

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE**

September 16, 2020 at 1:00 p.m.

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

MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Jonathan Start, MTPA– Vice Chair
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Support Staff Present:

Niles Annelin, MDOT
Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP
Jesus Esparza, MDOT
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Roger Belknap, MDOT
Eric Costa, MDOT
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Kyle Nelson, MDOT
Mike Toth, MDOT

Members Absent:

Robert Slattery, MML

Public Present:

Amber Hicks, MIC
Lance Malburg, Dickenson County Road Commission
Doug Mills, Baraga County Road Commission

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

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:05 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting. G. Strong conducted a roll-call to verify attendance.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda:

3.1. – Approval of August 19, 2020 Data Committee Meeting Minutes – Action Item (Attachment 1)

3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)

R. Belknap provided an updated copy of the TAMC budget. There is still a large fund balance available due to federal aid data collections have not taken place due to COVID-19 related executive orders.

Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

4. Review and Discussion Items:

**4.1. – 2020 and 2021 Pavement Condition Data Collection – R. Belknap/B. McEntee/
T. Colling**

TAMC has sent out communications to transportation partners informing them that federal aid data collections are suspended for this year due to COVID-19 restrictions and the federal aid monies are good until June 31, 2021 for federal aid data collection. TAMC will need to know by mid-November 2020 what

the Council can do for next year procedurally, for trainings, data sharing and quality review. Things will need to be put in place in order to get the quality data that is needed

4.1.1. – Policy Contingencies for Federal Aid Rating Teams – T. Colling

T. Colling suggested TAMC find out what the agencies policies are for employees riding in vehicles to collect data. TAMC will need to reach out to organizations like CRA, MPOs, RPOs, and MDOT to see what is allowed. He proposed the Council send out a survey to determine the social distancing policies at data collection agencies. T. Colling stated he has not heard of any agencies not willing to collect data this year. Some agencies are appointing a designee such as a consultant.

J. Start stated that if an agency decides that they are not going to participate, there is an option of another agency possibly collecting the smaller agencies data for them. A question was raised if two people from two agencies is still a viable option and how would this impact the quality of the data collected? One of the suggestions from MTU was a region and a road owner could do a co-rating. MDOT staff could then go back and rate 10 percent of the roads and compare the findings. If there are outliers, the agencies would need to review why there were differences. If the agencies cannot come to concurrence, they would then go out and collect another 10 percent. This is basically cross-checking each other, would not over-burden everyone, and it will help with quality control. This would cost up to 20 percent more. MTU would add a tool in Roadsoft and laptop data collectors where it would select the 10 percent samples randomly. The MDOT Regions, MPOs and RPOs would manage the process. A second option discussed is a statewide unilateral check where one consultant will do a review of a half percent of the entire state at the end of the year. The third possible option would be to go out with a Grand Valley Metro Council type van and do a video logging and have someone view those videos and rate them. It would cost approximately \$50.00 a mile as opposed to the regular \$13.00 a mile. By collecting the data this way however, they are unable to get the rutting data. The third option may not be viable especially due to the cost and it is very hard to rate using a video. There are going to be many issues to work out with any of these options for instance, how would TAMC do the rating and how would they check the rating?

All members of the TAMC Data Committee agreed to allow T. Colling to ask informally at the CRA Engineering Committee meeting tomorrow how many people are they allowing in the data collection van. MDOT's current COVID-19 precautions did not allow staff to participate in federal aid data collections in 2020.

Doug Mills suggested TAMC consider using two vehicles where two people would ride in one vehicle and an MDOT staff in another vehicle. Some did not feel it would be safe for a person to drive, rate, and talk on the radio. If using two vehicles the Committee feels it would take four individuals for safety. There may be a need for TAMC to have another policy demonstrating the minimum conditions to gather the federal aid data. The Council will need to check if the minimum is still viable today.

4.1.2. – Non-Federal Aid Collection – J. Start

TAMC still requires a two-person team and one must be qualified to do the rating.

4.1.3. – Quality Review Procedures – M. Toth

In the past, TAMC had requested that Chan Singh, MDOT, do the PASER quality control. Gil Chesbro, retired former TAMC Data Analysis Specialist, created some segments and C. Singh went out and reviewed the segmented clusters each year. Both have since retired from MDOT. However, the segmented clusters software remains with M. Toth who knows the quality control process. It would take a lot to train a new vendor. Talking with CSS, MTU, and TAMC support staff, M. Toth would like to see if the quality rating process can be moved internally to Roadsoft and maintained

through the Roadsoft team. M. Toth has not reached out to the vendor but he feels it will not be an issue to revise their contract. T. Colling does not see it any different than any other agency and MTU would be able to take that data into Roadsoft and give it to the agencies. Doing what M. Toth is suggesting would allow a crosscheck for quality control. They could make these changes by end of December or first of January. The concurrence ratings are to make sure that all the agencies involved accept the results of the data collections. If the COVID 19 pandemic is still active, TAMC will need to make changes in order to collect federal aid data as well as have quality control. The suggested changes are to do co-rating data collection and then conduct a statewide overall rating to keep the quality controlled. M. Toth would like to know if TAMC would like to extend the sample segments, if so, M. Toth will check with the vendor to see if they would do the changes and amend their contract. T. Colling will look for a past network view.

At this time, a two-person team, one from county and one from region, has been discussed and is being considered for reimbursement for federal aid data collection for next year, FY 2021. TAMC will not be altering the 3-person teams for FY 2020. Most of the agencies can use data from the last three years if they are not able to collect data this year for their TAMP. TAMC does not have any additional funding to assist with the TAMP. The current work program with the MPO/RPO does include development of the TAMP. Each planning region must decide how much they can help with the creation of TAMPs. The regions will need to have discussions with the local agencies to determine how much they can afford to give towards the development of the local agency TAMP. Regions have received an increase in funds in the past for additional data collection. There is no one size fits all approach for each agency. J. Tubbs reminded everyone that in the past TAMPs were only required if they wanted to move funds; these were not TAMC requirements.

4.2. – Traffic Signal Inventory Status Update – T. Colling

MTU continues to get ground truth and do more testing. They are using crash data and Google Earth as their sources to find signals. They have gone from 300 signals to approximately 700 signals and coming up with approximately 99-100 percent accurate signal counts. They anticipate having approximately 11,000 MDOT and local signals. They are differentiating between flashing signals and actual traffic signals.

4.3. – Culvert Activities Status Update – R. Belknap

MTU is working on their final draft report that they have submitted and received comments from the TAMC Bridge Committee. This report is based upon the findings from MTU to assist the Bridge Committee in creating a culvert data collection policy. This will be discussed at the next TAMC Bridge Committee meeting.

4.4. – Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Updates – C. Granger/B. McEntee

CSS has \$7,500 left in this year's budget and TAMC will need to plan their projects accordingly. If TAMC wants to implement the STIP or Culverts dashboard, CSS will need the hours to do that. The Data Committee would like CSS to plan on doing on-line trainings only for next year.

4.4.1. – Sharepoint Access and Use – D. Jennett

D. Jennett would like the Data Committee members to check and let him know if they can access Sharepoint.

4.4.2. - Dashboard Schedules and Data Sharing

The bridge and roads dashboard updates will be done by the spring and the finance, safety, and traffic dashboards are due in the fall but may be pushed back to November.

4.4.3. - State Transportation Improvement Program (JobNet/STIP) Integration with IRT – D. Jennett

D. Jennett did a brief demonstration in the test environment showing some of the changes made to the website, dashboards (including culvert), and IRT. It is hopeful that the changes will be completed by end of October and shown at the October TAMC virtual fall conference.

4.4.4. – Culvert Dashboard and Interactive Map Demonstration – D. Jennett

D. Jennett provided a brief demonstration of the culvert dashboard and interactive maps currently being created in the IRT.

4.4.5. – Status Update of 2019 IRT Bridge Data Clean-up – J. Esparza

Nothing new to report. TAMC support staff is still waiting on the last three agencies to submit updates or changes in the IRT for projects identified in the IRT with a cost amount of \$100 or less. Ed Hug, from the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, is assisting support staff in getting updates from Monroe County who has approximately 45 of the identified projects in the IRT.

4.5. – Progression of Statewide Strategy and Forecasting – B. McEntee/E. Costa

E. Costa is expanding the forecasting modal by using a six region approach to see how the data in the IRT can be incorporated. E. Costa is looking at the average deterioration rate by region. They may need to add a disclaimer about using mock data for the deterioration rate since we don't actually have 2020 data. He will be aging the system one year using the data that is currently available. This will go in the forecast for next year. They are looking at how the data can be used for next year's annual report. The forecast will be completed and shared in October 2020. He can present it to either the full Council or the Data Committee whichever group is available first. The next Data Committee meeting is in November.

4.6. - Data Committee Priorities in the TAMC 2021-2023 Work Program – R. Belknap (Memo and Attachment 3)

The TAMC 2021-2023 Work Program was reviewed and modified at the September 9, 2020 TAMC Strategic Planning Session. R. Belknap would like the Data Committee to review the changes he has made from the session and give feedback on the changes made to the goals and objectives.

Action Item: Data Committee members should provide comments on the TAMC 2021-2023 Work Program to R. Belknap by the next Data Committee meeting scheduled on November 18, 2020.

5. Public Comments:

None

6. Member Comments:

None

7. Adjournment:

J. Tubbs made a motion to adjourn; B. McEntee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m. The next TAMC Data Committee meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2020, at 1:00 p.m., via Microsoft Teams Meeting.

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
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE CONTRACT
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.08.22.2019.GMS