

NATIONAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES TARGET SETTING

Supported by the NCHRP

AASHTO
Standing Committee on
Performance
Management

Task Force on Performance
Measure Development,
Coordination, and Reporting

MAP-21 Target Setting Context

- A set of standard, consistent national performance measures will be established, but states will have flexibility to establish the target values of those measures. Thus, the term “consistent” applies to the performance measures, data methodologies (collection, processing and analysis), and performance reporting processes. There is no presumption that targets will be consistent across states – rather they will be specific to local conditions and needs and set at the discretion of DOTs and MPOs.
- States must submit biennial reports on progress toward target achievement for each national measure.
- For the Highway Safety Improvement Program, states that have not made significant progress towards meeting established targets face reductions in funding flexibility and additional reporting requirements.
- For the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), states that do not make significant progress towards meeting their established targets for asset condition or performance must report actions that they will undertake to achieve the targets.

Target Setting Overall Recommendations

Since the submittal of the SCOPM Task Force Findings on National-Level Performance Measures in November 2012, the Task Force identified the need for additional guidance on the specific topic of target setting related to national-level performance measures. Through a series of meetings, a subgroup of the SCOPM Task Force met to develop findings with regard to MAP-21 Performance Target-Setting. These findings and an updated set of recommendations on national performance measures target-setting was transmitted to US DOT in March 2013.

1. Provide maximum flexibility
2. Focus on what matters – the right outcome
3. Align targets with system ownership and funding levels
4. Base target setting on longer term trend data
5. Coordinate target setting through a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive process
6. Tell the story: performance is more than just a number
7. Avoid unachievable targets or the “one size target fits all approach”
8. Allow for appropriate timelines for target achievement
9. Guard against unintended consequences
10. Complement flexibility in target setting with transparency and accountability
11. Allow flexibility for DOTs and MPOs to use a risk based target setting approach

Resources

AASHTO Recommendations on MAP-21 Performance Measure Target Setting

Available at: <http://scopm.transportation.org/Pages/default.aspx> or directly at: <http://goo.gl/THQ73>

SCOPM Task Force Findings on National Level Measures

Available at: <http://scopm.transportation.org/Pages/default.aspx> or directly at: <http://goo.gl/NaAMb>

Target Setting Workshop

The SCOPM Task Force will meet on June 13, 2013 to focus on MAP-21 performance measure target-setting. The purpose of the workshop is to achieve the following:

- Provide further input to US DOT on areas where rulemaking has not been finalized (most likely for pavement and bridge performance areas)
- Provide input to US DOT on how target setting should be managed once the rules are in place
- Identify ways to help states prepare for MAP-21 performance measure target setting
- Identify next steps to continue working on target setting recommendations and preparedness

The expected products of this workshop is a further refinement of the target-setting recommendations to US DOT and action steps to help state DOT prepare for MAP-21 target setting requirements.

Task Force Members

CHAIR:

Paul Degges, Chief Engineer, Tennessee

VICE-CHAIR:

Bernie Arseneau, Deputy Commissioner, Minnesota

- Safety Performance Area Co-Lead

MEMBERS:

Judith Corley-Lay, Pavement Analysis Engineer, North Carolina*

- Pavement Performance Area Lead

Mara Campbell, Customer Relations Director, Missouri

Grant Levi, Deputy Director for Engineering, North Dakota

John Barton, Deputy Executive Director/Chief Engineer, Texas

Rick Land, Acting Chief Deputy Director, California

- CMAQ On-Road Mobile Source Emissions Performance Area Lead

Lynn Zanto, Administrator, Rail, Transit, and Planning, Montana*

Daniela Bremmer, Director of Strategic Assessment, Washington State*

- System Performance and CMAQ Congestion Performance Area Lead
- Target Setting Subgroup Chair

Tim Gatz, Director, Capital Programs, Oklahoma*

Tim Henkel, Division Director, Modal Planning and Program Management, Minnesota*

- Freight Performance Area Lead

Mark Van Port Fleet, Engineer of Development, Michigan

John Selmer, Director of Statewide Operations, Iowa

Nile Easton, Communications Director, Utah

Lori Richter, Performance Measure Manager, Wisconsin

Christopher Xenophontos, Assistant Director of Administration, Rhode Island

Tom Cole, Chief Engineer, Idaho*

- Safety Performance Area Co-Lead

Gregg Fredrick, Assistant Chief Engineer, Wyoming

- Bridge Performance Area Lead

*Member of Target Setting Subgroup