

**AASHTO RAC Region 4 Monthly Teleconference
February 18, 2016**

Participants:

Present	Name	Organization
	Carolyn Morehouse	Alaska DOT
Yes	Jean Nehme	Arizona DOT
Yes	Alicia Urban	Arizona DOT
	Anne Ellis	Arizona DOT
	Coco Briseno	California DOT
Yes	Pete Zaniewski	California DOT
Yes	Joe Horton – Vice Chair	California DOT
Yes	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
Yes	Randall Soderquist	New Mexico DOT
	Amy Estelle	New Mexico DOT
	Ron Horner	North Dakota DOT
	Gary Hook	Oklahoma DOT
	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
Yes	David Stevens	Utah DOT
	Leni Oman	Washington DOT
	Rhonda Brooks	Washington DOT
Yes	Tim M ^c Dowell	Wyoming DOT

Welcome

Cameron Kergaye reminded us the minutes from the January meeting at TRB are posted on the AASHTO SCOR/RAC web page at: <http://research.transportation.org/Pages/Region-4-Meeting-Notes.aspx>. Ned Parrish and David Stevens volunteered to review the minutes before distribution.

RAC4's Top 2017 NCHRP Problem Statements – Joe Horton and Pete Zaniewski

Many states have shared lists of high-ranking problem statements. Please submit if you haven't and Joe will provide a summary to SCOR meeting attendees. Ken Chambers reported that only three responses have been received from within Nevada DOT, and the lists from other states will influence Nevada's ballot. Cameron commented that the lists have helped, and comments would be valuable along with the titles of the high-ranking projects. The value to SCOR representatives is also a positive. Joe asked if negative feedback was valuable; one 'yes' comment, and one comment to be aware of state/national relationship and the corresponding value by appropriate perspective. Also, quicker feedback would be helpful for DOTs to share and discuss internally.

Research Cycle Discussion Topics: Problem Identification, Development, and Prioritization – Sue Sillick

Sue reminded everyone that the goal of this round robin is for everyone to share their processes and practices for each monthly topic. A lead state will begin by discussing their processes and practices first. Then, the rest of the attendees will discuss their processes and practices.

Sue provided an overview of Montana's program and recent administrative changes, along with research topic solicitation and selection. Montana has an annual solicitation (due April 30), and all problem statements require champions and sponsors. Small projects, partnering and pooled-fund projects, and high-priority projects offer entry into the research projects process downstream of the annual solicitation. Technical panels are formed and are critical for each project; they are diverse in composition, develop the scope of work, and support the project from beginning to end.

Joe Horton is utilizing "road maps" for guiding research programs, and could present that from California in a couple months or so.

Since this agenda topic is new this month, this same topic will be discussed at our March meeting. Sue will revise the schedule accordingly.

Implementation Success from an Unlikely Project – Michael Bufalino

Considering "Evaluating the Value of Crowd-Sourcing ... Bicycle Improvement Needs." ODOT started the project in which professors developed an app to identify issues: hazards, potholes, etc. for bicyclists. The DOT's project champion left the department and the project lagged, though there were still dedicated stakeholders and high-level interest. A discussion arose about a data source for the transportation system as tool for planning policy was initiated, and this was considered later in the existing project. MPOs use the app and drove public participation with it. The MPO developed a needs statement, and the DOT wanted to use it for public outreach to identify system needs by GIS location with a comment about the deficiency in the system. Along with the need for input, the agencies wanted a mechanism to provide feedback to the users: implementation assistance was provided (a couple thousand bucks) to re-write the app and a citizen's representative committed to providing feedback to the public.

The project met the original intent of receiving system deficiency information, but also exceeds original expectations by providing a mechanism to send feedback to users.

The key point is that spin-off topics and partners may provide unexpected benefits.

RAC Leadership Call Highlights – Cameron Kergaye

It was a short meeting; no notes have been prepared.

Questions and Open Discussion

Update on western states pooled-fund consortium: Pete Zaniewski reported that there have only been a couple of states that have responded positively. Randall commented that New Mexico is considering participation in pooled-fund studies. Probably not participating this coming year. Oregon is less likely to participate in consortium-style studies as opposed to deliverable-focus projects. Idaho found that of the four or five states in the northwest, there was difficulty identifying common topics. Utah still views this as an opportunity to travel to meet for discussion and to address common topics or issues. Pete Zaniewski commented that about six (a third of the region) states would be a good start to advance a two-year project. Cameron suggested that a draft agenda could be presented for consideration and possible commitment.

In March, Maribel Wong will discuss NTPEP and RAC

Also, David Huft and Randall Soderquist may present a summary on the recent peer exchange in Vermont.

Our next conference call is scheduled for **Thursday, March 17th** (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 .