said he could remove that dimension and just label the joints.

#### 11. Case 16-04 Adjustment to Section 340.2.1 for withdrawn ASTM C1028 reference.

Bob Herz submitted a new case to make a correction for an ASTM reference that was withdrawn. ASTM C1028, regarding friction testing, is only referenced in Section 340.2.1 Detectable Warnings. He said he searched ADA references and found no mention of this test as a requirement, only that it not be a “slippery surface.” He thought it would be fine to delete the ASTM reference in 340.2.1. As he reviewed this section, he thought it could be summarized and worded a little more clearly, so this case also includes the revisions shown in red on the handout. The back page of the case had the final language. He asked members to read it and see if his changes made sense.

Peter Kandarlis said that an industry representative helped draft the current version, but he didn’t have a problem with the revisions. Jim Badowich thought that the last sentence of the first paragraph should add “and alignment” to read: “Detectable warning panels shall be installed so the dome spacing **and alignment are** maintained across adjoining panels.” He said he had an issue with this on a job in Avondale.

On a separate question, Mr. Herz said that ADA and MUTCD require detectable warnings across the full width of sidewalks and other pedestrian pathways crossing of railroad tracks not within a paved road.

#### 12. New or Potential Cases.

Lance Webb of Mesa said they have a potential case regarding Section 106.4 for the use of alternative materials. He thinks there is a potential conflict of the MAG spec, which does not allow alternate materials before bidding, with state law 34-104, that requires any alternative materials be approved and released eight days prior to the final due date for bid proposals. He said changing Section 106 would help eliminate issues after the bid. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale uses its own process which includes this provision. Mr. Badowich said many agencies do, but that smaller agencies may rely on MAG specs. Tom Kaczmarowski said for some specialized equipment, you may need to specify a sole source without equal. There was also discussion about what cities have approved materials lists that include what are considered “equal” or acceptable substitutes. Chair Badowich suggested Mr. Webb submit a case.

#### 13. Working Group Reports

Chair Badowich asked for reports from the working group chairs.

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

Jim Badowich said the group met January 19<sup>th</sup> and the meeting notes were included in the packet. He said Arvid Veidmark was doing a roadshow on the horizontal directional drilling case and felt that it was being well received. Peter Kandarlis said a Canadian research group and other states have shown interest in this specification.

Mr. Badowich said one area of focus this year will be on water/sewer testing (Section 611). Areas of focus include flushing, chlorination, and additional testing such as the BAC-T tests used by Goodyear, Phoenix, Tempe and Mesa. Bob Herz suggested starting with one of those city's specifications. Mr. Badowich thought addressing the orifice size for flushing was important, and noted that the fire code has minimum sizes depending on the diameter of the line being flushed. Mr. Nebeker said the best method is size-on-size flushing as Scottsdale requires. Mr. Badowich said a minimum velocity is needed; otherwise you may clean the rocks, but still have them in the line which could cause problems with valves and maintenance. He said Avondale provided a 4" water meter and backflow preventer for flushing. Mr. Badowich asked Mr. Ramos if Scottsdale had some specifications, and if he could share them with Jami Erickson to work on this issue.

The last thing discussed at the working group meeting was polymer lids for boxes, as an alternative to cast iron lids currently in the MAG specs. He said the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 16<sup>th</sup>, at 1:30 in the MAG Cottonwood room.

**b. Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White said the group met January 25<sup>th</sup> and first reviewed a presentation showing different alignments for directional and radial dual ramps. This presentation is available online here: <https://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=8478>

Mr. White said he and Brandon Forrey were making revisions to the aligned and directional ramp details, and they plan to have them ready to present as a case in March. These details will be sent out to working group members to be reviewed at their next meeting on Monday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, at 1:30 in the MAG Cottonwood room. Mr. White said they are starting with these details, but other options may be submitted as future cases.

**c. Asphalt, Materials and Concrete Working Groups**

Greg Groneberg said much of what was discussed during the January 21<sup>st</sup> meeting has been covered already in discussions of Case 15-10 and 16-02. For Case 16-02, he repeated that the working group recommends using an approved list, and clarify it in the MAG specs so there is a process to be approved, and that certificates would be sent "on request." He said they also reviewed the list of out-of-date ASTM references and have assigned members to review them for correction. They are also looking into the specifications for the green paint now being used for bike lanes. He said Don Cornelison is also working on revisions to Section 710.

On the concrete side, Jeff Hearne said they were part of the discussion on Case 16-02, and will propose a minor revision to the CLSM ASTM reference. He said they would like to continue to use the test method in the old ASTM. In response to a question from Mr. Wilhite, he said he is continuing to work behind the scenes on the pervious concrete specifications, but is having trouble getting the industry reps in this area together.

The next meeting of the joint Asphalt/Materials and Concrete Working Groups is scheduled for Thursday, February 18<sup>th</sup>, at noon. The meetings will be held in the ARPA office, 916 W Adams Street, Phoenix.

d. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandaris handed out a sheet with suggested outside right-of-way standards and details priority listing (high or low). This was based on his assessment of feedback on different issues and asked the committee to comment if they had different views. He said he planned to attend working group meetings to have them report on the status of these different issues. He said he still had questions about what to do with “orphaned” specs that didn’t fall into current working group focus areas. He likely will be unable to attend the water/sewer group this month due to a conflict with a geo-structural conference, but plans to attend the next asphalt/materials meeting, and would like to make it a topic of the working groups for future assignments.

Specifications that were added to the list include backflow preventers, water trucks, rainwater harvesting and grease traps. Grease traps are an issue because they typically are handled on the building-side, but the work is normally done by a utilities contractor rather than a plumber. Chandler has created some guidelines.

Mr. Kandaris said he has volunteers to work on site-related improvements, and the Geotech Institute will help review cases. Warren White asked if he knew anyone specializing in landscaping. Jami Erickson had questions about backflow preventers.

14. General Discussion

Bob Herz provided an update on the guardrail details. He said MAG currently references the county standards, but the county is moving to the 31” Midwest Guardrail System. This system has the rails spliced between posts rather than on them. The new details will use the 3100 numbers, the existing guardrail details will still be available but the detail numbers are changed to the 2800 numbers to be consistent with the 28” guardrail height. He said the end treatments must be MASH compliant by 2017. Mr. Herz hopes to have details ready for the new system by January of next year. He expects changes to the MAG specs will need to be made, but the system needs to be designed first before he can know exactly what the changes should be.

The next item Mr. Herz wished to discuss was House Bill 2549. This proposed bill would affect agencies’ choices on what type of pipe materials can be selected if state funds are used on a project. Jami Erickson of Phoenix has been forwarding links to other agencies and said Phoenix is opposed to this bill. Other members such as Lance Webb of Mesa agreed. Ms. Erickson asked members to review the links she sent, including opposition expressed by the American Water Works Association. She felt the bill would remove the cities’ ability to choose materials based on project needs other than lowest cost pipe. There was also some confusion as to what constituted the use of “state funds” for such things as HURF road projects that included utility work, state-shared revenues and so forth.

Peter Kandarlis said the Governor's budget proposed moving the Arizona Geological Survey back under the University of Arizona as one of its research areas. He said it was originally moved away from U of A to better serve the research needs of the entire industry, and he thinks moving it back may be detrimental to receiving the funding it needs to meet the needs of industry.

Tom Kaczmarowski suggested the water/sewer working group review how utilities such as manholes and structures may fall under the EPA's National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) requirements regarding the handling of asbestos. He said Scott McDonald at Maricopa County is developing guidelines. He thinks other agencies should have internal discussions about this issue.

#### 15. Future Agenda Items

Chair Badowich asked the committee for any possible future agenda items. None were announced.

#### 16. Adjournment

Seeing no further business, chair Badowich adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.