



NETC Advisory Committee Minutes

Tuesday, March 25 , 2025, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. ET

Attendees:

Ulrich Amoussou-Guenou, MaineDOT	Dee Nash, NHDOT
Dave Gaylord, NHDOT	Emily Parkany, VT AOT
Brian Hirt, CTC & Associates	Jeff Pulver, MaineDOT
Devon Kleebatt, CT DOT	Kirsten Seeber, CTC & Associates
Matt Mann, UMTC	Nicholas Zavolas, MassDOT
Ashlie Mercado, VT AOT	

Identified efforts to use the remaining funds in CTC contract (ends 9/30/2025)

- Remaining funds through 2/28/25 = \$41,611. Plan on \$40,000 for group projects.
- The selected efforts and key NETC people CTC will work with on each effort are listed below, in the order CTC will work on them. The full Advisory Committee will review and approve the key deliverables.
 - ~ **Catalog website materials**
 - CTC will continue to host the website for three years for \$900/year to be prepaid prior to the end of the contract.
 - There is a chance that pre-paying won’t work with Maine, but CTC will try and see what happens.
 - Goal – easy, low budget and organized.
 - CTC will name and organize the website materials to make it easy for others to locate documents. CTC will produce a table of contents for the materials. CTC will provide a folder of materials with subfolders. The materials will be uploaded to a SharePoint site (TBD).
 - Types of Files
 - Meeting minutes – Easy to grab and put on the drive.
 - Research files for all of the projects
 - They have several deliverables. Slight manual process to create a file for each project and put the deliverables in them. Less than 10 hours total.

- (i) Include the quarterly reports? No
- (ii) Task reports? - Yes
- Events
 - Bit of a manual process. The videos are published on Vimeo. Can grab them and download them or link to them. Which would they prefer?
 - (i) Brian would be more comfortable downloading the videos and will also provide links.
 - Brian – Will have this ready by next month’s meeting. He will also put everything on a Google Drive for them to download.
- ~ **NETC At-A-Glance** – Emily and Ashlie
 - CTC met with Emily and Ashlie on 2/20/25 to discuss ideas regarding the AAG.
 - Initial thoughts: Four-page document that focusses on this phase of the pooled fund. Include a sentence or two on the history of NETC. Have a couple of pages with stats and graphics. Highlight a couple of projects and a topical discussion.
 - Kirsten and Katie will have a draft for Emily and Ashlie by 3/28/25.
- ~ **Research success videos key contacts** – Jeff, Ulrich and Devon
 - Begin with one video. Potential projects to highlight:
 - UAS projects [18-3: UAS in DOT Operations](#)/[20-3: UAS for Bridge Inspection](#)
 - Brian - Yes, better from a visual standpoint, but there are many videos out there on this topic. Not many (any?) MASH videos, so it may be a better project to feature. Which are the projects you want people to get the message about? Think about who the investigators for each. Who is around and would be willing to be interviewed?
 - (i) Brian – Need TAC members from more than one state to show how it worked across NE.
 - MASH projects [18-1: Development of MASH Computer Simulated Rail/Transition Details](#)/[20-1: In-Service Performance Evaluation of NETC Bridge Rails](#)
 - Kirsten and Katie will meet with Jeff, Ulrich and Devon on 3/27/25 to discuss a video.
- ~ **SME recognition synthesis** – Dee and Jeff
- ~ **Report remediation** – Devon and Emily

- The table below shows the selected efforts with CTC’s hours and cost estimates. Projects total = \$38,599.

Effort	Notes	Hours	Cost Estimate
Selected			
NETC At-A-Glance brochure – Four designed pages; featuring overall program stats and specific project highlights		90	\$10,755
Two videos on selected research success – 3-4 minute narrated videos, with SME or PI interviews intercut with stills and footage. Cost for two videos.		120	\$14,340
Methods for SME recognition – Synthesis and summary of national practices. Include a very short RAC survey.		85	\$10,158
Section 508 remediation of key reports			

VT - Smart Growth	Alt text and contrast appear to be straightforward. Nesting and table errors could get complicated but should be fixable.	18	\$2,151
CT - Bridge AI Report	Appears to be straightforward.	10	\$1,195
		Total	\$38,599

Implementation discussions

- Emily suggested a two meeting plan to approach project TACs regarding implementation/follow up activities.
 - ~ Meeting 1 – Convene the SMEs to see if they are excited about their projects. Meeting 2 – Webinar to present a project summary, a couple of states sharing how they are implementing or using the project results, and next steps.
- [21-1: Quality Review and Assessment of Pavement Condition Survey Vehicle Data Across New England](#) – CT, ME, NH, RI, VT attended
 - Meeting held on 2/27/25 to discuss follow up/implementation activities. The TAC members used the control site identification tool after the project ended, so they couldn't provide adequate feedback. The site selection guidelines document and the researchers' assessment of the Data Quality Management Plans didn't appear to be helpful. New Hampshire offered to allow other states to bring their vehicles to their control sites for calibration. MA had also offered their control sites for calibration but no one from MA was on the call. Attendees were going to follow up with MA.
 - Emily – Implementation fail or barrier that they haven't talked about nationally. Using the project tool but after the project ends so their experience can't inform the development of the tool.
 - This meeting showed the value of the TAC getting together a year after a project ends to see what has happened and learn what is needed by the states.
 - Dee – The project tool was intended to help the states decide where to have their control sites with minimal, medium and high roughness. The roads would change each year because roads get paved. Vehicles came to NH and used their test sites last year. NH has a method establishing their control sites already.
 - Dee – The fact the states came to NH and did a collaborative run on their control site was a success of the project.
 - Dee – The project looked at the DQMPs and compared their reports. Could states use each other's data from these plans? Not sure how to measure the benefit of that.
 - Emily – 19-1: CIAB Design project – She will write an email to see if people want to meet on this.
 - Part of it is who should be reached out to if the TAC folks are no longer at the TAC.
 - This may not be the best project for a Research Success video but could be featured in the At-A-Glance to discuss the collaboration between the states post project.

Adjourn

Next meetings: April 22, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. ET.