

Houston Galveston Regional CMM Assessment Workshop - Houston, Texas June 3, 2015

Business Processes

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HGAC has an Operations Task Force – a forum used to discuss funding of projects and defines the criteria for project selections LRP has moved from an output-based evaluation to an outcome-based evaluation Day-to-day operations among stakeholders work well (strong ad-hoc processes in place) Smaller communities beginning to become more involved in ITS Houston is a test bed for technology – leading edge region Strong and robust corridor-based plans 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HGAC is not providing much operations planning ... lagging behind what other agencies are doing on an ad- hoc basis. Projects generally drive the Regional Plan Even though day-to-day operations among stakeholders work well – it’s still highly ad-hoc There has been mention of a regional TSMO plan, but the interest has been low so far. Up until (3) years ago TxDOT, Mont Co, Harris Co, and City of Houston were the only stakeholder dealing with ITS.... System interfaces still are not integrated Cost Benefit analysis not being used to illustrate combined stakeholder used of ITS Technologies The region is not proactive in identifying specific operations strategies Management struggles with the “Big Picture” concept. Before and after evaluations conducted for projects, but not believed to be effective 		
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	Each jurisdiction doing its own thing according to individual priorities and capabilities	Consensus regional approach developed regarding TSM&O goals, deficiencies, B/C, networks, strategies and common priorities	Regional program integrated into jurisdictions’ overall multimodal transportation plans with related staged program	TSM&O integrated into jurisdictions’ multi-sectorial plans and programs, based on a formal, continuing planning processes
Consensus	1.0			
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next Level				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Task Force to develop a planning process Systematic Coordination for Major Corridors 				



Systems and Technology

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some smaller communities have operation plans and include a monitoring and evaluation piece – documentation conducted. Architecture updated on an ad-hoc basis for major projects TxDOT Configuration management is documented The region is familiar with systems engineering and developing co-ops; pieces of the systems engineering being used; guiding principles being documented. General consensus is that one size <u>does not</u> fit all There is flexibility in TxDOT accommodating local requirements Equipment are tested before purchased in Austin There is a fiber-sharing agreement - TxDOT 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional ITS Architecture is outdated (9y/o) Architecture updated on an ad-hoc basis for major projects Making the region's architecture compatible with the Statewide Architecture and standards is a challenge. Systems Engineering documentation ad-hoc Common practice – standards are guiding requirements, not the other way around when federal funds are involved. Austin's testing and approval process is not timely enough to accommodate emerging technologies desired by some local agencies. (and districts) Smaller communities document configurations, but isn't considered formal There isn't any documented guidance for use of shared assets There is a fiber-sharing agreement - TxDOT 		
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	Ad hoc approaches to system implementation without consideration of systems engineering and appropriate procurement processes	Regional conops and architectures developed and documented with costs included; appropriate procurement process employed	Systems & technology standardized and integrated on a statewide basis (including arterial focus) with other related processes and training as appropriate	Architectures and technology routinely upgraded to improve performance; systems integration/interoperability maintained on continuing basis
Consensus	Most other agencies	TxDOT and City of Houston		
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next Level				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore opportunities for local governments with procurement Note - Review weakness list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 				

Performance Measurement

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Houston’s use of Bluetooth, but looking at travel time reliability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make better use of the system with the measures (balance utilization) • Performance outcomes are being tied to project selection – started with policy parts in place, but without identified targets (H-GAC) • Using measures to dictate expectations from policy members on operation investments • Process are being finalized to look at evaluating key strategies (i.e., incident management) • Advancing to use simulation as part of the analysis • TXDOT – travel time, speed, incident clearance, truck-related, volumes • Built in performance process for some of the smaller cities; some as much as four times per year, others less • H-GAC Mobility Report produced for wide range (external) audience • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring outputs, but recognize the need to measure outcomes • For use in planning and investment decisions, limited use of PM • For towns smaller than 50,000, contractors monitor and manage the signals • For some, cannot maintain measures once attained • Mobility Report not widely read (by the internal audience) 			
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	Some outputs measured and reported by some jurisdictions	Output data used directly for after-action debriefings and improvements; data easily available and dash-boarded	Outcome measures identified (networks, modes, impacts) and routinely utilized for objective-based program	Performance measures reported internally for utilization and externally for accountability and program justification
Consensus			Could slip back to 2 and at times venture into 4	
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate the advancement of performance measures in smaller communities • 				



Culture

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Houston, when needed, can work with the mayor and city council on operational needs (used a Los Angeles example to prove they are better!) TXDOT gets everything that they asked for from District leadership. Top executive leaders are recognizing the need for more ops Visibility, familiar with the TranStar brand Grass roots activities are successful to get the message out, especially in a smaller cities Social media being used to update the current operational story (customer issues are being addressed) Focus to manage the non-recurring congestion; reoccurring congestion people tend to tolerate Understand that you have to have key champions and are significant (moving from a 1 to 2) Level of performance has sustained, but are capable to improve Intergovernmental agreements in place to implement TSMO (makes for a solid 3) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uneven with some of the local governments on what do we mean on defining operations (access management example) Leadership in local agencies may not understand fully what is meant by operational strategies Standards are not typically followed for some (consistency with decisions) Not really think of operational areas outside our comfort zone (truck use example) Inconsistent with keeping the policy makers in the loop. Be able to keep the message current. Champions may exist on one type of strategy (incident management), but not on some of the other strategies Focus to manage the non-recurring; reoccurring congestion people tend to tolerate Always have to compete with maintenance/capacity funds Need to do a better job with telling our operational story Need to do annual customer service surveys within the region 		
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	Individual Staff champions promote TSM&O – varying among jurisdictions	Jurisdictions' senior management understands TSM&O business case and educates decision makers/public	Jurisdictions' mission identifies TSM&O and benefits with formal program and achieves wide public visibility/understanding	Customer mobility service commitment accountability accepted as formal, top level core program of all jurisdictions
Consensus				
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next Level				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to better tell the operations story to make the business case for operations 				



Organization and Staffing

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRANSTAR agreement is flexible, as possible, to respond to the changing political environment • HGAC has hired a firm to document the work that is being done within their agency (not in TSMO, but in the air quality management programs) • City of Houston does have succession planning, training • Coordination with University of Houston to work alongside of county operations • City of Houston recognizes a manageable turnover rate. • TXDOT does provide some benefits to support their employees (PE/EIT exams/certifications, Certifications also for technicians) • Cross training is available and mentoring program at TXDOT 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difference between City authority and County authority • Perception TRANSTAR is TXDOT; never made it easy for consumers to communicate to • Marketing and communication is not being staffed to meet the consumer's need • Succession plans lacking • Groomed replacements do not really exist anymore. • Do we understand the skill sets to hire in this type of work? • Need more field staffing to be more proactive 		
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	TSM&O added on to units within existing structure and staffing -- dependent on technical champions	TSM&O-specific organizational concept developed within/among jurisdictions with core capacity needs identified, collaboration takes place	TSM&O Managers have direct report to top management; Job specs, certification and training for core positions	TSM&O senior managers at equivalent level with other jurisdiction services and staff professionalized
Consensus	Other/smaller agencies	Harris County 2.5	City of Houston definitely at a 3, maybe a 4. TXDOT is a solid 3	
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next Level				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop risk analysis to illustrate the need for succession planning. 				



Collaboration

Strengths Cited		Weaknesses Cited		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal coordination meetings held for major projects Formal coordination meeting held for special events (super bowl, final four, etc) – parking authority takes part in some meetings TranStar host monthly Incident management meeting for major projects coordination SHRP2 TIM train-the-trainer has been brought into the region Standard of operations are built-in for special event planning and coordination Private industry (towing) is on the floor at TranStar Metro and Harris County is on the floor at TranStar Central control of cameras are at TranStar Local Area TxDOT maintenance shop has access to cameras Formal Hurricane evacuation plans are in place 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No formal meeting to talk about the effects of upcoming projects on one another No Incident management plans for segments of freeways with recurring incident No incident management plans for arterials No incident management plans between TxDOT and local governments for seasonal incidents (i.e recreational travel – travel to the beach etc.) Lack of collaboration with SHP and transportation agencies for diversion/detour routes No standard operating procedures for coordinating incident management (i.e. crashes) No incident management plan in place for unplanned incidents 		
Level	1 — Performed	2 — Managed	3 — Integrated	4 — Optimized
Criteria	Relationships ad hoc, and on personal basis (public-public, public-private)	Objectives, strategies and performance measures aligned among organized key players (transportation and public safety agencies) with after-action debriefing	Rationalization/sharing/formalization of responsibilities among key players through co-training, formal agreements and incentives	High level of TSM&O coordination among owner/operators (state, local, private)
Consensus	1.0			
Workshop Actions to Advance to the Next Level				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore ways to have formal discussion to develop standard operating procedures in incident management coordination for unplanned events 				

