Minutes Notes SHIFT 2020 Workgroup
July 13, 2018
KYTC Conference Center C-109

Attended by:

John Moore	Nathan
Amanda Spencer	Mike Vaughn
Daniel Hulker	Travis Thomlinson
Jeff Thelen	Jason Blackburn
Stacey Courtney	Jeremy Edgeworth
Larry Chaney	Maridely M. Loyselle

Eileen Vaughan started the meeting. Explained the CHAF ID is what is used to have access to the SharePoint site of the SHIFT 2020 workgroup materials.

Also, Stacey Courtney rise the question regarding the issues with CHAF in regards to the imaginary/mapping of route on the "CHAF Project Profile". He also indicated by Maridely Loyselle, that currently, we are working to fix such challenges in drawing routes.

We rearranged the agenda by starting talking about the Project Selection, Eileen Vaughan lead this section by explaining:

1. How the project selection was executed previously
2. What Districts were selected

The previous workgroup in 2016 used a sample list of 100 projects from District 4, District 6 and District 10. The selection of projects from these Districts were based the representation of workgroup members from those Districts. They picked projects that were labeled "High", "Medium", and "Low" from the previous cycle. The projects represented different functional classes in order to test and statewide and regional formulas.

Eileen continued to explain that this time John Moore and the upper management are looking to do some things differently, including the fact that we have additional people in the working group represented. With that in mind, she talked about the move from the PIF database to CHAF. In PIF, we were only able to map to only one route. CHAF provides the convenience of handling multiple routes. She showed in a power point presentation a previously sponsored project that has been modified to show multiple routes. This will allow us to collect data from both routes. There is a need to decide how the information from these two routes will be handled in the SHIFT formulas. Do we take an average of the formula numbers? The same situation is occurring in projects with multiple counties. She showed the scenario projects with multiple counties.

Another aspect that we need to be aware of and test is the ability of manage projects that have ramps. Before all projects with ramps were mapped to the main line. Now with CHAF we can evaluate these types of projects and we need to make sure we select projects that fit these descriptions at the time of testing SHIFT 2020.

After the quick introduction of how the selection of projects were handled the last time and the need for testing the new capabilities that we have this time around; we moved to how SHIFT 2020 project selection should be.

1. Selection of Districts to select projects from: It was noted that we needed to make sure that we selected projects from what previously explained. From multiple route and projects with ramps to statewide project and regional.
   a. Selection of Districts:
      i. Jason commented that last time the selection of project of D4, D6 and D10 provided a good mixture.
      ii. The question was raised by Amanda Spencer in relationship of what is the value of selecting projects from the same Districts. Eileen explained that the ability of comparing projects in be able to compare the scoring and the ordering. Be able to compare last time with this time will offer the advantage of see how these projects fair.
      iii. Jason, mentioned the importance of working out the CHAF challenges and those tools in the programs that are at this time not working properly.
      iv. We decided that we were going to use Districts 1, 4, 5, and 10 for the sample list.
      v. It was asked if members could submit projects to be selected as part of this 100 projects. The answer was, yes.

Freight

Jeremy Edgeworth presented the Freight formula recommendations. He explained that the reliability ratio did not seem consistent.

The committee recommendation was to take the truck percentage and split it into single unit instead of the combo unit. This gives emphasis to what trucks are moving through.

The formula they proposed is:

Measure	Description
$FEGM = \dfrac{\frac{P_{TR}*AADT}{KHFN}}{V_{TR,KHFN-MA}}$ †Scaled - The percentile rank of the value. Converts value to score of 0 to 100.	P_{TR}: Percent Trucks AADT: Annualized Average Daily Traffic KHFN: Kentucky Highway Freight Network Tier $V_{TR,KHFN-MAX}$: Max Truck Vol in each KHFN Tier

In the process of developing this formula, the committee evaluated:

1. Bridge loads capacities

2. Bridges clearances
3. Maintenance issues
4. Truck trafficking

The freight team did not include additional elements mentioned above because they did not have a good source of data available. Therefore, this is future area to explore.

In the question and answer section of Freight

John Moore asked if the Freight Committee considered areas in which you identified choke areas. That this is something we need to think in how identify those points.

Larry Chaney asked how the lack of data in regards to the reliability would affect the achievement of performance target. Daniel Hulker answered that the performance target related to those are manage differently, using a different report set of data and only in the NHS. Daniel, explained that even though we have speed data, the challenge is on how to relate all this to the NHS. Reporting is done through NPMRDS.

In addition, it was mentioned that we still are not able to buy data for routes that do not exist.

John Moore make a clarification on reliability. Something can be reliably poor but reliable. However, the calculation does not say how reliable this road is in relationship with the speed.

The formula will give a zero if the route is not in the freight network. This includes routes that are alternative routes, they will get a zero. This is the same approach as last time.

What about to update the freight network?

What about also coal haul routes? How can we incorporate them?

Stacey Courtney asked if there will be enough time to submit an update by the ADD of the Freight Network. The ADD will try to move and update the Freight network on November 2018.

Jason asked how he will recommend to incorporate the coal haul routes and how to handle the counts. How could we give extra points?

The freight committee was encouraged to look at the coal haul routes and to report later.

Daniel Hulker explained, truck percentage is based on an adjacent truck station. This is what is used as truck counts. This numbers of counts are estimates.

Additional Considerations discussed:

Larry Chaney asked if there has been giving any consideration in relationship to project that have been previously funded by the SYP?

John Moore, explained that they are look to see if the solution march the needs. The instructions on this projects are that the District do better in capture the needs so they will score better.

Larry Chaney asked about how to include metric that included the Bike and Ped facilities. The challenge how to obtain data that will provide support to the investment.

Larry Chaney mentioned a project in Shelby County where a High School needs to have sidewalks.

Bike & Ped project facilities increase the amount of project cost we need to account for this somehow.

Amanda Spencer asked about how the taxpayer can get access to the total benefit?

The question comes down to what is more important, brand new projects or the project that has been in the pipeline. How about project that still after sponsorship do not score well.

John Moore talked about how North Carolina has a five-year commitment and the challenges of bringing that to Kentucky as how currently the process is done.