

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

October 1, 2014

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale, Vice Chair	* Julie Christoph, Mesa
Craig Sharp, Buckeye	Dan Nissen, Peoria
Warren White, Chandler	* Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Antonio Hernandez, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
* Wayne Costa, Florence	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
* Tom Condit, Gilbert	Kristin Tytler, Surprise
* Mark Ivanich, Glendale	Tom Wilhite, Tempe, Chair
Tom Vassallo, Goodyear	Harvey Estrada, Valley Metro
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Gregory Arrington, Youngtown

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Arvid Veidmark, AZUCA	* Peter Kandarlis, Independent
* Mike Sanders, AZUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Amanda McGennis, AGC (proxy)	* Jacob Rodriguez, SRP
Doug Laquey, AGC (proxy)	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Jim Anderson, Olson
Martin Ramirez, FNF Construction
Stew Waller, Rinker

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Wilhite called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

Dan Shafer introduced Kristin Tytler from the City of Surprise. She will be their new representative on the committee. Mr. Wilhite then opened the call to the audience. No members of the audience requested to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the September 3, 2014 meeting minutes. Bob Herz moved to accept the minutes as written. Harvey Estrada seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

Carry Forward 2013 Cases

4. Case 13-15: Revisions to MAG Sections 101, 601, 603, 615 and 618 for Rigid and Flexible Pipe. Updates to Details 200-1, 200-2 and 212. Update Sections 206, 355, 735, 739, 740.

Update pipe installation requirements. Warren White asked members to review the introductory memo for the case, which summarized the changes made since the last committee meeting. The bulleted items were those revised based on feedback during the last water/sewer working group meeting. He said much of the time was spent wordsmithing the sections for the default fill materials in Section 601. A clean version of 601 was provided as a handout at the meeting.

Bob Herz said he also provided a handout of Section 601 that had a few minor corrections and clarifications. He proceeded to highlight the changes which were shown in red on the handout. These included adding “barrel” after pipe in several places to clarify where measurements were made, and using the term “sheathing” instead of “sheeting” and the term “alternative” rather than “alternate”. He also spelled out “controlled low strength material” before the first use of the CLSM abbreviation. It was suggested to reference Sections 604 and 728 for CLSM and a consensus of members agreed. Other corrections were to reference “bedding” rather than “granular” material, add a reference to “Type I Backfill” for water consolidation, and refer to a specific Table 601-2 in Section 601.4.11.

After discussing and agreeing with Mr. Herz’s changes, Warren White went back to discussing other changes to Section 601. He said that Section 603 was combined into Section 601, and so Section 603 would be deleted. The trench widths table (601-1) was updated and included the widths for both rigid and flexible pipe types.

Section 601.4 was changed to clarify the default fill material and options for the different areas. For the bedding, MAG ABC per Section 702 would be the default. For the haunching area ABC would also be the default, however, with agency approval other granular material or CLSM may be used. The initial backfill area would be the same as the haunching area with the additional option to use native material with concrete pipe. The final backfill area is basically the same as currently in MAG. It allows for “sound earthen material” and also references Detail 200-1 for the different options for trench repair.

Jeff Hearne asked if there was a conflict between the text not allowing broken concrete material in 601, but yet also referencing ABC in Section 702, which allows for the use of recycled material as long as it meets all specifications. Warren said that agencies can still allow recycled material in ABC, and that clarifying this issue could be addressed in a future case.

Next he described the final changes to other sections that were included in the packet. In Section 101, the definition for native material was removed because it is defined elsewhere. He noted the changes to Section 206 received from MCDOT were included, and other sections that referenced the deleted Section 603 were also updated. A list of these minor changes to Sections 355, 739 and 740 were included on the back of the summary memo.

Section 615 also deleted references to Section 603 and included updates made by previous cases. Section 618 didn't have any changes since the last meeting. Section 735 included changes Mr. Herz provided due to the RCP case. On Detail 200-2, the trench section detail was updated removing “max” from the trench width note. On Detail 200-1, references to subsections of 601 were changed to refer to Section 601 generally, and a few minor changes were made to the notes. No changes were made to Detail 212. Mr. White asked if there were any questions.

Paul Nebeker cautioned that changing the compaction requirements to 95% could cause problems in the future, especially in easement areas and utilities. Bob Herz said only areas subject to vehicle traffic had to meet Type I requirements, other areas would fall under Type II which was 85% compaction. Mr. Nebeker thanked Herz for the clarification and said he felt the consolidation of the spec made it much easier to use. Tom Wilhite and Jim Badowich also thanked Warren White, the working group, industry representatives, Bob Herz and everyone who helped with the case.

Craig Sharp moved to accept the case as presented, with Mr. Herz's corrections to Section 601 and adding references to the CLSM sections. Jim Badowich seconded the motion. Chair Wilhite restated the motion and listed that the Sections updated included 101, 206, 355, 601, 615, 618, 735, 739, and 740. Details 200-1, 200-2 and 212 would also be updated. Section 603 would be removed.

A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining and 4 not present.

New Cases for 2014

5. Case 14-01: Miscellaneous Corrections.

- A. Change "transverse" to "longitudinal" in Section 321.8.2.
- B. In section 739.1, delete the extra occurrence of the word 'Pipe'.
- C. Delete "OR BRICK" from the title of Section 342.
- D. Change "forecast" to "for cast" in Section 750.3 JOINT REQUIREMENTS.
Revise wording in Section 107.11 to match "careful and prudent manner" in Section 101.2.
- E. Change "off" to "of" in Section 211.3.
- F. Change "values" to "valves" in 336, 345, and 616.
- G. Remove steps from Details 429 and 522. Fix notes.

Bob Herz discussed the new corrections items he provided including changing the word "off" to "of" in Section 211.3, and changing the word "values" to "valves" in several places. Craig Sharp said Misc. Correction G included two details that needed to have the steps removed from the drawings since the step detail was deleted in a previous case. Mr. Herz said that in addition to deleting the step and related callout in Detail 429, he noticed that the units in Note 4 were incorrect. The inches " mark needed to be changed to feet ' after 4 and 6. For Detail 522, Mr. Herz said in addition to deleting the steps and related callouts, Note 5 should be deleted and Note 6 renumbered to 5.

Jami Erickson moved to accept the miscellaneous corrections case A-G, including the modifications to the details as discussed. Bob Herz seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining and 4 not present.

6. Case 14-13: Revisions to Section 321. Incorporate MCDOT Supplements.

Incorporate MCDOT enhancements to Section 321 PLACEMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT into the MAG Specifications. Bob Herz said the included summary highlighted the changes. He said a redlined strikeout and final clean versions were provided in the packet. Mr. Herz explained that although there were questions about whether the thickness penalty table should apply to each layer, he decided to leave it as is. He gave an example of a contractor that was 3/16 short on one layer would not be penalized, and if he was 3/16 on the next layer, he wouldn't receive a penalty per layer, but based on the total thickness he would. Mr. Herz also felt that this also gave the contractor a chance to make up for thickness deficiency on the first layer by making the next layer thicker. He believed the final pavement would meet the strength requirements.

Antonio Hernandez said if the pavement layers are off it could affect the pavement design. Jim Badowich asked about a scenario where the first layer was too thick leaving the top layer too thin. Mr. Herz said there was still a minimum lift thickness the pavement must meet.

Mr. Hernandez commented that MAG needs a spec for how to repair cores. He said there were specs about how to take the cores, but nothing on the proper way to repair the holes, which

could lead to potholes. Rod Ramos thought it was a good comment, but maybe outside the scope of the current case. Jeff Benedict said they could address this problem at a future working group meeting and asked Mr. Hernandez to send the specs they use. Arvid Veidmark discussed how ADOT makes the repair using a type of grout. Mr. Hernandez said he would want matching asphalt. Tom Wihite said he also had concerns on the repair of pavement punctures. Mr. Veidmark noted that puncturing operations do go beyond the subgrade. For repairs, he said they typically were grouted and then repaved using a milling operation. Warren White said their discussions on pot-hole repair may relate to this issue.

With no further discussion, Mr. Herz moved to accept the case as presented. Rod Ramos seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 12 yes, 1 no, 0 abstaining and 4 not present.

7. Case 14-19: Revisions to Section 325 and 717.

Add provisions for terminal-blended asphalt-rubber binder (ARB). Jeff Benedict introduced Doug Laquay who was filling in for Brian Gallimore of AGC, and who worked on the details of the case. He said the case primarily was to provide a method for acceptance testing using grade samples rather than only at the plant. The handout provided a list of all the revisions.

One of the revisions was removing “terminal” when referring to the plant so it was not confused with “terminal-blended” asphalt-rubber binder. There were a few other wording corrections. Mr. Laquay said they also updated Section 325.7.2 to make the default method for getting material into the paver hopper be to have the hauling vehicles dump directly into the paving machine. This was to avoid tracking of asphalt-rubber onto adjacent pavements. He also discussed how when samples are obtained at the plant, adjustments can be made on-the-spot to get the mix correct, but at grade the samples are tested later, and can’t be adjusted on site. This was the reason for adding a penalty table for samples that don’t meet the standards.

Jeff Benedict said that samples from the lay-down machine tend to have lower numbers because there is draw-down during the handling. The testing procedure uses language similar to that in Section 321. Another change was adding language to allow coring in Section 325.9.5. Mr. Laquay said that Section 717 added language about the binder, and also used the ARB abbreviation rather than spelling out Asphalt-Rubber Binder every time.

Antonio asked about the differences between blending rubber at the hot plant and onsite. Jeff Benedict discussed how the trucks have agitators that can deliver the asphalt-rubber to several different plants without difficulty. He also clarified that no TR is involved in this process.

With no further discussion, Mr. Ramos moved to accept the case as presented. Mr. Herz seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the case was approved: 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining and 4 not present.

8. Working Group Reports

Chair Wilhite asked for reports from the working group chairs.

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

Jim Badowich said the last meeting was September 11, so the group could work on items discussed at the last committee meeting and so that Mr. Herz could attend. Mr. Badowich said the group spent most of the time finalizing Case 13-15. He said they also had an update to the proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling specifications, which will continue to be worked on next year.

b. **Asphalt/Materials Working Groups**

Jeff Benedict said the group would be on break until next year, but they will then continue to work on the Preservations Seal carry-over case. He said they can also look at the issue of repairing cores as discussed, and will likely have other updates to Section 321. One area they are looking at is in the area of permits for development work.

c. **Concrete Working Group**

Jeff Hearne said he would look at the sections that have not been touched yet, but doesn't have anything specific at this point. Warren White asked if addressing the ADA ramp issue would be appropriate for the group.

d. **Outside Right-of-Way Working Group**

Peter Kandarlis was not present to provide an update.

9. General Discussion

Gordon Tyus again asked agency members to review the contact list of public works director and provide any updates to him. He provided an outline of the steps needed to complete the updates to the specs book including reviews by the public works directors, MAG Management Committee and Regional Council. He said he would post the update packet on the website, and said the updated cases were also provided on the "2014 Cases Under Consideration" page. He said the final updated books would be a complete new edition and were planned to be printed and available in January.

Tom Vasallo asked about the ASTM access. Mr. Tyus said the individual cities need to connect directly through the ASTM provider. He can provide the contact information for members.

10. Future Agenda Items:

Chair Wilhite asked members about future potential cases and items for discussion. He noted that January and February meetings were typically a good time for presentations if there were issues the committee to hear.

Some of the comments included:

- Reviewing ADA requirements and the need for dual ramps.
- Bob Herz mentioned he has some potential cases.
- Jeff Benedict said there were lots of possibilities including equipment with intelligent compaction systems, and other technologies.
- Jim Badowich asked about fiberglass reinforced asphalt.
- Amanda McGinnis reminded members about the upcoming ASU Materials Conference the 17th and 18th. She said she could provide the information to Gordon Tyus.
- Tom Wilhite mentioned the use of green technologies
- Gordon Tyus would like references to asbestos pipe removed from the specs.
- Tom Wilhite also asked members if they knew of any legislation that would affect the specifications.

11. Adjournment:

Seeing no further business, the chair thanked members for their service and the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.