

Mesa's Comments 5/05/09

Here are a few comments from Mesa:

Case 08-10

1. At this point, I am not in favor of this case since the size and complexity of the supplement we would have to issue would be enough that we would probably just stay with our existing detail.
2. I also feel at a bit of loss to offer many specific comments because the changes Mesa would want to make to the proposed detail would bring the detail back to match Mesa's existing standard and wouldn't align with what other agencies want to do. Basically, we are just waiting to see what is adopted and we will adjust our supplement accordingly.
3. In the cover memo, you propose reducing the depth of ABC under pavement in Type "A" to 12-inches (or match existing, whichever is greater). That should be OK.
4. In Detail 200-1, should CLSM be called out as 1-sack or 1/2-sack as a default value?
5. Mesa wouldn't use Type B-Modified, but I understand it is in there for other agencies.
6. In Note 2 of Detail 200-1, it should be made clear that the choice of "type of backfill and base..." is limited to the choices shown on the detail. Otherwise, it sounds like a wide open choice.
7. In Note 2 of Detail 200-1, "specified" is misspelled.
8. In Note 3 of Detail 200-1, there is an "of" missing.
9. In Note 5 of Detail 200-1, should it be noted that the thicknesses of the base and surface course of AC shall be per the agency's requirements and/or as specified on the plans and specs?
10. In Specification Section 336.2.4.1, there is a requirement to chip seal cuts greater than 600-feet in length. Would the other agencies consider allowing a slurry seal instead?
11. FYI: In Specification Section 336.4, Mesa has our own pay width definition.

Case 09-03

1. Section 796.1 - Does the geosynthetic need to be protected from sunlight while stored outside?
2. Table 796-1 - The font for Class B on the asphalt retention line does not appear to match the font in the rest of the table.
3. Table 796-2 - Should a minimum weight requirement be stated?
4. Table 796-4 - This table seems misplaced. I suggest moving it into or right after Section 796.2.4.

Case 09-04

1. In the 2nd sentence of the sixth paragraph of Section 322.4, "...is not be allowed" should be changed to "...is not allowed" or "...is not to be allowed".

Case 09-05

1. Mesa has no comments at this time.

Case 09-06

1. In the last sentence of the second paragraph of Section 306.6, I suggest changing the "should" to "shall".
2. I suggest that the last sentence of Section 306.8 ("Paving platform found...replaced.") be deleted as not appropriate for a measurement and payment section.

Case 09-07

Here are a few minor comments:

1. Under Section 725.1, first paragraph - I suggest using the words "if specified" in place of the words "if provided for".
2. Under Section 725.2, listing of Type III, low alkali - Suggest changing "when applicable" to "when specified"
3. Where is Section 725.9? What is it meant to contain? Will this section be deleted and the sections re-numbered?

Case 09-09:

1. Proposed language to be inserted immediately prior to paragraph 792.2 (A): I suggest deleting the words "with the bid" in the first sentence of the inserted text. Allowing them to submit after bid opening during the shop drawing submittal stage should be sufficient for most projects. I have found that asking for things to be submitted with the bid often causes problems. (E.g., On a large roadway project, the low bidder doesn't submit the dust palliative material with his bid. The second bidder files a protest, even though the dust palliative work is a very small percentage of the overall project. The agency would be just as well served by seeing the submittal after the bid opening.)
2. Proposed language to be inserted immediately prior to paragraph 792.2(B): You refer to "...a local A-7". What is an A-7? Is it referring to soil classification?
3. Proposed language to be inserted immediately after the title in Section 792.3: I suggest saying "Owner" or "Agency" instead of "Buyer". As stated above, I also would eliminate the words "...at time of bid" altogether without replacement.

That's it.

Thank you,
Gordon Haws, P.E.
Supervising Engineer
City of Mesa Engineering Department
Phone (480) 644-3380, Fax (480) 644-3392