Advisory Team
Meeting Notes
1/9/02

Topic	Discussion & Decisions
Pavement	- Reviewed pavement summary sheet. - Brian demo-ed PMMP and a sample of how it might be used to get pavement grades. - Could have PMMP develop some frames/reports to serve our needs, e.g., summary for all districts. - Would this kind of summary have been put together without Compass? - This isn't being used for business decisions. Compass would be a way to incorporate this information into business decisions and get it onto people's desks. - Communication challenges: - seasonality biases - having half the data out of date - that what we're doing with the van is different than what we're doing by sampling - Question: what areas get done when? - Benefit: eliminate redundancy; save time; helps the districts - Benefit: provides a basis for creating performance measures. Can look at both funds and results. - Benefit: builds a stronger case for applying to the legislature for funding. - Could this data be used to change the way the DOT allocates funds to counties in the future? Are we developing an alternative funding model? Need to integrate this program with LOS model over time. Challenge of measuring efficiency and effectiveness. - Concern: Will the van be around in the future? - Would be good to separate by road class. - Information at the feature level or just the element level? - Would require more set-up work with Standards Team and the computer program to do features. - Goal of the program: offer comprehensible data to people in our organization who might not use this program otherwise. Offering feature-level data would serve this goal. - Feature-level scores also lets you compare it easily to other features. - Feature-level scores helps people understand what goes into the summary-level grades. **Decision:** Provide feature-level scores at the county level. Ask Standards Team to create rules necessary to do this. **Decision:** Provide information on the rating sheet for the segment and possibly for the county.
Other databases	3 handouts - Possible goal for the future: For anything we should be touching on a regular basis, we shouldn't be going in the field and rating. We should be inventory-ing and doing a condition rating on a regular basis and using the data from that. Especially for discrete (spot, rather than continuous) items, like culverts or signs. - SIGNview: **Decision:** Could be useful when all districts are in there. - Does have some information useful for Compass - Against: Not up-to-date on condition. - But is up-to-date on age, which can be used as a standard until we have reflectivity. Info. could be provided on the rating sheet. Useful as an indicator - Against: 5 districts -- not 1,2,3 -- have all their signs in Signview. Those 3 districts won't have them in there anytime soon. - Only available to sign shops. - As this develops as part of SIMS, Compass needs should be part of this. - Culvert inventory: **Decision:** Could be useful in the future to do condition rating when it's uniform & complete. Might be useful now for sampling culverts at the county level. - D2 culvert inventory has all culverts by condition, highway, distance, county on a 2-4

Topic	Discussion & Decisions
	year cycle. o Not a uniform rating system across districts. o All districts do have an inventory, but not all have a condition rating. o Inventories might not be electronic. Need to check. • Highway Performance Projection Summary: **Decision:** The van information better meets the needs of Compass. Same data, but different application and algorithms. • Compass can highlight: o Our data management is poor. o Business decisions need to be made and this can push them out there. Is central office failing to recognize needs early enough to provide a consistent method and tools for the districts? o User needs should dictate the system. Data needs to be simple, available, useful, user-friendly. • Future agendas for operations conference: Use them as working sessions for hashing through data systems, e.g., culverts. Or get this done in side groups through the year. **Decision:** Provide as part of the pilot report (and to DTD management team) list of possible data needs for the future, including existing databases that need more consistency among districts. Stress need and use for consistency in data gathering and reporting over time.
Other data	• Photolog mile marker: **Decision:** eliminate. • Road class: **Decision:** Should be able to do it electronically. If not, road class for the corridor in which the segment falls by hand. o Currently working on documenting which highways are which road class. o Not gathering the information would bring into question our priorities & methods. • Start place and end place: **Decision:** eliminate. • Start time and end time. **Decision:** keep.

Statistical validity	• Will have pavement data at the feature level for all counties.
	• **Decision:** 240 per district. 30 per county. Specific features per county.
	• Which features at the county level? They need to be inventoried for this to be an option.
	 o Revisit culverts when we have the inventory.
	 o Revisit noise barriers & retaining walls when inventory of miscellaneous structures is complete.
	 o Shoulders.
	  ▪ Important because this is a liability issue for counties.
	  ▪ Gravel shoulders separate from paved shoulders.
	  ▪ **Decision:** Enough samples to get 30 for gravel: either at the white line or at the end of 3-foot paved shoulder.
	  ▪ **Decision:** all paved shoulder the same.
	 o Revisit guardrail when we have an inventory. None being worked on.
	 o **Decision:** Look at impact attenuators, but do not include them in the safety score and do not report if it's not statistically significant. Let's go through one round; see where we get meaningful data; revisit in one year.
	• Extra segments not as big a deal with less time per segment because pavement has been pulled out.

Standards Team	**Decision:** See above for shoulders. Develop standards for gravel & for paved shoulders (concrete & asphalt together).
Weighting & ranking model	**Decision:** Standards Team subgroups flesh out features; revisit weightings. Weightings need to pass the blush test with the larger group. • New model doesn't pass the blush test. Stay with pilot model.
Rolling up the data	**Decision:** Stay with actual data. Feature scores & element grades.