

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

October 5, 2011

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	Mike Samer, Mesa
Scott Zipprich, Buckeye	* Javier Setovich, Peoria
Warren White, Chandler	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
* Dave Emon, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Greg Crossman, Gilbert	Marc Palichuk, Queen Creek
Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Chair	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Vice Chair

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
* Tony Braun, NUCA	Peter Kandaris, SRP
* Kwigs Bowen, NUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Brian Gallimore, AGC	
Adrian Green, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Arturo Chavarria, Hanson Pipe and Precast
Don Cornelison, Speedie & Associates
Jim Easterly, NUCA
Art Glover, Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Michael Hook, ACPA
Jerre Mills, Regional Pavement
Matt Rogers, ADS

1. Call to Order

Chairman Troy Tobiasson called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the September 7, 2011 meeting minutes. Jason Mahkovtz introduced a motion to accept the minutes as written. Greg Crossman seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Review of 2011 Cases Scheduled for a Vote

4. Case 11-13 – Replace Current Manhole Frame and Cover Details

Replace Details 423, and 424 with new details of products that are currently being manufactured. Scott Zipprich handed out updates to Details 423-1, 423-2, 424-1 and 424-2. He explained that the revised details are representative of the manhole frame and covers that agencies are currently receiving today. The only exception is the addition of a rubber seal for water-tight frames and covers. Also, revised details for Detail 523 – Pressure Manhole were removed from the case, since there wasn't time to make all the necessary revisions. Some of the revisions made included adding the ring thickness dimensions, and removing extraneous dimensions that were not needed. These details also added a plus or minus 2% weight and a 1/16th of an inch tolerance on all dimensions to allow minor variation for different manufacturers and the casting process. Mr. Zipprich asked members for any additional comments, and if they felt comfortable voting on the case. Mr. Tyus said the current MAG details are dimensioned for the class 30 cast iron, not the class 35 used today, so the new details would be more accurate. Mr. Herz said it could reduce problems with overzealous inspectors that reject products based on the old details. Jim Badowich moved and Scott Zipprich seconded a motion to approve Case 11-13 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

After the vote, Mr. Zipprich asked the members about their agencies use of bolt-down covers to reduce theft, and if there was a need for a bolt-down cover detail separate from the pressure manhole. Peter Kandaris said SRP occasionally uses them for this purpose. Paul Nebeker mentioned the difficulty of lining up the bolts. Tom Wilhite asked him if two bolts would be sufficient. He replied that he thought it would, although there would be other bolt holes. Others mentioned welding down the covers as an option. Scott Zipprich concluded that there wasn't a strong need for a separate bolt-down cover detail, and that future revisions to the pressure manhole may be satisfactory.

5. Case 11-19: Modify Section 340: Detectable Warnings

Modify Section 340 to provide performance-based detectable warning specifications. Peter Kandaris said the latest version removed specific material requirements, keeping mainly the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) language. The revised specification added a minimum static friction coefficient of 0.8 as per ASTM C1028 for the truncated domes.

Mr. Herz asked how a “design service life of 30 years” was determined. Mr. Kandaris said the working group was worried that types of materials such as rubber mats may not be adequately durable, and this was an attempt reduce future maintenance. Other members agreed that it would be difficult to define a 30 year service life without performance specifications. It was agreed to remove this line since agencies still had final approval of products.

Another issue Mr. Herz raised was the language about the colors. Some members objected to requiring white on dark (asphalt) and brick red on light (concrete). Currently the spec recommends yellow. It was decided to remove this sentence about the colors and have the color approved by the agency. Mr. Herz noted that the use of adhesives was not allowed. Mr. Kandaris said the working group did not want to allow adhesives, but that agencies could make exceptions such as for retrofits.

Bob Herz also asked what was meant by a “proven wet-set anchoring mechanism.” Members discussed how this could be interpreted. There was some confusion as to what an “anchoring mechanism” was, and if other terminology such as “attachment” or “anchoring process” should be substituted. It also wasn’t clear if anchoring meant anchor bolts, or if a roughened surface was adequate. Scott Zipprich asked if paving bricks could be used. Jim Badowich also asked if “cast-in-place” could be confused to allow the warnings themselves to be cast-in-place rather than manufactured prior to installation. Mike Samer suggested the attachment systems also be approved by the agency. Mr. Kandaris worked on language to help clarify that the detectable warning system would be installed in wet-set concrete in a way that provided a secure attachment.

Warren White suggested the last sentence referencing specific details be removed since the details may change, or additional details may be added in the future. The group agreed to delete this sentence. Peter Kandaris made revisions to the case during the discussion and provided feedback of the final language to the full committee.

Greg Crossman moved and Scott Zipprich seconded a motion to approve Case 11-19 with all the changes and revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 3 not present.*

6. Case 11-22: Revise Sections 325 and 717: Asphalt Rubber Specifications

Separate material and construction methods and give guidance to rubber specification. Jeff Benedict said he had received no further comments since the last meeting.

Bob Herz noticed that the version of the case in the packet was not the latest version that had incorporated the county's comments, and was concerned if other agencies had reviewed the latest version. Mr. Benedict said it was unfortunate because the current MAG specifications are not being used, and need to be updated. Members asked if the changes were relatively minor and could be summarized. Mr. Benedict explained some of the changes which included: cryogenic processes would not be permitted, the Marshall stability was raised from 600 lbs to 800 lbs, and several smaller changes were made to wording and formatting.

Mr. Kandarlis noted that the final revised version was presented at the September meeting where Maricopa County's changes were included and discussed, so the members did have had the final version available for the past month. He asked if any other agency had changes or comments since then. Since there were none, the committee agreed that they would refer to the revision that was presented during the September 7th meeting. Mr. Tyus said if members were clear that they are referring to the prior version, the committee could proceed with a vote.

Jim Badowich moved and Rod Ramos seconded a motion to approve Case 11-22 as presented during the September 7th meeting with the revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

7. Case 11-23: Revise Section 321: Asphalt Concrete Pavement

Address compaction issues and update Section 321. Jeff Benedict asked if there were any comments. Greg Crossman discussed clarifying tables regarding permitted work and the Engineering Analysis. Don Cornelison explained some of the changes including reducing the number of cores required per or sub-lot (500 tons or 1 day's production), because now they are taking many more cores than needed. This would also reduce testing workload. Troy Tobiasson asked how this would affect penalties. There was discussion about the number of cores needed, and if additional cores would be allowed to determine the extents of the deficient pavement or not. Jim Badowich said that the penalties were not sufficient to offset the increased future maintenance. He also said for residential streets and those with cul-de-sacs, the proposed coring would not be enough. Brian Gallimore suggested adding one core per street (for local/residential) and one core per lane for arterials. The sponsors were directed to update the language regarding coring and testing as discussed. Scott Zipprich added that the cores not be used to evaluate the extent of the deficiency, but be used for the whole sub-lot, with regards to penalties. Revisions discussed would be added to 321.10.1 Acceptance Criteria.

Bob Herz asked for a correction to Section 321.10.2. The reference to AASHTO T209 Section 11, should be Section 15. Another minor correction was to correct the word value to valve in the last paragraph of 321.8.6.

Tom Wilhite said he sent an email with several minor corrections, which was included in the agenda packet. Jeff Benedict said he hadn't noticed the email in time to make the corrections, but that they could be included in the update.

Rod Ramos moved and Tom Wilhite seconded a motion to approve Case 11-24 with the revisions discussed, and other corrections noted. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

8. Case 11-24: Add new Section 337: Crack Sealing

Add a new section with clear limits of its use and scope of crack sealing. There were questions about the specific material used for Crack Sealing. The most common brand name used is Pollyflex 3, which is designed for the desert environment. Mr. Kandarlis said you should use a different type in Northern Arizona. The agency is allowed to modify the type of sealant. Phoenix said they primarily use the Pollyflex 3 without problems. The final version includes the revisions previously discussed including removing references to blowing and incorporating Maricopa County's comments. Mr. Herz asked if the spec included filling material. Jeff Benedict suggested removing references to crack filling in the title and elsewhere and include only crack sealing for clarity. Jim Badowich moved and Greg Crossman seconded a motion to approve Case 11-24 with the revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 12 yes, 0 no, 1 abstaining, 2 not present.*

9. Case 11-29: Revise Section 701. Rock, Gravel and Sand (renamed Aggregates)

Revise Section 701. Change title from Rock, Gravel and Sand to Aggregates. Move materials to appropriate sections, and clarify types of aggregates. Update all references to Section 701. Brian Gallimore said he received no comments. Jeff Hearne said he received some comments from Art Glover at the County Flood Control District. Mr. Hearne said he explained and clarified the specifications, but that no changes were required or made to the case. Peter Kandarlis noted that the cover memo summarizes the changes. The case includes changes to all the other sections affected by the revisions to Section 701. Rod Ramos moved and Bob Herz seconded a motion to approve Case 11-29 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

10. Case 11-30: Update Section 702: Base Material and Section 310 Untreated Base Course

Update Section 702: Base Material. Revise for current standards. Brian Gallimore said he received no new comments. Scott Zipprich noticed that the ABC fractured faces requirement was reduced from 50%-30%, to be like ADOT, but the grading requirements of ADOT base were not the same as MAG. Don Cornelison said the 50% fracture face requirement was for crushed rock, there was none for gravel. He said he thought the grading band in MAG was superior to ADOT, that the new ABC was the best of both, and that the R-value for MAG was comparable to ADOT.

Bob Herz said the county did not have time to review this case, and would prefer to postpone a vote until next year. Syd Anderson said the City of Phoenix also wants time to review it. Troy Tobiasson said due to the agencies' need to have more time to review the case it would be carried forward to 2012.

11. Case 11-31: Revise Sections 220 and 703: Riprap

Revise Sections 220 and 703: Riprap. Indicate proper aggregate size and testing methods. Peter Kandarlis said the case was fairly simple. The last changes were made a couple months ago. The updates included having the proper testing requirements in Section 703 and updating grout specifications in Section 220. Syd Anderson moved and Jim Badowich seconded a motion to approve Case 11-31 as presented. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

12. Case 11-32: Modify Section 309: Lime Slurry Stabilization

Modify Section 309: Lime Slurry Stabilization to include the use of hydrated lime, add mix criteria, testing procedures and payment. Brian Gallimore said he received comments from Maricopa County on Section 309.2.2 to put the prohibition on quicklime back in. The text to be added back in would read, “The direct use of quicklime to the soil material is strictly prohibited.” The reference to quicklime would need to be deleted from Section 309.3.2 (a) and 309.4.4.1 as well. Peter Kandarlis also noted that in Section 309.2.3 (A) the chemical formulas should be using the letter “O” not the number “0”. Greg Crossman moved and Syd Anderson seconded a motion to approve Case 11-32 with the revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 2 not present.*

13. Case 11-33: Revise Section 311: Soil Cement Base Course

Revise Section 311: Soil Cement Base Course. Clarify and update the construction methods of cement treated subgrade. Bob Herz discussed references regarding optimum moisture in Section 311.4.4. He said the ASTM specification referenced wasn’t sufficient because testing with a nuclear gage could give a false reading. Peter Kandarlis said it could reference AASHTO test T-394 instead of T-217 or have some other test to get accurate moisture content measure. Greg Crossman said in Section 311.4.8 the purpose of the Engineering Analysis (EA) needs to be clear, and their needs to be recommendations on what to do. Brian Gallimore said the EA would help determine what needs to be done. Mr. Crossman said the engineer shall determine what corrective actions if any are required based on the EA. Bob Herz said to clarify the ASTM reference in Section 311.4.6, delete “standards as specified above.” And replace it with the specific reference to ASTM D6938. Greg Crossman moved and Syd Anderson seconded a motion to approve Case 11-33 with the revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 4 not present.*

14. Case 11-34: Revise Section 312: Cement Treated Base

Revise Section 312: Cement Treated Base to add provisions for measuring moisture content and update density testing procedures. Bob Herz said to replace reference to ASTM D2932 with D6938. The same concerns about moisture content discussed in Section 311 also apply to this case. Mr. Herz said references to the Arizona test method should be specified consistently in Section 312.3 and 705.4. Greg Crossman moved and Syd Anderson seconded a motion to approve Case 11-33 with the revisions discussed. A roll call vote was taken. *The case was approved: 11 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining, 4 not present.*

Carry Forward Cases

15. Case 11-21: Add new Section 623: Special Bedding for Mainline Storm Drain Pipe

Incorporate City of Phoenix supplement 623 into the MAG standards. Syd Anderson said a revised version of the case was included in the packet. He said he thinks there is some misunderstanding on the purpose of the specification with some suppliers. Mr. Anderson said this supplement is used by the City of Phoenix to deal with settlement issues on pipe 36" and larger. This is used on all pipe, not just corrugated metal or HDPE. He said Phoenix intends to keep the supplement this year and discussion on the issue can continue in 2012.

16. Working Group Reports

Chair Tobiasson again thanked the working groups and participants for all the work during the past year, stating that all the revisions done this year would have been possible without them.

a. **Specifications and Details Outside the Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandaris said the next meeting will follow the Water/Sewer Working Group meeting on October 18th.

b. **Water/Sewer Issues Working Group**

Jim Badowich said the last meeting spent time finalizing the manhole frame and cover details, and also discussed changes to the fire hydrant details including the use of offset connections. Notes of the meeting were provided in the packet. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 18th at 1:30 at the MAG office.

17. Staff Reports

Due to the length of the meeting, none was provided.

18. Additional Meetings in November and December

Chair Tobiasson reintroduced the idea of adding committee meetings in November and December to continue work on carry forward cases. He said in addition to carry forward cases, the committee could begin looking at future cases such as ASTM updates and cases that were previously withdrawn. Warren White mentioned cases based on the final ADA guidelines such as dual ramp details could also be reviewed. Members asked about meeting requirement and voting issues. Mr. Tyus explain that members could still vote on cases, but that those revisions would not be included in the standards until the following year. He said that the committee would still need a quorum of members present; otherwise the meeting would have to be canceled. Mr. Zipprich mentioned that MAG staff needed time to work on this year's updates. Continuing work on the cases in Working Groups was discussed as another option to continue finalizing carry forward cases. Members agreed due to current workloads, and the upcoming holidays, it would be better to make revisions at the working

group meetings, with the goal of having carry forward cases ready for a final vote in March of 2012, rather than waiting until the end of the year to vote on active cases.

19. Open General Discussion

In response to Mr. Herz's request, Mr. Tyus said he would post final copies of approved cases on the MAG website for members to review.

20. Adjournment:

Mr. Tobiasson adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.