

AASHTO SCOPM Task Force on
MAP-21 National Performance Measures

Target-Setting Workshop

John Barton, Texas DOT

Update: Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

Thursday, June 13, 2013

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

GOVERNANCE

- MAP-2I performance measure and target-setting rules should focus on federal objectives and state support of these objectives. The rules should be focused on the ability of states, using available federal funds, to deliver the desired results – not on how states manage their own programs that do not use federal funds.
 - States may choose to implement the MAP-2I performance requirements separately from the state performance management program. In some states, federal funds only support a small part of the overall budget. For these states separate performance management programs may be appropriate. In other states, the majority of the program is federally funded and state and federal goals and objectives may be the same.
 - The role of the forthcoming National Freight Network must be clarified.

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

GENERAL CONCERNS

- For the Freight, System Performance, and CMAQ areas, the performance measures are not mature and can be expected to be improved over time. Ideally the rules will allow for this – setting measures in stone too early could limit progress and ultimately the value of the performance measures
- Target setting has risks – an agency that doesn't meet the target they have established could face public criticism. There is also the possibility of unintended consequences, for example; the public could say “why is failure a reason to invest more \$\$\$” when not meeting a target?
- There is a need for good data and the time and staff to evaluate results versus target

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

PROVIDE MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY

- State should not be required to set targets in a uniform way
- Complement flexibility in target setting with transparency and accountability
- Allow flexibility for DOTs and MPOs to use a risk-based target-setting approach
- Allow states to approach target-setting for the entire set of national performance measures as a bundle. This may lead to having some targets get worse while others get better. This accommodates states that have tradeoff processes.
- Managing to a single target is difficult to do

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

PROVIDE MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY (CONTINUED)

- If a state wants to adjust targets dynamically (on an ongoing basis as conditions change), they should be allowed to do so.
- Would it be possible for states to use measures that are close but not exactly the same as the ones defined? This could be desirable mainly for the freight, system performance, and CMAQ measures.
- Consider allowing targets in the form of % change (slope or trend line rather than single number).

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

NEED FURTHER CLARIFICATION

- Target-setting is directly related to what goals and objectives have been established. Clearer guidance is needed on the federal goals and objectives for each of the performance areas.
- There are existing federal requirements that have some overlap with the national performance measure and target-setting requirements in MAP-21. Guidance is needed on the relationships across these overlapping federal requirements – for example:
 - Safety: NHTSA performance measure requirements
 - CMAQ: EPA air quality requirements
 - Freight: Long range plans and freight plans
- FHWA should provide further details on the definition of corridors, segments, and thresholds for the system performance and freight measures

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

NEED A RATIONAL SCHEDULE

- The time periods for the performance measure data collection, target-setting, assessment, and target-setting adjustments need to consider the varying processes each state has for these activities. Performance measures and targets are reported on the previous year's data. Two years later this reporting will result in an assessment of whether a state has met or not met its targets. If adjustments are needed to the targets based on this assessment, there may be lengthy processes to follow to adjust the target. When is the adjusted target reported - two years from the last reporting? When will the adjusted target be assessed? At the next biennial reporting? This may be only a year from the adjustment date.
- A mock case study of how this would work for a state would be helpful. Colorado may be a good state to use for this case study.

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

COMMUNICATION IS NEEDED NOW AND CONTINUOUSLY

- Based on the input provided in the surveys, it appears that there are varying degrees of understanding of MAP-2I and the schedule and processes for finalizing the rules.
 - Some people perceive MAP-2I performance measure requirements as broader than what is in the legislation.
 - Some people are not aware that FHWA is working on a contract with a private vendor to acquire truck and passenger movement data to support the system performance and freight measures.
- Regular webinars starting immediately may be helpful to keep people updated on MAP-2I facts and plans.
 - Webinars and resources on target-setting would be helpful

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

COMMUNICATION IS NEEDED NOW AND CONTINUOUSLY (CONTINUED)

- AASHTO communication activities should address
 - Concerns about what will happen if targets are missed.
 - Purpose of delving into target setting approaches prior to rulemaking, when measures are still speculative
- Different activities reach different audiences so use of multiple forums to communicate would be most effective.
- AASHTO and FHWA should continue to facilitate discussion amongst states

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

GUIDANCE AND TRAINING

- Process guidance is needed on:
 - Expected level of uniformity across states in target setting and reporting processes
 - Incentives and disincentives of target-setting. What is the incentive for setting stretch targets and the disincentive of setting low targets that are easy to meet?
 - Coordination of performance targeting across different MAP-21 performance areas

Key Cross-Cutting Issues and Recommendations

GUIDANCE AND TRAINING (CONTINUED)

- Technical guidance would be helpful on:
 - Target setting methods, covering establishment of trend lines, distinguishing normal statistical variations from actual changes; identifying performance measure relationships to factors such as weather, work zones, economic conditions, economic development, population, capacity, etc.
 - Present results in context of: funding, freight flow trends, population growth, weather, local jurisdiction action/inaction, customer survey results, assumptions vs. reality, etc.
 - Root cause analysis - several states noted in their survey responses that they would conduct “root cause” analysis to understand why targets were not met. This would involve delving into the reasons why the state did not accomplish what it thought it could do. Documented examples of these analyses for different performance areas would be of value.
- AASHTO and FHWA should establish clearinghouse for information exchange and/or information on best practices.
- Trainings should be ready to be delivered when rules are finalized