NCHRP Domestic Scan 08-01 Managing STIPS, TIPS, and Metropolitan Transportation Plans Under Fiscal Constraints

Webinar on Six-Month Survey Results

CTC & Associates LLC

December 3, 2010

ctc&
associates llc

Facilitators

- Patrick Casey, Investigator
  CEO of CTC & Associates

- Dylan Casey, Co-Investigator
  CTC Associate
  Faculty, St. John's College, Annapolis

Scan Participants

- Tim Henkel, Minnesota DOT, co-chair
- Harlan Miller, FHWA, co-chair
- Jeanne Stevens, Tennessee DOT
- Ben Orsbon, South Dakota DOT
- Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Nevada DOT
- W. David Lee, Florida DOT
- Thomas W. Clash, SME

ctc&
associates llc

NCHRP Domestic Scan Project Panel

- Harold R. Paul, Director LTRC (chair)
- Andrew Lemer, TRB
- Shane Brown, Washington State University
- David M. Burk, FHWA
- Nancy L. Chinlund, CALTRANS
- Marsha Fiol, Virginia DOT
- Rick Kreider, Kansas DOT
- Jim McDonnell, AASHTO
- Mark R. Norman, TRB
- Keith M. Platte, AASHTO
- Glenn Roberts, New Hampshire DOT
- Amy Schutzbach, Illinois DOT
- Mark Van Port Fleet, Michigan DOT

Accelerating Innovation–Tracing Domestic Scan Impacts   NCHRP 20-68B(02)

- Review of the effectiveness of the Domestic Scan Program in fostering the implementation of innovative technologies and practices

- Special interest in evidence of technology transfer beyond original core participants

- Continuation of a more in-depth review completed for two pilot scans

Survey Goals

Identify:

- Progress toward implementation of technologies and practices identified in each scan's implementation plan

- Benefits of the Domestic Scan Program to you, your agency, and industry as a whole

- Completed or planned dissemination activities

- Names of individuals (beyond participants) who have heard about scan findings

Webinar Goals

- Review and discuss survey results
- Share successes and challenges in implementing scan technologies and practices
- Reconnect with fellow scan team members
- Discuss role of scan participation once the final report is complete

Survey: Conduct of Scan

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

ctc&
associates llc

Survey Results: Scan Outcomes

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

Scan Results: Value of Scan

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

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

Survey Results: Implementation

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.

ctc&
associates llc

Survey Results: Implementation

Are any implementations planned within the next year?

Yes – 1   No – 2

Planned Implementations:

I will use the information gathered in the scan to help my future clients with their project delivery activities.

Strengthening risk management.

Accelerating consultant procurement process.

ctc&
associates llc

Survey Results: Implementation

❑ 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: *1*

Non team-member contacts regarding implementation (and even dissemination) are essential to tracing the extent of technology transfer attributable to the scan.

Survey Results: Dissemination

Two respondents listed a couple of of talks and publications:

- AASHTO Webinar Series
- Mn/DOT Commissioner's Staff presentation

Discussion

- Survey results

- What have been the successes and challenges in implementing scan technologies and practices?

- How does the scan fit in with the way you obtain and transmit knowledge about practices and technologies in your work?

Next Steps

- Final participant survey in six months

- Survey of accumulated contacts in six months – tracing impact of scan beyond initial participants

www.domesticscan.org