

**Meeting Minutes**

<b>Date</b>	7-24-17	<b>Time</b>	3:30 pm ET – 5:22 ET
<b>Facilitator</b>	Rick Kreider	<b>Secretary</b>	Megan Swanson
<b>Subject</b>	Research Advisory Committee (RAC) Region 3 Meeting		
<b>Attendees</b>	<p>Member states attending:</p> <p>Illinois –Ryan Culton, LaDonna Rowden, Megan Swanson</p> <p>Iowa – Brian Worrel, <a href="#">Peggi Knight</a></p> <p>Kansas – Rick Kreider</p> <p>Michigan – Michael Townley</p> <p>Minnesota – Linda Taylor, Hafiz Munir</p> <p>Missouri – Bill Stone, Jennifer Harper</p> <p>Ohio – Cynthia Jones</p> <p>Wisconsin – Diane Gurtner</p> <p>Guests: Jason Bittner (ARA), Josh Beakley (American Concrete Pipe Assn.), Natassja Linzau (TRB), David Pamplin (FHWA), Keith Platte (AASHTO), and Sid Stecker (FHWA)</p>		

**Key Points Discussed**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Highlights</b>
1.	<b>Review Agenda/Roll Call</b>	Roll call attendance marked above. Cynthia Jones moved that the meeting minutes be accepted, and the minutes were unanimously approved.
2.	<b>AASHTO Update</b>	<p>Keith Platte shared that all AASHTO TSP invoices have been sent out to the member agencies. Megan Swanson asked why the invoice for re:source is not included in this set. This is inconvenient for member agencies, as it would be more efficient to handle all TSP evaluation and payment at one time. Keith was not aware of the reasons that re:source was not included in the round of invoices.</p> <p>Keith is the lead for the AASHTO Innovation Initiative (All) which is best known for their tow plow and linear referencing implementation projects. He also leads the Transportation Curriculum Coordination Council (TC3). TC3 is planning to expand their offering of technician level training and is a potential host for the Ahead of the Curve Training. For states that participate in the TC3, there is a scholarship available to attend the annual meeting.</p> <p>Keith shared that while most of the AASHTO TSPs are eligible for 100% federal funding, the Transportation and Civil Engineering (TRAC)/Developing Elementary Students (RIDES) program is not. Keith will work with FHWA to determine eligibility for the AASHTO Rail Resource Center (ARRC), Design Publication Maintenance (DPM) and the Multi-State Transit Technical Assistance Program (MTAP).</p>
3.	<b>Guest Comments</b>	<p>Jason Bittner shared that he appreciated that the Ahead of the Curve class this week had a good representation from Region 3.</p> <p>Natassja Linzau shared that the Thursday morning breakfast will be a presentation on the four websites: High Value Research, Research Program and Project Management (RPPM), Transportation Pooled Funds (TPF), and RAC/SCOR. Natassja also pointed out the membership lists for the RAC task forces and regions have been made into dynamic membership lists to allow chairs to keep their roster of members up to date. Natassja also reminded the group that anyone who has peer exchange reports should send them to her for posting on the website.</p> <p>David Pamplin announced that there have been big fixes on the TPF website. Round one changes will be pushed out by the end of August. Round two changes will be identified by the committee and rolled out later in the fall.</p> <p>Sid Stecker shared that Deb Elston will be announcing two new pieces of guidance for the SPR program.</p>
4.	<b>AASHTO Reorganization</b>	Rick Kreider called for comments on the AASHTO Reorganization. The consensus of the group is that Rick had created a good summary that they agree with. A big concern it is not clear how

Key Points Discussed		
No.	Topic	Highlights
		<p>the new special committee combining RAC and All will work, since RAC is a group based on position/role in research and All us a subscription program that not all states participate in. There was also a concern about duplication of efforts, as RAC members work on technology transfer and implementation in their own DOTs regardless of involvement in All. Sid Stecker pointed out that once implementation begins to occur, it is no longer a research program, which is not the opinion/experience of most RAC members.</p> <p>Michael Townley suggested that states who have Sweet 16 projects should consider submitting for implementation assistance from All, as there may be some overlap. This would also increase synergy between these groups.</p> <p>Rick asked that members please get their thoughts to Tommy Nantung and Peggy Knight asap.</p>
5.	<b>High Value Research (HVR)</b>	<p>Rick Kreider, Bill Stone and Megan Swanson lead a discussion of High Value Research for Region 3. Rick wanted feedback on selection of the supplemental brochure projects. One general issue that several members mentioned is that each of us score the projects a little differently; some score on the premise that a project would be of value specifically to the scorer's state program, some score on value to the submitter's state, and others score on value at a national level. This may be something that we should discuss again in the future.</p> <p>Megan is working on a survey for the regional chairs about their experience with the supplemental voting this year. Each region set up their supplemental voting differently, which allows the region to meet the needs of their members. For region 3, there was some concern that the way that the projects were scored this year could lead to "gaming the system" through weighting of scores. It was suggested that for next year, each state should score their top 10 projects, and the Sweet 16 and HVR projects would be pulled from that pool.</p> <p>Bill, Megan, and Renee McHenry will work with Natassja to allow each state to identify the appropriate topic area(s) of the research projects that they submit. There will be a limited number of topics that represent the most commonly submitted topic areas. The topic for the second HVR brochure will be based off of the number of submittals in the most common topic area outside of safety, which is always a HVR topic. This will also be further discussed in the Value of Research Task Force.</p> <p>Region 3 has consistently had multiple submittals for each state, which is good, but can also make it difficult to adequately review and consider each proposal. Almost every state agrees that there needs to be a limit on the number of topics that are submitted per state. After much discussion, Megan moved that each state be a limited to 4 projects submitted annually. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.</p>
4.	<b>New Business</b>	<p>The group worked on the report for Region 3.</p> <p>Rick Kreider talked with the group about Wichita, where our summer 2018 meeting will be held. We will be in a historic and recently renovated Drury Hotel downtown. There is a Railroad Museum, and a strong public art movement in the city. Wichita is also famous for aviation, building B1 Bombers during World War II.</p>
16.	<b>Next Conference Call</b>	<p>September 12, 2017 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Central Time</p>

Action Items			
No.	Action Item	Owner	Target Date