

[NETC Meeting Notice and Agenda](#)

[Tuesday, May 22, 2018, 11am Advisory Committee Meeting](#)

DATE: Tuesday, May 22, 11:00am – 12:00pm

LOCATION: Conference Call: 1-866-906-7447 (code: 8626283)

ATTENDEES

Matt Mann (UMass-Amherst)	Dale Peabody (ME)
Ehsan Ghazanfari (UVM)	Nicholas Zavolas (MA)
Chris Jolly (FHWA)	Mike Sock (RI)
Dee Nash (NH)	Emily Parkany (VT)
Brad Overturf (CT)	Ian Anderson (VT)
Flavia Pereira (CT)	Hannah Ullman (NETC)
Deane Van Dusen (ME)	

AGENDA

1. Implementation of Project Results – Hannah Ullman

- Survey Monkey results discussion for projects 10-3 to 15-3 (results below)
- The survey was sent out twice, the second time was a reminder.
 - *The bullet points below summarize the discussion on NETC project implementation:*
 - *Should we look for projects who would have passionate TAC members?*
 - *How do this survey's comments compare to comments that were made during project selection/ranking?*
 - *The NETC should strive to better document comments early on in the process*
 - *The NETC should think about implementation at the beginning of projects and the level of implementation (e.g. how many states? All six? Only Northern/Southern states?)*
 - *Maybe NETC should set aside money for implementation at the beginning of a project; one suggestion was made to mandate for a project that a certain amount of the budget be saved for implementation. Another suggestion was that NETC set aside special money outside of the project for future implementation*

		Should this project be implemented? Select all that apply. (Count)			
Project	TAC Responses (%)	Yes, in my state	Yes, in other states	No	Maybe
10-3	2 (33%)	1	-	-	1
13-1	3 (43%)	3	-	-	1
13-2	0 (0%)	-	-	-	-
13-3	1 (14%)	2	1	-	2
14-1	2 (33%)	1	-	-	1
14-2	3 (50%)	2	2	-	-
14-4	0 (0%)	-	-	-	-
15-1	5 (100%)	5	3	-	-
15-2	3 (38%)	-	-	-	3
15-3	2 (33%)	1	1	-	1

Explain why or why not this project should be implemented.	
Project	TAC Comments
10-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report didn't produce a product to implement. It provides assurance the WMA is not more prone to moisture damage than HMA. The research summarizes that high RAP mixes may be used since moisture contents are negligible during the production process. However, that is just a short term condition. Long term field monitoring of high RAP sections needs to show performance as good as conventionally used RAP percentages. After which, our agency may be more likely to conduct further long term field monitoring of test sections regionally to determine feasibility in this region.
13-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In concept the research should provide performance characteristics of a mix that is routinely needed for ABC construction. However, I have not read the final report to make a decision either way. VTrans uses a 5000 psi closure pour concrete, but we have no test data on performance so bridge decks are membraned and paved. If this mix performs well then cost savings could be achieved without compromising durability. Our state is looking to continue to implement ABC techniques; implementing NETC 13-1, Development of High Early Strength Concrete for ABC Closure Pour Connection, would be advantageous for ABC, as well as in other projects applications.
13-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
13-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I said maybe because the devil is in the details. MassDOT would like to pilot but if [I'm] remembering correctly, how testing would be shown to other states and how cost sharing would work is still fuzzy. I feel details are still needed before implementing can happen. Implementation of 13-3 I see as potentially beneficial to the states involved. Particularly if we could implement something for the non-structural precast items that are fairly standard between states. Structural precast might be harder to implement due to the complexity of some units and how states differ more on the inspection of these items. One of the biggest hurdles is going to be getting a

	<p>system in place to provide cost sharing and a mechanism for payment from and to the different states.</p>
14-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [This project should be implemented in my state] to make sure the right type of training is being provided. • [I am] unsure how I might leverage the data.
14-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project, 14-2, is a survey protocol that should be implemented. Surveys such as this may become required in some form if more species of bats are put onto the endangered species list. • I say “yes” it should be implemented, because the project is already complete. Again, I am not sure what the word “implemented” really means here. • I thought this was already implemented. VTrans conducts bridge inspections for bat use regularly and this study was very useful.
14-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
15-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about where and when bats (general) use roadside habitat could help guide decisions about the Programmatic Agreement for NLEB between FHWA, FTA, FRA, and USFWS. For example, currently a project that clears 3 trees during the active season immediately adjacent to a highway is considered Likely to Adversely Affect NLEB. This does not make logical sense, as the bats are not likely to be using the trees adjacent to the roadway – in my opinion. This study could help inform changing this to a NLAA in the PA. I would suggest expanding to include the other state-listed bat species that are being considered by USFWS for future listing (Little Brown Bat, Tri-Colored) too. • It is a review of a survey process. The survey may become required in the future and should dovetail with USFWS protocol. • This species (NLEB) will likely be listed [as] federally endangered at some point. This project will help us to understand the species more fully and help with the conservation of the species. The more we know about this species and other bat species, the more informed we are when reviewing and conditioning projects (time of year cutting). • Although the final 4(d) Rule does reduce the regulatory restrictions associated with the listing of the NLEB, the rule may be reversed due to an ongoing lawsuit, and/or the NLEB may be upgraded to an Endangered status at some point in the future. The Tri-Colored Bat is also under review for federal listing. Currently, the way the USFWS regulates the NLEB is to assume they are present within every suitable roost tree, unless surveys are conducted to document otherwise. Although there has been limited research on bat activity along highways, this approach doesn’t seem justified based upon NLEB population data, where declines of up to 99% have been documented in some northeastern states. Therefore, it is important to understand to what degree the NLEB and other bats utilize highway corridors. This information is very important to informing the Section 7 consultation process for the NLEB and/or other species in the future. • I am a bit confused by the question, and am answering “yes” because it is my understanding that the project is already being implemented and that the research has already begun by [the] University of New Hampshire. I have not seen any updates, so I do not know what the status is. Sorry if this response is not helpful, just not quite sure what you are exactly asking.

15-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limited sample size makes me question the validity of conclusions that might be drawn from the study. • This study is active. The researchers are still analyzing the NDS data and have not provided any firm recommendations yet. Furthermore, this is a phase 1 proof of concept type study. There may not be implementable actions as a result of this work. It may require additional phases to develop actions. • [The] topic seems too general and needs to be boiled down to something more specific to make it more worthwhile.
15-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project was an excellent example of a well-scoped NETC project that meets a need. • I don't yet know enough about it to recommend its implementation in Rhode Island. • [One TAC member did not complete the survey but emailed the Coordinator]: Based on the progress, it looks promising. But, I prefer to hold on any definitive comment until I see all the results and final report with recommendations from the research team. • [Another TAC member also did not complete the survey but emailed the Coordinator]: I'll be honest, I don't understand the question in the survey. [The Coordinator emailed back an explanation but has not heard from the TAC member.]

2. Quick Response Project Award Updates – Hannah Ullman

- 15-4 QR: Optimizing Quality Assurance (QA) Processes for Asphalt Pavement Construction in the Northeast
 - Number of proposals received: 3
 - From: Rutgers/URI, UMaine, UNH
 - TAC review meeting will most likely be on May 31
- 17-2 QR: Quantification of Research Benefits
 - Number of proposals received: 4
 - From: RSG, UConn, UVM, VHB
 - TAC proposal review meeting is on May 29

3. Open Project Review (May 2018) – Hannah Ullman

Project # and Title	PI, University AC Liaison	Update	End Date
10-3: Low Temperature and Moisture Susceptibility of RAP Mixtures with Warm Mix Technology	Mogawer, UMass Dartmouth A. Scholz	This project and all deliverables are complete. TAC certificates of appreciation have been sent out.	5/31/17 (NCE)
13-1: Development of High Early-Strength Concrete for Accelerated Bridge Construction Closure Pour Connections	Brena, UMass Amherst E. Parkany	The NCE to 5/31/18 was granted and PI began work again at the end of February. Another NCE will be requested for an extension until the end of August. Panels were cast and are undergoing curing. They should be ready to move in this week to set them up to cast the closure pour. The PI expects the closure pour casting to take place during the week of May 28. That same week they will fabricate the freeze-thaw specimens for shipping to the testing laboratory. The PI will coordinate with MassDOT to do so. Panel testing will take place the first week in June. Draft final report will be finalized during the first two weeks in June.	5/31/2018 (NCE)

Project # and Title	PI, University AC Liaison	Update	End Date
13-2: HMA Mixtures Containing Recycled Asphalt Shingles (RAS): Low Temperature and Fatigue Performance of Plant-Produced Mixtures	Mogawer, UMass Dartmouth A. Scholz	A draft final report was submitted mid-March. The PI is still seeking feedback and expects to have final TAC comments by May 31.	12/1/17 (NCE)
13-3: Improved Regionalization of Quality Assurance (QA) Functions	Dave, UNH M. Sock	The PI is working on incorporating Denis Boisvert's comments into the final deliverables. The PI plans to wrap up everything by the end of May.	4/2/17 (NCE)
14-1: Measuring the Effectiveness of Competency Models for Job Specific Professional Development of Engineers & Engineering Technicians	Ahmadjian, UMass Amherst D. Peabody	There are no new updates. The project team is anticipating a completion date of 7/31/18. The project team continues to review and update model framework, summarize and discuss results, and work on a draft final report.	12/31/17 (NCE)
14-4: Optimizing Future Work Zones in New England for Safety and Mobility	Xie, UMASS Lowell MassDOT	This project and all deliverables are complete. TAC certificates of appreciation have been sent out.	12/31/2017 (NCE)
15-1: Use of Forested Habitat Adjacent to Highways by Northern Long Ear Bats	Foster, UNH D. Peabody	There are no new updates for this project. Work continues on schedule.	11/30/18
15-2: Using the New SHRP2 Naturalistic Driving Study Safety Databases to Examine Safety Concerns for Older Drivers	Knodler, UMass Amherst D. Peabody	The PI has scheduled a project update meeting for Friday, May 25. The coordinator is working with the PI and UMass administrative manager to receive a revised version of the budget reallocation that was approved in January 2018. They had some staff move around when Siby Samuel left and the tuition line item was never adjusted for that in the budget reallocation in January.	12/31/18
15-3: Moisture Susceptibility Testing for Hot Mix Asphalt Pavements in New England	Dave, UNH D. Peabody	The PI is working to schedule a TAC project update meeting in mid-June. He plans to finalize a draft report by the end of June.	7/31/18
15-4: Optimizing Quality Assurance (QA) Processes for Asphalt Pavement Construction in the Northeast	TBD A. Scholz	Proposals for this RFP were received May 18, 2018.	TBD
17-1: Quick Response: New England Connected Automated Vehicles	Chris Chaffee, AECOM Emily Parkany	AECOM provided a draft summary of cross-border issues to the TAC on May 11, as well a question guide for agencies to use before the June 11 workshop. A meeting for the presentation of a final report to the TAC was scheduled for September 10. The PI also provided an updated project schedule on May 7. The Coordinator and TAC chair allowed for a project end date of October 10, since the contracting was not executed until April 10.	10/10/2018
17-2: Quick Response: Quantification of Research Benefits	TBD E. Parkany/F. Pereira	Proposals for this RFP were received May 18, 2018.	TBD
Implementation of Project 13-3/Phase II: Possible 17-3 QR	TBD TBD	Eshan Dave agreed to work on a SOW for a 6-month Phase II project of 13-3. The Coordinator sent him a template to use at the beginning of May.	TBD

- Project 13-1
 - NH TAC member, Jim Amrol, retired 4/1/18. Is there a suggestion for a new NH TAC member?
 - *Dee Nash said that she would look into finding a NH replacement TAC member for the 13-1 project.*
 - AC vote on NCE to August 31, 2018 (RI, NH, VT voted so far)

- *Dale Peabody voted for Maine in favor of the NCE, thus there is the majority needed to now extend the project end date.*

4. Update on 18-series Projects – Hannah

- 18-1: The project TAC has met to finalize the SOW. This will be ready to be put into RFP form soon.
- 18-2: Denis Boisvert of NHDOT (TAC Chair) has offered to take the lead in developing the first draft of the SOW.
 - *Note that the draft SOW for this project has been completed and sent out for review by the TAC. The Coordinator will reach out to Denis Boisvert again about scheduling a time for the TAC to meet to review the SOW.*
- 18-3: Jeff DeCarlo of MassDOT (TAC Chair) has offered to take the lead in developing the first draft of the SOW.

5. NETC Fund Balance Update

- All previous fund transfers have been completed
- FY2016 Fund Balance Transfers – 0.00
- FY2017 Fund Balance Transfers – Decision deferred, but budgeted by each state
- NETC Coordinator funded through 9/1/2018 and limited funding through 2/15/2019 to complete NETC 15- and 17-series projects
- NETC Unallocated Balance as of 4/17/2018 with 15-4 as a Quick Response Project, and 17-1 and 17-2 subtracted out (each \$58,625; \$50,000 + \$8,625 F&A fee) – **\$89,983.32 unobligated research funds**
 - About \$165,000 of additional funds will be returned to the unobligated research funds when 7 currently open projects are closed out (remaining balances).
 - **Transfers were completed for all closed projects on May 10, 2018.**
- **TPF (222) Closeout Discussion**
 - Return remaining unobligated research funds early to states to provide to Maine pooled fund? Keep \$50,000 for 13-3 Phase II project?
 - *Discussion was had on whether AC members were in favor of transferring the majority of leftover “unobligated” research funds back to the six states early (instead of waiting until the end of the UVM Coordinator contract). The AC was in favor of doing this sooner rather than later.*
 - *One question that was posed was whether we can add on \$50,000 to project 13-3 for the Phase II of 13-3 or if we need to make it a separate project (this would mean F&A of \$8,625 would be charged).*
 - *Emily said that she would take a look at Chris Jolly’s recordkeeping spreadsheet to help estimate approximately how much each state would be returned in research funds. Note that since each state did not contribute the same amount.*
 - *Emily urged states to consider returning the leftover money to Maine after it is received at their state. Some AC members said they would like to do this; some others were concerned about whether or not their state would*

approve the money to be returned to Maine. More discussion will be had on this topic in the next couple of months.

6. Other Business

- June meeting is Tuesday, June 26, 2018 at 11am. This meeting will be a regular conference call.
- Any other business?

7. Adjourn