

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

May 2, 2001

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

VOTING MEMBERS

Barry Combs, Chandler	Stacy Caudell, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Pat Thurman, Glendale	* Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)
*David Ramirez, Goodyear	* Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Ted Collins, 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	Sean Goris, ACEA
* Tom Domizi, UTCA	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

\_Paul Ward

GUESTS/VISITORS

Kimberly Shaw of Grace Construction Products  
Ken Riley of Grace Construction Products  
Scott Smith of Smith Pre-Cast  
Steve Borst of Maricopa County Environmental Services Department

\*Members not attending or represented by proxy.

1. Call of Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of April 4, 2001. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes as written. Barry Combs seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2000 Carryover Case:

- a. **Case 00-08-Sections 610.3, 630.4.2, 631.3.5 & 759 - Steel Pipe:** Roger Olsen sent Doug Davis an E-mail informing him and the committee that the City of Phoenix will not be able to have their amendments prepared by the May 2, 2001 meeting. Because of staffing, they may not have the amendment any time in the near future. Roger suggested that the committee move forward without Phoenix.

4. 2001 Submitted Cases:

- a. **Case 01-02-Section 616 - Reclaimed Water Line Construction:** Steve Borst noted that he received the comments from Doug Davis regarding detection wire. There was a short discussion regarding detection tape/wire and warning tape. Out of the discussion, the committee indicated that warning tape above the pipe is not an affective way of notifying a contractor whereas a tape fixed on the water line will be more noticeable. Any warning/location tapes or tracer wires should be taped directly to the top of the pipe. Steve has sent copies of the proposed changes to various agencies and groups that may have an interest in the case. Steve will consolidate the comments from the various persons/groups. A consensus of the comments will be incorporated in the next draft and transmitted to Doug for next's months packet.

5. New Cases:

- a. **Case 01-03-Section 345.2 0 Permanent Pavement Replacement:** Jeff Van Skike submitted a case for the committees' review, comments, and action. A part of the street maintenance program of the City of Phoenix is asphalt overlays. Once the overlay is complete, manhole, value, etc. adjustments are required. When the adjustment consists of a complete removal and replacement of the frames and covers, the adjustments can be quite costly. Whenever conditions permit, Phoenix uses an insert adjustment ring to elevate the lid. They have found the product to work quite well and the cost is considerably less.
- b. **Case 01-04-Section 336.2.4 Adjusting Frames:** Jeff Van Skike submitted a on case for the committees' review, comments and action. The City of Phoenix has seen a number of cases where a utility company install conduits, pipelines, etc. in a paved street. Per the Specifications, the utility company is required to place a seal coat (slurry, chip, microseal, etc.) on half or the full width of the street. The thickness of the seal will leave the manhole frames, valve housings, etc. lower than the adjacent paving and in turn, causing a dip or give the effect of a chuck hole in the street. This case will provide a new paragraph which will require the utility companies to adjust all of the frames and covers affected by the seal coat. SRP and some of the other utility companies require that their crews adjust the frames. Peter Kandaris requested that the adjustment be called out on the plans and submitted to SRP so the adjustments can be scheduled with the utility work.

6. General Discussion:

- a. Kimberly Shaw and Ken Riley from Grace Construction Products addressed the committee regarding the use of Structural Fibers in portland cement concrete. Their intent is to have the fibers used an alternate to the steel reinforcement placed in manhole shaft sections. The steel

in the cones and flat tops will remain. There are a number of fiber additives on the market. They are placed in the concrete to help control shrinkage cracking and not to assist in the structural qualities of the concrete. Structural Fibers is the only non-metallic fiber that is considered a structural product. In a number of the manhole or pipe specifications, continuous steel may not be required. With Structural Fiber, the structural material will be installed throughout the concrete. The fiber can also be placed in shotcrete. The cost is competitive with that of the steel reinforcement. There are no known ACI or ASSHTO standards approved for Structural Fiber. However, the National Precast Concrete Association is looking into developing guidelines on this product. Kimberly and Ken were informed on the steps and procedure necessary to have their product submitted as a case.

- b. Jeff Van Skike questioned the use of CLSM in Type B backfill in Detail 200 or should ABC be an alternate installation. Peter informed Jeff that the backfill in Type B was intended to be only CLSM.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

