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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting called by: | Dianne Kresich, ADOT Project Manager |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Attendees: (Members in *italics* unable to attend) | Technical Advisory Committee Members: Paul Sittig, NMDOT Reza Karimvand, Susan Anderson, Heidi  Yaqob, ADOT *Matt Hanson, CalTrans Tom Kearney, FHWA* Caroline Mays, Steve Linhart, TxDOT | Project Team: Dr. Dianne Kresich, ADOT Project Manager *Research Team:* Allan Rutter, TTI, Principal Investigator Rafael Aldrete, TTI, Task 2 Lead Kevin Balke, TTI, Task 4 Lead Mark Jensen, CS, Task 5 Lead |

# Meeting Notes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Introduction and Overview | Presenter: | Dianne Kresich |

#### Discussion:

Dianne called the meeting to order, called roll and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | March 24, 2017 TAC Meeting Notes | Presenter: | Dianne Kresich |

#### Discussion:

Dianne asked if TAC members had any comments or changes to the meeting notes transmitted in advance of the meeting, and none did.

#### Conclusions:

The TAC agreed to adopt the meeting notes for the March 24, 2017 meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Chapter 1 Deliverables Update | Presenter: | Allan Rutter |

#### Discussion:

#### Allan described the process by an updated Chapter 1, incorporating discussions at the March 24 TAC meeting, had been developed and distributed, along with a high-level summary of this introduction to our study.

#### There were a number of comments and questions about the high-level summary. Dianne explained that she had submitted comments, and Reza and Caroline offered to send along other comments. Some felt the discussion of project process was too detailed, and the group expressed a desire for a simpler definition of the Concept of Operations, also specifying that the project was a study, not a research exercise. Paul appreciated the idea of a high-level summary and asked that the project team consider the audience as the document is revised.

#### Conclusions:

TAC members were asked to submit any further comments or edits to Dianne so that they could be incorporated into a revised summary document.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Submit comments or edits on Chapter 1 Summary | TAC members | 9/15/17 |
| * Submit revised Chapter 1 incorporating comments | Allan Rutter | 10/1/17 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Chapter 2 and Task 2 Tech Memo Submission | Presenters: | Allan Rutter, Rafael Aldrete |

#### Discussion:

#### Chapter 2 was submitted for TAC review, combining information collected during Task 2—Corridor Inventory and Task 3—Information Search and Synthesis. This consolidated and shortened the earlier Task 3 product (reviewed and discussed in March prior to the summer workshops) and included some of the GIS Inventory mapping included in our Stakeholder workshops. Our contract and work plan called for a more detailed description of the Corridor Inventory GIS database and stakeholder lists, so rather than include that information in a public-facing chapter, it was included in a tech memo.

#### TAC members discussed the process of forwarding comments and edits on the document. Generally, the group believed that the GIS corridor inventory description in the tech memo should be included as an appendix to the chapter in the interests of transparency about the corridor inventory. Committee members also asked for supplemental information from the inventory in the appendix regarding:

#### Bridge height information along the corridor

#### Truck parking locations and capacity (listing spaces in public and private locations)

#### Pavement condition information

#### More description of the meaning of the corridor maps was also requested, not just the maps themselves.

#### Conclusions:

TAC members were asked to submit feedback on the revised Chapter 2.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Submit comments or edits on Chapter 1 Summary | TAC members | 9/15/17 |
| * Submit revised Chapter 1 incorporating comments | Allan Rutter | 10/1/17 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Task 4 Report | Presenters: | Kevin Balke |

#### Discussion:

#### We conducted our four stakeholder workshops in June and July, as explained in the July 18 project update memo. Since then, we conducted one-on-one interviews with five stakeholders in each state identified by each TAC member. Kevin Balke discussed overall findings and issues from our workshops and interviews. The presentation was abbreviated by the amount of time available for the meeting, but the project team outlined steps for preparing a Chapter 3 that would identify the major issues and desired corridor functionality discussed by stakeholders.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Chapter 3 outline will be developed | Allan and Dianne | 9/15/17 |
| * Chapter 3 draft will be shared with TAC members | Allan and Kevin | 10/1/17 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item: | Project Schedule | Presenters: | Dianne Kresich |

#### Discussion:

#### Dianne asked the project team to propose a more realistic project schedule than the version currently in our work plan. A revised schedule was scheduled to be discussed, but time ran out during the meeting. A revised schedule will be submitted for TAC member review and comment.

| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Revised schedule produced | Allan | 9/15/17 |
| * Revised schedule shared with TAC members | Dianne | 10/1/17 |

# Next Steps

Revisions to Chapter 2 and a draft Chapter 3 are expected, as well as a memo describing schedule revisions.