

AASHTO SCOPM Task Force on
MAP-21 National Performance Measures

Target-Setting Workshop

Gregg Fredrick, Wyoming DOT
Tim Gatz, Oklahoma DOT

Bridge Performance Measure Area

Thursday, June 13, 2013

Bridge Participants



- Jean Nehme, Arizona DOT
- Floyd Roehrich, Arizona DOT
- Barton Newton, Caltrans
- Joshua Laipply, Colorado DOT
- Scott Richrath, Colorado DOT
- Colleen Kissane, Connecticut DOT
- Matt Farrar, Idaho DOT
- Chip Getchell, Maine DOT
- Paul Fernandes, Massachusetts DOT
- Rebecca Curtis, Michigan DOT
- Dave Juntunen, Michigan DOT
- Scott Zainhofsky, North Dakota DOT
- Tim Gatz, Oklahoma DOT
- Bruce Johnson, Oregon DOT
- Greg Freeby, Texas DOT
- Paul Cortez, Wyoming DOT
- Gregg Fredrick, Wyoming DOT
- Matt Hardy, AASHTO
- Kelley Rehm, AASHTO

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



GENERAL CONCERNS

- Resolution of input from Subcommittee on Bridges and Structures on changing the Good/Fair/Poor measure to one based on maintenance, repair and rehabilitation need category: Cyclical Maintenance (CM), Preventive Maintenance (PM), and Replacement/Rehabilitation (RR)
- Concern with definition and implications of expanded NHS - some owners of expanded NHS facilities don't want to be on new NHS and are attempting to change functional classification.
- Concern with use of deck area weighting – implications for smaller bridges
- End of calendar year reporting is not good for bridges – prefer reporting in April right after NBI data submittal

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



GENERAL CONCERNS (CONTINUED)

- Targets need to be set in the context of a budget/funding amount for NHS and Non-NHS
- Concern that necessary actions not captured by the performance measure may be deferred (e.g. addressing seismic issues)
- Cannot manage to a single target – target-setting is a multi-objective process, and States have many targets/objectives that must be balanced
- Concern with potential for inconsistent interpretations of performance data
- Need to assure the public that bridges below a target or labeled Deficient are still safe

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



MEASURE DEFINITION

- Definition of the CM, PM, RR measure still being clarified – expecting further input from Subcommittee on Bridges and Structures.
- Seeking greater flexibility in measure definition (i.e. trend targets vs. single-number targets)
- Concern that SD measure is not aligned with current bridge management practices and could result in a worst first strategy
- Concern that focus on SD target will drive sub-optimal project selection

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



MEASURE DEFINITION (CONTINUED)

- Concern about inconsistency of SD measure with risk-based asset management plan requirements – need measures to address safety and risk as well as condition
- Need to address the time required to initiate and complete a project that will have impact on the measure. Most projects cannot be initiated and completed within three year timeframe (inspection, programming, design, construction)

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



GUIDANCE AND TRAINING NEEDS

- Offer guidance on how other states are incorporating off-system bridges into target-setting
- Guidance should emphasize that the criteria for prioritization does NOT have to match the performance measure
- Advocate/provide for funding to help maintain target conditions for off-system NHS bridges
- FHWA/AASHTO should provide more support on how to use analytical tools like AASHTOWare BrM for target-setting
- Provide training on bridge-preservation policy

Bridge Issues and Recommendations



BEST PRACTICE SHARING

- Would like successful examples of bridge target-setting approaches (What is being optimized?)
- Would like to have a mechanism for comparing targets to those of peer states
- Note: North Dakota has an asset tradeoff model to produce targets (explore whether useful for others)