

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

May 4, 2016

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale, Chair
Craig Sharp, Buckeye
Warren White, Chandler, Vice Chair
Shane Swartwart, El Mirage (proxy) (audio)
Jess Knudson, Florence (audio)
Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale (audio)
Kent Westover, Gilbert (proxy)
Rob Godwin, Goodyear (proxy)
Bob Herz, MCDOT

Lance Webb, Mesa
Dan Nissen, Peoria
Robert Duvall, Phoenix (Streets)
* Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Roy Herrington, Scottsdale (proxy)
David Mobley, Surprise
Tom Wilhite, Tempe
* Jonathan Sorrell, Valley Metro
Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Greg Groneberg, ARPA
Jeff Hearne, ARPA
* Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA
Tom Brennan, AZUCA

Brian Gallimore, AGC
Peter Kandarlis, Independent
Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
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
Mark Moeller, ADS
Brian Sitarz, Oldcastle

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Badowich called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

Mr. Badowich introduced the proxies (Kent Westover, Rob Godwin and Roy Herrington) and also had the people on audio call introduce themselves (Shane Swartwart, Jess Knudson and Tom Kaczmarowski).

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Badowich announced the call to the audience. No members of the audience wished to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the April 6, 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Badowich asked if there were any changes. No corrections were noted.

Dan Nissen moved to accept the minutes as written. Tom Wilhite seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Carry Forward 2015 Cases

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

Jeff Hearne said a new revision dated 4/21/16 was included in the packet. He said during the working group they discussed whether to use the verbiage as shown in the revision or a checklist. They decided the checklist was more than needed. Mr. Hearne also said the text in 725.6 basically collects what is required in other specs all in one place.

Jim Badowich asked if there was a date on the mixes, and should it be added? Mr. Hearne said most cities require yearly approvals and they are already dated. Mr. Badowich said he'd found some at Avondale three years old, and pits can change in that time. He would like it to be more specific about dates. Mr. Hearne asked members to take it back to their agencies for review. He expected some comments from Jon Shi at the county.

New Cases for 2016

5. Case 16-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

Chair Badowich summarized current corrections and asked if there were any new submissions. Greg Groneberg and Jeff Hearne said they are investigating a few possible updates.

6. Case 16-02: Add Section 106.2.1 Certificate of Compliance, add Section 106.2.2 Certificate of Analysis, modify Section 717.2.1.2 Crumb Rubber, and modify several other sections as noted.

Bob Herz handed out a revised version of the case that incorporated comments from the Asphalt Working Group, including adding “upon request” by the engineer the Contractor shall submit certificates of compliance and analysis. This was so that paperwork was not generated when it wasn’t needed, but the engineer can still request them if they are desired by the agency, they are required for federal projects. He said the requirements for Certificate of Compliance and Certificate of Analysis were based upon the ADOT specifications, and in Section 717 references to ADOT were changed to reference the new MAG spec. He asked members to review the changes.

Rob Duvall suggested requiring a project name and number on the certificates. He said Phoenix uses these to help track certificates on projects. Jim Badowich asked if the engineer can require them on non-federal projects. Mr. Herz said yes, they could and they can request them at any time, before during, or after the project. Mr. Badowich agreed with Mr. Duvall’s suggestion.

7. Case 16-05: Dual Curb Ramps. New Details 236-1, 236-2, 237-1, 237-2 and revise Section 340.3.9 Tolerances.

Warren White said discussion on this case will also cover the discussion during the working group meeting. He thanked Brian Gallimore and Jeff Hearne for attending the working group meeting and for their comments. There were revised details in the packet. No changes were made to the specifications.

The first issue he discussed was options for increasing the strength of the ramps either via thickness, reinforcement (such as steel or wire mesh), or by the class of concrete. The group decided to increase the thickness to 6” for all ramps, and to use class A concrete. He said agencies currently use 4” thickness and type B concrete, but have had problems with breakage. Bob Herz said the County has not had problems with class B concrete since the compaction requirements for the subgrade under the ramp were increased to 95% in the 2009 update. Rob Godwin said they did have breakage of a 4” type B ramp and would like to increase its strength. He said the subgrade passed. Mr. Badowich said you can’t test the subgrade for every ramp, and he also would like to increase the thickness. Avondale also had a four month old ramp that was broken. Jeff Hearne and Brian Gallimore agreed that contractors typically are already using type A concrete as a measure of insurance to prevent breakage and that it is also easier to work with. Bob Herz said contractors have to submit compaction test results. Rob Godwin said they currently test 1 in 4 ramps, and want to do 1 in 2, but can’t do all of them. Jim Badowich said he received feedback from his public works department which doesn’t want to replace so many ramps, and if MAG doesn’t do this, he will need to have a supplement.

Mr. White introduced the next issue – the application of ramp control points. They were added to the current details and are located at the center of the ramp, back of curb. Bob Herz said that for directional ramps you may need more information to identify the angle or direction of the ramp. Ray Herrington said on their plans they may require additional criteria to define where

the ramp is located. Peter Kandarlis suggested showing the centerline to clarify the control point location.

Next, Mr. White discussed changes to the table in the upper right corner of the details, and how it related to the typical and maximum slopes on the section view. In order to have some construction tolerances the group suggested adding typical slopes, rather than using the maximum slopes. Changing the 8.33% ramp slope to 8% would affect the length of the ramps. They have been increased by 6" in the table to reflect this. The typical and maximum slopes on the section are both shown including the 1.5% preferred sidewalk slope and the 2% maximum slope. He said there were also changes to the notes, including requiring Class A concrete. He also noted that the line types of the landing area on the details need to be corrected to show them as dashed lines. Jim Badowich asked if the C column is based on the curb heights. Mr. White said it did take them into account. Finally he said they would probably need to adjust the way the sidewalk comes in on the curbed ramp option.

Jim Badowich said Note 5 may need to take into account the crosswalk markings, because they had an issue in Avondale where the ramps aligned with each other, but not with the crosswalk on an intersection that was skewed. Mr. Kandarlis asked which took precedence, and Mr. Badowich said he thought the ramp alignment still would.

8. Case 16-06: Update Section 727 Steel Reinforcement to replace withdrawn ASTM A82 and A185 with ASTM A1064.

Bob Herz said he received no comments since the last meeting and asked for any comments to the case as shown. Rob Duvall said that since the term "Mesh" was removed from the heading, it should also be changed in the text. Mr. Herz agreed and moved to accept the case with the revision to replace "Mesh" with "Welded wire." Rob Duvall seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 15 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 1 not present.

9. Case 16-07: Add Atmospheric Corrosion Resistance Low-Alloy Steel (Corten steel) to the Material portion of Section 415 Flexible Metal Guardrail.

Bob Herz said based on feedback from the previous meeting he added the term "weathering steel" to the spec since Corten is a brand name. He said this type of steel is required to be thicker (Class B) than standard guardrail because it is subject to erosion. He said they currently have been receiving Class A which is thinner. Seeing no further comments Mr. Herz moved to accept the case as presented. Warren White seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed: 15 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 1 not present.

10. Case 16-08: Valve Stem Extension Revisions.

Craig Sharp introduced a new case to separate valve box installation and grade adjustment details. This included revising Detail 391-2 to remove the valve stem extension drawing, and creating a new Detail 393 for the valve stem extension. The new extension drawing would allow adjustable lengths to be more easily manufactured.

There were comments about the minimum dimensions for the depth shown on the new Detail 393. Based on other dimensions they would need to be larger. Paul Nebeker asked when extensions were required. Mr. Sharp said currently valves under 5' do not need extensions and this was not changed. Mr. Nebeker said there are problems if they are too shallow because the key becomes difficult to turn if it is up too high. Rob Godwin suggested extending the depth that doesn't require an extension to 6' instead of 5'. Paul Nebeker said in other parts of the country extensions are not allowed. Mr. Sharp said he could adjust the detail to show a range of 36"-60". Mr. Nebeker suggested reviewing agency requirements and said valves are often activated automatically. Craig Sharp said representatives from Oldcastle brought in a sample valve extension for members to see.

Lace Webb of Mesa said Details 391-1 and 391-2 would also need to be adjusted if the maximum depth is increased. Mr. Sharp said they also need to be updated to reference the new Detail 393.

Rob Godwin suggested adding a specification to determine what it means to be "plumb." What tolerance is allowed? Mr. Nebeker said he has had issues with the dirt ring binding up and asked about the tolerances. Mr. Sharp said Note 4 allows the dirt ring to float freely above the plate it rests on. There were suggestions to note these items on the drawing.

Mr. Godwin also suggested using slurry around the valve installation since it is difficult to get good compaction around them. Mr. White said the revisions recently made to the specs already allow this as an option. Finally Mr. Nebeker suggested making the extensions even on a project when possible. Craig Sharp said he would work on the revisions and discuss it at the next Water/Sewer Working Group meeting.

11. Case 16-09: Revisions to Section 710 to Remove Low Volume Gyratory and Marshall Mixes.

Greg Groneberg introduced a new case from the Asphalt Working Group to revised Section 710. The case removes references to high and low volume mixes both for Gyratory and Marshall mixes. Currently the mix design is the same for both high and low volume options, so separating them just creates confusion and increased paperwork. While updating this section they also removed references to the superpave mix which is no longer used. Mr. Groneberg described how the tables were revised.

Rob Duvall thought including text about the arterials using Gyratory mixes and residential streets using Marshall should be left in. Also the first sentence of the 3rd paragraph should not be deleted but moved to the end of the 2nd paragraph. Peter Kandarlis suggested retitling the top of column of Table 710-2 to "Requirements" or something similar where "Low Traffic, High Traffic" was removed. He also asked if the mix design shows Gyratory or Marshall. Mr. Groneberg said that it did. Mr. Badowich added Marshall mixes typically have more binder, and that extra oil helps residential streets from "drying" out.

12. New or Potential Cases.

Warren White handout out an information sheet regarding the DOT/DOJ Q&A on when street alterations trigger ramp replacements. He suggested changing the title of the Microsurfacing section to Microsealing. This better describes the type of street maintenance being accomplished and is less likely to be thought as an alteration that changes the pavement structure of a street that would trigger the ADA requirement for ramp construction. Some thought that the name change wouldn't matter, but renaming the material may have the FHWA categorized it with chip seal and slurry seal. Bob Herz said that according the County, microsurfacing triggers replacement, but chip seal and slurry seal do not. The question is who determines that microsurfacing is a trigger. Brian Gallimore said the problem is city attorneys are deciding it, and often they may not understand the process. Members agreed that a mill and overlay process does trigger it. Finally, there was discussion on transition plans and how this could affect when ramps are replaced and what maintenance can be done. Mr. White said he plans to bring this discussion to the next Materials Working Group meeting.

The handout with links to the DOJ and FHWA information is posted on the website here: <http://www.azmag.gov/Events/Event.asp?CMSID=8361>

13. Working Group Reports

Chair Badowich asked for reports from the working group chairs.

a. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White said most of what was discussed during the meeting was covered during the discussion on Case 16-05, and that the notes were included in the packet.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 16th at 1:30 in the MAG office.

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

Jim Badowich they discussed water and sewer testing and are gathering city specs to create a template and come up with a draft. Flushing and chlorination will be covered.

He said Oldcastle has been helping revise and update the meter box details and lids. They plan on keeping the same dimensions to allow for interchangeable lids, but updating the materials to include polymer concrete. Mr. Badowich said they are also planning to have specs for a traffic rated option. Representatives from Oldcastle are working with Warren White to develop a case.

Another issue discussed was to reexamine extra protection for reclaimed water lines. The type of water and sewer lines need to be better defined. He asked if raw water should be considered as potable for separation concerns. Mr. Godwin said there was a blue ribbon panel that discussed this issue and raw is not considered potable. At the working group meeting Arvid Veidmark suggested sleeving as an option for separation.

Mr. Badowich said concrete encasement can be a problem because if the concrete cracks the pipe will.

He said they have also had to replace ductile iron sewer lines because the lining is failing that the pipe is deteriorating.

Finally he said Peter Kandaris joined the group to work on issues outside the right-of-way including backflow prevention to protect public water systems.

Mr. Badowich said the next meeting of the working group is scheduled for Tuesday, May 17th, at 1:30 in the MAG office.

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

Greg Groneberg said they worked on Case 16-02 which was already discussed, and Case 16-09 that was just introduced. They are now looking to clean up Section 310 rock correction procedures.

Another planned case is a proposed Section 719 for Polymer Modified Terminal Blended Rubberized Asphaltic Concrete. They currently are getting comments and plan to discuss it more at the next meeting.

The group also discussed problems patching trenches that are smaller than the width of the equipment. They plan on researching patching specs. Testing frequency and methods should be different.

For concrete, Jeff Hearne, said they already discussed Case 15-13. He is trying to revitalize the specs on pervious concrete and looking for contractor help on these new sections. He also described the plant tour on the 13th that had about 30 people. Agency staff member were represented on the tour which took about 2 hours and covered all three plants. He said they are trying to organize another tour on the west side in June. When asked about a walking tour, Mr. Hearne said it was more difficult to set-up do to safety issues.

The next meeting of the joint Asphalt/Materials and Concrete Working Groups is scheduled for Thursday, May 19th at noon. The meetings will be held in the ARPA office, 916 W Adams Street, Phoenix.

d. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said he discussed priorities with the Water/Sewer Working Group. He thanked Paul Nebeker for working on some items. Mr. Kandaris said he received CAD drawings for backflow preventers and is planning condense all the agency supplements down to 5 types that show the best practices. Underground storage tanks and drywells were also discussed. He plans to go the Materials Working Group next to look for help starting drafts, and with markups.

14. General Discussion

Jim Badowich asked if there were any general discussion items to bring to the committee's attention. None were given.

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 3:32 p.m.