

TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTABILITY

C O M M I S S I O N

Outcome Measures Subcommittee Meeting Virginia Housing Development Corporation April 23, 2007

Members Present:

Young Ho Chang, ATCS, PLC
Vice Mayor Charles Allen, Newport News
Georjeane Blumling, AAA Tidewater Virginia
Henry Connors, Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors, CIT
Douglas Fahl, Dewberry & Davis, LLC
Gary Fenchuk, East West Partners of Virginia, Inc.
Thomas Jewell, Carter Braxton Real Estate
John Lewis, Greater Richmond Transit Company
Mark Merhige, Shockoe Properties, Inc.
Dr. Rosemarie Pelletier, Public Private Solutions, Inc. (via conference call)
M. Siddique Sheikh, Alexandria Service Center, Inc.
Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors
Hunter Watson, Davenport & Company LLC

Others Present:

Ralph Davis, Office of the Secretary of Transportation
Mary Lynn Tischer, Commonwealth's Multimodal Transportation Planning Office
Kimberly Spence, VDOT, Transportation and Mobility Planning Division
Katherine Graham, Commonwealth's Multimodal Transportation Planning Office
John Miller, Virginia Transportation Research Council
Jim Gillespie, Virginia Transportation Research Council
Constance Sorrell, VDOT Chief of Systems Operations
Keith Wandtke, VDOT Policy Division
Mike Garrett, VDOT Policy Division
Jeff Keever, Virginia Port Authority
William LaBaugh, DRPT

Meeting Summary:

Mr. Chang began the meeting by welcoming everyone and asking Subcommittee members and other attendees to introduced themselves. He then asked if any member of the public wished to provide comments to the Subcommittee. No one came forward.

Mr. Chang stated that he would like the Subcommittee to discuss performance measures and overarching goals. He stated that his goal for the meeting was for the subcommittee to adopt the overarching goals. He pointed out that some Subcommittee members who did not attend the last subcommittee meeting may be seeing goals for the first time. Mr. Chang presented the goals for the consideration of the Subcommittee:

1. Mobility, connectivity, and accessibility – *To facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods, improve interconnectivity of all transportation modes, and provide accessibility for all.*
 - a. Congestion – is this a measure or an explanation?
2. Safety – *To provide a safe transportation system.*
3. Security – *To provide a secure transportation system.*
4. System management and preservation – *To preserve and manage the existing transportation system through technology and more efficient operation.*
5. Economic vitality – *To improve Virginia’s economic vitality.*
 - a. Affordability – is this a measure or an explanation?
6. Fiscal responsibility – *To improve program delivery.*
7. Coordination of transportation and land use – *To facilitate the coordination of transportation and land use activities.*
8. Environmental stewardship – *To improve environmental quality.*

Ms. Thomas suggested that it was important to note that the basis for the Outcome Measures Subcommittee goals was VTrans2025. Ms. Blumling questioned whether the Subcommittee’s goals of mobility, connectivity and accessibility should be separated. Deputy Secretary Davis suggested that breaking the goals out may result in too many goals. He added that one objective is to keep the number of goals limited. He also said that within the definition of the overarching goal, the individual goals are explained. Dr. Tischer defined the component parts of the first goal for the Subcommittee. She said that mobility refers to ease of travel, that connectivity refers to connecting parts of state and different activity centers, and that accessibility refers to access to different modes of transportation. Mr. Chang said that access was very important. Mr. Fahl added that the issue of interconnecting different regions of the state is important. Ms. Thomas commented that from a local government standpoint, connecting subdivisions may not be desired by those in the subdivisions. Ms. Blumling added that one way to better connect people and areas is to better connect transportation modes, and that better mobility therefore

leads to better connectivity. Deputy Secretary Davis commented that “easy movement of people” is better than “efficient movement of people,” as the goal was previously defined. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee needs to better define what is meant by “connectivity” before presenting its goal recommendations to the full Commission. As a result of the Subcommittee’s discussion, the first Subcommittee goal is: Mobility, Connectivity, and Accessibility – To facilitate the easy movement of people and goods (Mobility), improve interconnectivity of regions and activity centers (Connectivity), and provide accessibility to different modes of transportation (Accessibility).

Mr. Chang pointed out that safety and security were listed as separate goals by the Subcommittee. The subcommittee discussed whether the two goals should be combined as they are in the Virginia Performance Report. Mr. Lewis said that other states’ measures consider maritime security, and he felt important to include transit security. He was concerned that what the Subcommittee meant by security was not clearly defined. Ms. Thomas added that she thought that security is a way of ensuring safety. Mr. Fahl said that “security” is a term that has been used more frequently since September 11, 2001 and that since that time, it has meant something different. Mr. Fahl also questioned how many goals the Subcommittee wants. Dr. Tischer said that although security is an important issue, it is difficult to measure. As a result, she said that safety and security were combined into a single goal for the Virginia Performance Report, since safety was easier to measure. Mr. Lewis suggested that even if the goals are combined, the Subcommittee should clearly establish the differences between safety and security and come up with both clearer definitions and measures for each. Mr. Chang suggested that the Subcommittee consider combining safety and security into a single goal but said that the Subcommittee would revisit this issue. As a result of the Subcommittee’s discussion, the second Subcommittee goal is: Safety and Security – To provide a safe and secure transportation system.

Mr. Chang said that with regards to the goal of “system management and preservation,” he had some concerns with the term “more efficient” as stated in the goal: System management and preservation – *To preserve and manage the existing transportation system through technology and more efficient operation.* Ms. Thomas commented that the goals should not be worded in terms of attempting to improve something, but that the goals should be worded to establish a goal. She said that emphasis should be placed on meeting a goal rather than on just improving in a specific area. Dr. Tischer clarified in response to Mr. Chang’s concerns by saying that technology and “more efficient” operation are simply means to preserve and manage the existing transportation system – and that the objective of the goal is not necessarily “more efficient operation.” As a result of the Subcommittee’s discussion, the third Subcommittee goal is: System Maintenance and Preservation – To preserve and maintain the existing transportation system.

With regards to the goal of “economic vitality,” Ms. Thomas suggested that the Subcommittee define what is meant by economic vitality. Dr. Tischer stated that Virginia used very general economic measures such as how many jobs were created by transportation. She said that some of the other states cover economic vitality through their mobility goals and measures, and that those states equate economic vitality with ease of travel. Mr. Fahl said that Minnesota seems to consistently zero in on the key issues in its goals more so than the other states. Mr. Conners said that the Subcommittee should make a strong statement about the connection between mobility and economic vitality. Mr. Lewis also suggested that today jobs move to people, not people to jobs. He suggested that as a result, the Subcommittee should consider connecting mobility and economic vitality more closely. Mr. Chang agreed. Ms. Thomas cautioned the Subcommittee that doing so makes an assumption that there is a connection between mobility and economic vitality. Mr. Fahl said that he liked Florida’s measures for economic vitality. Deputy Secretary Davis pointed out that one problem with Florida, however, is that the measures are not necessarily linked to the goal. Ms. Thomas said that she liked Oregon’s approach – livability supported by the transportation system. Ms. Blumling said that mobility does not necessarily imply economic vitality and vice versa. Mr. Fahl suggested that the Subcommittee put economic vitality before mobility. At Deputy Secretary Davis’ suggestion, the Subcommittee decided to use Oregon as a model and define economic vitality as Oregon has: “Provide a Transportation System that Supports Economic Prosperity and Livability.” The new wording for this goal was adopted by the Subcommittee without objection. As a result of the Subcommittee’s discussion, the fourth Subcommittee goal is: Economic Vitality – Provide a transportation system that supports economic prosperity and livability.

The Subcommittee next discussed the goal of “financial responsibility.” Mr. Chang suggested that the Subcommittee revise the goal and call it “program delivery.” Deputy Secretary Davis added that “program delivery” was a broader term than “financial responsibility” and that program delivery, which focuses on providing services, could also incorporate fiscal responsibility. Mr. Lewis said that he had no problem with using fiscal responsibility but said that he wanted to see the Subcommittee adopt a measure to determine whether the right transportation projects are being selected. Dr. Tischer noted that use of the performance measures to select projects would result in the right projects. Mr. Watson suggested that the Subcommittee include customer satisfaction as a performance measure. As a result of the Subcommittee’s discussion, the fifth Subcommittee goal is: Program Delivery – To achieve excellence in the execution of programs and delivery of services.

Mr. Jewell suggested that there needs to be a way to get the message out to the public about positive developments in transportation. He said that there has been great improvement in transportation over the past few years, but it goes far

beyond the ability of this Subcommittee and staff to show people that things are happening and progress is being made. Mr. Jewell pointed out that there is no public relations department or person who develops a plan for getting the message out to the public. Mr. Jewell said that everything that the Subcommittee is suggesting needs to be done, but that the public needs to be informed about the good things that are happening in transportation. Mr. Fahl suggested considering Minnesota's goal of "inform, involve and educate all potentially affected stakeholders in transportation plans and investment decision processes."

Mr. Chang urged the Subcommittee to be careful in selecting goals because as Dr. Lance Neuman stated in the last Subcommittee meeting, the focus will be on whatever goals are selected.

Deputy Secretary Davis said that historically transportation agencies have not sufficiently informed the public of positive developments and added that he stressed this point to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The Deputy Secretary also said that whether getting the word out to the public is part of a performance measure or goal or whether it is a separate recommendation, it is something that is missing from the goals. He said that some type of vehicle needs to be put together to inform the public better about what is going on in transportation. The Deputy Secretary pointed out that the Subcommittee must decide whether it is a separate goal or a separate recommendation. Mr. Fahl suggested that such a vehicle needs to be factored into program delivery.

Mr. Conners said that he would like the Subcommittee to have a discussion on good customer relations and define what it means. Ms. Thomas commented that transportation agencies are asked to be fiscally responsible, but they need enough money to meet their missions. She asked whether the Subcommittee would be doing its job if it did not address that issue. Mr. Chang said that as a Subcommittee, they could make that recommendation. He said that an effective method is to show what the performance would be if the transportation agencies had enough money – to show the direct linkage between dollars and performance. Deputy Secretary Davis said that in VTrans2025, there was a stand-alone recommendation for better investment in transportation. He said that if the commission wanted to come to a similar conclusion, it could be a stand-alone recommendation.

Mr. Chang asked whether the Subcommittee resolved the issue of whether effective program delivery covers how well the agencies are doing and not necessarily whether they are doing the right thing. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee should not just concentrate on an agency's ability to deliver, but also on how projects are selected. Dr. Tischer suggested that the choice of projects should be based on identified measures. Mr. Chang said that a Subcommittee recommendation could be that the Outcome Measures Subcommittee goals should be used to select projects.

The subcommittee next discussed the goal of environmental stewardship. Ms. Thomas said that Oregon and Minnesota had a number of good measures related to environmental stewardship. Deputy Secretary Davis said that a survey conducted as part of Vtrans2025 found that environmental stewardship was one of the most important issues to citizens. Mr. Watson pointed out that the Subcommittee cannot underestimate the importance of the environment. He said that the public will react positively to emphasizing environmental concerns. Mr. Conners suggested that better land use would encompass environmental stewardship. Ms. Thomas said that VDOT's process of building and maintaining roads has impacts on land use and also on the environment. Mr. Fahl said that he was reluctant to link land use with the environmental issue. He said that it seems that environmental protection is an overarching issue that transportation agencies need to take care of but that land use is more of a local planning issue and not the responsibility of the transportation agencies. Mr. Chang got a consensus from the Subcommittee that for now the goals for land use and environmental stewardship will remain separate goals. However, he said that at the next Outcome Measures Subcommittee meeting, the Subcommittee will discuss whether the two goals should be linked.

Mr. Chang summed up the Subcommittee's decisions on the overarching goals:

- Fiscal Responsibility –change to “Program Delivery.”
- Mobility, Connectivity, Accessibility – need to define these terms.
- Safety and Security –combine into a single goal. The terms “safety” and “security” need to be better defined.
- Economic Vitality – livability will be added to this goal, using Oregon as a model. The goal will be reworded as follows: “Provide a Transportation System that Supports Economic Prosperity and Livability.”
 - Mr. Fenchuk asked about including “Affordability” under this goal. He said that the impact of land use decisions influence affordability. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee will put a placeholder for affordability as a possible performance measure.

Deputy Secretary Davis asked the Subcommittee to help articulate the importance of having overarching goals as opposed to just having performance measures. Mr. Fahl said that the goals create a framework for the identification of objectives that need to be measured. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee needs to emphasize why these goals should be used by transportation agencies. He said that the Subcommittee should establish goals that all transportation agencies can develop objectives and performance measures for, so that they all have the same vision. Ms. Blumling suggested that in order to provide consistency, the Subcommittee needs to have one voice for transportation – the goals framework is the one voice for transportation. Mr. Chang asked the Subcommittee to consider whether they are moving toward project development and priority setting. He said that it needs to be made very clear to agencies that project decisions will be made based on these goals. Mr. Fenchuk added that

the goals will help to optimize the maximum value for transportation dollars. Ms. Blumling suggested that anything transportation agencies do would have to link back to one of these goals. Ms. Thomas said that the public needs to know what their money is being spent on and agencies need to know what their spending priorities are. Mr. Chang asked the Commission's staff to draft an introductory paragraph that the subcommittee can discuss and approve at the next subcommittee meeting regarding the importance of having overarching goals.

Dr. Tischer explained performance measurement provisions in HB 3202. She recommended that the performance measurement requirements in HB 3202 be incorporated into the Commission's final report. Mr. Lewis said that the measures in HB 3202 do not seem to suggest change. He asked how the HB 3202 measures relate to directing investment. According to Dr. Tischer, most of the HB 3202 measures could be included in the goals the Subcommittee has discussed. She said that data do not currently exist on "job and housing access to transit facilities," but that such data was presently being collected. She also said that "job and housing access to pedestrian facilities" is extremely difficult information to obtain, but that data on new developments where sidewalks are being included is beginning to be collected.

Deputy Secretary Davis discussed setting targets and how that process leads to change. Specifically he said that once the history of a measure is known, a target for the measure can be set. Deputy Secretary Davis added that the Commonwealth Transportation Board is required to set such targets. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee does not necessarily have to make the HB 3202 measures a part of the Subcommittee's performance measures.

The Subcommittee next discussed (a) the Commission staff's finding that the performance measurement requirements in HB 3202 should be integrated into the Commission's final report and recommendations; and (b) the Commission staff's recommendation that the Multimodal Office biennially prepare regional and statewide measures and targets for the Commonwealth Transportation Board to consider for use in evaluating and selecting transportation improvement projects and in the transportation performance report. Deputy Secretary Davis said that there should be a vehicle whereby the goals in HB 3202 can be adopted by the CTB. Mr. Fenchuk said that none of the HB 3202 goals appear to be in conflict with what the Subcommittee is doing. Mr. Fahl said that the Subcommittee would be doing a good service to the Governor to incorporate HB 3202 into whatever the Commission ultimately decides upon. Mr. Chang agreed with the Commission staff's finding that the performance measurement requirements in HB 3202 should be integrated into the Commission's final report and recommendations. However, Mr. Chang questioned the Commission staff's recommendation that the Multimodal Office biennially prepare regional and statewide measures and targets for the Commonwealth Transportation Board to consider for use (1) in evaluating and selecting transportation improvement projects and (2) in the transportation performance report. He said that the

recommendation is somewhat premature. Mr. Chang concluded that the Subcommittee will consider the performance measures in HB 3202 as part of its work, as articulated in the Commission staff's finding: that the performance measurement requirements in HB 3202 should be integrated into the Commission's final report and recommendations. However Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee would not adopt the staff's recommendation at this time.

Dr. Tischer next gave the Subcommittee a presentation on mobility measures that Virginia has adopted and measures that other states have adopted. Ms. Sorrell gave a presentation on congestion measures and emphasized that VDOT is doing many things to improve operation and maintenance of the transportation system. She said that VDOT has looked extensively at what other states and countries do. According to Ms. Sorrell, 38% of the bridges in VA are in significant need of repair and 17 percent of primary road pavement is in need of repair. She said that VDOT currently collects data for those two measures and that VDOT is working on collecting similar data for secondary roads. She pointed out to the Subcommittee that one challenge in reducing congestion resulting from incidents is that VDOT is not in command at an incident. She said that during an incident, the state or local police are in command, with the exception of HAZ-MAT incidents, where the fire marshal is in charge. She said that VDOT has pursued some legislative initiatives in the past year to allow for quicker incident response times, such as allowing VDOT to drive on the shoulder to get to incidents more quickly – an initiative that State police supported. Ms. Sorrell also pointed out that real-time information on congestion is available through 511 Virginia and that providing accurate, timely information to the public is critical. She said that the average time it takes to clear a tunnel in Hampton Roads is 8 minutes – however the true time it takes for traffic to get back to normal operations is usually significantly greater.

Ms. Sorrell said that congestion occurs when volume exceeds capacity and travel speeds drop significantly lower than posted or free flow speed. She then discussed the sources of congestion and presented some information to the Subcommittee on best practices. Deputy Secretary Davis pointed out that Virginia is not necessarily trying to reduce congestion, but instead to manage the growth of congestion. Ms. Sorrell said that increased congestion is due in large part to a nearly 50% increase in the population of Virginia over the past several years. Mr. Fenchuk asked whether the Subcommittee should include as a measure an indicator of how well Virginia is doing in terms of growth of population versus highway construction. Deputy Secretary Davis reminded the Subcommittee that they need to consider not only roads but other modes of transportation as well. Mr. Chang added that the Subcommittee needs to make sure they measure outcome versus output – and that the Subcommittee should not only be looking at building roads but whether the transportation system is being made as efficient as possible. Ms. Blumling said that Virginia cannot continue building roads because it is running out of places to build them. Ms. Sorrell pointed out that reducing fatalities and crashes will reduce congestion.

She added that other nations such as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa have used technology much more aggressively to catch speeders and that such measures reduced the crash rate significantly (by about 40%) as a result of their implementation in those countries.

Ms. Sorrell next discussed the provision of real time information on congestion to travelers. She highlighted such services as Virginia 511 and the UVA Smart Travel Lab. She explained VDOT's current congestion measures: speed index, extent of congestion, duration of congestion, throughput, HOV performance, and average travel time. She pointed out that some of this information is based on trend data. She also explained that VDOT's new Dashboard 3 will introduce new measures, such as level of congestion, incident duration, work zone crashes, etc. Ms. Sorrell said that VDOT spends about \$1.5 million on transportation research at the University of Virginia, Virginia Tech University, and through federal grants, etc.

Ms. Pelletier asked whether Ms. Sorrell had an estimated cost of bridge repair. Ms. Sorrell said that the cost was just over \$800 million in fiscal year 2006 dollars. She added that the total repair needs for the system is \$3.8 billion and that VDOT currently has \$1.2 billion to address those needs. Ms. Pelletier also said that locals believe that maintenance is being done before it needs to be done because the perception is that state money to localities for maintenance is "use it or lose it." Ms. Sorrell said that VDOT does not distribute funds in such a manner and that money rolls over to subsequent years if it is not used. Ms. Pelletier also mentioned to Ms. Sorrell that she has heard concern among local police officers that they are not allowed to tell people to move their vehicle to the shoulder of the road after an incident. Ms. Sorrell said that she was not aware of this issue and that she would try to get additional information.

Dr. Tischer next presented information on best practices of other states for the following areas: safety and security, transportation system preservation and management, economic vitality, and program delivery. Following Dr. Tischer's presentation on other performance measures best practices, the Subcommittee discussed the following recommended performance measures, listed by overarching goal component:

GOAL: Mobility, Connectivity, and Accessibility – To facilitate the easy movement of people and goods (Mobility), improve interconnectivity of regions and activity centers (Connectivity), and provide accessibility to different modes of transportation (Accessibility).

- Mobility Measures
 - Transit Ridership
 - Transit Capacity
 - Congestion
 - Percentage of Congested Lane Miles
 - Delay

- Travel Time Reliability
 - Time to Clear Incidents
 - Number of Enplanements at Air Carrier Airports
 - Twenty Foot Equivalent Units (TEUs) Shipped Through the Port of Virginia
 - Freight Rail Capacity
- Accessibility Measures
 - Transit Availability
 - Transit Vehicle Revenue Miles
 - Access to Transit
 - Access to Airports
 - Alternatives to One-Person Commuting
 - Intercity Bus and Rail Service
- Connectivity Measures
 - Average Travel Speeds on Interregional Corridors
 - Intercity Travel Time Connectivity
 - Park and Ride Spaces

GOAL: Safety and Security – To provide a safe and secure transportation system.

- Safety and Security Measures
 - Number and Rate of Fatalities
 - Number and Rate of Injuries
 - Compliance with the Maritime Transportation Security Act
 - Percentage of Updated Emergency, Disaster, and Evacuation Plans
 - Percentage of Airports Participating in the Voluntary Security Certification Program
 - Percentage of Updated Transit System Safety and Security Plans or Continuity of Operation Plans

GOAL: System Maintenance and Preservation – To preserve and maintain the existing transportation system.

- Measures for Preserving and Maintaining Existing Transportation System
 - Percentage of Interstate and Primary Road Pavement in Need of Repair
 - Percentage of Bridges that Need Repair or Rehabilitation
 - Percentage of Transit Vehicles that Exceed Replacement Age
 - Increase Port Efficiency (Cargo per Acre)

GOAL: Economic Vitality – Provide a transportation system that supports economic prosperity and livability.

- Economic Vitality
 - Jobs created by transportation investment
 - Percent of transportation expenditures on small women and minority owned businesses (SWAM)
 - Tonnage originating or terminating in Virginia

GOAL: Program Delivery – To achieve excellence in the execution of programs and delivery of services.

- Program Delivery
 - Customer Service Delivery
 - DMV Wait Times
 - On-time / On-budget
 - Customer Satisfaction with the Transportation System

Mr. Chang suggested that the Subcommittee consider having a goal for “Preservation and Maintenance” of the transportation system and also have a separate goal for “Operation and Management” of the transportation system. Mr. Chang said that the Subcommittee has now discussed overarching goals and performance measures for all areas except for land use and environmental stewardship. He said that at the next meeting, the Subcommittee would discuss those two areas and develop performance measures for those goals. He said that the objective of the next Subcommittee meeting is to have a complete set of goals and associated performance measures by the conclusion of the meeting. The next Outcome Measures Subcommittee meeting will be held May 16 at the State Capitol Building in Richmond.

The meeting was adjourned.