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Project Purpose

- Study how states can work together to use performance management elements to improve corridor performance in the MAP-21 goal areas of
  - Safety
  - Infrastructure condition
  - Freight movement/economic vitality
  - System reliability/congestion reduction

- Provide state DOTs, MPOs, and other agencies/organizations with recommendations and tools to help improve performance
Webinar Purpose

• Present research results

• Receive input on the results

• Receive guidance on how to improve and make more useful for stakeholders
Webinar Overview

• Proposed Maturity Model

• Noteworthy Practices from Across the U.S.

• Two Case Studies

• Implementation Strategies – self-assessment and recommendations

• Questions and Discussion
Maturity Model
Purpose and Development

• Help agencies gauge how corridor level planning and monitoring activities within their jurisdiction compare with current/future national standards

• Overall design based on maturity models from other studies and industries

• Detailed design based on review of the practice
# Maturity Model

## Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/ Objectives</th>
<th>Level 1: None/Limited</th>
<th>Levels 2-5</th>
<th>Level 6: Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Management Processes</th>
<th>Level 1: None/Limited</th>
<th>Levels 2-5</th>
<th>Level 6: Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Setting</th>
<th>Level 1: None/Limited</th>
<th>Levels 2-5</th>
<th>Level 6: Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maturity Model
Elements

• Performance Management Process
  » Goals/Objectives
  » Performance Measures
  » Targets
  » Resource Allocation
  » Reporting/Monitoring
  » Management/Operations
  » Integration into Planning

• Institutional/Governance
  » Mobilization of Partners
  » Organizational Structure
  » Funding
  » Collaboration with Modal and Planning Partners

• Technology/Tools
  » Data Collection/Availability
  » Data Sharing/Standardization
  » Analysis Tools/Capabilities
  » Availability of Data for Users
Noteworthy Practices
Corridor Selection

- Geographic diversity
- Data availability
- Institutional diversity
- Goal area diversity
- Multimodal
Noteworthy Practices
Overview

• Map of Reviewed Corridors

• Summary Table Highlighting Noteworthy Elements

• Individual Corridor Summaries

• Summary of Key Points and Trends

• Separate Database
  » Will be web-based
  » Will be searchable
Noteworthy Practices
Reviewed Corridors
### Noteworthy Practices Database

#### Corridor Classification and Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>States Include</th>
<th>Other Focus Areas</th>
<th>Non-Highway Modes</th>
<th>Multistate Coordination/Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-35 (NASCO)</td>
<td>Corridor Coalition incorporates interests from Mexico through Canada along I-35</td>
<td>MX, TX, OK, KS, MO, IA, MN, Can</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>North America's Corridor Coalition (NASCO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional/Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobilization of Partners</th>
<th>Oversight/Leadership/Strategic Direction</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Organization Funding</th>
<th>Collaboration among Moda Partners</th>
<th>Collaboration with Planning Partners</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executed by Executive Director Tiffany Melvin for many years. Receives direct oversight from board as well as diverse membership. Stands as an advocacy organization for infrastructure improvements on I-35 but expanded into a multi-national organization with the addition of Mexican and Canadian membership. Also now a multimodal organization with greater focus on rail and to address freight and port activities.</td>
<td>Different state and local government jurisdictions.</td>
<td>Different states paid for private sector organizations and educational institutions</td>
<td>Events are often hosted with participation of class one railroads. Have had coordination meetings with the Mexican Ports of Lazaro Cardenas and Manzanillo as well as the Canadian Port of Churchill. It sponsors an educational consortium that allows researchers from different institutions along the corridor to share progress in research projects and new ideas.</td>
<td>NASCO, TxDOT, Port of San Antonio, Alliance, Texas, Kansas City Smart Port,</td>
<td><a href="http://www.coronet.com">http://www.coronet.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noteworthy Practices
Individual Corridor Summaries

**NASCO (I-35)**

**CORRIDOR SUMMARY**

Typology: International Trade  
Maturity: Established/Built Out  
Coalition: Private and Public Dues Paying Members  
Modes: Highway, Rail, Ports/Waterways  
Goal Areas: Freight/Economic Vitality  
Info Availability: High

**I-67**

**CORRIDOR SUMMARY**

Typology: Rural  
Stage of Corridor Development: Proposed  
Coalition: Grassroots  
Modes: Highway  
Goal Areas: Freight/Economic Vitality, Mobility/Reliability, Safety  
Info Availability: Medium

**Great Lakes Regional TOC**

**CORRIDOR SUMMARY**

Typology: Urban, Rural, International Trade  
Stage of Corridor Development: Built out  
Coalition: State DOTs/Other Public Sector Agencies  
Modes: Highway  
Goal Areas: Freight/Economic Vitality, Operations  
Info Availability: Medium

**Ports to Plains**

**CORRIDOR SUMMARY**

Typology: International Trade, Rural  
Stage of Corridor Development: Partially Built Out  
Coalition: Advocacy/Grassroots  
Modes: Highway, Rail  
Goal Areas: Freight/Economic Vitality  
Info Availability: Medium
Case Studies

• Test the maturity model and self-assessment – Feedback loop

• Gather information useful for providing guidance for ascending the model

• I-95
  » Very advanced: understand evolution
  » Data and information to test model

• I-15
  » Urban and rural
  » International trade
  » Overlapping CANAMEX
Case Studies
Lessons

- Clearly identify common need: articulate a vision, mission, goals, plan
- Serve a niche, do not duplicate or supplant
- ITS infrastructure and data collection are common roles
- Successful coalitions remain dynamic and adapt to changing needs
- Committed parties are necessary: organizations, staff, champions
- MOUs may or may not be necessary
Case Studies

Lessons

- Funding source is critical: stability and level
- Demonstrate success to maintain and build interest
- Leverage existing coalitions and organizations
- Maintaining and sharing data can be a vital role for a coalition
- Multimodality is a common and necessary progression towards greater maturity
- Perspective and interpretation of performance management, and question phrasing, impact an agency’s perceived level of maturity
Implementation Strategies
Self-Assessment Tool

• Tool Design
  » Questionnaire format
  » Conditional questions

• Output is summary maturity model, broad recommendations

• Further developed in future stages
  » Live web-based tool
  » Linked to noteworthy practices database
Implementation Strategies

Recommendations

• Why Should a Multistate Corridor Coalition Pursue Maturity in this Area?

• Actions to Initiate Capabilities

• Actions to Progress from Low to Medium Level of Maturity

• Actions to Progress from Medium to High Level of Maturity

• Link to Examples in Noteworthy Practices Database
### Implementation Strategies

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Should a Multistate Corridor Coalition Pursue Maturity in this Area?</th>
<th>Actions to Initiate Capabilities (Progress from Level 1 to 2)</th>
<th>Actions to Progress from Low to Medium Level of Maturity (Progress to Levels 3 and 4)</th>
<th>Actions to Progress from Medium to High Level of Maturity (Progress to Levels 5 and 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure/Leadership/Strategic Direction</strong></td>
<td>A formalized organizational structure helps to identify key coalition partners, define member roles (including leadership, advisory, and contributory positions), and establish an expectation for who is responsible for steering the strategic direction of the coalition.</td>
<td>Establish a basic organizational structure that identifies lead agencies and supporting staff.</td>
<td>Create a strategic plan or master plan that defines coalition goals and objectives, formalizes partnerships, represents all modes within the corridor, and provides strategic direction to guide coalition activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create an executive/steering committee to provide oversight and define the strategic direction of the coalition. If appropriate, develop a supporting committee structure, such as regional or technical committees, to provide recommendations to coalition leadership.</td>
<td>Example: The I-95 Corridor Coalition is led by an Executive Director along with an Executive Board and steering committee. Coalition leadership is supported by four program tracks committees and five regional committees.</td>
<td>Example: The I-15 Corridor System Master Plan outlines the mission and organizational structure of the Alliance and gives clear direction for the Alliance’s future corridor activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** The I-95 Corridor Coalition is led by an Executive Director along with an Executive Board and steering committee. Coalition leadership is supported by four program tracks committees and five regional committees.
Implementation Strategies
Web-Based Design

Create a central repository for corridor data and other relevant resources and make the information available to all members.

Example: Since its inception in 1994, NASCO has compiled corridor planning documents, data, and other research efforts on their website to serve as a clearinghouse of information for its members.

Leveraging the expertise of coalition members or hiring an outside consultant, conduct a technical study to assess corridor needs and/or describe corridor characteristics by mode or by corridor purpose (e.g., goods movement).

Example: The I-80 Winter Operations Coalition's strategic plan includes an inventory of the tools and technologies currently in use by member states.

I-80 Winter Operations Coalition
Implementation Strategies

Tool Demo

TOOL DEMO
Questions and Discussion