



## Notice of Meeting

Date/Time: Tuesday, May 21, 2019, at 10:30 a.m.

Location: Lake Michigan Room, MDOT Horatio S. Earle Learning Center, 7575 Crowner, Lansing, MI

1. Call to Order

Mr. Bruff called the meeting to order at 10:40 am.

2. Introductions

Introductions were made.

3. Changes or Additions to the Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

4. Approval of the April 2019 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Bolanowska made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, supported by Mr. Stepek. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Treasurer's Report

Ms. Lindsay Wallace reported that the balance had not changed from last month of \$23,060.

6. FHWA Update

Ms. Andrea Dewey reported that there are no self certification forms for MPOs from FHWA. The federal regulations are the best source of information in what is needed for this process.. Mr. Bruff asked that Ms. Dewey send a common source of information for the MPOs.

Ms. Dewey noted that the transportation performance measures deadline was May 20. FHWA has said that this information should be on each MPO website. Ms. Pat Karr asked if MDOT will be sending the TPM information to FHWA and FTA. Mr. Lanum said that yes, they will be sending the information to the federal government.

Ms. Dewey noted that the TIP fiscal constraint table should be included in the appendix. The TIP constraint table is generated by JobNet, and this information is different than the information in the fiscal constraint TIP chapter. Mr. Bruff said that the JobNet Policy Committee needs to be resurrected to discuss critical issues like this, and how the financial information in JobNet is not statics. Ms. Dewey agreed, noting that FHWA supports having a policy-level JobNet committee, and would like to participate.



7. MTPA Conference Update

Ms. Andrea Strach reminded attendees that early bird pricing for the July MTPA conference has been extended to May 24. There are 70 full conference paid registrations, and approximately 15 individual day registrations per day at this time. She has received three registrations for the student poster presentation. The rules and link for the poster presentation has been posted on the conference website. MDOT has registered its participants. Invoices to agencies for the conference will start going out around June 1, and subsequent invoices will go out periodically thereafter. Nomination for MTPA awards are still open, and will close in early June. There are 42 attendees for Tuesday's FHWA session. Please consider registering for the conference by the first week of July.

8. Asset Management Council (TAMC) Update

Mr. Stepek reported that TAMC is reminding MPOs and their local agencies to spend the money they have budgeted for 2019 PASER data collection by rating your federal and local roads.

9. MDOT Update

A. TPM Update

Mr. Lanum reminded MPOs to update their websites with transportation performance measures information. He also noted that he personally reviewed almost all TPM updates and provided comments to the MPOs that needed to edit the deliverables. Overall, the updates met the regulations, and looked good. Mr. Lanum said that he will be providing them to FHWA and FTA to ensure that all Michigan MPOs meet the federal deadline. The transportation performance measure information in the 2020 – 2023 TIP should be very much the same.

This afternoon there is a meeting to talk about MIRE data, and the new 2020 Safety Targets. MDOT will officially approve the safety targets on August 30, 2019. MPOs have until the end of February 2020 to approve the safety targets or create their own.

Mr. Bruff asked what is MDOT and what are the MPOs doing to address the safety measures? Are there aspects of this information that are being included in project applications, ranking or scoring projects? He went on to share that SEMCOG is part of an AMPO PM working group, and discussions have continued to share and discuss as a part of the national committee. The FHWA has an invitation-only workshop in Chicago in June, and the results of this would be included in a future MTPA meeting.

B. State Long Range Plan update

Mr. Mullen reported, on behalf of Mr. Brad Sharlow, on the State Long Range plan. The plan is moving toward completion of Phase 1, and beginning of Phase 2. There will be half day works on May 29<sup>th</sup> and June 11<sup>th</sup> at the Aeronautics building. The May 29<sup>th</sup> workshop will be to share the results of the public/stakeholder engagement. The June 11<sup>th</sup> workshop will be to develop the plan's vision statement, the values that support the vision, and high level goals. All MTPA members who were involved in Phase



1 are welcome to attend both workshops. If people are interested in attending, please contact Brad Sharlow or Kyle Haller. Trevor Brydon and Carolyn Ulstad have been asked to represent the MPOs as members of key stakeholder groups for Phase 2. They will represent the TMAs and the small MPOs.

The finalization of plan vision and goals will be approved by State Transportation Commission on July 18, 2019. The baseline inventory of model infrastructure, and development of baseline performance on the draft performance measures will be forthcoming. Following that, the development of revenue forecast scenarios will occur. Also note that the New Statewide Plan for Active Transportation (non-motorized, bicycle/pedestrian), will be add along with Freight/Rail Plans. Integrating goals and objectives from Michigan Airport System Plan (MASP) into MM2045, and working with MDOT-Aeronautics to update MASP accordingly.

c. Local Agency Program Update

Mr. Mullen is asking for a special effort by MPOs to address a specific request from Local Agency Programs. In a few Local Agency Program jobs, assets aren't matching description. Boulevards, highways, and other infrastructure with jobs on both sides of the road must both sides selected/highlighted for JobNet. Please make sure that the whole geography/asset is included. If it is not, this will hold up a project from moving forward.

10. Other Business

Mr. Bruff noted that the air quality training is rescheduled for June 25 & 26. SEMCOG is working with FHWA to plan a reliability workshop that is scheduled for August 27 & 28 9-3:30 at Horatio Earle Center. SEMCOG would like the workshop to focus on Michigan topics and issues. Ms. Dewey noted that FHWA will be sending more information on PELL training that will be occurring.

Ms. Susan Weber noted that FTA has a \$15 M innovation mobility management for Transit and a FTA \$423M for bus and bus facility program.

11. Adjournment for Lunch

Mr. Bruff adjourned the meeting at 11:35 am. A MDOT afternoon session will begin at 1:00 pm.



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

Meeting Attendance Tuesday, May 21, 2019 at 10:30 a.m.

Name	Organization
Pat Karr	Battle Creek MPO
Carolyn Ulstad	MACC
Heidi Phaneuf	MDOT
Nick Sapkiewicz	WATS
Don Mayle	MDOT
Lindsay Wallace	SCCOTS
Laurel Joseph	GVMC
Maja Bolanowska	Midland MPO
John Lanum	MDOT
Tanya DeOliveira	R2PC
Tom Bruff	SEMCOG
Andrea Strach	TCRPC
Eric Mullen	MDOT
Andrea Faber	GVMC
Jay Anderson	Bay City MPO
Jim Snell	TCRPC
Kim Gallagher	SWMPC
Brian Stark	Saginaw MPO
Kim Johnson	MDOT
Jim Sturdevant	MDOT

---

a voluntary association of public organizations and agencies responsible for the administration of transportation planning activities throughout the State of Michigan



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

---

Andrea Dewey	FHWA
Aaron Dawson	FHWA
Steve Stepek	KATS
Ryan Buck	WATA
Jenya Abramourh	SEMCOG
Tom Doyle	MDOT
Jeff Franklin	MDOT
Susan Weber	FTA

---

a voluntary association of public  
organizations and agencies responsible for the administration of  
transportation planning activities throughout the State of Michigan

# Transportation Performance Management (TPM) and Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) Implementation Workshop for the Midwest Region

Sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration

## DRAFT AGENDA

**Ralph H. Metcalfe Federal Building  
77 West Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL 60604  
June 18-20, 2019**

**Purpose Statement:** The purpose of this workshop, led by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), is to allow for peer-to-peer and information sharing on implementation of Transportation Performance Management (TPM) and Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) requirements from the Moving Ahead in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).

(Afternoon Before Day 1) – Tuesday, June 18, 2019	
TIME	SESSION
2:00 – 2:30 PM	<b>Check-in and Registration</b>
2:30 – 4:30 PM	<b>Federal Staff Only Session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening remarks by FHWA/FTA representative(s) (HQ and Division and/or Region leadership)</li> <li>Provide overview of workshop and relevant TPM-PBPP tools and resources.</li> <li>FHWA Division and FTA Region Staff moderated Q&amp;A and open discussion on TPM and PBPP implementation challenges and needs.</li> </ul>
TBD	<b>Networking Opportunity (to be announced)</b>

DAY 1 – Wednesday, June 19, 2019	
TIME	SESSION
8:00 – 8:30 AM	<b>Check-in and Registration</b>
8:30 – 8:45 AM	<b>Opening Remarks and Welcome</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening remarks by FHWA/FTA representative(s) (HQ and Division and/or Region leadership)</li> <li>Welcome provided by local host agency (e.g., State DOT/MPO/transit agency)</li> </ul>
8:45 – 9:15 AM	<b>Overview of the Workshop and Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review workshop agenda and learning objectives for Day One</li> <li>Audience Introductions                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants complete short worksheet that will be used throughout day’s discussions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Small group discussions among participants to introduce themselves and discuss worksheet responses</li> </ul>
<b>9:15 – 10:45 AM</b>	<p><b>Peer Perspectives on Implementing TPM and PBPP: <i>Coordination and Collaboration (Focus on Developing Written Provisions)</i></b>  <i>Discussion on how State DOTs, MPO's and Transit Operators are coordinating to develop written provisions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer Panel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2-3 presentations by State DOT/MPO/transit operators in the region (possibly State DOT/MPO pair from the same State)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Facilitated Q&amp;A and Open Discussion</li> </ul>
<b>10:45 – 11:00 AM</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>11:00 AM – 12:30 PM</b>	<p><b>Small Group Discussions: <i>Integrating TPM and PBPP into TIPs, STIPs, LRSTPs and MTPs</i></b>  <i>Explore how State DOTs, MPO's and Transit Operators are incorporating TPM and PBPP requirements into TIPs/STIPs/LRSTPs/MTPs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitated discussion for participants to collaborate in small groups</li> <li>• Report-outs from small groups</li> </ul>
<b>12:30 – 1:30 PM</b>	<b>LUNCH (on your own)</b>
<b>1:30 PM – 3:00 PM</b>	<p><b>Peer Perspectives on Implementing TPM and PBPP: <i>Target Setting Coordination and Collaboration</i></b>  <i>Discussion on how State DOT's, MPO's and Transit Operators are setting targets, factors that influence target setting and coordination during the target setting process.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer Panel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2-3 presentations by State DOT/MPO/transit operators in the region</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Facilitated Q&amp;A and Open Discussion</li> </ul>
<b>3:00 – 3:15 PM</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>3:15 PM – 4:15 PM</b>	<p><b>Small Group Discussions: <i>Monitoring and Reporting</i></b>  <i>Examine how State DOTs, MPO's, and Transit Operators are monitoring performance, showing progress to meet targets and adjusting targets.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitated discussion for participants to collaborate in small groups</li> <li>• Report-outs from small groups</li> </ul>
<b>4:15 – 4:45 PM</b>	<p><b>Town Hall Q&amp;A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q&amp;A session for questions and feedback</li> </ul>
<b>4:45 – 5:00 PM</b>	<b>Wrap-up / Adjourn for the Day</b>
<b>TBD</b>	<b>Networking Opportunity (to be announced)</b>

**DAY 2 – Thursday, June 20, 2019**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>SESSION</b>
<b>8:00 – 8:15 AM</b>	<b>Check-in</b>
<b>8:15 – 8:30 AM</b>	<b>Welcome and Recap</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overview of Day Two agenda and summary of Day One discussions and themes</li></ul>
<b>8:30 – 10:00 AM</b>	<b>Peer Perspectives on Implementing TPM and PBPP: <i>System Performance Reports</i></b> <p><i>Identify how State DOT's, MPO's and Transit Operators are developing system performance reports.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Peer Panel<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <i>2-3 presentations by State DOT/MPO/transit operators in the region</i></li></ul></li><li>• Facilitated Q&amp;A and Open Discussion</li></ul>
<b>10:00 – 10:15 AM</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>10:15 AM – 11:15 AM</b>	<b>Small Group Discussions: <i>Telling the TPM Story</i></b> <p><i>Discussion on effectively communicating the value-add of TPM to the public, elected officials, MPO boards, and other stakeholders.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interactive Exercise<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <i>Creating a Communications Strategy</i></li></ul></li><li>• Facilitated Q&amp;A and Open Discussion</li></ul>
<b>11:15 – 11:45 AM</b>	<b>Town Hall Q&amp;A</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Q&amp;A session for questions and feedback</li></ul>
<b>11:45 AM – 12:00 PM</b>	<b>Closing Remarks</b>





ASSOCIATION OF  
METROPOLITAN  
PLANNING  
ORGANIZATIONS

*AMPO Performance-based Planning and Programming  
Working Group Agenda*

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
444 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
June 11-12, 2019

**June 11 (8:30am-4:30pm)**

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| 8:15 AM  | ARRIVAL   |
| 8:30 AM  | Welcome and Introductions   |
| 8:45 AM  | Safety Targets in your Region (see attached discussion questions)   |
| 10:15 AM | BREAK   |
| 10:30 AM | Review of Safety Survey Results   |
| 11:00 AM | Roundtable Discussion – Challenges, Gaps, and Needed Resources  |
| 12:30 PM | LUNCH   |
| 1:30 PM  | Roundtable Discussion – Identifying Notable Safety Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Case Studies</li><li>- Guidebooks</li><li>- Tools and Templates</li><li>- Communication Performance Measures</li></ul> |
| 3:00 PM  | BREAK   |
| 3:15 PM  | Roundtable Discussion – Recommendations for Success <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Administrative versus Legislative</li><li>- Action items for FHWA, AMPO, AASHTO, APTA</li></ul>                                 |
| 4:30 PM  | ADJOURN   |

**June 12 (8:30am-11:30am)**

- 8:30 AM            Recap of Previous Day
- 8:45 AM            Refine Discussion and Frame Safety Whitepaper
- Current State of the Practice
  - Overview of Safety Survey Results
  - Challenges, Gaps, and Needed Resources
  - Notable Practices
  - Recommendations for Success
- 10:15 AM            BREAK
- 10:30 AM            Roundtable Discussion – Bridge and Pavement
- Context setting and framing for next meeting
- 11:15 AM            Wrap-Up and Next Steps
- 11:30 AM            ADJOURN

DRAFT



ASSOCIATION OF  
METROPOLITAN  
PLANNING  
ORGANIZATIONS

*AMPO Performance-based Planning and Programming Working Group  
Meeting Summary*

Atlanta Regional Commission  
229 Peachtree Street, Suite 100  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
December 12-13, 2018

*Attendees*

Tameka Macon, Federal Highway Administration  
Bill Keyrouze, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
Rachel Roper, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
David D'Onofrio, Atlanta Regional Commission  
Kyung-Hwa Kim, Atlanta Regional Commission  
Shayna Pollock, Atlanta Regional Commission  
Kofi Wakhisi, Atlanta Regional Commission  
Todd Lang, Baltimore Metropolitan Council  
Michelle Scott, Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Bob Cook, Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization  
Simone Weil, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
Felix Nwoko, Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Peter Koeppel, East West Gateway Council of Governments  
Jamie Fischer, Georgia Regional Transportation Authority  
Parker Martin, Georgia Regional Transportation Authority  
Saleem Salameh, KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission  
Monique de los Rios-Urban, Maricopa Association of Governments  
Nick Lepp, MetroPlan Orlando  
Martin Rivarola, Mid-America Regional Council  
Natalie Bettger, North Central Texas Council of Governments  
Scott Tillman, Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham  
Michael Kaczorowski, Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham  
Chris Evilia, Waco Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Matthew Gaskin, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (online)  
Andrew Meese, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (online)  
Dan Blevins, Wilmington Area Planning Council (online)

**December 12, 2018:**

*Welcome and Introduction to Next Round of Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization (AMPO) Performance-based Planning and Programming (PBPP) Working Group Meetings*

Bill Keyrouze welcomed everyone to the first of the new round of meetings for the AMPO PBPP Working Group.

Kyung-Hwa Kim welcomed the working group on behalf of the Atlanta Regional Commission.

Bill covered logistics and asked the group to do roundtable introductions.

*Introductions and First Impressions of How PBPP is Working in Your Region*

Bill asked the group to share their first impressions of how PBPP is working in their regions.

The Maricopa Association of Governments shared that the target setting process helped build strong relationships with their partner agencies especially at the technical level. They found the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) resources helpful. MAP-21 and the FAST Act helped establish a framework for where the data is coming from and the roles and responsibilities for carrying out performance management. Deciding between aspirational and data driven targets was one of the biggest challenges. Data driven targets were ultimately chosen. Data from the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS), HERE, and INRIX was used. Within the data, they built in a cone of uncertainty that created a buffer above and below the future data points based on factors such as climate change and the economy. Data analysis was done using the CATT Lab's Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) tool. This process required some back and forth for quality control and to make refinements and adjustments. No data is perfect.

The next step was incorporating performance management into project selection in order to meet the targets. To do this, they implemented a transparent performance-based tool for project evaluation. Staff are able to adjust the weighting of the evaluation based on priorities. They fill out the criteria with the project sponsor.

The Mid-America Regional Council shared that they discussed both aspirational and data driven targets, but ended up choosing a middle ground. Communicating the targets and data was identified as a challenge.

MetroPlan Orlando supported the state target for safety, but developed their own for the other measures. Their State Department of Transportation (State DOT) will provide the data for measures if MPOs support the state target. They communicate well with their State DOT. Equity was identified as a challenge as they program investments to meet the regional target, but must also consider what's best for each county. Data is also a challenge.

Tameka Macon and Bill shared that the FHWA Office of Transportation Performance Management is interested in identifying metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) who have set their own targets. A survey on performance management was sent out by the FHWA earlier in the week and will be sent via the AMPO distribution list as well.

Chris Evilia who is the volunteer executive director for the Texas Association of MPOs as well as the Waco MPO shared that target setting was a learning process. He identified communicating the

targets—especially the travel time reliability target—to the public and their policy boards as a challenge. He added that it can also be challenging to move the needle in the right direction. He explained that overall coordination with their State DOT went well. For example, their State DOT used State Planning and Research funds to hire the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) to help with the travel time reliability data. Without this assistance, this performance measure would have been difficult for the small MPOs in Texas. He added that increased coordination for the state targets would be helpful in order to help achieve them.

The Atlanta Regional Commission supported the state targets. They have been discussing performance measures for many decades, but it is still challenging. There is an immense amount of data and a lot of uncertainty and potential technology changes that can affect the future.

The Baltimore Metropolitan Council is a single state MPO, but decided to go with regional targets because the eastern part of their region is significantly different from the western part of the region and Baltimore is much older than other parts of the state. The prescriptiveness of the target setting process was identified as a challenge.

The KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission is a small tri-state MPO. They have three State DOTs, FHWA Division Offices, and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regions. They received a small Strategic Highway Research Program 2 grant on performance and decision making, which helped them create an action plan that outlines the process for performance measures. They supported the state targets, but requested to be involved in project selection.

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization would like to adopt MPO targets for now. The potential for aspirational vs. evidence based targets to be confusing to the public was identified as a challenge.

The Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization supported the state targets. Their State DOT owns the roadway network so MPOs/locals can effect little change. They adopted their metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) this year so are looking at how to incorporate more of target setting into the MTP and project selection. They adopted additional targets related to the number of miles of bikeways, sidewalks, and greenways.

The North Central Texas Council of Governments supported the state safety target, but developed their own targets for the others. It took a long time to get some of the data. For the congestion measure, they have staff resources available. State DOTs are traditionally very focused on roads, but MPOs have the ability to go beyond. Correlating projects to progress in meeting performance measures was identified as a challenge.

The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning adopted their MTP in October. They use their own data for roadways and bridges and are developing a decision support tool. The variations for the useful life for buses benchmark was identified as a challenge.

The East West Gateway Council of Governments is a bi-state MPO. They mostly set their own targets and are now focusing on resource allocations and outcomes. They commented that a lot of MPOs are struggling with the two- and four-year targets since money is already programmed.

The Boston Region MPO has made good progress, but is working to bring the different pieces of performance management together to allow it to be more cohesive and effective on a systemwide level. They experienced good engagement from both their transit agencies and their policy board.

The Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham has fifty-three municipalities and is one of the largest regions in the state. Their State DOT hired a consultant to assist with performance management. They supported the state targets. The state maintains all major roads. Engaging the policy board and moving the needle in the right direction for the reliability measure was identified as challenges.

The Georgia Regional Transportation Authority works closely with the Atlanta Regional Commission. They identified the transit measure as a challenge.

The Wilmington Area Planning Council identified fitting this into the congestion management process as a challenge.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments coordinates with over a dozen transit agencies. They started early and proactively in getting their partners engaged. This helped provide much of regional data. They developed their own targets, but in some cases, these ended up being similar or identical to the state's.

Chris summarized highlights of what the group shared:

- Most of the agencies here are supporting the state target
- Deciding between a data driven vs. aspirational target is a challenge
- Many found this first round of target setting challenging. However, with this round under their belt, many are hoping to drill deeper into the process next time
- Overall there is room for improvement in the performance management process
- This performance management process can be challenging since many agencies are not owners/operators
- Correlation to investment decisions can be challenging since the timeline for the project delivery process may not align with the timeframe for the targets
- Agencies are looking at facilities beyond what is required
- It may be helpful to look at refining the multimodal and single occupancy vehicle targets. For example, would it be helpful to include multimodal facilities inventories (e.g., sidewalks or bicycle facilities) in target setting?

Bill added that he has been hearing that coordination with partners (e.g., State DOTs) has been challenging. AMPO's good working relationship with AASHTO could be an opportunity to address this.

The working group confirmed that this was a challenge. They explained that the timeline for the measures may have contributed to the difficulties. They also added that coordination/communication with the different offices (e.g., headquarters, districts, and regions) of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) can also be challenging.

Bill asked the working group how the performance management process is documented in case of staffing changes.

Monique de los Rios-Urban responded that their information is memorialized on paper through planning agreements.

Todd Lang asked the working group if anyone had gone through a certification review since the performance management process started.

Dan Blevins responded that they were asked about the target setting coordination process and how the measures would be incorporated into their MTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They

have call out boxes throughout the MTP that highlight the measures as well as a one-page summary of each measure in the appendix.

Michelle Scott responded that they had their certification review in October. At this time, it was transitioning to a risk-based certification process. Their FHWA Division Office was involved in the target setting process.

Bill then elaborated on the scope of work for this series of PBPP Working Group Meetings. Four white papers will be developed based on the meetings and could highlight case studies, notable practices, challenges, and recommendations. They will not only be a resource to the MPO community, but also to AMPO as reauthorization is approaching. This is the first of five meetings. Each of the subsequent meetings will focus on one of the USDOT performance measures:

- PM1: Safety
- PM2: Bridge and pavement condition
- PM3: System performance, freight, and CMAQ
- Transit asset management

Saleem Salameh suggested that flow charts be included in the recommendations as they could help streamline the performance management process.

#### Roundtable Discussion and Identification of Issues on the Four Sets of Performance Measures

Bill led the working group in a roundtable discussion to identify key issues with the four performance measures. He explained that after the roundtable discussion, the working group will break up to discuss each performance measure and the issues in more detail.

The working group identified the following challenges with the safety performance measure:

- Data in general
  - Data quality.
  - It is difficult to know if you are doing an apples to apples comparison.
  - Privacy concerns make it difficult to access data.
  - Additional guidance for first responders for their reporting process especially relating to geocoding of crashes and identifying the cause of the accident.
- Data sets and data analysis
  - The vehicle miles traveled data for managed lanes.
  - The data looked at for the safety performance measure only looks at a subset (e.g., fatal or serious injury crashes that include a motorized vehicle) of the entire safety data. In addition, the absence of crashes does not indicate safety—it may just mean people are avoiding certain areas because they are not safe.
  - More data or analysis may be needed regarding distracted driving.
  - Bicyclists and pedestrians are looked at together, but should they be looked at separately? Should exposure data also be looked at? Should facility inventory be included?
- Timelines
  - The different reporting periods and timelines between the performance measures and the data.

- Project development timelines. A project may take a decade to implement so its benefits may not have an impact on the targets for a length of time.
- Revisiting the measures annually
- Challenges specific to small MPOs
- Including the performance measures in the MTP and TIP and showing influence with individual project and through a program of projects.

Kyung-Hwa emphasized that it is important to understand the data.

Jamie Fischer explained that the Atlanta Regional Commission has been careful to communicate that the targets they are setting are based on what they as the MPO can influence. For example, countermeasures that can be incorporated into the design.

Monique shared that they specifically explained that targets were not goals, but what they felt they could reasonably attain with the resources they have available.

Peter asked if it would be helpful to communicate what level of investment was needed to achieve a certain level of progress towards the measures.

The working group identified the following challenges with the bridge and pavement performance measure:

- Are the right things being measured? For example, the project delivery process for bridges is often lengthy, the use of International Roughness Index (IRI) for pavements could drop the condition rating and direct resources towards pavements that are not in need of repair, and are we missing an opportunity to collect data off the Interstate System?
- Does the process incentivize agencies to not do projects in hopes of getting more money by highlighting the need for money for areas in the worst shape?
- Missing data and data accuracy especially off of the National Highway System (NHS).
- Challenges specific to multistate MPOs.
- Looking holistically vs. piecemeal at the performance management process in general
- Communicating the information related to the performance measure

Kyung-Hwa shared that they have developed a more comprehensive tool that looks at their top needs.

Scott Tilman shared that they have an evaluation tool as well.

Peter explained that they are setting different targets for each of their states.

Saleem shared that they are supporting the targets for each of their three states.

Simone Weil added that CMAP offered to collect the non-NHS data through a grant from their State DOT.

Monique explained that they are considering using a buffer of influence criteria to help guide investment decisions. It would show how the same amount of funds invested in a big city would have a different level of impact in a smaller city.

The working group identified the following challenges with the system performance, freight, and CMAQ performance measure:

- Data



- Accuracy of the data sample and therefore concerns with using the data to guide investment decisions
- The need to calibrate the data related to traffic message channels (TMCs). One agency explained that they had to manually clean them up and send the corrections to RITIS.
- Clarification on how managed lanes are being handled. If the lanes are cantilevered over each other, it may be necessary to get the data from the operators of the managed lanes since probes cannot distinguish vertical difference
- The need for regionwide comparative data.
- Are the right things being measured?

Kyung-Hwa explained that they did an analysis a long time ago using HERE data. However, now that INRIX is doing the NPMRDS, it is done already. They have also purchased INRIX Analytics. She added that it would be helpful to know what people have access to and their experiences if they have also purchased INRIX Analytics.

Michelle shared that they are participating in the pooled fund study. However, they have concerns that they still cannot access some things.

Chris shared that TTI conducted an analysis and helped create a standardized process for the MPOs in Texas.

Since many of these reports are provided to Congress, Bill asked the group to also think about issues or benefits that would help convey the criticalness of programs such as CMAQ.

The working group identified the following challenges with the transit asset management performance measure:

- Are the right things being measured?
- Challenges specific to small agencies.
- Challenges related to not being the direct recipient.
- How does adding additional useful life to buses fit in with this process?
- Collaboration with partners
  - More interaction with the FTA would be helpful
  - Planning agreements between MPOs and transit agencies
  - Clarification on roles and responsibilities
- How is the transit asset management performance measure is being linked to the other regional performance measures?
- How performance management is evaluated in the triennial FTA review or FHWA certification review

Shayna Pollock shared that they have developed a tool and are in the process of refining it. She explained that the process helped them become invested in their transit agency's data. She commented that it would be helpful to know if any agencies are looking at regional data outside excel—for example in an enterprise system.

Todd, who sits on one of APTA's committees, shared that FTA is trying to refine the National Transit Database to help provide the data in an easier format than how it is shared and compiled currently.

Chris shared that the target setting process was helpful in educating their stakeholders about what an MPO is.

Todd asked if a specific MPO data sharing agreement is needed with the Tier 1 or Tier 2 plans.

#### Working Groups on Performance Measures Define Scope of Future Meetings

Bill asked the working group to break up into four groups. The groups each discussed one of the four measures in more detail in order to shape the scope and agenda of the future working group meetings.

#### Working Groups Report Out on Initial Scope

Bill asked the four breakout groups to provide a summary of the key points of their discussion.

The transit performance measure breakout group summarized their discussion which highlighted the following challenges and areas in need of discussion. They suggested that the transit asset management performance measure be discussed at the last meeting to allow time for the safety performance measure to be implemented.

- Data and analysis
  - Vehicles data
  - National Transit Database/spreadsheets
  - Different by transit agency
  - Transit agencies still developing equipment/facilities issues
  - Is the data correct?
  - No historical trends
  - Is the data comparable within as well as across regions?
  - Transit agencies and MPOs are still learning
  - Currently requires consultant assistance—will this be for long term?
  - Consistent and reliable moving forward?
  - Rushed process this time. Most agencies did not have time to look at different investment scenarios
- Terminology
  - Definition of useful life is used differently among transit agencies, the transit asset management rule, and asset life/replacement determinations and may not paint accurate picture of vehicle conditions
  - Facility
- Coordination with partners
  - Partners still do not know each other that well
  - MPOs do not have staff that are transit experts
  - Roles and responsibilities between MPO and transit agency
  - Data sharing difficulties
  - FTA is organized regionally so there is not an office or staff dedicated to each state
  - Challenges for multistate MPOs
  - Triennial reviews for transit agencies and certification reviews for MPOs
  - New relationships? e.g. private sector
  - Target setting can be siloed

- Target setting
  - Roles and responsibilities between MPO and transit agency
  - Investment decisions to achieve targets in general and especially for FTA funding categories, which are large and complex
  - Title VI, EJ, and equity.
  - Timeframe: targets are short term while planning and programming are mid- to long-term. For example, it can take two years to get a new bus
  - Timeframe: target setting schedule (180 days) is too short
  - How to tie to MTP goals and objectives
  - Investments: Goes beyond federal funding
  - Difficulty for small agencies whose staff must primarily focus on operations instead of planning and programming
  - How is new mobility incorporated?
  - One size does not fit all

The safety performance measure breakout group summarized their discussion which highlighted the following challenges and areas in need of discussion.

- Data and analysis
  - Consistent, reliable, and timely data
  - Additional research on the causes of crashes
  - New technology/modes of transportation
- Target setting
  - Difficult to know the level of investment required to meet targets
  - Communication of targets especially for Vision Zero or aspirational targets or if targets are not met.
  - Analysis of targets
  - Timeframe
  - Role of technology to help achieve targets
  - Factors that MPOs have less influence over through engineering solutions and would require partnerships to change policy (e.g., distracted driving and motorcycle helmet laws)
  - Funding can only be used on certain roads

The pavement and bridge performance measure breakout group summarized their discussion which highlighted the following challenges and areas in need of discussion.

- Pavement
  - Data and analysis
    - Data is based on IRI, which indicates the condition of the roadway surface.
    - Missing data is defined as poor
    - Data collection especially consistency in terms of the sampling process
    - Historical data is limited
    - Data and maintenance for the non-Interstate NHS
  - Target setting
    - Scope is limited to the NHS
    - Consistency of metrics for the non-Interstate NHS

- Pavements on the border of between condition levels
  - Ability to share
- Bridge
  - Data and analysis
    - Should the sufficiency rating be used since it determines eligibility for funding for rehabilitation or replacement
    - Methodology confusing when including bridge deck
    - Forecasting the rate of deterioration
    - Ensuring the process is replicable
  - Target setting
    - Should this performance measure be expanded to other assets—especially those related to technology (e.g., traffic signals and Intelligent Transportation Systems)?

The system performance, freight, and CMAQ performance measure breakout group summarized their discussion which highlighted the following challenges and areas in need of discussion. They organized their report out according to a potential outline of a white paper the working group could develop. They suggested that the working group conduct a survey on needs, challenges, gaps, and lessons learned prior to holding the working group meeting on this measure.

- Data
  - What data is needed? Is it accessible/acquirable? Is it modeled vs. observed?
  - Previous data and analysis (e.g., linear referencing and probe travel time) were expensive and time consuming. Many MPOs still find it challenging to find staff or devote staff time to analysis.
  - Software
  - Wish list items:
    - The FHWA provide data for roadways beyond the NHS
    - Training on data analysis be provided along with a MPO primer that includes an overview guidebook and definitions. Be sure to address issues specific to small MPOs.
- Target setting
  - What is it? Are they appropriate?
    - Should all MPOs be measuring the same things? (e.g., one size might not fit all—should there be differences for large and small MPOs?)
    - Should other measures be considered? (e.g., incident clearing time or incident management for nonrecurring congestion since it is a significant measure of performance)
  - Are the timeframes appropriate?
  - Resolve inconsistencies with the data analytics from the NPMRDS
  - One size does not fit all.
- Communications
  - Communicating the measure to stakeholders, partners, the policy board, ad technical committee
  - Wish list item:
    - As part of the MPO primer, include a section on communication

**December 13, 2018:**

Recap of the Previous Day

Bill provided a recap of the previous day's discussions.

Working Group Refines Scope of Future Meetings Based Upon Feedback

Bill led the group in a discussion to further refine the scope of future meetings as well as determine the structure of the meetings and recommendations. He shared that the scope of work runs through July 2020.

- PBPP Working Group meetings
  - 1.5 days each on a Tuesday/Wednesday or Wednesday/Thursday
  - Attendees: Since coordination was a key issue, we can invite AASHTO, APTA, FHWA, and FTA.
  - Bill – coordination element with transit providers or the State DOT. Do you want them included?
  - AASHTO and APTA. Plus TPM office for FHWA and FTA.
  - Meeting 1 (March/April 2019): Safety
  - Meeting 2 (September 2019): Pavement and bridge
    - Potential opportunity to combine with the AMPO Annual Conference
  - Meeting 3 (February 2020): System performance, freight, and CMAQ
    - NCTCOG volunteered to host and invite the TTI
  - Meeting 4 (May 2020): Transit asset management
- White papers
  - Audience: practitioners as well as USDOT
    - Ensure the content is helpful to MPOs of all sizes—perhaps break it down by the size or structure of MPOs
  - Purpose: assist MPOs in carrying out performance management as well as be helpful in informing discussions with Capitol Hill as reauthorization approaches
  - Content—the outline for each could be drafted in real time during the meetings:
    - Challenges and gaps with existing measures
    - Recommendations and successes in terms of existing resources (e.g., best practices, case studies, guidebooks, and templates specific to each performance measure and also communicating performance)
    - Recommendations that require changes to federal requirements or legislation
- Survey on the measure being discussed sent prior to each meeting—keep it short enough to ensure a good response rate
  - Questions to focus on process:
    - What was your level of comfort with the performance measure?
    - When did your DOT give you their target information?
    - When did you adopt your target?
    - Why did you either support the state target or set your own?
      - If you supported the state target, what does that mean?

- Who owns/operates the infrastructure? How much of your NHS is owned by someone other than the State DOT?
- Are you developing additional performance measures for other topics? (e.g., equity or accessibility) If so, how are you breaking them out for the federal measures and how are you looking at together?
- How did you formally adopt the targets?
- How are you tying the targets to programming and investment decisions?
- Can we tie into the survey being conducted by the FHWA Office of Transportation Performance Management?
- Timeline:
  - Send six weeks prior to meeting and leave it open for four weeks
  - Process for one week
  - Send results to working group one week prior to meeting

Kyung-Hwa added that somewhere in these meetings it would be helpful if MPOs could share their experiences with using data vendors.

Martin shared that they developed a synthetic model with Sidewalk Labs. They were the first region in US to do this.

Kofi Wakhisi asked the working group about their relationships with Bird or Lime?

Peter responded that the city of St. Louis required Lime to provide some data as part of an agreement to operate in the city. It seems like they are used significantly for joy riding.

Bob agreed that the scooters seem to be used for joy riding. Their data showed 400,000 trips in just under 12 months.

Nick pointed out that a request for proposals has been issued for National Cooperative Highway Research Project (NCHRP) 08-121: Accessibility Measures in Practice: Guidance for Transportation Agencies.

Bill added that there was legislation to create a pilot program within the Office of the Secretary at the USDOT that would buy a handful of data for agencies to look at accessibility measures.

Natalie brought up new datasets. For example, what category does mobility as a service fall into for the National Household Travel Survey and American Community Survey?

Monique added that connected and automated vehicles have the potential to provide additional data.

Michelle added that it might be helpful to see transit vehicles broken out of that family. Direction they want to move towards. Vehicle occupancy factor. Especially if they are increasing investment in dedicated lanes.

Natalie added that for example, if we had a regional portal for traffic signal data we feel it would be helpful, draw people.

Kofi added that they would like to explore potential data exchange models

The working group agreed that a resource that lists the targets for each agency would be helpful. Perhaps that could be part of the survey?

### Wrap-up and Next Steps

Bill summarized the next steps and wrapped up the meeting. He asked the group to share any resources they have related to performance management. Matt Hardy from AASHTO developed a Transportation Performance Management portal and offered to build an MPO tab. We just need to help him populate the resources. It will be organized by keyword. Once we the initial page up and running, agencies can add things to the portal directly.

- Next steps
  - Determine the date and location of the next working group meeting, which will cover the safety performance measure
  - Develop a draft survey for the meeting
    - Coordinate with the FHWA's Office of Transportation Performance Management on the results of their survey

Bill thanked the working group and the Atlanta Regional Commission for hosting. AMPO is looking forward to the next four meetings!



## AMPO Performance-based Planning and Programming Working Group

### *Highway Safety (PM1) Discussion Questions*

For each of the below Highway Safety Measures please consider the questions below:

- Number of Fatalities
- Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)
- Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

#### **Data:**

1. What data is required?
2. How accessible is the data?
3. Is the data correct for the application/measurement? If not, what is needed?
4. How consistent is the historical data for trends?
5. How comparable is the data with other regions?
6. How can the data be mapped?

#### **Analysis:**

1. What is the methodology for analysis/target setting?
2. How can it be improved?
3. How can it be made understandable to Staff/Boards/Public?

#### **Target Setting:**

1. Is the time frame for targets appropriate? If not, what should the time frame be?
2. Are the targets understandable? If not, how can they be made understandable?

#### **Collaboration with partners:**

- 1.) How was target setting done collaboratively?
- 2.) How has the State shared their data/reporting?

#### **Additional thoughts for consideration:**

- Challenges tying funding to outcomes and outcomes to funding
  - o For example, what do you need to spend to achieve your targets?
- Timely data challenges
- Analysis and communication with targets; aspirational versus attainable (i.e. vision zero)
- How to explain aggressive targets vs. less aggressive targets (cost of life)



- Public policy concerns (i.e. no motorcycle helmet law)
- Target setting and timeframe – annual targets are challenging
- 5 year rolling average needs to be updated every year – hard to communicate
- How do we plan for emerging technology in the target setting process? Can technology help move the needle on distracted driving?
- How can safety performance be used in reauthorization?
- How else can safety performance be used?

DRAFT