

MINUTES  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
BRIDGE COMMITTEE MEETING**

July 23, 2020 at 2:00 p.m.

Meeting was held via Teleconference per Executive Order from Governor Gretchen Whitmer  
Discontinuing In-Person/Large Meetings Due to the Coronavirus 19 Pandemic

**MINUTES**

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

**Committee Members Present:**

Christopher Bolt, MAC  
Rebecca Curtis, MDOT – Chair  
Brian Vilmont, Prein & Newhof

Keith Cooper, MDOT - Vice Chair  
Wayne Harrall, KCRC  
Brad Wieferich, MDOT

**Support Staff Present:**

Niles Annelin, MDOT  
Jesus Esparza, MDOT  
Dave Jennett, MDOT  
Bill McEntee, CRA

Roger Belknap, MDOT  
Chris Gilbertson, MTU  
Tim Lauxman, DTMB/CSS  
Gloria Strong, MDOT

**Public Present:**

None

**Members Absent:**

Al Halbeisen, OHM Advisers

**1. Welcome - Call-To-Order - Introductions:**

The meeting was called-to-order at 2:07 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting. G. Strong did a roll call to verify attendance.

**2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:**

None

**3. Additions or Deletions of Agenda Items:**

None

**4. Consent Agenda (Action Item):**

**4.1. - Approval of the May 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)**

**4.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Memo and Attachment 2)**

R. Belknap provided a copy of an updated budget report. All recently received invoices including funds paid to MTU and CSS for their culvert activities are included in the report.

**Motion:** B. Vilmont made a motion to approve the May 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes; Wayne Harrall seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

## **5. Update Items:**

### **5.1. – 2020 Bridge Inspections (Memo Attachment 3)**

The Federal Highway Administration has clarified that the National Bridge Inspection standards still stand and that all bridge owners will be inspecting their bridges on time and the data should not be affected by COVID-19 related restrictions. A notice has been sent out to bridge owners.

### **5.2. – Culvert Activities – R. Curtis/C. Gilbertson/R. Belknap (Memo Attachment 4)**

#### **5.2.1. – Survey of 2018 Local Agency Culvert Pilot Project Inventory Participants**

C. Gilbertson put together a summary of the culvert survey results. MTU will be doing Culvert Data Collection using Roadsoft and Culvert Condition Evaluations training webinars in September. These trainings may not change much in the future except for possibly the condition evaluation.

MTU did interviews with non-transportation agencies to find out how they may be able to use culvert data. None of them had a high level of use for the culvert data. They were content with the culvert data that they currently have. Huron Pines feels they have most of the data they need. The Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) was interested in taking a look at the data. Wexford County reached out to non-transportation agencies that have been doing culvert collections to get their data. MTU checked with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on their on-line reporting tool. MTU continues to gather data from different agencies. C. Gilbertson signed up to get access to the DNR database but is not sure if it is necessary for everyone to do that. It appears, SEMCOG may be able to use the culvert data the most.

MTU looked at MDOT's culvert condition assessment system evaluation data. TAMC has been holding off on using funding until we know more about what the needs are from agencies. Transportation agencies may not be ready to do the culvert data collection at this time.

For the Committee to have a full understanding of what to put in the Culvert Data Collection policy, MTU reached out to the culvert pilot project participants. The agencies like the type of culvert information that they collected.

C. Gilbertson showed graphs with the culvert survey data. In the pilot they used point data and most people prefer line data. Other areas reviewed were: simplified ratings, evaluation periods (how often should culverts be surveyed; some people said about every 10 years), how would they use the culvert data from the pilot (60-70 percent were still collecting culvert data after the pilot and they provided comments on how they did the collection); 22 percent said they would find other areas culvert data useful. They had a concern on the quality of the data and how it was collected; 78 percent have no concerns sharing their culvert data in a statewide database and some concern with how the data would be used. For the culvert data to be of any value, there needs to be a need for the data. It does not make sense to do all of this work and there is no use for the culvert data.

If anyone wants the actual survey results from the survey, C. Gilbertson will forward that upon request.

### **5.2.2. – TAMC Policy for the Collection of Culvert Data – R. Belknap/R. Curtis/ C. Gilbertson**

If the Bridge Committee plans to recommend to the full Council to pursue culvert data collection, Bridge Committee needs to show that there is a need and how the culvert data should be collected, what type of information should be gathered, if culvert data collection should be placed on a schedule as required of PASER data collection, if TAMC will need to seek more funding to do the culvert data collections, and how often it should be gathered. If TAMC decides to collect the culvert data, there will need to be a policy. The policy will need to reflect what at a minimum should be done to meet the requirements of the asset management plan per Public Act 325.

For the Culvert Pilot Project MTU provided how to collect the culvert data by using Roadsoft, what to collect, condition evaluation training, and provided a guidebook to evaluate the culvert. C. Gilbertson will check to see if Roadsoft has a section for frequency of culvert data collections.

Once there is a policy, MTU will adapt their trainings towards the policy. The trainings that MTU have scheduled for September 2020 will be the same as the pilot project training. It is felt it may be difficult if it is mandated for some of the smaller agencies to collect the culvert data as they did for the pilot project. They may not have the manpower.

TAMC may not mandate that agencies collect culvert data, but if an agency decides to collect the culvert data, and especially if they use the TAMC funding, everyone will need to be consistent when submitting their data. Therefore, a policy will be needed to provide guidance.

MTU will summarize the survey results and their findings in a report and make a recommendation to full Council as to what they recommend the Council do for culvert data. They will have the final report in draft form no later than the end of September. At the next Bridge Committee meeting in August 2020, C. Gilbertson will provide a draft report to the Bridge Committee. He will then add in anything that comes out of the August Bridge Committee meeting and provide a final draft report in September. Support staff has started to pull together a draft culvert policy outline. They will provide the draft policy outline at the August Bridge Committee meeting. At this time, it looks as if the recommendation to full Council will be to follow the same requirements as used for the Culvert Pilot Project in 2018, with some minor changes.

The Bridge Committee will calendarize the process so everyone knows what the plan is for culverts and creating the culvert policy and keep everyone involved on track. This would then be shared with the full Council. The Committee is currently on schedule for what was previously discussed. This plan will dictate on how the money will be spent. There is an ability to amend contracts to add culvert work.

MTU recently billed towards the remaining culvert funds for the survey. There is currently \$472,863.51 in the remaining culvert funds. The original allocation was \$2,000,000.00. MTU has provided a list of the number of agencies and number of culverts they inventoried. R. Belknap and C. Gilbertson will work on a draft budget for the remaining 2018 Culvert Pilot Project funds and present that at the August Bridge Committee meeting.

**Action Item:** MTU will provide a draft of its culvert findings with a recommendation of action for culvert data collection based on their findings to the Bridge Committee at the August 2020 meeting. A final draft will be submitted to full Council in September 2020.

**Action Item:** C. Gilbertson will check to see if Roadsoft has a section for frequency of culvert data collections.

**Action Item:** Support staff will provide a draft culvert policy outline at the August Bridge Committee Meeting.

**Action Item:** R. Belknap and C. Gilbertson will work on a draft budget for the remaining 2018 Culvert Pilot Project funds and present the budget at the August Bridge Committee meeting.

**5.2.3. - Status of Integrating 2018 Pilot Data into TAMC Dashboards/IMAP  
– R. Belknap**

This is currently in the UAT testing stage and is expected to go live in 2 – 3 weeks. R. Belknap gave a brief demonstration of the dashboards and interactive maps.

**5.3. - Local Agency Bridge Data Cleanup Efforts from IRT – J. Esparza/D. Jennett/  
B. McEntee**

J. Esparza and D. Jennett have been working on cleaning up contact information and cost for bridge projects of \$100 or less. The City of Grand Rapids, Muskegon County Road Commission and Oakland County Road Commission have updated their information. J. Esparza and D. Jennett have sent out a second request to different contacts that could possibly update the needed information. There are a few projects entered that have zero-dollar projects. In the future, these will need to be discussed, especially when doing an estimation of costs. Some agencies need to update their bridge projects in the IRT. It is recommended that once the projects are open to traffic the agencies report the project in the IRT. Bridge projects in ADARS do not populate into the IRT. The agency would need to enter them in.

**5.4. - Status of Bridge Committee Priorities in TAMC Work Program & 2020  
TAMC Strategic Planning Session – Belknap (Memo Attachment 5)**

The Bridge Committee's tasks in the TAMC Work Program were discussed and updated at their last meeting. The work plan will provide a good snapshot of the Bridge Committee's goals and objectives at the September Strategic Planning Session. R. Belknap will provide a final draft to the committee at their August 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**6. Public Comments:**

None

**7. Member Comments:**

None

**8. Adjournment:**

**Motion:** K. Cooper made a motion to adjourn the meeting; W. Harrall seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

The next TAMC Bridge Committee meeting is scheduled for August 27, 2020, via Microsoft Teams Meeting.

## 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>DI</b>	DISTRESS INDEX
<b>ESC</b>	EXTENDED SERVICE CONTRACT
<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.08.22.2019.GMS

DRAFT