MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
April 5, 2006
Aeronautics Building
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor
Jerry Richards, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Howard Heidemann, Member
Spencer Nebel, Member
David Bee, Member
Eric Swanson, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member

Absent

Steve Warren, Member
Susan Mortel, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Stacey Schafer, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Gil Chesbro, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Rob Surber, Center for Geographic Information

Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

Approval of Minutes- Rick Lilly

Mr. Slattery moved to approve the minutes. [Moved to strike following sentence ~~This issue was discussed in the Administrative & Education Committee report listed above~~] **Supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried.**

Correspondence and Announcements- Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly announced that everyone should have gotten a copy of the flyer for the Asset Management Conference. Mr. Lilly and Mr. Surber are passing these out as they are doing the Internet Reporting Process Training. 120 individuals have registered to attend the May conference.

Everyone should have gotten a set of the new 2006 road maps.

Mr. Lilly reminded the Council that there was an asset management (AM) seminar in Ann Arbor a few weeks ago that happened to be the same day as the Altarum meeting at MSU, so most of the people who were actively involved in any AM in Michigan were at MSU recently. Mr. Lilly did attend this conference and wanted to bring the Council up to date. The speakers were very good, and the conference itself was very good. There were speakers from Australia, New Zealand, Portland, Oregon and Canada and there were very on target. The Council is working in moving in the same direction as all of the other successful ones are.

Agency Reports

Mr. Palombo directed the Council members to the March American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) journal where information was given about capital investment on the nation's highways and bridges. If anyone would like to read more about this, Mr. Palombo has the website where it can be found.

Mr. Steudle informed the Council that AASHTO is doing a Domestic Scan this year, which will be two separate weeks within the country. The team is being pulled together. They have all said that they want to come to Michigan, so it should be expected that either in the third week in August or the second week of September the Council will have visitors from other states. Not only will they be talking about what the Michigan Department of Transportation is doing, but they will also want to know what the Transportation Asset Management Council is doing.

Mr. Steudle also informed the Council that the summer meeting of the AASHTO Subcommittee on asset management and the Transportation Research Board (TRB) committee is going to be in Traverse City this year, and all are welcome to attend. This meeting is going to be held on June 19, 2006. Mr. Steudle is going to e-mail the Council members more information as he receives it.

Committee Reports: Administrative & Education

Mr. Bee informed the Council that the committee reviewed the Cambridge Systematics report and the committee is recommending to the full Council that they accept all three documents (guide, training course, and the instructor's manual). The committee has reviewed all the information, and comments and corrections have been exchanged. Mr. Lilly informed the Council that they did provide them with all the final products, which each Council Member has a copy of. All of the concerns that the Council members had previously mentioned were addressed and changed to fit the likings of the Council as a whole. Mr. Palombo has pointed out an error in the guide; Cambridge will fix this problem and send

out new pages with the corrections made. A disc was submitted along with the paper documents. On the disc, all three documents can be found in either Word or PDF format so that changes can be made if need be. Overall, Mr. Lilly feels that the documents read very well and was very pleased with the product.

Mr. Steudle asked the Council what they wanted to do when some community or agency from a different state asks if they could use this guide, what should they be told? Mr. Lilly informed the Council that the contract with Cambridge states that Cambridge can not release any of the data without the Council's approval; it does not say anything about how the Council wants to distribute the data. Mr. Palombo informed the Council that the committee did not discuss this issue, and it is understood that it is a question on everyone's mind. The approach going into this project was simply to see what happens and then deal with issues when they come around. The Council does want to tell people that it is done and to take a look at it. Mr. Lilly stated that he feels the widening the distribution does nothing but make positive things for Michigan and its leadership. Mr. Lilly would recommend that as long as full credit is given to the Council then it should be able to be used for other purposes. Mr. Richards brought up the issue of cost and price for the guide. This guide is going to be placed on the website for all to view if they wished to do so. Mr. Palombo suggested that the Council wait to see what happens and then deal with the costs and such as they occur. The Council agrees that the guide could be distributed, but not the course itself. The issue of copywriting was brought up at the meeting as well. Mr. Slattery stated that several years ago they changed the laws on copywriting, and the new laws would not pertain to the Council's purpose with the Cambridge guide. Mr. Lilly stated that if people are going to use the information in guide for their own agencies, they should just go ahead and use it. However, if they are going to use it for commercial purposes they should be charged for it. It was thought that maybe a cover letter should be signed by Mr. Palombo to give approval to use the guide. **Mr. Bee made a motion to accept the work of Cambridge Systematics and close out the contract with them. Supported by Mr. Heidemann. Motion carried.**

Some of the issues that still need to be dealt with, such as cost and distribution, will be sent back to the committee for further discussion.

Mr. Bee informed the Council that the committee discussed future Council meeting locations. Originally, the Council was going to meet next month in Port Huron and then in October meet in Sault Ste. Marie, there have been some conflicts. The Council decided that in May they will meet at the Center for Geographic Information, in Lansing because the Aeronautics Commission room is being used for another purpose. In June they will meet in Sault Ste. Marie, and in October they will meet in St. Clair County. Mr. Steudle noted that one of the reasons for having the Council travel is to get different communities and agencies involved in what the Council is doing, for example meeting the county road commissions. Both Mr. Nebel and Mr. Heidemann are going to check to see

what local agencies would be available to meet with the Council when they are either in Sault Ste. Marie or St. Clair County. The committee meetings will be held in May at the Center for Geographic Information (CGI). **Mr. Slattery moved to amend the Council meeting locations. The May Council meeting will be moved to the Center for Geographic Information in Lansing and the June meeting to Sault. Ste. Marie. Port Huron will be hosting the October meeting. Supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion Carried.**

Mr. Bee indicated that the committee had a discussion on committee responsibilities. The committee had some recommendations from Mr. Lilly to consider. The idea of combining two of the committees was brought up, however, if this was to happen one of the problems that could come about is the issue of a quorum. This issue would be resolved by either having a smaller committee or having a member move from one committee to the other or the membership could stay as it is and the meeting could be posted as a public meeting. Another issue with the committee meetings was the date in which they were held. Several members have indicated that they would not be able to continue to devote a whole day to the Council, rather they would like the committee dates to be changed to accommodate partial day devotion to the Council. The idea of having the Data Management Committee and the Strategic Meeting combined so that they would be on the last Wednesday of every month was brought up, making the Administrative Committee meeting on the day of the Transportation Asset Management Council meeting, as it is right now. The committees should be functioning more as a technical working group. Mr. Lilly is going to work on distinguishing the differences of the each committee and those who will be serving on the committee. Mr. Lilly is going to put a draft together and bring it back to this committee for their input.

Mr. Bee informed the Council that June 1, 2006 is going to be the workshop to revise the Council's work plan. It will be held at the MDOT Secondary Center from 9:00am-3:00pm. This was the date that most of the Council members were going to be able to attend.

In terms of the training program for 2006, there is $50,000 set aside to fund this. The committee recommends holding two sessions of the pavement preservation courses sponsored by the National Center for pavement Preservation and four sessions of the asset management training program. **Mr. Steudle made a motion to approve the schedule that Mr. Bee laid out for the training. Supported by Mr. Heidemann. Motion Carried.** Mr. Steudle noted that this would be a great opportunity, as we take the guide course on the road, to tie it in with the Council meeting. If agencies do not know who the Council is, the course could be going on the same time the Council is meeting so that they can observe exactly who and what the Council is all about. Additionally, Mr. Steudle is concerned that staff might not have enough time to do all of this with all of the other Council activities going on, and idea of hiring someone was proposed. Mr.

Lilly assured the Council that staff would have enough time to do this once they get passed June.

Data Management Committee Report

Mr. McEntee reported that the committee did not have a chance to discuss the issue of data policy. Mr. Surber requested a discussion on how to establish a data policy for use at CGI. This was sent out to each of the Council members earlier in the week. Mr. Surber would like to have something in hand as we start moving into collection of the investment data as well as the next round of pavement ratings, which will begin in about 60-90 days. Mr. Surber is looking for a motion on behalf of the Council adopting these recommendations as the Council's first set of data policy, subject to modification. Mr. Surber added that at the last meeting he was assigned to go back and get some consensus with additional input from the Model Analysis Team and other staff, which is what he did. The team has come up with a more simplified wording, less technical and more policy wording. Some definitions were added because there was some confusion on what some of the terms were. Mr. Surber tried to make clear headings and really tried to stay away from implementation and to deal with the policy. Mr. Vibbert as well as Patricia Schafer had made some significant changes to the draft. **Mr. Nebel moved for adoption of the draft data policy draft. Supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried.**

Mr. McEntee informed the Council that the committee was not able to discuss the analysis of the PASER data. Mr. Vibbert passed out two handouts to the Council members. One was a summary of last years data, expressed in a different form then has been seen before. The other handout contained a series of observations and instructions. Several charts were shown including the lane miles that moved from one condition state to another, pavements that did not have projects but increased in condition, and finally improvements of pavement conditions were shown in these handouts. Mr. Vibbert went over both handouts and the charts with the Council members, addressing their comments and concerns.

Mr. McEnteereproted that the committee spent all of it's time discussing the issue of collecting PASER data on local road during 2006. Data collection in 2006 was addressed. The committee's recommendation is that, in 2006, we collect data on the federal aid system, like we have in other years. A process and procedure needs to be developed on doing one-third of the local road system. **Mr. McEntee moved that the federal aid system, as in 2005, and move beyond the federal aid system subject to the logistical issue that we need to address up to one-third of the local road system as agreed to by the Council. Supported by Mr. Richards.**

Considerable discussed ensued. A number of members expressed support for collecting the data again on the federal-aid eligible system however, there were too many unanswered questions regarding local roads.

Mr. Slattery moved to divide the question. Supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried, six to one. Mr. McEntee opposed. (Mr. Heidemann absent)

Moved that the PASER data, for 2006, will be collected the same as 2005. Motion carried six to one. Mr. McEntee opposed.

Mr. McEntee withdrew the second part of the divided motion. Supported by Mr. Richards.

Mr. Nebel motioned to do up to one-third of the local roads subject to the process that would be brought back to the Council for future approval, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion fails. Mr. Richards asked for a role call vote; Mr. Palombo, Mr. Slattery, Mr. Bee, Mr. McEntee, and Mr. Steudle all voted no. Mr. Richards and Mr. Nebel both voted yes.

Mr. Slattery moved that staff bring back a report addressing the logistical issues and a process for collecting data on local roads for the June meeting. Supported by Mr. Steudle. Motion carried.

Strategic Analysis

Mr. Richards gave the Strategic Analysis Report. He indicated that there were two points of focus during the meeting. The first was looking at bridges. The committee got into a lot of depth about bridges and heard a presentation from Mike Markow. Mr. Markow went through a rating system and showed the committee how bridges are rated. Dave Juntunen was the second presenter at the meeting. Mr. Juntunen, explained MDOT's bridge condition forecasting system. There was good discussion between everyone at the meeting about the strengths and weaknesses of the two systems. The committee is getting up to speed on bridge analysis and what's available. It was also suggested that in future annual reports specific deck ratings for bridges, as well as numbers for structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges reported be. Deck ratings should be concentrated on more because this seems to be one of the critical elements in a bridge's life cycle.

Mr. Richards concluded by stating that the committee discussed recent activities of the Model Analysis Team. A letter was looked over, signed by Mr. Palombo that alerted the local units that we have been collecting this information over the last three years and we need born-on-dates for projects that have been done. This is a prelude from the people at LTAPP, before they actually start to make phone calls to these agencies.

Monthly Report- Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly sent out the Monthly Report to all the members. No comments were made.

Approval of the 2005 Annual Report

Mr. Lilly passed out some additional information on data that will be put into the report. Some specific changes were made to the Annual Report. Mr. Lilly is going to make these changes and finalize the document. Mr. Palombo is going to write a paragraph about the Council's focus and goals, this will be added to Annual Report. **Mr. Bee made a motion to approve the 2005 Annual Report as amended, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion Carried.**

Final Update on Pilot Projects

Mr. Lilly gave a final report on the pilot projects. Mr. McEntee wanted to know if the data from the Alcona area was unusable or was it just conflicted because it had some information on collecting from the Federal Aid system. Mr. Lilly stated that the data was unusable because they did not report that information in the correct way. They did not break out the data by Federal Aid and local, these numbers could not be extracted, making it unusable.

Mr. Richards wanted to know the amount of money that was budgeted for pilot studies this year; Mr. Lilly informed Mr. Richards and the rest of the Council that the Council has set aside $250,000 for different studies. Mr. Palombo suggested that, at the appropriate time, the Council should sit down and figure out whether we are going to do this again, and figure out what it is that really needs to be piloted. This is a topic of discussion for a future meeting.

Acceptance and Approval of Cambridge Systematics Documents

This issue was discussed in the Administrative & Education Committee report listed above. **Mr. Bee made a motion to accept the work of Cambridge Systematics and close out the contract with them, supported by Mr. Heidemann. Motion carried.**

Discussion and Approval of Process to Collect PASER Data for 2006

This issue was discussed in the Data Management Committee report listed above.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.