SHIFT 2020 Workgroup – Minutes

9/26/2018 - Rm C117 - 9:30 -12:30

Attendees

Last Name	First Name	Representing
Allen	Charlie	KYTC – Highway District 4
Asher	Jill	KYTC - CO Design
Balaji	Jay	KYTC – CO Planning
Blackburn	Jason	KYTC – Highway District 10
Chaney	Larry	KIPDA
Chen	Mei	KTC
Courtney	Stacey	Purchase ADD
De Witte	Steve	KYTC – CO Planning
Harrod	Justin	KYTC – CO Planning
Hulker	Daniel	KYTC - CO Planning
Jones	Travis	KYTC - CO Program Mngt
McKenzie	Shane	KYTC – CO Planning
Mills	Deanna	KYTC – CO Planning
Norman	Anthony	KYTC – DEA/Planning
Pelfrey	Mikael	KYTC - CO Planning
Quarles	Ramsey	KYTC - CO Planning
Reynolds	Jonathan	KYTC – CO Planning
Ridgeway	Nathan	KYTC – HSIP
Rogers	Josh	KYTC - CO Maintenance
Ross	Steve	KYTC - CO Planning
Shive	Chad	KYTC - CO Maintenance
Skaggs	Mike	Lincoln Trail ADD and E'town MPO
Souleyrette	Reg	KTC
Spencer	Amanda	KYTC- CO Planning
Thompson	Travis	KYTC – Highway District 5
Vaughan	Eileen	KYTC – CO Planning

Summary of issues for further action/consideration

- none

SHIFT 2020 Workgroup Agenda

9/26/18
Rm C117
9:30 -12:30

Overview
Process for discussion and formula approval

Safety

Congestion

Economic Growth

Asset Management

Freight?

Review and next steps

Next Meeting October 19th 9:30 – 12:30
Discuss Benefit / Cost, Roadway Characteristics, Decision Lens results and other remaining items from 9/26

Meeting Minutes

SHIFT 2020 Workgroup: Overview – by Eileen Vaughan
- Began with a review of what is expected to be accomplished today – which is to reach consensus on the formulas
- Reviewed the handouts
- Go through each criteria for approval, recommendations, or more research
- If more research is needed this must be accomplished quickly as there is very limited time
- October 19, 2018: next meeting (this is during the Health Fair – may be distracting) to finish up what isn't complete
- Roadway Characteristics and Travel Time Savings aren't complete yet

<mark style="background-color:#00ff00">Green highlighting denotes a vote/agreement on an issue from the Working Group</mark>

Congestion – Vehicle Hours of Delay
- SHIFT 2018 and SHIFT 2020 measure is very different
- Jason: odd that District 10 has 8 in the top 50, but Stephen De Witte pointed out that the sample data only represented 4 districts
- Jill: the Purchase Parkway project only has 400 vpd – odd that it ranks high
- Stephen De Witte: HERE data may have been during construction
- Mei: data was all of 2017, would needs dates and milepoints of construction to remove the possibly bad data
- Jason: consider an if/then statement to eliminate low ADTs?
- Reg: can't just have 0 (zero) for a measure
- Mei: length has impact – the Mtn Parkway has over 11 miles long total delay; scoring showed 1st several projects were high then dropped off significantly; looked at delay per mile – then the intersections went up
- Reg: perhaps put an asterisk next to low ADT projects? May be a result of rural type projects (following 1 slow truck); depends on how the metric is defined
- Jason: concerned if this is the best way to measure delay
- Stacey: are we over thinking this because of the sample size?
- Jason: consider changing from "congestion" to "delay"
- Eileen: should we consider coming back next week with 2 options?
    1. ADT cap
    2. <mark style="background-color:#ffff00">???</mark>
- Reg: recommended a rural vs urban measure, and not just an abrupt cut off but a smooth transition
- Shane: Functional Class?
- Jason: supports a cap, need a rational method that can be applied statewide
- Steve De Witte: How far do we get away from the raw data?
- Shane: tiers?
- Eileen: North Carolina didn't scale at first but they couldn't tell the difference between projects; they wanted ranking, the score wasn't the goal – priority for funding
- Jill: if we know the magnitude of the problem we might be more willing to make funding available for the project

- Eileen: Does the group like the measure? ½ VHD + ½ VHS?
- Eileen: would prefer everything scaled the same; percentile rank has gaps
- Reg: makes sense to keep the sensitivity in the score until the end
- Eileen: do we like the delay measure?
- Amanda: Tier by functional class + ½ VSF?
- Jill: VSF doesn't do well in urban areas
- Mei: give FCs more weight? Urban vs rural?
- Amanda: 10 mph below reference speed? Facilities outside of freeways.
- 2 methods to set reference speeds discussed: 2 hour highest speed and daily average; currently use the daily average
- Decision: Mei will take another look at the data and bring back several methods to discuss at next meeting:
  - 50% VHD + 50% VSF
  - Tiered by Functional Class
  - Scaled by percentile rank vs normalized
- Jill: use VSF on only rural areas? Mei: the data is inaccurate: 0.5 in rural is really bad, 0.5 on urban is good
- Eileen: concern is that one number may overwhelm the rest of the formula

Safety
- Reg: suggested a second way to look at safety: a ratio of PCR/?
- Jason: 1500 PCR to 500: should be a greater difference in score; one more column to show____?; comes down to are we going to accept PCR as the new measure
- Reg: PCR is a misnomer; facility performance factor; HSM uses Expected Excess Crashes (EEC) = without improvements this is the number of crashes we expect above average
- Everyone agreed that we should change the name to EEC to be consistent with the HSM
- Reg: anticipates problems with scaling
- Jason: noted that HSIP gets into KABCP, SHIFT only the number of crashes, doesn't speak to severity
- Decision: group was good with the EEC but KTC will email a new list with the different scale

Economic Development
- Used the hybrid score with percent AND number of jobs increased, no change in rank
- Jason: no District 10 projects in the sample list; is the old way bad or inaccurate? Or is new way a better measure?
- Steve Ross: the new way changes a few projects way down the list; either way doesn't make a big difference
- Eileen: negative travel Time Savings (TTS): if the result comes out negative, the project will be looked at again, take the highest of the newest model vs the TREDIS non-modeling process, only 15 projects came out with negative TTS
- Jason: wants his projects run both ways to ensure D10 receives the highest possible benefit
- Daniel: the Travel Demand model can't give you a good answer for the lower ranked projects; non-model can't give you a good result for new routes
- Jason: if we can't get a good measure do we use TTS at all?
- Daniel: it's the best tool we have for his.

- <mark>Group came to consensus to continue using TTS process</mark>

Freight
- Eileen reviewed the changes
- Jason: single units vs combos: are we using standard state splits if there are no counts performed? Jonathan: not using state averages, would use counts on the same route or adjacent counts
- Jason: we should be doing class counts on all routes
- Amanda and Daniel: discussion on 20/80 or 60/40 weights statewide vs regional; gave combo trucks a higher weight statewide because of the through volume
- Jill: why percentage and not volume of trucks? It's multiplied by AADT so volume is in there.
- Jason: concerned about weight and not percentage because of coal haul routes
- There was discussion on weight-posted bridges and coal haul routes; an extended weight permit doesn't allow violations of bridge weight postings
- Stacey: there might be a problem with an evaluation route: when a final link is complete then the freight will come
- Eileen: probably need to look at the evaluation route
- Jason: does the statewide model evaluate the new routes?
- Daniel and Josh: the statewide model has a truck component
- Steve De Witte: possibly add a flag for the last segment of a truck route?
- Travis Thompson: question about #40: millions of sq ft of warehouses, trucks all over, but low truck percent? Ramsey: depends on where the count station is located, safety of team placing count tubes
- Amanda and Ramsey: discussion on overriding counts when there are special projects; doesn't get put into HIS because the count is not done in the same count station location
- Daniel: also doesn't capture seasonal counts
- <mark>Decision: everyone is good on the freight formulas and the statewide (60/40) vs regional (20/80) splits</mark>

Concluding remarks
- Next meeting: October 19
- Amanda: would like to see a 1 page summary with old vs new formulas
- Agenda will include: Roadway Characteristics, Asset Management, Benefit/Cost, Congestion again, Scaling, results of Decision Lens survey

<mark>**Safety Benefit Factors**</mark>
- <mark>Jason: suggested primary get 100% and secondary gets 50%; built-in check for validation? SHIFT 2022?</mark>
- <mark>score with option #2 with boundaries</mark>
- <mark>Jill: should we rethink primaries?</mark>
- <mark>New rule? If you choose rural as primary, you can choose urban as secondary</mark>
  - <mark>Project #804: primary - adding lane to fully controlled, secondary - reconstructing intersection</mark>
- <mark>Eileen will send this out and revisit the topic during next meeting</mark>