

AASHTO CPBM/TPM Pooled Fund Joint Quarterly Meeting Notes

June 17, 2021, 2PM — 4PM EDT

Welcome and Agenda

- CPBM Chair Tim Henkel welcomed attendees to the Joint American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Committee on Performance-Based Management (CPBM) and Transportation Performance Management (TPM) Pooled Fund quarterly meeting. He shared the purpose of the quarterly web calls is to share AASHTO and CPBM Committee information and updates with CPBM members and TPM Pooled Fund Members and to get input on TPM needs. He reminded attendees that links to the notes and slides from today's web call will be posted on the TPM Pooled Fund Web Portal at tpm-portal.com.

FHWA Perspective / TPM Dashboard Updates

Presenters: Steve Gaj, Bill Bolles, and Nelson Hoffman, FHWA

- Steve shared a few words to frame Bill and Nelson's discussion on FHWA's perspective on TPM reporting and FHWA's newly updated TPM Dashboard.
- Bill Bolles outlined the TPM reporting process—emphasizing the complete, accountable, and consistent nature of the TPM reporting process.
- Nelson opened the TPM Dashboard (<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/reporting/state/>) and showed how to access it from the TPM Site Homepage. Nelson displayed the data and graphics available for each individual state in the dashboard.
- Nelson highlighted the inclusion of PM2 and PM3 measures in the dashboards. Nelson also shared how each of the graphics and tables have narrative descriptions attached to help users decipher the context of the data involved. Lastly, based on feedback from DOTs, the dashboard also now includes both full distress and IRI-only data.
- Steve closed the presentation by thanking those involved in making the TPM Dashboard possible.

Discussion

An attendee asked what guidance FHWA will provide on addressing COVID-related impacts on 2020 performance reporting?

Nelson said that this is still an open issue.

Pete Stephanos noted that there is already an opportunity to adjust targets and identify the cause as COVID-related. Please contact FHWA with any questions.

Karen Miller commented to thank FHWA for the consistency in following the safety template as well as the flexibility to include more information - very helpful!

Feature Presentation: Management Integration Matters – Final Guidance from NCHRP Project 08-113

Presenter: Mara Campbell, Jacobs

- Mara outlined the reasons for integrating performance, risk, and asset management: improving decision-making, capital planning, system performance and resiliency, agency culture of cooperation and collaboration, optimizing agency position, and getting everyone to move in the same direction. She also emphasized process, data, and staffing synergies.
- Mara then broke down the NCHRP Project 08-113 Integration Framework, consisting of 5 key areas: Resource Requirements, Approach to Integration, Data and Software Needs, Personnel and Skills and Policy and Agency Structure.
- Prior to introducing the guidance, Mara emphasized that every agency is different, and there is no silver bullet—but the guidance will certainly help your agency move in the right direction in terms of Integration.
- Mara estimates that the guidance will be out in the next few weeks and will be officially published approximately in September and will include a maturity assessment developed for self-assessing agency's Integration practices. The guidance was developed with the help of CalTrans, UDOT, VTrans, TRIMET, and MnDOT.
- Lastly, Mara shared the key observations from the research, specifically: the critical need for an Integration Champion, that the agency culture has a significant impact on Integration steps, the importance of executive-level buy-in, and the importance of enterprise standards and data glossaries.

Discussion

An attendee thanked Mara for the presentation and commented that they were eager to see the guidance.

New Performance Measures Discussion

Presenter(s): Christos Xenophontos, Rhode Island DOT and Hyun-A Park, Spy Pond Partners, LLC

- Christos opened the discussion by emphasizing the importance of performance measures, particularly, because today transportation agencies are changing quickly, new priorities are emerging, customers expectations are rising, and performance management abilities continue to evolve.

- After Christos' introduction, Hyun-A posed a few questions to kick off today's discussion:
 - Do you think we need new performance measures?
 - What areas of a transportation agency need new measures? Why?
 - Do the new measures need to relate to a national view?
 - What are our greatest challenges with implementing new measures?
 - What can we do through the AASHTO Committee on Performance-Based Management and the TPM Pooled Fund to make progress with new measures?

Discussion:

(Kelly Travelbee) In terms of the strategic framework presented by Christos, I might add "accessibility"

(Daniela Bremmer) Perhaps the first question should be rephrased: do we need new decision tools?

(Tonia Norman) I think a key question is "who is the appropriate we"? States often find a way to create their own measures for their specific uses. Do "we" really need measures across states/agencies?

(Christos Xenophontos) We can continue to hear about the need for new performance measures in other areas. The key is definitely how do we balance the need for states and the national level.

(Hyun-A Park) In many of my most recent meetings and events regarding performance measures, almost everyone brought up equity in the context of TPM. A question for this group is: what does equity mean? It seems we need a standard just to frame our approach toward these broad terms.

(Jay Styles) I think that equity is going to be looked at through different lenses. In Northern Virginia, we saw public disapproval of the express lanes because people could "buy their way" out of traffic. But that changed when people saw it works in reducing congestion. We're going to have balance these kinds of things with respect to equity.

(Andrew Ludasi) In some cases we need to CHANGE/FIX the existing measures. TTRI has both data issues and a structural one. I'm in the office of freight planning. I've done some analysis on how we are required to calculate TTRI, but when you look at the inputs for the TTRI—some of them don't necessarily make sense.

(Hyun-A Park) So it seems what you're saying is that we need to holistically look at the performance measures we are using.

(Scott Zainhofsky) Yes, I agree with Andrew Ludasi. For example, TTRI in a rural state like North Dakota is useless for managing our systems, but we have other performance measures that

more accurately explain this system. Allowing states to establish performance measures that make sense for their state is far more helpful in actually managing our systems.

(Holly Bieneman) I don't think we'd like new measures, but there are some things we are trying to measure but have trouble getting our hands on. Accessibility is one; equity is another. Emissions is standard for conformity; but something we are looking at statewide as well.

(Tonia Norman) Question is "how effective are the existing measures that states/MPOs/transit agencies/aviation agencies, etc. use in managing resources and assisting with performance-based decisionmaking?"

(Karen Miller) To me - the most important thing as we move forward is that congress doesn't dictate a measure. Instead they should dictate a framework and then allow FHWA to discuss with us all to come up with the best measures—not those in DC, but those being impacted. There are always going to be measures that have no relevance for some states, but great relevance for others.

(Christos Xenophontos) So what we are looking for is goal areas, not necessarily directly greater system performance. We want to be making these decisions with full transparency as public agencies, and we need the goal areas to guide us in the right direction.

(Hyun-A Park) To organize this conversation into buckets, we seem to have three:

- 1) How do we make performance measures better for states?
- 2) How can we use and improve performance measures for decision making?
- 3) Where are new areas where we implement or improve performance management?

In terms of number 3—which we had hoped this conversation would focus mainly on—it seems that accessibility has been mentioned the most. So a question is how can the federal agencies help states advance in this or other areas?

(David Putz) We want improved decision making, which I don't think anyone will argue about. Though perhaps the question we should be asking is - are the measures at the level at which the decisions are being made? If not, how do we create a framework that supports this notion of "alignment?"

(Kelly Travelbee) I would advocate accessibility for states that have interest, NOT as a new national measure. I agree with Andrew, I think there are national measures that need some work. For example, for accessibility we need to identify opportunities (strategies) for data, methods, etc. that may support accessibility measures down the road.

(Andrew Swords) An accessibility performance measure would be both interesting and challenging. It would be helpful to understand what success would look like, and what actions would help move the needle.

(Daniela Bremmer) I agree, and USDOT's RFI on Equity data and measurement goes right to that issue.

(Monica Zhong) Kelly, I agree with you on accessibility measures. That's the weak spot for us at FDOT.

(Deanna Belden) We do still have one national goal area that is missing any measures, national goal #7. Presumably this would be a first priority for any new national measures? But I agree that accessibility, equity and more holistic measures like link to health need to be developed.

(Bradley Sharlow) The other question to ask is "Is 1-4 years enough time to establish and make significant progress on a performance target, or should the target period be extended to 5 years"?

(Deanna Belden) I agree that targets should be longer term than 1-4 years.

(Monica Zhong) Several NCHRP projects are aimed at equity and accessibility. One such project, NCHRP 08-159, looks at accessibility to health care, education etc. (Understand how accessibility to employment, health care, education, and other vital needs varies for different population groups in different settings, and methods for effectively assessing mobility and accessibility options). Right now, panel members are solicited.

(Christos Xenophontos) One really great point I saw in the chat is: are 1-4 years long enough to make a difference in these areas? Another question I want to pose, should we be judged year-by-year or at the end of each performance period—considering statistical aberrations.

(Pete Stephanos) The goal for national measures, is not just how we can make them helpful nationally, but helpful for states as well. We posed some measures that we had hoped would account for that, but also acknowledged and knew that this is new ground, and we'd need to reflect on that. We met with AASHTO two years ago that we needed to reflect earlier on what is/isn't working prior to the end of the first performance period. We are ready and willing to adapt and change in light of everyone's experiences, but it's also our responsibility to take action when it needs to be done. There's going to be new measures that the new administration wants to support, but we try to do that in a way that isn't behind closed doors but in cooperation with states.

(Scott Zainhofsky) I agree with Karin and Christos' comments about flexibility and collaboration. These are the same points I was trying to make. It comes down to "what is the purpose of the federal measures." NDDOT will continue to use data-driven and performance-based decision processes. However, the federal measures will never be the basis for those decision processes, unless they are meaningful to our customers who are driving all of our roads (not just the NHS).

(Christos Xenophontos) I think I reflect everybody on the CPBM that we are ready, willing, and able to start looking at these areas. Our discussion became what are the performance measures that can be decision-making tools, but maybe we need to identify the goal areas first to inform this. We need to understand that we need to look at the overall goal we need to achieve rather than the cookiecutter approach of having the same performance measure for everybody.

(Jay Styles) In the end, we need to see from Congress what they want. Then they can tell us what we want, then we can tell them how much it will cost, and then they're going to have to

cough up the dough. We don't need micro-managed measures. We are having to do things differently to acquire the funds.

(Christos Xenophontos) We want to organize meetings and brainstorming sessions to continue developing the discussion on this topic.

(Tonia Norman) My suggestion is to establish a cafeteria plan of recommended types of measures but don't require use of any particular one.

(Hyun-A Park) We'll wrap up this conversation here, in the interest of time.

CPBM Business

Subcommittee on Emerging Technologies - SMET

Presenter(s): Daniela Bremmer and Jay Styles

- Daniela quickly outlined how CPBM and CTSO worked together jointly to form this subcommittee and what this subcommittee focuses on and does.
- Daniela shared a link to their new page on the new TPM Portal, a list of COVID-19 related system impact/data projects, their efforts in updating the AASHTO CAV/CAT Policy Principles, and an assortment of other subcommittee activities are all outlined in the webinar's slides (beginning on slide #31).
- Daniela displayed contact information for members of their subcommittee.

Subcommittee on Asset Management

Presenter(s): Anne-Marie McDonnell

- Anne-Marie updated attendees on recent and upcoming TAM events, resources, and research, including the TAM National Conference 2021 (August 10-12) and the collection of TAM webinars on the TAM portal.
- In terms of research, Anne-Marie highlighted the 08-137 effort to enhance the Online TAM Guide and the 08-138 effort to connect TAM & TSMO.

Subcommittee on Organizational Management

Presenter(s): Deanna Belden and Charlie Purcell

- Deanna kicked off their presentation by running through the subcommittee's Mission and Goals and their monthly meeting information—which can be found in the slides.
- Deanna and Charlie outlined the three activities of the subcommittee: 1) Process Improvement led by Gary Vansuch, 2) Non-system Performance Measures led by Deanna herself, and 3) Support the Agency Capability Building (ACB) Portal led by Charlie himself.

- Charlie shared a link to the Agency Capability Building portal: <https://www.agencycapability.com/> If you are interested in serving on the panel for the associated implementation research project, or participating in one of the pilot projects, please let Charlie know.

Subcommittee on Risk Management - SRM

Presenter(s): Jean Wallace

- Jean Wallace started her presentation by giving a run-through of the subcommittee's mission and goals and some highlighted SRM-sponsored research projects: NCHRP 02-123(04), NCHRP 23-09, and NCHRP 23-15.
- Jean also identified NCHRP 23-24 and NCHRP 08-151 as approved projects and shared some upcoming SRM-related events.

Work Group Research Updates

Presenter(s): Tammy Haas and William Johnson

- Tammy and William quickly ran through the keys to their presentation with time running short, and encourage attendees to take a full look at their slides (beginning on slide #56).

TPM Pooled Fund Business

- With time running short, Christos Xenophontos reminded attendees that the Pooled Fund would be transitioning to an AASHTO Technical Services Program and encouraged attendees to contact Matt Hardy for more information.

Wrap Up

- Karen Miller summarized the set of action items:
 - Check out the FHWA TPM Dashboard and stay tuned for the guidance developed through NCHRP Project 08-113
 - Contact Christos (christos.xenophontos@dot.ri.gov) with further thoughts on future performance measures
 - Join future sub-committee meetings! You do not have to be a CPBM member to participate.
- Christos Xenophontos thanked attendees and presenters and wrapped up the meeting.