

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

May 5, 2004

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| David Fern, Chandler | * Keith Kesti, Peoria |
| Mark Weiner, Gilbert | Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.) |
| Pat Thurman, Glendale | * Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water) |
| * David Ramirez, Goodyear | * Rod Ramos, Scottsdale |
| Ted Collins, MCDOT | Brett Huskey, Surprise |
| * Steven Borst, MCESD | James Bond, Tempe |
| Doug Davis, Mesa | |

ADVISORY MEMBERS

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| John Ashley, ACA | Brian Gallimore, AGC |
| * Baird Fullerton, ACEC | Peter Kandaris, SRP |
| Jeff Benedict, ARPA | Paul Nebeker, NUCA |
| * Don Green, ARPA | * Tom Domizi, NUCA |
| * Jim Grose, AGC | |

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Robert Herz, MCDOT
Jorge Garcia, Grabber Power Products
Jim Anderson, Olson Precast of Arizona, Inc.
Tommy R. Thomas, Ameron International
Ken Horton, Western Concrete Products
Stew Waller, Rinker Materials

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the April 7, 2004 meeting minutes and had no comments. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes as written. Jeff Van Skike seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2003 Carry Over Case:

- a. **Case 03-03 - Details 252, 253 & 254 - Bus Bays:** Ted Collins received no comments since the last meeting on this case. Doug requested to label the detail in the lower right corner "Cross-Section CC." He also asked why the change to single curb when curb and gutter could be used. It was noted that the structural section of the concrete pavement (9") adjacent to the single curb will be stronger than the curb and gutter (6"). Doug poled the members to see how many members used the near side locations. Several members nodded that they would use the near side. Jeff commented that Phoenix has not used the near side in some time. Pat Thurman stated that it should remain for those agencies that may use the detail.

4. 2004 Cases

- a. **Case 04-01 - Detail 230 - Sidewalk:** Since the last meeting, Ted Collins received no comments on this case. Also, none of the committee members had any comments. Doug noted that if no comments continue, a call for a vote could be in the July meeting.
- b. **Case 04-02 - Detail (new) -Handrails:** Ted Collins provided a revised detail for this case. Ted made a number of changes in the detail from the last submittal. The two major changes were (1) the additions of a new ground installation and (2) a change in the titles. Pat noted a typo in the spelling of a radius in the upper right corner of the Detail. David questioned if the 2" dimension of the pipe was an inside or outside a diameter? The censes was ID.
- c. **Case 04-03 - Detail (new) - Sub-grade Drain:** Since the last meeting, Ted Collins received no comments on the case. Pat requested that Note #1 be changed to require the drains per plans or approval of the Engineer and delete the installation of the drains at the option of the contractor. Glendale does not prefer the detail and the above changes will allow them to make the decision on the use of the drains. If no further comments are raised, this case could be ready for a vote in the July meeting.
- d. **Case 04-04 - Details 250, 260 and 262 - Driveway Entrances and Alley Entrance.** Ted Collins revised the Details to be provided to the committee however, he left the Details in his office. Bob Herz will ensure the Details will be provided in the next meeting.
- e. **Case 04-05 - Miscellaneous Bloopers:** There were no discussion or comments on the three current cases.
- f. **Case 04-06 - Section 342 - Decorative Pavement and Detail 225 - Concrete Pavers:** David Fern provided the first draft of the specification and details for review by the Committee. This first draft followed the wording of the prior handouts on the case. The major changes were in the Details, e.g., one change was the deletion of the steel angle at the edge. Doug reviewed the previous handout as if it was the first draft and had several comments. A written copy of the comments was provided to David. Doug provided a quick overview of his comments. Doug poled the members to see how many members would be using this specification. Three agencies indicated that they will be using the specifications on a regular bases. Phoenix has received some complaints from powered wheel chair users. They discovered that the sand used to hold the pavers in place becomes dislodged between the bricks and caused the powered wheel chairs to slip.

- g. **Case 04-07 - Detail 404 - Water and Sanitary Sewer Separation Protection:** Steve Borst was not present to discuss the case. Doug solicited comments from the Committee. No comments were noted.
- h. **Case 04-08 - Section 321.6.5 - Asphalt Cement Content and Section 321.6.6 - Air Voids:** Since the last meeting, Ted Collins received no comments on the Case. Jeff Benedict informed the Committee that AGC and ARPA will be commenting on the Case. ARPA will be discussing the Case in their next regular meeting. The meeting will be within the next couple of weeks.
- i. **Case 04-09 - Section 758 - Reinforced Concrete Pressure Pipe - Steel Cylinder Type:** Pat Thurman noted that Doug Davis provided the only comments since the last meeting. Doug researched the records and discovered that Case 86-03 installed RCPP in the Specifications. In 1986 and now, Mesa has a concern about the smaller sizes of this pipe. Due to the cost and the special materials required for tapping services on the pipe, Mesa does not desire to permit the pipe in their distribution system (less than 18"). Mesa has no objections for sizes 18" through 72". Also, the largest size AWWA indorses is 72". AWWA design criteria can be used in larger diameter pipes however, AWWA notes that the owner will take any responsibility/liability for the design, manufacturing and installation. Mesa feels that if larger pipe sizes are allowed in the Specifications, the condition or disclaimer should be noted. After a short discussion, between Tommie Thompson, Pat and Doug, Pat will limit the sizes of the pipe.

4. New Cases:

- a. **Case 04-10 - Section 321.8 - Measurements:** Ted Collins submitted a Case for the Committee's consideration. Ted discovered the measurement for calculating asphalt concrete is not practicable. Ted suggested that the unit of measurement be changed from 0.01 to 0.1 of a ton.

5. General Discussion:

- a. Jim Bond asked the members if they issue permits to pothole contractors and if so what are the fees. Most if not all members issue permits however, none knew the cost of the permit. Doug noted that the permit is needed to insure the contractor has proper insurance to work in the right-of-way. A short discussion proceeded regarding the back filling of the hole. There seem to be a problem with settlement of the hole with the pothole contractors. Pat Thurman noted that Glendale has a Detail for pot-holing that if used resolves all problems with settlements. Since some interest seems to have developed, Pat will submit the Detail to the Committee for review and consideration as a Case.
- b. Doug Davis noted that Paul Ward is collecting data on truncated dome installations. Please provided your (each agency's) information on the domes that have been installed to date. The information requested are locations, contractor name, manufacturer of domes, date of installation.
- c. Brian Gillimore asked about the latest status on the water and sewer certifications with the County Health Department. Doug has been in conversation with the County on a solution to the problem. Mesa has reviewed the County requirement and separated them into contract work and permit work. In the case of contract work where Mesa will provide the

plans, survey, testing, inspection, etc. Mesa will sign and seal the form provided by the County. In the case of permit work, Mesa intends to provide a letter stating that the testing was performed and passed all tests. The first test case will be sent to the County for their review.

- d. Stew Waller asked how MAG developed the extra sack of portland cement in the manufacturing of concrete pipe. The specification has been in MAG before any of the current members were on the committee and no answer could be provided.
- e. Paul Ward introduced a subject that was initially requested by the Arizona General Contractors (AGC) and was passed on by the MAG Executive Director to him, regarding the possible inclusion of members of the consultant community as voting members on the Specifications and Details Committee. Mr. Ward reported that an extremely successful partnership between elected members and members of the business community has recently achieved a major milestone with the approval of the Regional Transportation Plan. With the approval of the Plan by the legislation, an election to extend the current half-cent sales tax for transportation will be held. Mr. Ward continued that, he had been directed to explore how a similar type of partnership might work within the Specifications and Details Committee.

The Chairman pointed out that the Committee already included several members of the consultant and contracting community as advisory members and found the guidance that they provided to be invaluable in the workings of the Committee. The General Consensus of the elected members was that voting members should be from member agencies, specifically because these agencies are the “owners” of projects that the Committee developed Specifications and Details for.

The main concern from the advisory members rested in who had the authority to suggest “Cases for Consideration.” Currently, only voting members are allowed to submit cases. This means that an advisory member needs to find a “sponsor” agency to submit a possible change to the Specifications and Details. During the meeting there were no reported instances of any Cases that had been reported by advisory members that had not been sponsored.

Mr. Ward requested members to discuss the possible concept with their agency managers and be prepared to report on the outcomes at the next meeting. The Committee also discussed a possible mechanism that would allow advisory members to submit Cases for consideration and have voting members decide at the beginning of a meeting as to whether there was sufficient need or desire to move forward with such a Case.

The Chairman and Mr. Ward agreed to review the by-laws of the Committee to see what changes might need to be made to accommodate having advisory members as possible voting members and members will discuss this possibility with their own agencies prior to the next meeting.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.