

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE, COMMUNICATION, and EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

November 4, 2020 at 10:30 a.m.

The meeting was held via Teleconference per Executive Order from Governor Whitmer Discontinuing
In-Person/Large Meetings due to the Coronavirus 19 Pandemic until further notice

MEETING MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Derek Bradshaw, MAR
Gary Mekjian, MML
Todd White, MDOT

Jonathan Start, MTPA – Chair
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Support Staff Present:

Niles Annelin, MDOT
Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Roger Belknap, MDOT
Jesus Esparza, MDOT
Dave Jennett, MDOT

Members Absent:

None

Public Present:

None

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called to order at 10:31 a.m. Everyone was welcomed to the meeting. G. Strong verified attendance by rollcall.

2. Changes or Additions to the Agenda:

None

3. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

4. Consent Agenda – J. Start (Action Item):

4.1. - Approval of the August 5, 2020 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

4.2. – TAMC Financial Report – R. Belknap (Attachment 2)

R. Belknap provided an updated TAMC Budget Financial Report – FY 2018 – FY 2020.

Motion: D. Bradshaw made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda; G. Mekjian seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

5. October 28 and 29 TAMC Conference Update – G. Strong/T. Colling/R. Belknap:

The October 28 and 29, 2020 first virtual 2-half days conference was well attended. Speakers were well received and had a wide variety of presentations. There were a few minor challenges but ultimately things went very well. The conference had 352 registrants and 38 instructors. There was a very high attendance for registrants. There were 159 survey responses received by MTU. Session evaluations scores were 4.5 or 4.6 out of 5. Things that we could have done better were audio and more time to interact (interactivity). There were a lot of positive comments on the quality of the presenters and quality of the sessions. Many liked the virtual format. The virtual luncheon did not go very well and was not well attended. The switch from Adobe format to Zoom format seemed to be a minor technical

issue with switching from the conference to the luncheon. TAMC is on the schedule for Amway Grand Plaza Hotel in Grand Rapids, just in case TAMC is able to hold a conference in person however, it is very unlikely that the restrictions due to COVID-19 is lifted by May 2021. R. Belknap suggested having sessions throughout a week for the next TAMC conference. T. Collins noted from past sessions held through an entire week or longer schedule conflicts tend to happen. With week-long sessions people tend to have a hard time scheduling an hour every day for a week to attend sessions and then attendance tend to die off as the week goes on.

6. 2021 TAMC ACE Committee Proposed Meeting Schedule (Attachment 3 and Action Item) – R. Belknap/G. Strong:

A list of proposed 2021 meeting dates were provided to the ACE Committee for their review and approval. It is felt the meetings will be held virtually for quite some time. Currently, the MDOT Aeronautics Building Commission Conference Room is not scheduling any meetings until further notice due to COVID-19 restrictions for in-person meetings. G. Strong will send the list of dates to the conference room scheduler to be placed on their conference schedule if the restriction is lifted. G. Strong will place the dates on the ACE Committee members calendars. If there is no pressing need to meet every month, the Committee will cancel but for now a meeting will be scheduled for each of the months as listed on the proposed 2021 meeting schedule. G. Mekjian may not be able to attend the March 3, 2021 meeting due to being away on spring vacation.

Motion: A motion was made by D. Bradshaw to approve the proposed 2021 ACE Committee meeting dates; T. White seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

7. 2021 Data Collection and Training Procedures (Memo and Attachment 4) – T. Colling:

MTU provided four suggestions of options for the collection of PASER data to the ACE Committee. Those options are:

- 1.) Stay with the current policy (3 agency teams) and require partners to provide staff or contractors that can travel with two others. (pre-COVID-19 option)
- 2.) Use of 2-person, 2 road agency teams. MDOT and local agency rate roads together. The Regional Planning Organization and/or Metropolitan Planning Organization (RPO/MPO) joins, if possible, for collection and manages process.
- 3.) Use of 2-person, 1 road agency teams. Road agency rates their own roads, one of other two partners does concurrence checks on rated roads. Or, lastly, option
- 4.) Use of 2-person, 1 road agency teams. Road agency rates their own roads no concurrence checks, use only normal quality review process.

Having the road owner and someone who is not part of that agency doing the evaluation helps assure the quality of the road rating is good and would be easier for the data collection to be completed. Driving, analyzing, typing in the laptop would be difficult with just one person and it would be safer with two people in the vehicle doing the rating. T. Colling feels Option 1 is easy, however, the negative is having to find people to do it for them due to COVID-19 agency and state restrictions for being so close in a vehicle. Option 2 is easy but loses efficiency; one less person in the vehicle than Option 1. Option 3 is different, as it would require making changes in RoadSoft which would have to be done soon and training would have to also be changed. MTU has budgeted for this task if needed. If a decision is made by December it is possible to make the changes for this option but if the decision is made in January or February to use this option, MTU would find it difficult to make the necessary changes.

G. Mekjian feels whatever is needed to be done to get the good data in and be safe is the option that TAMC needs to use and TAMC will need to allow for flexibility. These options may pose a challenge for the MPOs and RPOs but the key issue may be timing. It is felt the MPOs/RPOs can deal with changes in November because they have time to work on items but come January things become more problematic. If one of the people in the vehicle is not from the MPO or RPO and they are not managing the data, it may be difficult. The MPOs and RPOs had the highest number of people stating that they would have an issue with their staff getting in a vehicle with another person due to the virus. It is still assumed that MDOT staff will not be allowed to participate in the data collections due to

COVID-19 restrictions. It was felt that TAMC may never go back to a three-person team because it may be discovered that using a two-person team is easier. Then again, some agencies may prefer to have the three-person team as it makes it less stressful to do the data collections. MTU will also be presenting these options at today's full Council meeting this afternoon.

8. Perspectives on Culvert Data Collection (Memo and Attachment 5/Action Item) – R. Belknap:

There are two main points for consideration. In the current FY 2020 MTU contract the task listed for culverts was for the continuation and wrapping up of the 2018 culvert work. However, since that time AASHTO has come out with a culvert guidance document and the Council requested that MTU use this new guidance in their full report and it could also be used in the creation of the culvert policy. There is no additional funding left from the MTU Culvert Activities contract and it was suggested that funds from MTU's Education and Training contracts where there are significant funds still available from canceled 2020 trainings, be used to cover this task. The task is expected to spend approximately \$15,000. It was felt that asking for additional funds at this time would not be acceptable and using funds from the Education and Training contract would be most acceptable. If TAMC decides to fund and reimburse for culvert data collection, they will have to take funds from the current pavement data collection fund or request additional funds. The culvert policy that the TAMC Bridge Committee has been tasked to create would be used for data collection guidance and provide a procedure on how reimbursements would be handled for culvert data collections. If TAMC decides not to request additional funding for culvert data collection and the agencies are asked to collect culvert data without getting reimbursed, the policy is more of a guidance on the data sharing mechanisms and formats. Links to the current TAMC policies were provided in the memo shared with the ACE Committee. It is felt that funds are going to get tight due to the COVID-19 issues and does not feel there will be any increase in funds and asking for additional funds would not be acceptable. TAMC may have to provide information to agencies on what culvert data they need to collect and ask them to do it without reimbursement. There is not enough money in the current regions allocations to cover culvert data collections.

Motion: D. Bradshaw made a motion to approve the transferring of \$15,000 from the MTU Education and Training Contract to use on the Culvert work tasks that includes the addition of the AASHTO guidance.; G. Mekjian seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

9. Transportation Asset Management Plan Review and Acceptance (Memo) – G. Strong:

Per Public Act 325, 29 of the 41 Group A agencies have submitted their TAMPs to TAMC in the IRT. G. Strong did a review of the 29 TAMPs to assure that they met the requirements of the Act. The template provided by MTU that several of the agencies used simplified the review process. G. Strong is recommending approval of 17 of the 29 TAMPs. A few of the agencies that she was not able to recommend approval only needed to provide proof from their governing board that they approved their agency TAMP and others required more detailed information provided in their TAMP as needed per Public Act 325. One agency she was not able to open their document and will work with CSS and the agency to access the document. A couple agencies TAMPs were quite lengthy and not as easy to find the required documentation and G. Strong has asked R. Belknap to also review those documents to verify her findings. She has provided a listing in the memo for the Committees review detailing all her findings in the submitted TAMPs. G. Strong has contacted a couple of those agencies and requested that they submit the needed information into the IRT. G. Strong is awaiting approval to contact the remaining agencies and request the documentation that she needs to approve their TAMP. She wants to assure the agencies that TAMC wants to help them and are willing to work with them to meet their TAMP requirements. Those agencies that TAMC is not able to approve at this time that do not meet the requirements in their TAMP, there is no penalty to the agencies until October 2024. The Certification in the MTU template does not state that the agencies governing board approves the agency TAMP. The agency must only show a resolution or meeting minutes showing the governing board approved their TAMP in order to meet the Public Act 325 requirements. This may be something that needs to be modified in the MTU template. The ACE Committee will recommend to the full Council later today at the full Council meeting that approval be granted to the agencies G. Strong has recommended approval stating they have met all of the requirements of Public Act 325.

10. Public Comments:

None

11. Member Comments:

None

12. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m. The next meeting will be held December 1, 2020 at 10:30 a.m., via Microsoft Teams.

TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADA	AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CFM	COUNCIL ON FUTURE MOBILITY
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
CUPPAD	CENTRAL UPPER PENINSULA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REGION
ESL	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION

MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RBI	ROAD BASED INVENTORY
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.11.27.2018.GMS