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Motivations for “Prototype”

» **2005 AASHTO Strategic Plan** –
  “Increased use of benchmarking techniques”

» **AASHTO/FHWA/TRB 2003 CEO Leadership Forum** –
  “Performance measures for benchmarking performance among peer states”

» **AASHTO/FHWA 2004 Scan** –
  “Data exchange/warehousing for benchmarking performance among participating states”
Goals for Prototype

» Demonstrate value/feasibility of using comparative performance measures on wider basis
» Develop measures that will promote sharing of best practices
» Identify challenges and barriers
Principles

» Voluntary participation
» Minimal bureaucracy
» Cooperative approach
» Use existing data
» Commitment to accuracy
Participants

- Florida
- Virginia (Lead)
- Missouri
- Delaware
- Ohio
- New Mexico
- Wash. State
Focus on Project Delivery
On Time, On Budget

» Basic business issue for all DOTs
» High visibility to stakeholders
» Good data is collected by DOTs
» Most DOTs follow similar processes but not the same software
Comparison were difficult

» Terminology differs among DOTs
» Similar data fields collect different data
» Some data had to be chased down
On-Time Performance

% of projects finished on or before **ORIGINAL** scheduled contract completion date

- State F: 20%
- State B: 23%
- State E: 39%
- State D: 40%
- State A: 55%
- State C: 56%
- State G: 65%
On-Time Performance

% of projects finished on or before CURRENT scheduled contract completion date

- State F: 24%
- State B: 55%
- State A: 63%
- State E: 71%
- State C: 72%
- State D: 88%
- State G: 94%
On-Budget Performance

% of projects finished at/below ORIGINAL bid amount

State B: 28%
State D: 40%
State F: 41%
State E: 43%
State G: 45%
State C: 46%
State A: 60%
On-Budget Performance

% of projects finished within 110% of original bid amount

State B: 53%
State E: 73%
State G: 77%
State D: 78%
State F: 81%
State A: 89%
State C: 91%
Caveats

» Agency with “generous” estimates could appear better than agency with aggressive estimates

» Doesn’t address magnitude of cost or schedule overruns

» Focus on letting doesn’t address cost and schedule problems in pre-construction
Conclusions

» Shows comparative measurement is possible
» Has identified top performers and promoted sharing of best practices among peer DOTs
Support from the SCoH

» Expand this measure to more voluntary states for best practice sharing

» Identify more comparative measures that would be a benefit to DOTs
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