



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

Administrative, Communication and Education Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 @ 10:30 AM

*In accordance with [Executive Order 2020-154 \(COVID-19\)](#), this will be an online Microsoft Teams meeting.
Persons needing accommodations for participating in this meeting should contact Roger Belknap
at least 24 hours prior to the start of this meeting: belknapr@michigan.gov Phone: (517) 230-8192*

Meeting Telephone Conference Line: +1 248-509-0316 Access Code: 136 683 240#

Web Meeting Access Link: [Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

1. Welcome - Call to Order – Introductions
2. Changes or Additions to the Agenda (*Action Item as needed*)
3. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items
4. Consent Agenda (*Action Items*)
 - 4.1. Approval of the November 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes (*Attachment 1*)
 - 4.2. TAMC Financial Report (*Attachment 2*)
5. Proposed FY21 Budget Amendments (*Memo & Attachment 3*)(*Action*)
6. Proposed FY22 TAMC Budget (*Memo & Attachment 4*)
7. 2021 “Pilot” Data Collection and Training Policy (*Memo & Attachment 5*)(*Action*)
8. Transportation Asset Management Plan Review & Acceptance (*Memo*)(*Action*)
9. 2020 TAMC Annual Report Update
10. Public Comments
11. Member Comments
12. Adjournment *Next meeting January 6, 2021.*

**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

DRAFT



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

Memo

To: TAMC Council & TAMC ACE Committee Members
From: Roger Belknap
Date: November 30, 2020
Re: FY2021 TAMC Budget Amendment

Background & Recommendation

The FY2021 TAMC Budget will need to be updated to reflect contract costs for the Michigan Technological University's Center for Technology and Training (MTU-CTT) 2021 Training and Education Program as well as the 2021 TAMC Technical Assistance Activities Program. The FY2021 approved budget allocated \$225,000 for the Training Program, however the approved contract amount was \$211,391.21; The FY2021 approved budget allocated \$115,000 for Technical Assistance Activities, however the approved contract amount was \$129,464.81. These two changes will increase the MTU-CTT program budgets by \$856.02, which has little effect to the overall TAMC program budget.

Also, since the approved budget also included \$10,000 for the Fall 2020 TAMC Conference, TAMC may consider moving the \$10,000 into the Unallocated Contingency since TAMC did not incur travel, food or lodging costs against the \$10,000 because the event was held in a web-based platform.

Attachments

Attachment 3 shows a comparison of the TAMC Approved FY2021 Budget and the amendments proposed.

TAMC Budget FY2021 - DRAFT Ammendment



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

	FY21 Budget Approved	FY21 Budget Proposed
	\$	\$
I. Data Collection & Regional-Metro Planning Asset Management Program		
Battle Creek Area Transportation Study	\$ 20,500.00	\$ 20,500.00
Bay County Area Transportation Study	\$ 19,900.00	\$ 19,900.00
Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
East Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 108,000.00	\$ 108,000.00
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 46,000.00
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 22,000.00
Macatawa Area Coordinating Council	\$ 19,000.00	\$ 19,000.00
Midland Area Transportation Study	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000.00
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 51,000.00	\$ 51,000.00
Networks Northwest	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
Region 2 Planning Commission	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Saginaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000.00
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 55,000.00
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 174,000.00	\$ 174,000.00
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 41,000.00
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	\$ 88,000.00	\$ 88,000.00
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 54,000.00
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	\$ 42,000.00	\$ 42,000.00
MDOT Region Participation	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
PASER Quality Review	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Fed. Aid Data Collection & RPO/MPO Program Total	\$ 1,116,400.00	\$ 1,116,400.00
III. Central Data Agency (MCSS)	\$ 374,950.00	\$ 374,950.00
IV. MTU Training & Education Program Contract	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 211,391.21
V. MTU Activities Program Contract	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 129,464.81
VI. TAMC Expenses		
Fall Conference Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -
Spring Conference Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Unallocated / Contingency	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Other Council Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
TAMC Expenses Total	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Total Program	\$ 1,871,350.00	\$ 1,872,206.02
Appropriation - Michigan Transportation Fund	\$ 1,876,400.00	\$ 1,876,400.00
VII. Special Projects with Separate Budgets	FY21 Budget	FY21 Budget
MI Local Agency Culvert Inventory Pilot (FY2018 HB4320 S-3)		
Central Data Agency (MCSS)	\$ -	\$ -
MTU Project Management & Training Program Contract	\$ -	\$ -
TAMC Administration & Contingency	\$ 472,863.51	\$ 472,863.51
Data Collection & Equipment (Allocation to Local Agencies)		
Special Projects Total	\$ 472,863.51	\$ 472,863.51



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

Memo

To: TAMC Council & TAMC ACE Committee Members
From: Roger Belknap
Date: November 30, 2020
Re: FY2022 DRAFT TAMC Budget

Background & Recommendation

TAMC will need to adopt a FY2022 Budget at the January 6, 2021 meeting. As part of the TAMC Strategic Planning Session held on September 9, 2020, staff provided reports on historical expenses in support of the TAMC program. Are there any questions or considerations that should be evaluated ahead of the January 2021 TAMC meeting?

Attachments

Attachment 4 shows a comparison of the TAMC Approved FY2021 Budget and the Proposed FY2022 TAMC Budget.

**TAMC Budget
FY2022 - DRAFT Proposed**



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

	FY21 Budget Approved	FY22 Budget Proposed
	\$	\$
I. Data Collection & Regional-Metro Planning Asset Management Program		
Battle Creek Area Transportation Study	\$ 20,500.00	\$ 20,500.00
Bay County Area Transportation Study	\$ 19,900.00	\$ 19,900.00
Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
East Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 108,000.00	\$ 108,000.00
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 46,000.00
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 22,000.00
Macatawa Area Coordinating Council	\$ 19,000.00	\$ 19,000.00
Midland Area Transportation Study	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000.00
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 51,000.00	\$ 51,000.00
Networks Northwest	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00
Region 2 Planning Commission	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Saginaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000.00
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 55,000.00
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	\$ 174,000.00	\$ 174,000.00
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 41,000.00
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	\$ 88,000.00	\$ 88,000.00
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 54,000.00
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	\$ 42,000.00	\$ 42,000.00
MDOT Region Participation	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
PASER Quality Review	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Fed. Aid Data Collection & RPO/MPO Program Total	\$ 1,116,400.00	\$ 1,116,400.00
III. Central Data Agency (MCSS)	\$ 374,950.00	\$ 374,950.00
IV. MTU Training & Education Program Contract	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 225,000.00
V. MTU Activities Program Contract	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 115,000.00
VI. TAMC Expenses		
Fall Conference Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Spring Conference Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Unallocated / Contingency	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Other Council Expenses	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
TAMC Expenses Total	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Total Program	\$ 1,871,350.00	\$ 1,871,350.00
Appropriation - Michigan Transportation Fund	\$ 1,876,400.00	\$ 1,876,400.00



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

Memo

To: TAMC Council & TAMC ACE Committee Members
From: Roger Belknap
Date: November 30, 2020
Re: 2021 Data Collection and Training Procedures

Background

TAMC has been discussing a variety of options for 2021 Roadway Condition Data Collection and Training as it is assumed the policy of 3-member Data Collection Teams for Federal Aid collection will not be an option for 2021. At the November 4 2020, TAMC meeting, the following 4 options were discussed, with most members favoring option #2.

1. Keep the three-person teams and continue with current and past practice.
2. Use a two-person two agency team.
3. Use a two-person one agency team having another agency review and concur with the data gathered set by a sample.
4. Use a two-person one agency team with no review of data until after the fact QA/QC is done statewide.

At the November 18, 2020 TAMC Data Committee meeting, a recommendation of #2 was formally approved. TAMC members also expressed viewing 2021 as a "Pilot Year" for alternatives to the current policy as opposed to making permanent changes to the policy.

Attachments

Attachment 5 contains a first Draft of the 2021 "Pilot" Policy for the Collection of Roadway Surface Condition Data that will be discussed at the meeting. Staff has highlighted areas of proposed changes to the existing policy; for ease of use, here is a link to [current TAMC data collection policy](#).



Policy for Pilot Collection of Roadway Surface Condition Data

The intent of this pilot policy is to provide guidance on procedures and related training considerations for roadway condition data collection while temporary state of emergency declaration is in place that would otherwise prohibit standard TAMC policies for data collection. The Transportation Asset Management Council approved this policy to go into effect on _____, and will expire on _____.

Introduction:

The Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC) was established to expand the practice of asset management statewide to enhance the productivity of investing in Michigan's roads and bridges. Part of the TAMC's mission is to collect physical inventory and condition data on all roads and bridges in Michigan. This document describes the policy and procedures for collecting the physical inventory and surface condition data of paved and unpaved roads and streets owned by Public Act 51 agencies on the Federal Aid eligible and Non-Federal Aid eligible within Michigan. The TAMC has a TAMC Asset Management Coordinator who is responsible for the support and operation of the TAMC activities.

According to Act 51 (P.A. 499 2002, P.A. 199 2007); each Local Road Agency and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) shall annually report to the TAMC the mileage and condition of the road and bridge system under their jurisdiction. Additionally, procedures and requirements developed and presented by the TAMC shall, at a minimum, include the areas of training, data storage and collection, reporting, development of a multiyear program, budgeting and funding, and other issues related to asset management.

The TAMC has given the responsibility of managing the TAMC work program to the Regional Planning Organizations (RPO)/Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). The RPO/MPOs have TAMC work activities included in their annual work programs and have funds allocated from the TAMC for those activities. The RPO/MPO will have to allocate those funds among eligible work activities in order to best complete the priorities of the TAMC. Therefore, the RPO/MPO may need to limit its authorizations for reimbursements to manage its work programs.

This policy applies to the collection of roadway surface condition data on:

- Federal-aid (FA) eligible network of public roads and streets using the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating system (PASER),
- Non-Federal-aid (NFA) eligible network of public roads and streets using the PASER system, and
- Unpaved roads and streets on either the FA or the NFA networks using the Inventory Based Rating™ (IBR) system.

Rating Teams

NOTE: Refer to the *PASER Training/Certification* Requirements section of this policy for training and certification requirements.

Data collection logs MUST contain rating team members' or observers' names and agencies, mileage, rating dates, and rating times. Although the TAMC supports interest by others in the data collection process, observers will not be reimbursed by the TAMC for their time.

FA Rating Teams

Rating teams must be comprised of a minimum of two raters: one (1) member representing the RPO/MPO and one (1) member representing the Act 51 road agency being rated (County, City/Village), OR one (1) member representing MDOT. All of these members must meet the training and/or certification requirements. Additional participants may be included however, they must meet the training/certification requirements in order to be reimbursed with TAMC funds through the RPO/MPO for their effort. Although the TAMC supports interest by others in the data collection process, observers will not be reimbursed by the TAMC for their time.

NFA Rating Teams

- a. If TAMC reimbursement for NFA data collection has not been approved, but the agency would like condition data included in TAMC's state wide database:**

The Act 51 road agency may establish their own collection schedule and collect data on their NFA network.

The rating team shall consist of a minimum of one rater: one (1) member/representative of the Act 51 road agency who meets the training and/or certification requirements.

The TAMC encourages all rating team participants to follow their agency's safety procedures and practices.

- b. If TAMC reimbursement is being requested:**

Road agencies must receive authorization prior to gathering any data from the RPO/MPO for reimbursement for NFA data collection.

Road agencies must submit a written request for reimbursement; the request should include the miles of NFA rated and the total estimated cost (actual costs claimed must not exceed the estimated costs) for the data gathering, trained/certified team members' time, and vehicle use. This request must also clarify which fiscal year the data collection and reimbursement will take place. Requests for NFA data collection reimbursement authorization are required to be received by the RPO/MPO by October 1.

The RPO/MPO decision on what requests for reimbursement are approved will consider:

- available budget,
- absence or age of the NFA data that will be collected,
- last year of reimbursement to the road agency for that NFA data set. No more frequently than once every three [3] years,
- rating team members' training and/or certification status

The rating team shall consist of a minimum of two (2) people: one (1) member/representative of the Act 51 road agency who meets the training and/or certification requirements and one (1) member who the Act 51 road agency chooses to represent it, RPO/MPO, Act 51 agency staff or others. Untrained or uncertified raters will not be reimbursed. Although the TAMC supports interest by others in the data collection process, observers will not be reimbursed by the TAMC for their time.

The TAMC encourages all rating team participants to follow their agency's safety procedures and practices.

PASER Training/Certification Requirements:

Training:

- Any rater who participates in the PASER data collection and influences the rating activity MUST attend PASER training in the same year the data collection occurs.
- New raters (never attended PASER training before) and seasoned raters (who did not attend PASER training the year prior) MUST attend one (1) supplemental PASER webinar training session in addition to attending one (1) on-site session.
- Individuals who are PASER Certified Raters are exempted from training as defined in PASER Certification Eligibility Requirements section of this policy.
- Any rater who participates in the data collection for unpaved roads shall attend IBR training within three years of the year IBR data collection is conducted.
- New IBR raters (never attended IBR training before) and seasoned raters (who did not attend IBR training within three calendar years of the IBR data collection) MUST attend one (1) IBR training session.
- RPO/MPO representatives are required to send at least one member of staff to attend PASER and IBR training events every year. Other RPO/MPO staff members can apply for certification status. RPO/MPO representatives are critical to the success of the PASER data collection effort, so it is important for them to continue to promote and support the program by attending training events.

Certification Eligibility Requirements:

To be considered a candidate to take the PASER certification exam the rater must meet the following criteria:

- All raters: Six (6) or more years (not including current year) of attendance of PASER training as verified through the Center for Technology & Training (CTT) records.
- Raters who are licensed professional civil engineers: Three (3) or more years (not including current year) of attendance of PASER on-site training as verified through CTT records.
- Raters who actually rated a portion of their road network during TAMC collection for the same number of years trained (not including current year). This will be verified by a signed letter from the individual stating their rating experience.
- Raters who attended the annual TAMC PASER training portion of the workshop as well as the examination administration portion of the workshop.

Certification Exam:

- The written certification exam will be administered at the on-site sessions of PASER training to eligible candidates.
- Raters must pass the written certification exam during the on-site training sessions. The passing score is 70% correct or will be adjusted using the normal distribution (bell curve) of the scores depending on the difficulty of the exam questions at the discretion of CTT staff.
- Raters who do not pass the certification exam will be able to attend another PASER training session and retake the exam as many times in one year as space and CTT administration allows.
- The TAMC will hold exam results and exam questions as documents that are not open to the public without a freedom of information act request to prohibit development of files of exam questions that can be used to memorize facts rather than learning concepts.

There is no current certification exam for IBR (unpaved road) data collection.

Certification Responsibilities:

- Certified raters are required to attend PASER training every fourth year and recertify by taking the certification exam.
- Certified raters are required to attend an organizational webinar for updates to business rules and changes to the data collection process as necessary. This webinar is required to keep certified raters informed of new guidance in the program and provides raters with an opportunity to interact with TAMC members.

MDOT Region Representative Responsibilities

NOTE: Each MDOT Region must designate a MDOT Region Representative to be a contact source for the TAMC.

- Ensuring that a trained and/or certified MDOT rater participates on the rating team for the annual FA data collection.
- Providing an MDOT vehicle for the annual FA data collection.
- Ensuring non-MDOT members of rating team are provided with State of Michigan travel and reimbursement rate schedules at the start of the rating season.

RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator Responsibilities

NOTE: Each RPO/MPO must designate a RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator to be a contact source for the TAMC.

- Establishing the data collection schedule and coordinating the dates for FA road rating with the respective rating teams.

NOTE: The TAMC outlines policies for the data collection cycle schedule as well as first and last days of annual data collection in the *Data Collection* section.

- Ensuring the collection teams have access to the computer equipment and GPS devices needed for data collection.
- Ensuring the collection teams have access to vehicle capable of being used for data collection. In the event the collection teams are using vehicles owned by the Act 51 road agency, confirmation of insurance coverage of all passengers is required. Act 51 road agency may include equipment rental rates as defined in MDOT's Schedule C as associated costs for data collection. In the event the collection teams do not have access to a vehicle capable of being used for data collection, the RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator will secure a rental vehicle and administer rental contracts and obtain insurance coverage for all passengers.
- Ensuring/verifying the rating team has the required number of trained and/or certified raters from the Act 51 road agency(ies) collecting the road surface condition data (see the *Rating Teams* and the PASER Training/Certification Requirements sections of this policy for more information).
- Ensuring daily data collection logs which MUST contain team members or observers' names and agency, vehicle, vehicle mileage traveled, rating dates and time are accurately completed for each day of reimbursable data collection.
- Verifying/checking the miles of road surface condition data collected.
- Performing quality control checks of the data collected.

NOTE: The RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator MUST review the collected data—looking for missing entries (zeros), valid surface type, missing surface type, valid number of lanes, missing lane information, and large increases/decreases in PASER scores for road segments that have had no treatments—before sending it to the Center for Shared Solutions (CSS).

- Ensuring that the completed PASER data export file is the correct file type and submitting the PASER data export file to the CSS (see the *Data Submission/Standards* section of this policy for more information).
- Submitting RPO/MPO invoices for reimbursement to the TAMC Asset Management Coordinator monthly or quarterly for all expenses related to training, data collection efforts, quality control, and data submission activities. Including copies of daily collection logs and any other backup information as attachments to the invoice.

Data Collection

- FA data collection must be completed in a two- (2) year cycle for the entire FA network.
- NFA data collection is encouraged with or without TAMC reimbursement.
- Each rating team must complete the following logs when being reimbursed for their work:
 - Daily data collection logs which MUST contain team members or observers' names and agency, vehicle, vehicle mileage traveled, rating dates and time are accurately completed for each day of reimbursable data collection.
 - Prepare a list that includes rater's names and agencies, as well as the certification that all raters were appropriately trained/certified.
- Data collection on paved roads must be consistent with the current [TAMC PASER Training Manual](#), the [Sealcoat Revised Rating Guide for Michigan](#), and, when appropriate, the [Asphalt, Concrete, and Sealcoat PASER Manuals](#) (accessible at <http://michiganlap.org/paser-resources>).
- Data collection on unpaved roads and streets must be consistent with the current IBR training and the *IBR Field Guide*.
- The use of the Roadsoft Laptop Data Collector (LDC) is required.
- The first day for data collection shall be the first Monday in April of each year; the last day for data collection shall be the last Friday in November of each year.

Data Submission/Standards

- FA/NFA data collected is to be submitted to the CSS by the RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator, who will submit the data following quality assurance and quality control guidelines.
- The export file from Roadsoft MUST be in a shapefile format; exports containing text files are not accepted. See the current [TAMC PASER Training Manual](#) (accessible at <http://michiganlap.org/paser-resources>) for additional information.
- The deadline for the RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator to submit the data to the CSS is the first Friday of December.

Reimbursement

Note: Act 51 road agencies must receive prior authorization from the RPO/MPO for reimbursement for NFA data collection. Please refer to the earlier section on NFA Rating Teams: b. If TAMC reimbursement is being requested section.

The TAMC has given the responsibility of managing portions of the TAMC work program to the RPO/MPOs. The RPO/MPOs have TAMC work activities included in their annual work programs and have funds allocated from the TAMC for those activities. The RPO/MPO will have to allocate

those funds among eligible work activities in order to best complete the priorities of the TAMC. Therefore the RPO/MPO may need to limit its authorizations for reimbursements in order to manage its work programs and will work with its members to coordinate activities.

- Rating team members who represent MDOT will be reimbursed by the TAMC via annual approved budget for PASER review.
- Rating team members who represent the RPO/MPO will be reimbursed via annual project authorization with the TAMC.
- Rating team members who represent Act 51 (county, city, or village) road agencies will be reimbursed, for FA data collection and, with prior authorization, for NFA data collection activities, and for expenses directly related to the data collection effort (i.e., time, travel, meals, vehicle) via annual RPO/MPO project authorization with the TAMC. The TAMC will not directly reimburse Act 51 road agencies. Act 51 road agencies shall submit invoices and supporting information to the RPO/MPO for costs associated with PASER data collection that has been authorized by the RPO/MPO. The RPO/MPO will request payment from MDOT and subsequently reimburse the road agency following receipt of payment from MDOT.
- The RPO/MPO Regional Coordinator will submit invoices for reimbursement to the TAMC Asset Management Coordinator monthly or quarterly for all expenses related to training, data collection efforts, quality control, any Act 51 road agency's associated cost invoice(s) detailing expenses directly related to data collection (i.e., time, travel and/or meal reimbursements), and data submission activities. Time, travel and/or meal reimbursements will be processed according to State of Michigan travel and meal rates. Copies of daily collection logs, **vehicle rental contracts, rental rates** and any other backup information will be included as attachments to the invoice.

If you have any questions relating to this policy, please contact:

TAMC Asset Management Coordinator
Michigan Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 30050, 425 W. Ottawa Street
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 230-8192

www.michigan.gov/tamc



Memo

To: TAMC & ACE Committee Members
From: Gloria M. Strong, TAMC Departmental Technician
Date: November 30, 2020
Re: TAMP Group A – Due October 1, 2020 - Status and Recommendations

TAMC has been tasked by Public Act 32512 to receive and review Transportation Asset Management Plans from local road agencies responsible for 100 or more certified miles of road. There are 41 local agencies in Group A that are required to submit their TAMPs by October 1, 2020. As of November 24, 2020, TAMC has received 30 City and Local Agency TAMPs uploaded into the IRT for TAMC review. TAMC support staff has reviewed each of the TAMPs submitted for the seven required elements as mandated by Public Act 325: 1) Pavement, Bridge, Culvert, & Traffic Signal Assets Inventory, 2) Performance Goals 3) Performance Outcomes 4) Revenues and Expenses 5) Project Coordination with Other Entities 6) Risk of Failure, and 7) Proof of Acceptance by the Local Agency's Governing Board.

Recommendation for TAMP Approval:

Below are agencies that have submitted a TAMP meeting all of the requirements per Public Act 325 and are recommended approval of their TAMP since the November 4, 2020 TAMC Meeting:

1. City of Troy	5. Huron County Road Commission
2. Road Commission of Kalamazoo County	6. City of Royal Oak
3. City of Grand Rapids	7. City of Southfield
4. Sanilac County	

Below are the agency TAMPs that were approved by TAMC at their November 4, 2020 Meeting:

1. Ottawa County	10. City of Walker
2. Iosco County Road Commission	11. City of Lansing
3. Oceana County Road Commission	12. Muskegon County
4. Cheboygan County Road Commission	13. City of Livonia
5. Alger County Road Commission	14. Osceola County Road Commission
6. Wayne County Road Commission	15. Monroe County Road Commission
7. Macomb County Department of Roads	16. St. Joseph County Road Commission
8. Genesee County Road Commission	17. Calhoun County
9. Berrien County Road Department	

Agency TAMPs Requiring Additional Information

The following agency TAMPs require additional information as noted. TAMC support staff will work with each agency to assist them with meeting the Act requirements.

1. City of Romulus – Agency only submitted a one-page project table. Agency has been contacted by email 10/28/2020 and agency responded that they will upload their complete TAMP into the IRT as soon as possible.
2. Lenawee County Road Commission - No meeting minutes/resolution; only a signed certification for Proof; Scott Merillat will get TAMP Approval/Resolution at 12/03/2020 Board Meeting.
3. City of Wyoming – Missing Bridges, Culverts and Traffic Signal Asset Inventories and Agency Proof of TAMP Approval. Agency has been contacted by email 10/29/2020.
4. Clinton County Road Commission – No signed certificate/meeting minutes accepting the TAMP and Coordination of Effort documentation. 11/10/2020 Agency responded that they are working on getting this information to TAMC and will upload it into the IRT as soon as possible.
5. City of Ann Arbor – Still under review. Agency submitted in a PowerPoint presentation which does not meet the requirements of Public Act 325. Additional review and contact with agency is needed. 11/24/2020 – Addition review completed, agency contacted and requested to submit the required information.
6. Dickinson County Road Commission – Needs Traffic Signal Assets; 10/30/2020 - TAMC support staff contacted agency and requested needed information. 11/11/2020 – Agency responded they will upload this information into the IRT as soon as possible.