



Instructions

1. Introduction – Safety

The goal of this exercise is to delve deeply into the process of national performance measures target-setting and identify the issues that states will encounter in their effort to meet MAP-21 requirements. Each working group will need to take the range of issues identified, synthesize these issues into an AASHTO perspective for all states, and then suggest recommendations to consider for the SCOPM Task Force. These recommendations will be the focus of the discussion at the workshop on June 13th to identify recommendations to FHWA and actions that AASHTO and other partners can take to prepare for MAP-21 target-setting requirements.

1.1. Exercise Assumptions

For the purposes of this exercise, we will assume that all of the recommendations of the SCOPM Task Force have been adopted in the rulemaking. These are the measures recommended in November 2012 and the further target-setting recommendations from March 2013. The timeframes for when the first reporting is delivered and the first monitoring is conducted are included in this package (Reporting Timeline). This reflects the current understanding of the requirements. However, these dates may change once the rules are released.

1.1.1. Measure Recommendations

- **Number of Fatalities**—Five-year moving average of the count of the number of fatalities on all public roads for a calendar year.
- **Fatality Rate**—Five-year moving average of the Number of Fatalities divided by the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for a calendar year.
- **Number of Serious Injuries**—Five-year moving average of the count of the number of serious injuries on all public roads for a calendar year.
- **Serious Injury Rate**—Five-year moving average of the Number of Serious Injuries divided by the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for a calendar year.

See the Background Resources document for more information.

1.1.2. Target-Setting Recommendations

- AASHTO supports state flexibility in the setting of targets; as provided in MAP-21.

- In terms of assessing progress towards targets established by the states, it is recommended that state-set targets be based on a 3- to 5-year projection of the five-year moving average data. Annual reports would demonstrate progress using these projections. Targets should be evaluated every two years. For example, in 2015 a 3-year (or 5-year) target is set for 2018 (or 2020). In 2017, FHWA assesses whether progress has been made toward the 2018 (or 2020) target based on what the five-year moving average is in 2017.
- Further, it is recommended that any USDOT progress assessments take into account unique characteristics of a state's situation that would affect their ability to meet some targets and not others. For example, dramatic changes in VMT may affect a state's ability to meet both of the rate-based measures, but not the count-based measures (and vice-versa). Therefore, USDOT needs to consider these situations when assessing progress towards targets. After considering these unique situations, for a state to be penalized it should fail to meet at least two of its targets. For example, if a state misses one target, such as serious injuries per VMT, it should not have the same effect as if all four targets had not been met. Similarly, if a state has been a historically high performer, it should not be penalized for failing to meet an aggressive target this first time.
- As part of a NHTSA initiative, many local and statewide law enforcement agencies are adopting the use of e-citation and e-crash reporting. This change is increasing the data reporting which is helpful when making law enforcement decisions to be data driven. However an unintended consequence will impact states/territories when it comes to the Special Rules under the MAP-21's language for the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (page 55). With added data, the current number of serious injury crashes has increased (and will increase for other jurisdictions converting to e-crash reporting). The MAP-21 expectation is to reduce serious injury crashes yet the baseline data in many states/territories will be rising. The program guidance should be built to allow states/territories the ability to explain how or if a movement to e-reporting has influenced their crash data file. This does not impact the FARS system, as that data base already contains all of the data on fatal crashes.
- Since the determination of whether states are meeting requirements of the special rules [for older drivers, pedestrians and rural roads] could occur before evaluation of whether states are making significant progress toward their general safety targets, the special rules test should be deferred until the overall targets are evaluated.
- The requirements and penalties for these special rules should be based on progress a state is making toward its required targets for the four performance measures.
 - For example, if a state is making significant progress toward its performance targets, then the state should not be subject to the considerations mandated in law if the older road user fatality and serious injury rate per capita increases in a two-year period.

- Also states meeting their overall targets, but not experiencing a decrease in the rural fatality rates, should not be required to obligate the FY2009 amount of high risk rural road program funds for rural high risk roads.

1.2. Exercise Process

A working group for each performance area has been formed, representing a range of states in AASHTO's membership. The current list of members is attached.

There will be two calls scheduled for the working group – kickoff call on May 21st and a second call June 7th. Most of the work will be done offline and circulated via email.

- Exercise package sent to working group
- Kick-off conference call (May 21st at 2:30PM EST)
- Surveys filled out
- Conference call to determine recommendations (June 7th at 11:30AM EST)
- Draft recommendations produced and circulated to the working group
- Finalize recommendations to be used at the workshop on June 13th

1.3. Exercise Background Resources

A collection of all relevant materials for this exercise has been compiled and included in the Exercise Package. It includes the following:

- General Target-Setting Recommendations
- Performance Area Specific Recommendation
- Appendix with Additional Resources

1.4. Exercise Support

Spy Pond Partners staff are available to support you with this exercise. They will participate in all calls and will support the co-chairs of each performance measure area in any way that is needed.

Contact Hyun-A Park (hpark@spypondpartners.com or 617-500-4857) or Perry Lubin (plubin@spypondpartners.com or 617-909-7197).

2. Exercise Package

The package will be sent to the working group on Friday, May 17th to review before the kickoff call. It will include:

- Instructions
- Survey document and link to online survey

- Example Reporting Template
- Reporting Timeline
- Exercise Background Resources

3. Kickoff Call

A kickoff call will be held on May 21st and the agenda will include the following topics:

- Exercise Overview
- Survey Step
- Recommendations Development Conference Call
- Final Products of Exercise
- Schedule

4. Survey

Each member of the working group will complete a two-part survey. The first part asks questions regarding their readiness for developing national performance measures and targets and the process they will use. The second part asks what the state will do after the first monitoring period when they either exceed, meet, or do not meet their targets. The working group can choose to ask additional states, not involved on the working group, to fill out the survey.

After the surveys are completed, the consultants will synthesize the survey results for the committee to use at the conference call. The co-chairs will use this document to draft a list of candidate recommendations prior to the conference call.

5. Conference Call

The working group will take the material generated from the survey results and determine the recommendations for their performance area. The goal of the call is to agree on the general set of recommendations.

6. Recommendations

Draft and final recommendations will be produced using email to get input. The co-chairs can determine if another call is needed.

7. Post Workshop

A summary of the workshop will be distributed to the working group. A decision will be made after the workshop on whether further activities are needed.