

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

October 28, 2003

SUBJECT:

Proposed 2004 Revisions to MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction

SUMMARY:

The MAG Standard Specifications and Details for Public Works Construction represent the best professional thinking of representatives of several Public Works Departments and are reviewed and refined by members of the construction industry. They were written to fulfill the need for uniform rules governing public works construction performed for Maricopa County and the various cities and public agencies in the county. It further fulfills the need for adequate standards by the smaller communities and agencies who could not afford to promulgate such standards for themselves. The MAG Standard Specifications and Details Committee has completed its 2003 review of proposed revisions to the MAG Publication. A summary of these recommendations has also been sent to MAG Public Works Directors, in addition to members of the Management Committee, for review for a period of one month. If no objections to any of the proposed revisions have been suggested within the month review time frame, then the proposed revisions will be regarded as approved and formal changes to the printed and electronic copies will be released. It is anticipated that the annual update packet will be available for purchase in early January 2004.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Development of these revisions has been achieved during open meetings of the MAG Specifications and Details Committee and has included input from several professional contractor and utility groups and private companies. There have been no members of the public present to address the Committee, although there were some interested parties present during discussions on the possible implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act provisions with regard to curb ramps.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Approval of the latest revisions will ensure that the MAG Specifications and Details reflect the latest and best practices in public works construction appropriate for MAG agencies.

CONS: Due to the constant evolutionary change inherent in the Specifications and Details process, annual updates to the printed and electronic versions are necessary.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The MAG Specifications and Details are a series of recommendations developed over many years, principally by senior inspectors and their supervisors from many MAG agencies. These recommendations are not prescriptive, but are often adopted entirely, or in part, by MAG agencies in developing public works projects.

POLICY: In prior years, action by the MAG Public Works Committee was the only review needed prior to publication of the revisions. The MAG Public Works Committee has now been discontinued so formal review by the Management Committee is requested.

ACTION NEEDED:

Information and discussion.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG Specifications and Details Committee. Review and recommendations for the cases submitted for consideration were achieved throughout 2003.

VOTING MEMBERS

Doug Davis, Mesa, Co-Chairman,
Rod Ramos, Scottsdale, Co-Chairman,
David Fern, Chandler
Mark Weiner, Gilbert
Pat Thurman, Glendale
David Ramirez, Goodyear
Ted Collins, Maricopa County DOT

Steven Borst, Maricopa County ESD
Keith Kesti, Peoria
Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (Street Transportation)
Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
Bret Huskey, Surprise
James Bond, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA
Baird H. Fullerton, ACEC
Jim Grose, AGC
Brian Gallimore, AGC

Jeff Benedict, ARPA
Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
Tom Domizi, NUCA
Paul Nebeker, NUCA

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

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	VOTE DATE /Draft Date	VOTE
02-03	Section 321.6 - Corrective Req. AC for Deficiencies	MCDOT	3 Sep 03 3 Sep 03	8 Yes 0 No 2 Abstain
02-04	Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete	MCDOT	3 Sep 03 3 Sep 03	7 Yes 0 No 3 Abstain
02-14	Section 738.1 - Third Party Certification for HDPE	Scottsdale	6 Aug 03 4 Jun 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-15/ 02-17	Section 603.3.2/601.1 - Trench Width	Scottsdale	3 Sep 03 3 Aug 03	9 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-16	Section 603.5.5 - Affidavit of Installation	Scottsdale	3 Sep 03 22 Aug 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
02-18	Section 601.4.2 - Bedding by Water Consolidation	Scottsdale	Withdrawn by sponsor	Yes No Abstain
02-20	Section 601.2.2.1 - Center Clearance of Multiple Pipes	Scottsdale	6 Aug 03 2 July 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
03-01	Miscellaneous Corrections A, B (English) & C	MCDOT/ Gilbert	3 Sep 03 Various	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain

CASE	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED BY	VOTE DATE /Draft Date	VOTE
03-02	Section 350.2 & 350.3 - Various Removals	MCDOT	2 Apr 03 5 Feb 03	8 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain
03-03	Details 252, 253 & 254 - Bus Bays	MCDOT	Carried over to next year	Yes No Abstain
03-04	Section 718 - Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete	Chandler	3 Sep 03 6 Aug 03	10 Yes 0 No 0 Abstain

* Case approved as noted.

A summary of the above cases is shown as Attachment One.

CONTACT PERSON:

Paul Ward, MAG, (602) 254-6300

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-03 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 321.6**
Title: **Various Modification to Asphalt Concrete Deficiencies**
Sponsor: **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**
Advisor: **-**

DISCUSSION:

This case modifies Section 321.6 - Corrective Requirements for Deficiencies. Each subsection has been reviewed and modified to provide a clearer understanding of the testing frequency, the tests to be conducted, the acceptable tolerances, penalties and/or corrective action for each percentage point below the minimum standard, etc. The modifications in this case will improve the quality of the asphalt being placed.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	September 3, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	2	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-04 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 710**
Title: **Asphalt Concrete**
Sponsor: **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case modified a number of areas within Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete. Some of the modified areas are the elimination of the medium traffic asphalt concrete design, modifying the mix design criteria, clarifying and changing the production tolerances in field testing, establish sampling frequencies and standards for plant testing, etc. The modifications in this case will provide better control on the product the Agencies are receiving.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	September 3, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	7
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	3	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-14 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 738.1**
Title: **Third Party Certification for HDPE**
Sponsor: **Scottsdale**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case will require a third party plant inspection of all High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE) manufacturers. The inspection will insure that the pipe is being manufactured by the current ASTM standards. Once the plant has passed the inspection, the certification of compliance will be affixed on the pipe. Also, this case further defines the information that will need to be placed on each length of HDPE pipe.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	June 4, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	August 6, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-15/17 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Sections 603.3.2 and 601.1**
Title: **Trench Width**
Sponsor: **Scottsdale**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

Because of their similarities, carry over Cases 02-15 and 02-17 were combined into one case. This combined case will allow the Engineer to make modifications in the width of a pipe trench. This modification can only be permitted when the contractor cannot achieve the required compaction in the pipe zone. This case will provide flexibility to the Specifications without sacrificing quality in installation.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	August 22, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	9
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-16 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 601.5**
Title: **Affidavit of Installation**
Sponsor: **Scottsdale**
Advisor: **-**

DISCUSSION:

This case will, upon request of the Engineer, Plans and/or Special Provisions, require the manufacturer's representative to provide an affidavit that the contractor is familiar with the installation methods and procedures. Also, the case requires the manufacturer's representative to review the contractor's installation of the pipe. If the installation is not correct, the contractor will make corrections as necessary. The manufacturer's representative will then provide an Affidavit of Installation stating the contractor is complying with the manufacturer recommended installation methods. This requirement is currently in Section 303.5.5 for High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE). This case will move the requirement from the HDPE Section and make it a requirement for all types of pipes.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	September 3, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	August 22, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-18 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 601.4.2**
Title: **Bedding by Water Consolidation**
Sponsor: **Scottsdale**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case was intended to provide further control in the placement and compaction of the material within the pipe zone. After several drafts, the Committee could not come to consensus as to the proper wording of the case. The wording considered did not fully or correctly portray the methods applied in the field and as a result, the proposed case could be misleading. Therefore, instead of creating additional misunderstanding, the Sponsor withdrew the Case.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the Sponsor's request to withdraw the case. No action is required at this time. This summary is for information only.

Draft Date: -
Vote Date: -

	Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	-
		Negative:	-
		Abstention:	-

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **02-20 (Carry Over)**
Section/Detail: **Section 601.2.2**
Title: **Multiple Pipe Installations**
Sponsor: **Scottsdale**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case places a condition on Table 601-1, Trench Widths, relating to the installation of a single pipe in a single trench. In some installations, the Table has been used for multiple installations which may not be correct. If multiple pipes are desired in a single trench, the Engineer will need to design for the condition and place the design criteria such as, the distance between pipes, type of back fill, etc. on the plans and/or in the Special Provisions. Because multiple pipe installations are not frequently used and because of the various considerations required for each type of pipe, the Committee chose not to insert a multiple pipe table at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	July 2, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	August 6, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **03-01**
Section/Detail: **Details 502.2, 426 and 420.1**
Title: **Miscellaneous Corrections (A, B & C)**
Sponsor: **Maricopa County Department of Transportation and Town of Gilbert**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case will correct various typos, bloopers and other errors in the Details. None of the changes affect the meaning of the Details. This case was generated to provide a mechanism to ensure that the various errors will be corrected in the original documents. There was a total of three Details submitted for corrections this year.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	Various Dates		Vote Summary: Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0
			Abstention:	0

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **03-02**
Section/Detail: **Section 350.2 and 350.3**
Title: **Various Removals**
Sponsor: **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case addresses various removal items in Sections 350.2 and 350.3. The case provides better separation for the removals of non-structural items, e.g., roots rubbish, etc. to that which is considered as structure in nature, e.g., headwalls, irrigation structures, storm water inlets, catch basins, etc. This will help the contractors in placing the correct cost for such removals in the appropriate item within the bid proposal.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	February 5, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	8
Vote Date:	April 2, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **03-03**
Section/Detail: **Details 252, 256 and 254**
Title: **Bus Bays**
Sponsor: **Maricopa County Department of Transportation**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

Initially, MCDOT wanted to make a couple of changes to provide some additional clarification to the Bus Bay Detail. In a review at the last regular meeting, the committee realized that none of the agencies use the detail and the changes proposed would not improve the Agency's use of it. As a result, the Case was carried over to next year to allow more time to develop a common Detail that would be used by the Agencies.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the action of the Committee to carry over the case to next year, no action is required at this time. This summary is for information only.

Draft Date:	July 3, 2002		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	-
Vote Date:	-		Negative:	-	
			Abstention:	-	

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

Date: October 1, 2003

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Case Number: **03-04**
Section/Detail: **Section 718**
Title: **Preservative Seal for Asphalt Concrete**
Sponsor: **City of Chandler**
Advisor: -

DISCUSSION:

This case is two fold. First it changes the existing Type D generic polymer modified asphalt to a specific acrylic polymer asphalt preservative seal. This acrylic polymer is the latest product offered today and is used by two of the member Agencies. Second, the case updates the testing procedures and limits on the other types of seals.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Draft Date:	August 6, 2003		Vote Summary:	Affirmative:	10
Vote Date:	September 3, 2003		Negative:	0	
			Abstention:	0	