



# New England Transportation Consortium

## NETC Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

**DATE:** Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 11:00am – noon ET

**LOCATION:** Dial-in: 608-721-7576; Access Code: 1930608

Jim Bryce, UME	Greg Rowangould, UVM
Chris Jolly, FHWA	Ann Scholz, NHDOT
Matt Mann, UMass	Kirsten Seeber, CTC & Associates
Lily Oliver, MassDOT	Maina Tran, CTC & Associates
Emily Parkany, VTrans	Nicholas Zavalas, MassDOT
Dale Peabody, MaineDOT	Christos Xenophontos, RI
Flavia Pereira, CT DOT	

### 1) Jim Bryce, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Infrastructure Durability Center

- New University of Maine AC member, taking over for Per Garder.
- He sees lots of synergies between the TIDC and NETC, especially related to promoting the lifespan of infrastructure in New England.
- Dale – Jim is not a researcher or professor, but brings practical industry experience to the AC.

### 2) Open Project Review (November 2019)

Project # and Title	PI, University AC Liaison	Update	End Date Budget
18-1: Development of MASH Computer Simulated Steel Bridge Rail & Transition Details	Chuck Plaxico, Malcom Ray, Roadsafe LLC D. Peabody	The PI has completed Tasks 3B and working on Task 4B. He will begin Task 5B this week. These are the extra tasks added to the contract.	6/1/20 \$199,936
18-2: Framework of Asphalt Balanced Mix Design for NE Agencies	Walaa Mogawer, UMass Dartmouth A. Scholz	Tasks 3- 5 are in progress. CTC will coordinate a check in meeting for mid-December.	6/30/20 \$127,499
18-3: Integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into State DOTs	Jon Gustafson, WSP E. Parkany	Task 2 is in progress. CTC will coordinate a check in meeting for mid-December.	3/31/2021 \$146,632
18-4: Quick Response: ICNet Workshop	Daniel, UNH A. Scholz	The project memo was attached to the October AC <a href="#">meeting minutes</a> .	10/14/19 \$30,000
19-1: Curved Integral Abutment Bridge Design	TBD E. Parkany	ME is in contract negotiations with WSP. The contract is expected to be signed by the first of the year.	TBD \$150,000
19-2: Multi-Scale Multi-Season Land-Based Erosion Modeling and Monitoring for Infrastructure Management	TBD A. Scholz	Three proposals were received. GZA Environmental was selected. ME has notified all proposers of the results and will begin contract negotiations. The contract is expected to be signed by the first of the year.	TBD \$150,000
19-3: Experimental Validation of New Improved Load Rating	TBD N. Zavalas	Waiting to hear from TC chair on final SOW revisions before sending to ME for processing	TBD \$200,000

Project # and Title	PI, University AC Liaison	Update	End Date Budget
Procedures for Deteriorated Steel Beam Ends		into an RFP. The RFP probably won't be posted until January.	

**Discussion:**

- 18-2 – Dale – He received Tasks 1 and 2. Has the TC reviewed and addressed these? Maina – All members have received the reports. She has not received feedback. Dale – If the TC is comfortable with those reports, post them on the NETC website.
  - Ann – The TC asked the researcher to hold off on the next task until the they talked about the survey from Task 2. The next TC check in call should happen soon. **Action item:** Maina will schedule the call.
- 18-3 – Is the AC okay with posting interim project deliverables on the NETC website? Emily feels the Task 1 report would be useful to share and wants to link to it in her quarterly research newsletter.
  - Dale – Yes, if the TC has reviewed the deliverable and the PI has addressed their comments/questions.
  - Christo – Mark the deliverable clearly as “Draft.”
- 18-4 – **Action item:** Kirsten will add the seven Research Needs Statements to the website, along with the project’s summary memo. Dale/Emily – Are any agencies taking a closer look at the RNS and to pursue them further?
- 19-1 - Matt – Who does the selection notification go to? The agency and/or the actual proposer? Dale – The contact listed on the RFP receives the notification. For UMass, it went to someone in the contract’s office. Matt – The information wasn’t forwarded to the UMass proposer. **Action item:** Dale will talk to Kim Lawrence (ME) to see if the proposers can also be sent the selection notification and/or also be added as a contact on the proposal. This would happen on future RFPs.

**3) Implementation**

- 15-series - Kirsten sent the completed spreadsheet (except RI) to the AC on 11/12/19.
  - ~ Christos sent it to Michael Sock for information on implementation activities at RI.
  - ~ Emily – 15-series – Does the AC want to discuss their implementation activities and how it might influence future projects? **Action item:** Kirsten will add this to the December AC agenda.
  - ~ Is there a volunteer to facilitate the 15-series implementation discussion? – Emily will give her impressions on the 15- series projects and VT’s implementation activities, and then the other AC members can jump in.
- 13/14/17-series – Kirsten sent the blank spreadsheet to the AC on 11/12/19. NH has sent back their results.
  - ~ AC members should send their information to Kirsten by **12/13/19**.
  - ~ There is not an implementation spreadsheet for older projects. Ann/Emily – Not interested in going back beyond the 13-series to find out about implementation.
- Closeout webinars for past projects – The four webinars (15-2, 15-3, 15-4, 17-1) will be scheduled in January. Looking at the weeks of January 6<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> or 27<sup>th</sup>.
  - ~ Once dates are confirmed with the project PI’s, Kirsten will create an email that AC members can send out to their departments. The emails will also be sent to the NETC mailing list.
  - ~ These webinars will be recorded and added the project pages on the NETC website.

#### 4) NETC Research Problem Statement template

- Kirsten revised the template based on the AC's discussion at the October meeting. Ann and Nicholas sent edits. The latest version is on pages 3-4.

##### Discussion:

- Kirsten removed Greg pointed out that on page 2, Section 8, #2 "The required literature search has been conducted." from page 2, Section 8, #2 as it is no longer relevant.
- Christos – Do the two endorsements come from the same DOT? Yes. one from the AC member and one from someone willing to chair the committee.
- Christos – For a problem to be selected, how many folks need to vote for it? Selection is based on rank. The AC works through the process at the in-person meeting in March. They fund as many projects as possible.
- Matt suggested combining Sections II and III. Ann would to keep them separate but revise the description for Section III. Research Objectives - "Define specific research objectives." The emphasis should be on the objectives and not describe the methodology.
  - **Action item:** Emily will take a stab at rewriting Section III. Kirsten will resend to the AC for comments.

#### 5) Research Problem Statement Solicitation

- If we follow last year's timeline, the solicitation will be sent out December 20, 2019 with the statements due January 24, 2020 (5 weeks). Projects would be selected at the March in-person AC meeting.

##### Discussion:

- Emily – Start the solicitation process earlier this year, after the AC has provided comments on the problem statement form.
  - The AC will provide feedback on the RPS form by end of November. Kirsten will send the solicitation by 12/6/19. Submission deadline for the RPSs will be 1/24/20.
  - What if a problem statement is late? The AC decided that if a second signature cannot be obtained by the deadline, then an email attached to the RPS from the second endorser stating their willingness to chair the TC, should the project be funded, will suffice. A completed RPS must be submitted by the deadline, no exceptions.

#### 6) RFP Scoring Criteria

- Kirsten revised the Proposal Evaluation Guidelines based on the AC's discussion at the October meeting. The evaluation switched from a weighted rating system to a points system to match ME's requirements.
- Dale and Kim Lawrence have reviewed and revised the guidelines per ME's requirements.
- This will be used with project 19-3 and the points for the categories may be changed for future projects.

##### Discussion:

- Matt – Can the TC's score sheets be made available to the proposers (or something provided in writing), which shows the pros and cons to the proposers? Maina – ME does not share score sheets but they do provide the comments from the TC. Proposers can contact Kim Lawrence for more information.
  - More information from Kim Lawrence (ME) - *We avoid giving a side-by-side comparison of numerical scores. We feel they are looking to improve future proposals and the verbal notes are much more practical for that than numerical scores.*

- Why can't the total score add up to more than 100 points like the AC decided last meeting? Can we go back to those?
  - Ann – This way of scoring is very different from what NETC has done in the past.
- Emily – Section 2. Research Approach and Section 3. Application of Results don't seem that different.
- Ann – Section 4. Qualifications of Principal Investigator – She has questions about assigning a higher number of points for this section than others. A recent RFP a proposer lost on this category when the other sections in their proposal were great.
- Flavia – Past performance of a PI – If want to look at PI from the past five years, how can find out if a they have delayed a project? Ann – Section 4. Currently doesn't say anything about past performance of PIs. Flavia should comment on this when it's sent out.
  - Nicholas – This a whole new discussion. Should we do follow up on experiences with PI's on previous NETC projects so we have a body of information that the committee/TC can review when analyzing them for future proposals? Anyone interested in tracking this? Ann – An evaluation form for PIs was created. It was going to sent out to TCs for their completion. It was sent out the University reps for their feedback and got hung up there.
  - Kirsten and Ann will look for the form and send it to Nicholas and Ann.
- Ann suggests the AC review the form and provide feedback. **Action item:** Kirsten will send the form to the AC in Word so they can track changes and provide comments in the document.

#### 7) June 2019 NETC Symposium – Continuing discussion on when to have the next Symposium

- No decision was made. Some folks are okay with waiting until 2021 while others are open to 2020.
- Symposium objectives - Is the main purpose to get research needs for NETC projects or is it more of a networking event for technical experts from the NE states? Or both?
- Potential new topic groups – Construction, Geotechnical, Highway Design, HR, TSMO, Transit

#### Discussion:

- Not enough time for discussion on this topic.

#### 8) Website refresh ([NETC website](#))

- Held meeting on 11/11 to discuss structural, content, and design changes to the website.
- CTC made “easy and quick” changes (e.g., structural/layout and content) with the current site. Remaining changes will be made after the new design is up.
- Working with CTC's web developer on creating mockup design.

#### 9) Other Business

#### 10) Adjourn

**Next meeting:** December 17<sup>th</sup> from 11:00am – noon ET