MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
May 3, 2006
Romney Building
Lansing, Michigan

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

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman
Steve Warren, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Howard Heidemann, Member
Spencer Nebel, Member
David Bee, Member
Eric Swanson, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member

Absent

Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor
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

Meeting was called to order at 1:15pm

Approval of April 5, 2006 Minutes - Rick Lilly

Mr. Nebel moved to approve the minutes, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried. Mr. Lilly pointed out that there was a correction that needed to be made on the minutes. The correction was noted and will be corrected.

Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly passed out two handouts that need to be placed in the Asset Management Guide, to replace the existing ones. These handouts contain the corrected information. There are 33 people signed up for the first training class on May 11, 2006.

DRAFT

Mr. Lilly passed out a couple of different informational pieces. First, there was a bill that was passed by the Senate on May 2, 2006 and it is now over in the House of Representatives. This bill continues to give cities and villages flexibility on moving their monies from their major streats over to their local streets if they are using an asset management process.

Two other handouts were distributed to the Council from the May 2, 2006 Journals of the House and Senate. Mr. Lilly informed that Council that on May 2, 2006, the Legislature received the Council's Annual Report so the Council was in compliance with the law.

Agency Reports

Mr. Palombo reported that he gave a presentation to the State Transportation Commission regarding the 2005 Annual Report. The presentation was well received. There were a number of comments commending the work that the Council is doing. Commissioners have showed interest in the Internet reporting tool and would like to be given a presentation on how it works. The Center for Geographic Information (CGI) is going to provide the members with a password so that they can access the information in the tool.

Committee Reports:

Data Management

Mr. McEntee stated that there was discussion about what is going to be done for the 2006 summer data collection. Committee Activity Reports were sent out to each member. Further committee topics will be discussed later in the agenda.

Monthly Report – Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly wanted to draw attention to the June 1, 2006, meeting on the update of the work plan. The format is that everyone will receive a copy of the current work plan. Members will be asked to go through each of the items and do one of four things; keep it as is, keep it but modify it, eliminate it, or is there any new activity that needs to be added. Members will be split up into groups. Each group will take a different section of the work plan and discuss it. The current work plan will be sent out a week ahead of time so each member will have a chance to thoroughly look it over with the process in mind. The meeting will start at 9:00 AM and is not expected to go past 3:00 PM. It will be held at the Horatio S. Earle Learning Center (formally the Secondary Center). A map will be sent out to those who have never been there before.

DRAFT

Revised Committee Process – Rick Lilly

At the April meeting there was discussion about the current committees and a number of options were discussed. Mr. Lilly passed out a handout that described possible new committee structures. Mr. Lilly added that he only received comments back from three of the Council members regarding what would work best for them. Committees will become much more technical and less repetitious.

Mr. Warren asked if there was a possibility of having a combined Data/Strategic committee meeting. This would still be a possibility if that's what the Council wanted, as long as the meeting is posted, because the meeting would have a quorum of the Council. The only issue would be the day and time that the committee would meet. Mr. Steudle asked how it is decided which recommendations come to the Council. Mr. Lilly stated that a recommendation from the committee would be made to the Council for their approval; much like it is right now. Would it be possible to send someone in the member's place, with the member's opinion? Mr. Lilly stated that because there is no official actions taken (and only recommendations) this could be done. Mr. Warren stated that there is never a lack for things to discuss at the committee meetings. He stated that putting all the committees on one day would slow down the process of getting business taken care of, so it would be in the best interest of the committees and the Council to have the committees on different days. Mr. Heidemann pointed out that what each committee is doing, and the date that they are meeting, might be the best way to hold the meetings. Mr. Nebel agreed.

Mr. Lilly stated that the two committees could be combined, and held on a separate day from the Council, having a larger time slot for the committee to meet . The Open Meetings Act is not the problem; they just need to be posted.

Mr. Slattery moved to combine the Data Management and Strategic Analysis committees; that it be held separate from the Council meeting .date; and leaving the Administrative and Education Committee to meet on the same day of the Council meeting, supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried.

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that the new Data Management committee will meet at 1:00 PM on the last Wednesday of the month at the Michigan Townships Association offices. All committee meetings will be posted in accordance with the Open Meetings Act

Report on the Internet-reporting tool training – Rick Lilly and Rob Surber

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that 13 training sessions were held and 367 people had attended. Those who attended represented 272 agencies or 44% of the total agencies in the state. To break it down further, there were 69 road commissions, 166 cities and villages, 3 from Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)

DRAFT

region offices, 19 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) /Regional Planning Agencies (RPA), 4 consultants, and 1 township. Mr. Surber handed out a map to all Council members showing the cities, villages, and counties of those who have not registered. He broke down the statistics on who has and has not entered data into the reporting tool. A letter was sent to all Regions and MPO's as a reminder to those who have not registered. They were asked to send each community in their region a reminder to get registered. The help desk is getting, on average, six calls a day. All comments are being taken on how to improve the tool, and they will be brought back to the Council as to how to make this a better process in the future. There is a cutoff of June 1, 2006 to be registered for reporting. If agencies have not registered they are going to be registered as noncompliance with the law.

Schedule of Activities for June 7, 2006, Council Meeting – Rick Lilly & Spencer Nebel

Mr. Lilly asked who was going to be driving themselves and who was going to be flying to Sault Ste. Marie for the June 7, 2006, Council meeting. Mr. Nebel indicated that there has been a tentative schedule put together for the meeting. Mr. Nebel meet with his RPA, who is helping to coordinate this, and it was proposed that the Council would open the meeting up to the regions, road commissions, and other local road agencies within the Upper Peninsula to give them an opportunity to interact with the Council. There would be a presentation from the Easter U.P Regional Planning and Development Commission on the PASER activities that have taken place there. There has been a scheduled round table discussion with the Council, road commission engineers, and city engineers. There will be an 11:15 AM press briefing. Before the meeting begins Mr. Palombo will be giving an overview of what is happening with asset management. The Council meeting will begin at its normal time (1:00 PM) and upon conclusion the Council will have the opportunity to visit the new border station in Sault Ste. Marie. The flight from Lansing will leave for Sault Ste. Marie at 8:30 returning back to Lansing at 6:00 PM.

Update on Conference – Terry McNinch

Mr. McNinch informed the Council that things are looking very good. 224 people were registered for the conference at the time of the Council meeting. Of the 224 registered, 41 are from MDOT, 61 are from counties, 67 are from cities and villages, 19 from consultants, 3 members of the House of Representatives, 4 members of the State Transportation Commission. All of the presentations are going well and coming together. There were four agencies signed up to do a poster session at the conference. Mr. Lilly informed the Council that Terry McNinch and Jan Pohl have done a great job on putting this conference together. The Council acknowledged Terry's and Jan's leadership and diligence in bringing the conference together.

DRAFT

Analysis of 2005 PASER ratings – Staff

Gil Chesbro gave the Council a presentation on the comparison between the 2004 and 2005 PASER data collection. Mr. Lilly stated that we have given all the information to Mr. McNinch and his staff to try to answer how this is going to affect the running of RoadSoft. There are some real concerns that this is going to affect the model. It was thought that we might want to take away the previous years ratings so that they can not see what was reported the last year. Mr. McEntee stated over the next couple of months, during the training, that people pay close attention to those segments, that we have identified, where there is a variance from one rating to another and see if it was data entry error or is there a difference between the two ratings. The Council should not lose sight of the fact that 70 percent of the ratings look really good. The model may be able to make some solid projections on conditions of where we are going based on the 70 percent that is good. The Council needs to move forward on correcting the 30 percent bad numbers, not to disregard the 70 percent that is good. The Council does not need to change direction as we head into the 2006 data collection as far as the teams and the training.

Mr. Lilly stated that the committee suggested that as they are out doing the 2006 data collection that they pay close attention to quality control areas that were done in 2005, should we tell them to do this? It was suggested the Council may not know enough at this time to take a vote on this issue, but it was thought that we might not have enough time to put this off until the June meeting. If the Council can defer this particular item to the Model Analysis team that would be in the best interest of time.

Mr. Palombo stated that in this analysis there is some difference in opinion. There are some obvious mistakes, is there a way to develop a piece of software, that as each county's data comes in, through a series of 'if thens' that could do a series of checks to catch errors? Mr. Lilly reported that the Council is doing a different process then what has been done in the past, in terms of data. The data will not be going to Mr. Chesbro; it will go to CGI, which is where it is supposed to go. When a group gets done, they can run a series of programs where they start to identify the anomalies quickly and be able to pick out the errors. This is one ability that we will have this year. This should be done before we apply the analysis to the quality control. Mr. Surber stated that as long as we are checking internal to the data itself of that year, it would be something that could be done. Whatever is being used now can be put in the 'if then" process it could work. Some of it is not zero tolerance, it's suspicious. If not correct it would be sent back to the Regions.

Mr. Warren stated that data collection was not completed until the last minute in 2005. Meaning that some roads were done at the beginning of the year and others at the end, the roads that were done at the beginning of the year might have improved by the time that the collection is completed. The data that was

DRAFT

collected maybe inaccurate, do to improvement, when the data collection is finally submitted.

Mr. Slattery raised the issue that there is only one person doing the quality control rating, which is different from all the rest of the collection. It was suggested that the Quality Control should be done the same way when doing the other ratings. One person's opinion of a rating might be different from a three person team. Mr. Lilly said that when the motion was approved last month to do things the same as 2005, did it include Chan Singh doing quality control? Mr. Lilly stated that Mr. Warren made a good point about the timing; Mr. Singh did not even start the collection until September of last year. Mr. Chesbro, if this is a controlled experiment do we want to change two of the variables at the same time? Do we want to change the quality control at the same time we are changing the collection? We would never know which one was responsible for the previous errors.

Mr. Heidemann stated that if we could keep things the same as they were the previous year, one could compare the data and see how it lines up. Every year there are going to be new people to do the assessment. If we are getting consistent data year after year then it could be said that a good tool was being used, even though it might not be exactly what the quality control person said, there would be consistent data from the people out there actually rating the roads. Mr. Palombo said it is important to understand the group dynamic going on while rating, as opposed to one individual doing all the ratings.

Mr. Steudle, raised the issue of thinking about how we collect this data differently. Is there and automated way to take subjectivity out of it? Or, a machine that does it and gives it a number. It is his recommendation that we try an alternative way to get the best answers. Mr. Steudle recommended that staff do a recommendation for a pilot study and have it brought back to the June meeting. Mr. Warren stated that the idea for alternatives would mean that some testing would need to be done. He stated that it takes a long time to do public business, and wondered if there was a way to latch onto something that has already been started. Mr. Lilly stated that the Council has the money set aside to do this. Mr. Palombo thought that doing quality control right after data collection has been completed, would make for more accurate ratings. Mr. McEntee agrees with what was said but stated the Council is putting a lot of time, effort, and money into a model that relies on a rating method that is really dependent on what level of work is required on a segment of road. A lot of the automated systems give a number for the roads that is not necessarily correlated to the mix of fixes, which is the PASER theory. There is a lot of theoretical things that need to be kept in mind as we go and look at automated systems and how they will be related to existing data.

DRAFT

Mr. Surber stated that CGI needs to be included in any discussion regarding this to make sure that the new data with the existing data. Mr. Lilly is going to try to come up with a recommendation at the Data Management Meeting.

Local Roads

Mr. McEntee would like the Council to ask Mr. McNinch to talk to his statistical people to see if we can come up with the size of the local road system, for paved roads, that we would need to look at to make some meaningful statement about the conditional system in October or November. Mr. McEntee suggested that the Council ask Mr. Lilly to take a look at pilots to collect data on local road system this summer and to the extent we can authorize local agencies who want to, within reason, complete data collection on their paved road system without taking MDOT or Region staff, if they can, get the roads collected this summer. The goal being that, in the October time frame, we have enough information to know the size of the sample so that we can say something meaningful about the rest of the system. The proposals are to define the system from a statistical point of view, use the data that we currently have beyond the federal-aid system, and to train and encourage people to go beyond the federal-aid system and collect their own data and we will use it as best we can. Mr. Warren stated that come September/October if there is discretion about any kind of revenue enhancements, that we need to be in a position to have something to say, not only about the federal-aid system, but the Council is going to be asked about the local road system. Mr. Warren thinks that if we are doing pilots of automated data collection we might be able to place some local roads in with it or while we are out there surveying to include some local roads in those areas. Mr. Warren thinks that the Council needs to keep local road numbers and data collection in front of us this year.

Mr. Lilly stated that this issue of local roads was discussed at the committee meeting because as Mr. McNinch and his staff were looking at the data we sent up, they immediately started doing this. However, there is nothing specified in his contract that he needs to do this. The Council really needs to be able to point to something that he was authorized to do specifically so that the proper payments can be made.

Mr. McEntee moved to authorize Mr. McNinch, through LTAP, to determine whether a statistically significant sample of the local road system would able to collect data accurately represent the condition of that system, supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried.

Mr. McEntee moved to use, to the extent we can, the pilot study, PASER ratings that were authorized last year on the local road system and incorporate it into the analysis that we have, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.

DRAFT

Mr. McEntee moved that staff make recommendations on methods for collecting rating during summer of 2006 on the sample of local roads systems identified by LTAP and prepare some guidance for our proposals on pilots studies for collecting that data, supported by Mr. Steudle. Motion carried.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM.

DRAFT