

Meeting Minutes

Date	05-09-2017	Time	1:30 pm CT
Facilitator	Rick Kreider	Secretary	Megan Swanson
Subject	Research Advisory Committee (RAC) Region 3 Meeting		
Attendees	Member states attending: Illinois –Ryan Culton, Megan Swanson Indiana – Tommy Nantung Iowa – Brian Worrel Kansas – Rick Kreider Michigan – Michael Townley Minnesota – Linda Taylor, Hafiz Munir Missouri – Bill Stone, Jennifer Harper Ohio – Cynthia Jones, Zona Keppler Wisconsin – Lynn Hanus		

Key Points Discussed

No.	Topic	Highlights
1.	Review Agenda/Roll Call	Roll call attendance marked above. Linda Taylor moved that the meeting minutes be accepted, and the minutes were unanimously approved.
2.	Transportation Knowledge Network (TKN)	At the leadership conference call, Cameron Kergaye, who is the chair of the Coordination and Collaboration task force, has volunteered to have a conference call to discuss how TKN might fit as a working group within the C&C Task Force. Megan Swanson requested that Bill Stone see if Illinois could be looped in for the conference call so that Karen Waters can participate.
3.	High Value Research (HVR)	<p>Bill Stone reported that 107 projects were submitted for HVR this year. This is down from 123 last year. Bill Stone shared that there were some website issues that caused the submittal process to go down.</p> <p>May 15th is the deadline for the regions to give their Sweet 16, Safety and Operations and Maintenance. The Value of Research task force is looking forward to hearing how the process goes. Rick will send the full results out to the whole group.</p> <p>Attendees discussed the new process for selecting both the Sweet 16 and supplemental brochure projects that we started this year, including:</p> <p>Is it more important to spread the wealth or to select the top scoring project? The consensus for the group is that it is probably is best to go by points.</p> <p>The way that we scored this year was beneficial in allowing people more latitude in determining how they want to weigh their points. Several states weighed in on how they handled the scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iowa had hard time determining how many points to give in order to reflect *how much more* they liked one project over another. They created a formula to determine how many points to use. • Missouri selected their top 4 and gave each 25 points, and then did top 3-4 for each supplemental. • Minnesota selected Sweet 16 first and then did a top 3 for each of the brochure topics. Determining how to spread the points was a little difficult, so Linda looked at the end product and worked backwards. • Illinois suggested that it may be easier to just score all of the projects and select the sweet 16, followed by the next most popular for the topic related selections. <p>There was also a discussion on whether we should have a consistent way to score things, if there should be a limit to the number of projects submitted, how people are scoring projects (benefit to the scorer's state, benefit to submitting state, or in benefitting research in general),</p>

Key Points Discussed																		
No.	Topic	Highlights																
		<p>and how we could potentially incorporate Transportation Pooled Funds. Megan Swanson will see if FHWA would be willing to do a brochure on Pooled Funds. Maine did have one project put in that was a TPF. Maybe do a top 5 TPF projects brochure to show how the TPF program is a good way to get things done for states that have a lower budget and/or to show how this valuable information can be used through implementable activities.</p> <p>Bill Stone pointed out that states could request for their classification of the project could be changed. This could be left up to the region to approve a change to the assigned topic.</p> <p>Congratulations to MN, MO, IN and WI on being selected for the Sweet 16!</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>MN</td> <td>Hydraulics Inspection Vehicle Explorer (HIVE) Enhances Culvert Inspections</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MO</td> <td>Using Online Surveys and Facebook Ads to Solicit Customer Feedback</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IN</td> <td>Site Selection for New Lighting Technologies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WI</td> <td>Recycled Materials Resource Center – Third Generation</td> </tr> </table> <p>Congratulations to IL and IN on being selected for the Safety Supplemental!</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>IL</td> <td>Effects of Intersection Right-Turn Lane Design & Skew on Safety & Operations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IN</td> <td>T-Scan: Stationary LiDAR for Traffic and Safety Studies - Object Detection and Tracking</td> </tr> </table> <p>Congratulations to WI and OH on being selected for the Maintenance and Operations Supplemental!</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>WI</td> <td>Evaluation of Thin Polymer Deck Overlays and Deck Sealers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OH</td> <td>Alternative Stream Channel Maintenance at Bridge Crossings</td> </tr> </table> <p>Rick Kreider asked each state to weigh in on their experience – how they handled the scoring, anything they would change or anything they especially liked.</p> <p>Illinois – Megan Swanson and Ryan Culton suggested that we straight score the projects, select the sweet 16, then the following 2 safety projects, then the following two “other” projects.</p> <p>Indiana – Tommy Nantung likes the project selection as we did this year and feels that it has more balance in scoring. He would not support</p> <p>Iowa – If staying with 100 pts, Brian Worrel suggests having a point cap per project of up to 25, as when a project is very high scoring, it skews the spread of points. He would probably prefer IL suggestion, but maybe only selecting top 10 or 12.</p> <p>Michigan – Michael Townley liked the technique of being able to choose how many points are assigned to each project. It would be great if we had some way to recognize Pooled Funds – maybe a separate category for pooled funds.</p> <p>Minnesota – Linda Taylor wants to only have one scoring (all projects worth 100 points) and rank the top 10-12. There should be a max number of points for any project. She suggests a max vote of 25 points. No limit on projects,</p> <p>Missouri –Jennifer Harper did the sweet 16 first and then looked at safety separately, same with maintenance. She also agrees with the 25 point cap. If we used the Illinois method, she would like to score only the top 10-12 and prefers no limit on projects,</p> <p>Ohio – Zona Keppler had tech staff review and provide feedback to inform the scoring. They were looking at what was good for OH. She agrees that we should score the top 10 or so, and</p>	MN	Hydraulics Inspection Vehicle Explorer (HIVE) Enhances Culvert Inspections	MO	Using Online Surveys and Facebook Ads to Solicit Customer Feedback	IN	Site Selection for New Lighting Technologies	WI	Recycled Materials Resource Center – Third Generation	IL	Effects of Intersection Right-Turn Lane Design & Skew on Safety & Operations	IN	T-Scan: Stationary LiDAR for Traffic and Safety Studies - Object Detection and Tracking	WI	Evaluation of Thin Polymer Deck Overlays and Deck Sealers	OH	Alternative Stream Channel Maintenance at Bridge Crossings
MN	Hydraulics Inspection Vehicle Explorer (HIVE) Enhances Culvert Inspections																	
MO	Using Online Surveys and Facebook Ads to Solicit Customer Feedback																	
IN	Site Selection for New Lighting Technologies																	
WI	Recycled Materials Resource Center – Third Generation																	
IL	Effects of Intersection Right-Turn Lane Design & Skew on Safety & Operations																	
IN	T-Scan: Stationary LiDAR for Traffic and Safety Studies - Object Detection and Tracking																	
WI	Evaluation of Thin Polymer Deck Overlays and Deck Sealers																	
OH	Alternative Stream Channel Maintenance at Bridge Crossings																	

Key Points Discussed		
No.	Topic	Highlights
		<p>that there should be a 25 point cap.</p> <p>Wisconsin – This was Lynn Hanus’ first time doing this. It was difficult to determine how to allocate points when projects could be sweet 16 as well as another supplemental. It would be beneficial to limit the number of projects that are submitted. Would like to do something for HV Pooled Funds.</p>
4.	New Business	<p>THINGS TO TALK ABOUT AT RAC THIS SUMMER</p> <p>There is a breakout scheduled for the TKN Task Force. This is an issue that will need to be resolved as far as where it is located (TKN or CC) could be a revitalization of the TKN Task Force or a kick off for the TKN working group.</p> <p>The group agreed that it would be beneficial to touch base on some of the coordination topics to have a better handle on how we are ensuring that we do not duplicate research and/or that we are abreast of research projects done in other states. The group would like to talk about what each state is doing – basically a highlight of recently completed or implemented projects. We may want to start doing this again at our R3 calls, but we should also plan on doing this at our annual meeting in July.</p> <p>The group discussed a Region 3 social activity for Louisville. We plan to go for a long walk and then stop for a drink or meal as available.</p> <p>Tommy and Peggi will provide an update on NCHRP projects.</p> <p>We will start to discuss the 2018 summer meeting in Kansas City. Rick will bring a clip to show about KC.</p> <p>Include an agenda item on upcoming Peer Exchanges. MO/KS are planning a peer exchange in the late fall of 2017, covering quality and timeliness of reports. OH will share information on their March 2017 Peer Exchange.</p> <p>MN just did a research strategic plan and they found a gap in aligning research with strategic goals. If any other states have information on how they address and attach their research to the strategic goals of their department, please share with Linda Taylor.</p> <p>OH does not have a formal check off on being in line with the strategic goals of the department, but they discuss it</p> <p>MI has a formal process for identifying strategic priorities. They will be finalized this summer and then they will have a call for projects. Final selection is also tied back. Information is in the research and implementation manual.</p> <p>IL doesn’t have a strategic plan, but does try to ensure that new research furthers our mission and related back to our mission statement.</p> <p>IN has key performance measures, and research projects must meet 3 of the 5 measures. Autonomous vehicles is the number one area that they have been instructed to tie back to. Each group (materials, construction, etc.) brings their own research needs.</p> <p>The call adjourned at 2:59 PM CT.</p>
16.	Next Conference Call	<p>July 24, 2017 (at RAC/TRB State Reps Annual Meeting) 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. Eastern</p>

Action Items			
No.	Action Item	Owner	Target Date

1.	Submittal of Region 3 Sweet 16, Safety and Topic Winners by May 15 th .	Rick	May 15 th
2.	Showcase Your State Research at next meeting	Region 3 DOTs	July 24 from 3:30 – 5:30 EDT