SHIFT 2020 Workgroup – Meeting Minutes

6/28/18 - Rm C117 - 9:30 -12:30

Attendees:

Last Name	First Name	Representing
Allen	Charlie	KYTC-D04
Asher	Jill	KYTC - CO Highway Design
Blackburn	Jason	KYTC-D10
Carter	Lindsay	KYTC - CO Program Management
Conyers	Max	Lexington MPO
Courtney	Stacey	Purchase ADD
DeWitte	Steve	KYTC - CO Planning
Edgeworth	Jeremy	KYTC - CO Planning
Gleason	Kenzie	Lexington MPO
Higdon	Tonya	KYTC - CO Planning
Hulker	Daniel	KYTC - CO Planning
Jones	Travis	KYTC - CO Program Management
Loyselle	Maridely	KYTC - CO Planning
Mills	Deanna	KYTC - CO
Moore	John	KYTC - CO
Ridgway	Nathan	KYTC - CO
Rigney	Ron	KYTC - CO Program Management
Rogers	Josh	KYTC - CO Maintenance
Ross	Steve	KYTC - CO Planning
Saha	Neela	KYTC - CO Planning
Shive	Chad	KYTC - CO Maintenance
Skaggs	Mike	Lincoln Trail ADD and Elizabethtown MPO
Soporowski	Lynn	KYTC - CO Planning
Spencer	Amanda	KYTC- CO Planning
Thelen	Jeff	Northern KY ADD
Thompson	Travis	KYTC-D05
Thomson	Scott	KYTC - CO Planning
Vaughan	Eileen	KYTC - CO
Witt	Thomas	KYTC - CO Planning

SHIFT 2020 Workgroup: Overview & Schedule – by Eileen Vaughan

- The meeting started at 9:34 a.m. and began with introductions and an overview of what we are doing, and thanked everyone for their participation.
- She went through the SHIFT 2020 Workgroup power point presentation (all presentations can be found on the SharePoint site), including a discussion on
    - Technical Advisory Groups: please join a group if you'd like
    - Data requirements: requiring the tech groups to meet with the data group (Ramsey Quarles) to ensure the data used is complete and consistent
    - SharePoint site:
        - Those outside of KYTC should have access
        - All presentations from today will be stored on SharePoint site
        - Encouraging tech groups to store their working documents there
        - Use this site to obtain information from any missed meetings

The presentation notes will only be information in addition to the power point presentations.

SHIFT Overview for Workgroups - John Moore

- SHIFT Data: handout detailing the data used in the SHIFT scoring process
- Overview of history of SHIFT
- Background
    - Highway Plan was over programmed
    - NC: data-driven process modeled after VA's solution-driven process (performance measures)
    - Goal: to get buy-in across the state
    - Vision: that in the future that it is realized that a Highway Plan can be produced that provides an appropriate balance between data-driven needs and solutions and the visionary projects like the KY parkway system
    - 2018 Highway Plan: a little over programmed which provides flexibility in case a project doesn't go forward, another is there in its place

SHIFT Overview for Workgroups - Eileen Vaughan

- Eileen went through the SHIFT process from last year:
    - Projects
        - Projects outside of SHIFT have their own method of getting into the Highway Plan
        - Bridges can be capital improvements if they increase capacity
        - Sponsorships: everyone appeared to feel there were enough sponsorships, SHIFT 2020 sponsorship is anticipated to be the same but can be revisited if necessary
    - Statewide scoring, reviewed:
        - Data requirements
        - Crash history measures: safety and roadway characteristics were combined to show a larger weight for safety
        - Congestion measure
        - Economic competitiveness: Tredis, a project must be big enough to have county impacts

        - Accessibility/connectivity measure (regional only): there was some confusion in this measure because spot improvements resulted in zero points
        - Freight measure: got a zero if project wasn't on the freight network
        - Benefit/cost measure: the benefits were adopted directly from NC research; NC used a safety benefit factor which performs like a high, planning-level crash Modification Factor (CMF); costs: difficult to track down all of the Design costs so costs only included R, U, and C costs
        - Asset management: KY is so far behind in pavement and bridge asset management due to lack of funding that it was decided to give them a boost
    - So we have a score, now what?
        - Looking for a comparative values
        - Also looked at score, schedule, feasibility, deliverability, maybe wait to see effect of another project completion has on a current project
    - Statewide significant projects
        - Focused on interstates and vision projects and large regional projects that would not be feasible under regional funding (ie Brent Spence bridge replacement)
    - Regional projects
        - Why did we choose the regions? Similarities
        - Pool funds between projects – didn't work out that way for SHIFT2018 due to lack of confidence that the funds would be available the following cycle, will change as confidence increases
    - Boost points
        - Formulas didn't capture whole picture
        - Would like to give more guidance to boosters in capturing local knowledge
        - 2 Workgroup members said they didn't use all their allotted sponsorship and boost points – both thought it was too much and filled in the end
        - Another member liked the extra projects so that his local officials didn't feel left out
        - Eileen went over some statistics from SHIFT2018: most projects got boosted together (District + ADD/MPO)
        - The process went well in that the Districts, ADDs, and MPOs came out with a much better understanding of what was important to each other
        - Prioritization process was documented on the SHIFT website under 2017 District Transportation Process
    - Next steps
        - Eileen shared the schedule for SHIFT2020 – starting in January 2019
        - Gives a little more time to sponsorships

Technical Advisor Group Briefings

- **Safety –** Eileen Vaughan
    - Discussion of SPFs, adjustment factors, potential crash reductions (PCRs, Delta)
    - Question: will the SPFs be based on statewide statistics or regional? Answer: statewide
    - Questions: when will the new SPF analysis method be available to the ADDs and MPOs so that the analysis methods are consistent across the state? Answer: January 2019 on request, probably another year before we can do our own analyses

- **Roadway Characteristics –** Thomas Witt
    - Started out in a separate category but was folded into Safety, same weight though
    - Using shoulder width as a surrogate for clear zone in rural areas
    - Vertical curves – stopping sight distance, can't see over hills
    - Shoulder width in urban areas – run off the road is typically not a problem
    - Workgroup member suggested that a clear zone measure was one of the single biggest safety issue for rural areas and suggested once sponsorships are known, send out district or ADD personnel to do a subjective analysis/measure. Follow up discussion included:
        - Hard to measure everywhere consistently, are you suggesting an average or minimum clear zone? Including transversible slopes?
        - A roadside hazard rating was suggested
        - The workgroup did not recommend replacing the shoulder width with a clear zone measure
        - Need to set up clear consistent measuring guidelines
        - Urban areas: looking at lateral offset instead of clear zones or shoulder width
- **Congestion –** Eileen Vaughan
- **Economic Development –** Tonya Higdon
    - Contact Daniel Hulker and Scott Thomson (KYTC Planning-Modal) for modeling questions
    - The longer predictive period equates to less accurate predictions – must strike a balance
- **Freight –** Jeremy Edgeworth
- **Benefit / Cost –** Maridely Loyselle
- **Asset Management –** Chad Shive
- **Missing Criteria** – Steve DeWitte