

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

April 7, 1999

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

VOTING MEMBERS

Carl Doak, Chandler	Lisa Ruane, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Pat Thurman, Glendale	Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)
* Joe Evans, Goodyear	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	

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Laura Stegall, MAG

GUESTS/VISITORS

Steve Watters of Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:39 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 3, 1999 were approved.

3. Submitted Cases:

- a. **99-01 - Section 603.4.2 - HDPE Pipe Bedding:** Doug Davis requested further data on the shape of the ribs, e.g., the width of the valley at the outside diameter and at the midpoint. If the data is not available, a small sample (6" x 6") of the pipe would suffice. The sizes in question would be 4", 6", 8", & 10" diameters. Doug questioned the 95% compaction with ABC and the possibility of floating the pipe. Steve Watters indicated that the pipe could be floated in the smaller sizes if the contractor did not take care with the compaction of the material. When asked, Steve did not have a problem if the committee required chips in the smaller pipe diameters (4", 6", & 8"). Mark Weiner informed the committee that Gilbert requires chips to 6" above the pipe. Pat Thurman of Glendale requires only ABC. The problem with chips is the water infiltration (could cause settlement) and with re-excavation (will not hold vertical walls on trenches).
- b. **99-02 B - Detail 101-1 & 101-2 - Index:** The case was resubmitted with the correct page numbers and placed in the monthly mailing for the committee's review and comments. The members had no comments on this case.
- c. **99-03 - Sections 104 & 105 - Partnering:** Pat Thurman provided a discussion on the merits of the case. He submitted the case in behalf of the AGC. The basic purpose of the case is to provide a frame work to resolve disputes between contractors and agencies. Doug Davis had several preliminary comments on the case. A short summary of the comments are as follows: 1) partnering should be selected on a project by project basis by the agency and not every project, 2) The case referred to several people (titles) not defined by the MAG Specifications, 3) Notifications should apply to all projects and not to the selected projects as discussed in item 1 above, 4) The time for response in Part C, (Page 14) could be increased, 5) Mesa does not agree with part E, (page 14) and should be deleted and 6) the long version of Section 105.17 is preferred (page 15). Carl Doak suggested that item 5 above be written to permit the non-binding and/or binding arbitration upon agreement between both parties.

4. New Cases:

No new cases were submitted.

5. General Discussion:

- a. Laura Stegall of the MAG administration, provided a demonstration of the new MAG Specifications on the Internet. There will not be ample room in the computer for all of the details. Laura will place the latest detail revisions on the site. Only the most common details or current changed details will be placed on the web site.
- b. Bob Erdman requested the status of the MAG Metric. Laura will have the first draft ready for review by the end of this month. Bob agreed to provide the proofing of the specifications and details.
- c. A memo from Doug Davis was placed in this month's packet regarding the reflective tape placed on the barricade in Detail 130. The tape will not adhere to the painted wood members. Doug requested comments on how each agency is handling the problem. He

will need the information by next meeting. After the feed back, Doug may enter it as a case.

- d. Maricopa County obtains bids for various maintenance work for streets, etc. Other agencies that would like to have the County perform some of this work via IGA or other agreement, will need to contact Bob Erdman. By pulling together, better unit costs can be obtained. The County will administer the work, including inspection. Bob will publish (fax or Internet) a complete list of work the county is offering.
 - e. A fax has been sent to various agencies regarding the dust suppressants in MAG Specifications. Several are carcinogenic in nature. Doug Davis will be sponsoring a case from Peter Kandaris regarding dust (Section 792). If other agencies intend to submit a case on this topic, they were requested to hold off so they would not waste time in a duplicated effort. Bob Erdman informed the committee that a company named High Tech Federal evaluates various products. The County intends to use the firm to evaluate the effectiveness of several dust suppressants. The other agencies can join in on the research and evacuation.
 - f. A letter for EEC, a law firm, soliciting information on MAG Detail 424, 30" manhole covers. They are representing Phoenix in a legal action regarding the manhole. In the letter, they request any information regarding why the lighter weight was established. They were familiar with the lighter weight maintenance aspects of the manhole lid. No other reasons were brought forward by the members.
 - g. Various Public Works Directors have received a letter from MAG advising them that their committee (Public Works Committee) has been abolished. If so, then the Specifications and Detail Committee will become a regular committee instead of a subcommittee.
6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p. m.