Attachment A: 2012 VE Program Performance Form

Instructions: The following form follows the format of the electronic survey that will be used by FHWA Division Offices to submit VE Program Performance information via FHWA's SharePoint website. A few question numbers are out of sequence due to the logic required in the survey software. There are certain questions that will be skipped if the first question in a sequence is answered 'no' in the SharePoint survey. There are instructions, below, when this occurs within a series of questions. Provide your answer to each question in the center column under response. Please make sure to read the specific guidance and instructions provided in the far right column for each question as these are intended to assist in a filling out the survey.

Question:	Response:	Guidance and Instructions:
What is the State, Territory or Federal Lands office being reported?	CA	A radio dial will be used in the survey to select your State. Enter your State in the response column.
PART 1 – VE Programs		
VE Program **1a_7. Does your DOT have a formalized VE Program?**	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no. **Note: If answer is 'no', the survey will skip questions 1a_1 through 1a_6 and automatically go to 1a_Comments.**
1a_1. Does your DOT's VE program include a documented and adopted VE Policy?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1a_2. Does your DOT's VE program have an identified VE coordinator?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1a_3. Does your DOT's VE program include a VE Training initiative?	Yes	A VE Training initiative ensures the necessary resources and activities to prepare staff to participate in VE analyses. The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1a_4. Does your DOT's VE program include VE Program Performance Goals and Measures?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.

1a_5. Does your DOT's VE program include a plan to monitor, evaluate and report on the performance of the VE Program?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1a_6. Does your DOT's VE program include documented procedures for conducting VE analyses?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1a_Comments. Briefly provide comments on your State DOT VE Program.	It's important to have VE coordinators at the working/project level to ensure steady communication between Management, PM, PE, VE Coord., and major project stakeholders. At Caltrans, District VE Coordinators are heavily involved in the VE study, and the HQ VE Program manager deals with overall policy, procedures, reporting, training, outreach, and contracting out. This structure works well to promote the VE methodology and develop a successful program.	Comments may include lessons learned, successful practices or issues influencing your State DOT's VE Program. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.
VE Policy and Procedures **1b_9. Does your DOT have an official VE Policy/Procedure?**	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no. **Note: If answer is 'no', the survey will skip questions 1b_1 through 1b_8 and will automatically go to 1b_Comments.**
1b_1. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes to identify candidate projects to conduct VE analyses?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_2. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes to assure that required VE analyses are conducted?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_3. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes to conduct VE analyses?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_4. Does your	Yes	The survey will have a

DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include a process for scheduling VE analyses?		checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_5. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes to review, accept and reject VE recommendations?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_6. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes for tracking and monitoring VE analyses?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_7. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include processes for tracking and monitoring implementation of VE recommendations?	No	The process should include the requirement to ensure approved recommendations are incorporated into projects prior to construction. The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_8. Does your DOT's VE Policy/Procedure include or reference established VE coordinator roles and responsibilities?	Yes	The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
1b_Comments. Briefly provide comments on your State DOT's VE Policy/Procedure.	A clear Departmental policy (DD-92) and guidance manuals (Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM), Team Guide and Report Guides), are essential for a successful VE program.	Comments may include lessons learned, successful practices or issues influencing your State DOT's documented VE Policy. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.
VE Program Resources **2. Identify the title and links to any of your DOT's VE Program websites, such as:** **- General VE Program Information** **- VE Program Policy** **- VE Program Procedures** **- VE Program**	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/value/index.htm http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/value/valueanalysis.htm http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/value/info.htm http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/guidance.htm http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/value/guides.htm	Please enter any external State DOT internet websites where VE data is stored. Please note the content of the page (i.e. policy, procedures, reports, etc) Please do not include any intranet sites that would not be available for other State DOTs.

Performance Reporting **- Other VE program activities, documents, or resources.**		
Improving VE Analyses **3a. Briefly describe any practices your DOT uses to improve the VE Program and VE analyses conducted more successful.**	Caltrans VA Program employs a number of practices that help improve the usefulness and attractiveness of the program to project managers. These include: • Integration of Risk Analysis with VA Studies, specifically for projects that are further along in the delivery process. • Utilization of Value Metrics to help improve project decision making, specifically early on in the delivery process when major options are still being evaluated. • The application of VA to internal programs and processes. This has been of increased interest within Caltrans due to the need to better utilize and optimize limited resources in the wake of the economic downturn. • VE Study process includes Implementation Meeting and follow-up until the disposition of all VE Alternatives have been determined. Project performance must be properly defined and concurred by the stakeholders at the beginning of the VA study. The performance attributes and requirements developed are then used throughout the study to identify, evaluate, and document alternatives. This process, Value Metrics, emphasizes the interrelationship between cost and performance and can be quantified and compared in terms of how they contribute to overall value. Value Metrics provides a standardized means of identifying, defining, evaluating, and measuring performance. Once this has been achieved, and costs for all VA alternatives have been developed, measuring value is straightforward. Value Metrics can improve VA studies by: • Building consensus among project stakeholders (especially those holding conflicting views) • Developing a better understanding of a project's goals and objectives as they relate to purpose and need • Developing a baseline understanding of how the project is meeting performance goals and	Briefly describe unique practices or policies that assist the State in conducting successful VE analyses. Examples could include: - Program Coordination - Planning, coordinating and conducting VE analyses -Integrating VE within the project development process - Coordinating with other project cost and quality reviews - Reviewing/Accepting/Rejecting Recommendations - Monitoring and tracking activities - Other practices and policies Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.

	objectives • Identifying areas where project performance can be improved through the VA process • Developing a better understanding of an alternative concept's effect on project performance • Developing a deeper understanding of the relationship between performance and cost in determining value • Using value as the basis for selecting the best project or design concept	
3b. Briefly describe any practices your DOT uses to encourage the use of and help make construction VE Change Proposals (VECPs) more successful.	NA	Briefly describe unique practices or policies that enable VECPs to be implemented in a successful manner. Examples could include: - Encouraging submittals of VECPs - Reviewing/approving/rejecting VECPs - Monitoring and tracking the implementation of VECPs - Implementing VECPs on design-build projects Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.
4a. Identify the typical project factors and associated measures that your State DOT used on VE analyses conducted in 2012.	Caltrans employs the following performance measures in additional to measuring cost and time(schedule) benefits: • Mainline Ops. • Local Ops. • Maintainability • Environmental Impacts • Construction Impacts In addition, Caltrans considers other performance measures as needed by the particular project including: • Land-Use Compatibility • Ride Quality • Phaseability Also see external write-up for full details.	Identify and briefly describe how project functions (e.g., traffic flow, safety, etc) are typically analyzed, evaluated and used during the Investigation, Speculation, and Evaluation phases of VE analyses; explain the typical level of effort expended in analyzing these critical project functions. Examples: Factor Measure Safety Crashes

		Traffic flow Delay Cost $$$
4b. Describe how your DOT incorporates life cycle cost analysis in VE analyses.	Based on the initial cost estimates previously developed, the VA Study Team Leader will work with the team to perform a life-cycle cost analysis, if the relevant information is available and there is a high likelihood that life-cycle cost savings can be quantified and realized by implementing the VA alternative.	Summarize your DOTs use of life cycle cost analyses while conducting VE analyses; indicate whether they are conducted as part of the study directly, if the study incorporates an independently conducted life cycle cost analysis, etc.
4c_1 What percentage of VE analyses completed in FY 12 occurred during the Planning and Concept Development Phase?	6%	For the total number of VE analyses completed in FY 12 (as reported in Question 9a) select the approximate percentage of analyses completed during the timetables shown. **Please note that questions 4c_1 through 4c_4 must add up to 100%.**
4c_2 What percentage of VE analyses completed in FY 12 occurred during the Preliminary Design Phase from 0-30% Final Design?	32%	**Please note that questions 4c_1 through 4c_4 must add up to 100%.**
4c_3 What percentage of VE analyses completed in FY 12 occurred during the Final Design Phase from 30-60% Final Design?	38%	**Please note that questions 4c_1 through 4c_4 must add up to 100%.**
4c_4 What percentage of VE analyses completed in FY 12 occurred during the Final Design Phase from 60% or later?	24%	**Please note that questions 4c_1 through 4c_4 must add up to 100%.**
4c_Comments. Briefly describe your State DOT's experience regarding the timing of VE analyses.	Caltrans seeks to schedule VA studies as early as funding requirements permit. This is generally in PR&ED Phase. Studies that are performed closer to final engineering typically focus on constructability and risk mitigation. While the earlier in the project delivery process, typically the better, even projects produced late in design have yield major benefits	Provide additional details about successful practices, lessons learned and opportunities for improvement regarding the timing of VE analyses.

	Local transportation agencies use VE very effectively to cut the cost of their programming documents while selecting the best alternative for their communities.	
4d. For design-build projects, select the option that best represents when VE analyses are typically conducted by your DOT. **-Planning and Concept Development** **-Preliminary Engineering and prior to issuance of RFP** **-After issuance of RFP** **-State DOT does not currently use design build**	Preliminary Engineering and prior to issuance of RFP.	Select the timetable that best matches your DOTs timing for scheduling and conducting VE analyses for design-build projects. If your state does not use or permit design-build contracting, indicate as appropriate.
4d_Comments. Briefly describe your State DOT's experience regarding the timing of conducting VE analyses for design build projects.	We have only performed a few DB VE studies. Policy dictates before RPF, and funding is an issue during planning. Our experience is in the Preliminary Design, but we need to be careful of the proposals. The Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) used in design build is a more effective tool for implementing innovation and alternative methods within the project scope. We don't want to hinder that process with a detailed VA alternative.	Use the "Comments" section to briefly detail the approach taken to conduct the study based on the stage of the project when the study was conducted and identify successes and lessons learned. Enter N/A if your State does not allow design build.
4e_1. Did your State DOT conduct more than one VE study for any Major Project during FY 2012?	No – No Major projects done this year, but our practice is multiple studies for Major projects.	This question is referring to whether your State conducted more than one VE study on a single major project. The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no. **Note: If answer is 'no', the survey will skip question 4e and will automatically go to question 5.**
4e. Identify all milestones of the development of a Major Project where the VE analyses occurred. **- Planning and Concept Development Phase** **- 0-30% Preliminary**		This question is attempting to capture your State DOT's experience with conducting more than one VE study on a single major project. This question is not attempting to capture average information, rather, if a single major project underwent more than one

Design Phase -30-60% Final Design Phase -60% Final Design or later		VE analysis, at what point in the life of the project were they conducted.
5. Briefly describe any special VE analyses conducted by your DOT in FY 2012.	Caltrans has applied VA to a number of internal programs and processes in 2012. This includes: • Design Delegation Enterprise Risk Management Plan • Streamlining the Right-of-Way Rail Permit process • Streamlining of the Advertising and Award Process within Division of Engineering Services (DES) • Transfer of DES-Office Engineering Activities to the District Level • Facilities Asset Management Plan Development • Re-envisioning Caltrans Transportation Planning	Special studies may include process reviews, streamlining initiatives, organizational reviews, etc. Describe any other special VE analyses that were completed during FY 2012. Answer "N/A" if your State did not conduct any special studies.
6. Describe any successful VE analyses that were completed by your DOT in FY 2012.	Caltrans and FHWA performed two Road Safety Audit/VE studies for two highly controversial projects that were stopped legally by the public. These process combined where a very effective tool to educate the public about transportation projects and to re-scope the projects to meet the real need and purpose of the improvements. In both case, throughout time, the project's scope had over step its need. Using RSA/VA to quantify the safety improvements was very reassuring to the public that we were doing our due diligence and reconsidering their needs. Both studies kick started the project forward with consent from all the major stakeholders, including Caltrans. Key to Caltrans VA study "Best Practices" are the use of Value Metrics and Risk Analysis used in conjunction with the FAST Diagram to thoroughly analyze the project. This deeper understanding of the project leads to innovative and meaningful changes. Two examples of how these "best Practices" aided projects includes: • SR78 / Nordahl Road interchange. On this project the analysis identified the Opportunity Risk to the schedule associated with the effect that the need to maintain the pedestrian access during construction had on the project. The VA Team developed a solution using a temporary pedestrian/bicycle crossing structure to permit 2 stage versus the original 3 stage construction. This reduced construction 6 month and permitted completion of the project before the start of the holiday shopping season, which was very important to the local merchants and other project stakeholders. This solution also resulted in reducing project construction cost $1,200,000, and $875,000 in highway user costs (25%). • The design team for the Alameda Corridor East Grade Separation with Fairway Drive	Briefly describe one or two successful VE analysis or "lesson learned" from conducting a VE analysis that is an agency "best practice". If a web link to the study is available, please provide the web link. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the successful practice.

	proposed 2 solutions, one lowering the road under the railroad, which is problematic due to high water table in the area, and the second alternative which goes over the railroad, which, due to the clearance required over the railroad, has significant impacts to businesses, access and realignment of adjacent streets. The first was the preferred alternative. Based on the performance and risk assessment, an alternative to partial raise of the railroad profile permitted the road to be placed under the tracks at an elevation that avoided the high water table issue. This also avoided a full take on the fast food restaurant property. This solution not only saved $13,000,000 (or 11% of the project cost) but also reduces construction time by 15 months. It also improves local traffic operations by improving sight distances and design speeds. It reduces construction impacts to local businesses and reduces some storm drain relocation. It also reduces environmental impacts of the project as well as the long term maintenance.	
7_1. Describe a unique or innovative VE recommendation that provided a significant benefit to the project on which it was implemented.	• SR78 / Nordahl Road interchange. On this project the analysis identified the Opportunity Risk to the schedule associated with the effect that the need to maintain the pedestrian access during construction had on the project. The VA Team developed a solution using a temporary pedestrian/bicycle crossing structure to permit 2 stage versus the original 3 stage construction. This reduced construction 6 month and permitted completion of the project before the start of the holiday shopping season, which was very important to the local merchants and other project stakeholders. This solution also resulted in reducing project construction cost $1,200,000, and $875,000 in highway user costs (25%). • The design team for the Alameda Corridor East Grade Separation with Fairway Drive proposed 2 solutions, one lowering the road under the railroad, which is problematic due to high water table in the area, and the second alternative which goes over the railroad, which, due to the clearance required over the railroad, has significant impacts to businesses, access and realignment of adjacent streets. The first was the preferred alternative. Based on the performance and risk assessment, an alternative to partial raise of the railroad profile permitted the road to be placed under the tracks at an elevation that avoided the high water table issue. This also avoided a full take on the fast food restaurant property. This solution not only saved $13,000,000 (or 11% of the project	Describe any implemented VE recommendation(s) that could potentially be of value to other DOTs. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.

	cost) but also reduces construction time by 15 months. It also improves local traffic operations by improving sight distances and design speeds. It reduces construction impacts to local businesses and reduces some storm drain relocation. It also reduces environmental impacts of the project as well as the long term maintenance.	
7_2. Describe a unique or innovative VECP that provided a significant benefit to the project on which it was implemented.	NA	Describe any implemented VECP that could potentially be of value to other DOTs. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough to convey the issue identified.
VE Training **The following three questions relate to the number of individuals attending VE training activities conducted by your State DOT during FY 2012.** **8a_1. Enter the number of State DOT and LPA staff that received VE training in your State during FY 2012.**	74	Enter the number of State DOT and LPA staff that your State DOT trained during FY 2012.
8a_2. Enter the number of FHWA staff receiving VE training within your State during FY 2012.	0	Enter the number of FHWA staff trained during FY 2012.
8a_3. Enter the number of consultant staff receiving VE training in your State during FY 2012.	0	Enter the number of consultant staff trained during FY 2012.
The following seven questions relate to your State DOT's approach to conducting VE training during FY 2012. **8b_1. Did your DOT conduct any VE awareness building**	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)

presentations or briefings for agency leadership?		
8b_2. Did your DOT conduct and VE awareness building presentations or briefings for technical staff?	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)
8b_3. Did your DOT conduct short duration workshops on conducting VE analyses?	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)
8b_4. Did your DOT conduct an NHI VE Training Course (Workshop) during FY 2012?	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)
8b_5. Did your DOT conduct a SAVE Mod I training course during FY 2012?	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)
8b_6. Did your DOT conduct a SAVE Mod II training course during FY 2012?	No	(Check the box for yes. Leave blank for no.)
8b_7. Did your DOT conduct another type of VE training course during FY 2012?	Yes – Team Member Training – 8 hour mini Mod 1	If your state conducted training other than one of the six types listed please describe the type of training.
Part 2 – Summary of VE Analyses **9a_1. Enter total number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 and completed by agency staff.**	0	Report on the VE analyses that were completed during FY 12 which were completed by agency staff. **Note: 9a_1 and 9a_2 should represent all project VE analyses completed during FY 12.**
9a_2. Enter total number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 and completed by consultant staff.	34	Report on the VE analyses that were completed during FY 12 which were completed by consultant staff. **Note: 9a_1 and 9a_2 should represent all project VE analyses completed during FY 12.**
9b_1. Enter number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 that were required by Federal Law and completed by agency staff.	0	Of the numbers reported in Question 9a_1 and 9a_2, indicate the number of analyses that were conducted to meet current Federal Regulations which were completed by agency staff

9b_2. Enter number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 that were required by Federal Law and completed by consultant staff.	30	Of the numbers reported in Questions 9a_1 and 9a_2, indicate the number of analyses that were conducted to meet current Federal Regulations which were completed by consultant staff.
9c_1. Enter number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 that were specially designated by FHWA and completed by agency staff.	0	The FHWA Division Offices have the authority to require States to conduct VE analyses on any project determined to be appropriate (as specified in 23 USC 106(e)(2)(c)). Of the analyses reported in Questions 9a_1 and 9a_2, indicate if any of these were specially directed by FHWA which were completed by agency staff.
9c_2. Enter number of VE analyses completed in FY 2012 that were specially designated by FHWA and completed by consultant staff.	0	The FHWA Division Offices have the authority to require States to conduct VE analyses on any project determined to be appropriate (as specified in 23 USC 106(e)(2)(c)). Of the analyses reported in Questions 9a_1 and 9a_2, indicate if any of these were specially directed by FHWA which were completed by consultant staff.
9f_1. Enter the anticipated number of VE analyses to be completed during FY 2013.	20(FY12)+20(FY13)=40	For informational purposes only, report on any analyses that were initiated in FY 12 but will be finalized in FY 13, in addition to all other VE analyses planned for completion in FY 13.
9f_3. Enter the anticipated number of VE analyses to be completed during FY 2014.	20 (new regulations will decrease program size)	For informational purposes only, report on any VE analyses that are planned for FY 14.
10a. Enter the estimated costs associated with conducting the VE analyses during FY 2012.	1,446,000	The costs associated with conducting the VE analyses is developed using an estimate of the direct costs attributed to the VE program and includes the following; - Contract amounts associated with consultant-led VE analyses

		- Approximate salary, travel and incidental agency costs associated with supporting consultant-led VE analyses - Approximate salary, travel and incidental costs associated with conducting VE analyses - Approximate costs with documenting VE analyses It is understood that these costs are an estimate, however, the estimate must be documented and retained to justify the value used.
10b. Enter the estimated costs of the projects studied during FY 2012.	1,843,281,000	This is not the total cost of the project. These costs should reflect the cost of those items considered during the VE study. The cost of construction should always be used, however, right of way costs should only be used if ROW recommendations were considered.
11a. Enter the total number of proposed VE recommendations during FY 2012.	201	Only count the highest number of potential implementable VE recommendations, keeping in mind that if two recommendations are mutually exclusive, that is selection of one recommendation eliminates the possibility of implementing the other, only one recommendation should be counted. (see 12a for an example).
11b. Enter the total number of approved VE recommendations during FY 2012.	90	Enter the total number of the VE recommendations that were approved and implemented.
12a. Enter the value of proposed VE recommendations during FY 2012.	88,121,000	Enter the total net value of the proposed recommendations. Same as in 11a, only count the highest value of mutually exclusive recommendations proposed. For example if 1 recommendation is for $1.5M and another mutually exclusive recommendation is for $0.25M, count only 1 implementable recommendation for a total of $1.5M.

12b. Enter the value of approved VE recommendations during FY 2012.	64,309,000	Enter the total net value of the VE recommendations that were approved and implemented.
13a. Enter the total number of VECPs submitted for FY 2012.	Not tracked	
13b. Enter the total number of VECPs approved for FY 2012.	36	Enter the total number of the VECP recommendations that were approved and implemented.
14a. Enter the value of VECPs submitted for FY 2012.	Not tracked	
14b. Enter the total value of VECPs approved for FY 2012.	3667000	Enter the total net value of the VECP recommendations that were approved and implemented.
Part 3 – Benefits of VE Analyses & VE Change Proposals **The next five questions relate to the type of VE recommendations approved. If a specific recommendation can be shown to provide benefit to more than one category as defined in questions 15_1 through 15_6, count the recommendation in each category that is applicable.** **15_1. Enter the number of approved VE recommendations that improved safety.**	0	Report each approved recommendation (from Question 11b) in terms of the project feature or features that the recommendation benefits. If a specific recommendation can be shown to provide benefit to more than one feature described below, count the recommendation in each category that is applicable: - **Safety:** Recommendations that mitigate or reduce hazards on the facility - **Operations:** Recommendations that improve real-time service and/or local, corridor, or regional levels of service of the facility. - **Environment:** Recommendations that successfully avoid or mitigate impacts to natural and or cultural resources. - **Construction:** Recommendations that improve work zone conditions, or expedite the project delivery. - **Right of Way:** Recommendations that lower the impacts or costs of right of way.
15_2. Enter the number of approved VE recommendations that improved traffic operations.	23	
15_3. Enter the number of approved VE recommendations that mitigated environmental impacts.	21	
15_4. Enter the number of approved	44	

VE recommendations that improved construction.		
15_6. Enter the number of approved VE recommendations that mitigated right of way impacts.	0	
VE Change Proposals **The next five questions relate to the type of VECP proposals approved for construction projects. If a specific VECP can be shown to provide benefit to more than one category as defined in questions 16_1 through 16_6, count the VECP in each category that is applicable.** **16_1. Enter the number of approved VECPs that improved safety.**	Not tracked	Report each approved VE change proposal (from Question 13b) in terms of the project feature or features that were benefited by the recommendation. If a specific recommendation can be shown to provide benefit to more than one category as described below, count the recommendation in each category that is applicable: **Safety:** Recommendations that mitigate or reduce hazards on the facility **Operations:** Recommendations that improve real-time service and/or local, corridor, or regional levels of service of the facility. **Environment:** Recommendations that successfully avoid or mitigate impacts to natural and or cultural resources. **Construction:** Recommendations that improve work zone conditions, or expedite the project delivery. **Other:** Recommendations not readily categorized by the above performance indicators.
16_2. Enter the number of approved VECPs that improved traffic operations.	1	
16_3. Enter the number of approved VECPs that mitigated environmental impacts.	0	
16_4. Enter the number of approved VECPs that improved construction.	9	
16_6. Enter the number of approved VECPs that mitigated right of way impacts.	0	
Part 4 – FHWA Stewardship and Oversight of VE Programs **17a Is VE evaluated**		Enter yes if the Division considered and documented risks for the VE program during FY 12. The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box

as part of your Division's Annual Risk Assessment process?		for yes or leave blank for no. **Note: If the answer to this question is no questions 17b and 17c will be skipped in the survey.**
17b Is VE evaluated directly (i.e. individual VE risk assessment conducted specifically for VE) or indirectly (i.e. VE incorporated as a part of a larger program such as Design) during your Division's Annual Risk Assessment?		Enter Directly if the Division considered and documented risks specific for the VE program during FY 2011. Enter indirectly if VE was considered during the risk evaluation of a larger program. **Note: If the answer to this question is 'indirectly' question 17c will be skipped in the survey.**
17c. What was the identified level of risk assigned to VE by your division?		Select one of the following levels of risk assigned by your Division. - High Risk to program - Moderate Risk to program - Low Risk to program - Not Evaluated
17d_Comments. Provide comments on how VE was considered or integrated into your Division's Annual VE Risk Assessment.		Comments should include the process used to conduct the VE risk assessment and could include challenges, best practices improvement recommendations or other comments
18a. Did your DOT or Division conduct a review of the DOT's VE Program between FY 2010 and FY 2012?		Enter yes if either the DOT or Division evaluated any component (policies, procedures, analyses conducted, etc) of the VE program and documented the results during the specified period. The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
18b. Does your DOT or Division plan to conduct a review of the DOT's VE Program in FY 2013?		Enter yes if either the STA or Division plans to evaluate any component (policies, procedures, analyses conducted, etc) of the VE program and documented the results during FY 13. The survey will have a

		checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19a. Is VE specifically discussed in your Division's Stewardship and Oversight Agreement with your DOT?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no. **Note: If answer to this question is no, questions 19b_1 through 19b_8 will be skipped in the survey.**
19b_1. Is VE addressed by reference in the Design Oversight Section of the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_2. Are the VE Federal Regulations referenced in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_3. Are the State DOT VE Policies and Procedures referenced in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_4. Is the role of the Division's VE Coordinator identified in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_5. Are the Division's roles and responsibilities for VE discussed in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_6. Is the Division's participation in VE analyses discussed in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
19b_7. Is the Division's role in the review of VE recommendations		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.

identified in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		
19b_8. Is the Division's role in VE Program monitoring, evaluating and reporting discussed in the Stewardship and Oversight Agreement?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
20a. Identify your Division's typical level of participation in VE analyses on projects with full FHWA oversight.		Select the answer that best applies. Normally (80-100% of Projects) Frequently (60-80% of Projects) Occasionally (40-60% of Projects) Sometimes (20-40% of Projects) Rarely (0-20% of Projects)
20b. Identify your Division's typical level of participation in the approval/rejection process of VE recommendations on projects with full FHWA oversight.		Select the answer that best applies. Normally (80-100% of Projects) Frequently (60-80% of Projects) Occasionally (40-60% of Projects) Sometimes (20-40% of Projects) Rarely (0-20% of Projects)
20c. Identify your Division's typical level of effort monitoring the implementation of VE recommendations on projects with full FHWA oversight.		Select the answer that best applies. Normally (80-100% of Projects) Frequently (60-80% of Projects) Occasionally (40-60% of Projects) Sometimes (20-40% of

		Projects) Rarely (0-20% of Projects)
The following six questions are based on your Division's efforts to ensure that the States complete the required VE analyses prior to authorizing a project for construction.		
21_1. Does the Division check that all required VE analyses are performed on projects with full FHWA oversight prior to authorizing a project for construction?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
21_2. Does the Division spot check that required VE analyses are performed on projects with full FHWA oversight? (e.g. sampling of projects, program assessments or process reviews)		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
21_3. Does the Division spot check that required VE analyses are performed on State administered projects?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
21_4. Does the Division verify that the State VE policies, procedures & guidance comply with VE Federal regulations?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
21_5. Does the Division verify the accuracy of the data collected during the annual VE Call for Data?		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.
21_6. Does the Division have a documented process to check that all required VE analyses		The survey will have a checkbox. Click on the box for yes or leave blank for no.

are conducted prior to authorizing a project for construction?		
22a. Identify any clarification or revisions FHWA should consider in 2013 when updating the Federal Regulations on VE, 23 CFR 627.		FHWA will be updating the VE Federal Regulation during 2013 and would like your input on improvement opportunities. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough for FHWA to take appropriate action.
22b. Identify any clarifications of revisions FHWA should consider in 2013 when updating the FHWA VE Policy.		FHWA will be updating the VE Policy Guidance during 2013 and would like your input on improvement opportunities. Please make sure your response is clear, concise and informative enough for FHWA to take appropriate action.
Thank You for your time assembling and reporting on your States VE Program efforts. **Please provide comments on how the FHWA VE program can be improved or how this data collection process can be improved.**		This is your opportunity (State DOT and Division) to provide feedback on any part of the VE program, training, guidance, sharing, etc. FHWA HQ will take all comments and as appropriate and able will act on them to improve the VE program. Thank you for your time. Ken Leuderalbert Ken.Leuderalbert@dot.gov 317-226-5351