

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

September 4, 2002

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

VOTING MEMBERS

Doug Davis, Mesa, Co-chairman
* Rod Ramos, Scottsdale, Co-chairman
Barry Combs, Chandler
P Keith Kesti, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert
Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Pat Thurman, Glendale
* Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
* David Ramirez, Goodyear

Bob Erdman for Ted Collins, MCDOT
*Brian Pirooz, Surprise
S t e v e n B o r s t , M C E S D

James Bond, Tempe Michael Hook, Hanson Pipe
& Products

*

ADVISORY MEMBERS

* J a m e s P u l i c e , J r . , A G C
Tom Domizi, UTCA
J i m G r o s e , A G C
Peter Kandar, SRP Engineering
P a u l N e b e k e r , U T C A
*
Sean Goris, ACEA
Jeff Benedict, ARPA

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

John Ashley, Arizona Cement Association
Joe Phillips, MCDOT
Corey Welch of Nyloplast
Mark Kastl, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Mark Moiller, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Dale Phelan, Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.
Steve Clayton, Hanson Pipe & Products

- * Members not attending or represented by proxy.
- P Members attended for a portion of the meeting.

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 August 7, 2002. Barry Combs noted three typo/word selections in the minutes. The first is in 4e, fourth sentence, the word “through” should be “thought”. The next two are in 5c, first sentence, the work “address” should be “addressed” and word “regard” should be “regarding”. Barry Combs introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes with the above exceptions. Pat Thurman seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2001 Carry Over Cases:

- a. **Case 01-08 - Section 336.2.4 - Pavement Replacement:** Rod Ramos did not attend the meeting to address the direction he would like the case to proceed. Since the material submitted for the case was not in a form for voting, the committee took no action. The case was a carry-over case and per the committee’s by-laws, it died.

4. 2002 Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 02-03 - Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirement for Deficient Asphalt:** There was a short discussion regarding the case and it’s readiness for a vote. Joe Philips concurred that some issues discussed were not fully covered in the present revision. Bob Erdman requested the case be carried over to next year.
- b. **Case 02-04 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** Within the last month, there were a number of changes incorporated into this case. Due to the short time to fully review the impact to the Specifications, Bob Erdman requested the case be carried over to next year. Two of several issues discussed in the meeting were as follows: 1) With the approval of this case, there will be two Sections that deal with asphalt and they do not agree with each other. 2) The case allows 3/8- inch for shoving and rutting of the asphalt surface where industry standard is 1/4-inch.
- c. **Case 02-05 - Section 711 - Paving Asphalt:** Jeff Benedict expressed concern about the Direct Tension Test. He interpreted the case to require a test at every submittal. Also, the equipment to preform the test is quite expensive. After reviewing the case further, Note #3 resolved the problem by only requiring the test when the Creep Stiffness is below 3000 MPa. As a results of Jeff’s concern, it became obvious that the notes did not stand out.. To improve the case, the word “note” was placed in front of each note number and the word “NOTE” was placed at the heading above the notes. Also two typos were discovered in Note #3: The word “con” should be “can” and the word “stasified” should be “satisfied”. Bob Erdman introduced a motion for a vote on the case with the above word changes. Jeff VanSkiike seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 8 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.
- d. **Case 02-06 - Miscellaneous Corrections:** Doug Davis provided a brief review for each of the six parts of the case (A through F). Barry Combs introduced a motion for a vote on Case 02-06. Mark Weiner seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained.
- e. **Case 02-11 - Section 340.1 - Expansion Joints:** From Phoenix’s comments last month, Doug

Davis placed only selected comments in the case. There were a number of other comments that did not relate directly to the joints or presented a major change to the case. They were not placed in the case. Those comments can be addressed in a case next year. Doug reviewed the changes with the committee. Doug Davis introduced a motion for a vote on the case. Jeff Van Skike seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 8 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.

- f. **Case 02-12 - Section 107.6.1 - Contractor's Marshaling Yard:** Since the committee's approval of this case last month, Pat Thurman has reviewed the case and suggested four word changes. The changes dated September 4, 2002 were reviewed by the committee. During the review, James Bond presented a fifth word change. By a voice vote of all yeas and no nays the Committee approved the word changes.
- g. **Case 02-13 - Section 603.1.2 and 738.1.2 - Water Stops:** In this month's packet, there was a single page regarding this case submitted by Rod Ramos. Since Rod is not at the meeting, the reason for the page is unknown. Several of the members had different editions of the case. The edition under review by this committee is the one dated July 8, 2002. After a short discussion, Doug Davis introduced a motion for a vote on the case dated July 8, 2002. Barry Combs seconded the motion. The case passed with a vote of 8 yes, 0 no and 0 abstained.
- h. **Case 02-14 - Section 738.1 - Third Party Certification for HDPE:** Doug Davis had several comments regarding the format of the case. First the certification was placed in the introduction of the section. There are subsections of 738.5 and 738.6 that discuss certifications and markings. This case should be placed in the appropriate subsection. Doug does not believe that web sites of certifications providers should be placed in the Specifications. Since the sponsor was not in attendance, the Committee did not know the direction the sponsor would like to direct this case. Since the case has some merit, the Committee, by voice vote carried the case over to next year.
- i. **Case 02-15 - Section 603.3.2 - HDPE Trench Width:** Pat Thurman felt that this case along with the other HDPE cases were not presented in a clear format. It is very difficult to understand what is being voted upon and should be carried over to next year. Comments from the other members followed along the same line and the case was carried over to next year.
- j. **Case 02-16 - Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation:** See comments on case 02-15 above. This case was carried over to next year.
- k. **Case 02-17 - Section 601.1 - Minimum Trench Width:** See comments on case 02-15 above. This case was carried over to next year.

- l. **Case 02-18 - Section 601.4.2 - Bedding by Water Consolidation:** See comments on case 02-15 above. This case was carried over to next year.
- m. **Case 02-19 - Detail 541 - Catch Basin - Type G:** After a very short discussion, Jeff Van Skike introduced a motion for a vote on this case. Barry Combs seconded the motion. The case did not pass with a vote of 0 yes, 4 no and 3 abstained.
- n. **Case 02-20 - Section 601.2.2.1 - Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes:** See comments on case 02-15 above. This case was carried over to next year.

5. General Discussion:

- a. There was a discussion as to the status of the ADA truncated domes. John Ashley drafted a letter for MAG to the Access Board and provided a copy to Doug Davis, who in turn, transmitted it to Paul Ward. John took several pictures of the installation in Chandler for review by the committee. Based on John's letter, Paul Ward will proceed with a MAG letter for the Board. Paul outlined the steps required to send a letter under the MAG letterhead. There were a number of steps however, Paul believes that ample time is available to accomplish our goal. The deadline date for written responses to the Board is October 28, 2002. Jeff Van Skike provided an e-mail from ITE requesting each agency write to the Access Board. The e-mail included a copy of a letter sent by Pueblo Colorado. The letter can be used as an example. John, Jeff and the others felt that 50 letters from 50 agencies will have a better impact than one letter from a joint agency.
- b. Steve Borst discussed the possibility to extend the Specifications to the private sector regarding the installation of water and sewer mains. The Committee did not want to take any special considerations for private utilities. However, it is the developer's option to install the utilities per MAG standards. If the local agencies do not force the developers to use MAG, than there is little control in the enforcement of a minimum standard for installation.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p. m.