

AASHTO SCOPM Task Force on
MAP-21 National Performance Measures

Target-Setting Workshop

Mara Campbell, Missouri DOT
Rachel Falsetti, Caltrans

CMAQ Performance Measure Area

Thursday, June 13, 2013

CMAQ Participants



- Floyd Roehrich, Arizona DOT
- Jessie Jones, Arkansas DOT
- Muhaned Aljabiry, California DOT
- Rachel Falsetti, California DOT
- Sandi Kohrs, Colorado DOT
- Sabrina Williams, Colorado DOT
- Colleen Kissane, Connecticut DOT
- Phil Peevey, Georgia DOT
- Jerry Casey, Maine DOT
- Nate Howard, Maine DOT
- Howard Simons, Maryland DOT
- Paul Fernandes, Massachusetts DOT
- Pat Bursaw, Minnesota DOT
- Mike Henderson, Missouri DOT
- Christa Ippoliti, New York State DOT
- Patrick Lentlie, New York State DOT
- Alan Warde, New York State DOT
- Lynn Weiskopf, New York State DOT
- Michelle Conkle, Texas DOT
- Jack Foster, Texas DOT
- Jim Ponticello, Virginia DOT
- Tim Sexton, Washington State DOT

CMAQ Participants



- Todd Lang, Baltimore Metropolitan Council
- Ross McKeown, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Dave Vautin, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Craig Goldblatt, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Harold Brazil, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Christie Gotti, North Central Texas Council of Governments
- Matt Hardy, AASHTO
- Jennifer Brickett, AASHTO

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



GENERAL CONCERNS

- Lack of consistent processes established for modeling impacts, especially delay
- Concern that targets could drive suboptimal project selection
- CMAQ-eligible projects may not be the best projects to improve performance
- Concern that approach may systematically favor some jurisdictions in project selection, undermining equitable distribution
- Need to recognize differences between areas that already have low emissions and little congestion and areas with substantial air quality and congestion issues
 - For some areas, a target to “maintain” or even get worse could be justified in order to achieve other objectives

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



PROGRAM PERFORMANCE VERSUS SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

- MAP-2I requirements may not favor use of CMAQ funds to address highly localized problems

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



MEASURE DEFINITION

- Need more precise definition for the measures
- AASHTO's proposed measure is not aligned with current reporting process.
- Concern with use of 2009 non-attainment timeframe, particularly for states that have made gains over last four years.
- Some concerns with basing MAP-2I measures on the annual CMAQ report; set of projects that the report considers is different than the set of projects adopted that year

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



MEASURE DEFINITION (CONTINUED)

- Consider reporting hours of delay per capita rather than total
- For emissions, use kg/day for consistency with FHWA database
- FHWA travel time data – provide for small sections that can be aggregated

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



GUIDANCE AND TRAINING NEEDS

- Current CMAQ project models focus on emissions reduction, not delay; many CMAQ projects don't impact delay. Provide examples of calculation methodologies.
- Guidance needs to address emissions and delay impact assessment for a range of project types
- Need guidance on data source and method for setting a baseline/ redefinition of baseline
 - Need for use of regional emissions and delay from models or would targets be based on estimated reductions from CMAQ projects, independent of a baseline value?
 - Annual reductions estimated from funded CMAQ projects or averaged over multiple years to smooth out variations?

CMAQ Issues and Recommendations



BEST PRACTICES SHARING

- New York has a model for project analysis tool (explore whether useful for others)