TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE
April 24, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.
MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan
MINUTES

**Frequently Used Acronyms Attached

Members Present:
Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair   Bob Slattery, MML, via Telephone
Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS   Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Support Staff Present:
Niles Annelin, MDOT   Roger Belknap, MDOT, via Telephone
Gil Chesbro, MDOT   Tim Colling, LTAP/MTU, via Telephone
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS   Polly Kent, MDOT
Dave Jennett, MDOT   Tim Lauxmann, DTMB/CSS
Craig Newell, MDOT   Gloria Strong, MDOT

Members Absent:
None

Public Present:
*Douglas Adelman, MDOT, via Telephone   *Colleen Hill-Stramsak, HRC, Inc, via Telephone
*Jim Hoekstra, Kalamazoo County, via Telephone   Karen Howe, MDOT
*Ryan Minkus, Kalamazoo County, via Telephone

***Traffic signal subject matter experts**

1.Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:
The meeting was called-to-order at 1:03 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting. P. Kent introduced Craig Newell as her replacement as the MDOT, Asset Management and Planning Division Administrator, due to her retirement on April 30, 2019.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:
None

3. Consent Agenda:
   3.1. – Approval of March 20, 2019 Data Committee Meeting Minutes – *Action Item* **(Attachment 1)**
   Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the March 20, 2019 meeting minutes; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

   3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)
   An updated financial report (04/19/2019) was provided to the committee.

4. Traffic Signal Pilot Efforts – B. McEntee (Attachment 3):

The Committee needs to determine which data elements need to be collected for traffic signals and added to the TAMC IRT. B. McEntee shared a list of traffic signal data elements that the committee feels TAMC may want agencies to collect. He requested that the committee review the list, select the elements that they feel would be required for the agencies to collect, place those elements on two lists – one high priority list and one low priority list. For the high priority list, which is colored green, are elements currently available in most agencies that have a traffic signal inventory and would be most useful for TAMC and would help with painting a broader picture of traffic signals statewide. The lower priority list, which is colored red, are the minimum elements needed for traffic signal inventory. This list does not have to be finalized prior to the due date of the traffic signal template, which is October 1, 2019. MTU is currently working on the draft template and expects to have the draft available for Council review by mid-May. B. McEntee suggested having the data elements selected by the Committee no later than the end of May and then Council can approve the requirements for the asset management plan template in June. If something is demanded, such as cost estimates, MTU will need to be given that information as soon as possible to place it in the template. The data elements that need to be collected can be changed right up to the due date. Currently, there is a placeholder in the template for culverts and traffic signals. Number of culverts, cost, and how many should be replaced each year are currently fields in the template. The majority of the elements are already in Roadsoft. MTU may be able to have Roadsoft compute the age of the signals if the agencies provide the installation dates of the signals. T. Colling will check to see if this is possible to add to Roadsoft. The traffic signal subject matter experts assisted the Committee in selecting what they believe are the necessary elements to collect. Some important data elements to collect are: Intersection Type, which includes – Signal, Pre-amped (firetrucks), Hawk (pedestrian), Railroad (should this be called Signal Type?); Age; Count Down Pedestrian; Span Type (NA is needed); Vehicle Heads (Number of Heads); Full Modernization Date; Installation Date; Maintenance Info; Expected Service Life, and Pole Type (will need a definition). TAMC may not need to collect Case Signs, Pedestrian Heads, and Left Turn Heads. Adding ownership information and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements were also discussed. Adding in the ADA requirements will increase the costs of modernization and/or replacement. MDOT and Kalamazoo County both have an expected 30 years of life for a Total Rebuild and 10-15 years for Controllers.

TAMC will need to determine what this information is going to be used for in an agency's asset management plans. One use will be to determine cost or value of the signal system. In addition, it can be used to help determine how much of an agency's funding is devoted to maintenance and operations of the traffic signal and how relatively current is the traffic signal system – are they old or modern? This will help with determining funding needed to keep the traffic signals operating. How the agency is going to collect their traffic signal and culvert data in a reasonable timeframe will also be in the asset management plan. It is unrealistic to ask the agencies to collect the culvert and signal data before they do their asset management plan in 2020.

TAMC should include the cost of installation of traffic signals. They may be only interested in assets costing $20,000 or more. It was suggested that the Committee put the lists in order by cost impact also. Some agencies, such as Oakland, Kalamazoo, and Grand Rapids, already have traffic signal data. Smaller agencies may not have the level of detail as larger road commissions. There are many agencies that already collect traffic signal data and TAMC may be able to get the majority of data they need from what is already collected. A survey could be done to find out what existing Traffic Signal data is currently available from local agencies.

D. Adelman, MDOT, suggested that TAMC send out a survey regarding agencies existing signals and ask the agencies what data elements they feel would be useful to collect. TAMC could also get the agencies definition of things, such as pole types, from this same survey. B. Slattery feels the Council should consider doing a pilot of data collection efforts for traffic signals.

Action Item: B. McEntee will incorporate everyone's comments into his document and talk to MTU about where they are in creating the template. He will send the revised document out to the committee for their review and comment by end of May. T. Colling will check to see if it is possible to add age of signals as a field to Roadsoft.

5. Presentations – 2018 PASER Data Analysis, Quality Review and Forecast – G. Chesbro:
G. Chesbro presented a PowerPoint presentation on the "Forecast of Pavement Conditions 2018-2028." G. Chesbro again reviewed the 2013 – 2016 data as requested by the Council. For 2013-2014, he found problems in the linear referencing system related to 2013 data. There was a 4% difference between his initial review and his second review of the data. The data showed the roads did not move to poor condition as fast as initially indicated, but still moved towards poor. There were changes in revenue and condition during one of the years, which also caused a significant difference for 2016 that was demonstrated during his initial review. To avoid this in the future, more years of data could be used in the model inputs, however this would make the model less reactive and possibly delay results. Further discussions will need to be had on how to quality check data analysis.

Motion: J. Start made a motion to include the results, as amended by the Data Committee, of the review of the forecast analysis of pavement conditions from 2013-2016, as part of the 2018 TAMC Roads and Bridges Annual Report; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

6. Review and Discussion Items:

6.1. – 2018 TAMC Annual Report Update – D. Jennett (Attachment 4)
G. Chesbro provided new text to the committee for the 2018 TAMC Roads and Bridges Annual Report, explaining the 2016 data re-analysis forecast results conducted in April 2019. The committee would like the title changed to "TAMC Examines Paved Federal Aid Forecast Model" instead of "TAMC Exams Pavement Condition Forecast Model." They also modified the introductions in each paragraph. The data year in question is not part of the change matrix used for 2017. They would like to drop the 2017 statement. They want a statement included with the document indicating that TAMC is always striving to do the best job possible of providing clear data analysis reporting as new data comes in, which includes data forecasting. This document could also be used as a tool when talking to SEMCOG. For future data analysis that demonstrate large or unusual changes, the committee would like explanations provided at the time of the analysis to avoid having to go back and figure out where the large change occurred and why. The committee also reviewed graphs demonstrating the Paved Federal Aid Road Conditions. They would also like to discuss attachment 4 further at their next Data Committee meeting in July.

Action Item: D. Jennett will make the necessary changes as discussed and add the new text to the back of the 2018 annual report.

Action Item: The Committee would like to discuss the "TAMC Examines Pavement Condition Forecast Model" document at the July Data Committee Meeting.

6.2. – Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – B. McEntee
CSS is finalizing a few TAMC tasks. For the three-year projects, they are making minor changes (projects and maps are done) and the MPO/RPO task is almost complete. They expect to have these tasks fully completed by May. CSS plans to look into including the planned project data from the State Transportation Improvement Program (eSTIP/JobNet) with the three-year project task. MTU will conduct two warranty trainings. The Elected Officials training material draft will be available for review on June 1, 2019. MTU anticipates releasing the Webinar training at the end of July, which will be a PowerPoint presentation with audio voiceover. A more technical training for people handling the warranties will be done via on-site training in January 2020. TAMC will provide MTU with a couple of slides for their trainings. There are some agencies that are doing warranties on their own that are less than the $2 million cap mandatory warranties. There will be two locations to place agency warranties – Mandatory and Voluntary. For warranties that are mandatory, the agency will need to answer a few questions when entering their projects

with warranties. If it is voluntary, they do not need to include additional information or answer additional questions.

6.3. – Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – R. Belknap (Attachment 5)
R. Belknap provided an updated report on investment reporting compliance as of April 15, 2019 for committee review. There are 90 agencies that are not compliant, and he is working with MDOT Finance Division Act 51 staff on getting them compliant. Most are minor issues that must be completed in order to make them compliant.

6.4. –Work Program: Target Costs/Priorities by April – R. Belknap (Attachment 6)
Support staff, TAMC committee chairs, and TAMC Chair, Joanna Johnson, are developing a list of discussion topics for the June 5, 2019, Strategic Planning Session. On April 15, 2019, the committee chairs met with the TAMC Chair to prepare the prioritized list of tasks for each committee and TAMC collective goals for the June 5, 2019 session agenda. Some of the tasks on the work program will need to be assigned to a committee. It was requested that the committee review their section of the draft work program provided and identify any other tasks that they would like to add for discussion at the session. B. McEntee would like to add pavement forecasting and discuss how to develop a plan to help draw attention to TAMC happenings and the annual report. TAMC needs to do a better public outreach to the local agencies, general public, and the legislature. TAMC needs to identify resources that can help with this effort and how much it will cost. The committee feels TAMC needs to send out a better press release and add a statement to the cover letter that will draw attention to the annual report and make it more interesting by stating why people need to read the annual report. B. McEntee would also like to add pavement forecasting to the list of tasks. He would like TAMC to take a look at how the system would be if we doubled our investment in rehabilitation (4's and 5's), double the amount in heavy CPM (5's and 6's), and did a 50% increase in light CPM (7's and 8's); with no particular increase in rate for reconstruction. TAMC needs to discuss how they can improve on our forecasting system. MTU could take a look at it also and give some suggestions from an outside perspective. If the committee has any additional task's they feel need to be added to the work program, they will need to forward them to R. Belknap and J. Johnson by the end of April.

6.5. – Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Update – C. Granger
CSS did a release that went out into production on the IRT last week. CSS is currently working on the warranty, dashboards, Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Planning Organization, and the three-year projects reports, which all are about half-way done. Their next task is the culvert work.

CSS would like to know if the Committee would like CSS or the agency to delete their old 2015 planned projects at the end of the Roadsoft update. CSS could tell them what they have in their planned projects and ask the agency if they want CSS to pull them over into the IRT when the new plans come in or delete them. The agency downloads this information into Roadsoft and then it gets downloaded into the IRT. (Release 2.9) TAMC needs the agencies to look at that information and update their data regarding their projects because some of those projects stay in the system a long time and some have been completed but just not removed. CSS will then go on to bigger items, such as the dashboards and bridge and pavement interactive maps. (release 2.10). CSS will need to release the dashboards by May 2, 2019, when the annual report comes out. The next task for CSS is working on the culvert data tasks.

7. Public Comments:
None

8. Member Comments:
J. Start suggested using the unit costs that MTU used in their study that was released in October for the 2019 annual report forecasting.

9. Adjournment:
Motion: J. Start made a motion to adjourn the meeting; R. Slattery seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m. The next TAMC Data Committee meeting is scheduled for July 24, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing.

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.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
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 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 21ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL
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
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
RCOC	ROAD COMMISSION OF OAKLAND 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
WAMC	WATER ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
X-Council	A GROUP OF KEY PEOPLE FROM MIC/TAMC/WAMC

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.04.24.2019.GMS