**MASH Implementation Pooled Fund TAC meeting**

**Wednesday, January 19, 2022 -- 12:00pm -1:00pm CT**

Participant list submitted in Excel file.

No questions on budget modifications – approved

Reminded Joe Hall retired – Ted /Donna likely to take his place in the PF, but still in discussion

New solicitation – John discussed objectives

Utah, question: joining without voting, but receiving benefits?

John to check

from Mary McRae to everyone:    12:24 PM

Does the additional 30% in costs translate to a 30% increase in the number of projects?

John: it depends on the prioritized project required budget

from Josh Keith CDOT to everyone:    12:25 PM

I support what Shawn is talking about, funds are very tough to get at CDOT as well. Thanks

from Mustafa Mohamedali WSDOT to everyone:    12:25 PM

Following states have already committed for 2023:

Alabama Department of Transportation

California Department of Transportation

Colorado Department of Transportation

Florida Department of Transportation

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

Massachusetts Department of Transportation

Michigan Department of Transportation

Ohio Department of Transportation

Texas Department of Transportation

from Mary McRae to everyone:    12:27 PM

Likewise Alaska, if we are holding a straw poll on the tiered membership concept.

Mary (AK):  difficulty to coming up to MASH (industry) – most compelling portion of this (solicitation) is that industry is not meeting DOTs needs.

from erik.emerson to everyone:    12:35 PM

we need to have a way to encourage managment to keep funding research on roadside design.

John suggests he (John) can carry message to them (management)

from Mustafa Mohamedali WSDOT to everyone:    12:36 PM

Also vehicle design, weight, and other parameters are developing and these will be continued need to be evaluated for MASH compliance

Tim (Ws): cost from 50 to 65? Inflation is also a fact to consider.

John: MwRSF was at 65K; seems to be the market for participation for research at this level.

from Marc Danley to everyone:    12:38 PM

Will there be any changes to the pooled fund when we switch to a performance based spec?

John /Roger: It shouldn’t. Switching MASH writing to a specification will allow a more objective MASH interpretation.

from Mustafa Mohamedali WSDOT to everyone:    12:43 PM

It is very, very important we hear from member states for any comments and feedback that may impact the solicitation in good time before the solicitation goes live!

Nathan Schulz (TTI) presented an update on current pooled fund project “Development and Evaluation of a Non-Proprietary Sign Support System for MASH TL-3 Conditions” (Dean Kanitz and Carlos Torres with MDOT are tech reps.)

Nathan reported they have encountered a slight obstacle based on the state survey results and was hoping to make the states aware of this obstacle. The purpose of the update was not to generate immediate discussion/input from the states. Rather, the purpose was to inform them of the obstacle and let them know we they maybe be contacted in the following weeks requesting additional input from them.

Nathan presented the results of a full-scale crash test from another TTI project on the evaluation of a sign support at 90-degree impact, which resulted in a failure, due to occupant compartment penetration from the impacting sign. Nathan noted that the tested sign system was similar to the one that was supposed to be investigated in his current pooled fund project. Nathan questioned the best way how to proceed with this on-going project, and suggested he will be contacting the DOTs in the future weeks.

from erik.emerson to everyone:    12:52 PM

How much penetration was there?

from Mary McRae to everyone:    12:52 PM

It looked like almost half the sign went into the vehicle, just by visual comparison of sign and door frame.

from Roger Bligh (internal) to everyone:    12:54 PM

Yes, the penetration was extensive and clearly in the occupant compartment.  We did not try to quantify the dynamic penetration distance.

from Dick Albin to everyone:    12:53 PM

is the 90 degree orientation required for all signs or just ones near an intersection?

from Mary McRae to everyone:    12:55 PM

I thought MASH required 0 and 90 degrees tests?

Nathan explained that 90-deg sign impact tests should be performed for all those signs that are implemented in a way that can be hit at that direction (not just at intersection).

from erik.emerson to everyone:    12:54 PM

MwRSF has similar results with temporary signs at the same orientation

from Mary McRae to everyone:    12:56 PM

ah, thanks so much for the clarification