National Performance Management Measures

**Why Are We Doing Performance Management?**

- To transform the Federal-aid Highway Program and to provide a means to the **most efficient investment** of Federal transportation funds
- To refocus on **national transportation goals**
- To increase the **accountability and transparency** of the Federal-aid Highway Program
- To **improve decision-making** through performance-based planning and programming
Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measures

Number of fatalities

Rate of fatalities

Number of serious injuries

Rate of serious injuries

Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries

Metropolitan Planning Organization Safety Performance Measures Fact Sheet

Safety Performance Measures
The Safety Performance Management Measures regulation supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and requires State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to set HSIP targets for 5 safety performance measures. This document highlights the requirements specific to MPOs and provides a comparison of MPO and State DOT responsibilities.

How do MPOs establish HSIP targets?
Coordination is the key for all stakeholders in setting HSIP targets. Stakeholders should work together to share data, review strategies, and understand outcomes. MPOs must work with the State DOT. MPOs should also coordinate with the State Highway Safety Office, transit operators, local governments, the FHWA Division Office, National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) Regional Office, law enforcement, and emergency medical services agencies. By working together, considering, and integrating the plans and programs of various safety stakeholders, MPOs will be better able to understand impacts to safety performance to establish appropriate HSIP targets. Coordination should start with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). More information on the SHSP is available at https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/shsp/.

MPOs establish HSIP targets by either:
1. agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or
2. committing to a quantitative HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area.

To provide MPOs with flexibility, MPOs may support all the State HSIP targets, establish their own specific numeric HSIP targets for all of the performance measures, or any combination. MPOs may support the State HSIP target for one or more individual performance measures and establish specific numeric targets for the other performance measures.

If an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target, the MPO would:
1. work with the State and safety stakeholders to address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area
2. coordinate with the State and include the safety performance measures and HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan area in the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan)
3. integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State highway transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP
4. include a description in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets

If an MPO establishes its own HSIP target, the MPO would:
1. establish HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan planning area in coordination with the State
2. estimate vehicles miles traveled (VMT) for all public roads within the metropolitan planning area for rate targets
3. include safety (HSIP) performance measures and HSIP targets in the MTP
4. integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP
5. include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets
Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measures

- MPO must set targets for each of the five Safety Performance Measures
- MPO may adopt and support FDOT targets
- MPO must establish targets by February 27
- MPO targets are reported to FDOT
- MPO targets reviewed with TIP and FHWA certification
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Crash data for years 2010-2015 from FIRES/DHSMV databases
How Florida has responded to MAP-21 Performance Measures

- Developed performance report series
- Identified core and supporting measures
- Established targets for fatalities and serious injuries
  - 5% annual decrease
  - Achieve zero transportation deaths in long-term
- Assess safety through Strategic Highway Safety Plan
## Comparison with Florida and Florida Counties

### County Population (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>2,496,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>1,748,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>1,320,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>1,229,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1,145,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>916,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>864,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota / Manatee</td>
<td>702,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vehicle Miles Traveled (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Vehicle Miles Traveled (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>53,565,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>43,259,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>35,657,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>34,745,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>33,164,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>28,718,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>23,138,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota / Manatee</td>
<td>20,185,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDOT: Multimodal Mobility Performance Measures**
(7 largest MPOs urbanized areas)
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Percent Reduction in 5-Year Average Fatalities (2006-2014)
FDOT Target: 5% Annual Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Year Annual Averages (Percent Change)</th>
<th>Sarasota/Manatee</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sarasota/Manatee: 5-year annual average fatalities reduced from: 94 \(\Rightarrow\) 73

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Number of Fatalities per 100 million VMT

Sarasota/Manatee fatalities are below Florida average

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Percent Reduction in 5-Year Average Injuries (2006-2014)

FDOT Target: 5% Annual Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Year Annual Averages (Percent Change)</th>
<th>Sarasota/Manatee</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>202,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>196,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sarasota/Manatee: 5-year annual average injuries increased from 5,700 ➔ 5,900

Does Not Meet Target

Meet/Exceed Target

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
*Injuries include Incapacitating, Non-incapacitating and possible injury totals
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Number of Injuries per 100 million VMT

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports

Sarasota-Manatee injuries are below Florida average.
Crash Hot Spots
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Crash data for years 2010-2015 from FIRES/DHSMV databases
Sarasota/Manatee Crash Characteristics

Annual Average, 2010-2015

- **Impaired Driving**: 666
- **Aggressive**: 3,169
- **Aging**: 4,086
- **Teen**: 1,591
- **Motorcycle**: 326
- **Bike**: 279
- **Pedestrian**: 268
- **Injuries**: 3,750
- **Fatal**: 87
- **Vulnerable Users**: 868
- **All crashes**: 13,946

Annual Trends of Types of Crashes in Sarasota/Manatee Counties (2010-2015)

- **Serious Injuries**
- **Aging**
- **Aggressive**

Data from FIRES/DHSMV GIS databases
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Percent Reduction in 5-Year Average Non-Motorized Fatalities (2006-2014)

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Percent Reduction in 5-Year Average Non-Motorized Injuries (2006-2014)

Reported Injuries have increased in Florida and Sarasota/Manatee

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports

*Injuries include Incapacitating, Non-incapacitating and possible injury totals
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Number of Bike/Ped Fatalities per 10,000 population

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
Sarasota/Manatee and Florida Comparison

Number of Bike/Ped Injuries per 10,000 population

- Sarasota-Manatee bike/ped injuries are above Florida average

Data from FDOT Traffic Crash Facts Annual Reports
Crash Hot Spots
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Crash data for years 2010-2015 from FIRES/DHSMV databases
**Highway Safety Improvement Program Performance Measures**

| PM 1 | Number of fatalities |
| PM 2 | Rate of fatalities |
| PM 3 | Number of serious injuries |
| PM 4 | Rate of serious injuries |
| PM 5 | Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries |

### Safety Performance Measures

The Safety Performance Management Measures regulation supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and requires State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to set HSIP targets for 5 safety performance measures. This document highlights the requirements specific to MPOs and provides a comparison of MPO and State DOT responsibilities.

#### How do MPOs establish HSIP targets?

Coordination is the key for all stakeholders in setting HSIP targets. MPOs must work with the State DOT. MPOs must also coordinate with the State Highway Safety Office, transit operators, local governments, the FHWA Division Office, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Regional Office, law enforcement and emergency medical services agencies, and others. By working together, considering and integrating the plans and programs of various safety stakeholders, MPOs can be better able to understand impacts to safety performance to establish appropriate HSIP targets. Coordination should start with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). More information on the SHSP is available at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/shsp/.

MPOs establish HSIP targets by either:

1. Agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP targets.
2. Committing to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area.

To provide MPOs with flexibility, MPOs may support all the State HSIP targets, establish their own specific numeric HSIP targets for all of the performance measures, or any combination. MPOs may support the State HSIP target for one or more individual performance measures and establish specific numeric targets for the other performance measures.

#### If an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target, the MPO would:

- Work with the State and safety stakeholders to address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area.
- Coordinate with the State and include the safety performance measures and HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan area in the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan).
- Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the GSHP.
- Include a description in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets.

#### If an MPO establishes its own HSIP target, the MPO would:

- Establish HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan planning area in coordination with the State.
- Estimate vehicles miles traveled (VMT) for all public roads within the metropolitan planning area for rate targets.
- Include safety (HSIP) performance measures and HSIP targets in the MTP.
- Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures and targets described in the State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the GSHP.
- Include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets.
Summary of Trends and Conditions
Number of Fatalities

Annual Fatalities and 5-Year Average Fatalities

5-Year Average Number of Fatalities has decreased
Summary of Trends and Conditions

Fatality Rate

Fatality Rate 5-Year Rolling Average

- 2009: 1.444
- 2010: 1.273
- 2011: 1.154
- 2012: 1.048
- 2013: 0.977
- 2014: 0.985

5-Year Average Fatality Rate has decreased

PM 2
Summary of Trends and Conditions
Number of Injuries

Annual Injuries and 5-Year Average Injuries

- Number of Injuries:
  - 2009: 6,119
  - 2010: 4,557
  - 2011: 5,066
  - 2012: 5,478
  - 2013: 7,215
  - 2014: 7,308

- 5-Year Rolling Average:
  - 2009: 5,687
  - 2010: 5,473
  - 2011: 5,397
  - 2012: 5,687
  - 2013: 5,925

5-Year Average Number of Fatalities has increased
Summary of Trends and Conditions

Injury Rate

5-Year Rolling Average

Injury Rate are increasing
Summary of Trends and Conditions
Non-Motorized Fatalities and Injuries

Annual Non-Motorized Fatalities and Injuries and 5-Year Rolling Average

- Non-Motorized Fatalities & Injuries
- 5-Year Rolling Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-Year Average of Fatalities and Injuries has increased.
Moving Forward

- Create relationship between crashes and Federal-Aid Highway Segments
- Develop spreadsheet tool for use in identifying corridors for evaluation and safety improvements
- MPO deadline for establishing first safety performance measures targets: FEBRUARY
- Incorporating performance measures into LRTP
- Review of performance measures for remaining programs under MAP-21
Schedule for Developing Performance Measures

- Effective date of final rule: April 14, 2016
- State DOT sets targets: August 31st of each year
- MPOs set targets: February 27th each year
- LRTP to include safety performance measures after May 27, 2018

*4-Year reporting (2014-2018)
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