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Background of the Scan

- US Congress is considering a performance management approach for Federal transportation programs and their grant recipients
- State DOTs, transit agencies and MPOs held more accountable
- Performance *Measurement* vs. Performance *Management*
- Leveraging the experience in Sweden, the UK, Australia and New Zealand who use performance management for surface transportation programs
Purpose of the Scan

- Seek examples
- Effectively set performance measures
- Investigate performance tied to budgets
- Learn to demonstrate accountability through performance measures
- Leverage their learning curve
Final Report
Where We Went

- The Swedish Road Administration
- The British Department for Transport
- The New South Wales Road and Traffic Administration in Sydney, Australia
- The Victoria Department of Transport and Vic Roads in Melbourne, Australia
- The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads in Brisbane, Australia
- The New Zealand Transport Agency
Scan Team Members

State DOT

- Carlos Braceras, Scan Co-Chair and Deputy Director, Utah State DOT
- Daniela Bremmer, Director, Strategic Assessment, Washington State DOT
- Leon Hank, Chief Administrative Officer, Michigan State DOT

Federal Highways and Federal Transit

- Robert Tally, Jr., Scan Co-Chair and Indiana Division Administrator, FHWA
- Jim March, Acting Director Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA
- Kristine Leiphart, Deputy Associate Administrator, FTA
- Connie P. Yew, Stewardship/Oversight Team Leader, Office of Infrastructure, FHWA
- J. Woody Stanley, Team Leader Strategic Initiatives Team

Local/MPO

- Jane Hayse, Chief Transportation Planning Division, Atlanta Regional Commission

AASHTO

- Tony Kane, Director Engineering and Technical Services, AASHTO

Private Sector

- Steven Pickrell, Senior Vice President, Cambridge Systematics

Other

- Jenne Van der Velde, Strategic Advisor, Public Works and Water Management, Dutch Ministry of Transport

Scan Logistics/Recorder

- Jake Almborg, American Trade Initiatives
- Gordon Proctor, Report Facilitator
Observations

- Clearly ingrained national goals into performance management systems
- Broad national goals vs. specific targets
- Budgets and targets were not linked
  - Ambitious national visions spurred investment
- Constant reporting & iterative improvement
Considerations

- High-level transportation policy goals
  - With a few, clearly articulated, measures and targets
- Collaborate with transportation agencies
  - Negotiate local targets which implement the national goals and measures
- Clearly track, measure and report performance
- Emphasize incentives, instead of penalties
- Understand that the true benefit of performance management is achieving long term improvement to the decision and investment process
Considerations

- The major policy goals were remarkably consistent
  - Safety
  - System preservation
  - Economic growth
  - Environmental sustainability
  - System operations (*congestion and trip reliability*).

- Asset management was strong
Considerations

- Less is more, in terms of measures
  - Evolution: many measures to fewer
  - Agencies have extensive metrics, but few targets are required by the central government (e.g. safety and greenhouse gases)
Considerations

- ‘Do it with people, not to them’
  - Performance targets are negotiated, not imposed
  - Metrics are benchmarks for continuous improvement vs. milestones for penalty
  - Performance agreements across agencies are common
  - Managing to short term targets can compromise progress toward long-term goals
Considerations

- Metrics are translated into personal terms
  - ‘The Journey Home’
  - ‘We Are Community Builders’
  - ‘We are a travel agency’
  - ‘Support for the Journey’
  - Support for ‘Active Travel’ of walking, cycling
Considerations

- **PM takes time**
  - Agencies had systems for more than a decade
  - PM is long-term, iterative process

- **Important outcomes difficult to measure**
  - Environment, economy, quality of life measures are elusive

- **Candor can earn criticism**
  - Media, politics can exploit candid reporting
Considerations

- Continuous communication between agencies, ministries and parliament
- Service Level Agreements & other forms of negotiations
- On-going reporting and communication
In other words….

Less is more
Do it together
Use compelling language
Carrots instead of sticks
Not a black box
Main Implementation Audiences

- Key federal, state and local policymakers
  - Including the US Congress
- State DOTs, local government and MPO’s
  - Transport leaders and operators
- Performance Management professionals and researchers
Top 10 Implementation Priorities

1. Brief Congressional Staff
   House—done
   H and S—after the final report is printed

2. Conduct DOT CEO Workshop(s)
   Oct 2009
   Feb 2010
   TBD

3. Present scan findings to other key stakeholder groups
   TRB, Universities, USDOT, OMB, GAO
   AASHTO, AMPO, NACE, APWA, APTA, etc.
Top 10 Implementation Priorities

4. Develop illustrative ways to present performance information
   NCHRP 20-24 (37 F&G )

5. Develop a performance management website
   NCHRP 20-24 (37 F ) plus new solicitation of the state DOTS

6. Conduct peer reviews on performance management
Top 10 Implementation Priorities

7. Evaluate comparative safety, and greenhouse gas emission efforts from Australia and Europe
   White paper developed – in review

8. Synthesize best practices in benefit-cost analysis from abroad
   FHWA and other contract resources

9. Case study report on the use of British public service agreements
   FHWA and other contract resources
Top 10 Implementation Priorities

10. Development of an R&D performance management road map (e.g.)

10.1 Document Australian risk management practices
10.2 Develop guidance for measuring sustainability and livability
10.3 Performance Management Leadership Module
10.4 Etc.

(NCHRP 20-24 (75)—panel to be named)
Questions

www.international.fhwa.dot.gov/pubs/pl10011/p10011.pdf