

**Citizens Advisory Committee  
Highway, Road, and Bridge Subcommittee**

---

**Meeting Minutes – May 16, 2008**

Aeronautics Auditorium  
2700 East Airport Service Drive  
Capital City Airport

**Start Time:** 9:07 AM.

**Present:** Brent Bair, Dan DeGraaf, Russell Gronevelt, James Klett, Keith Ledbetter, Steward Sandstrom, Kirk Steudle, Robert Struck.

**Absent:** Mickey Blashfield, Mike Fikes, William McFarlane.

Mr. Struck opened the meeting and asked members to introduce themselves.

Motion was made to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Motion was seconded, and minutes from the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting were unanimously approved.

Motion was made to approve the amended agenda. Motion was seconded, and the agenda for the meeting was unanimously approved.

Mr. Struck invited comment from members of the public, but none was forthcoming.

Mr. Struck invited comment from members of the Subcommittee. Mr. Gronevelt asked whether the Subcommittee would be discussing revenue alternatives; the consensus of the Subcommittee was that it would focus first on tabulating needs, and that discussion and a report on alternatives might follow.

Housekeeping

Mr. Struck noted that only two meetings remain before presentation of the draft report of the Subcommittee.

New Business

Pietro Semifero gave a presentation on the **crash-data resources** available from the **Office of Highway Safety Planning**, Michigan State Police. He also explained that that office focuses on behavioral causes of traffic crashes, not engineering-related causes. There are presently 300,000 crashes a year in Michigan, causing 1,000 fatalities and costing \$12 billion/year by UMTRI's estimate. The standard UD-10 crash report used by police does not include a road-condition variable, but the location of crashes might be correlated by road agencies with network data on pavement conditions.

The suggestion was made to award some safety funds for proven countermeasures, or to focus spending on corridors that included high-crash locations.

Susan Mortel of the Bureau of Transportation Planning, **Michigan Department of Transportation** summarized **state-trunkline needs**.

She explained the meaning of *remaining service life* as an indicator of system condition.

She presented “ribbon charts” showing four alternative programs: the current program, the “do-nothing” alternative with no increase in funds, and “better” and “best” alternatives. Without additional revenues, state highway pavements will decline from 90 to 65 per cent “good” by 2015, and to 60 per cent by 2017. Program size will average \$590 million/year between 2010 and 2015, half the current size.

The “better” program will yield 85 per cent “good” pavements, plus improvements in auxiliary assets, and average \$2.5 billion/year. Maintenance spending would rise from \$296 to \$350 million/year, and capacity spending from \$69 to \$744 million/year.

The “best” state-highway program would address all preservation needs, restoring pavements to 90 per cent “good” with improvements in remaining service life to build system health. More reconstruction would yield longer intervals between work. Up to \$3.24 billion would be available for new roads and capacity improvements.

In 2009 we will choose between alternative forecasts of system health. Which way do we go? It was suggested that graphs of alternative funding mixes might be applied below the ribbon charts, and the cost expressed per year per user.

Steve Warren of the **Kent County Road Commission** reported on a survey of county road commissions on **conditions on the non-federal-aid-eligible system**. Kent County has a goal of raising its 700 miles of primary road to 70 per cent “good” condition by 2016. However, condition began to decline in 2006 due to inflation in costs and declining MTF distributions. Other units are thought to be in the same situation. A survey of 11 counties (12 per cent) using PASER rating system found 43 per cent of local roads “poor,” 27 per cent “fair,” and 30 per cent “good.” This is much worse than the federal-aid system.

### Old Business

The Subcommittee reviewed the working draft of its report, as edited by the Road Commission for Oakland County.

It was decided that the report would begin with an executive summary, and be accompanied by a thank-you letter from Chairman Struck.

The Subcommittee made the following observations about **material to be collected for the report**:

Mr. Bair asked if anyone know of any nationwide rankings of states' roads besides those of TRIP and *Overdrive* Magazine. Do we know if road conditions are costing Michigan any plant locations? It was thought that MEDC might provide some data, or anecdotes.

The ASCE infrastructure might contain some information on road conditions.

A graph ought to combine the curves of rising demand and falling purchasing power.

A measure of safety performance is wanted.

It would be good to tabulate the age of the road and bridge assets.

The ability to match federal aid should be graphed against the available funding.

The effect of the winter of 2007-08 on the number of "poor" miles should be graphically shown.

Pictures of "good," "fair," and "poor" roads should be included, along with an explanation of bridge ratings.

The editors reminded the Subcommittee that data and statements must be attributed, and not on the order of, "people are saying . . ."

The contribution of locally-raised revenues to local-roads expenditures ought to be mentioned. Reports are available for counties, but city data are needed.

Sample prices of ancillary features should be included.

Can we summarize the value of our capital stock? What does it mean when we say its value is declining?

The costs of congestion are important, as justification for new capacity.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Struck invited comment from members of the public, but none was forthcoming.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM.