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**HSM Pooled Fund Priority Setting - Notes**

1. Project Deliverables

-The status of ongoing efforts was reported. The SPF Clearing house Concept of Operations is anticipated by early 2014. The ConOps will provide a better explanation of how SPF Clearing house can be designed and used.

-The NCHRP Calibration Guide has delivered its draft guide to panel members and it may be summer before a preview version is available for the Pooled Fund to access.

- FHWA will publish the SPF Guides on the new Roadway Safety Data Program Website once they clear FHWA public affairs. There may be minor changes to the guides from what is currently posted on the Pooled Fund Study site as a result of the public affairs process.

1. Accounting:

This pooled fund has over 2/3 of its committed funding available for projects through 2015, approximately 890,000 to allocate.

1. Setting Priorities:

Many projects were presented (Table 1) the projects were identified from previous ballots, and various discussions with other project partners. They were presented to the members and new projects were called. The projects were compiled in a ballot for members to rate.  *Chat pod comments and additional ideas and comments received after the meeting are noted in item 4.*

Discussion of Needs and Projects:

* There needs to be an extensive **survey of HSM implementation in practice**. FHWA is currently working with AASHTO to develop this project. The NCHRP Lead States project Phase II is about to begin. Special consideration should be given to the disparity in usage of HSM; there is both lack of support and lack of knowledge that keeps partners from using HSM. Designing a way to capture these differences be designed in the survey instrument would be useful.
* After the meeting another comment regarding the **survey of HSM implementation** suggested strong effort be made to make this cross cutting.  To the point raised in our discussion it seems often that the safety group may be doing one thing and the designers or operations people another.  Ideally there is adequate communication in an organization to catch all of this but all too often there seems to be a breakdown. This study/survey could have serious research funding implications.  One comment I got promoting my recent research needs statement questioned if HSM implementation was far enough established to warrant funding implementation based research.
* Reframed the purpose of Pooled fund was to address gaps that FHWA, AASHTO, NCHRP and TRB could not accomplish.
* Potentially the SPF Clearing house may cost @575k which includes development and 3 years of maintenance. The concept of adding local SPFs to the Clearinghouse was posed.
* Illinois is developing **local road SPFs**, Pennsylvania is developing two-lane rural SPFs, and Louisiana is collecting local road data. The consideration of shared usefulness was debated as so many variables make it questionable functionally: specifically because the local roads have different design standards, data accessibility and maintenance.
* A discussion of **SPF Clearinghouse usage** ensued, specifically the differences between SPF Clearing house and CMF Clearing house. The SPF Clearinghouse is intended to identify, how jurisdiction SPFs were developed, data used etc. no “grab-and- go”. The potential to develop training that would explicitly describe these differences was suggested, and the option to name the SPF Clearinghouse so that it was not confused by the similarity with CMF Clearinghouse.
* Understanding the value of calibration and developing jurisdiction SPFs and their efficacy were discussed, specifically how to evaluate a “good” value, and when is it beneficial to develop jurisdiction SPFs. There was discussion of what determines a valid calibration factor as there is no accepted validity or accuracy reference like standard deviation to explain goodness of fit, etc. A recommendation to do a **write-up of how to evaluate SPF performance** was added to ballot.
* The **Development of crash prediction model for Managed lanes** didn’t receive enough support from members to make ballot. However, from chat pod it was noted: Questions about the impact of HOV on safety performance are coming up quite a bit here in WA.
* A lively discussion about the need for **guidance to determine what level of safety analysis to use at what stage of project**, when to use what method was proposed. For example, doing HSM alternatives analysis on an interchange project or using State SPFs for network screening, knowing what is appropriate and most useful. Mike Cotley, mentioned they will have a poster on applying HSM to all levels of project development process Monday evening session of TRB annual meeting and all are welcome to come by. From chat pod it is noted: the question about scale and scope of safety analysis as part of DOT business seems quite relevant - it is being asked across divisions here at WSDOT.

Table 1. Ballot results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Which of the following projects would you give high priority for this year? (pick 3) | # of votes | % votes |
|  0.  SPF Clearinghouse | 3 | 25% |
| 1.   Jurisdiction SPF vs. regional SPF research |   |   |
| 2.   Peer Exchanges | 9 | 75% |
| 3.   Develop workshops on best 1st steps in implementation | 1 | 8% |
| 4.   Develop advanced training to support SA | 2 | 17% |
| 5.   Conduct workshops on HSM to states not using HSM | 3 | 25% |
| 6.   Provide High level marketing briefs |   |   |
| 7.   Host local/MPO data peer exchange | 1 | 8% |
| 8.   Clearly separate HSM from SA |   |   |
| 9.   EB implementation using spreadsheets | 2 | 17% |
| 10.   Maintain momentum of HSM training | 1 | 8% |
| 11.   Informal SPF workshop | 1 | 8% |
| 12.   Resource Gap Assessment to identify needs to develop (Pricilla) | 5 | 42% |
| 13.   Local road SPFs in Clearinghouse |   |   |
| 14.   Training how to use SPF Clearinghouse (Msh) |   |   |
| 15.   Write-up how to evaluate SPF performance (Ida) | 5 | 42% |
| 16.   Guidance about scale and scope of HSM application (April) | 6 | 50% |

-The ballot results suggest a shift in priorities from last year has occurred, many members suggested a SPF Clearinghouse may be premature and we might need to make a more concerted effort to review gaps as #12.

-Coordinating with NCHRP HSM Lead States and TRB Highway Safety Performance Committee through Peer Exchanges was a heavily favored project #2 in order to learn and share specifics of HSM applications.

-Developing guidance and resources on Scale and scope #16 as well as how to evaluate SPFs #15 were also highly prioritized actions for this year.

1. Next Steps and offline project suggestions:

-The group suggested meeting again in **early February** to finalize priorities since such a major shift of direction was determined and to allow members who were not able to attend this meeting a chance to provide input and feedback on proposed priorities for this year. This timing may also prove valuable to make use of information gathered at TRB Annual meeting.

- Has there been any efforts at the national level to **develop a calibration factor clearinghouse**?  I know today we talked about an SPF clearinghouse, but I think a calibration factor clearinghouse would be beneficial too.  Particularly for a state that has not calibrated but has similar data (crash, roadway, etc.) to another state that has may be calibrated, so that state that hasn’t calibrated could potentially use the other states calibration factor or even may compare the other states calibration factor to their calibration factor once they develop one.

-Has anyone considered using **small groups or breakouts** for these pooled funds?   A conference call with more than about 4-5 people can be really awkward to manage.