



New England Transportation Consortium

NETC Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

DATE: Tuesday, May 26, 2020, 11:00am – noon ET

LOCATION: GoToMeeting Link: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/628554149> Dial-in: 646-749-3122;
Access Code: 628-554-149

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ulrich Amoussou-Guenou, MaineDOT | Emily Parkany, VTrans |
| Alex Bernier, UConn | Dale Peabody, MaineDOT |
| Colin Franco, RIDOT | Greg Rowangould, UVM |
| Chris Jolly, FHWA | Ann Scholz, NHDOT |
| Matt Mann, UMass | Kirsten Seeber, CTC & Associates |
| Tanya Miller, VTrans | Jo Sias, NHDOT |
| Deidre Nash, NHDOT | Maina Tran, CTC & Associates |
| Lily Oliver, MassDOT | Nicholas Zavolas, MassDOT |

1) Open Project Review (May 2020)

| Project # and Title | PI, Organization AC Liaison CTC Project Manager TC Chair | Update | End Date Budget |
|---|---|--|------------------------|
| 18-1: Development of MASH Computer Simulated Steel Bridge Rail & Transition Details | Chuck Plaxico, Malcom Ray, Roadsafe LLC D. Peabody K. Seeber Jeff Folsom, ME | Final report, fact sheet and poster are posted on the project page . | 6/1/20 \$199,936 |
| 18-2: Framework of Asphalt Balanced Mix Design for NE Agencies | Walaa Mogawer, UMass Dartmouth A. Scholz M. Tran Joseph Blair, NH DOT | Tasks 3- 5 are in progress. A project update status meeting is scheduled for the first week of June. | 6/30/20 \$127,499 |
| 18-3: Integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into State DOTs | Adrienne Lindgren, WSP E. Parkany M. Tran Jeffrey DeCarlo, MA DOT | Task 3 is almost complete. Task 4 is in progress. A project update meeting is scheduled for 5/27/20. | 3/31/2021 \$146,632 |
| 19-1: Curved Integral Abutment Bridge Design | Adam Stockin, WSP E. Parkany K. Seeber Alex Bardow, MA DOT | Kirsten sent WSP's proposal for instrumenting/monitoring one VT bridge to TC for comments. Many comments received. | 6/30/2022 \$151,316 |
| 19-2: Multi-Scale Multi-Season Land-Based Erosion Modeling | Aimee Mountain, GZA | Task 2 is in progress. A project update meeting was held on 5/20/20. The research team | 6/30/2022 \$148,035 |

| Project # and Title | PI, Organization AC Liaison CTC Project Manager TC Chair | Update | End Date Budget |
|---|---|--|--------------------|
| and Monitoring for Infrastructure Management | A. Scholz M. Tran Neil Olson, NH DOT | presented survey results on land data gathered. They will continue to reach out to a few more states to obtain additional responses. | |
| 19-3: Experimental Validation of New Improved Load Rating Procedures for Deteriorated Steel Beam Ends | TBD N. Zavalas K. Seeber Alex Bardow, MA DOT | ME negotiating the contract with the PI. | TBD \$200,000 |
| 20-1: In-Service Performance Evaluation of NETC Bridge Railings | TBD D. Peabody K. Seeber Jeff Folsom, ME DOT | Need full TC so CTC can schedule the SOW review meeting. Draft SOW with TC Chair and AC Liaisons for review and feedback. Draft SOW will be sent to TC prior to the SOW review meeting. TC CT – Need member MA – Need member ME – Jeff Folsom (chair) NH – Chelsea Noyes RI – Need member VT – Chris Mooney | TBD \$120,000 |
| 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 | Need full TC so CTC can schedule the SOW review meeting. Draft SOW with TC Chair and AC Liaisons for review and feedback. Draft SOW will be sent to TC prior to the SOW review meeting. TC CT – Need member MA – Need member ME - Colby Fortier-Brown NH – Susan Klasen (chair) RI – Need member VT – Ian Degutis/Mandy White | TBD \$200,000 |
| 20-3: Investigating Thermal Imaging Technologies and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to Improve Bridge Inspections | TBD D. Peabody M. Tran John “Sam” Maxim, ME DOT | Need full TC so CTC can schedule the SOW review meeting. Draft SOW with TC Chair and AC Liaisons for review and feedback. Draft SOW will be sent to TC prior to the SOW review meeting. TC CT – Need member MA – Need member ME – Sam Maxim NH – Nick Goulas RI – Need member VT – Evan Robinson | TBD \$175,000 |
| 20-4: New England Connected and Automated Vehicle Legal and Regulatory Assessment | TBD E. Parkany/N. Zavalas K. Seeber | A SOW review meeting was held 5/15/20. The TC chair is revising the SOW based on the TC comments. A follow up SOW review meeting is scheduled for 6/5/20. | TBD \$100,000 |

| Project # and Title | PI, Organization AC Liaison CTC Project Manager TC Chair | Update | End Date Budget |
|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| | Daniel Sullivan, MA DOT | Emily - | |
| Creating a NETC that Works | | Funds have been set aside should the AC want to move forward with this effort. | TBD \$50,000 |

Discussion:

- 18-1 – Emily – Has the ME FHWA Division Office been presented with results of this project? Other states will want to mimic this. Dale – Jeff Folsom (TC chair) has been in contact with the ME FHWA Division Office. As far as Dale know, the FHWA Division Office will be accepting the project’s results. They presented to the Engineering Council and comments are due 6/1/20.
 - ~ 20-1 will provide the needed data to support 18-1’s results. Emily – VT is putting together information to make their own decision on guardrail.
- 19-1 – **Action item:** Kirsten will compile the TC’s comments and send back to WSP this week.
 - ~ Emily – The consensus from the TC is that it will be difficult to instrument a bridge that doesn’t have sensors on it. The one curved bridge in VT that has sensors used geofoam to support the abutments, which isn’t ideal. Can they use one of the other three straight bridges and add curve to them? Also, WSP will need to come up with a better proposal to include more details/costs.
 - ~ Colin – Are the sensors working and/or been calibrated? Has it been checked on by anyone? If not, then project should be scrapped. Emily – The sensors have not been checked. Colin - Ask WSP to look at the instrumentation and ensure it is calibrated prior to starting this add on task.
 - ~ Colin – Will the project produce modeling that will work with other bridges? Emily – The original project tasks will go on and the objective is to develop guidelines for the design of curved integral abutment bridges.
- 19-2 – **Action item:** Colin will send an email to one of his IT guys.
- 19-3 – Dale – When the TC developed the SOW into an RFP, they specifically spelled out that \$50,000 would go to shipping beams, as the project requires. Dale removed that piece from the contract, but he doesn’t know why. Alex Bardow (TC chair) is concerned there wouldn’t be funds to ship beams.
 - ~ Alex has done shipping of beams in MA and MA covered it. Dale will keep \$40,000 in the project’s direct expenses in case the shipping is not covered by a state (MA). The contract has been negotiated with UMass for \$180,000. This will bring the total project cost to \$220,000.
 - ~ Are the AC members okay with the additional \$40,000 being added to the direct expenses for this project? Emily – Ok. Ann – Ok. Lily – Ok. Dale – Ok. Colin – Ok. Ed was not on the call to vote for CT.
- 20-series projects
 - ~ Nicholas has identified three MA TC members for 20-2 and 20-3 and are waiting for their confirmation. Two members want to be on one project.
 - ~ Colin – He has one person for 20-1, which he will send to Kirsten and Maina.
 - ~ Andrew Mroczkowski (CT) is trying to assist with getting CT members for 20-series projects.
 - ~ Emily – Can we start scheduling SOW meetings with four TC members identified? Ann – Yes. A quorum is four members.

- ~ Dale – The sooner we can get the TC members identified, the sooner the process can get moving. When we get to the November/December timeframe for contracts, things slow down due to the holidays. Then the contracts will not be finalized until after the first of the year.
- Dale reached out to NYS DOT to determine their interest in the 20-series projects. Ryan Lund responded that they will not financially participate in them for now. Some of their folks are interested in 20-2 and would like to stay in the loop. They would possibly participate next year.

2) Implementation - Closeout webinars for closed projects

- 15-4: [Quick Response Project: Optimizing Quality Assurance \(QA\) Processes for Asphalt Pavement Construction in the Northeast](#). Webinar held on Thursday, May 7th. Twenty-two attendees and lots of participation.
 - ~ Colin – Good work has been done on this project. He suggests Jo Sias write up a proposal for a Quick Response Project, so they can start implementing things for asphalt QA for the NE region. It may involve some arm twisting and facilitation. Jo may have to meet one-on-one with folks to get them cooperating and moving. The project funds would be for her to travel.
 - ~ Emily – Why didn't implementation happen with 15-4? Jo – The scope was to develop the roadmap, but not to implement it. The project focused on gathering information on the current state of practice, identify where opportunities and challenges existed, and develop the roadmap.
 - ~ Emily – Are there things that can be done to get us closer to implementation? Jo – Yes. Dale – ME and NH discussed trying to implement 15-4 but their states couldn't. Other states might be able to implement. He is supportive of an implementation project.
 - ~ Colin – At the national level, an implementation program exists. This new project would be about that. The roadmap was developed, and Jo came up with what could be done. Now she can go to each state to see what could be done to encourage them to collaborate.
 - ~ Colin – 13-3: Improved Regionalization of Quality Assurance (QA) Functions had issues related to settling finances among the states. That shouldn't be an issue here.
 - ~ Lily – Did we do a survey on implementing 15-4? Review those comments. **Action item:** Kirsten will look for the comments and send to Colin. Ann – Colin may want to check with his folks on this. They weren't not involved in the original implementation survey.
 - ~ Keep this topic on the agenda.
- 18-1: [Development of MASH Computer Simulated Steel Bridge Rail and Transition Details](#) Kirsten working with Chuck Plaxico to find a date and time. The webinar has been pushed to June or early July due to the PI's schedule.
- All webinar recordings/presentations can be found on the project pages or [here](#).

3) Marketing Ideas – Nicholas Zavalas

- **NETC "What's happening?" newsletter** - NETC would distribute to AC members a monthly (or bi-monthly) email 'quick update' of NETC-related activities that can easily be forwarded to DOT staff et al. This update could include a range of information such as:
 - ~ recently completed NETC research
 - ~ current and/or recently awarded NETC research
 - ~ upcoming Webinars/Seminars (NETC)
 - ~ call for NETC TC participants
 - ~ NETC State DOTs - announcements (i.e., transportation research & education)

Discussion:

- Dale – Great idea. Being proactive and pushing information out, rather than putting it on the website and waiting for folks to find it.
- Emily – Does CTC have the bandwidth to do this every other month? **Action item:** Kirsten will discuss with Brian Hirt (CTC) about this project.
- Nicholas – Happy to help work on it.
- Nicholas – Ideas above could be rolled into the newsletter. Click on their links to find out what’s going on at the individual states.
- **NETC State DOT Research Activities Update** - NETC DOT ACs to periodically/regularly share a listing of their respective research project activities:
 - ~ recently completed research,
 - ~ current research and/or
 - ~ new research project selections

Discussion:

- These ideas could be incorporated into the newsletter.

4) Final Reports – 508 compliance/technical editing

- **508 compliance**
 - ~ Lily forwarded MA’s standard contract language related to 508 compliance. Is this something ME can incorporate into their contracts?

SECTION 508 COMPLIANCE

All electronic and information technology deliverables rendered under this contract shall comply with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (**29 U.S.C. § 798 SECTION 508**) and the Access Board Standards available for viewing at <http://www.section508.gov>. Unless otherwise indicated, the Consultant represents by signature on this Agreement that all deliverables shall be in compliance with all applicable Access Board Standards. Further, the Consultant shall adhere to Information Technology Division (ITD) Enterprise Information Accessibility Standards and the Web Accessibility Standards, Version 2 (collectively the “ITD Accessibility Standards”) issued by “ITD,” available online at <http://www.mass.gov/accessibility>.

Discussion:

- **Action item:** Dale will use MA’s language in the ME contracts, modified for ME.
- **Technical editing** – Continued discussion from April meeting.
 - ~ The AC wanted to decide on this topic this month, prior to the next batch of RFPs being posted by ME.

Discussion:

- Greg – He doesn’t see a need for this in RFP/contract language. He assumes that reports should be well-written and understandable. If they are not, then the TCs should reject them.
- Colin – Is there a requirement that PIs submit chapters prior to submitting the Draft Final Report? Dale – Most PIs submit a draft task report to the TC and get comments back. Task reports are required from some, but not all projects.

- Matt – PIs should submit error free reports, but that doesn't always happen. Some PIs are better than other. They have had issues with similar formatting across the report and one voice (due to different people writing different sections of the report).
- Lily – The main responsibility for editing lies with the PI. MA requires a professional editor for copy editing only. They do not fundamentally change the report if it is poorly written. MA asks the PIs for interim deliverables that are incorporated into the final report.
- Dale – They are trying to be as specific as possible in the contract for deliverables.
- Dale – He understands that it is important to have a well-written technical report. He's wondering if it's a problem right now for NETC? He would hate to add something into an RFP that would add costs if it is not needed. Emily – Agrees.
- Greg – Sometimes he sees good research with bad writing. Maybe tech editing should be added to project budgets. Emily – Likes the suggestion of writing it in the contract that tech editing is an acceptable expense.
- Matt – Is there a specific template for final reports? Kirsten – No
- **Action item:** Kirsten and Maina will keep an eye on this issue from CTC's point of view. The AC Liaisons and TCs will also be aware. If we find that there are major issues, then we will add a tech editing requirement to SOW, RFP, and contract.

5) NETC Website Refresh

- CTC has received feedback from a few members and will proceed with the website refresh.
 - ~ Changes to some of the wording on pages need to be made.
 - ~ State logos are good. No university logos/
 - ~ Reconsider the NETC logo to represent DOTs for managing a multimodal transportation system.
 - ~ Consider mimicking Clear Roads project pages ([sample](#)) so the NETC project page contains only project information.
 - ~ Lose states names around the image of just the states. They are in the logos below so it's should be fine.

Discussion:

- Kirsten – CTC will move forward with theme and organization and keep AC in the loop.

6) Other Business

- Unfunded Research [page](#) now on the NETC website.

7) Adjourn

Next meeting: June 23, 2020 from 11:00am – Noon ET