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April 3, 2018

www.T4america.org
@t4america
Transportation for America is the alliance of elected, business and civic leaders from communities across the country that want smart, locally-driven transportation solutions — because these are the investments that hold the key to our future economic prosperity.
Today’s Agenda

T4America will work with Massachusetts’ leaders to develop a shared understanding and:

• Have a discussion on the RPA experience with Performance Measurement at the Central Mass RPC, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission and Franklin Regional Council of Governments.

• Have an interactive session with Josh Ostroff from T4MA and Kevin Thompson of Transportation for America about the learning of the Academy and what it means for your work and goals.
PIONEER VALLEY

SAFETY COMPASS
Background

- Regional Top 100 High Crash Intersections Report
- GIS data – RMV, DOT, Cleaned Data Released
- Intersection 200 ft buffers
- Rotaries, Interstate Crashes and Ramps - Excluded
- Case by case variability – some locations are treated as a single intersection, some as multiple intersections
- EPDO – Equivalent Property Damage Only
  ( Fatal Crash = 10, Injury = 5, Property Damage = 1)
- Nomenclature – Intersection naming is not consistent in MassDOT records
- Locations appearing on the Top 100 High Crash Intersections List receive additional points in TIP project scoring criteria
Comparison: Communities in Top 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number of Intersections in Top 100</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number of Intersections in Top 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLYOKE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HOLYOKE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICOPEE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CHICOPEE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WESTFIELD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFIELD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WEST SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHAMPTON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EAST LONGMEADOW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST LONGMEADOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LUDLOW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUDLOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAWAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AGAWAM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANBY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMHERST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRANBY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH HADLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HADLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBRAHAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PALMER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of Communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total # of Communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety Compass

• Problem – the Top 100 Report does not provide safety data for most communities.

• Solution – Regional Safety Compass
  – Summarizes most recent 3 years of MassDOT crash data by community (2012 – 2014).
  – Identifies the top crash locations in each community
  – Classifies predominant crash trends
  – Maps crash location, injury crashes, and fatal crashes
  – Provides an overview of key findings from the data
  – Provides different data for urban and rural locations
  – Digital version given to each community

• http://www.pvpc.org/content/safety-compass
**Pioneer Valley Safety Compass**
**BRIMFIELD (2012 – 2014)**

**TOWN CRASH PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Manner of Collision</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head On</td>
<td>No injury</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ice 2 Cloudy 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Snow 8 Snow 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Swipe</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wet 11 Rain 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Vehicle</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sand 1 NR* 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other 1 Sleet 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Manner of Collision</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head On</td>
<td>No injury</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ice 3 Cloudy 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sand 0 Snow 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Swipe</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wet 5 Rain 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Vehicle</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Snow 7 NR* 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other 0 Sleet 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Manner of Collision</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>Fatal Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head On</td>
<td>No injury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ice 4 Cloudy 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slush 0 NR* 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Swipe</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snow 5 Rain 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Vehicle</td>
<td>Non-fatal injury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wet 4 Snow 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other 0 Sleet 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 178**

^ Non Incapacitating  @ Possible  $ Incapacitating  * Not Reported

**TOP CRASH LOCATIONS IN TOWN:**

1. The Intersection of Main Street (Route 20) and Warren Road. It had a fatal crash in the year 2013. (Total Crashes – 3, EPDO* - 12)
2. The Intersection of Palmer Road (Route 20) and Old Palmer Road (Total Crashes – 4, EPDO* - 12)
3. Massachusetts Turnpike I-90 in the vicinity of Little Alum Pond Road (Total Crashes – 3, EPDO* - 11)
KEY FINDINGS:
- The Town of Brimfield experienced a total of 178 crashes within the calendar years of 2012 to 2014.
- The Town experienced 2 fatal crashes within the analysis period. One at the intersection of Main Street (Route 20) and Warren Road and the other along Sturbridge Road (Route 20) east of its intersection with E Brimfield Holland Road.
- The Town experienced 1 non-motorist crash within this period which involved a wheelchair along Saint Claire Road in the year 2014. It resulted in a non-incapacitating injury.
- More than 52% (93 out of 178) of the total crashes were single vehicle collisions with other objects.
- "Followed too closely" was one of the top driver contribution codes for the crashes.
- More than 40% of the total crashes occurred along the Interstate I-90.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST HARMFUL EVENT</th>
<th>DRIVER CONTRIBUTION CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision with motor vehicle in traffic</td>
<td>No improper driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with guardrail</td>
<td>Followed too closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with tree</td>
<td>Operating vehicle in erratic, reckless, careless, negligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with animal - deer</td>
<td>or aggressive manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with parked motor vehicle</td>
<td>Driving too fast for conditions or speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with utility pole</td>
<td>Failed to yield right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with other</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overturn/rollover</td>
<td>Failure to keep in proper lane or running off road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with ditch</td>
<td>Other improper action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with embankment</td>
<td>Fatigue, Illness or Physical Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with other post/support</td>
<td>Over correcting or over steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with curb</td>
<td>Made an improper turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with median barrier</td>
<td>Distracted, Emotional or Inattention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with other movable object</td>
<td>Operating defective equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with unknown fixed object</td>
<td>Swerving or avoiding due to wind, slippery surface, vehicle,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-collision</td>
<td>object, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>AMBIENT LIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dark - roadway not lighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban minor arterial or rural major collector</td>
<td>Dusk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural minor arterial or urban principal arterial</td>
<td>Dark - lighted roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban collector or rural minor collector</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison – Massachusetts Vs. Pioneer Valley

Total Fatalities - 5 Year Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Massachusetts Total</th>
<th>PVPC Total</th>
<th>Massachusetts Rate</th>
<th>PVPC Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>371.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>360.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>360.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison – Massachusetts Vs. Pioneer Valley

Combined Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries - 5 Year Averages
Comparison – Massachusetts Vs. Pioneer Valley

Total Serious Injuries - 5 Year Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Massachusetts Total</th>
<th>PVPC Total</th>
<th>Massachusetts Rate</th>
<th>PVPC Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>3714.2</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>3595.2</td>
<td>406.2</td>
<td>406.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>439.6</td>
<td>439.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>3365.8</td>
<td>465.2</td>
<td>465.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>3251.8</td>
<td>478.4</td>
<td>478.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pioneer Valley Historic Crash Data
Next Steps

• Work with MassDOT on “First Harmful Event” category
• Begin to look at Safety Performance Measures by community to identify trends
  – Work with communities and MassDOT to identify additional safety data needs
  – Update every 3 – 4 years
• Continue to work local police to identify the importance of submitting crash data to MassDOT

Gary M. Roux
Principal Planner
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
(413) 781-6045
gmroux@pvpc.org
PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN FRANKLIN COUNTY
Performance Measures Required by the FAST Act

- SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- PAVEMENT/BRIDGE PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- WE’VE ADOPTED MASSDOT’S SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- THE OTHERS ARE IN DEVELOPMENT
Fast Facts about FRANKLIN COUNTY

- MOST RURAL COUNTY IN MASSACHUSETTS
- TOTAL POPULATION OF 72,000
- 26 TOWNS; SMALLEST TOWN HAS A POPULATION OF 100
- 725 SQUARE MILES
- POPULATION DENSITY IS LESS THAN 100 PEOPLE PER SQUARE MILE
Evaluation Criteria

- WE USE PERFORMANCE MEASURES TO RANK CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
  - Cost Effectiveness
  - Condition
  - Mobility
  - Safety
  - Community Effects
  - Land Use
  - Economic Development
  - Environmental Effects
Draft Performance Measures for Passenger Rail Service Expansion
OBJECTIVES

- Compile information to determine the success of the pilot service expansion to help decide the most appropriate future rail service levels.

- Identify and understand the aspects of the service expansion that are working well (or are less successful) to refine the service expansion during and after the pilot.
Draft Performance Measures

- Measures and Information to Track and Evaluate Success
  - Ridership total
  - Passenger-related revenue as a share of operating costs
  - Regional Support for rail expansion
Draft Performance Measures

- Understanding Key Elements of the Expanded Service
  - Ridership by Train
  - On-time Performance
  - Customer Satisfaction
CMMPO Performance Management: Year in Review 10/1/16 – 10/1/17
Evolution of Performance Management

Federal Transportation Legislation

MAP-21 & FAST Act
State DOTs and MPOs must collaborate on specific performance measures and targets that support 7 National Goals

CMMPO Performance Management Program
CMMPO exceeds federal legislation requirements to create own evolving PBPP* process that meets the needs of the region

7 National Goal Areas
- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition
- Congestion Reduction
- System Reliability

18 Goals and Objectives across 10 federal transportation planning emphasis areas
- Freight Movement and Economy
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays
10 Federal Emphasis Areas

SAFETY
SECURITY
STATE OF GOOD REPAIR
CONGESTION / MOBILITY

MULTIMODAL OPTIONS
REDUCE GHG / PROMOTE SUSTAINABILITY
EQUITABLE TRANSPORTATION

ECONOMIC VITALITY / FREIGHT MOVEMENT
STORMWATER MGMT AND RESILIENCY
TRAVEL & TOURISM
PBPP Framework

- **Vision, Goals, Objectives**
- **Performance Measures**
- **Gather and Analyze Data Needs Assessment Congestion Management Process**
- **Identify Trends and Targets**
- **Screen Candidate TIP Projects with Performance Management Scoresheet**
- **Coordinate with the State and WRTA on Federally Required Targets and Measures**
- **Identify Needs for Further Study as Necessary (UPWP)**
- **Report to CMMPO Stakeholders through Annual Report Card Year in Review**

**PLAN**
- **TIP (Project Level Investments)**
  - Evaluate Projects (Criteria based on objectives)
  - Develop Five-year Investment Program
  - Allocate Resources
  - Program Projects
- **LRTP (System-Level Framework)**
  - Conduct Scenario Planning
  - Identify 20 Strategy and Alternative
  - Develop Investment Priorities
  - Allocate Resources

**PROGRAM**
- **Evaluate to Determine Effectiveness of Strategies**
- **Evaluate Performance Management Criteria Matrix**
- **Monitor Conditions with Annual Report Card**

**MONITOR & EVALUATE**
The following Year in Review only shows performance for four out of the ten federal emphasis areas from 10/1/16 – 10/1/17.

These four federal emphasis areas are where measures and targets have been solidified and are backed by consistent and strong data to indicate regional performance.

This report is a summary and only meant to identify strengths and weaknesses throughout the region.
Update of 4 out of 10 Federal Emphasis Areas:

- SAFETY
- CONGESTION
- STATE OF GOOD REPAIR
- EQUITABLE TRANSPORTATION

Status Indicator for Performance in Each Emphasis Area:

- Better Than Baseline
- Trend is stable
- Worse Than Baseline
Year in Review Performance Summary

SAFETY

GOAL: Improve safety and security of the region

OBJECTIVE I
Reduce number and rate of injuries and deaths and lower the average Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO).

Description – The CMMPO visualizes a region where the number and rate of vehicle crashes are reduced by 2025. In order to monitor this reduction, the CMMPO decided on four indicators related to safety:

- Reduce average EPDO of the HSIP* eligible locations by 10%
- Reduce number of total crashes by 10% in 10 years
- Reduce the fatal crash rate by 10% in 10 years
- Reduce the injury crash rate by 10% in 10 years

Trend – Based on the charts below, the trendlines depict the CMMPO as unable to meet the specified safety targets set for 2025.
OBJECTIVE I

Improve transportation accessibility for all modes

**Description** – In order to create a holistic transportation system it would be beneficial to repair the pedestrian network (sidewalks and curb ramps) alongside repairs made to the road system. Curb ramps are a small but important part of making sidewalks, street crossings, and the other pedestrian routes that make up the public right-of-way accessible to people with disabilities.

**Target** – Increase the number of ADA compliant ramps in the region by 100 per year for a total of 2,975 compliant ramps in 10 years.

**Trend** – The number of ramps with a condition of “Compliant” have been steadily increasing since the baseline data has been set. As of 2017, the CMMPO has surpassed its goal with compliant ADA ramps. The chart below outlines the increase in ADA Compliant Ramps and how the region is on track to make its goal.
Year in Review Performance Summary

STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

GOAL: Achieve state of good repair to improve mobility for all modes

OBJECTIVE II

Maintain condition of region’s roadways

**Description** – All roadways are in a constant state of deterioration because of time, weather, and traffic load. Because of this, CMMPO transportation staff implemented a pavement management program to assist decision makers in determining the most cost-effective strategies to address the region’s deteriorating roadway conditions. The targets and measures related to this goal are geared toward reducing the lane mileage of poor and very poor roads and sidewalks in the region.

**Target** – A) Reduce the mileage of roads in poor or very poor condition by 50 lane miles over 10 years.

B) Reduce the mileage of sidewalks in poor condition by 10% (1.72 miles) over 10 years.

**Trend** – A) The region has seen a total reduction amount of 197.8 lane miles that were in poor or very poor condition from the baseline year, 2014. The target is to have a 50 lane mile reduction in poor or very poor pavement conditions from baseline year, 2014, which means that the region has met and achieved this target.

B) With regards to the sidewalks, it is not determined whether or not the region is on track to meet it’s target. Between 2015 and 2017, there has been an additional of 29.5 sidewalk segments included in the regional sidewalk survey. Because of this, another approach is suggested to measure the state of the regions sidewalks.

Because the region is on track to meet Target A and Target B needs more information, the CMMPO is on track to meet its pavement goals.
OBJECTIVE III

Maintain condition of on and off-system bridges

Description – Evaluating the sufficiency of the region’s bridges is done by calculating factors that relate to the ability of a bridge to remain in service. A “Structurally Deficient” (SD) bridge is a status used to describe a bridge that has one or more structural defects that require attention. This status does not indicate the severity of the defect but rather that a defect is present.

Target – Decrease the number of bridges in the region by 10% every year that are "Structurally Deficient."

Trend – The amount of SD bridges in the region has increased by 22% from 2014 to 2016. Additionally, the number of SD bridges from 2016 through 2017 has remained the same. Because of the increase in SD bridges in the region, the CMMPO is not on track for reducing the number of SD bridges in the region by 10% every year.
OBJECTIVE IV

Maintain transit vehicles in state of good repair

Description – The purpose of this objective is to maintain a state of good repair for all paratransit vans and fixed route buses of the Worcester Regional Transit Authority’s (WRTA) bus fleet.

Target – To comply with FTA regulations to maintain the average age of paratransit vans of 5 years old and fixed route buses of 12 years old.

Trend – At the close of FY 17, the average fleet age of paratransit vans is 3.23 years old and the average fleet age of fixed route buses is 5.3 years old. Because the average age of both paratransit vans and fixed route buses are below the average fleet age suggested by the FTA, the CMMPO receives a green light for this objective.
OBJECTIVE I
Reduce travel delay through Intelligent Transportation Systems.

Description — Providing a safe, efficient, effective, and reliable transportation system is becoming more difficult to achieve because roadway congestion is increasing nationwide. Expanding existing roadways to increase capacity often is not practical or possible. An attractive and cost-effective approach for improving capacity is to optimize the efficiency of existing facilities using advanced traffic management systems (ATMS).

ATMS use a variety of intelligent transportation system (ITS) technologies to manage vehicles on existing roadways and to maximize the value derived from and capacity of our transportation system.

Intelligent Transportation System Technology Examples

Target — This objective has two targets — one for implementing ITS technologies on the highway and one for implementing ITS technologies with transit.
2. Install Transit Signal Priority (TSP) – 5 signals every 5 years.

Trend — Overall, the CMMPO has improved for the first highway target and remained the same for the second transit target. Because there is some improvement for this objective, the CMMPO receives a greenlight.

Target 1: As of 2016, MassDOT has completed 13% of VMS signs on I-290. This installation is a part of Project 607484, which will place 18 Closed Circuit Television cameras and four VMS along the I-290 corridor in the region.

Target 2: The Worcester Regional Transit Authority (WRTA) has not installed any TSP signals.
OBJECTIVE II

Manage congestion with increases in population.

**Description** – When traffic demand approaches or exceeds the available capacity of the highway system, the end result is congestion. Congestion is recognized as a problem of national importance that adversely affects both the economy and quality of life. With a regional increase in population, there will be an increase of vehicles on the road which means more congested miles in the network. This objective is to manage the number of congested miles in the region with a growing population.

**Trend** – As of 2015, the miles of congested roads per capita is below the trendline which means that the CMMPO is doing well. Looking ahead for 2020, the congested miles per capita is projected to be above the trendline. Between now and the next 2020 census, the CMMPO has an opportunity to implement congestion solutions to maintain the congested miles per capita below the trendline.

**Target** – Using the established congested miles per capita trendline; maintain a congested miles per capita figure below the trendline.
OBJECTIVE I

Assure that transportation improvements are geographically equitable throughout the entire region

**Description** – The CMMPO Region is made up of six subregions, North, Northeast, Southeast, South, West, and Central/Worcester. This measure evaluates the geographic equity of TIP projects, making sure that every person in all subregions has the same opportunity to benefit from a TIP project.

**Target** – No subregion’s TIP project per capita calculation should be more than 33% below the average project per capita calculation of the six subregions. As long as the TIP project per capita remains below 33% of the subregion’s average project per capita for all six subregions, the CMMPO will be considered within the target of this goal.

**Trend** – Every subregion within the CMMPO is not more than 33% below the average project per capita which means that everyone in the region has had the same opportunity to benefit from a TIP project.
OBJECTIVE II
Access to essential services for Environmental Justice (EJ) populations

*Description* – The CMMPO is committed to ensuring that traditionally underserved and underrepresented communities receive a fair share of the regional transportation system’s benefits, and are not subject to undue burdens. Access to essential services such as employment opportunities can be challenging for underserved populations living in EJ areas. This measure evaluates how many EJ block groups have access to a frequent WRTA bus routes within ¼ mile.

*Target* – This target is to make sure that the same or greater percentage of EJ block groups intersect a frequent WRTA bus route.

*Trend* – This year is considered baseline for this measure and a trend will be determined with further updates of this report.

---

# EJ Block Groups intersection 2017 WRTA Routes: 138

Total # of EJ Block Groups (2015 5 Yr ACS): 168

% of EJ Block Groups intersecting WRTA Routes: 82.1%
### CMMPO Regional Performance Management Report Card: 10/1/16 - 10/1/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Target / Measure</th>
<th>2016 Status</th>
<th>2017 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REDUCE THE INCIDENCE OF CRASHES WITH RESULTANT CASUALTIES</td>
<td>Reduce number and rate of injuries and deaths and lower the average EPDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY ALONG FREIGHT ROUTES</td>
<td>Reduce number and rate of injuries and deaths along primary freight routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCE SECURITY, PREPAREDNESS AND COORDINATION</td>
<td>Evacuation routes established; preparedness campaign complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY FOR ALL MODES</td>
<td>Increase ADA-compliant ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTAIN THE CONDITION OF THE REGION’S ROADSWAYS</td>
<td>Rehabilitate 50 miles of roadways in poor condition; improve sidewalks in poor condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTAIN CONDITION OF BRIDGES</td>
<td>Decrease number of structurally-deficient bridges by 10% annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTAIN TRANSIT VEHICLES IN STATE OF GOOD REPAIR</td>
<td>Average age should be maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUCE TRAVEL DELAY THROUGH INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>This objective has two targets – one for implementing ITS technologies on the highway and one for implementing ITS technologies with transit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGE CONGESTION WITH INCREASES IN POPULATION</td>
<td>Using the established congested miles per capita trendline, maintain a congested miles per capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPAND THE BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT NETWORK IN THE REGION</td>
<td>Increase bike lane mileage and storage rack availability; increase number of bus routes served by sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASE THE NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES WITH COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES</td>
<td>Work with communities to increase participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBAT SPRAWL AND ITS EFFECTS</td>
<td>Enhanced TIP screening; include criteria in the TIP scoring system to consider the effects of a proposed project on regional PDAs and PPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUCE EMISSIONS</td>
<td>Institute and encourage TDM policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARANTEE THAT TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS ARE GEOGRAPHICALLY EQUITABLE THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE REGION</td>
<td>No subregion’s TIP project per capita calculation should be more than 33% below the average project per capita calculation of the six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EJ) POPULATIONS</td>
<td>This target is to make sure that the same or greater percentage of EJ block groups intersect a frequent WRTA bus route.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEED SHIPPING IN THE REGION</td>
<td>Reduce delay along established primary freight routes, 2 every five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACCESSIBLE AND AVAILABLE ALLOWING FOR JOB EXPANSION</td>
<td>Improve the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks near two major employment centers every five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSURE THAT ANY NEW CANDIDATE TIP PROJECTS INCLUDE GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE (GI) APPROACHES</td>
<td>Get commitment from all 40 communities to incorporate GI approaches into their local ordinances; especially transportation planning for stormwater mgmt and infrastructure resiliency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE HIGHER PRIORITY TO TIP PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE GI IN THEIR PLANS IF THEY ARE LOCATED WITHIN A 100 AND 500 YEAR FLOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart Your Course

1. What resources, support, or technical assistance do you need to develop the performance measures that will help you identify key tasks and their associated resources?

2. List at least three other organizations that you know of and can reach out to in order to engage them in the development and implementation of performance measures.

3. List at least three other organizations in the region that you don’t know personally who could be impacted by your action plan. How could you reach out to them? Where do you know these organizations who could help make additional contacts?

4. What is the first actionable step towards your main goal?

Define Victory

1. If your organization were to participate in a workshop like this in 10 years, what disruptions and goals should first be addressed?

2. What are the most disruptive outcomes that you want to achieve? How should they be addressed?

3. How do these outcomes fit into those goals?

4. Which performance measurement areas will you focus on to help determine which investments will achieve your stated objectives?
Why did we create the Leadership Academy

Material covered: national, state and local applicability

Your feedback: what was the most helpful? Where did you need more?
Why is this valuable?

Deconstruct an Action Plan
Ten years out

- A significantly transformed transportation network
- Focus on future needs and reinvestment, including lifecycle and replacement costs
- “People-centered” transportation paradigm that accounts for environment, health, quality of life
- Use data for good decisions
- Agencies that are efficient, but nimble
Regional Outcomes

• Address energy conservation/GHG emissions reductions
• economic inequality
• quality of life
• health outcomes
How does transportation fit in?

• Transit is essential to GHG reduction
• Reducing congestion is key to air quality and quality of life
• Transportation is key to economic development
• Must re-think the radial transit network to provide interconnectivity
Which Performance Measures make sense?

- Ridership per capita
- Environmental (air quality, GHG emissions)
- Public health (mortality/morbidity)
- Social equity/access to opportunity (low-income residents served, employer/journey to work data)
Group Exercise

- Ten year horizon: challenges and goals
- Desired regional outcomes
- How does transportation fit in?
- What are meaningful performance measures?
What is newsworthy, and helps explain what you do and who benefits?
Next Steps

T4America and T4MA will continue to work with and your region. Keep an eye out for:

- A survey, tell us what was most valuable that you learned from the Academy.

- Are you currently working on a regional action plan? Tell us what it is and what stage you are in, we can help you.

- Are there any topics we did not cover? What webinar topics would be most beneficial for your current and future work?
2017 Transportation Leadership Academy

@transportationforamerica
@t4america
T4America
www.t4america.org
Thank You – Q&A