

**AASHTO RAC Region 4 Monthly Teleconference
June 15, 2017**

Participants:

Present	Name	Organization	Planning to Attend Summer Meeting?
	Carolyn Morehouse	Alaska DOT	
Yes	Diane Kresich	Arizona DOT	Yes
	Jim Appleton	California DOT	Yes
Yes	Pete Zaniwski	California DOT	
Yes	Joe Horton – Chair	California DOT	Yes
	Aziz Khan	Colorado DOT	
	Amanullah Mommandi	Colorado DOT	
	Wayne Kawahara	Hawaii DOT	
Yes	Ned Parrish	Idaho TD	Yes; and Director
Yes	Sue Sillick	Montana DOT	Yes
	Mostafa Jamshidi	Nebraska DOR	
Yes	Ken Chambers – Vice Chair	Nevada DOT	Yes
Yes	Randall Soderquist	New Mexico DOT	Yes
	David Hadwiger	New Mexico DOT	
	Ray Chavez	New Mexico DOT	
	Ron Horner	North Dakota DOT	
	Clayton Schumaker	North Dakota DOT	
Yes	Ron Curb	Oklahoma DOT	Yes
	Teresa Stephens - Secretary	Oklahoma DOT	Yes
	David Ooten	Oklahoma DOT	Yes
Yes	Michael Bufalino	Oregon DOT	Yes
	Darin Hodges	South Dakota DOT	
Yes	Dave Huft	South Dakota DOT	Yes
Yes	Rocio Perez	Texas DOT	Yes
	Wade Odell	Texas DOT	
	Kevin Pete	Texas DOT	Yes
	Cameron Kergaye	Utah DOT	Yes
Yes	David Stevens	Utah DOT	
Yes	Rhonda Brooks	Washington DOT	Yes
	Tim M ^c Dowell	Wyoming DOT	
Yes	Enid White	Wyoming DOT	Yes

Call to Order and Roll Call– Chairman Joe Horton called the meeting to order, and Ken Chambers, acting for Secretary Teresa Stephens, confirmed attendees. Ned Parrish and Randall Soderquist volunteered to review the minutes before distribution.

RAC Leadership Call Highlights (Thursday, June 8, 2017) – Joe Horton

- AASHTO will be sending out requests for states to review staff appointees to committees.
 - TRB
 - Camille Crichton-Summers, formerly of New Jersey DOT, has gone to work at TRB
 - Jon Williams has retired
 - Crawford Jenks has returned to TRB
 - and TRB will be hiring a new Implementation Coordinator since Wasseem Dekelbab has returned to his previous position at NCHRP
 - FHWA
 - Deb Elston will be retiring on August 31, 2017
 - Michael Trentacoste will be retiring at the end of September 2017
 - FHWA will be sending many representatives to the summer meeting
 - A position paper on the AASHTO reorganization is being drafted for SCOR at their retreat
 - High Value Research selectees were announced on May 19, 2017. There was discussion about having different attendees than the traditional Value of Research Committee Chair; there will be outreach to identify presenters
 - Region 4 discussion:
 - Idaho – Ned Parrish
 - Texas – Rocio Perez
 - Utah – Cameron Kergaye
 - Washington – Rhonda Brooks
- Historically a presentation template has been sent to awardees to give a brief summary of their projects at the appropriate sessions.
If a moderator position is available, Region 4 unanimously selected Joe Horton.

RAC Mid-Year Meeting in July – Joe Horton

- Louisville attendees are identified in the right-hand column of today's attendance sheet
- Region 4 meets at 3:30-5:30 p.m. Monday, July 24, 2017 in Louisville, Kentucky
- Please identify potential RAC4 agenda items. Some are:
 - SCOR/RAC reorganization; including "Implementation" as a separate group
 - RAC mid-year meeting planning – Region 4 will host in just two years.
 - Discussion topics – the next topic is "performance measures"
- Time for "Regional Dinners" is blocked starting at 5:30 p.m. Wednesday, July 26, 2017.
 - Teresa Stephens has some local recommendations for dinner
 - Alternatives to just dinner were discussed: Churchill Downs, and the Kentucky Derby Museum. [The Brown Hotel's shuttle is available for groups up to ten, will go up to 1-1/2 miles from the hotel (Churchill Downs is outside that radius), and is subject to availability (airport service is first). Ken]

Discussion Topic: Implementation - Sue Sillick

Montana – Sue will be hosting a peer exchange this summer, either the week of August 21 or September 11; implementation and performance measures will be the focus. Sue is preparing a RAC survey on these topics and asked if anyone would like to review this survey. Enid, Rhonda, and Rocio offered to review the draft survey. Sue also asked if there was anyone who was fairly new to RAC Region 4 who hadn't yet attended a peer exchange. No one indicated this was the case for them. Currently most of Montana DOT's contracts require an implementation meeting between the researcher and each project panel. Each of the researcher's recommendations is discussed and the panel responds whether each recommendation will be implemented fully, partially implemented, or not implemented. Reasons are also documented. The researcher takes this information and prepares an implementation report for each project. That report is reviewed and approved by the appropriate Division Administrator, who is ultimately responsible for implementation of research results in their Division. Currently Montana DOT does not have a long-term implementation follow-up, but Sue hopes to take that step.

South Dakota – Dave Huft conveyed that final reports for South Dakota must include implementation recommendations. Their project panels review recommendations and responds to each. Some projects require the development of a more detailed, formal implementation plan. Sue Sillick asked Dave to share some examples, and asked that such plans, documentation, or forms that may help other states be posted on the RPPM website.

Idaho – Ned Parrish said their reports typically include implementation recommendations. They recently added language to contracts specifying that researchers meet with project teams to discuss implementation of results and to develop implementation plans as appropriate that include a schedule for implementation tasks and identify who is responsible for various implementation activities.

New Mexico – Randall Soderquist is currently working specifically on implementation. He is identifying plans and ideas to improve implementation – as an example, better integrating implementation issues into technical panels - a definition for implementation, and a gradation to help describe implementation.

Texas – Rocio Perez reported that Texas DOT is also integrating implementation into technical panels.

Arizona – Dianne Kresich reported that Arizona DOT requires general implementation plans in their proposals, and the level of detail depends upon the customer. They conduct a follow-up, anywhere from six months to two years after the project, to identify what was implemented. They review their process every three to five years, and it may be about time to revisit that. Arizona DOT does have a database for general documentation. Dianne observed that obstacles to implementation include budget and staff turnover.

Washington – Rhonda Brooks shared that she is reviewing projects funded in the past six years to determine the state of implementation, and for recommendations that were not implemented, why not. Rhonda identified that another obstacle for implementation is management indecision.

Oregon – Michael Bufalino is working on producing their first research report in a new format: recommended changes will be located in the first chapter. Readers can review the Executive Summary, then see recommendations, and read further for background.

Rhonda Brooks proposed a potential additional discussion topic: research organization. Several people pointed to older surveys and our state “fact sheets”. Dave Huft also mentioned two other studies, one co-authored by Barbara Harder.

Next Meeting

Our next Region 4 meeting will be at the Summer RAC/TRB State Representatives’ meeting in Louisville, Kentucky on Monday July 24th from 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.