

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

July 3, 2002

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

VOTING MEMBERS

Barry Combs, 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	* Brian Pirooz, Surprise
* Steven Borst, MCESD	Rod Whitt for James Bond, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

* James Pulice, Jr., AGC	* Tom Domizi, UTCA
* Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
* Paul Nebeker, UTCA	Art Brooks for Sean Goris, ACEA
* Jeff Benedict, ARPA	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

John Ashley, Arizona Cement Association
Corey Welch of Nyloplast
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, inc.

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of June 5, 2002. Jeff Van Skike noted a typo in the title to Case 02-02. The word "Strom" should be "Storm." Jeff introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes with the above exception. Ted Collins seconded the motion. A voice votes of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2001 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 01-07 - Sections 750 & 630 - Various Water Changes:** Rod Ramos was not present to address the progress of this case. In the last meeting, Jim Grose was to locate and if found, provide the latest copy of the AWWA for large size resilient-seated gate valves for Doug Davis. Jim was not at the meeting. Doug will call Jim.
- b. **Case 01-08 - Section 710 - Pavement Replacement:** Rod Ramos was not present to address the progress in the case. There was no discussion or comments from the members on this case.

4. 2002 Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 02-02 - Section 738.1 - Definition of Low Pressure Storm Drain:** A revised case dated July 3, 2002 was placed in the monthly packet. It is the same case as presented in the last meeting, except that the inserted paragraph labeled B was removed in Section 603. After last month's meeting, Doug Davis realized the previous handout had the paragraph in the Section. He did not intend for it to be placed in that location. After some general discussion on the case (dated July 3, 2002), Ted Collins made a motion for a vote. Mark Weiner seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.
- b. **Case 02-03 - Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirement for Deficient Asphalt:** Joe Phillips was not able to consolidate all of the comments for the next draft on this case. There was no discussion or comments from the members on this case.
- c. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** See meeting minutes in Case 02-03 above.
- d. **Case 02-05 - Section 711 - Paving Asphalt:** See meeting minutes in Case 02-03 above.
- e. **Case 02-06 - Miscellaneous Corrections A & B:** There was no discussion or comments regarding the two corrections in this case.
- f. **Case 02-08 - Section 345-2 - Adjusting Frames:** Jeff Van Skike and Doug Davis revised the case (dated July 3, 2002). The valve and manhole cover adjustments were placed into a separate subsection. By removing the lid adjustments from the frame adjustments, confusion between the two should be eliminated. A copy of the case was provided in the monthly packet. Rod Whitt requested that the words "rings and" in the first sentence of the new paragraph be deleted. After a short discussion on the case, Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on Case 02-08 dated July 3, 2002 with the one exception noted above. Jeff Van Skike seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention (Chandler) and 1 at the time of voting had temporary left the meeting (Goodyear).

- g. **Case 02-09 - Detail 130 - Barricades** - Ted Collins explained the reason for this case. Jeff Van Skike informed the committee that the City of Phoenix has some difficulty in the color change. They endorse the colors of black and white even though the color of orange and red with white has been adopted by the MUTCD. After a short discussion, Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on Case 02-09 dated April 10, 2002. Doug Davis seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no and 2 abstained (Phoenix, Tempe).
- h. **Case 02-10 - Table 725-1 - Concrete Classes (Metric Only)** - Ted Collins provided a new draft of this case dated July 3, 2002. This latest draft rounded the minimum concrete strength to the next whole number (MPa) using the soft conversion method. After a short discussion, Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the Case 02-01, dated July 3, 2002. Barry Combs seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.
- i. **Case 02-11 - Section 340.1 - Expansion Joints** - Doug Davis provided a short overview of the case. Jeff Van Skike of Phoenix received some negative comments from staff due to the closeness of the wider gaps the expansion joint will make in the sidewalk. John Ashley commented that the joints need to extend completely through the concrete for the joint to work properly. He has repaired numerous locations where sidewalks have popped up due to the concrete being inter-tied under the expansion joint. Barry Combs has a specification in Chandler requiring the contractor to place the expansion joint material on form stakes prior to inspection and placement of the concrete. This helps ensure that the joint will be placed through the concrete. Barry agreed to modify the paragraph to require staking of the expansion joint material prior to inspection.
- j. **Case 02-12 - Section 107.6.1 - Contractor's Marshaling Yard:** Doug Davis and Pat Thurman modified paragraphs E and F of this case based on comments from the last meeting. The modifications were provided in the monthly packet. Rod Whitt asked if this was for CIP projects only. Barry Combs indicated that Chandler has used it on all projects since the wording is generic. Art Brooks questioned the liability of the case if damage was done by the contractor's use of the yard and the Agency did not require documentation from the contractor. John Ashley noted that subcontractors are not covered in the case. Doug will review the subcontractor and liability issues of the case.

5. New Cases:

- a. **Case 02-06 - Miscellaneous Corrections C & D:** Doug Davis discussed two new miscellaneous corrections cases. The first is a misspelled word in Detail 303-2. Horizontal should be horizontal. The second is the drawing of the fence fabric in Detail 160. The fabric stopped at the bottom tension wire instead of 2 inches above ground. The committee had no comments on the cases.
- b. **Case 02-13 - Section 603.1.2 and 738.1.2 - Water Stops:** The sponsor of the case was not present however, a short discussion continued with questions to the local sales representative, Mark Kastl. Mark explained the various gaskets/water stops on the market. Quite often the gaskets provided with the pipe are used for water stops which cannot be

trusted to seal. The water stop will need to comply with ASTM C-923 which is a generic specification that a number of manufacturers can meet. John Ashley questioned the minimum concrete cover over the gasket. Mark will review the ACI for any minimum standard.

- c. **Case 02-14 - Section 738.1 - Third Party Certification for HDPE:** This case will require all manufacturers of corrugated HDPE pipe be certified which includes a plant inspection. Doug Davis conducted a small survey of the certifications required in the current Specifications. The results were as follows: ACP requires plant certification by requiring the pipe to approved by Underwriters Laboratory; PE pipe requires plant certification by requiring NSF Seal; SCP, VCP, ABS Truss, and PVC only requires manufacturer certifications; DIP and CIP requires no certifications. There was no further discussion or comments from the members on this case.
- d. **Case 02-15 - Section 603.3.2 - HDPE Trench Width:** The committee reviewed the case. There was no discussion or comments from the members on this case.
- e. **Case 02-16 - Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation:** This modification to the Specification will drop the requirement for the Affidavit of Installation for corrugated HDPE but will retain the affidavit for ribbed HDPE. Mark Kastl indicated that the third party inspection and the wall strength of the corrugated pipe will replace the need for the affidavit. Doug Davis noted that the wall strength of HDPE is one of the lowest of flexible pipe. Mark disagreed and will provide test data supporting his position.
- f. **Case 02-17 - Section 601.1 - Minimum Trench Width:** This case will require slurry or other type of flowable fill material to be placed in the pipe zone for the widths provided in the Section 601.1. When compaction equipment is used, the trench width will be widened to allow for equipment. Doug Davis has concerns about changing the trench width and its affect on the loading of the various pipes other than HDPE. In further review of the Table 601-1, Doug noted that a discrepancy between the two widths for 42" pipe in Table 601-1. The committee might want to review the discrepancy and make appropriate corrections.
- g. **Case 02-18 - Section 601.4.2 - Bedding by Water Consolidation:** The committee noted that the case could be interpreted to mean water consolidation in 8-inch lifts for the entire depth of the trench. That was not the intent and Mark Kastl made a note to change the wording. There was no further discussion or comments from the member on this case.
- h. **Case 02-19 - Detail 541 - Catch Basin - Type G:** Doug Davis asks the members if this detail has been used by any of the agencies. No member indicated that they had used the detail. Mark Kestl concurred that the detail was used more in the private sector than public.
- i. **Case 02-20 - Section 601.2.2.1 - Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes:** Doug Davis asks the members if their agency installs dual pipes. No member indicated that they use the dual pipe installation. Mark Kestl concurred that the detail was used more in the private sector than public.

6. General Discussion:

- a. John Ashley provided an update on the ADA's requirement for truncated domes. Paul Mueller of PCA discussed the requirement with the U.S. Access Board in Washington last week. The U.S. Access Board develops the minimum design standards for ADA. Paul was informed that the Board has not finalized their study regarding the domes. Paul was granted a 10 minute audience with the board on October 9, 2002 to address our concerns. John was soliciting comments about the domes from the agencies for this meeting.
- b. Doug Davis provided an update on the sealing of the Specification and Details. A policy statement was approved by the board. The statement was enclosed in this month's packet. The board ruled that the Specifications and Details did not have to be sealed. The responsibility for the accuracy of the Specifications and Details will fall upon the Agency. However, the Engineer is responsible to amend the Specifications and/or Details on the plans if he feels that a Specification and/or Detail are not adequate for the project.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p. m.