

**AASHTO RAC Region 4 Monthly Teleconference
June 16, 2016**

Participants:

Present	Name	Organization
	Carolyn Morehouse	Alaska DOT
	Jean Nehme	Arizona DOT
	Alicia Urban	Arizona DOT
	Anne Ellis	Arizona DOT
	Jim Appleton	California DOT
	Pete Zaniewski	California DOT
	Joe Horton – Vice Chair	California DOT
	Aziz Khan	Colorado DOT
	Amanullah Mommandi	Colorado DOT
	Wayne Kawahara	Hawaii DOT
	Ned Parrish	Idaho TD
Yes	Sue Sillick	Montana DOT
	Mostafa Jamshidi	Nebraska DOR
Yes	Ken Chambers - Secretary	Nevada DOT
Yes	Randall Soderquist	New Mexico DOT
	Amy Estelle	New Mexico DOT
	Ron Horner	North Dakota DOT
Yes	Gary Hook	Oklahoma DOT
Yes	Teresa Stephens	Oklahoma DOT
	Bryan Cooper	Oklahoma DOT
Yes	Michael Bufalino	Oregon DOT
	Dave Huft	South Dakota DOT
	Dana Glover	Texas DOT
Yes	Rocio Perez	Texas DOT
Yes	Wade Odell	Texas DOT
Yes	Cameron Kergaye - Chair	Utah DOT
	David Stevens	Utah DOT
	Leni Oman	Washington DOT
Yes	Rhonda Brooks	Washington DOT
Yes	Tim M ^c Dowell	Wyoming DOT

Welcome – Cameron Kergaye reminded us the minutes from the May 19 teleconference are posted on the AASHTO SCOR/RAC web page at: <http://research.transportation.org/Pages/Region-4-Meeting-Notes.aspx>. Teresa Stephens and Wade Odell volunteered to review the minutes before distribution.

RAC Leadership Call Highlights – Cameron Kergaye

- NCHRP panel nominations: consideration and discussion of how to better separate or combine the synthesis and panel-nomination due dates for clarity.
- Keith Platte talked about the AASHTO restructuring (Cameron shared the file for review); AASHTO staff will attend region meetings next month in Providence to answer questions.
- TRB is launching a new “micro-website” on transformational technologies.
- Waseem Dekelbab, TRB staff, has been appointed the first NCHRP Implementation Coordinator. He will focus on the implementation plan approved by SCOR.
- OSTR – Tim Klein reported that panels are reviewing 212 UTC proposals for 35 grants.
- FHWA – John Moulden reported that Mary Huie is the new Innovation Management/Technology Transfer manager. Also, Sid Stecker will join next month as Leslie Wright’s replacement as State contact for SPR Subpart B. He will attend the RAC meeting and will speak at the “Your Role in RAC” session and be available for questions about the super circular (2 CFR 200).
- UT, CA, MT, TX peer exchanges mentioned; AR, FL, and KY are also being scheduled this year. John Moulden would like to be informed of peer exchanges so he can help accommodate FHWA participation.
- New operating guidelines for RAC; Cameron shared via File Share pod on web meeting. One noteworthy change is that friends of committees will not have voting privileges.

Note: Montana received two all-day training sessions – one day each on indirect cost allocation plans and 2 CFR 200 – were held in Montana. Instructors from the resource center attended and led class with a manual of slides, exercises, and other related materials.

Q: Would it be possible to post notifications on the SCOR/RAC website of planned peer exchanges to help identify those scheduled and enable interested parties to coordinate?

A: Sue will bring this topic to the next website working group.

TRB/RAC Meeting and Dinner; Providence, RI, in July – Cameron Kergaye

The agenda is posted at the [RAC website](#). New members, as well as returning participants, are encouraged to review the agenda and prepare for that meeting. Sixteen attendees are scheduled for the Region 4 dinner on Wednesday, July 27th at 5:30 p.m. Sue will make a reservation after June 30, likely at Jacky’s Waterplace & Sushi Bar.

Thank you for coordinating this, Sue!

Performance Measures for Research – Randall Soderquist

If any states have any measures for research, internal or external, please send those or any information (templates, etc.), please send those to Randall. Tim McDowell will bring information to Providence. Rocio Perez is assembling information for the summer meeting and will share. Sue is working on that as well, programmatically and project-by-project.

Research Selection – round robin, led by Sue Sillick

Montana – panels develop scope of work (SOW), check for similar work already completed or in progress, identify deliverables, including those needed for implementation and identify implementation barriers so that they can be reduced or eliminated. The Research Project Statement Form is used to help guide panels through SOW development. MT also has a one-page SOW Tips & Tricks guidance document Champions present to high-level committee (RRC) if there is any contention when projects were moved forward to panels or an RFP will be issued. MT can contract with any public entity without any completion. Typically, if there are no red flags, if a Research Topic Statement was submitted by an individual from a public entity, the panel will ask that person to develop a proposal. MT has a proposal template on their website for public entities. The RRC approves funding for each research project. Evaluation includes cost, usually 20% of score. About 10-15 new projects had historically started each year, but this will drop since full obligation will be necessary beginning next year. Sue conducted a survey: states' obligation strategies vary. It should be noted that this obligation method is not mandatory.

Q: Is there a budget set-aside for Technology Transfer?

A: No specific line-item for technology transfer; their librarian contributes to that effort.

Q: Is there a set-aside for on-call?

A: Historically, only a small amount (was maybe \$100k) but to expedite, and after survey, prioritization this may change.

Q: Is FHWA an activist?

A: They are supportive, participate on panels and on the RRC, but consider research a low risk and don't always participate on the RRC. FHWA-MT has also delegated experimental features activities; FHWA is no longer requiring work plans by approved by them. However, Sue stated, they will send the work plans to FHWA to keep them in the loop and as an FYI.

Wyoming also requires champions. They have a similar process with slightly fewer layers for selection and funding.

Nevada's process is similar also, with expert task groups (seven) to review problem statements and proposals by subject (e.g., "design of roads and bridges").

Utah also has topic groups (seven this last time) and they have a particular day where they all meet (about half from DOT, half submitters), talk, answer questions, then DOT ranks and selects about 80-90% of program based on those discussions. Wyoming noted a similarity in that they ask managers to prioritize by their subject area.

Texas segregates five functional areas; they send submissions to panel members of each of the five functional areas for initial review and rank, then several weeks later, each panel meets for a day to discuss, re-rank, and forward to the TxDOT administration for funding.

The next discussion topic is conduct of research, monitoring research, and project management in September.

Roundtable - Open Discussion –

Our next meeting will be at the Summer RAC/TRB State Representatives' meeting in Providence, Rhode Island, on Monday July 25th from 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

After the summer meeting, we will return to our regularly scheduled programming via conference call on Thursday, August 18th (10:00 Hawaii Time, 11:00 Alaska Time, 12:00 Pacific Time, 1:00 Mountain Time, and 2:00 Central Time).

Please e-mail potential agenda items to Cameron at ckergaye@utah.gov .