

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

July 5, 2000

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

VOTING MEMBERS

*Carl Doak, Chandler	Stacy Caudell, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	*Brian B Pirooz, Peoria
*Pat Thurman, Glendale	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
David Ramirez, Goodyear	*Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)
Ted Collins, MCDOT	Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
*Bob Erdman, MCDOT	Andy Goh, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

*James Pulice, Jr., AGC	Jeff Benedict, ARPA
*Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
Paul Nebeker, UTCA	*Mike Bonar, ACEA
Tom Domizi, UTCA	Sean Goris, ACEA

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

Jim Jones, Division Mgr. of Star Pipe Products
Ryan Andersen, Regional Mgr. of Star Pipe Products
Jim Gauge of Star Pipe Products
Paul Puris of Sandvick Equipment & Supply Co.

* Members not in attendance or represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of June 7, 2000. Jeff Van Skike introduced a motion for a vote with no exceptions. Ted Collins seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 00-03 - Detail 210 - Speed Hump:** Andy Goh provided copies of the case (detail) for review by the committee. During the meeting, the members reviewed the detail and had the following comments and suggested changes: The spacing between the vertical dimensions should be one foot and not two feet as shown on the detail. Change the second Note #7 to #8. Change the title to “Residential Speed Hump”. Number 210 was assigned to the detail. Several cities requested an alternate method be considered for the milled edge. For the transverse milling, they preferred a 18-inch width of existing asphalt be removed and replaced to anchor the ends. For the longitudinal milled edges, the milled edge will be deleted and the new asphalt overlaid on the existing asphalt. Doug Davis will check with his Transportation Division regarding the length of the hump. They may not support the 12-foot dimension.
- b. **Case 00-04 - Detail - Standard Trench Plating Detail -** Andy Goh provided copies of the case (detail) for review by the committee. During the meeting, the members reviewed the detail and had the following comments and suggested changes: The notes should be numbered. Additional notes should address the physical properties of the plate and the design parameters. The depth of the milled shelf or existing asphalt shall be the same as the plate thickness. The removal of the full depth asphalt will not be permitted. Other plate sizes than that shown in the detail will be accepted upon submittal of supportive documentation to the Engineer. The one inch tolerance on each side between the plate and the milled edge should be increased to two inches. The plate profile views should be moved above the table. The duplicated columns and weight column can be deleted. The bottom portion of the trench detail can be deleted.
- c. **Case 00-05 - Miscellaneous Corrections:** There were no discussions or comments regarding this case.
- d. **Case 00-06 - Detail 422 - Brick Sewer Manhole & Cover Frame Adjustment:** The committee reviewed the details provided in the packet and had no comments. Doug Davis suggested to Ted Collins that a scan of the Specifications be conducted to check if any reference to this case is in the Specifications. If no changes are made in the details and no reference to the case is found in the Specifications, a vote could take place in the next meeting.
- e. **Case 00-07 - Section 615.10(B) - Hydrostatic Sewer Test:** Since Roger Olsen did not attend the meeting, Jeff Van Skike spoke on his behalf. Jeff provided copies of the latest revision of the case. Contrary to the discussion of the last meeting, Roger felt that the leakage should be expressed in 100 foot lengths instead of 1,000 feet. There were no comments from the members on the case. If no changes are presented in the next meeting, a vote could be taken.
- f. **Case 00-08 - Section 610 & 759 - Steel Pipe:** Tom Domizi provided a two-year listing of projects constructed with steel pipe. The list was from only two plants owned by Northwest Pipe Company. Doug Davis has comments from Mesa’s staff review however. He did not have the time to personally review them. Once Doug has reviewed the comments, he will contact Tom. No other comments were presented by the members.

4. New Cases:

- a. **Case 00-09 - Section 710 - Asphalt Concrete:** Doug Davis presented two changes in Section 710 for the committee's review and approval. The first change is in table 710-7. In the initial drafting of the new Section 710, the 25-mm mix was placed in the wrong asphalt range. The second item is in the volumetrics production tolerances. The present Specification requires the tolerance to be the design criteria. This is not obtainable or realistic for effective air voids. The case will modify the voids to a reasonable/obtainable limit.
- b. **Case 00-10 - Section 750.3 - Joint Requirements:** Jeff Van Skike presented this case for Roger Olsen. Roger would like the committee to consider Star Pipe Products Stargrip joint restraints. Jim Jones of Star Pipe Products discussed the product with the committee. Jim provided a packet of materials regarding the joint restraint and other products they produce. The Stargrip works very similar to Megalug. Stargrip has its own patent. The patent is in the gripper. Some advantages over Megalugs are: They are replaceable. The nut is screwed onto the shaft with a right-hand thread while the locking device has left-hand threads. The left-hand threads will prohibit improper installation of the device. Stargrip is manufactured for ductile iron pipe only. Different from Megalug, a separate device is manufactured for plastic pipe. The device has a full circular restraint rather than grippers. Stargrips are not manufactured in split rings. Stargrips are compatible with all classes of ductile iron pipe.

5. General Discussion:

- a. Rod Ramos believes he has discovered an inconsistency in Section 792 - Dust Palliative. The application rate given in table 792-1 does not seem sufficient to achieve the penetration as stated in Note #1. Since Peter Kandaris worked on the case, he will check his reference material for an error in the Table.
- b. As a member of ACEA, Sean Goris submits articles to their monthly publication, Newz & Viewz. He is preparing an article on the MAG Specifications and Detail Committee. He will provide a draft to the co-chairmen for their review and editing prior to publication.
- c. The next monthly meeting of the committee will be in conflict with the Streets and Roads conference. Rod Ramos asked for a show of hands of the members that will be in attendance at the next meeting and those that would be in attendance if the meeting be scheduled for the following week. Since full attendance could be achieved on August 9, 2000, the meeting was change to the later date.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p. m.