Montana's Approach to Asset Management

MDT's Performance Programming (P3) Process

April 26, 2012 Revenue and Transportation Interim Committee



Presented by: Lynn Zanto, Administrator Transportation Planning Division Montana Department of Transportation

Topics

- Asset Management Theory
- **The Performance Programming (P3) Process**
- System Performance (Results)

Asset Management Theory

Asset Management - Definition

A systematic and ongoing process that seeks to maximize an asset's useful life most cost effectively.

Asset Management - Features

Assets can be managed by ...

- Physical Characteristics (Example: Pavement Condition)
- Operational Characteristics (Example: Level of Service)
- A Combination of Both

Assets are Governed by Management Systems that ...

- Utilize Best Available Data
- Measure System Performance
- Establish Objectives via Performance Goals
- Optimize Future Investment Decisions

Examples of Transportation Assets

Roads

- Managed by Physical Characteristics (Pavement)
- Or by Operational Characteristics (Level of Service)
 - MDT utilizes Both Methods to Manage Roads
- Bridges
 - Managed by Multiple Physical Characteristics
 - Overall Condition Number of Structurally Deficient/Functionally Obsolete Bridges
 - Bridge Deck Health Deck Health Index
- Rest Areas & Other Facilities
- Signs, Guardrails, Equipment, Etc ...

Examples of Management Systems

- Pavement Management System
- Bridge Management System
- Congestion Management System
- Maintenance Management System
- Safety Management System

Management Systems Predict Performance

(As a Function Of Budget & Investment Strategies Over Time)



Management Systems Evaluate Alternatives

Resurfacing and Rehabilitation Stretch Resources Reconstruction Work needed when Useful Life is Over *Ideal Mix = Best Package to Meet Performance Goals*





Resulting in ... "The Right Treatment at the Right Time"



10

Performance Programming Process (P3)

MDT's Performance Programming Process

A process to develop an optimal funding allocation and investment plan based on strategic highway system performance goals and the continual measurement of progress toward these goals.

Implemented in 1999.

Vision for P3 Process established via TranPlan 21

- *TranPlan 21* is Montana's long-range transportation plan.
- *TranPlan 21* is part of an ongoing process that ...
 - Identifies Transportation Issues
 - Evaluates Public (and Stakeholder) Needs and Priorities
 - Establishes and Implements Policy Goals and Actions
- The purpose of *TranPlan 21* is to ensure that MDT continues to address customer priorities by directing resources to programs and projects that reflect those priorities.
- The P3 Process is a tool to help MDT accomplish this task.

P3 Process Governs Interstate, NHS & Primary Routes



Note: Urban and Secondary Routes not included in P3 Analysis.



Performance Programming – Goals

At present, the following goals exist for MDT's Performance Programming Process:

Pavement Condition (Interstate, Primary, NHS System)

Performance Goal:	Maintain average ride in the desirable (or superior) range with less than 3% of the miles in unsatisfactory condition.					
Note: Ride is defined as the	quality (smoothness) of the ride as perceived by the highw	vay user.				
Bridge Condition						
Performance Goal:	Reduce the number of functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridges on the state's highway system.					
<u>Congestion</u>						
Interstate: NHS: Primary:	Maintain Level of Service at "B" or Above Maintain Level of Service at "C" or Above Maintain Level of Service at "C" or Above	Note: A driver experiences noticeable discomfort when experiencing conditions below Level of Service "C".				
<u>Safety</u>						
Performance Goal:	To reduce fatalities and incapacitating injuries in half in two decades, from 1,704 in 2007 to 852 by	the State of Montana by y 2030.				

Performance Programming – Annual Activities

Each year the Performance Programming Process (P3) ...

- Accesses data from MDT's Bridge, Congestion and Pavement Management Systems to determine the current condition of the state's roadways and bridges.
- Analyzes the effects of various funding scenarios on system performance.
- Develops an "optimal" funding plan designed to meet or exceed performance goals for all systems.
- Presents the "optimal" funding plan to MDT staff for approval.
- Presents staff recommendations to the Transportation Commission for approval.
- Monitors MDT's tentative construction plan (TCP) to assure that future projects align with the funding plan.

System Performance (Results)



Bridge Condition - Statewide

Structurally Deficient / Functionally Obsolete Bridges: 2011 - 2020



Performance Goal = Reduce Total Number of Structurally Deficient (SD) / Functionally Obsolete (FO) Bridges



Funding Recommendations ...

Fund Distribution (2011 Analysis)

Measure	System	Missoula	Butte	Great Falls	Glendive	Billings	AII
Average Ride Q	uality (Target 60-100)						
	Interstate	80	81	81	82	81	81
	NHS System	80	79	79	79	79	79
	Primary	76	77	77	76	77	77
	All	79	79	79	79	79	79
% of Pavements	Poor						
	Interstate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	NHS System	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	Primary	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
	All	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Distribution of 2	016-2020 Funds by Dis	trict and Syste	em				
	Interstate	6%	6%	5%	3%	4%	24%
	NHS System	12%	6%	6%	8%	7%	39%
	Primary	9%	8%	6%	8%	6%	37%
	All	* 27%	20%	17%	19%	17%	1 00%

* Conforms with state law regarding maximum allowable district allocation for Primary System.

Bottom Line: <u>Management Systems</u> help direct funding & provide equity between the districts. <u>District personnel</u> provide direction with regard to nominating individual projects & determining overall district priorities.

Results of Fund Distribution Plan

Performance Goals = On Track

- Bridge Reduce Number of SD/FO Bridges
- Congestion Maintain Level of Service (All Systems)
- Pavement Desirable/Superior Pavement (with less than 3% Poor)
- Safety Progress toward Reducing Fatalities / Incapacitating Injuries
- Equality of Pavement Condition Achieved
 - No Significant Difference in Condition throughout Montana
- Conformity with State Statutes
- Most Optimal Plan Possible Advanced to Transportation Commission for Approval

Alternative Fund Distribution Plans

- Based on ...
 - District Population
 - District Lane Miles
 - Equal Funding to All Districts
- Yield Results that are less fair, less efficient and less defensible than our current fund allocation method (equivalent pavement condition).

Current Method vs. District Population

System Performance declines if funds distributed to each District by Population



Current Method vs. Old Method (Lane Miles)

System Performance declines if funds distributed to each District by Lane Miles



Current Method vs. Equal Funding

System Performance declines if funds distributed to each District Equally



Bottom Line ...

MDT's current fund allocation and project prioritization method (the Performance Programming Process) is fair, equitable, efficient ... and provides a mechanism for making cost-effective and accountable decisions.

One Final Thought ... Directed Funding

System Performance declines dramatically if funds directed away (lost) from Core Program



What Do Our Customers Think?

Customer Satisfaction has Increased "Across-the-Board" since P3's Implementation



Montana Transportation System Components: Percent Change 2001-2011

A Little Praise for Performance Programming

National Recognition for the State of Montana

2011 Report on the Performance of State Highway Systems: Measuring Transportation Investments: The Road to Success

Montana is leading the way in having essential tools needed to help decision makers choose more cost-effective transportation funding and policy options.

Sponsored by PEW Center on the States & The Rockefeller Foundation

 2008 Transportation Planning Excellence Award: *Transportation Asset Management Category*

> Sponsored by Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, & American Planning Association

Questions

