# Survey Respondents

* Jessie Jones, Arkansas DOT
* Michael Henry, Arkansas DOT
* Thor Anderson, Arizona DOT
* Edgardo Block, Connecticut DOT
* Holly Ostdick, Illinois DOT
* Matthew Haubrich, Iowa DOT
* David Schwartz, Kansas DOT
* Kirk Zeringue, Louisiana DOT
* Subrat Mahapatra, Maryland SHA
* Deanna Belden, Minnesota DOT
* Michael Iacono, Minnesota DOT
* Karen Miller, Missouri DOT
* Larry Shifflet, Pennsylvania DOT
* Christos Xenophontos, Rhode Island DOT
* Peggy Thurin, Texas DOT
* Sreenath Gangula, Washington DOT

# Original Pooled Fund States That Did Not Respond to Survey

* Alabama DOT
* California DOT
* Colorado DOT
* Delaware DOT
* Hawaii DOT
* Michigan DOT
* Mississippi DOT
* New Jersey DOT
* Oklahoma DOT
* Utah DOT
* West Virginia DOT
* Wisconsin DOT

# Survey Responses

## TPM Implementation Ingredients – Good TPM is a complex set of related activities. It involves people, processes, tools, and financial resources. Which of the following TPM activities is the biggest implementation challenge for your agency?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TPM Implementation Category | Examples | Agencies Rating as Biggest Challenge |
| People | Coordination and communication | 18.75% |
| Processes | Measure calculation, target-setting, performance-based planning, reporting | 43.75% |
| Tools | Systems and sources for data collection and analysis | 6.25% |
| Financial Resources | Linking long-range plans to investments, resources to carry out TPM | 31.25% |

## Please describe the noteworthy TPM implementation practice you would be willing to share with your peers.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TPM Implementation Category | Example | Agency | {Presentation Description |
| People (count=4) | Coordination and communication | Minnesota DOT | * Coordination Externally with MPOs and Internally within DOT
 |
| Missouri DOT | * State DOT/MPO/Transit Coordination
 |
| Washington DOT | * MAP-21 Folios as Communication Tools
 |
| Arkansas DOT (Jones, not attending) | * Stakeholder and MPO Coordination, PM Agreements
 |
| Processes (count=4) | Measure calculation, target-setting, performance-based planning, reporting | Iowa DOT | * Target-Setting Based on Likelihood and Consequences
 |
| Connecticut DOT | * Deliverables Shared Calendar
* Off-Year Progress Meetings reviewing performance results against established targets
* Reconciliation of state and national performance measure dashboards (communication tool)
 |
| Texas DOT | * Use of Decision Lens
 |
| Pennsylvania DOT | * Unable to attend but noted that they have a noteworthy practice in this area – did not specify
 |
| Tools (count=2) | Systems and sources for data collection and analysis | Maryland SHA | * PM3 Target Setting Methodology
 |
| Arkansas DOT (Henry, not attending) | * Enterprise data warehouse and sharing information through ArcGIS. Developing models to predict asset condition with different funding scenarios
 |
| Financial Resources (count=1) | Linking long-range plans to investments, resources to carry out TPM | Illinois DOT | * Highlighting Objectives/Goals Toward Targets in LRTP
* TPM Agreement among MPOS, transit agencies and Departments
 |
| My agency does not have a noteworthy practice | * Arizona DOT
* Kansas DOT (not attending)
* Louisiana DOT
* Minnesota DOT (Iacono)
* Rhode Island DOT
 |

## Planning, Programming, Budgeting, Monitoring and Performance Management: The link between planning, programming, budgeting, and monitoring in a TPM framework is critical to improving agency performance over the long term. Which of the following has been the biggest impediment for your agency in incorporating PBPP?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PBPP Category | Number of Agencies Rating as Biggest Challenge |
| Incorporating performance measures into long range plans and other performance-based processes | 1 (6.25%) |
| Allocating resources to projects to achieve goals, objectives, and targets | 7 (43.75%) |
| Tracking and evaluating programming decisions and outcomes | 5 (31.25%) |
| Reporting and communicating results | 0 (0.00%) |
| Collaborating and coordinating on PBPP activities | 3 (18.75%) |
| *Open-ended comments*Arkansas DOT* All these topics are relevant and important. It would be good to spend some time on each.

Connecticut DOT* All of the above

Minnesota DOT (Belden)* Integration of federal measures into our already well developed system.

Missouri DOT* Having the resources (financial and staff) to effectively do PBPP as the new requirements may trump what's really best to do

Illinois DOT* Data Management

Washington State DOT* There are multiple impediments in addition to the selected option. Resource allocation, incorporating federal measures in agency project prioritization process and decision making, etc.
 |

## Please describe the noteworthy PBPP practice you would be willing to share with your peers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PBPP Category | Agency | Presentation Description |
| Incorporating TPM into Long-Range Plans (count=4) | Texas DOT | * Use of Decision Lens and Preprocessor to Predict Results
 |
| Maryland SHA | * Incorporating Performance Measures into Long-Range Plans and Other Performance-Based Processes
 |
| Arkansas DOT (Jones, not attending) | * Project identification and evaluation process
 |
| Arkansas DOT (Henry, not attending) | * Web-Based Form to Compile Projects Recommended by Different Districts, Divisions, MPOs and other Sources
 |
| Allocating Resources to Achieve Goals, Objectives and Targets (count=1) | Iowa DOT | * Data-Driven Project Initiation and Prioritization
 |
| Reporting and Communicating Results (count=2) | Minnesota DOT | * MnSHIP Process (not federal Measures
* TAMP
* New TPM Dashboard/Website
 |
| Connecticut DOT | * Reconciliation of State and National Measure Dashboard
 |
| Collaborating and Communicating (count=2) | Missouri DOT | * Collaborating and Coordinating on PBPP Activities
 |
| Illinois DOT | * Collaborating and Coordinating (with MPOs and Transit Agencies) on PBPP Activities
 |
| My agency does not have a noteworthy practice (count=7) | * Arizona DOT
* Kansas DOT
* Louisiana DOT
* Minnesota DOT (Iacono)
* Pennsylvania DOT (not attending)
* Rhode Island DOT
* Washington State DOT
 |
| Other | Washington State DOT* [WSDOT] does a good job of communication and reporting project performance but not sure if we have a successful process in place to integrate the above mentioned activities in a streamlines fashion.
 |

## Which of the following topics is most important to include in the peer exchange to help agencies advance from low to medium TPM capability maturity?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Capacity-Building Category | Most Important (# of agencies) |
| Challenges and gaps from agencies with low TPM capability | 5 (31.25%) |
| Lessons learned from agencies with high TPM capability | 8 (50.00%) |
| Information about resources and tools for the TPM community | 2 (12.50%) |
| Information about specific performance measurement areas | 1 (6.25%) |
| *Open-ended comments*Connecticut DOT * Implementation in the performance-based planning and programming aspect of TPM (the "last mile" tying the plans to outcomes)
 |

## Other potential presentations and topics of interest in the survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agency (if applicable) | Presentation Ideas |
| Iowa DOT | * Never Let the Idealized Perfect State Stop You from Making a Start
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * How to Integrate Federal Measures into a Performance Management System
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * Collaborating and Coordinating on PBPP Activities
 |
| Connecticut DOT (other) | * TPM Governance – Standing Committee Structure
 |
| Texas DOT (other) | * Lessons Learned in Using Data (Granularity)
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * PBPP – Doing What is Required vs. What is Best
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * Data Management Issues
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * Resourcing TPM
 |
| N/A – Speed Sharing Idea? | * Tying Plans to Outcomes
 |

## All Agency Input for Presentations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agency | Presentation Ideas |
| Arkansas DOT (not attending) | * **TPM Implementation (People)** Stakeholder and MPO Coordination, PM Agreements
* **TPM Implementation (Tools)** Enterprise data warehouse and sharing information through ArcGIS. Developing models to predict asset condition with different funding scenarios
* **PBPP/Incorporating TPM into Long-Range Plans**
	+ Project identification and evaluation process
	+ Web-Based Form to Compile Projects Recommended by Different Districts, Divisions, MPOs and other Sources
 |
| Connecticut DOT | * **TPM Implementation (Process)**
	+ Deliverables Shared Calendar
	+ Off-Year Progress Meetings reviewing performance results against established targets
	+ Reconciliation of state and national performance measure dashboards (communication tool)
* **PBPP/ Reporting and Communicating Results** Reconciliation of State and National Measure Dashboard
* **Other** TPM Governance – Standing Committee Structure
 |
| Illinois DOT | * **TPM Implementation (Financial Resources)**
	+ Highlighting Objectives/Goals Toward Targets in LRTP
	+ TPM Agreement among MPOS, transit agencies and Departments
* **PBPP/Collaborating and Communicating** Collaborating and Coordinating on PBPP Activities
 |
| Iowa DOT | * **TPM Implementation (Process)**

Target-Setting Based on Likelihood and Consequences* **PBPP/Allocating Resources to Achieve Goals, Objectives and Targets** Data-Driven Project Initiation and Prioritization
* **Other** Never Let the Idealized Perfect State Stop You from Making a Start
 |
| Kansas DOT | **None** |
| Louisiana DOT | **None** |
| Maryland SHA | * **TPM Implementation (Tools)** PM3 Target Setting Methodology
* **PBPP/Incorporating TPM into Long-Range Plans** Incorporating Performance Measures into Long-Range Plans and Other Performance-Based Processes
 |
| Minnesota DOT | * **TPM Implementation (People)** Coordination Externally with MPOs and Internally within DOT
* **PBPP/ Reporting and Communicating Results**
	+ MnSHIP Process (not federal Measures
	+ TAMP
	+ New TPM Dashboard/Website
 |
| Missouri DOT | * **TPM Implementation (People)** State DOT/MPO/Transit Coordination
* **PBPP/Collaborating and Communicating** Collaborating and Coordinating (with MPOs and Transit Agencies) on PBPP Activities
 |
| Pennsylvania DOT (not attending) | * **TPM Implementation (Process)** Unable to attend but noted that they have a noteworthy practice in this area – did not specify
 |
| Rhode Island DOT | **None** |
| Texas DOT | * **TPM Implementation (Process)** Use of Decision Lens
* **PBPP/Incorporating TPM into Long-Range Plans** Use of Decision Lens and Preprocessor to Predict Results
* **Other** Lessons Learned in Using Data (Granularity)
 |
| Washington State DOT | * **TPM Implementation (People)** MAP-21 Folios as Communication Tools
* **PBPP/Other – [**WSDOT] does a good job of communication and reporting project performance but not sure if we have a successful process in place to integrate the above mentioned activities in a streamlined fashion.
 |