

## **Appendix D: DOT Performance Measurement Systems for DOT Funded Positions at Resource Agencies**

### ***Performance Standards for Interagency Environmental Technical Advisory Teams at FDOT***

Florida's ETDM process is evaluating ETAT performance. Both FDOT staff and resource agency members have performance standards to uphold, per the agencies' master and operating agreements, including:

- ETAT review of Planning and Programming Screens within 45 days.
- FDOT response to comments and inquiries within 30 calendar days.
- FDOT response to request for additional information within 30 calendar days.
- Number of Requests for Additional Information.
- Establishment of quality assurance protocols for digital information. Quality checks on system performed within 90 calendar days of completing field reviews and technical reports.
- Completion of Dispute Resolution Process within 90 calendar days.
- Review of all environmental documents and permit pre-applications within 30 calendar days.
- Position makes joint field visits as needed to make decisions in the field.

The above performance standards are unique in the inclusion of incentives to reduce requests for additional information. FDOT is also asking each agency to describe their process before and after ETDM implementation, in order to establish a baseline, increase interagency understanding, and identify further areas for improvement. (See FDOT ETDM Annual Evaluation Questions).

Each agency's ETAT representatives meet annually with the FDOT ETDM Coordinator to review program issues and concerns including, workload, staffing and resource needs. At the meeting, the participants exchange information related to the efficacy of the ETDM process, and identify both program deficiencies and ways to improve the process. Topics discussed at the annual meeting may include:

- Role of cooperating agencies and levels of involvement
- Quality of submittals
- Number of permit application revisions
- Achievement of concurrent processing
- Number of requests for substantive additional information
- Sufficiency of quality assurance protocols for digital information
- Interagency communication and coordination

- Sufficiency and quality of documentation of all actions
- Timeliness of performance under the ETDM process
- Efficacy of conflict resolution process

FDOT is hoping to move toward a truly electronic performance management system that will allow a substantive, fact-based conversation about how the system is working while reducing generation and processing of reports and FDOT time required for contract oversight. Timeframe is the initial element being tracked, but ultimately FDOT anticipates being able to query all aspects of an agency's response and responsiveness. FDOT is looking at 18 potential measures.

### ***NCDOT Uses Resource Agency Performance Goals in Context of Mutually Agreed Position Description***

NCDOT relies on job descriptions and annual reports submitted by each funded position rather than DOT-set performance goals or measures. NCDOT contracts provide a summary of job responsibilities, expectations for conduct, contract terms (duration and cancellation clauses), invoicing and payment schedules, annual reporting requirements, and other administrative items. Resource agencies with staff supported by NCDOT also submit an annual report discussing how the positions are increasing efficiency and effectiveness, qualitatively.

The funded position and the resource agency set the performance goals and measures for a given DOT-funded position for the year, but those objectives must be consistent with the job description developed by the agencies. Measures have included:

- Total number of major permit actions taken
- Processing times
- Number documents reviewed
- Number of meetings attended
- Number documents drafted/prepared
- Number of hours spent in permit process meetings
- Number of meetings vs. number percent actions taken
- Reviews and approvals (i.e. water quality certification issues, doc reviews, letters)
- Percentage of projects placed on hold
- Number of project specific contacts and requests from last year to this year
- Design changes issued (an underlying process that affects performance)
- Number of days in training
- Reduction in impacts on TIP projects
- Site visits

NCDOT supplemented this assessment with an internal customer satisfaction survey of regions and engineers who interact with the funded position. Upon review of the annual reports, the

NCDOT Funded Position Program Administrator prepares a summary of the accomplishments of the Program. This is an evaluation process that NCDOT considers an opportunity to enhance communication, set common goals, and identify areas that agencies can support each other to improve mutual processes.

NCDOT is continuing to evolve both the types of agreements used and the accountability system employed for measuring performance of funded positions. The positions' self-assessment and effectiveness report will be circulated to the regions in advance of DOT rankings, so regional DOT staff may benefit from a broader appreciation of that which the person may have been accomplishing outside a given DOT region.

### ***Maryland State Highway Administration (MDSHA) Performance Tracking Tools***

At the Maryland State Highway Administration (MDSHA), each funded position at a resource agency is required to submit monthly time sheets and a summary of their progress/activities. The time sheets identify how many hours each day are spent on which specific projects, along with a summary of total hours per project that month. With regard to document review, MDSHA asks for a listing of all documents commented upon, substance of comments, date due, and date provided. Meeting attendance is tracked as well as issues that have emerged and recommendations for addressing those. Involvement in interagency task forces, review of policy documents, handbooks, or procedures commented upon are also tracked, as well as regulations, policies, or other information from the resource agency that was provided to the SHA. Outreach, education and continuous improvement efforts are recorded. A progress call is made to each agency on a monthly basis to discuss workloads and project issues. Each quarter, the agencies submit an invoice showing the number of hours and the corresponding money (salary and travel expenses) spent on each project. These are then reviewed and forwarded for charging against specific federally funded projects. The agency representatives work on an average of 10 projects per month (the projects are either in the Project Planning-NEPA process or the Design-wetland permit process). This system requires the funded staff to each spend approximately two days per quarter completing the monthly time sheets, progress reports, and quarterly invoices. The SHA staff person averages two to three hours per quarter per agency to review and process the forms.

### ***Caltrans Updating Contracts and Performance Standards***

Caltrans has attempted to track progress according the following service standards for funded positions from data compiled on a quarterly basis; however Caltrans reports that the level of documentation varies by agency.

- Percentage of mandatory reviews, concurrence findings, consultation and/or permit actions completed within the statutory time frames.
- Percent rate of participation (80 percent is performance standard) in critical field review/scoping meetings.
- Percent rate of participation (80 percent is performance standard) in meetings to develop interagency programmatic approaches.
- Tracking time by project and type of action (permit review, consultation, scoping meetings) spent on DOT projects.
- Response time (24 hour or less standard) on urgent communications.

Caltrans formerly compiled performance measure data and then compared that data with the above performance goals on a quarterly or semi-annual basis. The agencies discussed identified problems or areas for process improvement—within either the DOT or the partnering agency. Performance measures served several functions: accountability needs, ensuring that the positions are used as intended and not absorbed into some other program need, tracking progress toward objectives or process improvement, and internal communications or advocacy needs. Caltrans is now moving toward a less data intensive and agency specific reporting system that is still being developed.

The performance measures for Caltrans' funded position at USFWS give an indication of Caltrans' new direction in revising performance measures for all positions. Notably, the FWS staff person is expected to achieve the expected turnaround times 100 percent of the time for those projects designated as a priority by Caltrans, unless Caltrans and FWS have mutually agreed to extend the timeframe.

- Formal Consultation:
  - a. Within 30 days of request, notify Caltrans if additional information is needed.
  - b. Complete consultation / issue Biological Opinion within 120 days of receipt of sufficient information.
- Informal Consultation:
  - a. Within 30 days of request, notify Caltrans if additional information is needed.
  - b. Complete consultation within 60 days of receipt of sufficient information, unless Caltrans and FWS mutually agree to a 30-day extension.
- Append project to a Programmatic B.O.
  - a. Within 30 days of request, notify Caltrans if additional information is needed.
  - b. Complete consultation within 30 days of receipt of sufficient information, unless Caltrans and FWS mutually agree to a 30-day extension.

### ***Kentucky's Monthly Reporting Template***

The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet utilizes a monthly reporting template that notes highlights and/or areas to improve on and documents resolution of issues pertaining to areas covered within the previous monthly report, in addition to the following:

- Number of projects received
- Number of projects processed
- Average turn around time
- Number of re-coordinated projects
- Number of new/first time projects
- Number of projects responded on or before 30 day period
- Number of projects responded to after 30 day period

- Number per district
- Number of each type of project reviewed (possibly so connection of time frames)
- List of projects with unusual circumstances (i.e., requests for speedy review, extra involvement by the Service, etc.)
- List/description of non-typical projects (i.e., Service involvement of identifying mitigation opportunities, etc.)
- List of meetings, site-visits, and/or misc. out of office work
- Summary of time spent per #2, #3, and misc.
- Additional explanation/suggestions

### ***PennDOT Customer Satisfaction Survey and Revised Performance Assessment System***

PennDOT uses an internal customer satisfaction survey to discern the value the funded position is providing for the agency and to identify issues and areas for improvement. The performance reviews focus on the value added to the Department above the baseline level of support each agency provides as a function of its normal mission. The agency's satisfaction level is recorded based on individual perceptions of how much the positions' contributions help to improve the quality of environmental documents, how well the agency representative understands DOT processes and their interrelationships with other agencies, the availability of the funded representative to meet DOT project needs, the level of communications effectiveness and responsiveness, their effort and ability to identify and resolve issues at the lowest level, and their ability to help facilitate the development of priority projects.

PennDOT's model has been implemented in several states. North Carolina and South Carolina are also using a customer service satisfaction survey with each new position funded at other agencies, which North Carolina is following up with interviews of DOT staff, to identify strengths and areas for improvement in how the funded positions are functioning. This qualitative information has been among the most valuable. North Carolina assesses the satisfaction of regulatory agency stakeholders as well. North Carolina, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania each identified some problems with the system, including a tendency toward above average scores and in the case of one, initial fear on the part of the resource agency staff being evaluated.

### ***Oregon DOT's Intra-agency Audit***

Oregon DOT performed internal audits on their Intergovernmental Agreements and DOT-funded positions. Their audit found that "there is little quantified data to show that ODOT is getting agreed-upon services or to measure the effectiveness of the agreements." The audit recommended making the agreements more specific and performance-based.

### ***Washington State DOT Measures for FWS and NOAA Positions***

Washington State DOT is in the process of developing and updating performance measurement information; measures for their FWS funded position were the only ones available and are included in the bibliography. The agency is tracking:

- Total months of funded position effort during the reporting period (i.e. for all funded positions at the agency combined. WSDOT and FWS factor in how many people are working that quarter. Sometimes the agency has had people temporarily detailed to another activity. Sometimes WSDOT has provided additional support in a period.)
- Number of biological assessments received.
- Percent of biological assessments responded to within 30 days (the consultation completed or a letter requesting additional information is sent).