Summary of Results
Six-month Survey of Domestic Scan Team Members
Scan 08-01: Managing STIPS, TIPS and Metropolitan Transportation Plans in Response to Fiscal Constraints

(This memorandum is part of the work of NCHRP 20-68B(02): *Accelerating Innovation – Tracing Domestic Scan Impacts*)

CTC & Associates LLC
January 30, 2011

Scan 08-01: STIPS, TIPS, and Metropolitan Transportation Plans in Response to Fiscal Constraints

Nationally, the requirement to consider "fiscal constraint" has proved problematic for many Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and State DOTs. Since this is an emerging practice, all participants need to feel comfortable and need to be able to explain to the public the process and calculations necessary to provide a true financial picture of long-range transportation plans and short-range Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs). This includes the new requirement for using "Year of Expenditure" dollars for TIPs, STIPs, and MTPs and the option of using "Cost Bands and Ranges" for the out-years of the MTP, as well as the requirement to demonstrate that the existing transportation system can be adequately operated and maintained.

This scan considered how state and metropolitan agencies address institutional and technical issues when identifying and applying fiscal constraints to modify their highways system plans.

Scan Team Members
>Timothy A. Henkel, Minnesota DOT (scan co-chair)
>Harlan Miller, FHWA (scan co-chair)
>Jeanne Stevens, Tennessee DOT
>Ben Orsbon, South Dakota DOT
>Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Nevada DOT
>W. David Lee, Florida DOT
>Thomas W. Clash (Subject Matter Expert)

Sites Visited
>State transportation agencies in:
>New York, Vermont, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Texas, Washington

Scan Dates
>May 31- June 6, June 14 - 20, 2009

Final Report Published
>April 2010

Survey Results

Scan 08-01: STIPS, TIPS, and Metropolitan Transportation Plans Under Fiscal Constraint had seven team members, including two co-chairs and a subject matter expert (SME). Of the seven original members, five responded to the survey.

Conduct of Scan. Please rank each of the following scan program features in terms of its contribution to the overall value of this particular scan tour, where 1 is "not important" and 5 is "extremely important." If it did not apply to your scan, please pick N/A (Not Applicable).

Answer Options	Not Important				Extremely Important	N/A	Response Count
Preparatory materials and meetings in advance of the scan tour	0	0	0	3	2	0	5
On-site visits to view the subject technology or practice	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
Face-to-face technical exchange with host state personnel and other scan participants	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Final report of scan findings	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Post-scan consultation with host state personnel and other scan participants	0	0	0	0	3	2	5

Scan Outcomes. Please rank each of the following scan program outcomes in terms of its contribution to the overall value of this particular scan tour, where 1 is "not important" and 5 is "extremely important."

Answer Options	Not Important				Extremely Important	Response Count
Introduction to a new technology or practice	0	0	4	0	1	5
Clearer understanding of a new technology or practice	0	0	0	4	1	5
Identification of one or more individuals at a host state to call on as a future resource	0	1	0	3	1	5
Identification of one or more scan participants to call on as a future resource	0	0	0	3	2	5
Information with which to begin implementation of a technology or practice at your agency	0	0	1	3	1	5
Information with which to continue implementation of a technology or practice at your agency	0	0	2	2	1	5

General comments regarding the overall value and benefits of the NCHRP Domestic Scan Program:

> *The Domestic Scan Program is a great value to the participants, in particular the scan team.*

> *The scan identified both best practices and the issues associated [with the] topics. It illustrated that "one size does not fit all", that while there were identified best practices, it may not be the best practice for your state.*

Did your participation in the scan facilitate the implementation of any new practices or technologies?

> *Yes – 2*
> *No – 2*

Completed Implementations:

> *Live STIP software development*

> *We will see if the scan has any influence on the reauthorization of the next bill. We will try to influence the outcome to [have] less accounting and annual budgeting and more planning and broad direction and incentives.*

> *Not so much implementation as it initiated greater dialog between FHWA (local) and state. Also have initiated regular peer to peer meetings with neighboring states (held 3+ times a year) to exchange information on how to best handle similar issues.*

Are any implementations planned within the next year?

> *Yes – 1*
> *No – 2*

Planned Implementations (within the next year):

> *Live STIP will be developed over the next 1-2 years*

> *Whenever reauthorization begins.*

Number of respondents who attempted an implementation without success: *none*

Number of contacts provided regarding current or planned implementation activities: *1*

Number of contacts outside the agency provided: *one*

Dissemination Activities (from two respondents):

Organization – AASHTO
Event – Webinar
Date – 02/10/2010
Title/Subject – Same as Scan
Used Scan PowerPoint? (Yes/No) – Yes

Organization – Mn/DOT
Event – Commissioner's Staff
Date – 01/01/2010
Title/Subject – Managing STIPS, TIPS, and Metropolitan Transportation Plans in Response to Fiscal Constraints Management
Used Scan PowerPoint? (Yes/No) – Yes

Webinar Summary

Date
> Friday, December 3rd, 2010

Attendees
> Facilitators:
>> Dylan Casey, CTC & Associates LLC
>> Patrick Casey, CTC & Associates, LLC
>
> Scan Team Members:
>> Tim Henkel, Minnesota DOT, scan co-chair
>> Jeanne Stevens, Tennessee DOT
>> Ben Orsbon, South Dakota DOT
>
> Panel Members:
>> Shane Brown, Washington State University
>> Rick Kreider, Kansas DOT
>> Andrew Lemer, TRB

Media
> http://domesticscan.org/scans/0801-managing-stips-tips-metro-trans-plans

Summary

Draft survey results were provided to scan team and panel members, prior to the webinar. Following introductions and a review of the results, each team member discussed some of their implementation efforts and their view of the impact of the scan. The scan team members all thought that the scan was successful in capturing, understanding, and documenting successful, innovative technologies and practices.

Tim Henkel said that the survey fairly represented the outcome of the scan. He noted that it was a planning/procedure and practices scan and not oriented toward hard-tech. He emphasized that this sort of scan and distillation of knowledge is "just as important" as tech-oriented scans. Regarding MPO involvement, the panel needs to recognize that the planning world has many stakeholders, e.g., state DOTs, regulatory partners. Having so many distinct stakeholders makes face-to-face dealings all the more important and productive. Overall, the scan worked extremely well. It was easy to accommodate the size and scale of participation. The conversations were very productive and lead to a broad understanding of the (tremendous) variation between the states regarding planning activities and demands. Mr. Henkel further emphasized that the face-to-face contact afforded by the scans is particularly important in an era of growing regulation because there is often great emotion that comes along with the implementation of these regulations. The "human part is an important part" of discussions and is impossible without face-to-face discussion. He noted that many of the implementation activities called for in the scan are in a holding pattern awaiting passage of the

transportation reauthorization bill by Congress; future conversations will occur as the reauthorization process continues.

Ben Orsbon echoed Tim Henkel's comments. He pointed out the value to all participants, both scan members and scan sites, of seeing how the implementation of regulations had varied across MPOs. The scan evaluated the utility of fiscal constraint and examined how it was implemented in planning policy. "The key is not to interpret planning under fiscal constraint as an accounting exercise. Fiscal constraint is a constraint on planning vision."

Jeanne Stevens emphasized the importance of making contacts and their use as resources in the future. She underlined the effectiveness of the peer-to-peer and face-to-face nature of the scans, saying it was far and away the preferred mode of communication. "Seeing the expressions and body language of colleagues is particularly important when discussing controversial or sensitive topics." Regarding implementation plans, she said that the biggest challenge was that reauthorization hasn't happened yet.

Panel member Rick Krieder suggested that there may be other ways to disseminate the results of the scan to a broad audience, possibly an article in a trade magazine, especially since the research results seem both broadly applicable and readily available for dissemination.

Andy Lemer, the project coordinator for NCHRP, asked how the results of the scan influence how people conduct business. Tim Henkel responded that they had used webinars to publicize the scan results and that they'd had connections from over 200 locations on the last one. He noted that the challenges of publicizing the results of this scan are similar to the challenges of publicizing a national transportation planning vision. The states are trying to understand this new vision individually and, in particular, get away from planning as primarily an exercise in accounting. Ben Orsbon added that the results of the scan could well be circulated within the AASHTO standing committee on planning along with the affiliated sub-committees and MPOs. "They all need to know about the scan report and its findings." Regarding dissemination, Tim noted a problem of ensuring resource availability for dissemination and implementation of scan results. In particular, post scan activities like webinars and such consume personnel and financial resources which should be considered when evaluating the scan overall.