No Boundaries Phase II
Transportation Pooled Fund #TPF-5(330)

Minutes - Teleconference
March 31, 2016 | 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. Central

Attendees

Florida: Kristin McCrary
Illinois: Stephanie Dobbs
Michigan DOT: Todd Rowley, Allison Porrett
Missouri DOT: Mike Shea
New York State DOT: Mike Lashmet, Greg Grimshaw, Joe Thompson
Ohio DOT: John Stains

Pennsylvania: Jon Fleming
South Carolina DOT: Jim Johannemann
Virginia DOT: Joe Williams
Washington State DOT: Jay Wells
CTC: Kim Linsenmayer, Patrick Casey, Kirsten Seeber
DW Clonch: Diana Clonch

Outreach/membership update

- The New York State DOT has officially joined the No Boundaries pooled fund.
- A few members have reached out to maintenance folks in states/Canadian provinces that have expressed in No Boundaries. They sent an email explaining the study, along with the March newsletter.
- WASHTO conference – 17 to 18 WASHTO states attended the conference. There was no opportunity to get on the agenda so Jay (WS) put the No Boundaries flyer in the attendee packets.
- Tom (OH) has asked SCOM to send an email to their members that would explain the study along with a link to the March newsletter. We can follow up with folks once they have received the email.
- John (OH) received an email from ICA, a consulting firm that is interested in participating in No Boundaries. They are active in the maintenance world and have experience in asset management. However, ODOT isn't in the position to accept funds from private industry. The group had talked about involving private industry in some way with No Boundaries in the future, but the group needs to further explore the best way to take advantage of their expertise without endorsing products. One likely route for involvement is via a state DOT that uses an innovation developed by industry with success and would like to share their experiences with others.
  - ➢ We will circle back to how best to engage industry partners in No Boundaries as we plan future meetings.

Asset management survey

The group reviewed and discussed the draft survey on asset management practices developed by CTC. The goal of the survey is to gather state-of-practice information about state DOT maintenance management: What systems are they using? How is it going? What lessons have they learned?

Per previous TAC discussions, the draft survey includes questions in three areas:

- Data integration using maintenance management systems
- Sharing data outside the agency
- Incorporating maintenance costs of project elements into asset management

Revising the questions

The group provided the following edits and additional questions for the survey:

➢ Jay (WS) – The desire for information is driven by MAP-21 and we should have the MAP-21 requirements in mind as we go forward. The survey is a good first step and he is fine with the questions.

➢ Allison (MI) – Question #2 under Introductory Questions should go first to find out an agency's status related to a maintenance management system.

➢ Allison (MI) and Stephanie (IL) would like to add an answer option of "in development" for the Question #2. They want to know if folks have a system, and if so, what type.

➢ Jay (WS) - Add a comment box to each question so folks can provide clarification.

➢ Mike (MO) – What categories of assets do they track? All agencies track bridges and culverts, but what about assets related to structures and other aspects of maintenance? He would be interested in seeing how other states group their assets.

➢ John (PA) and Allison (MI) – What obstacles have you had in creating the system?

➢ Jay (WS) – How are you funding your system? Most are legacy systems that are being patched together so an agency has to create parallel systems that can work with the older systems.

➢ Jay (WS) – Maybe change the question to "What systems are you using related to maintenance?" to find out what is going on.

➢ Stephanie (IL) – "What kind of system are you using, an umbrella system or individual systems?" List individual systems such as time, materials, labor, etc. She wants to know who has an umbrella system and how it works. Also, is the system meeting expectations?

➢ Allison (MI) – How does your maintenance management system operate? One overall system that combines everything or individual systems that tie together or something else?

➢ Stephanie (IL) – Asking about lessons learned would be critical as well.

Adding a new topic area

The group discussed the usefulness of adding a section to the survey related to data collection and agreed to add a few questions.

➢ Jay (WS) – We're talking a lot about real-time data and what it means. For example, we're finding we don't need to update every three seconds. By updating every five to ten minutes we can save a lot of money in vendor processing costs. Find out how often others have their system data update. How are they minimizing costs while optimizing data usefulness?

➢ Jon (PA) How much information do they get and how often do they get it? There can be data charges each time the system sends information. Also, how do they receive their data (cellular? Wi-Fi?).

➢ Allison (MI) – We are looking at the details of the collection devices, who in the field will have them, and the cost for data.

Distributing the survey

The group agreed to distribute the survey to the AASHTO Subcommittee on Maintenance.

Compiling the results

CTC will synthesize the results and share them with he TAC members. The group discussed several opportunities for applying the results to No Boundaries efforts:

- Jay (WS) – This is a global issue so we should present information at other groups' meetings, such as TRB and AASHTO. Too many people are doing different things and not communicating about it.
- Mike (MO) – Start with a No Boundaries meeting and invite the experts at the different states to attend electronically. Then once we have it down, share our findings at other national meetings, focusing on the practical side of how to build a maintenance management system.
- Todd (MI) – As a group, could we pull information to ask folks "What would be your perfect system?" This would help folks who are just starting to build one save time and effort.

ACTION ITEMS

CTC:

- Revise the survey per the TAC feedback. Add questions on data collection related to the collection devices and the associated costs.
- Resend to the group and give them a week or so to comment.

Soliciting innovation submissions

The group provided feedback on CTC's draft form for soliciting submissions of innovative practices and tools used by maintenance professionals around the country. The form will be incorporated into the No Boundaries website, and the results will be posted on the site in both a sortable table, and on pages that provide details about the innovations. CTC can also develop an area of the members-only portion of the website to facilitate member discussions regarding which innovations should be the focus of No Boundaries technology transfer efforts. TAC feedback on the form:

- Allison (MI) – Good questions. She likes the idea of having the results put into a database that can be filtered and/or sorted. She would like submitters to be able to add attachments.
- Todd (MI) – He would like to see questions about how long the product/practice has been in use, if the submitter would recommend the innovation, and the important issues discovered by using the innovation. He would also like submitters to be able to add people that could be contacted for more information.

ACTION ITEMS

CTC:

- Revise the form, resend to the group and give them a week or so to comment.
- Add the functionality of submitting attachments with the form.
- Put the form on a draft page on the site to show what it will look like.

Next face-to-face meeting/technology transfer opportunity

CTC presented several potential topics for the group to consider for the next No Boundaries face-to-face meeting. (Refer to the agenda.)

Drones in maintenance work

AASHTO posted a video on this topic in March, which included examples of MDOT's use of drones for maintenance. The meeting could address costs, legal issues, uses (including emergency management), ownership, types of drones, etc.

- The group agreed to make this one of the topics at the next face-to-face meeting.
- Some member agencies are already using drones and will have information to share. They are using them to assess damage, to inspect bridges and culverts, and to assess pavement conditions and incident management. Jay (WA) said WSDOT has used drones to investigate a landslide and has a video to share. John (OH) said ODOT has a drone research facility that is involved with questions related to incident management.
- Drones could also be considered for multiple functions within an agency (shared use).

Asset management and other initiatives

CTC shared a list of successes and new initiatives shared by the TAC members at the December meeting as a reminder about what folks are currently doing at their agencies. This list could be a jumping off point for what the group might want to share at an upcoming meeting.

- Mike (MO) – He would like to see the results of the asset management survey as a topic. Members could present where they are at with their asset management/maintenance management systems. Also, open the meeting up to other states who might want to come and share their innovations.
- Jay (WS) – He is tasked with getting some innovations off the ground and would be interested in how other states do innovation rodeos or competitions at their agencies.

Timing and location of next meeting

The group agreed to hold the meeting in late fall but not right before Christmas.

- If MI hosts the meeting, they could demonstrate their drone technology. Todd (MI) – He would have to talk to Allison and Steve Cook but doesn't think hosting would be a problem.
- Jay (WS) and John (OH) volunteered to host as well.

ACTION ITEMS

CTC:

- Begin drafting a potential agenda for the face-to-face meeting to discuss with TAC members.
- Work with Todd (MI) to determine if MDOT would like to host the fall meeting. Determine timing that is best for members and secure a meeting location.