



New England Transportation Consortium

NETC Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 26, 2021, 11:00am – 12:30pm ET

Attendees:

Ulrich Amoussou-Guenou, MaineDOT	Lily Oliver, MassDOT
Alex Bernier, UConn	Emily Parkany, VTrans
James Bryce, UME	Dale Peabody, MaineDOT
Colin Franco, RIDOT	Ann Scholz, NHDOT
Brian Hirt, CTC & Associates	Kirsten Seeber, CTC & Associates
Chris Jolly, FHWA	Jo Sias, UNH
Matt Mann, UMass	James Sullivan, UVM
Tanya Miller, VTrans	Maina Tran, CTC & Associates
Andrew Mroczkowski, ConnDOT	Nicholas Zavolas, MassDOT
Dee Nash, NHDOT	

1) James Sullivan – New UVM representative replacing Greg Rowangould

- Greg Rowangould is stepping down as the UVM representative to NETC due to time constraints.
- [Jim Sullivan](#) is the new UVM representative. He is a Senior Research Analyst at the UVM Transportation Research Center and manages the VTrans research program there.

2) Open Project Review (January 2021)

Project # and Title	PI, Organization AC Liaison CTC Project Manager TC Chair	Update	End Date Budget
18-2: Framework of Asphalt Balanced Mix Design for NE Agencies	Wala Mogawer, UMass Dartmouth A. Scholz M. Tran Joseph Blair, NH DOT	Final report delivered and posted on website. Project is closed. A webinar will be held on 2/18/21.	12/31/20 \$127,499
18-3: Integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into State DOTs	Jag Mallela, WSP E. Parkany M. Tran Jeffrey DeCarlo, MA DOT	Project is complete. Final meeting was held on 1/19/21. Report will be revised based on some of the feedback from the meeting. Still waiting on tech transfer deliverables. PI will hold a webinar in early 2021.	3/31/2021 \$146,632
19-1: Curved Integral Abutment Bridge Design	Adam Stockin, WSP E. Parkany K. Seeber	Task 1 report is complete without the state bridge engineers survey results, which they will add later. Nicholas and Lily are checking with Alex Bardow on his availability for this project.	3/31/2022 \$151,316

Project # and Title	PI, Organization AC Liaison CTC Project Manager TC Chair	Update	End Date Budget
	Alex Bardow, MA DOT	Task 2 is underway. Kirsten will schedule the Task 2 TC meeting.	
19-2: Multi-Scale Multi-Season Land-Based Erosion Modeling and Monitoring for Infrastructure Management	Aimee Mountain, GZA A. Scholz M. Tran Neil Olson, NH DOT	Task 2 is complete. Project status meeting will be held on 1/25/21.	2/28/2022 \$148,035
19-3: Experimental Validation of New Improved Load Rating Procedures for Deteriorated Steel Beam Ends	Simos Gerasimidis, UMass Amherst N. Zavalas K. Seeber Alex Bardow, MA DOT	Task 1 (ID common unstiffened beam-end corrosion topologies) is 50% complete and Task 2 (Review of existing structures) is 25% complete.	3/31/2023 \$179,995
20-1: In-Service Performance Evaluation of NETC Bridge Railings	Christine Carrigan, RoadSafe D. Peabody K. Seeber Jeff Folsom, ME DOT	Kirsten is scheduling the kickoff meeting.	6/30/2022 \$119,978
20-2: Current Status of Transportation Data Analytics and A Pilot Case Study Using Artificial Intelligence (AI)	TBD A. Scholz M. Tran Susan Klasen, NH DOT	UMass Lowell conditionally awarded. ME is in contract negotiations. Hope to have contract signed by the end of January 2021.	TBD \$200,000
20-3: Investigating Thermal Imaging Technologies and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to Improve Bridge Inspections	TBD, AECOM D. Peabody M. Tran John "Sam" Maxim, ME DOT	AECOM Technical Services Inc. conditionally awarded. ME is in contract negotiations. Hope to have contract signed by the end of January 2021. Kickoff meeting tentatively scheduled for 2/23 or 2/24.	TBD \$175,000
20-4: New England Connected and Automated Vehicle Legal and Regulatory Assessment	Greg Rodriguez, Stantec E. Parkany/N. Zavalas K. Seeber Daniel Sullivan, MA DOT	Kickoff meeting scheduled for 2/2/21. Not for notes - Kirsten will send agenda to the TC today or tomorrow.	12/31/2021 \$105,446
Re-Creating NETC	Kirsten Seeber/Chris Kline, CTC & Associates A. Scholz K. Seeber A. Scholz	CTC sent a summary of the Task 2 and Task 3 responses to the TAAC on 1/15/21. CTC is currently working on the summary memos for both tasks and scheduling a meeting to review Tasks 1-3 for April.	8/12/2021 \$50,000

Discussion:

- 18-3
 - ~ Maina – We received lots of feedback from the TC, so we’re waiting for a revised draft final report in the next couple of weeks. The PI will share the Standards of Procedure for each state, which will be put on a private NETC webpage.
 - ~ Emily – The TC is interested in the project’s outcomes and the PI is on top of things.
- 19-1
 - ~ Nicholas will reach out to Alex Bardow again to confirm his involvement and availability.

- ~ Kirsten – The PI will send an email to the TC about Task 2 (Finite Element Studies). They are slightly deviating from their original plan; the product will be the same, but the way they get there will be slightly different than how they proposed it.
- 19-2 - Maina – The PI is beginning the erosion modeling toolkit.
- 19-3 - Kirsten – The PI has identified several bridges in all states which could be candidates for beam specimens, and they're in the process of finding out the timelines of each project and means for transportation.
- 20-2
 - ~ Maina – The contract is not signed, so the kickoff meeting is on hold.
 - ~ Dale – ME is waiting for some documents from UMass Lowell to process the contract.
- 20-3 - Dale – The contract with AECOM will probably be signed next.
- 20-4 - Emily – With the \$100,000 budget, we can't do everything we ever wanted with this project. If Stantec comes up with a scope for an additional \$50,000 sometime this year, NETC may approve the extra funds and extend the current project. An extension to the project would be easier than contracting for a new project.

3) Implementation

- Emily – Implementation may require TC and Board members to identify the project's next steps. Would it be a good use of the TC's time to follow up and ask whether the project has been useful?
 - ~ Dale – Once a project is complete, he talks with his TC member about what was good, what didn't work, what they got out of it, etc. Each TAAC member should reach out to their TC members to find out what could be implemented from completed projects.
 - ~ Ann – Agrees with Dales' approach. Also, not all six states have to agree to implement something. A couple or a few states can do implementation together.
 - ~ Emily – The 18-series projects are coming to an end. Each TAAC member should follow up with their TC members.
 - ~ Including implementation plans in the final reports begins with the 19-series projects.
 - ~ Brian – Can we get potential implementors on the project webinars? Is it being done?
 - Dale – Nothing is formalized, but it's a good idea. It's up to AC members to promote the thought at their agencies and get their staff on the project webinars.
 - ~ Kirsten – We could hold a meeting for TC members and implementors for an implementation meeting at a set time after the project ends, such as three months.
 - ~ Emily – It's more important for TAAC members to reach out to their staff and get them to attend the 18-2 project webinar. For 18-1, reach out to your staff that work in that area, provide them with the [project page link](#) and the [webinar link](#), and ask them what they are doing so the TAAC members can report back. There is lots of enthusiasm for 18-3, so once the final report is out, reach out to their staff about it.
 - ~ Dale – 20-1 is a follow-up to 18-1, and that's kicking off soon. The whole goal is not to full-scale test. Emily – Reach out to your folks to let them know that and ask them to help make 20-1 a success so that individual states are not doing testing.

4) Closeout webinars for closed projects

- TAAC members to report on any implementation activities for recently closed projects.
 - ~ NETC 18-1: Development of MASH Computer Simulated Steel Bridge Rail and Transition Details
 - ~ NETC 18-2: Framework of Asphalt Balance Mix Design for NE Agencies – Webinar scheduled for 2/18/21. 25 registrations as of today.

- **Action item:** Kirsten will send out an invitation to all AC members asking them to invite/forward to right people, including FHWA, who should attend.
- ~ NETC 18-3: Integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into State DOTs – Kirsten will coordinate a webinar for late February/March.
- All webinar recordings/presentations can be found on the project pages or [here](#).

5) Research Problem Statement Solicitation

- Nine Research Problem Statements were received from CT, (1), MA (2), ME (3), NH (1) and RI (2) DOTs. Ten statements were received last year.
- Problem Statement Ranking/Discussion meeting on 3/17/21 from 9:00am-2:00pm via webinar.
- Next steps:
 - ~ Kirsten will compile all problem statements into one document and create a summary sheet with a quick overview. That will be sent this week.
 - ~ Kirsten will post problem statements on a members-only page of the website.
 - ~ Kirsten will send the problem statements and a scoring sheet to the DOT representatives. The members will discuss the problem statements within their agencies, get comments and score them. Suggestion from Ann to ask the folks who are scoring if they would be willing to be on the TC, should the project get selected. **Action item:** Kirsten will include a statement on implementation in the email to prompt that discussion at the DOTs.
 - ~ Projects will be discussed at Ranking meeting on 3/17/21.
- Discussion
 - ~ Dale – Ask SME folks if they would be on the TC. The quicker we get the TC members assigned, the quicker they can start on the projects.
 - ~ **Action item:** Kirsten will set the meeting up using GoToMeeting.
 - ~ Emily – Voting should be similar to NCHRP voting, with scoring from 0-5.
 - ~ Colin – Any idea of continuations of projects that are happening now, especially the 18- and 19-series projects? Nine problem statements are not too many, so if continuations would help, the more the merrier.
 - Emily – There are not supposed to be continuations in general. Colin – If a project needs to be further investigated, then set money aside to work on it.
 - ~ Dale – We don't have to select a problem statement just because it fits in the budget, especially if not all of the states are on board. If a project makes the cut but the TAAC is not excited about it, they can discuss that.
 - ~ Colin – Yesterday there was a TC meeting for 19-3, which used homogenous soil, but what about tiered soil? How would you do that? The PI said it wasn't in the contract and it would be an additional effort. If we get the TC to suggest that a new project would be good then the AC could discuss it in March.
 - Nicholas – Under Colin's scenario, would that be an extension to an existing contract or a whole new project? Colin – Either. Up to TC to say that additional effort needed on this project and this is the cost. Nicholas – Likes the idea but trying to avoid time-consuming administrative stuff.
 - Ann – This why they are doing the Re-Creating NETC. Is there a need to keep funds for off-cycle projects or a non-traditional type of project?

6) NETC Website Refresh

- Members Only section.
 - ~ Different levels of access.

- ~ Research Problem Statements.
- ~ Re-Creating NETC project page.
- ~ Policy and Procedures Manual – Drafts for review.
- ~ Ann – Open to having a members-only section. Things get lost in her inbox and she would rather have a link.
- ~ Dale – Same. Would like to have it one place. In favor of members-only section.
- ~ Emily – Likes keeping information as public as possible. Not a fan of logins because they're difficult to keep track of.
- ~ Kirsten – CTC will create a members-only section and update the AC on the logins.
- Research Project pages
 - ~ Should TC meeting minutes be accessible to everyone or only the committee, TAAC and University reps?
 - Ann – Would prefer to keep private but on request. But who would make that decision?
 - Dale – Meeting minutes, why bother posting them at all?
 - Emily – 18-3 meeting update slides, are these available to everyone? A researcher may not want them available to everyone. Kirsten – We would probably need researcher's permission. Maina – This page is just for a subscriber. Not everyone with a login would be able to see the secure pages.
 - Kirsten – We would put a note on the page that there is additional content that you must be logged in to see.

7) Symposium – Ideas

- AC to share ideas/thoughts on a NETC Symposium after having attended the TRB Annual Meeting virtually.
 - ~ Ann – The TRB Annual Meeting had its ups and downs. There has also been an EDC summit and innovation fairs.
 - ~ The Symposium committee will come up with ideas and come back to the AC.
 - ~ Emily – We don't need a fancy exhibit system. We could do pages for exhibitors and it would be nice to have posters but we could find an easier way than the TRB system. Also, pre-recorded sessions, with PIs available for Q&As, are an option.
 - Dale – Need to better understand the options and costs so the AC can make the best decision.
 - Emily – Has a one-pager from AZ showing the month of innovation webinars. She will send this to Kirsten and Maina. They have a STIC supporter that set up the meetings and did the registrations. She likes the idea of administrative help.
 - Emily – She did the AACHTO RAC conference last July. They used Microsoft Teams.
- **Action item:** Kirsten will add Alex Bernier to Symposium Committee communications.
- Symposium committee meeting is scheduled for February 25 to further discuss ideas.

8) Other Business

- Ann – Wayne Frankhauser of MaineDOT did a great presentation yesterday on composite bridge systems. He made a plea on the need for education. Ann sent him an email asking what he meant specifically. Is there a need for education and training in New England and could NETC provide this?
- Dale – A recent presentation used a photo of the FRP composite bridge drains ME is using all the time. These are using a direct result of [NETC 09-3: Advanced Composite Materials in New](#)

[England's Transportation Infrastructure: Design, Fabrication and Installation of ACM Bridge Drain System.](#)

- Colin – We don't hear about the little successes that happen in increments. He would like a way to do this.
 - ~ Emily – An example of a little success: Motivated by UT DOT's [Innovation and Efficiencies Report 2021](#) that just came out. They give a qualitative value to their research projects. Asking for letters of interest to do something similar and referenced [NETC 17-2: Quick Response Research: Quantification of Research Benefits](#) as a starting point.
 - ~ Colin – Maybe NETC should do study on what it really takes to get something implemented (policy, spec, widget, etc.) within the six New England DOTs. Sit down with the DOTs and find out their implementation processes.
 - Ann – Specification committee in NH, kicking off a new project where they will look at a spec. If something changes, it will become a special provision for a while and then eventually turn into a spec documentation.
 - Emily – We missed our chance to write an RPS on this type of project. Colin – We've been talking about implementation since early 2000s with SCOR. Victor Menendez implemented EDC because research was sitting on shelves and not being used. What is really needed to get things done and use them? Let's dive deep and find out what is needed to get implementation going. What could be done with the six states, strategizing to work together, to get things done?
 - Dale – It's not too late, NETC can decide to put money aside for this type of project. We should have the conversation at the March TAAC meeting.
- Colin – NCHRP prob statements will be coming out soon. Can NETC do some trading with each other, to see what each other has proposed and help each other out with voting? **Action item:** Send Ann your NETC ballots and we will discuss them at the March meeting.

9) Adjourn

Next meeting: February 16, 2021 from 1:00 – 2:30pm ET.