

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

June 1, 2016

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Jim Badowich, Avondale, Chair | Steve Ketchum, Mesa (proxy) |
| Craig Sharp, Buckeye | Dan Nissen, Peoria |
| Warren White, Chandler, Vice Chair | Robert Duvall, Phoenix (Streets) |
| Nick Russo, El Mirage (audio) | Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water) |
| * Jess Knudson, Florence | Rod Ramos, Scottsdale |
| Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale | David Mobley, Surprise |
| Tom Condit, Gilbert | Tom Wilhite, Tempe |
| * Tom Vassalo, 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 | Jeff Rodgers, SRP (proxy) |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Troy McGahey, New Horizon Sales
Mark Moeller, ADS
Peter Rupel, Phoenix
Brian Sitarz, Oldcastle

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Badowich called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Badowich introduced the proxies (Steve Ketchum from Mesa and Jeff Rodgers filling in for Christina Buckle of SRP) and also had those on audio call introduce themselves (Nick Russo of El Mirage).

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 May 4, 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Badowich asked if there were any changes. Peter Kandaris noted that he attended in person, rather than via audio as noted in the minutes.

Bob Herz moved to accept the minutes with Mr. Kandaris' correction. 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 he has not had any comments since the last meeting. Mr. Badowich asked if there were any comments at the last working group meeting. Mr. Hearne said there were none, and proposed voting on the case and the next committee meeting.

New Cases for 2016

5. Case 16-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

Chair Badowich asked if there were any new submissions. None were presented.

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 provided a revised version of the case, but since it was not in the agenda packet copies needed to be made. The discussion jumped ahead to Case 16-05. After that case was discussed and copies were provided to the committee, Mr. Herz summarized some of the changes. These included the sentence shown in red on the first page that added, "issuance of

the solicitation for a construction price proposal (aka: at the time of advertising for bids).” He also said “upon request” was added to many of the other sections shown on page three. He thanked Phoenix for providing other references to the certificates of compliance and certificates of analysis and said he was continuing to review them. Mr. Herz asked members to take the case back to their agencies for review and provide him comments.

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 provided a handout of the updated case at the meeting. He said the details had been reviewed at the last working group meeting as well as by FHWA and ADOT. The revision incorporated many of their comments, including removing the limits of the landing area. He noted the tables now show typical minimums that need to be maintained.

One of the first areas Mr. White wanted to discuss was the maximum slopes vs. the preferred slopes, and whether to show both on the detail as currently shown on the draft details. Mr. Herz recommended removing the maximum slopes from the details since they are in the specifications, and you want contractors to use the preferred slopes to allow for construction tolerances. Mr. White said workers in the field may not have the specs available. Tom Kaczmarowski recommended to leave it as is, but add a note on where the max values came from. Paul Nebeker said the workers in the field often only have the drawings and the details should lead them back to the specs. Mr. White said this was true for inspectors as well. Rod Ramos said he thought it should be clear in the specifications that if the maximum slope values were exceeded, the ramp needs to be removed.

Warren White asked members to review the changes to Section 340.3.9 Tolerances. He said they added back in a construction tolerance of $\frac{1}{4}$ ” and also wordsmithed the last sentence on the ADA guidelines for slopes. Mr. Herz suggested adding “if not compliant remove and replace.” Mr. White said he could add, “See Note 2” to the details for the maximum slope dimensions. Mr. Badowich said the note refers contractors back to the spec.

The next item of discussion Mr. White brought up was the measurement of the wing. Currently it is shown parallel to the curb, which is how it is defined in PROWAG. This works for straight or radial ramps, but not as well on directional ramps. The revised details show the slope of the wings measured perpendicular to the ramp. This would add a little tolerance in the construction. Craig Sharp asked if not using it parallel might throw it off and not be ADA compliant. Mr. White said it actually makes it flatter, so that wouldn't be a problem.

Peter Kandarlis commented on the tables that added (TYP) to the dimensions for C and D. He said typical does not mean approximate. Rod Ramos gave the example where on the wings it says 10% MAX TYP, means that the other ramps are 10% MAX slope, not that it is typically 10%. Bob Herz suggested changing the C and D dimensions “varies.” Mr. White said that's what they ended up doing on Chandler's details. Mr. Ramos said they show all spot elevations at Scottsdale and said the dimensions of the wings need to be calculated. He said that you can't have a one-size fits all detail. It needs to have an engineer determine the sizes. Brian Gallimore said contractors would like a little flexibility in construction, and allow the curb heights to

vary. Mr. Herz said radial ramps and wing sizes can be calculated to get a hard number, but it doesn't work for directional ramps. Steve Ketchum of Mesa said as long as the grade slope is 2% or less you can provide typical dimensions that work. Mr. Ketchum also asked about other types of ramp details. Mr. White said inline ramps, blended transitions and other options would need to be addressed in future cases. Rod Ramos said ADOT has a table that shows the values for sample ramp locations and directions, but that it is a full page table. Mr. Gallimore said contractors are leery about dimensions that say "varies." Bob Herz said the designer should design them, the construction specs shouldn't dictate it. Jim Badowich said he would be in favor of a table like ADOT uses, because often engineers just spec MAG details, and people in the field would need some guidance.

Mr. White next said the control points were moved to the face of the curb to match Detail 234. The directional ramp details also added note 8 "Ramp alignment should connect control point to control point of receiving ramp within 5 feet" which is needed for a blind cane user to detect the ramp. Other changes included allowing a walking space behind ramps as 5' preferred to match MAG sidewalks. ADA has a minimum of 4' when there are restrictive conditions. Steve Ketchum thought this seemed a reasonable approach.

Bob Herz said these details are for new construction. You would likely need separate ones for retrofits in order to fit within existing right-of-way. Mr. Ketchum said Mesa has retrofit details. Mr. Herz said the county is working on them. Warren White clarified that the draft details meet the current draft PROWAG requirements.

Steve Ketchum asked about signalized vs unsignalized ramps regarding requirements for push buttons. He noted that he also supports the use of directional ramps. Mr. White said during the working group meeting they specifically decided to leave the push-button location off the details leaving the locations to be determined by the traffic engineers. He also asked members to review the case and email him any comments before the next curb ramp working group meeting. He would like to get the case approved this year.

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

Craig Sharp provided updates to the case based on feedback from the Water/Sewer working group meeting. Revisions included modifying the dimensions for the depth to the collar and the bottom of the nut. It also increased the gap between the dirt ring and riser for more flexibility. The revised case also includes Detail 391-1 since it also has an extension on it.

In the working group it was decided that all installations in dirt should have concrete collars that included reinforcing steel. Mr. Nebeker recommended showing the steel ring location with a large dot rather than a square, and labeling a #4 hoop.

Back on Detail 391-1, Jim Badowich said he would like to see the "middle part" of the adjustment for Type C installations shown if it has a valve extension. He said in the field he has seen installations with several sections stacked creating a snake effect that can stop the extension key from reaching the bottom. He said a uniform piece of pipe should be used. Mr.

Sharp said he would check to see what sized pipe would be appropriate. Mr. Badowich also said to label it as “riser pipe” rather than PVC, because other materials may be used.

Rob Duvall said that on Detail 391-2, Notes #2 and #6 duplicate notes on the drawing. They could be references as “See Note #2” as an example. There was also a missing arrow for the frame and cover note.

Craig Sharp said he would make these changes and would like to put it up for a vote at the next meeting.

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

Greg Groneberg handed out the latest revisions to Section 710. The case added a new sentence on the second paragraph that stated, “Typically, Marshall mixes are used for residential applications and Gyrotory mixes are used for arterial applications.” This text was added back in to help clarify the preceding sentence. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale had similar language. Peter Kandaris said he preferred changing “residential” to “low volume” and “arterial” to “high volume.” Jim Badowich agreed since they have collectors and other heavy use roads not covered by the residential and arterial terminology. He asked Mr. Groneberg if this was reviewed at the working group meeting. He said that it was and that this was the only issue left to clarify.

Tom Kaczmarowski asked about the line before Table 710-1 that allows thickness of layers to be 150% of the minimum lift thickness. He said that ¾” gyrotory mixes could allow for up to 4-½” lift thicknesses, and wondered if this may be excessive in order to get compaction. Greg Groneberg said Phoenix has used a 3” lift followed by a 2” lift. Mr. Gallimore said the contractor still must meet compaction requirements, which deters the use of that large of a lift thickness. He encouraged members to attend the next working group meeting for more discussion.

10. Case 16-10: Proposed new Section 719 POLYMER MODIFIED TERMINAL BLENDED RUBBERIZED ASPHALTIC CONCRETE

Greg Groneberg introduced a new case for a new Section 719. The terminal blended rubber asphalt section is based on Section 710, but modified for this specific material. Some differences are in Table 719-1, the ½” band is proposed as 90-100 and the 3/8” band at 75-90. They needed to free up some voids for the extra oil. For the 3/8” the typically are near the high end of what is currently allowed at about 82-83, but may want to go higher in some cases.

It was also discussed that the PMTBRAC abbreviation could be removed for clarity. Mr. Groneberg also thought they may want the No. 8 sieve size to be courser such as 34-45. He said this process is being used more and more, typically for overlays. He said it provides better performance in residential areas including cul-de-sacs. Mr. Duval said Phoenix is currently using it with positive results.

Peter Kandarlis asked how the material was for patching. Mr. Groneberg said it is now readily available. Mr. Badowich asked if it was compatible with existing asphalt. Brian Gallimore said it was, and that it is becoming popular as use as a “quiet pavement.” He gave an example of Bell Road near Sun City.

11. Case 16-11: Update to Section 309 Lime Stabilization or Modification of Subgrade

Bob Herz introduced a new case to update Section 309. AASHTO T-26 was discontinued, so he added specifications for the acceptable pH range of water used in the process. He noted that MCDOT had a problem with a contractor using raw non-potable water. Brian Gallimore said he forwarded the proposed change to local contractors and will get comments back to Mr. Herz. Mr. Herz asked for agencies to review the case and comment on the proposed revision.

Mr. Kaczmarowski asked if potable water meets the spec. Mr. Herz said it was inside the pH range. It was recommended to undelete the sentence “Water known to be of potable quality may be used with test.” Mr. Herz said the same water source is to be used for the mix design as to be used during construction.

12. Case 16-12: Revision to Alteration of Work Section 104.2.1

Bob Herz introduced a new case to incorporate MCDOT language into Section 104.2.1. He said MCDOT contracts replace the MAG language, and he thinks this revision would provide stronger protection. He encouraged any agencies that may use the MAG language to review the proposed change and get comments back to him.

13. Case 16-13: Proposed New Detail 115 Temporary Site Access with Trackout Pad

Bob Herz provided a new detail to solve a problem County has had with trackout installations, of rocks being scattered on the roadway and damage to the edge of pavement. The detail helps prevent this and also was requested from the County air quality department. Jim Badowich asked if “cold mix” is the right term, and if so do we have a definition of it? Tom Wilhite was concerned about the gutter flow. Mr. Herz said pipe allows the drainage of upstream ponded water and also allows access over the curb.

Brian Gallimore said other people have used millage instead of asphalt, and he thought it worked well. Mr. Herz said this would only be required on larger subdivisions not for a single lot or small construction site. The track-out pad is for dust control. Dan Nisson said the detail should address pedestrian and bicycle access issues for infill areas or where pedestrian and bicycle facilities already exist. Mr. Badowich thought this could be addressed with a simple note.

14. Case 16-14: Proposed revisions to water meter box and cover details. Revised Details 310-314, 320 and add new Detail 315 for polymer concrete meter box lids.

Warren White introduced a new case to update MAG meter boxes and lids details. He was assisted in developing them by OldCastle and the Water/Sewer Working Group. He said the

covers (Details 310-314) were consolidated into a Detail 310 which replaced cast-iron covers with steel. A new Detail 315 was created to allow polymer lids as an option. Both cover details allow for the use of different types of automatic meter readers (AMR). They can also be used for reclaimed by changing the text and/or color on the lid. Detail 320 was updated to allow alternative materials such as polymer concrete and others as listed in Note #3. Thermoplastics currently are not allowed. These boxes are for general loading in pedestrian areas. (not traffic rated).

Jim Badowich commented that agencies are getting away from metal lids, and many are going to polymer boxes. They wanted to maintain the same sizes so lids are interchangeable. Mr. White said in order to do this the dimensions are not to vary more than 1/16”.

Mr. Badowich asked about the vertical load rating, and said there was discussion at the working group about heavy duty boxes and intermediate traffic. Attendees from OldCastle said that the combination of the lid and box are used to meet loading requirements. Bob Herz asked if the lids have a separate rating (i.e. steel vs. polymer).

15. Case 16-15: Proposed new Detail 319 Traffic Rated Box and Cover

Warren White introduced a separate case for new traffic rated box and cover. They would go together and need to match. In this case, you don't want the lids interchangeable with other non-traffic rated boxes. The boxes and covers will be discussed at the next Water/Sewer Working Group meeting

16. Working Group Reports

Chair Badowich asked for reports from the working group chairs.

a. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White said one thing not previously discussed was a question on the use of the 7” curb in Tempe that he still needed to get more information on. The next meeting time is to be determined.

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

Due to the length of the meeting, and since many members needed to leave, Jim Badowich decided to quickly wrap up the meeting. He said the notes for all the working groups were in the packet if members wanted to review them. The next meeting of the Water/Sewer Working Group is scheduled for Tuesday, June 21st, at 1:30 in the MAG office.

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

The next meeting of the joint Asphalt/Materials and Concrete Working Groups is scheduled for Thursday, June 16th at noon. The meetings will be held in the ARPA office, 916 W Adams Street, Phoenix.

d. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandaris attended May working group meetings and his comments on outside right-of-way projects are provided in the meeting notes.

17. General Discussion

Jim Badowich said the discussion on Microsurfacing/Microsealing will be postponed until next month.

18. Adjournment

Chair Badowich adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.