

TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING
June 1, 2022 at 1:00 p.m.
MEETING MINUTES

This meeting was held via hybrid with Microsoft Teams and at the Michigan Department of Transportation Aeronautics Building Auditorium, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing, Michigan. 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](tel: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 List attached**

Members Present:

Ryan Buck, MTPA, Lansing, MI
Joanna Johnson, CRA, Lansing, MI – Chair
Robert Slattery, MML, Lansing, MI
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA, Lansing, MI
Brad Wieferich, MDOT, Lansing, MI

Jacob Hurt, MAR
Bill McEntee, CRA, Lansing, MI – Vice-Chair
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS, Lansing, MI
Todd White, MDOT, Lansing, MI

Support Staff Present:

Tim Colling, MTU/LTAP
Rob Green, MDOT
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Eric Costa, MDOT
Mark Holmes, DTMB/CSS
Eric Mullen, MDOT
Pete Torola, MTU/LTAP

Public Present:

Lina Chapman, MDOT
Ed Hug, SEMCOG

Heather Hoeve, MDOT
Ryan Laruwe, MIC, Treasury

Members Absent:

Kelly Jones, MAC
Gary Mekjian, MML

1. Welcome – Call-To-Order:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:07 p.m.. Everyone introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting.

2. Changes or Additions to the Agenda (Action Item, as needed):

None

3. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

4. Consent Agenda (Action Item):

4.1. – Approval of the April 6, 2022 Meeting Minutes (Attachment 1)

4.2. – TAMC Financial Report (Attachment 2)

R. Green provided an updated copy of the TAMC Budget Financial Report.

Motion: B. Wierich made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda; B. McEntee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

5. Michigan Infrastructure Council (MIC) Update – R. Laruwe, MIC Executive Director:

R. Laruwe thanked TAMC support staff for the completion of the annual report. The MIC is working on getting fully staffed and hoping to be fully staffed by the end of July 2022. The spring 2022 Champions Program was kicked off on April 7, 2022. They are looking at setting up another Asset Management Champions Program and R. Laruwe invited the Council to share this information with others and invite them to participate. Scholarships are available. The MIC is working on their 30-Year Strategy as required. They will be contacting the TAMC to get their advice and expertise in their stake holder groups.

6. ACTION ITEMS:

6.1. – Transportation Asset Management Plans - Group B – G. Strong (Attachment 3):

For Public Act 325, Group B, there are 41 agencies due. A total of 13 agencies did not submit a TAMP as required by Public Act 325. G. Strong recommended today to the TAMC approval of the following five Group B TAMPs: City of Taylor, Arenac County Road Commission, Charlevoix County Road Commission, Menominee County Road Commission, and the City of Garden City.

R. Buck recommended to eliminate the TAMP approval recommendations going to the TAMC ACE Committee prior to going on to the TAMC. This would eliminate a month or more of waiting for final approval from the Council. The Council agreed with the recommendation.

Motion: R. Slattery made a motion to approve the above stated TAMPs as recommended by G. Strong; R. Buck seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

6.2. – Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Environmental Finance Center MTU Support Letter (Attachment 4):

T. Colling requested on behalf of MTU a letter of support for MTU to continue supporting the Environmental Finance Center. It is a program very similar to the LTAP program. MTU will not receive much funding for the contract, but they are hoping for better funding in the future. The letter of support from TAMC is needed for the application to the EPA for this program. T. White suggested MTU contact the Water Asset Management Council (WAMC) to give a letter of support in addition to the TAMC letter of support for MTU. R. Laruwe, MIC Executive Director, will review the TAMC support letter on behalf of MIC/WAMC (to consider also providing a letter of support from the WAMC) and will contact T. Colling.

Motion: R. Slattery made a motion to approve the EPA Environmental Finance Center letter of support for MTU; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

6.3. – Consideration of Budget Amendment for SEMCOG (Attachment 5)

SEMCOG submitted a second request for a budget amendment on May 7, 2022. Their first request for a budget amendment was approved. Oakland county went out and did multiple PASER data collections and by the time they sorted out who went out and collected, their invoice was submitted in the wrong year. Oakland needs \$10,484.94 for August – September 2021 PASER data collection.

Same for Monroe County who is requesting \$2,705.50 for data collected in September 2021. SEMCOG has used all of their funds that were allotted for FY 2021. In the past some council members were displeased about the untimeliness of the invoice submissions at the last request for a budget amendment. The Council approved the past budget amendment to come from the MDOT line item. There are still funds available in the MDOT line item, the FY2021 quality Review Contract (\$50,000), and the MTU line items from FY 2021 (\$13,000) that the funds could be used from to pay SEMCOG. SEMCOG's invoices were rejected in the past because they did not come from the same fiscal year that the PASER data was collected. The funds must come from FY 2021. Monroe County normally bills monthly. Oakland county submitted while they still had funds, but they did not include their Waterford staff and by the time they resubmitted it was too late, and the invoices were rejected. Also, due to the pandemic data collections had been halted. When the ban was lifted, the agencies were working hard to get caught up on data collection efforts and did more data collections than what was normally collected prior to the pandemic. They are requesting an amendment to the asset management contract for FY 2021, so that they can bill the above agencies expenses under that contract and pay the vendors for the work they have performed. E. Hug assured the Council that SEMCOG will revise its process to assure that this does not happen again in the future. J. Johnson stated she will not be supporting this FY 2021 budget amendment for SEMCOG as they were informed that there was a deadline that TAMC gave for them to meet and this request was not submitted by the deadline, this request after the deadline is not fair to other regions, and she feels that SEMCOG needs to work on to figure out how to get their invoices submitted in time. J. Tubbs stated that she is not supporting the SEMCOG budget amendment request because SEMCOG has already expended their FY 2021 budget and it was past the TAMC deadline to submit for amendments. If they still had funds in their FY 2021 budget, J. Tubbs would have approved the amendment.

Motion: R. Slattery made a motion to approve SEMCOG's request for a budget amendment for FY 2021; T. White seconded the motion with an amendment to the motion that SEMCOG will review their process and amend it so that this will not occur again in the future. A roll-call vote was conducted. The following members voted "Yes" to approve the SEMCOG budget amendment: Ryan Buck, Jacob Hurt, Bill McEntee, Brad Wierich, and Todd White. The following members voted "No" to not approve the SEMCOG budget amendment: Joanna Tubbs, Joanna Johnson, and Robert Slattery. The motion to approve SEMCOG's request for a budget amendment for FY 2021 is approved.

7. Presentations and Announcements:

7.1. – MTU Data Collection State of Practice Report – T. Colling (Attachment 6)

State of Practice Scan for PASER Data Collection Report Overview – June 1, 2022. T. Colling went through this report that he and Pete Torola, MTU, created. They reviewed ways for data collection that would help do PASER data collections quicker, faster, and better. They looked at things that weren't commercial and it is not about the rating system. The study goals were to find and evaluate condition data collection methods that provide low-cost, high-quality data at the state level on a yearly cycle, be accessible for local road-owning agencies to do their own collection over and above the TAMC's efforts, provide a network-level metric for the state to identify overall condition trends, provide project-level planning guidance at a road-owning-agency level, provide condition modeling opportunities at a state and local level, and lastly, to be relatable to historical data. They looked at Simple Rating Systems that provides one overall condition rating, and does not record individual distress measures, such as PASER-Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating, and Complex Systems that provides component measures of distresses which may or may not roll up to an overall condition rating, such as PCI – Pavement condition Index. The Collection Modes Identified were – Human Visual Inspection, Specialized Sensors Package-equipped Vehicle, Smartphone Applications, Vehicle Electronic Control Units, Embedded Pavement Infrastructure Sensors, and Remote Sensing. They had a hard time getting the cost for these modes.

Costs for doing the different collection modes were assumed DIY model where TAMC owns the vehicle and does collection at lowest cost, equipment and collection assumptions did not significantly impact cost competitiveness, equipment (assumed 5 units for the state amortized over 2 years and did not include training, maintenance, or equipment upgrade/repair costs, collection: used fraction of PASER costs. Vendors did not provide must cost information so MTU created an equation that would give the result of other solution collection estimates, and lastly, processing which did not include any data handling/storage costs. TAMC is currently paying between \$11.99-13.75 per mile, which includes training. MTU also gave estimated costs for other data collection solutions within the presentation, including the automated distress survey cost from NCHRP 531. MTU also gave the budget impact of cost per mile. Other issues that MTU found were proprietary rating scales concerns, data storage issues, data accessibility concerns, and centralized vs distributed collection issues. MTU also expressed issues on repeatability in their report. MTU included an Asset Management Domestic State of Practice Study within the report which show a wide recognition of the importance of asset management and showed an interesting trend in Minnesota. The recommendations mirror what TAMC has been doing. It was suggested that MTU include what Grand Valley Metro Council cost per mile might be for using their van for IRI and imagery to see if they are on the same realm as others. J. Johnson feels this may be a good presentation to have at the September 28, 2022, TAMC Celebration and Conference.

7.2. – Gary Mekjian’s Resignation from TAMC

J. Johnson informed the Council that G. Mekjian has resigned from the TAMC and TAMC is awaiting a recommendation for his replacement from the Michigan Municipal League (MML).

8. Old Business:

8.1. – TAMC Schedule of Activities and Trainings 2022 – J. Johnson/R. Green (Attachment 7)

Council members were encouraged to sign up to represent TAMC at events and trainings if they have not volunteered for a session. A Council member is needed for the June 16, 2022 (in the morning) for the PASER webinar. The PowerPoint presentation will be provided.

8.2. – TAMC Coordinator Update – T. White

T. White reported that the TAMC Coordinator duties will be contracted out and they are in the process is putting together the contract. They are looking to use one administrative support person to handle the administrative tasks for TAMC, MIC, and WAMC to give more continuity and transfer of knowledge between the three Councils.

8.3. – 2021 TAMC Michigan Roads and Bridges Annual Report – J. Johnson

The report was released on April 29, 2022 and the IRT has been updated with the 2021 data.

9. Committee Review and Discussion Items:

9.1. – Bridge Committee Update – B. Wieferrich

The Bridge Committee did not hold a meeting last month. The Committee will be discussing updating the TAMC culvert policy to be more in line with the PASER data collection policy so that the culvert data collections will have a deadline for when their culvert data should be submitted to TAMC. This is something that should be discussed with the ACE Committee.

9.2. – ACE Committee Update – R. Buck

The TAMC ACE Committee did not meet today. The ACE Committee may be looking at a different meeting time to allow time for Council members to meet in-person at the TAMC meeting that follows the ACE Committee meeting.

9.2.1. – 20 Year TAMC Celebration and Conference

The Conference Planning Committee has met, and good progress is being made on the event. The 2022 Conference agenda is near completion and the Call for TAMC Awards has been sent out. Sponsorships will be discussed at the next meeting.

9.2.2. – Asset Management Orientation for New Staff (for Planning and Local Agencies/Center for Technology and Training)

The ACE Committee may pull together an adhoc committee in order to discuss how to onboard new people to data collection and TAMC policies and processes. This could possibly be done via emails. Everyone is encouraged to participate.

9.3. – Data Committee Update – B. McEntee

The Data Committee has been reviewing E. Costa’s data analysis that he provided for the annual report. Discussions were had about getting back into the statewide strategy. The Data Committee would like to put together a timetable for key tasks that need to be done for the annual report. The timetable needs to include when the data needs to be ready to go and when it needs to be added to the TAMC website. The Committee would like E. Costa to look into the mix-a-fixes from the 2021 PASER data. J. Johnson provided a 2018 PowerPoint presentation provided by Gil Chesbro, former TAMC data analyst, to E. Costa and the Data Committee reviewed the presentation and eliminated a few slides. E. Costa will use this presentation at the 2022 TAMC Celebration and Conference in September.

The State of Michigan has changed the platform for their website and the TAMC website has changed. Training has not been provided but will be provided to TAMC support staff in the future. The main items for the TAMC website has been added and will continue to be worked on. It is a work in progress. The TAMC Website can be found on the MDOT website under “About Us,” click “Commissions,,” and then click on the “Transportation Asset Management Council.”

Action item: For ACE to review the TAMC policy for data sharing. Most of the data can be downloaded from the IRT however, issues also arise when people want the data in a specific format which can be time consuming and costly for TAMC. The ACE Committee should also look at the TAMC policy for data sharing and discuss if it should go through as a FOIA request.

10. Public Comments:

E. Hug asked when can the 2022 PASER data uploads be done. D. Jennett and M. Holmes stated that the 2022 PASER data uploads to the IRT will be allowed on July 1, 2022. This is the first year they are migrating Framework to version 22, it first goes to Roadsoft, then to CSS to update IRT, and then other programs such as JobNet.

11. Member Comments:

There was a question in the work plan under the bridge committee section develop a performance metrics for culverts. The Bridge Committee is to propose the metrics to the Council.

Brad Wieferich was congratulated on his recent promotion as the MDOT Chief Operations Officer and Chief Engineer.

J. Tubbs and G. Strong will not be available to attend the July 6, 2022 TAMC meeting.

12. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 6, 2022, 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building Auditorium, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing, Michigan.

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	
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.03.15.2021.GMS