

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

May 5, 2010

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Jim Badowich, Avondale	Mike Samer, Mesa
* Scott Zipprich, Buckeye	Jesse Gonzales, Peoria, Chairman
Warren White, Chandler	Syd Anderson, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
* Dennis Teller, El Mirage	Jami Erickson, Phoenix (Water)
Edgar Medina, Gilbert	Mark Palichuk, Queen Creek
John Flatt, Glendale (proxy)	Rodney Ramos, Scottsdale
Troy Tobiasson, Goodyear, Vice Chairman	Jason Mahkovtz, Surprise
Bob Herz, MCDOT	Tom Wilhite, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA	Jeff Hearne, ARPA
Jeff Benedict, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP
Tony Braun, NUCA	Paul R. Nebeker, Independent
Bill Davis, NUCA (proxy)	Mike Smith, ARPA
Brian Gallimore, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Gordon Tyus

* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Niranjan Vescio, Stronggo

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jesse Gonzales called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the April 7, 2010 meeting minutes. Tom Wilhite noted his name was misspelled twice under Case 09-15. Bob Herz introduced a motion to accept the minutes with the correction noted by Mr. Wilhite. Jason Mahkovtz seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2009 Cases (old cases)

a. Case 09-13 – ADA-Compliant Dual Sidewalk Ramps: *Develop ADA-compliant details for 35-foot and 20-foot corner radius dual sidewalk ramps.* Jesse Gonzales said he met with staff from the City of Phoenix regarding the dual ramp design Phoenix has developed, but not yet published. He said the Phoenix detail has most of the same design elements as the draft design he previously submitted, but was further along in development. Mr. Gonzales proposed to substitute the Phoenix dual ramp detail (with some modifications) as a replacement for the previous submission at the next committee meeting.

b. Case 09-14 – Revise Ramps for ADA Compliance: *Revise Details 231, 232, 233 and 234 to obtain compliance with ADA requirements.* Bob Herz provided two new details for Curb Ramp – Type ‘C’ to replace the current MAG Detail 233. The new details modify ramps to include a 5’ landing. *Option A* shows ramps for sidewalks adjacent to curbs, and *option B* illustrates ramps for sidewalks set back from the curb. The width of the ramps would vary depending on the curb height. Rod Ramos noted that the ramps could have a slope greater than 12-1 for some installations if you only go by the table that determines dimension ‘D’. He promoted the use of an elevation worksheet as is done in Scottsdale, or the use delta elevations to determine an allowable range for the use of the detail. Jesse Gonzales suggested that a note could be added to clarify slope requirements. Members agreed that the slopes need to be checked, and the detail may need to be modified depending on site conditions. Mr. Herz asked for additional feedback from the committee on these details as well as the previously submitted Detail 232.

c. Case 09-15 – Revisions to Section 610.4 for Water Line Handling: *Modify 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.* Tom Wilhite said he had not received any comments since last month. Jesse Gonzales said that many aspects of this case were discussed during the first Pipe/Water Working Group meeting on April 21, such as the proper handling of pipes and potential possibilities for contamination. Mr. Gonzales said he would summarize the discussion and forward his notes to Mr. Wilhite.

4. 2010 Cases (new cases)

d. Case 10-01 – Miscellaneous Bloopers: *Correct typographic errors.* Bob Herz provided a new blooper Case 10-01c to correct a typographical error in Section 321.10.2. The incorrect table is referenced in the top paragraph of page 321-7. The reference to Table 321-6 is to be changed to Table 321-5. Members discussed whether this simple

change could be voted on during the meeting. Peter Kandaris said the practice in the past has been to announce the vote a month prior to action. Members agreed to schedule a vote on Case 10-01c at the next committee meeting.

e. Case 10-02 – Utility Pothole Repair: *Revise and add keyhole repair to Detail 212 and add new Sections 355 and 708.* Peter Kandaris said he had not received comments since the last meeting. Jesse Gonzales said he thought the case was in good shape and asked if members were ready for a vote. Bob Herz said he would like to review it further, and since he will not be able to attend the June meeting, suggested the vote be postponed a couple months so Maricopa County and other agencies can complete a final review of the proposed changes.

f. Case 10-03 – Modify Section 336 Pavement Matching and Surfacing Replacement: *Revise Section 336 to be in conformance with changes made last year to Detail 200-1 and Detail 200-2.* Peter Kandaris said he has not received any additional comments. There was some discussion on whether references to Detail 200 should be updated to specify Detail 200-1 or 200-2 since the details now occupy two sheets.

g. Case 10-04 – Revise Section 109.8: *Remove quotations of Arizona Revised Statutes from text located in Section 109.8 PAYMENT FOR DELAY.* Bob Herz proposed to schedule a vote on the case at the next committee meeting.

h. Case 10-05 – Revise FOREWORD: *Clarify use of the MAG Specifications and Details for Public Works document.* Jesse Gonzales said he received comments from a professional engineer on the language referencing professional judgment. He also gave an example of landscape architect that refused to use MAG details because he did not know who or how they were created. Peter Kandaris said that according to the AZ Board of Technical Registration, registrants are not required to seal agency details, but they are required to provide a disclaimer that they didn't prepare the details. Bob Herz mentioned that problems also occur when engineers are not using the details appropriately.

i. Case 10-06 – Revise Controlled Low Strength Materials (CLSM) Specifications: *Update the CLSM specifications in Sections 604, 701 and 728 to match current industry standards.* Jeff Hearne of ARPA provided updated revisions based on feedback received from Maricopa County. He then led the committee through the changes for each section. For section 701, there was much discussion about whether the C-33 grading size No. 57 aggregate should be added back into the specifications as a default. Bob Herz said that Maricopa County liked the current specification, and knew the CLSM would work with this aggregate. Several other members agreed to have it as the default. Mr. Hearne explained that the reason the working group took it out was to allow more flexibility in the mix design. Other members suggested that the engineer could still specify a custom mix if they wanted. Mr. Hearne suggested that Section 701.3.5 remain as it currently is in MAG to retain the No. 57 aggregate as the default.

For section 728, Mr. Hearne went through the minor changes. Rod Ramos suggested moving the word “generally” in the note for Table 728-1. Several members provided

comments about the compressive strength column in Table 728-1. Mr. Hearne said there was much discussion about this in the Concrete Working Group meetings. It was thought that if you didn't have a "recipe" to follow, guidelines would be needed when creating new mix designs. Maximum values for ½ sack and 1 sack were to ensure excavability, whereas for 1 ½ sack, a minimum strength was needed for its use in encasement applications. Members were concerned about the testability of these strengths and that the table may be misused for acceptance criteria. Since the No. 57 aggregate and the amount of cement used are now the defaults, it would follow a recipe that provides acceptable strength. Syd Anderson said Phoenix has specific product codes for the mixes they accept. Paul Nebeker said it would be nice to be able to call out a MAG CLSM mix rather than many different city mixes. Mr. Hearne agreed to remove the third column of Table 728-1.

For section 604, discussion focused on how to clearly note if and when ready-mix concrete would be allowed as a replacement for CLSM. It was suggested to include language that required prior approval from the engineer for its use as a CLSM substitute. Jeff Hearne said he would revise the case based on the committee's feedback and provide an update prior to the next meeting for further review.

j. Case 10-07 – Revise Detail 230 – Sidewalks to change minimum from 4' to 5': *Revise the minimum sidewalk width to match the minimum ADA requirements for two wheel chairs to pass, and to allow a wheel chair to u-turn.* Bob Herz provided an updated detail that showed the grade break at the back of the sidewalk since it is included in Maricopa County's detail. One comment noted the grade break would not be needed for areas with zero setbacks from the sidewalk. Rod Ramos said Scottsdale has a supplement that uses a thicker concrete sidewalk that can support the weight of emergency vehicles that may drive over them. John Ashley asked if the 1" drop from the sidewalk to the planter area could cause a tripping hazard. Mr. Herz said it is not designed for pedestrians to walk in that area and other supplemental details also have the 1" elevation difference.

k. Case 10-08 – Revise Section 717 Asphalt Rubber. *Revise Section 717 ASPHALT-RUBBER to obtain a uniform specification.* Bob Herz presented a new case to update the Asphalt-Rubber section of MAG to match Maricopa County's current supplement. He said he will be coordinating efforts with Phoenix to try and incorporate their rubberized asphalt supplement as well. It was noted the ADOT has their own asphalt-rubber specifications but they are designed for highway/freeway use.

l. Case 10-09 – Revise Safety Rail Detail 145. *Adjust Detail 145 to comply with AASHTO pedestrian loading requirements.* Bob Herz submitted a new case that updates MAG's safety rail detail to meet the AASHTO loading requirements of 50 plf applied at the top of the rail. This is done by decreasing the distance between posts and specifying a higher grade B steel post. Committee members asked if it was necessary to change the spacing if the rail is used as intended. Mr. Herz said on a project in Maricopa County the railing was used along a bridge and had to meet AASHTO standards. He said the revisions would also meet building code standards. Jami Erickson asked if the railing shown on the scupper detail should also be updated.

m. Case 10-10 – Proposed New Detail 122 – Pavement Marker for Fire Hydrants. *The new detail would standardize placement of fire hydrant markers and enhance public safety.* Bob Herz submitted a new Detail 122 that identified standard locations of fire hydrant pavement markers for local streets (including those with left turn lanes and medians), cul-de-sacs, and types of intersections. He asked for members to take the detail back to their agencies and fire departments to see if they will work as shown.

n. Case 10-11 – Revise Detail 110 – Plan Symbols. *Update and expand graphic standards to have plans be more uniform among MAG agencies.* Bob Herz presented a case that summarized the recommendations of the Symbols Working Group. Many additional linetypes and symbols are proposed to be added to MAG based on a consensus of their uses by different agencies participating in the working group. He said that existing and proposed symbols could be designated by gray shading or by using dashed lines as determined by current agency practices. Rod Ramos had questions about traffic related symbols such as standard pole symbols, push buttons and the video camera and if additional symbols were needed. Mr. Herz explained some weren't added since traffic signal symbols were typically on a separate drawing and not needed for normal plan drawings, however, some symbols such as the video camera were added when there was a consensus among agencies. Mr. Ramos also questioned whether lines needed to be shown coming out of symbols such as water valves and manholes. Since the linetypes that go to them identify what the symbol is, additional notation may not be required. Bob Herz asked members to review the new symbols and provide comments.

o. Case 10-12 – New Section 361 – Shallow Depth Fiber Optic Micro-Conduit Installation. *Provide specifications for the installation of underground fiber optic micro-conduit telecommunications facilities within the public right-of-way.* Rod Ramos introduced this case with a brief outline of the proposed specification. He said he would submit a more comprehensive version at a future meeting, but welcomed comments and additions from members.

5. General Discussion:

Chairman Gonzales introduced Shimin Li of the Maricopa County Environmental Services Water and Waste Water division to fill the position left vacant. Members welcomed him to the committee.

Potential Speed Hump Case

Warren White said Chandler has developed additional speed hump details and asked if the committee was interested in reviewing them. General discussion about the use of speed humps and the drainage issues that can result when installed on existing streets followed.

AASHTO and ASTM Standards

Jeff Hearne commented that AASHTO was considering developing a web portal similar to ASTM. Gordon Tyus said that for the ASTM web portal, MAG has placed the project in the

FY 2011 MAG Budget and Work Program currently under review by the Management Committee and Regional Council, and that if approved, may allow MAG to fund the project.

Specifications and Details Outside the Right-of-Way Working Group Update

Peter Kandaris provided a report on the first meeting of this working group which was convened to address issues of public works construction outside of the right-of-way, up to the building envelope area addressed by building codes. Currently this gray area does not have any standardized specifications and details. Mr. Kandaris handed out a memo summarizing the discussions from the April 28 kick-off meeting. The memo has been posted on the MAG website. <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/detail.cms?item=11976>

He explained that the working group planned to involve many outside agencies and vendors on different issue areas, and that ASU was interested in participating on the sustainability aspect of the types of projects where these standards may be used. He said the working group planned to use a format similar to the supplements that Phoenix produces. He was working on a check list used to determine whether a MAG specification should be included or not, and if so, should it be modified. Other items that could be included are new specifications such as the pervious concrete or parking lot construction. Many agency supplements could contribute sections that are not applicable in the right-of-way such as landscaping.

Jesse Gonzales said his agency wanted to make sure that tax dollars are not spent on private development work. Mr. Kandaris said that although developers may use them, the intention is as standards for public works projects. Mr. Gonzales also mentioned that he is working on an updated draft of the 616 Reclaimed Water specifications that has been modified for use outside the right-of-way.

Rubber Gasket Requirements

Bob Herz said MAG 618.2 requires rubber gaskets to use 60% rubber, however AASHTO does not make this requirement. He asked if anyone knew the rationale for the MAG requirement, and if one was not found he would consider a case to revise 618.2 to match the AASHTO standard.

Debris Caps

Jesse Gonzales asked if there was interest among the committee in removing the debris cap requirements from MAG specifications. Jami Erickson and other members believe the cost and hassle of using the caps may exceed their maintenance benefits.

Local Government Contracts for Federal Projects/MAG Sample Contracts

Gordon Tyus said he received a call from the ADOT Civil Rights office inquiring about local project contracts referencing the MAG Specifications and Details. A representative from the ADOT office told Mr. Tyus that projects funded with federal dollars such as ARRA need to meet additional requirements. Mr. Tyus told the committee that the MAG specifications do not provide for this, and additional contract language would be required. Jami Erickson said that Phoenix is doing many paving projects with ARRA funds and they can assist other agencies with meeting federal requirements if necessary. Gordon Tyus also said that MAG's sample contracts have not been updated recently, and asked if any agencies refer to them, or

if the committee should consider their removal. Tom Wilhite said Tempe does use them. Mr. Tyus said MAG's attorney is going to review them for possible changes. Peter Kandaris submitted typographic corrections to the table of contents for the sample contracts/forms section.

Arizona Utility Coordinating Committee Project Improvement Project Guide

Jesse Gonzales said a member of the AUCC asked him to consider incorporating or referencing the project guide above in the MAG specifications. Members commented that the guide mainly referred to the design process, not the construction specifications, so much of it may not be applicable. Jami Erickson said she sat in on the AUCC meetings and could report on areas where references may be appropriate.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.