

MEETING SUMMARY

SHRP2 *Railroad-Department of Transportation Mitigation Strategies (R16)* Peer Exchange Meeting

TO: Jessica Rich, Pamela Hutton, Kate Kurgan

PREPARED BY: CH2M R16 Team

MEETING DATE: October 3-4, 2017

VENUE: Wyndham Grand Hotel, Chicago, IL

Purpose of Peer Exchange

The peer exchange is part of the implementation plan for *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies (R16)*, developed through the second Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP2). Members of state departments of transportation (DOTs) and passenger (Amtrak) and freight railroads (Class I Railroads and the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) were invited to participate in a peer exchange to discuss strategies for improved working relationships that would lead to faster and more efficient project delivery.

Topics discussed included partnering and communications in advancing railroad-DOT relationships, identifying intersections in railroad-DOT processes, structuring Master or Standard Agreements, the Section 130 program, Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency (CREATE) Program, design-build and other contracting methods, and benefits of the R16 Community of Interest (COI). The COI is part of the R16 implementation plan and includes representatives from several state DOTs, railroads, appropriate federal agencies, and AASHTO who meet both in person and via webinars to discuss and share information and best practices. The goals for the peer exchange were to enable participants to share best practices, lessons learned, challenges, and accomplishments; learn about potential new processes with railroads and highway agencies; and identify ways to foster a collaborative environment in which to capture the most innovative ideas from all stakeholders for expediting project delivery. The peer exchange agenda is attached as Appendix A.

Participants

Meeting participants represented 16 state DOTs, four Class 1 railroads and an association that represents Short Line railroads as well as federal agencies and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Invited host speakers from the Illinois DOT and the City of Chicago also attended. A complete list of participants is attached as Appendix B.

Executive Summary

This peer exchange is the first of two that are included in the scope of work to implement the SHRP2 *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* product. The agenda was designed to share key issues already identified by states and railroads participating in the FHWA/AASHTO Implementation Assistance Program with a broader array of state DOTs and railroads. Presentations on specific topics were deliberately kept brief so that lengthy discussion periods could be accommodated and maximum input from all parties could be achieved. There was general consensus that “we are all one industry.” Users are not concerned with the details of the various transportation providers when the transportation network doesn’t function efficiently; they expect and rightly demand an integrated, seamless transportation network.

Throughout the two-day event, several critical points were made and are noted below. The PowerPoint presentations from the meeting are available on the AASHTO SHRP2 website at http://shrp2.transportation.org/Pages/R16_RailroadDOTMitigationStrategies.aspx. Case studies, examples of agreements, operating and training manuals are available at AASHTO’s R16 Innovation Library website at http://shrp2.transportation.org/Pages/R16_InnovationLibrary.aspx.

At the conclusion of the meeting, evaluations were distributed to the participants. Generally, the evaluators gave high marks to the exchange, finding that the content would be a benefit to their agencies. Most important were the presentations on master agreements and the Section 130 program. Several suggestions for future sessions were identified. A summary of the meeting evaluations is included as Appendix C.

The following are key concepts from the peer exchange that, when taken individually or separately, would improve relationships between DOTs and their railroad partners and speed up project delivery.

- Communication is key; communicate early and often; involve all partners and give those partners sufficient lead time. Maintain open lines of communication by having a succession plan and process to address turnover.
- Break down internal silos.
- Encourage face-to-face conversations/meetings between DOTs and railroads.
- Establish a single point of contact.
- Maintain communication from early planning stage to implementation.
- Encourage people to think beyond individual modes (multi-modal thinking).
- Share revenue between transportation networks/modes.
- Consider the Railroads’ needs, including:
 - Pre-construction meetings held solely with railroads
 - Right-of-way considerations
 - Weighing of convenience (nice-to-haves) versus need
- Streamline DOT/railroad processes for construction projects.
 - Establish which departments/agencies need to be involved.
 - Establish when departments/agencies need to be involved.

- Retain institutional knowledge.
 - Consider electronic file-sharing.
 - Take steps to minimize negative impacts of staff turnover.
- The more Standardized Agreements you can develop with common terms and conditions, the better; individual projects can then be limited to scope amendments.
- Section 130 is a great program; however, a large amount of the federal budget goes unspent every year. Further, the needs and issues related to grade crossings are continuing to evolve. Innovative solutions are needed to provide the greatest public benefit.
- Partner to fund projects of joint interest.

Day 1 Overview

Day 1 of the meeting began with an overview of the SHRP2 program and *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* (R16). Industry leaders then participated in a panel discussion on the importance of communications and partnerships in advancing railroad-DOT relationship. After lunch, meeting participants separated into five groups to conduct a tabletop exercise to identify intersections in railroad/DOT processes and how those processes could be improved. The final afternoon session included a lively panel discussion on structuring Standard or Master Agreements.

Summary of Presentations, Day 1

Session 1: How SHRP2 and *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* (R16) Can Assist Your Agencies

Kate Kurgan, AASHTO, and Jessica Rich, FHWA, presented an overview of the SHRP2 program and *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* (R16). Railroad-DOT interaction requires a thorough review of the safety, engineering, and operational impacts during construction where highways and railroads intersect or are in close proximity. Rapid highway construction goals require a new approach that eases the project agreement process for both industries. During the research phase of the SHRP2 program, several specific strategies were identified that, if used consistently by transportation agencies and railroads, would improve coordination and speed project delivery. This approach facilitates beneficial relationships between railroads and public transportation agencies and encourages the use of best practices, streamlined processes, and Standardized (Master) Agreements. The benefits of using *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* (R16) include:

- Expedited project delivery
- Better management of limited resources
- Improved communication, cooperation, and collaboration
- Streamlined processes
- Transparency
- Improved quality
- Win-win solutions
- Less risk

Session 2: Executive Leadership Panel on Importance of Partnerships and Communications in Advancing Railroad-DOT Relationships

Panelists:

- Randy Blankenhorn, Transportation Secretary, Illinois Department of Transportation
- John Dinning, Manager of Public Works, CN
- Derrick James, Director of Government Affairs, Amtrak
- Jo Strang, Vice President, American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association

Moderated by Frank Frey, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) General Engineer, High Speed Rail Division, the panel of senior managers representing the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), Canadian National (CN), Amtrak, and American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association (ASLRRRA) discussed the importance of partnerships and communication, what makes the process successful, and challenges that need to be addressed. Highlights from the discussion are below:

- Communication is key.
 - Breakdown silos within agencies.
 - Encourage face-to-face conversations between DOTs and railroads.
 - Establish a single point of contact.
 - Maintain communication from planning stage through implementation.
- Encourage multi-modal thinking.
 - Think beyond individual modes.
 - Recognize that this type of thinking may require new people and new ideas.
 - Share revenue between transportation networks/modes.
- Consider the railroads' needs.
 - Conduct pre-construction meetings held solely with the railroads so that their specific and unique needs are not lost in a much larger meeting of stakeholders.
 - Consider right-of way responsibilities.
 - Weigh convenience (nice-to-haves) versus need.

Session 3: Railroad/DOT 101: Identifying the Intersections in Their Processes

Mike Loehr, CH2M R16 SME, facilitated a tabletop exercise to identify the intersections in railroad/DOT processes. Meeting participants were separated into five groups and were presented with a fictitious grade separation project. The groups were instructed to consider the project and answer a series of questions regarding departmental/agency involvement in project design and construction processes. Key findings from the exercise are below:

- Inconsistencies exist in DOT/railroad approaches
 - Streamline processes for construction projects.
 - Establish which departments/agencies need to be involved.
 - Establish when departments/agencies need to be involved.
- Involve the railroads early in the planning and environmental permitting stage
 - Benefits all parties.
 - Generates savings in man-hours and dollars.

Session 4: Panel Discussion on Structuring Standard or Master Agreements to Meet State-Specific Requirements

Panelists:

- Steve Meyer, Capital Projects Director, Utah Transit Authority
- Scott Hoftiezer, Railroad Program Manager, Colorado Department of Transportation
- Lisa Stern, Railroad & Safety Engineering Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
- John Dinning, Manager of Public Works, CN

Moderated by David Solow, another CH2M R16 SME, the panel of representatives from Utah Transit Authority, Colorado DOT, Wisconsin DOT, and CN discussed structuring Standard or Master Agreements, what makes the process successful, and challenges that need to be addressed. Highlights from the discussion are below:

- Develop Master and Standard Agreements to streamline and accelerate the construction process, generate time savings, and encourage coordination.
 - Determine the scope, terms, and conditions that both parties agree on and put those to the side; focus then on only the issues that need attention.
 - Facilitate meetings between legal personnel to negotiate indemnification language.
 - Define what both parties agree upon and provide lawyers only with those issues where conflicts exist.
 - Ensure that the operator is the owner of the railroad prior to facilitating negotiations.
 - Develop a task order or a project notice that details project-specific requirements.
- Retain institutional knowledge through information-sharing.
 - Minimize the negative impacts of staff turnover.
- Search for win-win solutions.
- Turn challenges into opportunities.

Day 2 Overview

Day 2 of the meeting began with a brief recap of Day 1. The morning sessions included presentations and engaging discussions on the Section 130 program, including agency perspectives, eligibility, funding, and project selection. After lunch, staff from the Illinois Department of Transportation and Chicago Department of Transportation participated in a panel discussion on strategies, successes, and lessons learned from the Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency (CREATE) Program. Next were presentations on implementing design-build and other contracting methods. The final afternoon session discussed the benefits of the R16 Community of Interest.

Summary of Presentations, Day 2

Session 5: Section 130 Perspectives – Part 1

Kelly Morton, FHWA Transportation Safety Specialist, presented the federal perspective on the Section 130 program. Key points from the presentation and related discussion include:

- FHWA monitors state Section 130 projects by the obligation rate, which reflects the funds that have been converted.
 - Obligation rates were perceived as inaccurate by some of the meeting participants as they do not reflect advance construction amount.
- Few requirements exist for state-administered programs and states administer the program in different ways.
- Due to limited funding sources, states administer projects that have the biggest bang for the buck.
- A disconnect may exist between state DOTs and railroads regarding Section 130 projects.
 - Feedback from the railroads is not considered by the states.
- Crossing consolidation projects reduce collisions between motor vehicles and trains, remove a potential safety hazard at a fraction of the cost of warning signals and gates, and redirect limited resources to the remaining crossings that have the greatest public necessity.
 - Consider developing a single project into a crossing consolidation project (North Carolina and Ohio are good examples).
- Lack of Section 130 project prioritization hampers its use.
 - Revise formula for Section 130 project selection.
 - Account for active signal crossings where incidents are still occurring.
 - Revise Accident Prediction (AP) formula and Hazard Index (HI).
 - Conduct secondary, on-the-ground review of sites.
 - Conduct cost-benefit analyses.
- A disconnect may exist between local agencies and state DOTs.
 - Address local concerns at crossings that do not rank high enough for federal funds.
 - Support preventative measures at crossings with no crashes, but that have other concerning characteristics.
 - Provide technical assistance/tools to facilitate coordination.
 - Develop a simple presentation/overview for city/county engineers.
 - Create FHWA video for Section 130 program.

Session 6: Panel Discussion on Section 130 Perspectives – Part 2

Panelists:

- Scott Hoftiezer, Railroad Program Manager, Colorado Department of Transportation
- Jim Weatherhead, Rail Program Coordinator, Minnesota Department of Transportation

Facilitated by Kamie Young, BNSF Manager of Public Projects, representatives from Colorado DOT and Minnesota DOT presented railroad and state perspectives on Section 130. Highlights from the discussion are below:

- Many different perspectives exist but all agencies are working toward improvement.

- Streamlined processes should be developed for project elements to support consistency in DOT regulations and agreements.
- Project selection cannot be based solely on a formula; importance of engineering judgement should be recognized.
- Information on Section 130 programming and projects should be more readily available to the public.
- Antiquated infrastructure issues need to be addressed.
 - As equipment gets older, it becomes obsolete and replacement parts cannot be purchased.

Session 7: Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency Program (CREATE) Panel Discussion

Panelists:

- Jeff Sriver, Director of Transportation Planning and Programming, Chicago Department of Transportation
- Samuel Tuck, Bureau Chief of Freight Rail, Illinois Department of Transportation
- Elliot Ramos, Rail Project Engineer, Illinois Department of Transportation

Facilitated by Mike Loehr, CH2M R16 SME, representatives from the Chicago DOT and Illinois DOT shared the successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the CREATE program. Highlights from the discussion are below:

- Develop operating partnerships in delivering successful, multi-beneficial projects.
 - The CREATE program is a cooperative project composed of multiple Class I railroads and DOTs as Chicago is the busiest freight and passenger rail hub in North America. The old adage that “when the Chicago rail network sneezes, the rest of the North American railroad network gets a cold” is really true.
- Appoint a long-term project lead and support staff retention.
 - The CREATE program appointed a program lead who has remained in the position since the program’s inception.

Session 8: The Effect of Implementing Design-Build and Other Innovative Contracting Methods on Existing Agreements and Processes

Panelists:

- Troy Creasy, Project Manager II, CSX
- Steve Meyer, Capital Projects Director, Utah Transit Authority

Facilitated by Mike Loehr, CH2M R16 SME, representatives from CSX and Utah Transit Authority shared their experiences with Design-Build and other contracting methods. Highlights from the discussion are below:

- Design-Build can allow for innovation through unique construction aspects while minimizing community impacts.

- Design-Build can help to deliver the project more quickly than Design-Bid-Build, generating time savings.
- In regards to projects where Federal agencies are involved, the Federal Transit Administration understands Design-Build and therefore projects can go through approval processes more quickly.
- Design-Build is more hands-off once Notice to Proceed is given to the Design-Build Contractor.
 - Important to frame the project with prescriptive specifications up front.
 - Define and allocate risk.
- In regards to selecting a contracting method, seek the best value concept.
- A toolbox for selecting a contracting method would be useful to state DOTs and railroads. Steve Meyer noted that UDOT has its own matrix for selecting the optimal procurement methodology and that UTA has developed its own white paper describing same.

Session 9: How the COI Can Benefit You

Panelists:

- Troy Creasy Project Manager II, CSX
- Lisa Stern, Railroad & Safety Engineering Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Facilitated by Pam Hutton, AASHTO SHRP2 Implementation Co-Lead, representatives from CSX and Wisconsin DOT shared how their respective agencies have benefited from the COI. Benefits discussed include:

- Develop solutions through collaboration/face-to-face meetings.
- Develop preliminary engineering agreements.
- Gain additional perspective.
- Develop and implement corridor-wide projects.
- Develop a public projects manual to provide a consistent message to all parties.
- Facilitate regular meetings with regions.

Topics of national interests that this COI could provide input on:

- Pre-emption 50-second rule
- Section 190 Grade-Separation Funding (pertains to California only)
- Hump-profile crossings
- Traffic signal warrant
- Grade-crossing active warning devices or roundabouts
- Cue cutters and pre-signal

Appendix A – Peer Exchange Agenda



SHRP2 *Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies* (R16) Peer Exchange Agenda October 3-4, 2017

This meeting is a facilitated discussion for a corps of peers and experts from lead DOTs and railroad industry to share experiences on various topics related to R16 technologies and their implementation

Day One – Tuesday, October 3, 2017 Wyndham Grand Chicago Riverfront, Chicago, IL

Time	Agenda Topic	Speaker
8:30 – 9:15 AM	Welcome and Overview	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from FHWA, FRA, AASHTO • Safety Moment • Welcome from Illinois DOT • Self-Introductions • Agenda Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jessica Rich, FHWA • Pam Hutton, AASHTO • Frank Frey, FRA • Randy Blankenhorn, Illinois Transportation Secretary
9:15 – 10:00 AM	Session 1 – How SHRP2 and <i>Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies</i> (R16) Can Assist Your Agencies	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of SHRP2 program • Overview of <i>Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies</i> (R16) • Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jessica Rich, FHWA • Kate Kurgan, AASHTO
10:00 – 10:15 AM	Break	

Time	Agenda Topic	Speaker
10:15 – 11:45 AM	Session 2 – Partnering, Leadership, and Communications: Advancing Railroad-DOT Relationships	Frank Frey, FRA, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Leadership Panel on Importance of Partnerships and Communications in Advancing Railroad-DOT Relationships Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randy Blankenhorn, Illinois Transportation Secretary Jo Strang, ASLRRA John Dinning, CN Derrick James, Amtrak
11:45 – 1:15 PM	Lunch	
1:15 – 2:45 PM	Session 3 – Railroad/DOT 101: Identifying the Intersections in their Processes	Mike Loehr, CH2M, Facilitator Breakout Session
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tabletop Exercise of Fictitious Grade Separation Project (Whole group) Breakout Session: Working through the Processes to Achieve Mutually Successful Outcomes Report Out (What Can I Take Back to My Agency?) Questions and Interactive Discussion 	
2:45 – 3:00 PM	Break	
3:00 – 4:45 PM	Session 4 – Structuring Standard or Master Agreements to Meet State-Specific Requirements	Dave Solow, CH2M, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best Practices Given that States have Unique Requirements While Railroads often Span Numerous States (Suggested Topics to be covered in this section): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-State Coordination (RR) in a State-Specific Environment Sovereign Immunity Indemnification Working with Operators who are Not the Owners Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve Meyer, Utah Transit Authority, Scott Hoftiezer, CDOT Lisa Stern, Wisconsin DOT John Dinning, CN
4:45 – 5:00 PM	Wrap-up	Kate Kurgan, AASHTO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions Wrap Up Plan for Tomorrow’s Meeting 	
	<p>Adjourn – Optional Group Dinner at 6:00 p.m. Club Lago 331 W. Superior 312-951-6028 http://www.clublago.com/</p> <p>Gather in the lobby at 5:45 and we will arrange groups for Ubers/Taxis as it’s about a 5 minute trip and walkable back if desired.</p>	



Photos courtesy Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Department, Missouri DOT, Oregon DOT, and FHWA

SHRP2 Railroad-DOT Mitigation Strategies (R16) Peer Exchange Agenda October 3-4, 2017

This meeting is a facilitated discussion for a corps of peers and experts from lead DOTs and railroad industry to share experiences on various topics related to R16 technologies and their implementation

Day Two – Wednesday, October 4, 2017 Wyndham Grand Chicago Riverfront, Chicago, IL

Time	Agenda Topic	Speaker
8:30 – 8:45 AM	Recap of Day 1 - Agenda Overview	Jessica Rich, FHWA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap of Day 1 Agenda Review for Day 2 Questions and Interactive Discussion 	
8:45 – 9:45 AM	Session 5 – Section 130 Perspectives - Part 1	Kelly Morton, FHWA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal perspective of the Section 130 program Section 130 program, eligibility and funding Questions and interactive Discussion 	
9:45 – 10:15 AM	Break	
10:15 – 11:30 AM	Session 6 – Section 130 Perspectives - Part 2	Kamie Young, BNSF, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Railroad and State Agency Perspectives on Section 130 to Improve Maintenance and Safety Advancing Standardized Section 130 Agreements as a Method to Accelerate Project Implementation Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott Hoftiezer, CDOT Jim Weatherhead, MnDOT
11:30 AM – 1:00 PM	Lunch	
1:00 – 2:15 PM	Session 7 – Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency Program (CREATE) Panel Discussion	Mike Loehr, CH2M, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CREATE, a partnership between U.S. DOT, Illinois, Chicago, Metra, Amtrak, and the nation's freight railroads, will invest billions in critically needed improvements to increase the efficiency of the region's passenger and freight rail infrastructure and enhance the quality of life for Chicago-area residents. Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Samuel Tuck, Illinois DOT Jeff Sriver, Chicago Department of Transportation Elliot Ramos, Illinois DOT

Time	Agenda Topic	Speaker
2:15 – 2:30 PM	Break	
2:30 – 3:30 PM	Session 8 – The Effect of Implementing Design-Build and other Innovative Contracting Methods on Existing Agreements and Processes	Mike Loehr, CH2M, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on Timelines • Effect on Existing Relationships • New Contacts with Railroads • Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan Leonard, Pennsylvania DOT • Troy Creasy, CSX
3:30 – 4:00 PM	Session 9 – How the COI Can Benefit You	Pamela Hutton, AASHTO, Facilitator
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources You Can Use • Webinars • Learn Best Practices • Expand Knowledge Base • Strengthen Networks • Questions and Interactive Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Troy Creasy, CSX • Lisa Stern, Wisconsin DOT
4:00 – 4:15 PM	Wrap Up	Pam Hutton, AASHTO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions • Wrap Up • Next Steps 	
4:15 PM	Adjourn	

Appendix B – Participant Contact List

Name	Organization/ Agency	Job Title	Email Address	Phone Number
Randall S. Blankenhorn	Illinois Department of Transportation	Secretary		
John Althof	Montana DOT	Highway-Rail Safety Manager	jalthof@mt.gov	(406) 444-7247
Troy Creasy	CSX	Project Manager II	troy_creasy@csx.com	(804) 998-3262
John Dinning	CN	Manager of Public Works	john.dinning@cn.ca	(601) 914-2658
Carly Dutkiewicz	CH2M	Transportation Planner	carly.dutkiewicz@ch2m.com	(773) 458-2818
Frank Frey	FRA	General Engineer, High Speed Rail Division	frank.frey@fra.gov	(202) 493-0130
Jim Hatt	Oklahoma DOT, Rail Division	Assistant Division Manager	jhatt@odot.org	(405) 522-0287
Brandon Henning	Nevada DOT	Railroad Safety Program Coordinator	bhenning@dot.nv.gov	(775) 888-7333
Scott Hoftiezer	Colorado DOT	Railroad Program Manager	scott.hoftiezer@state.co.us	(303) 757-9541
Jason Holder	Indiana DOT	Manager of Railroad Services	jholder@indot.in.gov	(502) 851-3844
Derrick James	Amtrak	Director of Government Affairs	jamesde@amtrak.com	(312) 544-5118
Michael Jett	Indiana DOT	Director of Utilities and Railroad Division	mjett@indot.in.in.gov	(317) 408-9176
Steve Klinger	Norfolk Southern	Highway Crossing Signal Engineer	stephen.klinger@nscorp.com	(404) 529-1234
Kate Kurgan	AASHTO	Associate Program Manager, SHRP2	kkurgan@ashto.org	(202) 624-3635
Hal Lindsey	CH2M	R16 Project Manager	hal.lindsey@ch2m.com	(703) 673-8515

Name	Organization/ Agency	Job Title	Email Address	Phone Number
Michael Loehr	CH2M	Americas Transit and Rail Practice Leader – Civil Engineering	michael.loehr@ch2m.com	(570) 575-4692
Teresa McNamara	Caltrans	Railroad Coordinator	teresa.mcnamara@dot.ca.gov	(916) 654-6691
Steve Meyer	Utah Transit Authority	Capital Projects Director	smeyer@rideuta.com	(801) 236-4700
Kelly Morton	FHWA	Transportation Safety Specialist	kelly.morton@dot.gov	(602) 382-8976
Jessica Rich	FHWA - Tennessee	Safety Engineer	jessica.rich@dot.gov	(615) 781-5788
Richard Scott	BNSF	Manager of Public Projects	richard.scott2@bnsf.com	(763) 782-3492
David Solow	CH2M	Executive Advisor	david.solow@ch2m.com	(949) 202-8262
Mitch Sothers	Kansas DOT	Coordinating Engineer	mitch.sothers@ks.gov	(785) 296-3529
Jeff Sriver	Chicago DOT	Director of Transportation Planning Services	jeffrey.sriver@cityofchicago.org	(312) 744-7080
Lisa Stern	Wisconsin DOT	Railroad & Safety Engineering Supervisor	lisa.stern@dot.wi.gov	(608) 267-7349
Jo Strang	American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association	Vice President	jstrang@aslrra.org	(202) 585-3432
James Styron	North Dakota DOT	Rail Planner	jstyron@nd.gov	(701) 328-4409
French Thompson	BNSF	Director of Public Projects	french.thompson@bnsf.com	(817) 352-1549
Samuel Tuck	Illinois DOT	Bureau Chief of Freight Rail Management	samuel.tuck@illinois.gov	(312) 793-3940
Jim Weatherhead	Minnesota DOT	Rail Program Coordinator	jim.weatherhead@state.mn.us	(651) 366-3671
Jamie Winstead	Montana DOT	Utility Engineering Specialist	jwinstead@mt.gov	(406) 444-6078
Kamie Young	BNSF	Manager of Public Projects	kamalah.young@bnsf.com	(913) 551-4484

Appendix C – Evaluation Report Results

Summary of Evaluations of R16 Peer Exchange, held October 3 – 4, 2017

Fourteen evaluations were provided to staff following the two-day meeting. Of those who self-identified, one was from the Federal Railroad Administration, six were state departments of transportation (DOTs) and two railroads.

The following are some highlights of the feedback.

- The evaluators gave high marks to the overall peer exchange, with an average of 9.29 (with 10 as the highest rating) that it “met expectations” and 9.07 that it presented “clear information.”
- Seven out of 14 gave the peer exchange a “10” as “worthwhile”; however, one “7” (a state DOT representative) brought the overall score down to 9.29, which still represents very positive feedback from the participants.
- Evaluators rated the overall agenda content with an average 8.65 (with 10 as the highest rating). The highest rated session was on the combined Section 130 panels (sessions 5 and 6), with a rating of 9.36. The lowest was on the CREATE panel discussion (session 7) with 7.69.
- Most (8.38) felt the exchange was a benefit to their agency; and an average of 9.0 thought the format encouraged active participation. A similar number (8.21) found that the session helped them better understand model agreements.
- Comments regarding the “most important ideas” from the exchange generally focused on two issues – master agreements, mentioned by six of the respondents, and Section 130, also referenced by six.
- As to questions or issues not addressed, Section 130 was again mentioned. Respondents said they would like more discussion time on this topic, examples of hazard indices and how they are used by states, and funding. One respondent mentioned that the agenda “may have tried to cover too much.” Others mentioned ADA issues, having more breakout sessions at future peer exchanges, and the value of having examples of master, construction, and right-of-way agreements available during the meeting. (It was not clear whether some of the respondents knew about the Innovation Library and the availability of the agreements and other materials housed there.)
- Other suggestions for future topics included more on Section 130, pre-emptions and humped crossings; design-build contracts; and discussions on specific conflicts between railroads and DOTs and how they can be resolved.