

**AASHTO RAC Region 4 Monthly Teleconference  
April 21, 2016**

Participants:

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
	Carolyn Morehouse	Alaska DOT
	Jean Nehme	Arizona DOT
	Alicia Urban	Arizona DOT
	Anne Ellis	Arizona DOT
Yes	Jim Appleton	California DOT
Yes	Pete Zaniewski	California DOT
Yes	Joe Horton – Vice Chair	California DOT
	Aziz Khan	Colorado DOT
	Amanullah Mommandi	Colorado DOT
	Wayne Kawahara	Hawaii DOT
Yes	Ned Parrish	Idaho TD
Yes	Sue Sillick	Montana DOT
	Mostafa Jamshidi	Nebraska DOR
Yes	Ken Chambers - Secretary	Nevada DOT
	Randall Soderquist	New Mexico DOT
	Amy Estelle	New Mexico DOT
	Ron Horner	North Dakota DOT
	Gary Hook	Oklahoma DOT
Yes	Teresa Stephens	Oklahoma DOT
	Bryan Cooper	Oklahoma DOT
	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
Yes	David Stevens	Utah DOT
	Leni Oman	Washington DOT
Yes	Rhonda Brooks	Washington DOT
	Tim M <sup>c</sup> Dowell	Wyoming DOT

Others in attendance were: Maina Tran, TRB; Sylvia Medina, TX Development.

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

### High Value Research Voting – Cameron Kergaye -

The current 27 submittals will be sent to members with instructions for a two-stage selection process. Six to eight projects will be selected in the first round, and those will be prioritized in the second round with its own set of instructions. Cameron will share the complete list before voting to insure that all are captured.

### Ahead of the Curve in July – Cameron Kergaye

Thank you to all interested participants. Nine people in Region 4 have expressed an interest, and all names have been forwarded for consideration for enrollment. Cameron anticipates that decision and notification sometime next week.

### Multi-State Peer Exchange – Ned Parrish

In late 2015, a multi-state, virtual exchange was conducted after receiving permission from FHWA. Idaho, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming participated, each addressing a specific topic: research quality; communicating research results; intellectual property and contract clauses; and research results, implementation, and deployment.

TTI was contracted via the Oregon-led pooled fund project to plan, facilitate, host, take notes, and draft the final report. Each state planned a session, typically a 2-hour morning session, looking at current practices and discussing strengths and weaknesses. Subsequent off-line breakout sessions identified take-aways, then after lunch another 2-hour session was used for discussion of what was learned and how to incorporate those lessons.

An additional element that was included in the exchange was an evaluation of this type of virtual medium. Feedback was that the overall mechanism was good; it enabled beneficial discussions. Much of the success was credited to Dave Huft of South Dakota who led the first session and provided a power point template that was utilized in most sessions. This template included basic information from participants to provide context, as well as serving as a guide for what was to be provided for each session by each state. Discussed weaknesses were that there was less casual contact and opportunity for discussion during off-time; agency leadership participation was lacking, but offline meetings were held. Positives identified were: an opportunity for a wider range of participants (project managers, champions, universities, division offices) and off-site presenters were able to be involved. Additionally, it cost each state only about \$5,900 by utilizing Oregon's pooled-fund project, and having a third party facilitate, capture notes, and draft the final report in a comprehensive timely manner was appreciated by all staff. Also, Ned noted that walk-through/practice sessions as recommended by TTI were very helpful.

All states involved recommended that this type of medium be utilized in the future. The final report is posted at <http://research.transportation.org/Pages/RACPeerExchangeReports.aspx>

Q: Were there distractions for staff by daily activities?

A: No, the meetings were in videoconferencing rooms, and people were away from their desks. Also, three of the four sessions were in one week, so we had to all focus just on those topics.

Q: This looks like a good report; is this the first all-virtual exchange, and did the video element help improve the quality of the exchange?

A: The video portion was not a highlight, but it was functional. It was also good for presenters, regardless of location. Also, preparation helped, and TTI was able to compile slides for easier reference and presentation.

## How Do You Write a Solid Request for Proposal? – Teresa Stephens

Idaho: formatting and content is spelled out – level of detail, length, etc.

Montana: scope of work is critical; panels help; used South Dakota's scope of work guidelines. Also provide a template RFP including purchasing language. Some things should be specifically identified, but some things may be left more open to allow researchers latitude.

Q: Are qualifications/CV, and list of participants required?

A: Yes, as well as timelines.

Cameron commented that a survey could be sent to RAC for similar information that could be helpful. Ned suggested that the RPPM web page may provide more information. It was also noted that Utah (and many other states) have multiple points of communication between the Department and the researchers to allow revisions to the proposal before it is incorporated in an agreement.

Comment: the RPPM database has some example documents that may be useful.

## Research Marketing – round robin, led by Sue Sillick

Linda Taylor is looking for a presenter on this subject for the summer meeting in Providence.

Rhonda Brooks shared that Washington conducts webinars, produces project summaries, newsletters/brochures, has executive briefings on next steps (internal marketing), and their internal web page has brief articles for the employees. They also maintain a portfolio of ongoing projects organized by topic and distribute that biennially.

Randall Soderquist stated this is a weak area for New Mexico, but they're working on it. They are beginning to do outreach with the districts, they are working with I.T. to increase website involvement. Social media is underutilized due to security concerns. Linda Taylor, MN, has been helpful to New Mexico.

Ken Chambers commented that Nevada is looking at having champions or panel members identify and present successes or benefits on individual projects.

Ned Parrish told a tale about Idaho: they are developing stories about projects intended to draw people's interest. These stories can be incorporated at a variety of meetings or events.

Cameron pointed out that marketing is communication. In Utah when research results are presented, the Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing (P.E. certification, etc.) is engaged to allow for attendees at hour-long presentations receive certificates with credit hours.

Wade Odell shared that in Texas, research staff attends conferences (maintenance, cement, traffic safety, planning) where they set up a table and display project posters, program booklets (very popular), newsletters, and business cards. Occasionally vendors inquire and can be put in contact with appropriate staff. They are also doing quarterly research meetings internally with subject matter experts so employees and the public can get details about current projects. Also web-contact to districts improves their communication.

Joe Horton of Caltrans is presenting in July at the RAC meeting. He will share their [annual highlight report](#) which summarizes completed tasks, introduces what is coming up over the next few years, and what's going on with research partners. The highlight report also identifies related programs at the federal program level, e.g., SHRP2, and provides a detailed breakdown of research funding. Project summaries are sometimes done, and are well received.

Q: What state DOTs market to their legislatures?

A: Montana provides summary information, and presents as necessary.

#### RAC4 Secretary Position – Joe Horton

Joe has opened nominations for Secretary for Region 4. In July, Joe will replace Cameron as our Chair. Ken Chambers will vacate the Secretary role to serve as Vice-Chair and a new Secretary will be appointed. The main responsibilities are to produce the monthly minutes, though the Secretary may be asked to attend RAC leadership or other meetings. This is an excellent opportunity to learn more about roles and functions within RAC, as well as to be more involved. Joe sent an e-mail to RAC4 but has received no response at this time. If you are interested or would like to know more, please contact Joe at [joe.horton@dot.ca.gov](mailto:joe.horton@dot.ca.gov) or call him at (916) 654-8229.

#### Round Table - Open Discussion

None at this time.

Our next conference call is scheduled for **Thursday, May 19<sup>th</sup>** (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](mailto:ckergaye@utah.gov) .