MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
June 1, 2005
Public Safety Offices
Ionia, Michigan

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

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Tom Wieczorek,Vice Chairman
Eric Swanson, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor
David Bee, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Steve Warren, Member
Robert Slattery, Member

Absent

Howard Heidemann, Member
Susan Mortel, Member

Staff Present

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

Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 PM

Approval of Minutes- Rick Lilly

- **April 6 Regular Meeting**

  Mr. Wieczorek moved and Mr. Slattery supported. Typo errors were noted and Rob Surber was present during this meeting, and the minutes do not list his name. Motion was carried as amended.

- **April 27 Workshop**

  Mr. Wieczorek moved and Mr. Slattery supported. A correction to the minutes was made, Rob Surber was present during this meeting, and the minutes do not list his name. Motion was carried as amended.

Correspondence and Announcements-Rick Lilly

An article from the Virginia DOT was passed out along with the newsletter from the Midwest Regional University Transportation Center noting that Ernie Wittwer has retired. Also the TAMC's 2004 Annual Report was highlighted in the newsletter.

Committee Reports

1) **Strategic Analysis**

The committee continued a discussion on model development. The committee along with representatives from the RQFS, LTAP and RoadSoft are going to be going through a process over the next couple of weeks and identifying certain business requirements for the model. Following that, if the decision is to move forward, it would go to a more technical group to figure out the technical requirements in order to meet the business requirements. This would answer the question on what we want the model to do. The hope is that, at the next Council meeting, to go over this issue and get some of these answers to these questions on what we want the model to do and a more complete report from the committee. We have a good start on the business requirements, looking at it from the perspective of outputs and what the specifics are. Much of this has to do with looking at existing number of miles by certain condition categories, having the ability to project miles statewide and by region, by condition and remaining service life. These are the types of outputs we are talking about at this point, being able to break that down by pavement type and functional class. The more challenging part is to figure out some of the testing that we want to do by funding levels. We are moving forward, still very much in the conceptual discussion stage.

We have talked about the possibility of hiring Katie Zimmerman, but this could fall under soul source contracting. The conclusion of the committee was that given an MDOT and statewide procurement process for consultants, soul sourcing may be complicated and maybe we should use Ms. Zimmerman as more of an advisor. Our contract people recommended that we go out and setup a CS138 process, that's where we can hire someone on a consultant basis for a short period of time for not a big contract. We would have to get approval from MDOT finance, which has been done, and then approval from Civil Service. Our proposal is over at Civil Service being reviewed right now, if approved, then all we would have to do is to get two more quotes from people simple asking what they would charge us to do what Ms. Zimmerman would be doing and then it would be up to the Council to pick one of the three and we could go ahead and do it. The big thing is that we would setup $100,000 for each year from the next 5 years, essentially a half million dollars total that the Council would have available to go out and do this. MDOT staff recommended that if we wanted to do this that we move forward with setting up the business process with our PED people. If at a later date it still is appropriate to bring Ms. Zimmerman in it could still be possible.

Mr. Vibbert met with the Performance Excellence Division and they are ready to do this once they get some extra information from us. We need to identify a sponsor, meet with the sponsor, identify the team members, and then scheduling issues. Do we want to move forward with the PED or wait

until Ms. Zimmerman is brought in? The Council is going to need to have the model ready by next year; we are looking at either RoadSoft or RQFS or a combination of the two, the decision needs to be made either by August or no later then September because if the decision is not to go with either one of those we have to get the RFP started immediately in order bring something else in so that it can be tested during 2006. Mr. Warren said that the sense of the committee is to move forward with the PED and have Ms. Zimmerman be a participant and be another member of the team. At this point and time neither RoadSoft nor RQFS will give everything that the Council is going to need, so both are going to need to be modified.

Mr. Warren had a question that if we enter into a contract, what kind of action does that require? Under the Open Meetings Act that is a policy decision and it would have to come back to the Council. The Mr. Warren addressed the issue of needing some answers by a certain date, and he was wondering if the Council would start thinking about what the questions are. He can envision a process where the Council has some specific things and have an idea of some of the questions that need to be answered and it would help the committee to know what these questions are. Also, there may be an option that we are trying to develop the perfect model, the hybrid of RQFS and RoadSoft, but RoadSoft and RQFS exist right now. RoadSoft does have the ability to evaluate the entire system. Lacking having the perfect model by the date we had in mind where we have to have to have some questions and answers, could there be a scenario where we say that we are going to evaluate the data that we have and maybe get part way with the answers that we need. We almost have that now and if we have some of these questions we can start to prepare to answer these questions with the model and the data that we have and it could be recognized that the Council is working on a superior model that someday we are going to be able to answer those questions even better. We have to have some answers and if we wait to have the perfect model that will give us the perfect results we are not going have as much interest from outside sources. This would be good direction because there may be a simple program that could be written for RQFS to be able to take the PASER data and start running it through it. In the mean time Mr. Lilly would have to contact Terry McNitch and say that the Council wants to start running some scenarios, and find out what some of the things are that Mr. McNitch will need in order to do that. There are going to be some steps that we are going to have to take. The output might help us to determine which one we like best.

The recommendation as to whether the committee moves ahead with Ms. Zimmerman or if they are going to chose RQFS, RoadSoft, or neither will have to come back to the Council. Everything else the committee can

decide as a committee. By July the hope is to have the process in place and to bring it back to the Council.

2) Administrative & Education

2006 budget has been introduced in the legislation for $1,626,400, which is $40,000 less then requested. At mid-May our expenditures were $245,500 which was about the same as last year. Data collection in 2004 cost $959,730 or $10.20 per lane mile. The TAMC did recognize some savings in our collection efforts by using MDOT employees because we did not have as many lost days as we did using a contract employee.

The Cambridge contract was discussed. They are working on pulling all of the information and literature together and they have developed a draft questionnaire. They will be in Grand Rapids later in the week, Detroit area/Southeast Michigan, and then ending in the Upper Peninsula sometime in July. They are continuing to schedule interviews. At the same time on the national level, the NHI course is being updated and hopefully they are going to be paralleling our efforts with the new state program so that there is consistency across the line.

6th National Asset Management Conference will take place in Kansas City in November. There are three different sessions all featuring Michigan presenters.

National Center for Pavement Preservation Training update shows that we have had 88 individuals for three classes, 31 from cities, 14 from counties, 9 from MPO's, 32 from MDOT, and 2 consultants. We have spent $39,759.59 on these three program and we had good responses. A concern was the cost of the class, $40,000, for the three classes is a lot considering that we have allotted $80,000 for the year. The next courses will be in the fall after the start of the new fiscal year.

A training video was brought up, and we talked about looking at finding someone to assist us in a communication project. We would need help deciding what theme we are going to use, who are we communicating with, and what programs we want, and making sure that whatever video we have goes a long with NHI work so that we maintain a consistency. As a committee it was thought that we would need communication/technical support on putting this together. This would then be distributed throughout the state. Mr. Steudle brought up the idea that the Council should purchase the New Zealand program video, as an example of what one agency has done.

Mr. Wieczorek moved to authorize the ordering of the tape from New Zealand, supported by Mr. Steudle. The motion carried.

The committee also talked about the need for certification for Capital Preventative Maintenance. This idea was brought up because we do not have anything equivalent for the Capital Preventative Maintenance Activities, and some of the information suggests that you really have to know what you are doing otherwise there could be some bad experiences. We might have a hurdle to overcome in Michigan for communities that have attempted these things and had some level of failure and are not willing to try again.

3) Data Management

Gil Chesbro addressed the committee regarding the need to get timely data logs submitted to him during this year's data collection process. In the past Mr. Chesbro had been having trouble keeping track of where we are at because some regions were slow in responding. Mr. Chesbro is going to indicate to agencies that logs be in to him on a certain date or payment will be held up.

The committee has had some conversations around the issue of the format detail provided by regions and their reports on data collection within those regions. Some regions are reporting at the local level rather then the region level. Mr. Lilly and staff are going to look at standardize process for reporting. We will then have a clearer understanding of how we are going to report the PASER data collected on individual segments of road. The committee will hear back on this next month.

The 2005 PASER data collection training will begin next week, included in the training process will be a form developed by CGI which will facilitate updating the framework map while we are out doing the data collection. Hopefully this will make it very easy for the people who discover differences between the current versions of the framework and what actually exists on the road and report that back to CGI to get it corrected. There was a two page hand out that each of the Council members received.

Mr. Lilly has started to look at automated data collection processes; as an alternative to the PASER rating process. The range is about $75-$190 a mile. No recommendation or changes have been made at the moment, but we are looking at ways in potential years that we could change the data collection process.

The committee had some brief comments from Mr. Vibbert regarding the ACT 51 financial reporting process. Accountants are currently trying to work with the Council's definition of the work types.

Monthly Report-Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly presented the monthly report to the Council. There were no questions or comments from the Council Members

Amendment to Act 51-Carmine Palombo

Mr. Palombo received a call from a staff member representing Representative Burns. They indicated that they wanted to propose additional revisions to Act 51 that would go further then additions already added. They wanted to add that if a community was actively involved and had an asset management program, essentially you could use the money as needed consistent with the output of your asset management program. He indicated that he was hoping that we as individuals could review this and find a way to support it when Representative Burns introduced it.

The Council made a decision that they were not going to take a position on political items like this, but they can give feedback and comments to them through their individual parent agencies. If the cities, villages, and counties think that this is good legislation then it should go through that way, but it should not go through by the Council.

The Council should stay apolitical of possible. The Council is a subset of the State Transportation Commission and if the Council takes a stand then it goes back to the Commission, so the decision should be presented to the Commission first. The consensus was not to take a formal position on this matter, but comments and other feedback could be given by individual agencies.

Report on International Scan-Kirk Steudle

Mr. Steudle passed out the draft of the International Scan on Asset Management. The handout was the 30 day summary of what all went on. It goes into case studies and details of each individual organization and who they are and what they are responsible for. Mr. Steudle went through the draft with the Council.

The idea of starting to put together a Michigan Asset Management Conference was presented to the Council. The target date for this would be sometime next spring or summer.

Tabled Item: Pooled Fund for Asset Management Training

Mr. Slattery moved to take the pooled fundraiser off the table and Mr. Wieczorek supported. Motion carried.

Mr. Lilly did some more checking and the initial proposal was that Mr. Slattery had moved to appropriate $20,000 into the pooled fund and then it was requested that Mr. Lilly go back and get additional information to make sure that this was not a way of circumventing the executive order, limiting out of state travel. There are some (6 exceptions) exceptions to the executive error which Mr. Lilly listed. Mr. Lilly feels that the state travel may be waived if the Council wanted to travel to the Asset Management Conference. Mr. Lilly said that if we wanted to get this exemption we would want to get a letter from Mr. Palombo and have it sent to Gloria Jeff for consideration.

Mr. Slattery moved to direct staff to draft a letter to Gloria Jeff to be signed by Chairman Palombo to allow the Council to participate in this. Mr. Slattery motioned and supported by Mr. Wieczorek. Motion carried

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM