

**AASHTO Research Advisory Committee
Value of Research Task Force
Meeting Minutes**

Date	July 20, 2014	Time	1:00 noon Central
Co-Chairs	Mark Morvant, Louisiana DOTD Linda Taylor, Minnesota DOT	Scribe	Bill Stone, Missouri DPT
Subject	RAC/TRB Annual Meeting Value of Research Task Force Session		
Attendees	<u>State DOT – members</u> Mark Morvant, LA (co-chair) Linda Taylor, MN (co-chair) Darryl Dockstader, FL Bill Stone, MO Dave Huft, SD Steve Bower, Mich. Clayton Schumaker, ND Michelle Owens, Al Glenn Roberts, NH <u>State DOT – friends</u> Jason Siwula, Ky David Jared, Ga Linda Narigon, IA Enid White, Wy Tim McDowell, WY Gary Hook, Ok Ann Scholz, NH Donald Williams, WV Curtis Bradley, Mass Megan Swanson, Il Amanullah Mommandi, Co Neil Mastin, NC Terry Swygert, SC Peg Lafky, Wi Kevin Mahoney, Ct	<u>Other organizations – friends</u> Pat Casey, CTC & Associates Brian Hirt, CTC & Associates Chris Jenks, NCHRP Kevin Womack, OSTR-USDOT Robert Eger, RME Consulting Jonathon Dowds, University of Vermont Valerie Lefler, Integrated Global Dimensions Jorge Prozzi, University of Texas-Austin	

Key Points Discussed

No.	Topic	Highlights
1	Welcome and introductions	Mark and Linda kicked of the meeting with introductions.

2	Review Mission / SCOR Strategic Plan Previous	<p>Mark Morvant went through some bullets from the Mission. He discussed the opportunity to talk later about performance measures as this is part of the Value of Research mission statement. Mark asked if anyone would like to add any additions to the Mission Statement. None was provided.</p> <p>Linda Taylor spoke about the May 20, 2014 meeting minutes and Action Items. Mark asked did anyone have any additions to the meeting minutes. Dave Huft, made motion Steve Bower seconded the motion to accept the May minutes.</p>
3	High Value "Sweet 16" Update	<p>Received over 100 submittals for Sweet Sixteen. Mark thanked everyone and Research Impacts Document was produced by LTRC. FHWA had done this in the past. The goal was to get each state to submit at least one high value research project, but fell a bit short but was a great turnout.</p> <p>The full research compilation is posted on the RAC website and will appear in the next TRB Newsletter.</p> <p>Mark requested suggestion for the Guidance document on submission of Sweet 16 nominations. He noted it was sent out this year for submissions the process went smoothly and met all of the deadlines.</p> <p>Mark spoke about Research Makes a Difference document. Pat Casey presented the final document. Pat Casey recognized that Brian Hirt is the one that developed the write-ups. The content of the brochure was the 16 High Value Research Projects. This was the first year the brochure covered all 16 projects. Although each project does not have a separate write-up due to space, there was good representation of state innovation and research activities. It was agreed to continue to use the sweet 16 as the basis for the brochure. The guidance for project selection will need to be updated.</p> <p>The certificates will again be awarded at the AASHTO Annual Meeting to state CEOs. Last year there were 5 high value projects also presented by the chief engineers and Mark will check whether this would be done again this year.</p> <p>Mark spoke about the RPM software and whether it will be sustainable for the original intent and not simply for the high value research submittals. Contract about ready to run out and may not be available for next year. If the submittal process changes there could be a new form and submittal process better tailored to the needs of the High Value Research.</p>

4	Work Group Update Research Performance Measure Survey	<p>Bill Stone gave a short synopsis of the presentation on the recently conducted RAC Survey of Research Performance Measures. It is scheduled to be presented at the RAC Annual meeting on Thursday July 24, 2014 at 8am.</p> <p>Discussion moved from Performance Measures to a more basic topic of how does a state measure success with its Research Projects/Program. The survey on Performance Measures was to get the conversation started and get the definitions identified. There was a discussion about what should be the task force's next step? Options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One definition is not going to work for applied, and basic. Guidelines and Guidance are more appropriate to provide than a definition. • What are the most important measures that are important to States There are 30 measures in RPM and they could be a starting point. Conduct a survey to prioritize something like 5 measures from the 30 to understand what state feel are the most valuable. • Develop a framework that is defensible and aligns with other states. • There are many performance measures coming out through operations, safety on National Scale and then see how Research fits those measures. • The question was posed should we spend Committee time on performance measures or continue on the topic of marketing the Value of Research which was the original focus of the Task Force. • Develop a webinar with presenters from states with experience implementing performance measures.
5	Work Group Update Marketing the Value of Research	Working group needs to review list of HVR projects and determine whether or not to put together another brochure or develop a series of webinars or go-to meetings..

6	Work Group Update Benefit Quantification	<p>Dr. Eger of RME Consulting gave a presentation on what is going on in Florida. It was entitled "Modeling Financial Achievability of Transportation Research Projects.</p> <p>The following were the objectives of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a Develop a decision-making framework of the multi-stage research and development process • Illustrate the application of the framework • Identify areas in which data are not aligned with the framework <p>The project looked at incorporating the fundamental aspects of Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), Cost benefit analysis (CBA), Return on investment (ROI), Quality/performance measurement and Managerial costs.</p> <p>He noted that every task the manager can determine if moving forward at each decision point.</p>
---	---	---

Action Items

No.	Action Item	Owner	Target Date
1	Coordinate AASHTO meeting as necessary for presentation of Sweet 16	Mark	Sept 2014
2	Coordinate Sweet 16 Poster Session	Mark	Sept 2014
3	Submit AASHTO newsletter article for sweet sixteen	Mark	Oct 2014
4	Determine next step for performance measures	Task Force	Oct 2014
5	Follow up on additional marketing brochure	TBD	TBD
6	Next conference call is September 10, 2014	TBD	TBD