

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

July 6, 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
Jason Richardson, Chandler, (proxy)	Robert Duvall, Phoenix (Streets)
Nick Russo, El Mirage (audio)	* Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Jess Knudson, Florence	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale (audio)	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 Kandaris, Independent (audio)
* 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

Bob Erdman, Cutler Repaving
Troy McGahey, New Horizon Sales
Mark Moeller, ADS
Brian Sitarz, Oldcastle

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Badowich called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Mr. Badowich introduced Jason Richardson filling in for Warren White of Chandler and also announced those on audio call (Tom Kaczmarowski, Peter Kandarlis and Nick Russo).

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 June 1, 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Badowich asked if there were any changes. Seeing none, Bob Herz moved to accept the minutes as written. Gregory Arrington 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, and suggested that it was ready for a vote. Bob Herz moved to accept the case as presented. Craig Sharp seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 3 not present.

New Cases for 2016

5. Case 16-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

Chair Badowich asked if there were any new submissions. None were presented. He said the case would be up for a vote during the September meeting.

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 an updated version in the packet that included adjustments to Section 725.2 and a few other additions based on comments. He asked members if they found any other places referencing certificates of compliance or analysis to let him know. Tom Wilhite said that in the paragraph stating the laboratory is responsible to provide to the “contracting agency”... to change this to Engineer. Jeff Hearne suggested adding “or Certificate of Analysis” in Sections 725.2 and 725.2.1 to be consistent. He also said that it may be preferable to have the

analysis since it is backed by real data. Jim Badowich asked if the case just deleted references to ADOT's specs on these items. Mr. Herz said that they needed to be defined in MAG because many places in the MAG specs require the certificates but don't reference ADOT. He said the new spec is patterned after the ADOT spec. Mr. Herz said he will provide an update next month for final review and would like to vote on the case in September.

7. Case 16-05: Dual Curb Ramps. New Details 236-1, 236-2, 236-3, 237-1, 237-2, 237-3 and Revise Section 340.3.9 Tolerances.

Jason Richardson filling in for Warren White said he would bring back any comments from the committee. Bob Herz said the "curb ramp radius" note should say "curb return radius." He also said that the ramp length would need to be adjusted for the slope of the sidewalk. He thinks the lengths currently are not enough, that that they should be recalculated. Gordon Tyus said that one of the major changes was that there were new details for the 20' radius curb returns. Mr. Herz said they can be a problem keeping the ramp wings inside the curb returns. Mr. Wilhite asked if you could move the expansion joint out to the sidewalk. He also asked if it was possible to fit the ramps in the 20' detail if the curb height is 7" Mr. Herz said the MAG specifications currently require the joint at the curb return. He thought it would be better to use a combination ramp where the 7" curb is ramped down to 4" for example and then use the dual ramp detail. Rod Ramos said they have to modify ramps all the time on retrofits, and that you may not be able to show all the variations.

Jim Badowich asked what was meant by "heavy rough broom." Jeff Hearn said typically in the field they refer to light or heavy broom, and you could eliminate "rough." Mr. Badowich said that in his recent experience constructing ramps, 6 out of 10 were "field fit" around signal poles, rather than using a purely standard detail.

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

Craig Sharp provided updates to the case based on feedback from the last committee and Water/Sewer working group meetings. Bob Herz provided written comments on the case with a handout at the meeting. (See attachment) One of the major issues was that since 391-1, 391-2 and 270 were interrelated, it was important that they were consistent. He suggested removing callouts on 391-2 (Type A) and refer to Detail 270. Mr. Herz also wanted to know if the rebar should be shown on 270, or if it was needed, and if so what size diameter should the hoop be? Craig Sharp said it should be roughly centered in the concrete, but that the dimension would vary based on the type used. For a Type A it would be about 27". Mr. Herz thought that "centered" was not clear enough, and thought providing the location and diameter would be better. Mr. Sharp said many agencies do not require the rebar, and they only use it in unpaved areas, although Phoenix requires rebar in all of their adjustments including adjustments outside of the pavement. He did agree to add revisions to Detail 270 to the case and said he would incorporate the changes, and would like to vote on the case next month.

Paul Nebeker added that he thought the nomenclature in the field typically referred to Type C as "metal valve box", Type A for "asphalt" and Type B for placing in "the dirt." Next there was a discussion about keeping the pipe inside of the valve box slightly above the dirt level by

clarifying the dimensions or possibly adding a general note. Bob Herz noted that the way Detail 291-2 currently shows the dirt and bottom of frame were the same and based on the dimensions would not allow the extra ¼” noted.

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

Greg Groneberg said the only comments he received since the last meeting were on striking the last sentence of the first paragraph that was added back in a modified form earlier. Several members agreed to strike the sentence. The other change was to clarify the maximum lift thickness, so the text stating it could be up to 150% was removed and a new Table 710-2 was added. Rob Duval said he liked the new table, since it was much clearer. Jim Badowich said the engineers typically don’t call out lift thicknesses, but some agencies require a minimum of two lifts. He said the mixes often dictate the number of lifts required.

Jim Badowich said that since the case was on the agenda for action, and striking the last sentence of the first paragraph was a minor change it could still be voted on. Seeing no further discussion, Rob Duvall moved to accept the case with the change noted above. Tom Condit seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain and 3 not present.

10. Case 16-10: Proposed new Section 719 and Section 326. New POLYMER MODIFIED ASPHALT CONCRETE, Material and Placement Specifications.

Greg Groneberg said updates to Section 719 included a change to the title and not referring to “terminal blend” because this could restrict the binder types.

Greg Groneberg also provided a handout at the meeting of a proposed new Section 326 that would be the new placement specification for the proposed Section 719. The new section is based on the existing Section 321, but only retains the parts relevant to Polymer Modified Asphalt Concrete. Mr. Groneberg thought that this material should have its own placement specifications just like conventional mixes and conventional rubber (Section 325). Changes to the spec in the new Section 326 included referring to Section 719 instead of 710, and the temperature in Section 326.6 is different. He said that making changes or adding requirements would be easier in a separate section rather than making them in the existing 321.

Bob Herz suggested striking the last sentence of Section 719.1. Lance Webb asked if there was a maximum temperature for discharge in 326.6. Mr. Groneberg said they would try to incorporate Mesa’s and other agency’s supplements. He explained with a separate placement section a lot of more things could be more easily worked into it. Bob Herz and Lance Webb agreed that this material is applied differently.

Mr. Tyus said it would be helpful to highlight the changes in the new Section 326 compared to Section 321. Mr. Groneberg said that he could do that, and that he expected more changes and revisions to it in the next revision.

Mr. Webb said that Mesa prefers to use polymer modified asphalt it when possible. Greg Groneberg said Phoenix is now using it for residential overlays. The dense grade handles side pressures better than rubber asphalt mixes, and he thinks this material is headed towards use in a much bigger scale. Mr. Badowich said it was good to see MAG lead the way in developing these specifications.

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

Bob Herz said he received some comments, but has not had a chance to incorporate them into the case yet. He said he would provide an updated version for the next meeting, and asked if there were any additional comments.

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

Bob Herz withdrew this case for review.

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

Mr. Herz provided an updated detail that included two proposed new notes based on committee comments. The first was to clarify that the detail was for large construction sites, and that alternate methods may be used for smaller projects. The second was to require that sidewalks and pathways that cross the access be maintained. Craig Sharp said he liked the second note. Mr. Herz said that if both notes were retained he would make the first one #1 in the General Notes section and the second as #3 in the list.

Mr. Sharp asked if the sidewalks should be shown on the detail. Mr. Herz said he would not like to show them on the detail, since the location and whether they exist would not be known. Jim Badowich asked about the term “cold mix.” Paul Nebeker said that was the normal terminology used, but asked why not be able to use hot asphalt as an option, since often the access will be in the same location as a future driveway, which would be reconstructed anyway. Dan Nissen agreed. Tom Wilhite said why not remove the top of gutter (using a horizontal saw cut), and allow it to act much like a driveway. Mr. Herz said this could be added as optional detail. Jim Badowich warned that they had problems in Avondale where a temporary access was flooded. Members stated that the contractor would have to maintain or rebuild the access is such a case.

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.

A revised version of the case was provided in the agenda packet. Mr. Richardson asked if there were any comments for him to bring back to Mr. White. Mr. Badowich said the case was discussed during the last water/sewer working group meeting, and their comments were added. Brian Sitarz of Oldcastle, assisted with the details and noted that the lids were designed to be 1/8” smaller all around the boxes.

Mr. Badowich recapped that the purpose of the case was to allow different materials such as polymer concrete boxes and lids, and to use steel rather than cast iron lids. There was no change in the dimensions, since one goal is to allow interchangeability. For example, Phoenix is now using polymer concrete lids in concrete boxes. He noted that if you are concerned about interchangeability, some polymer concrete boxes being used in the region do not match the current MAG dimensions, so the lid and box have to match. The lid details also are designed to accommodate various AMR systems. Bob Herz commented that in the notes on the details everywhere it says “should not” change to “shall not.” Jim Badowich said the case would be on the agenda for possible action at the next meeting.

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

The traffic-rated box Detail 319 was updated based on feedback at the working group meeting. Tom Wilhite asked if Detail 319 could be used in the street. Mr. Badowich said yes, these are H20 AASHTO rated, and the box and lid go together as a system. He explained there are polymer boxes rated at 20K but this is not the same as H20, and should only be allowed for use with occasional traffic loads.

Bob Herz said this detail also needed to change “needs” and “should” to “shall.” Mr. Badowich pointed out the Note 3 allows the label to change on the cover as needed. Paul Nebeker asked if we need to show the bedding and compaction requirement, and if it needs a collar concrete box around it. Mr. Herz said it should refer to the installation requirements in Section 602.

Typically boxes placed in the street have concrete collars around them, but it should not be necessary because the boxes are designed to handle the traffic loading on their own. Also they are often placed in concrete driveways. Tom Wilhite asked if there was a problem using them in the street without a concrete collar. Jim Badowich said they placed one on Van Buren Street five years ago and have not had a problem with it.

Bob Herz asked what the slots were and if they could be labeled. Brian Sitarz said he would work on the details. Jim Badowich said the case would be on the agenda for possible action at the next meeting.

16. Case 16-16: Revision to Section 717. Change TSR method from AASHTO T-283 to ASTM D 4867 to be consistent with Section 710.

Greg Groneberg introduced a new case to change TSR method from AASHTO T-283 to ASTM D 4867 to make consistent with Section 710. The only difference between the tests is the AASHTO test includes a freeze/thaw cycle. The changes are in Table 717-5 and in Note 5 on the next page. No additional comments were made.

17. Case 16-17: Revision to Section 321: Address multiple concerns with testing for permit work.

Mr. Groneberg handed out another new case that revised areas of Section 321. One simple correction was to fix an error in Table 321-8 in the over compaction penalty spec that adds a Type II Slurry. It should be an engineering analysis (EA) only. The other changes were to

address concerns with coring and testing for permit work. Revisions were made in: 321.10.1 for Acceptance Criteria, 321.11 for Referee Testing, and 321.14.1 for Scope of Coring Method.

Mr. Groneberg said there were problems with how the testing methods were done. He said Brian Gallimore had more information on the case, but couldn't attend today. Jim Badowich asked why permit and agency work are different. Mr. Groneberg said there are problems with the engineers on record approving tests with no agency oversight, and the quality of the testing is not always as good. Bob Herz said the requirements for permit work should be more stringent because an agency can decide whether or not to accept a penalty knowing that they would have to accelerate maintenance. Rob Duval said Phoenix requires the same testing labs for all, but have different penalties.

18. Working Group Reports

Chair Badowich asked for reports from the working group chairs.

a. **Curb Ramp Working Group**

Warren White was not present to make a report; however, the minutes from the meeting were provided in the packet. The date of the July meeting is still to be determined.

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

Mr. Badowich said the group spent a lot of time discussing the water meter box cases. Another area of discussion was on testing, and they plan to prepare cases on this next year. The next meeting of the Water/Sewer Working Group is scheduled for Tuesday, July 19th, at 1:30 in the MAG office.

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

Greg Groneberg said most of the discussion was already covered, but they are still getting data on changes to the rock correction procedures. The next meeting of the joint Asphalt/Materials and Concrete Working Groups is scheduled for Thursday, July 21st at noon. The meetings will be held in the ARPA office, 916 W Adams Street, Phoenix.

d. **Outside ROW Working Group**

Peter Kandarlis said he planned to present some draft materials at the next meeting.

19. General Discussion

Jim Badowich said Warren White introduced the topic Microsurfacing/Microsealing in regards to DOJ requirements for ramp replacements. Bob Herz and Greg Groneberg agreed that you may want to wait for determination. Bob Herz said that slurry seal currently does not trigger ramp replacements, but how it is applied here versus the definitions they use (that it is sprayed on) don't match. Jim Badowich was concerned that it would become expensive to do maintenance if it required replacing all the ramps. Mr. Herz said PROWAG currently requires replacing them all with dual ramps, which would be even more expensive. Mr. Groneberg said that it was discussed at the asphalt working group meeting. Mr. Badowich suggested discussing it internally at your agency.

20. Adjournment

Seeing no further discussion, Chair Badowich adjourned the meeting at 3:46 p.m.