

The following table lists the cases submitted and the recommendations as shown:

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009 CASES FOR CONSIDERATION

Case	Description	Recommended Action
08-10	Detail 200 – Trench backfill and pavement Replacement	Approval
09-01	Modification to Section 340.2.1 – Detectable Warnings	Approval
09-02	Revisions to Section 630.6 – Air Release and Vacuum Valves	Approval
09-03	New Section 796 – Geosynthetics	Approval
09-04	Modification to Section 321 – Add Pavement Fabric Interlayer for AC Overlay	Approval
09-05	Revisions to Sections 220 and 703, and Detail 555 – Riprap Construction	Approval
09-06	New Section 306 – Mechanically Stabilized Subgrade - Geogrids	Approval
09-07	Revisions to Sections 725 and 701 – Portland Cement Concrete	Approval
09-08	Modification to Detail 240 – Valley Gutter	Approval
09-09	Revisions Section 792 – Dust Palliative	Approval
09-10	Incorporate Section 322 - Asphalt Concrete Overlay into Section 321 and delete Section 322	Approval
09-11	Modify Section 230 - Dust Palliative Application	Approval
09-12	Miscellaneous Bloopers A- Correct reference to Table 321-6 in section 321.10.4. B- Correct percent passing #30 sieve in section 325.2.1 C- Correct values in Table 715-1	Approval

Case	Description	Recommended Action
09-13	Dual Curb Ramp Details	Carry Forward
09-14	Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance, Details 231, 232, 233 and 234	Carry Forward
09-15	Revisions to Section 610.4: Pipe Protection	Carry Forward

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 08-10
Section/Detail: Detail 200 and Sections 336 and 601
Title: Trench Backfill and Pavement Replacement
Sponsor: Salt River Project
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this case was to make revisions necessary to eliminate numerous agency trench backfill and pavement replacement supplemental details by combining the most common practices. In 2008, the sponsor provided an updated Detail 200 and proposed revisions to Sections 336 and 601 to incorporate the most common agency supplements and exceptions. The sponsor also provided member agency representatives a summary of what would need to change in their agency supplements if the revisions to the MAG Specifications and Details were adopted.

Committee members requested that the case be reduced in scope to just standardizing and updating the detail drawings and delay revising sections 336 and 601. Detail 200 was split into Detail 200-1 which includes the section details for the most common trench repair methods, and Detail 200-2 which shows plan views for longitudinal and transverse trenches as well as additional details. This case should help to reduce agency supplements by providing several standard choices for trench backfill and pavement replacement details.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	February 2, 2008	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	12
Vote Date:	September 2, 2009		Negative:	1
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-01
Section/Detail: Section 340.2.1
Title: Modification to Detectable Warnings
Sponsor: Maricopa County
Advisor: Bob Herz

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the case was to update requirements to conform to current ADA requirements. The revised subsection shall read:

340.2.1 Detectable Warnings. Detectable warnings shall consist of raised truncated domes aligned in a square grid pattern in conformity to the Americans with Disabilities Accessibility Guidelines. Truncated domes shall have the following nominal dimensions: base diameter of 1.0 inches (0.9 inches minimum), top diameter of 50 percent of the base diameter minimum to 65 percent of the base diameter maximum, and height of 0.2 inches. Dome center-to-center spacing of 2.35 inches, measured between the most adjacent domes on the square grid. Dome center-to-center spacing for radial installations shall be 1.6 inches minimum and 2.4 inches maximum with a base-to-base spacing of 0.65 inches minimum. Detectable warnings shall contrast visually with adjoining surfaces. Visual contrast shall be obtained by color, use safety yellow or other approved color. The color shall be an integral part of the material surface. The material is to be durable with a non-slip surface not subject to spalling, chipping, delamination, or separation. All detectable warnings shall be approved by the jurisdictional agency prior to installation.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	January 7, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	June 3, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-02
Section/Detail: Section 630.6
Title: Revisions to Air Release and Vacuum Valves
Sponsor: City of Phoenix
Advisor: Jami Erickson

DISCUSSION:

This case modified section 630.6 regarding vacuum relief valves, to remove references to specific vendors and include language for agency approved vendor lists. The revised section shall read:

630.6 AIR RELEASE AND VACUUM VALVES:

Valve assemblies shall be furnished and installed where shown and as detailed on the drawings.

(A) Air release on water mains shall be controlled by the use of an air release valve assembly, of size and type as shown on the plans. Air release valves shall be of the flanged or screwed type as designated on the Agency's approved products list or in the special provisions.

(B) Vacuum and Air Relief when called for on the plans shall be controlled by a vacuum relief valve on the air release valve noted above. The valves shall be of the same manufacture or may be a combination air and vacuum valve assembly designated on the Agency's approved products list or in the special provisions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	January 7, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	13
Vote Date:	September 2, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-03
Section/Detail: New Section 769
Title: Geosynthetics
Sponsor: Salt River Project
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

MAG agencies currently use various geosynthetic materials for public works projects, yet there are no material or placement specifications within the MAG documents. Because of the increased use of these products in pavements, base and subgrade reinforcement, erosion protection, and filtration and separation, it is proposed to add a comprehensive materials section to the MAG document.

Revisions were incorporated based on comments from committee members and written comments from Mesa and Maricopa County Department of Transportation. Revisions included definitions of various geosynthetic materials applications. Members discussed including environmental protection. Revisions to the introductory paragraph and recommended additional language for the general description work scope were also discussed. Minor revisions to Table 796-4 were discussed and incorporated in the final approved case.

This new section provides material specifications for geosynthetics used in pavement, filtration and drainage, erosion control and soil or base reinforcement. Application and installation of these materials is addressed in Cases 09-04, 09-05 and 09-06.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	February 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	13
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	1
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-04
Section/Detail: Section 321
Title: Add Pavement Fabric Interlayer for Asphalt Concrete Overlay
Sponsor: SRP
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the case was to modify MAG Section 322 Asphalt Concrete Overlay to include pavement fabric installation specifications, not currently in MAG specs.

During discussions on this case, it was noted that with the new asphalt concrete specifications approved during the prior year, it would make sense to incorporate the entire Section 322 as a subsection of 321. So the fabric interlayer revisions to the concrete overlay would be placed in Section 321. (See Case 09-10.)

This case added the installation requirements for the pavement fabric interlayer materials specified in Case 09-03: Section 769 Geosynthetics. Revisions were incorporated from oral comments during committee meetings and written comments received from Mesa and Maricopa County. Discussions included adding a new table to Section 321 that specifies minimum temperature requirements for all asphalt concrete placement. Final discussion included adding cautionary text about the use of joint heaters to avoid damage to the fabric during paving operations.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	February 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	3
			Abstention:	1

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-05
Section/Detail: Sections to 220 and 703, Detail 555
Title: Revisions to Riprap Construction
Sponsor: SRP
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this case was to update MAG Section 220 "Riprap Construction" to include geosynthetic materials, to incorporate Maricopa County Supplemental Specification 224, and to modernize and update specifications for riprap construction and materials.

Initially the case was designed to add installation of new geosynthetic materials, but grew to include MCDOT supplements and to update the riprap specifications throughout. This included removing archaic uses such as using sacked concrete for riprap, and discussions about methods and types of grouting. While working on this case, additional changes to the materials section (MAG 703) and MAG Detail 555 were also incorporated.

The final approved case provides riprap material and construction specifications that are more inclusive and up-to-date, as well as reduce Maricopa County supplements.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	February 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	14
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-06
Section/Detail: New Section 306
Title: Mechanically Stabilized Subgrade - Geogrids
Sponsor: SRP
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

This case creates a new installation specification (Section 306) for base and subgrade reinforcement geosynthetics, also called geogrids. This section is primarily based on ADOT standard specification 306 and manufacturer's recommended updates.

Members discussed the use of geogrid fabrics and methods to repair grid material cut during utility excavation work. Revisions based on comments from the committee and written comments from Mesa and Maricopa County were incorporated in the new Geogrids section.

It was suggested that issues of repairing geogrids during trench repair be addressed in Section 336 in a future case.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	February 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	13
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	1
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-07
Section/Detail: Sections 725, 710, 503, 728
Title: Portland Cement Concrete
Sponsor: City of Goodyear and Arizona Rock Products Association
Advisor: Troy Tobaisson

DISCUSSION:

Specification Section 725 Portland Cement Concrete requires major revision due to lack of updating in recent years. This case replaces all of Section 725 with a new set of specifications that incorporate changes in concrete technology, materials, and construction processes.

During 2008, the MAG Concrete Modernization Working Group met monthly to develop the new concrete specifications. The group was composed of agency technicians and industry experts, and included several committee members. Major changes/revisions included: elimination of 14 day compressive strength requirement; increase allowable amount of fly ash and add other concrete additives; moving aggregate requirements to section 701; reorganizing sections on mix design proportioning, mixing and delivery; clarifying wording for field personnel; updating the acceptance section and adjustment table; updating references to appropriate ACI and ASTM standards; and updating and clarifying the language throughout.

During 2009, the full committee provided extensive oral and written comments which were incorporated into the final specification. Discussions included: cylinder and core testing and acceptance criteria, clarifying job mixing process, and standardizing terminology throughout. A special meeting was held with Maricopa County DOT to discuss and then address their concerns. References to the Portland Cement Concrete in MAG sections 503 and 728 were also updated.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	March 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	14
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-08
Section/Detail: Detail 240
Title: Modification to Valley Gutter
Sponsor: Maricopa County
Advisor: Bob Herz

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the case was to revise valley gutter thickness to be consistent with the commercial and industrial driveway thickness as shown on Detail 250-1.

Detail 240 was revised to show the valley gutter constructed 9" rather than 8" thick and widened to 6' rather than 3'. Several additional notes were added or revised to clarify construction. These included defining joint locations to take into account ADA ramp installation, and clarifying the requirements for contraction joint construction.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	March 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	13
Vote Date:	September 2, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-09
Section/Detail: Section 792
Title: Revisions to Dust Palliatives
Sponsor: Salt River Project
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

Case 09-09 made modifications to Section 792 – Dust Palliatives to update it for current dust palliative products and compliance with environmental requirements.

Based on input from product vendors, the application rate values for polymers needed adjustment. In addition, specifications for tall oil pitch emulsions were added. Testing requirements were added including a method to ensure environmental compliance.

Revisions to the application of dust palliatives are in Case 09-11.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	March 4, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	14
Vote Date:			Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-10
Section/Detail: Section 321
Title: Incorporate Section 322 - Asphalt Concrete Overlay into Section 321 and delete Section 322
Sponsor: Salt River Project
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

Changes made to Section 321 in 2009 resulted in a comprehensive asphalt placement specification. The existing asphalt concrete overlay specification heavily references Section 321 and is really just a subset of asphalt placement work. The purpose of this case is to revise Section 321 to include all requirements for asphalt concrete overlay work and eliminate Section 322. The asphalt concrete overlay placement requirements would be included in a new subsection 321.8.6.

In the process of reviewing this case, members suggested updates to the asphalt concrete overlay specifications such as replacing burning or blading of damaged pavement with milling or repair.

The final revised subsection 321.8.6 incorporated committee comments, and cleared up language and previous references to be consistent with the rest of Section 321.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	May 6, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	August 5, 2009.		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-11
Section/Detail: Section 230
Title: Modify Dust Palliative Application
Sponsor: Salt River Project
Advisor: Peter Kandarlis

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of Case 9-11 was to revise MAG Section 230 to include: a product verification process, applicator compliance verification, updated distributor equipment requirements, field quality control measurements, remedies for deficient work, and warranty of work.

The existing specification does not provide methods to measure and verify that the quantity and quality of dust control products delivered and applied at the site are in conformance with the bid materials. Also the existing specification does not provide remedies for deficient work or warranty of the work. There have also been many changes in dust control materials, and agency practices. This specification also includes improvements in the application and vendor verification of dust palliatives.

Discussions included the length of warranty and it's applicability in areas with traffic. Revisions included product acceptance and warranty periods based on type of application, with no warranty requirement for applications subject to traffic.

This case updates the application of dust palliatives materials that were updated in Case 09-09.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the following data, the MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends approval of this case.

Submittal Date:	May 6, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	14
Vote Date:	October 7, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-12
Section/Detail: New Sections 331 and 714
Title: Miscellaneous Bloopers
Sponsor: Maricopa County and Arizona Rock Products Association
Advisor: Bob Herz and Jeff Hearne

DISCUSSION:

This case corrects errors in the current specifications due to incorrect references, oversight or formatting issues. The three bloopers corrected were:

A- Correct reference to Table 321-6 in section 321.10.4.
(Changed the reference number to match the table number.)

B- Correct percent passing #30 sieve in section 325.2.1
(The graduation table 325.2.1 was corrected to make the passing range on the No. 30 sieve from 5 to 15 percent, not 15 to 24 percent.)

C- Correct values in Table 715-1
(Previous formatting errors required placing correct values in the table based on a previously published edition.)

RECOMMENDATION:

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee recommends carrying forward this case for further discussion in 2009.

Submittal Date:	June 3, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	12
Vote Date:	September 2, 2009		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-13
Section/Detail: To be determined
Title: Dual Curb Ramp Details
Sponsor: Peoria
Advisor: Jesse Gonzales

DISCUSSION:

MAG currently only has single curb ramp details for street corners. Many agencies use dual curb ramps and have supplemental details for them. It was proposed to add dual curb ramp details to the MAG details. This would promote a uniform standard for dual curb ramps and help reduce agency supplements.

The City of Peoria submitted several schematic diagrams for dual curb ramps. The City of Tempe also submitted the supplemental detail drawing they use for consideration.

Since there is still additional work needed to come to a consensus on a detail that incorporates the essential and best aspects of agency requirements. This case will be continued in 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee plans to carry forward this case for further discussion in 2010.

Submittal Date:	July 1, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	0
Vote Date:	No Vote Taken		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-14
Section/Detail: Details 231, 232, 233 and 234
Title: Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance
Sponsor: Maricopa County
Advisor: Bob Herz

DISCUSSION:

To obtain compliance with current ADA requirements, MAG sidewalk ramp details need to be updated. Details 231 and 233 have undersized landing areas for turning. Revised details show 5-ft by 5-ft landing dimensions. Details 232 and 234 are non-compliant since the path going across the ramp exceeds the allowable 2% maximum cross slope. Details have been revised to obtain a 1.5% cross slope for the landing at the bottom of the ramps.

Many agencies have supplements to MAG which can be used to update the MAG details for ADA compliance. The City of Tempe submitted the supplemental detail drawing they use for consideration.

Since there is still additional work needed to come to a consensus on a detail that incorporates the essential and best aspects of agency requirements and be compliant with ADA requirements. This case will be continued in 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee plans to carry forward this case for further discussion in 2010.

Submittal Date:	July 1, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	0
Vote Date:	No Vote Taken		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY
OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

October 9, 2009

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: 09-15
Section/Detail: Section 610.4
Title: Pipe Protection
Sponsor: City of Tempe
Advisor: Tom Wilhite

DISCUSSION:

This case proposed modifying 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. The current proposed language reads:

Every precaution shall be taken to prevent foreign material from entering the pipe. The ends of the pipe shall be plugged or wrapped at all times when a pipe laying is not in progress, which includes storage and staging at the site. The open ends of each pipe section shall be protected from foreign material entering by taped closure of the polywrap when the pipe is stored or staged. The pipe line shall be protected by a water-tight plug or other means approved by the Engineer when the pipe is in the trench if pipe laying is not in progress.

Comments from pipe industry representatives and suppliers objected to the expense and difficulty in keeping the ends plugged during shipping and handling. Since additional feedback from industry and member agencies is required. This case will be continued in 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee plans to carry forward this case for further discussion in 2010.

Submittal Date:	July 1, 2009	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	0
Vote Date:	No Vote Taken		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0