

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE MEETING
April 20, 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
Bob Slattery, MML, Upper Peninsula, MI
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA – Vice Chair, Waterford, MI

Ryan Buck, MTPA, Ann Arbor, MI
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS, Marshall, MI

Support Staff Present:

Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Dave Jennett, MDOT

Eric Costa, MDOT
Robert Green, MDOT
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Members Absent:

None

Public Present:

None

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

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:34 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 March 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.

3.3. – MTU TAMC Activity Reports – T. Colling

3.3.1. – March 2022 (Attachment 3)

T. Colling provided a status update from MTU.

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

4. Review and Discussion Items:

4.1. – Data Committee Discussion on Annual Report – R. Green/D. Jennett

R. Green reported that the annual report is coming along well and pretty much complete at this time. All comments and suggestions have been considered and/or added to the report. The letter to distribute the annual report is done and the report will be sent out on April 29, 2022, to meet the May 2, 2022, deadline to the State Transportation Commission.

R. Buck stated that he appreciates everything the TAMC support staff has done, especially while being short-handed. R. buck also reported that at the Michigan Transportation Planning Association (MTPA) meeting they discussed MDOT’s continuing to participate in the PASER data collection. The consensus of MTPA is the agencies would like MDOT in the vehicle doing PASER data collection. MDOT is still evaluating what they plan to do for next data collection season.

4.2. – Introduction to Program Timeline – B. McEntee/D. Jennett

There has been a lot of discussion as to when TAMC standing tasks, such as the annual report and conferences, tasks related to TAMC tasks need to start and when do things need to be completed. TAMC would like to have a timeline for each of their important tasks that must be completed. D. Jennett shared a roughly drafted timeline spreadsheet that was created some time ago by TAMC support staff. This is only a rough draft that has not been shared with MTU, Data Committee, MDOT staff, and anyone that coordinates with TAMC. TAMC support staff will work further on this after tasks such as the annual report gets completed. This document will be placed in a centralized location for everyone to utilize when it is finalized. It was suggested to just do milestone dates instead of such a detailed report where people can do a quick glance for dates.

4.3. – Data Collection State of Practice Report Discussion – T. Colling

T. Colling went through his “State of Practice Scan for Pavement Data Collection Report” overview, April 20, 2022. MTU is looking to find and evaluate condition data collection methods. They are looking at simple rating and complex rating systems. They started by looking at different collection modes, such as human visual inspection, specialized sensors package-equipped vehicle, smartphone applications, etc. T. Colling reviewed some of the different technologies used by some of the vendors, costs associated with the collections using specific collection types and trainings.

Some of the issues they discovered are **Proprietary Rating Scales** were hard/not possible to do QA, **Data Storage** issues due to specialized sensor packages generate between 1 to 19 GB/mile, **Data Accessibility** that have long lead times for repair/replacement of equipment and less flexibility and, **Centralized vs. Distributed Collection** due to road owners detached from the collection process.

He also hit on Minnesota’s Asset Management Domestic State of Practice Study which is widely recognized for their demonstration of the importance of asset management. T. Colling noted that their report stated many things that TAMC is also doing or has done. Minnesota tends to be very progressive and MDOT uses them as a benchmark.

Should TAMC be looking at doing some of these different data collections methods or keep doing what we have been doing? One issue is the increase in cost when doing some of these different methods. If people are not going to use the data, then there is no reason to spend the additional monies on alternative collection methods.

4.4. – Culvert Data Submittal – R. Green/E. Costa

During the annual report review they had a discussion on the increased revenues and the decreased deterioration rates.

Based upon E. Costa’s analysis, the conclusion thus far is the heavy urban and suburban counties with intricate road networks have the greatest number of lane miles improved without a corresponding pavement

project. They are mostly county primary owned roads and have variable dispersion patterns throughout the county (not concentrated on county borders). A good majority are major collector roads which in turn comprise most of the PFA network. This is abundantly true in urban areas. Minor arterial systems should also be noted as having a higher than ideal count. Trunkline primary and minor arterial systems should also be flagged for elevated (more than ideal) LM count.

This analysis is still ongoing. This data is changing daily until at least August when the majority of the data will be submitted.

Next Steps:

Examine specific routes across counties and networks to see if anything can be uncovered

- About 10 percent of this network intersects with the QR ratings. Want to compare the QR rating where available.
- Examine responsible agency at the CVT level

R. Buck suggested that E. Costa reach out to a few of the counties, such as Ingham County, to see why there has been changes in these segments.

4.5. – Conversations on a Statewide Investment Strategy – E. Costa/B. McEntee

This goes with agenda item 4.4. from E. Costa with digging deeper into the data uploaded. After E. Costa completes what he is currently working on for data analysis, he will work on the Statewide Investment Strategy.

4.5.1. – Discussion of Analysis 2012-2021 – mix-of-fixes

B. McEntee would like to know what the optimum mix-of-fixes would be to get us to good, fair, poor. E. Costa will do further analysis once he has completed what he is currently working on.

4.5.2. – Further Analysis of Condition Data and IRT Data. Who will perform MDOT or MTU?

E. Costa will do the further analysis once he is done with what he is currently working on.

4.6. - Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Updates – C. Granger

4.6.1. – Dashboards – May 2, 2022 Release Update

CSS has completed the updates for roads and bridges. This will move into production on April 29, 2022.

4.6.2. – 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 analysis. The meetings have been pushed back per D. Jennett.

4.6.3. – Center for Shared Solutions Priorities

- CSS' primary focus is on the culvert tasks.

Sprint 2.28 – Moving to production on 4/29/2022

- Road and dashboard updates
- Bridge ratings - change Poor to Severe/Poor on dashboards and on IMAP
- Vector Tile Cache – increase font size on IMPA and IRT maps. They also have the ability to change the shields

Sprint 2.29 – In Progress

- CSS has completed the reports for D. Jennett on IRT projects
- CSS has completed the 2021 dashboard tweaks
- CSS has in development the BUG-IBR ratings which need to make sure only available on non-pavement roads
- CSS has in development the IRT export projects as shapefiles.
- CSS has in development the update to the admin screen to support culverts and export/download process.
- CSS has in development adding the culverts to IMAP, the IRT MAP, and dashboards.
- CSS also has in development to create service to bring culvert data from Roadsoft to TAMC.

4.6.4. – IRT New Application Updates and Reminders

See agenda item 4.6.3.

4.6.5. – TAMC Website

See agenda item 4.6.3.

The State of Michigan is changing platforms for their website. It is beyond TAMC support staff control. The website is going live on April 22, 2022. There are only two developers on the MDOT side to get things completed for all MDOT sites. The URL, links, annual report, and interactive maps will work. R. Green has requested that there is a notice stating, “Please excuse us while our website is under construction.” The major deliverables will be out there. There are some items that will need to be corrected. TAMC will now be under the STC on the new website.

5. Public Comments:

None

6. Member Comments:

J. Tubbs thanked the TAMC support staff for their work on the 2021 Michigan Roads and Bridges Annual Report.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m. The next TAMC Data Committee meeting will be held on May 18, 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 |
| IJA | 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 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 |
| TAMP | TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN |
| TPM | TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES |
| UWP | UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM |
| WATS | WASHTENAW AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY |

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.03.02.2022.GMS