TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE MEETING
March 16, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.
MINUTES

The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams. 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. Accommodations can be made for persons who require mobility, visual, hearing, written, or other assistance for participation. Large print materials, auxiliary aids or the services of interpreters, signers, or readers are available upon request. Please contact Orlando Curry at 517-335-4381 or complete Form 2658 for American Sign Language (ASL). Requests should be made at least five days prior to the meeting date. Reasonable efforts will be made to provide the requested accommodation or an effective alternative, but accommodations may not be guaranteed.

**Frequently Used Acronyms Attached

Members Present:
Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair, Royal Oak, MI   Ryan Buck, MTPA, Ann Arbor, MI
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS, Marshall, MI   Jennifer Tubbs, MTA – Vice Chair, Waterford, MI

Support Staff Present:
Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP   Eric Costa, MDOT
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS   Robert Green, MDOT
Kyle Nelson, MDOT   Gloria Strong, MDOT
Mike Toth, MDOT

Members Absent:
Robert Slattery, MML

Public Present:
None

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:
The meeting was called-to-order at 1:32 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 (Action Items):
   3.1. – Approval of the February 16, 2022 Data Committee Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

   3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2) – R. Green
   R. Green provided an updated TAMC budget report for the Committees review. More invoices are coming in for FY 2021 and FY 2022. PASER and IRT trainings are currently going on.

   3.3. – MTU TAMC Activity Reports – T. Colling
   3.3.1. – February 2022 (Attachment 3)
   T. Colling provided a status update from MTU. MTU continues to provide trainings and working on culvert tasks. Everything is on schedule.

Motion: R. Buck 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. – Continued Discussions of 2021 PASER and Annual Report – E. Costa/R. Green

E. Costa and R. Green showed the data and data analysis results from the FY 2021 PASER data and discussions were had regarding what will be included in the annual report. Since FY 2017, there has been a significant increase in Reconstruct in FY 2021 and a decrease in Heavy CPM and Light CPM. E. Costa will also put this information in Lane Miles. The federal-aid and non-federal aid paved condition pie charts were also reviewed. There was a total of 111,078 lane miles collected during the FY 2021 PASER data collection. Highlighting the success of the PASER data collection for FY 2021. MDOT was not able to participate due to state COVID restrictions in the FY 2021 PASER data collection. Other agencies have completed some areas MDOT is responsible for. The people in the PASER collection vehicle are usually MDOT, region and local agency or designees for their organizations. When other people do data collections for different agencies, there is an issue as to who now owns that data and if the quality of the data is good.

Action Item: R. Buck feels TAMC needs to discuss whether or not MDOT needs or plans to participate in future PASER data collections.

4.2. - Quality Review for PASER Data Collection – T. Colling/M. Toth

MDOT is coordinating with MTU/CSS and others to input QR segments into Roadsoft vs. the old system. MTU had a meeting with MDOT and are moving ahead. They need to figure out physically where the data will be placed. This involves some changes where CSS will handle and maintain the data. How they are going to move forward needs to be figured out. They also need to see how this data will be migrated. They need to know what needs to be done and how much it will cost to accomplish those goals. They will come up with a couple of options and bring them to the Data Committee for their review and approval.

4.2.1. – Roadsoft Modifications for Quality Review Performance – B. McEntee
Nothing new to report.

4.3. –Conversations on a Statewide Investment Strategy – E. Costa/B. McEntee
Nothing new to report.

4.4. – Culvert Data Submittal – R. Green

The TAMC Bridge Committee discussed at their last meeting the culvert data collection season. The Bridge Committee is considering recommending to the Council to have the Culvert data collection season begin April 1 – November 1 each year. They would like to know if the TAMC Data Committee approves of this timeline. The current TAMC Culvert Data Collection Policy does not give a timeline so therefore it will need to be updated and redistributed to the appropriate agencies. T. Colling suggested to not give a beginning date but keep the end date November 1, same end and submission time as the PASER data collection season to allow agencies the flexibility to begin their culvert data collections early when the weather breaks in their area.

4.5. - Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Updates – C. Granger
4.5.1. – Culvert Enhancement Estimate
C. Granger provided the estimate from CSS for their culvert work. They are currently working on the Culvert Integration Project Data Flow from Roadsoft to MGF, and from MGF to TAMC (CSS).

The flow is Culvert data is collected in Roadsoft, it is then sent to the CSS Web Service, then a CSS staff member will export the submitted data to a shapefile. Then the shapefile is uploaded into 1integrate. 1Integrate will validate the data and produce an output file containing validation issues.

Valid results will be saved into MGF. CSS staff will update the web service. Once into MGF, it is then put into the TAMC IRT database. Culvert data will be displayed as a layer in IMAP and IRT. The TAMC culvert dashboards will be created with the desired reports. Current reports, based on pilot data, are condition, material type, and span or diameter. If 1Integrate was to do this it would be very costly. Having CSS do this instead is less complicated and more cost effective.

CSS estimates to create and provide this service will take approximately 300 hours, which includes user interface. The estimate for the service is 300 hours at $100 an hour = $30,000. The back end after it has been processed through is $20,200.00. The CSS budget is $700,000, estimate for service to MGF is $30,000, estimate from 1Spatial for Rule creation is $8,000, spent to date DTMB is $5,622.31, spent to date 1Spatial is $12,946.00 and the remaining is $13,431.69. what is not listed is the Culvert Dashboard/IRT/IMAP work and that estimate is the $20,200.00. There is a difference of $6,768.31 out of the $70,000 budget to go towards regular budget for pieces in the regular budget work. The current available funds in the FY 2021 and FY 2022 budgets should cover the culvert work costs. It would only be a need to do the adjustments within the current budget. The money is available CSS just needs the go ahead to begin the work from the TAMC Data Committee. CSS will make this one of their top priorities.

Motion: J. Tubbs made a motion to approve the CSS Culvert Estimate and to start the culvert work and use the funds already allotted to CSS in the CSS FY 2021 and FY 2022 budgets. The TAMC Data Committee will take this request to the TAMC on April 6, 2022, for their final approval; R. Buck seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

4.5.2. – Act 51 Distribution and Reporting System (ADARS) Upgrade
C. Granger spoke with Dave Wearsch, MDOT, and the ADARS team, and they are currently still going through a lot of analysis. They are interviewing agencies to find out ownership information. Later this year they will look at the IT area and determine if any changes need to be made.

4.5.3. – CSS Priorities
CSS is working on the 2021 Michigan Roads and Bridges annual report updates.
CSS will begin the culvert work.

4.5.4. – IRT New Application Updates and Reminders
Sprint is coming out on March 24, 2022 and will be providing the ability to provide shapefiles. CSS has made a lot of PASER review screen changes in the IRT. They worked with G. Strong on updates to the TAMP review screen and updated the compliance report. All of these changes are in UAT and will be pushed on March 24, 2022.

4.5.5. – TAMC Website
CSS will begin adding the culvert information.

5. Public Comments:
Any comments for the annual report should be directed to R. Green by close of business today.

6. Member Comments:
J. Tubbs noted that if there is a trend going away from what TAMC has been teaching for investment strategies within mix-of-fixes or if it is a one-time issue due to the pandemic, then it should be explained in the annual report.

B. Slattery shared a blog from the Citizens Research Council, who is a non-partisan private group that's mission is to influence legislative priorities based on best practices. They put out policy documents for legislatures to consider in a non-partisan fashion. In the blog, the author does not give TAMC as much credit as they deserve and may confuse legislators. He looks at all roads, regardless of ownership or functional class, and insinuates that Michigan may not have the best practices for asset management. Joanna Johnson, TAMC Chair, and T. Colling are meeting with the author on Friday, at 3:00 p.m., regarding some of the concerns that were published. The Citizens Research Council and the author did not talk with TAMC prior to this blog. TAMC reports all data to be transparent and is an honest broker of data, whether the results are good or bad. What is being objected to is the blog is broad brushed implying that all Michigan roads are not using federal performance matrix on all roads. There is a reason why the Federal Highway Administration has a standard for the National Highway System (NHS), the highest portion of the system. Local roads do not have the same standards or budget as an NHS. The performance matrix is for NHS. There are items in the article that are factually incorrect. The author is an engineer that does not separate TAMC from MDOT and did not do his research. TAMC has a good asset management program in Michigan. The data submitted to TAMC is readily available to the public in a usable format for everyone to understand. Prior to making such statements, the author should have contacted both MDOT and TAMC for more accurate information.

7. Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m. The next TAMC Data Committee meeting will be held on April 20, 2022, at 1:30 p.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
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE CONTRACT
ETL	EXCHANGE, TRANSFER AND LOAD
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
IIJA	Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

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 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
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
WATS	WASHTENAW AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY