



Michigan  
Transportation Asset  
Management Council

## Administrative, Communication and Education Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, February 3, 2021 @ 10:30 AM

Please take notice that a meeting of the Administrative, Communications and Education Committee of the Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC) will take place by electronic means of Web Meeting and Telephone Conferencing for the above date and time as provided under [Act 267 of the Public Acts of 1976](#) as amended, or commonly referred to as the Open Meetings Act. Members of the public body may participate by electronic means by joining Web Meeting and Telephone Conference links provided below. Persons needing accommodations for participating in this meeting should contact Roger Belknap-TAMC Coordinator, at least 24 hours prior to the start of this meeting: [belknapr@michigan.gov](mailto:belknapr@michigan.gov) Telephone: (517) 230-8192.

Meeting Telephone Conference Line: +1 248-509-0316 Access Code: 445 090 990 #

Web Meeting Access Link: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

1. Welcome - Call to Order – Introductions
2. Election of Committee Officers
3. Changes or Additions to the Agenda (*Action Item as needed*)
4. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items
5. Consent Agenda (*Action Items*)
  - 5.1. Approval of the December 2, 2020 Meeting Minutes (*Attachment 1*)
  - 5.2. TAMC Financial Report (*Attachment 2*)
6. 2021 TAMC Conferences
7. 2021 TAMC Awards Program
8. Transportation Asset Management Plan Review & Acceptance (*Memo*)(*Attachment 3*)
9. Public Comments
10. Member Comments
11. Adjournment *Next meeting March 3, 2021.*

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

December 2, 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:**

Steve Stepek, MTPA

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

The meeting was called to order at 10:33 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 November 4, 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; T. White seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

**5. Proposed FY 2021 Budget Amendments (Memo and Attachment 3) (Action Item) – R. Belknap**

R. Belknap reported that there were two MTU contracts approved at last month's meeting and he has submitted the required forms to execute the contracts to MDOT Finance. The FY 2021 TAMC budget will need to be updated to reflect contract costs for the MTU 2021 Training and Education Program as well as, the 2021 TAMC Technical Assistance Activities Program. The FY 2021 approved budget allocated \$225,000 for the training program however, the approved contract actual amount was \$211,391.21. The two contract dollar amounts were adjusted according to the MTU work tasks. The FY 2021 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 program budgets by

\$856.02, which has little effect to the overall TAMC program budget. Since the approved budget also included \$10,000 for the Fall 2020 TAMC Asset Management Conference, TAMC may consider moving the \$10,000 into the Unallocated Contingency since TAMC did not incur travel, catering, or lodging costs against the \$10,000 because the conference was held in a web-based platform.

**Motion:** G. Mekjian made a motion to accept the modified actual contracts amounts as stated in the revised MTU contracts as provided; D. Bradshaw seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

#### **6. Proposed FY 2022 TAMC Budget (Memo and Attachment 4) – R. Belknap**

R. Belknap provided a copy of the TAMC FY 2021 approved budget and a proposed FY 2022 budget. He is hoping to have the FY 2022 budget adopted at the January 6, 2021 TAMC meeting. R. Belknap is not suggesting any changes to the proposed MPO/RPO budget at this time. The changes that were just approved under agenda item #5 for MTU are reflected in the 2022 budget. Support staff has not received any notification of a budget reduction for TAMC. Currently, the remaining \$465,000 culvert pilot project funds have not been designated to any specific culvert tasks. The Bridge Committee may have something to suggest in January 2021 of how to use the remaining funds. The ACE Committee would like the Bridge Committee to come up with suggestions on how to use the remaining funds as soon as possible. TAMC received the culvert funds in the spring of 2018. Once the Council decides on how to use the remaining 2018 culvert funds, they will need to begin revising the agency work programs.

**Motion:** D. Bradshaw made a motion to approve the draft 2022 budget as presented; G. Mekjian seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

#### **7. 2021 Pilot Data Collection and Training Policy (Memo and Attachment 5) (Action Item)**

At the November 4, 2020, TAMC meeting the following four options were discussed and most members supported Option 2. At the November 18, 2020 TAMC Data Committee meeting, a recommendation of option 2 was formally approved.

The four options are:

- 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.

S. Stepek stated that MTPA liked the flexibility of options 2 through option 4. TAMC supported Option 2 to use a two-person, two-agency team to do the data collection. MTPA and other local agencies want to be able to make that local decision on who makes up the two-person team that will be in the data collection vehicle. They want to have a say on who the people are in the vehicle. Currently, the agencies can have their own designee. The road owner designates their designee. TAMC has always allowed the agencies to decide who will be their designated person. A decision needs to be made if persons in the vehicle should be two from the same agency or a consultant, etc. or a two-person separate agency team designated by the road owner. It was suggested that a form be signed showing that the road agency has designated a specific person to do the rating so that there is a paper trail showing that the agency approved the people in the data collection vehicle. Most are in favor of temporarily approving a two-person team from two-agencies who has been trained and certified within the last three years. If both agencies do not have a problem with the two-person team being from the same agency, they can simply complete a consent form showing that both agencies are approving the two-person same agency rating team.

A 11/25/2020 Draft Pilot Policy for Collection of Roadway Surface Condition Data was reviewed, and several modifications were suggested and noted by support staff. Anyone who had been trained in 2018, 2019, and 2020 is allowed to be reimbursed for data collection this year. MTU has money in their budget to do training. The safest

way to train for the data collection is a web-based training. The rating certification is difficult to do web-based however, MTU is trying to figure out how to better train for the rating exercise. There are two issues that MTU is having and those are not being able to verify that a person was physically there, but they do have to sign something that says they were physically there. The other is using web-based, T. Colling feels people are going to demand using web-based training from now on. It is understood that there is value in training in-person but at this time not possible due to the COVID-19 restrictions. In the past, the first web-based trainings normally would begin in February. The first on-site trainings (3-4 hours sessions) are in February, March and April of each year. It is difficult to interact with people in web-based trainings. T. Collings suggested not allowing certification for this year as it would be difficult to proctor it. It would be difficult to assure that no one else took the test for them. As long as someone has been certified within the last three years, they are still certified.

For MPO/RPO responsibilities using equipment and vehicles for doing ratings, a minor issue about what they should do about using rented vehicles arose. The agency can reference Schedule C for reimbursements and if a vehicle is rented, the agency will need to reference where the vehicle was rented from and show rental contracts in order to get reimbursed.

#### **8. Transportation Asset Management Plan Review and Acceptance (Memo)(Action Item) – G. Strong:**

Per Public Act 325, 31 of the 41 Group A agencies have submitted their TAMPs to TAMC in the IRT. G. Strong did a review of the 31 TAMPs to assure that they met the requirements of the Act. Seventeen of the 31 TAMPs were recommended for approval at the November 2020 ACE Committee meeting. G. Strong is recommending approval today for seven of the 31 TAMPs that have been submitted in the IRT to TAMC. She has provided a listing in the memo for the Committees review detailing all her findings in the submitted TAMPs. G. Strong is still awaiting needed information from some agencies that did not submit all of the necessary documentation into the IRT. For the 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 these agencies until October 2024.

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, except for those agencies that have submitted past the October 1, 2020 due date. The agencies that have submitted past the October 1, 2020, deadline may not be in compliance of Public Act 325. T. White will review the Michigan Attorney General's Opinion that was recently received by MDOT regarding the TAMPs to verify if an agency is out of compliance with Public Act 325 if their TAMP was not received by the due date.

**Motion:** D. Bradshaw made a motion to recommend approval to the full Council pending the review of the Attorney General's opinion if the TAMC can state the agency is in compliance with Public Act 325 if the TAMP was received after the October 1, 2020 due date; T. White seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

#### **9. 2020 TAMC Annual Report Update – D. Jennett**

D. Jennett has begun work on the 2020 TAMC Roads and Bridges Annual Report. He is currently working on the SharePoint to get it operational for Council members and support staff to share documents that need to be reviewed for the report. Eric Costa, MDOT/TAMC Data Analyst, is working on the data analysis.

#### **10. Public Comments:**

None

#### **11. Member Comments:**

J. Start informed the ACE Committee that he will be replaced as representative of the MTPA by Ryan Buck. J. Start's last meeting will be in January 2021. The State Transportation Commission (STC) will have to take action to approve Ryan Buck to TAMC at their January 2021 meeting. Mr. Buck will begin working with TAMC in February 2021 if approved by the STC.

## **12. Adjournment:**

T. White made the motion to adjourn the meeting; D. Bradshaw seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting was adjourned at 11:54 a.m. The next meeting will be held January 6, 2021 at 10:30 a.m., via Microsoft Teams.

### **TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:**

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

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

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

DRAFT





# Memo

**To:** TAMC & ACE Committee Members  
**From:** Gloria M. Strong, TAMC Departmental Technician  
**Date:** January 8, 2021  
**Re:** TAMP Group A – Due October 1, 2020 – Status and Recommendations

TAMC has been tasked by Public Act 325 to receive and review Transportation Asset Management Plans from local road agencies responsible for 100 or more certified miles of road.

**TAMPs Current Status:**

# of Group A Agencies Due by Oct. 1, 2020	# TAMPs Received by Oct. 1, 2020	# TAMPs Received After October 1, 2020	# TAMPs Not Submitted	# TAMPs Pending Review
41	21	10	10	1

**TAMPs Recommended and Approved by TAMC - November 4, 2020:**

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	

**TAMPs Recommended for Approval and Still Pending – December 2, 2020:**

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	

**Group A Agencies that Have Not Submitted Their TAMPs and/or Pending Review:**

1. Baraga County	7. City of Kentwood
2. Bay County	8. Mason County
3. City of Dearborn Heights	9. Midland County
4. City of Farmington Hills ( <b>Received 12/1/20; pending review</b> )	10. City of Norton Shores
5. Hillsdale County	11. City of Portage
6. City of Jackson	

**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.

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL TAMP DISCUSSION  
MEETING**

January 11, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting was held via teleconference due to the discontinuing of in-person/large meetings due to the Coronavirus 19 Pandemic. Below are meeting minutes as provided under Act 267 of the Public Acts of 1976 as amended, or commonly referred to as the Open Meetings Act.

**MINUTES**

**\*\* Frequently Used Acronyms List attached**

**Members Present:**

Christopher Bolt, MAC  
Joanna Johnson, CRA/RCKC – Chair  
Gary Mekjian, MML  
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS  
Brad Wieferich, MDOT

Derek Bradshaw, MAR  
Bill McEntee, CRA – Vice-Chair  
Robert Slattery, MML  
Todd White, MDOT

**Support Staff Present:**

Niles Annelin, MDOT  
Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP  
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS  
Eric Mullen, MDOT

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

**Public Present:**

Ryan Buck, WATS/MTPA  
Amber Hicks, MIC

Jingjing Chang, MDOT  
Laura Loomis, MDOT

**Members Absent:**

Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

**1. Welcome – Call-To-Order:**

The meeting was called-to-order by at 10:00 a.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting. Attendance was verified by roll call by G. Strong. Today's discussion was led by J. Johnson, TAMC Chair.

At the December 2, 2020 TAMC meeting it was decided to set up a separate meeting in January 2021 to discuss whether or not an agency is out of compliance with Public Act 325 if they submitted their TAMP after the October 1, 2020 due date based upon the opinion recently received by MDOT from the Michigan Attorney General's Office and any other issues regarding TAMP submissions.

**2. Status of TAMP Submittals as of January 8, 2021 – G. Strong (Memo):**

G. Strong provided an update on the status of TAMP submittals along with a memo which includes actions taken by the Council on TAMPs at their November 4, 2020 meeting. There were 41 agencies due by October 1, 2020. Twenty-one TAMPs were received out of the expected 41 by October 1, 2020. Ten TAMPs were received after October 1, 2020. Ten agencies have not submitted their TAMPs. There is one TAMP currently pending review. G. Strong recommended approval of 17 TAMPs which were approved by the Council at their November 4, 2020 meeting. Fifteen of the 17 TAMPs approved by the Council at the November 4, 2020 meeting were received by the October 1, 2020 due date.

### **3. Review of Legislation Involving TAMC and Act 51:**

#### **3.1. – Links to TAMC-related Public Acts (Attachment 1)**

Legislation References:

- PA 164 - (13) less than 100 certified miles, the plan is considered approved on submission. Once approved by the local body.
- PA 153 - (7) A city or village that has not adopted an asset management plan shall obtain the concurrence of the department to transfer more than 50% of its major street funding to its local street system.

(16) Once the Asset Management plan for the city or village has been approved, amounts distributed to a city or village under this section shall be expended toward attainment of the condition goals in the asset management plan and as otherwise required by this act.

- PA 152 - (10) The reconstruction of an existing highway if not in conflict with its asset management plan as provided in section 9a..... Therefore, A county may expend surplus money for the development, construction, or repair of an off-street parking facility.

(23) Once the asset management plan for a county as described in section 9a has been approved, amounts distributed to a county under this section shall be expended toward attainment of the condition goals in the asset management plan and as otherwise required by this act.

#### **3.2. – TAMC Chair Email Links from December 2, 2020 (Attachment 2)**

#### **3.3. – Attorney General Summary of Opinion: November 4, 2020 (Attachment 3)**

Copies of the above were provided in today's meeting packet for reference to the discussion.

### **4. Questions Generated from this Conversation:**

**4.1. – The ability to transfer to the local system is still intact but must it only be used toward attainment of the TAMP?** For agencies not required to submit a TAMP the Act 51 team makes the decision as to whether or not an agency will be able to transfer funds. TAMC does not make that decision. TAMC support staff does assist the Act 51 team with review of all local agency TAMPs, which includes TAMPs from the smaller road agencies with under 100 certified miles. If an agency submits an unacceptable TAMP, per Public Act 325, Section 14, The transportation Asset Management Council shall provide an opportunity for the noncompliant local road agency to appear before the TAMC to discuss the reasons the local road agency is not compliant and ways for the local road agency to become compliant.

**4.2. – What if a TAMP was late and not certified? Does this restrict the ability to move monies?**

Per Public Act 325, the TAMP must be submitted by the date established by TAMC (October 1, 2020) and approved by the agency governing body or it is not an acceptable TAMP and not in compliance. From the Attorney General opinion, the TAMC is not given the authority to modify the schedule once established. The TAMC only has the authority to take actions specifically written in the legislation. L. Loomis stated that the Act 51 team works with the agency to become in compliance as the agency may not be aware of what they are required to submit. R. Slattery feels that the agency should still be able to transfer funds, regardless of if they submitted

by the October 1, 2020 date. The Act 51 team would make the final decision of whether or not an agency can transfer funds. Public Act 325 there is no penalty until October 2024, and 120 days after that date to become compliance once notified of any mandatory changes that need to be made to their TAMP to be an approved TAMP. The TAMC understands that they are unable to modify the TAMP due date schedules, however they want to work with each agency to become in compliance with Public Act 325. The Council does not want to penalize an agency to the point that they are not able to transfer funds. The Council is willing to work with agencies with training, use of the MTU template that is provided to the agencies, and submission of their TAMP into the IRT. TAMC would like to see all agencies successful in their submissions.

**4.3. – Who determines if there is attainment toward a goal?**

TAMC support staff and the Act 51 team work together with the agencies to help them be successful with submitting an acceptable TAMP. The reason that the Act 51 team does not allow them move no more than 50% of their funds is to assure that they have enough money to keep their major federal roads in good repair.

**4.4. – TAMP Plans “approved upon submittal” for those locals with fewer than 100 miles? What does that mean to them and how does this fit?**

Support staff would like to see the Council mirror the top 124 agencies process for the agencies with fewer than 100 miles and work with them to submit an acceptable TAMP.

**5. TAMC Policy for the Submittal and Review of Asset Management Plans (Attachment 4):**

A copy of the policy was provided for reference.

**6. Summary of Assignments for Committees:**

J. Johnson would like the ACE Committee to look at the current policy and work with the Data Committee to review what was discussed today and bring their recommendation to the February 3, 2021 TAMC meeting. TAMC support staff will work with the ACE Committee to draft letters of varying stages in the TAMP process and develop a method to encourage those agencies that have not yet submitted a TAMP.

**7. Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. The next full Council meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2021, at 1:00 p.m., via Microsoft Teams Meeting.

<b>TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:</b>		
<b>AASHTO</b>	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS	
<b>ACE</b>	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)	
<b>ACT-51</b>	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.	
<b>ADA</b>	AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT	
<b>ADARS</b>	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM	
<b>BTP</b>	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)	

<b>CFM</b>	COUNCIL ON FUTURE MOBILITY	
<b>CPM</b>	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	
<b>CRA</b>	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)	
<b>CSD</b>	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)	
<b>CSS</b>	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS	
<b>DI</b>	DISTRESS INDEX	
<b>ESC</b>	EXTENDED SERVICE CONTRACT	
<b>ETL</b>	Exchange, Transfer, and Load	
<b>FAST</b>	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT	
<b>FHWA</b>	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	
<b>FOD</b>	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)	
<b>FY</b>	FISCAL YEAR	
<b>GLS REGION V</b>	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION	
<b>GVMC</b>	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL	
<b>HPMS</b>	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	
<b>IBR</b>	INVENTORY BASED RATING	
<b>IRI</b>	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX	
<b>IRT</b>	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL	
<b>KATS</b>	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY	
<b>KCRC</b>	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION	
<b>LDC</b>	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS	
<b>LTAP</b>	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	
<b>MAC</b>	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES	
<b>MAP-21</b>	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 <sup>ST</sup> CENTURY (ACT)	
<b>MAR</b>	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS	
<b>MDOT</b>	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	
<b>MDTMB</b>	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET	
<b>MIC</b>	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION	
<b>MITA</b>	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION	
<b>MML</b>	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE	
<b>MPO</b>	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION	
<b>MTA</b>	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION	
<b>MTF</b>	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS	
<b>MTPA</b>	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION	
<b>MTU</b>	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY	
<b>NBI</b>	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY	
<b>NBIS</b>	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS	
<b>NFA</b>	NON-FEDERAL AID	
<b>NFC</b>	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	
<b>NHS</b>	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM	
<b>PASER</b>	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING	
<b>PNFA</b>	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID	
<b>PWA</b>	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION	
<b>QA/QC</b>	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL	
<b>RBI</b>	ROAD BASED INVENTORY	

<b>RCKC</b>	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY	
<b>ROW</b>	RIGHT-OF-WAY	
<b>RPA</b>	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY	
<b>RPO</b>	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION	
<b>SEMCOG</b>	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS	
<b>STC</b>	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	
<b>STP</b>	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM	
<b>TAMC</b>	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL	
<b>TAMCSD</b>	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION	
<b>TAMP</b>	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN	
<b>TPM</b>	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES	
<b>UWP</b>	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM	
<b>WATS</b>	WASHTENAW AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY	

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.09.09.2020.GMS

DRAFT