

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

April 7, 2010

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	Mike Samer, Mesa
Scott Zipprich, Buckeye	Jesse Gonzales, Peoria, Chairman
Warren White, Chandler	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Dennis Teller, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Edgar Medina, Gilbert	Mark Palichuk, Queen Creek
Tom Kaczmarowski, Glendale	* Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
* Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Vice Chairman	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Tom Wilhite, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Jeff Benedict, AGC	Peter Kandararis, SRP
Kwigs Bowen, NUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Tony Braun, NUCA	Mike Smith, ARPA
Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Phil Cisneros, Southwest Gas
Arturo Chavarria, Hanson Pipe and Precast
Bill Davis, NUCA
Brian Platten, Garney Construction
Kenny Pollock, Southwest Gas
Mike Sanders, NUCA
Ann Seiden, Southwest Gas
Niranjan Vescio, Stronggo

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jesse Gonzales called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the March 3, 2010 meeting minutes. John Ashley introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Tom Kaczmarowski seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2009 Cases (old cases)

a. Case 09-13 – ADA-Compliant Dual Sidewalk Ramps: *Develop ADA-compliant details for 35-foot and 20-foot corner radius dual sidewalk ramps.* Jesse Gonzales said he has continued to work on the proposed details and to get feedback from the access board. He also provided copies of a letter from the Department of Justice to Victor Mendez at the FHWA stating the department's position that all street resurfacing requires sidewalk ramps to be updated to meet current ADA standards. He also described his attendance at a webinar conducted at the City of Phoenix regarding transition plans. Such plans are required for organizations with more than 50 employees. An article from the *APWA Reporter* on transition plans was provided for reference. Mr. Gonzales asked the committee for additional feedback.

b. Case 09-14 – Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance: *Revise Details 231, 232, 233 and 234 to obtain compliance with ADA requirements.* Bob Herz provided an updated drawing for Detail 232 for Curb Ramp –Type 'B' with minor updates. He said updates to the other details are in progress and requested additional feedback from the committee.

c. Case 09-15 – Revisions to Section 610.4 for Water Line Handling: *Modify Section 610.4 to clarify water line pipe protection measures at the job site prior to placement (during storage or staging) to help prevent contamination.* Tom Wilhite provided updates to Section 610.4 based on discussions at previous meetings about how to protect water pipe. The update included the option of tarping and described other methods of preventing foreign materials from entering pipe during storage and construction. Mr. Wilhite asked for additional feedback.

4. 2010 Cases (new cases)

d. Case 10-01a – Miscellaneous Bloopers: *Correct typographic errors in Section 317 Asphalt Milling.* No comments were provided on Section 317; however, Bob Herz provided a handout that noted typographic corrections were needed for Table 715-1 and Section 340.2.1. He stated that these updates were passed in the 2010 update, but the errors were missed in the publication process and should be corrected and updated immediately for the online publication and future reprints. Jesse Gonzales moved and

Dennis Teller seconded a motion to accept these corrections and update the 2010 publication online. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

e. Case 10-02 – Utility Pothole Repair: *Revise and add keyhole repair to Detail 212 and add new Sections 355 and 708.* Phil Cisneros of Southwest Gas gave a short presentation on the keyhole repair process. He described a short history of its use in the region including photos of tests done in various cities. He also described the process and equipment used including a hand-held testing device that records the compaction of fill. Mr. Cisneros described other uses and benefits of the process. The complete presentation is posted on the MAG web site: <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/detail.cms?item=11790>

Discussions during the presentation focused on quality control issues such verifying compaction data, and more information about how the device works. It was noted that it records the amplitude of the compaction hit, and that different soils would compact differently, so the data would need to be correlated to match the soil type.

Peter Kandaris provided updated specifications for Section 355 and revisions to Detail 212 based on feedback from Maricopa County. Changes included references to backfill specifications and noting the smallest keyhole size allowed is equal to two times the tamper size. Detail 212 was revised to make types A and B consistent and to better organize and clean up the details and notes.

f. Case 10-03 – Modify Section 336 Pavement Matching and Surfacing Replacement: *Revise Section 336 to be in conformance with changes made last year to Detail 200-1 and Detail 200-2.* Peter Kandaris handed out a color version of Section 336 and said it was now available in Microsoft Word format for easier editing. He said that most of the changes to the section were reorganizing it to match the flow of the process, and making it consistent with details 200-1 and 200-2 that were revised last year. A few other minor typographic corrections were made. He asked the committee to review the case and said he would make the Word version available.

g. Case 10-04 – Revise Section 109.8: *Remove quotations of Arizona Revised Statutes from text located in Section 109.8 PAYMENT FOR DELAY.* Bob Herz said no changes have been made or comments received since the last meeting.

h. Case 10-05 – Revise FOREWORD: *The purpose of this change is to clarify use of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works document.* Jesse Gonzales asked for the committee to look at it again and provide feedback.

Mr. Gonzales also discussed the proposed document that supplements the MAG Specifications for “Public Works Construction Not in the Right of Way.” He noted that the need for such a document was growing, and could address such issues as how to use reclaimed water in areas not currently covered in the MAG specifications. He also said that many parts of the MAG specifications were appropriate to use for these types of projects, as well as many city supplements. The possibility of forming a working group for this project was discussed.

Peter Kandaris said a working group would help to determine the scope and pieces that could be included in the document. Jeff Hearne added that other projects such as pervious concrete may be more appropriate for this document. Members Kandaris, Gonzales and Hearne agreed to get together for further discussion. Mr. Gonzales asked Brian Gallimore to ensure AGC participation.

i. Case 10-06 – Revise Controlled Low Strength Materials (CLSM) Specifications:

The purpose is to update the CLSM specifications in Sections 604, 701 and 728 to match current industry standards. Jeff Hearne of ARPA introduced this case that was the final draft prepared by the ARPA/MAG Concrete Working Group. Mr. Hearne briefly summarized the changes in each section. Section 604 was reorganized and makes references to current ACI standards. Section 604.4 was changed to be Performance Testing. Section 701.3.5 was updated to make CLSM aggregates match concrete aggregates specified in ASTM C-33 (same as the concrete section). Section 728 was updated to include current materials and additives. Notes under Table 728 were moved, with a new one added describing pumpability using additives such as fly ash. The mixing section now refers back to 725.7 (concrete). Also the specification does not allow rejected concrete to be used as CLSM. Mr. Hearne asked members to bring the document to their departments for feedback.

John Ashley asked about using materials on-site and availability of materials in remote areas. Discussion included past use of ABC. Mr. Hearne stated that although it may be specified on mix design tags, suppliers are now using concrete aggregates, and that the revised specification actually allows others sizes besides the #57 rock currently specified.

There was discussion about the balance the working group tried to make between having a performance-based specification and a recipe for the mix. The revised specification allows for greater variation in mixes, but there is difficulty in creating a performance standard due to the difficulty in testing low strength materials properly. Cylinders are not reliable at low strengths and easily damaged.

The methods of performance testing in 604.4 were discussed regarding when paving could be completed, and traffic allowed. Scott Zipprich said that plating requirements allowed traffic on the site until final patching could be done.

Discussion on the changes to Table 728-1 included the purpose for ½ sack, 1 sack and 1½ sack concrete mixes. Tom Whilhite asked about the appropriateness of the strength maximums and minimums in the third column. Discussion included that minimums were not needed for ½ sack and 1½ sack because the mix formula would guarantee that it would have a greater strength than the native soil it is designed to replace. Maximum strengths could help ensure excavability. A minimum strength for 1½ sack was added since it is used for protection purposes.

j. Case 10-07 – Revise Detail 230 – Sidewalks to change minimum from 4’ to 5’: *The purpose of the case is to revise the minimum sidewalk width to match the minimum ADA requirements for two wheel chairs to pass, and to allow a wheel chair to u-turn.* Bob Herz introduced this case which provided information and diagrams on ADA accessible routes requirements for passing and turning. The case included revisions to Detail 230 changing the sidewalk width dimension and notes. Jesse Gonzales said that many cities already use 5’ sidewalk widths. He also made a comment about using vertical curbs instead of roll curbs created the problem of having utilities under concrete since the sidewalks are moved back to allow ADA access around driveways. Mr. Herz asked members to review the case and send him comments.

5. General Discussion:

Chairman Gonzales introduced Syd Anderson as the new representative from the City of Phoenix to replace Jeff Van Skike who recently retired. He said that Syd has many years experience as the lab supervisor in Phoenix, and welcomed him to the committee.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Portal Access

Gordon Tyus provided an update on the ASTM web portal based on discussions with Jim Thomas at ASTM. He described an online demonstration of the ASTM web portal given by Mr. Thomas which allows users to make and read notes and commentary on ASTM specifications. It also provides easy cross linking and access to past and present specifications. He also discussed possible custom configurations to allow MAG member agencies to access ASTM standards via a MAG portal, and possible costs and features.

Mr. Tyus investigated the ASTM web portal project further by searching the MAG specifications for all references to ASTM standards. MAG references them over 400 times. This information was given to Mr. Thomas to help determine what sections of ASTM were needed. During this research, Mr. Tyus found that many of the references in MAG are to ASTM standards that have been removed or superseded. He suggested that members review the bolded entries to see how these references could be corrected, and that a future case may be warranted.

Gordon Tyus also described another discussion he had with Mr. Thomas on the previous day. The ASTM representative told Mr. Tyus most of the specifications MAG references are in Section 4, and said a custom portal with unlimited access to Section 4 as well as X number of downloads to other sections could be set-up. Access can be determined by computer IP recognition or user name and password. Although the total costs will vary depending on the number of agencies, what sections are needed, and the number of users, Mr. Thomas gave Mr. Tyus a ball-park figure of about \$25,000. A typical portal for a single organization, for one library was about \$3,000, and another 1.75 times that for network access to other computers. The ASTM access portal would meet lab requirements to maintain certification.

Mr. Tyus told the committee that Mr. Thomas was willing to give a similar demonstration and proposal along with their web development partner Citation (based in Scottsdale) at the June 2, 2010 committee meeting. Mr. Tyus also asked members to survey their organizations

to see what ASTM specifications they required and how many users they would need, to help get a better estimate of the portal requirements and costs. He also said he would investigate other funding sources at MAG.

Several members commented on the ASTM access they currently use and how a shared portal could save costs, and provide other advantages. It was agreed to add the ASTM presentation by Mr. Thomas to the agenda of the June 2, 2010 meeting.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.