OLD BUSINESS

1. Approval of the May 13, Meeting Minutes – G. Johnson

   ACTION: The May 13, 2013 meeting minutes were approved as written.

2. Pavement Marking Technical Agenda – M. Bott

   The anticipated funding shortfall for the 2012 Annual Pavement Marking Program was the catalyst for the establishment of the Pavement Marking Technical Agenda. With an expected program cost of $21 million and a budget of $14 million, the entire FY 2012 program could not be delivered. Therefore, the FY 2012 program cost was reduced by eliminating the replacement of special markings for FY 2012. The Pavement Marking Technical Agenda team was directed to develop goals and objectives for the pavement marking program including the associated program cost. The findings of the Pavement Marking Technical Agenda team were submitted to EOC in November 2012 and January 2013.

   Upon reviewing the recommendations, EOC directed the team to develop a broader set of trunk-line goals and objectives related to overall roadway delineation. EOC directed the sponsors of the Pavement Marking Technical Agenda team, Mark Van Port Fleet and Scott Thayer to meet with the technical agenda team members to further develop roadway delineation goals. The team membership would be reviewed to ensure that the membership was appropriate for this additional task.

   In developing roadway delineation goals, EOC directed the team to review existing Department policies regarding roadway lighting, pavement marking, roadway signing including delineator policy and mile marker policies.

   The following summarizes the team’s revised recommendations,

   Proposed Roadway Delineation Goal: Deliver a cost efficient asset-managed delineation system on MDOT roadways that provides positive guidance to keep motorists safely in their lane during normal driving conditions and strives to deliver delineation in severe weather conditions.

   Proposed Action Items:
Short Term – 1 Year
- Maintain the practice of placing pavement markings on all state trunklines using the 6 inch edge line standard.
- Extend the special marking replacement cycle from 3 to 4 years.
- Rescind BOHIM 2003-17 and replace with the updated Pavement Marking Materials Usage Guidelines to incorporate all marking materials and adhere to special marking placement guides.

Intermediate – 1 to 3 Years
- Update all Region pavement marking Sequence Number/Logs and provide a uniform format for statewide consistency.
- Identify Corridors of Significance in each Region to be marked by July 4th (or agreed upon date) of each year.
- Establish one longitudinal marking contract and one special marking contract per Region.

Long Term – 3+ Years
- Conduct research to develop material selection matrix for expected service life of pavement marking materials that is compatible with MDOT’s road and bridge construction and maintenance practices and supports the department’s delineation goal. Evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of implementing Warranty/Performance Based Specifications and Performance Contract Requirements in the Annual Pavement Marking Program.

ACTION: EOC adopts the proposed roadway delineation goal along with the proposed action items.

EOC also directs Mark Bott and his team to develop several strategy options for the 2014 Pavement Marking Program. The strategies will be constrained by the FY 2014 budget total for all safety programs not by the FY 2012 budget amount of $14 million. The proposed strategies will be presented to EOC at a future meeting.

EOC also directs that Mark and his team work with Research Administration to initiate a research study to assist MDOT with developing long term strategy alternatives to meet the adopted roadway delineation goal.

3. The use of a Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain / Public Private Partnership procurement for a freeway lighting project in the Metro Region – C. Youngs

Control Section: TBD
Job Number: TBD
Construction Cost: TBD
Letting Date: TBD
Desired Award Date: December, 2013

The project scope is to provide freeway lighting at 4 locations in the Metro Region. The scope also includes the operation and maintenance of the lights for a period of time. The lights are located at 3 plazas that go over I-696, and the M-10 tunnel near Cobo Hall. There are approximately 5,000 lights total at these locations. Project details such as length of the operations and maintenance period, funding mechanisms and bidding processes will be determined as the project is developed. EOC approval to proceed is requested.

ACTION: Approved
NEW BUSINESS

1. 2016 State Trunkline Fatality and Serious Injury Goal – M. Bott

The stated goals of the State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) aim to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all Michigan public roadways from 889 and 5,706 respectively in 2011 to 750 and 4,800 in 2016. The proportionate 2016 goal for state trunkline is to reduce fatalities 4.5 percent per year from 419 in 2011 to no more than 333 in 2016 and reduce serious injuries 5.8 percent per year from 2,286 in 2011 to no more than 1,700 in 2016. MDOT also continues to strive Toward Zero Deaths and minimize serious injuries as a long term goal.

EOC is requested to adopt this new 2016 interim goal for state trunkline.

ACTION: EOC directs Mark Bott to review the 2016 goal statement with the Office of Communications. The MDOT Scorecard and the Governor’s Dashboard should also be reviewed to ensure consistency with the proposed 2016 safety goal. Mark will bring an updated recommendation to a future EOC meeting.

2. Pavement Selection – B. Krom

Department Policy requires that a Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) be used to determine the most cost effective pavement design. Pavement selection was determined using the procedures outlined in the MDOT Pavement Design and Selection Manual, 2012 Edition. Department Policy requires that the pavement alternate with the lowest EUAC be selected. Final pavement selection requires approval by the Engineering Operations Committee. EOC is requested to approve the following lowest cost alternates:

a) Project: CS 39041 JN 102995
Reconstruct I-94 BL (Stadium Dr.): From 11th St to east of Seneca Lane
BMP -0.056 to EMP 1.013
Reconstruct/Reconfigure US-131/I-94 BL Interchange
Letting Date: 12/06/2013

Recommended Pavement Selection Alternate:
Reconstruct I-94 BL mainline with Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement
1.5” HMA, 5E3, High Stress, Top Course
2” HMA, 4E3, High Stress, Leveling Course
3” HMA, 3E3, Base Course
6” Aggregate Base
18” Sand Subbase (80% existing, 20% new)
6” dia. Subbase Underdrain System
30.5” Total Section Thickness

Reconstruct Interchange Ramps with Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement
1.5” HMA, 5E3, High Stress, Top Course
2” HMA, 4E3, High Stress, Leveling Course
3” HMA, 3E3, Base Course
6” Aggregate Base
18” Sand Subbase
6” dia. Subbase Underdrain System
30.5” Total Section Thickness
Present Value Initial Construction Cost $226,148/lane-mile
Present Value Initial User Cost $324,158/lane-mile
Present Value Maintenance Cost $117,805/lane-mile
Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost (EUAC) $24,252/lane-mile

Action: Approved

b) Project: CS 35032  JN 109659 & 105981
Reconstruct US-23: From Kirkland Dr. to AuSable River Bridge
BMP 7.793 to EMP 14.650
Letting Date: 03/07/2014

Recommended Pavement Selection Alternate:
Reconstruct with Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement
1.5" HMA, 5E1, Top Course (mainline)
2" HMA, 4E1, Leveling Course (mainline)
3" HMA, 3E1, Base Course (mainline)
1.5" HMA, 5E03, Top Course (shoulders)
2" HMA, 4E03, Leveling Course (shoulders)
6" Dense-Graded Aggregate Base (mainline)
9" Dense-Graded Aggregate Base (shoulders)
Existing Sand Subbase
8" Sand Subbase (southern part of project)
12.5” Total Section Thickness

Present Value Initial Construction Cost $454,019/mile
Present Value Initial User Cost $51,720/mile
Present Value Maintenance Cost $254,150/mile
Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost (EUAC) $27,584/mile

Action: Approved

c) Project: CS 28013  JN 109985
Reconstruct US-31: From 3 Mile Rd to Holiday Hills Rd, Traverse City
BMP 4.173 to EMP 5.655
Letting Date: 03/06/2015

Recommended Pavement Selection Alternate:
Reconstruct with Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement
1.5" HMA, 5E3, High Stress, Top Course (mainline)
2" HMA, 4E3, High Stress, Leveling Course (mainline)
3" HMA, 3E3, Base Course (mainline)
6” Aggregate Base (mainline)
Existing Sand Subbase
12.5” Total Section Thickness

Present Value Initial Construction Cost $834,947/mile
Present Value Initial User Cost $235,365/mile
Present Value Maintenance Cost $588,411/mile
Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost (EUAC) $60,211/mile

ACTION: Approved

3. Guidelines for Updating Signal Inventory Information – P. Corlett

The Signal equipment inventory is housed in the Traffic & Safety software program, SAFESTAT. Equipment changes made in the street are not always updated in the SAFESTAT inventory. This document will define what information concerning equipment changes need to be updated in SAFESTAT and who has the responsibility of making those updates.

Signal inventory is used in developing future modernization contracts, in monitoring maintenance activities and in energy billing for each electronic traffic control device under MDOT’s jurisdiction. Currently changes can be made in the street and not identified properly in the MDOT statewide inventory database (SAFESTAT). This can lead to loss of power consumption savings (as when LED technology is implemented), inaccuracies in tracking maintenance activities and difficulty prioritizing modernization of equipment based on age.

During the Signal Energy Billing re-engineering, SAFESTAT was identified as having a key part by providing a statewide inventory of traffic signal equipment along with the age of that equipment. Also, it was noted the SAFESTAT database did not always correctly reflect conditions on the street. Changes to equipment made as part of the normal modernization process has been handled by Traffic Signals unit, was routinely updated in the SAFESTAT database and provided the most accurate information available to the unit. However, changes to equipment are often made in the Region in response to damage by vehicular crashes, electrical storms or Region initiated LED re-lamping of signal heads. These regional changes were not always reported to those responsible for maintaining the signal equipment inventory in SAFESTAT. The inaccuracy causes loss of cost savings (as with LED re-lamping), difficulty in monitoring maintenance activities and incorrectly prioritizing future signal modernization projects where age is the method of determining which device will be modernized. This document provides both Region and Lansing personnel guidance on what information should be updated in SAFESTAT but also who has the responsibility for putting the information in SAFESTAT so the inventory will be accurate and usable by all interested parties.

ACTION: EOC directs that the proposed guidelines be reviewed by the Operations Administration Division and the seven regions prior to EOC action. Paula will bring the updated guidelines back to EOC at a future meeting.

4. Fixed Price/Variable Scope (FPVS) on CPM Double Chip Seal project, Bay Region – B. Wieferich

Contact Person: Jackie Pethers
Region/TSC: Davison TSC
Control Section: 32011, 32021, 79011, 32092
Job Number: 119097
Route: M-25, M-142, M-138, M-25

Project Location(s): M-25 from Tuscola/Huron county line to south city limits of Sebewaing
M-142 from east village limits of Elkton to M-53
M-138 from Bay/Tuscola county line to Thomas Road (gapping village of Fairgrove)
M-25 from north city limits of Port Hope to north of Parisville Road
Work Description: Double Chip Seal with Fog Seal
Est. Const. Cost: $1,723,000

Key Dates: Plan Completion: 8/15/2013
Letting: 11/01/2013

The goal of the FPVS project will be to maximize the amount of work that can be completed used a fixed dollar amount.

The Bay Region is requesting the use of FPVS on a CPM Double Chip Seal on multiple routes in Huron and Tuscola Counties. The project will be set up similar to the FPVS crack sealing projects let in 2012 and 2013.

ACTION: Approved.

Steven Bower, Secretary
Engineering Operations Committee
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