

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

May 4, 2005

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

AGENCY MEMBERS

Doug Davis, Mesa, Acting Chairman	Steven Borst, MCESD
Jim Badowich, Avondale	Mahe M. Hazine, Peoria
David Fern, Chandler	P Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Matthew Woodland, Phoenix (Water)
Greg Rodzenko, Glendale	* Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
* David Ramirez, Goodyear	* Brett Huskey, Surprise
Bob Herz, MCDOT	James Bond, Tempe

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA	Don Green, ARPA
* Jeff Benedict, AGC	Brian Gallimore, AGC
Don Cornelison, ARPA	Peter Kandaris, SRP
* Tom Domizi, NUCA	Paul Nebeker, Independent

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.  
P Members attended for a portion of the meeting.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Jennifer Brown, FHWA	Bob Bowman, Red Rock Curb, Inc.
Jerro Smith, City of Phoenix	Jorge Garcia, Grabber Power Products
Shawn Shelton, Construction 70, Inc.	Steven Stamper, StrongGo LLC K. M.
Ken-ichi Maruyama, Town of Gilbert	Hussain, MAG Building Codes

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:46 p.m. by Acting Chairman, Doug Davis.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Chairman was not present at the meeting and no minutes were provided for review or approval. The minutes for the April meeting will be reviewed and approved by the Committee at a later date, once they are available.

3. 2004 Carryover Case

- a. **Case 04-07 - Detail 404 - Water & Sanitary Sewer Separation/Protection:** Steve Borst provided a general review of the changes in the Case. In summary, the notes in Detail 404 have been moved to the Specifications. The notes have been rewritten to require the use of ductile iron pipe for new installations and encasement with Portland cement concrete for existing facilities. The Committee had no comments on the Case. Steve will provide a final draft of changes by next meeting.

4. 2005 Cases

- a. **Case 05-01 - Detail 210 - Residential Speed Hump:** Doug Davis provided a quick review of the two changes in Detail 210. The Committee had no comments to contribute to the Case.
- b. **Case 05-02 - Section 601 - Table 601-2:** Doug Davis provided a quick review of the two changes in Table 601-2. The Committee had no comments to contribute to the Case.

5. New Cases: No new cases were submitted.

6. ADA Discussion

Jennifer Brown, from the Arizona Division office of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) made a brief presentation to the Committee regarding the ADA regulations concerning public works construction that were now in force. She reported that, although FHWA did not develop the regulations (the Access Board is responsible for the regulations), FHWA is responsible for ensuring that any federally funded projects are developed with the ADA regulations in mind.

In answer to a question, Ms. Brown reported that FHWA had investigated a few complaints regarding alleged ADA non-compliance and had provided reports to the Department of Justice (DOJ), but none of these complaints involved ramps or truncated domes. She reported that there had been some complaints regarding truncated domes at the national level. There were some questions regarding the process used for handling complaints. The general understanding is that agencies did not have to immediately retrofit all of their existing sidewalks and ramps, but that they should develop a plan for improving current facilities when the opportunity presents itself.

Paul Ward reported that, following discussions during the meeting in March, 2004, and since MAG Specs are not prescriptive (meaning that member agencies are not REQUIRED to follow them), committee members had decided that a regional ramp design that incorporated truncated domes was not necessary at that time.

Members were asked to report on their agency's actions regarding the development of details for ADA ramps. Avondale and Maricopa County indicated that they were awaiting further guidance on the matter from their own agency resources and from MAG. Tempe had modified an existing ramp detail and had tried four different products. Phoenix and Chandler were also evaluating different products - Chandler had tried six different types. Gilbert has developed a detail and has participated in some test areas, Glendale is developing a detail on an arterial intersection, and Mesa has based their trials on the standard MAG detail, but were trying different products and styles.

The ADOT representative, who had attended the previous meeting, had sent his regrets for not being available for this meeting. However, Ms. Brown reported her understanding that ADOT had developed a set of specific curb details. ADOT has done extensive testing on different products and has added four different products to their approved products list.

The consensus of the Committee was that it would be appropriate to modify existing MAG details to show that ADA requirements needed to be included, but the precise product to be used would be left up to the agency concerned.

7. General Discussion:

- a. Doug Davis provided the latest proposed revision to the by-laws, dated May 3, 2005, for Committee review and comments. Brian Gallimore noted that the Advisory Members were not correct. The Advisory Members provided the correct names. Since Tom Domizi was not present, there was a question if he will be representing NUCA. Mr. Ward will contact NUCA or Tom to confirm his membership. The vote on this revision was postponed until the NUCA member can be confirmed.
- b. Don Green provided a proposal for the rewrite of a portion of Section 710 and a complete rewrite of Sections 320 and 321. The Committee can begin review of the potential Case.
- c. Paul Nebeker informed the Committee that his company had experienced identity theft. Another contractor was issued a permit from a local municipality under his company's name. They used his licence and insurance to obtain the permit. A general discussion was held regarding the agency member's issuance of the permits and ways to prevent this from happening to other contractors. The biggest problem for the agencies is the insurance. This rogue company may not have insurance and can go out of business over night, the contractor that the rogue company is using cannot be held liable which could leave the Agency liable for not checking that the contractor has the proper insurance and any damages that would occur from an accident.
- d. Peter Kandarlis advised the Committee that SRP now has a web page that will directly tie all of the local agency's web sites. This central site could be useful when obtaining information from a number of different Agency's web sites.
- e. Mr. Ward had the following items: 1) The 2005 up dates to the Specifications and Details were delivered to the printers today. He anticipates that they will be for sale by mid next week. 2.) Paul informed the Committee that no proposals were submitted for the

consolidation of the local Agency's specification and details into the MAG Specification & Details. Paul outlined three options: 1) Abandon the project; 2) rebid, or 3) conduct the study in house. After some discussion, the members agreed to rebid the project again. Some members knew of consultants that would have submitted a proposal however, they did not know of its existence. If no successful bids are submitted this next time, then this option will be dropped and further discussions will take place as to the next action.

8. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.