

Meeting Minutes

Date	September 9, 2014	Time	2:30 pm (Eastern)
Facilitator	Amy Schutzbach	Secretary	Michael Townley
Subject	RAC Region 3 Meeting		
Attendees	Member states attending: Illinois – Amy Schutzbach, Megan Swanson Indiana – Tommy Nantung Iowa – Linda Narigon Kansas – Rick Kreider Michigan – Michael Townley Minnesota – Linda Taylor, Hafiz Munir Missouri – Bill Stone, Jennifer Harper Ohio – Cynthia Gerst Wisconsin – Lori Richter		

Key Points Discussed		
No.	Topic	Highlights
1.	Review agenda / roll call	Agenda approved. Roll call attendance marked above.
2.	Review previous meeting minutes	A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. Motion carried.
3a.	Review action items from March meeting	Action items were reviewed
3b.	2014 Annual RAC Meeting	Cynthia provided a summary of feedback from the 2014 Annual RAC Meeting. There were quite a few questions in each survey, so reviewing the answers is challenging. The CEO session and TRB session were the best received. ROI, performance measures, and implementation were areas of interest for next meeting. About forty people took the survey. The survey data will be provided to Region 4 for review. Lori Richter will provide a summary of the budget to Cynthia and Amy.
3c.	Implementation issues	<p>Michael led a discussion of implementation issues. The answers to the following questions are found in the attached <i>State Implementation Practices Table</i>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does your organization decide who will be the champion of implementation? 2. How does your organization hold the champion accountable? 3. How do you ensure that implementation activities are monitored to document benefits? 4. How do you fund implementation monitoring activities?
4a.	Mentoring	We have a number of new members in the region: Megan and Laura from Illinois, Jen from Missouri, Hafiz from Minnesota, and Diane, Peg, and Lori from Wisconsin. RAC has established a mentoring program. New members are

		<p>provided a mentor, an experienced RAC member from the same region. Mentoring guidelines have been developed.</p> <p>Megan and Laura will be mentored by Amy.</p> <p>Missouri, Minnesota, and Wisconsin staff would like an out of state mentoring program. Wisconsin may have a unit supervisor hired within the month that will also need mentoring.</p> <p>Cynthia, Tommy, and Rick are willing to volunteer as mentors.</p>
4b.	2015 TRB Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration opened last week. The Marriot Marquis was filled very quickly. There are other hotels filling up close to the conference center. • A series of webinars are being offered to orient people to the new venue. • Cynthia announced that there will be an <i>Ahead of the Curve</i> workshop on Thursday morning 8:00 to Noon. • Sunday 3:30pm to 5:00pm is the preferred time for the RAC Region 3 meeting. It was recommended that food be brought into the meeting at that time if the hotel will allow outside food delivery. Cynthia will look into this.
5.	Recently Completed Research Highlights	<p>Indiana – Tommy Nantung reported on the following recently completed projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPR3557 cement kiln dust additive to pavement. The kiln dust reacted with the soil and did not perform as expected. The sulfate content was not specified and was not disclosed. This was an internal report only. It was not placed on the internet. Ohio, Kansas, Illinois, and Iowa would like a copy of this study. • SPR3631 Bridge beam post tensioning technology report is available. • SPR3616 Safety interventions report is available. This project developed safety review check lists and guidelines for safety engineers to follow when mitigating risk. <p>Iowa – Linda Narigon reported on the following recently completed projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Adaptive Field Detection Method for Bridge Scour Monitoring Using Motion-Sensing Radio Transponders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TR-617 Final Report (PDF) Tech Brief (PDF) ○ Depth gauge in scour hole that sends warning to phone has been evaluated. • Development of Asphalt Dynamic Modulus Master Curve Using Falling Weight Deflectometer Measurements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TR-659 Final Report (PDF) Tech Brief (PDF) • Standards for Single Span Prefabricated Bridges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TR-663 Final Report (PDF) ○ New standards have been developed • Comparative analysis of seatbelt laws was also recently completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A comparative policy analysis of seat belt laws ○ Final Report • Statewide Heavy Truck Crash Assessment • Synthesis Study: Effectiveness of Safety Corridors • Additional pooled funds have been completed in the last few months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TPF-5(081) SWZDI: Calibration of Highway Safety Manual Work Zone Crash Modification Factors

- TPF-5(081) SWZDI: Development of a TL-3 Transition between temporary concrete barrier and guard rail
- SPR-3(042) AURORA: Cameras and Operational Impact of Remote Road Condition Monitoring
- SPR-3(042) AURORA: Synthesis of Practice on the use of Multiple ITS Sensors at RWIS Sites
- TPF-5(205) Development of Performance Properties of Ternary Mixes

Kansas – Rick Kreider reported on the following projects:

- KTRAN: KSU – 09-8 *Chip Seal Manual* project had the following objectives
 - Develop a manual on chip seals
 - learn the overall chip seal operation
 - learn the workings, maintenance, calibration and proper operation of equipment used in chip sealing
 - Learn chip seal design procedures
- KTRAN: KU – 13-4 *Load and Resistance Factor Design Calibration to Determine a Resistance Factor for the Modification of the Kansas Department of Transportation - Engineering News Record Formula* (LRFD for PDA)
 - Determined a revised Resistance Factor
 - KS will provide the full report to MoDOT and IowaDOT

Michigan –Michael Townley provided a summary of the following projects:

- Monitoring Highway Assets
 - The researchers conducted a literature review to identify current technologies suitable for inventory data collection. These included: LiDAR, Aerial photography, Satellite imagery, Mobile imaging, and Manual data collection.
 - Costs for various methods were presented and an RFP developed
 - The summary report can be found at the following link:
 - http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/Spotlight_-_Monitoring_Highway_Assets_7-9-14_462382_7.pdf
- Accelerating Bridge Construction
 - A tool was developed to determine when accelerated bridge construction should be done.
 - The summary report can be found at the following link:
 - http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/Spotlight_Accelerating_Bridge_Construction_7-17-14_464791_7.pdf
- NCHRP Speed Limit Research problem statement input has been requested.
 - Input or support has been provided by several states

Ohio – Cynthia Gerst provided a summary of the following projects:

- Evaluation of Ohio Work Zone Speed Zones Process
 - The report considering various construction activities and appropriate corresponding speed reductions.
 - Variable speed limit signs were discussed. The research indicated ways to increase safety and maintain credibility in the work zone.
 - The report is available at the following link:
 - http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Planning/SPR/Research/reportsandplans/Reports/2014/Roadway/134716_FR.pdf
- Comparison and Testing of Various Noise Wall Materials
 - Noise wall barrier materials research was completed and results questioned the FHWA model used to predict noise levels. FHWA

		<p>asked Ohio to pull their report from the website. Ohio pulled the report off the web.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ohio has recently posted a solicitation for a maintenance pooled fund study. If interested contact Cynthia.
	Additional Discussion	<p>A discussion about project control and unexpected results of research occurred.</p> <p>It was recommended that future meetings include proposed research and research needs to explore pooled fund opportunities.</p> <p>Rick offered to provide a Powerpoint on national research directed at HMA given to the Kansas Asphalt Pavers Association.</p> <p>Tommy will circulate copies of Purdue University Prof. Darcy Bullock's research communications presentation from the 2014 RAC annual meeting Research Management Tools session. He will also forward it to AASHTO to be posted on the website.</p> <p>Next meeting Tuesday November 18 with Iowa as host.</p>

Action Items			
No.	Action Item	Owner	Target Date
	Provide an update to Amy and Cynthia on the budget for 2014 annual meeting	Lori	This month
	Cynthia if the hotel will allow outside food delivery for the Region 3 TRB annual meeting.	Cynthia	2 months
	Ohio, Kansas, Illinois, and Iowa would like a copy SPR3557 cement kiln dust pavement additive study.	Tommy	One week
	KS will provide the full LRFD for PDA report to MoDOT and IowaDOT	Rick	One week
	Tommy will circulate copies of Purdue University Prof. Darcy Bullock's research communications presentation from the 2014 RAC annual meeting Research Management Tools session. He will also forward it to AASHTO to be posted on the website.	Tommy	One week

State Implementation Practices Table
AASHTO Research Advisory Committee Region 3 State Research Program Implementation Questions and Answers
September 9, 2014 Conference Call Meeting Minutes

	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Michigan	Minnesota	Missouri	Ohio	Wisconsin
Questions	Amy Schutzbach	Tommy Nantung	Linda Narigon	Rodney Montney	Michael Townley	Linda Taylor	Bill Stone	Cynthia Gerst	Lori Richter
1. How does your organization decide who will be the champion of implementation?	The Department selects a Technical Review Panel (TRP) chair who is an expert in the field of study. Typically, the TRP chair is a member of the Technical Advisory Group that selected the project for funding. The TRP chair, along with the Research Implementation Engineer, makes sure the project is on track for implementation and keeps the researcher focused on producing implementable deliverables.	The person who requests the research project initially is assigned the role of project champion for implementation.	The champion is usually identified by the office most affected at the end of a research project.	The KSDOT project monitor that manages the research project is the one that champions implementation. Typically they are the one who requested the effort initially.	The project manager of a research project generally takes on the role of champion under the current system. In the proposed system an Implementation Manager will be assigned by the Engineering Operations Committee (EOC) when they determine a project should be implemented.	The technical liaison that spurred research develops the implementation plan.	All projects have a division engineer level person to champion the project, the technical contact is also involved, but research office staff Jennifer and Andy champion the implementation.	When considering projects the appropriate staff for implementation is assigned to the project team upfront. The implementation manager determines the right person from each project team to champion research implementation.	Research office leadership has recently changed and information is not readily available at this time.
2. How does your organization hold the champion accountable?	There is not a mechanism by which to hold the chair accountable. The work of the TRP chair and members is voluntary; there is typically no mention of research activities in their job description. Chairs are typically involved with the research and look forward to having findings implemented. If a TRP chair does a poor job with a project, (s)he may not be selected for future roles in the research program.	Each champion has performance measures included in their performance plan that set implementation goals. Each performance review is an opportunity to keep the champion accountable. Additionally, lists are kept on implementation status to track the projects that are not progressing.	At this time Iowa does not have a system to hold people accountable, but hope to have implementation performance measures in the future.	The research office does not monitor implementation at this time.	At this time a biannual <i>Innovations Report</i> is published showing managers the status of implementation. It does not seem like managers in various bureaus are using this data to keep champions accountable. A new system will require the Implementation Manager to report to the EOC.	The Local Road Research Board or innovation research group decides if a project will be implemented. Then the technical liaison that spurred the research continues as champion.	Missouri has an informal system of communication, but not a formal accountability system.	The champion is part of implementation plan development, deadline setting, and planning. This initial buy in helps establish accountability. In the interest of receiving funding for the next project the champion is motivated to build credibility by implementing the existing project.	Research office leadership has recently changed and information is not readily available at this time.
3. How do you ensure that implementation activities are monitored to document benefits?	We cannot ensure that implementation activities are monitored at this time. We recently were able to fill our Research Implementation Engineer position through a temporary assignment. The Research Implementation Engineer is now working with TRP chairs to coordinate and implement the findings of our research, and we are currently focused on this effort. We also have a position hired through the Illinois Center for Transportation who is assisting us with determining benefits of some of our older projects. We are hoping that as we create a culture of research and implementation throughout the department, we will be able to expand our focus to continual tracking of implementation activities.	Indiana DOT monitors each project for 5 years. This effort is part of Perdue Universities role through the Joint Transportation Research Program.	Iowa's research office will monitor and track selected high value research projects. They do not have a standardized follow-up program at this time. The Research office drives implementation discussions. During annual research focus group meetings (such as Structures or Safety focus group...) They will discuss projects not marked as implemented (or marked as not fully implemented) and will briefly discuss each one to document if any implementation has been done.	The research office does not monitor implementation at this time.	Research Administration ask project managers to report on the status of implementation and benefits realized every two years as part of publishing an <i>Innovations Report</i> for administrators to review. Additionally, in a proposed system, the Implementation Manager will be responsible for reporting to EOC.	MNDOT is building modules into their tracking system to set implementation goals up front for each research project. In the future these goals will be tracked to see that projects meet goals. MNDOT is also hiring a consultant that will review the results of several successful projects and report on implementation.	The research office discusses projects that are being implemented, but there is no formal monitoring at this time.	Implementation plans are tracked for 5 years.	Research office leadership has recently changed and information is not readily available at this time.
4. How do you fund implementation monitoring activities?	We have the capability of using SPR Part II funds for implementation of pilot projects and implementation support. It is a new area that we are just starting to navigate. We also currently fund implementation by including implementation assistance tasks in the original work plan. These cover the development of an implementation plan, implementable deliverables (e.g. training course, policies and specifications, guides and manuals), and implementation cost analysis by the Principal Investigator.	\$100,000 is set aside each year for implementation assistance.	\$100,000 of SPR Part II funds are reserved annually for use on selected pilot and implementation projects. These efforts are tracked by the Iowa DOT research office staff.	Kansas does not have funding set aside for implementation at this time.	If implementation requires extensive monitoring a research project is started to fund the effort. Alternatively certain program areas conduct their own monitoring. Most projects are funded by the area or region choosing to implement the research.	MNDOT is setting aside \$1 million a year to implement research. Funding is composed of part SPR II and part state funds.	The DOT incorporates STIP program funding into appropriate projects to facilitate innovation.	2013 was first year of separate implementation funding. \$750,000 was set aside and an implementation engineer position was filled. After the first year it was determined that most projects need implementation facilitation and support, but not as much funding as anticipated. \$200,000 per year is now set aside to fund implementation.	Research office leadership has recently changed and information is not readily available at this time.