CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Performance Measures

For The Quarter Ending
March 31, 2009



Written and compiled by:

The Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement

1120 N St. Sacramento, CA 95814

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... I

OVERVIEW..... 1

UPDATES SINCE LAST QUARTER..... 2

WEB SITE AND CONTACT..... 3

SECTION 1: KEY DASHBOARD INDICATORS..... 5

- SAFETY GOAL 6
- MOBILITY GOAL 7
- DELIVERY GOAL 8
- STEWARDSHIP GOAL 11
- SERVICE GOAL 12

SECTION 2: TRENDS AND PROGRESS OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES..... 13

- SAFETY
  - OBJECTIVE 1.1 TRAVELER FATALITY RATE..... 14
  - OBJECTIVE 1.2 WORKER FATALITIES..... 14
  - OBJECTIVE 1.3 WORKER INCIDENT RATE..... 15
- MOBILITY
  - OBJECTIVE 2.1 VEHICLE HOURS OF DELAY..... 16
  - OBJECTIVE 2.2 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM RELIABILITY..... 17
  - OBJECTIVE 2.3 INTERCITY RAIL RIDERSHIP..... 19
  - OBJECTIVE 2.4 SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE..... 20
- DELIVERY
  - OBJECTIVE 3.1 PROJECT DELIVERY COSTS..... 21
  - OBJECTIVE 3.2 PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES..... 22

*TABLE OF CONTENTS **(CONT'D)***

- **DELIVERY**
  - **OBJECTIVE 3.3 PURPOSE AND NEED OF PROJECTS**…….…… 24
  - **OBJECTIVE 3.4 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS**…….…… 24
  - **OBJECTIVE 3.5 LOW BIDS VS. ENGINEER'S ESTIMATES**…… 25
- **STEWARDSHIP**
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.1 PAVEMENT CONDITION**…..…… 26
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.2 CALTRANS' FINANCIAL RESOURCES**…… 26
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.3 MAINTENANCE LEVELS OF SERVICE**…… 28
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.4 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS**…….…… 29
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.5 REAL PROPERTY RETENTION AND DISPOSAL**…..…… 29
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.6 CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES**…….…….. 30
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.7 MANAGEMENT OF CALTRANS' ASSETS**……..…… 30
  - **OBJECTIVE 4.8 BRIDGE CONDITION**…..……..…… 33
- **SERVICE**
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.1 EMPLOYEE ATTRITION RATE**…… 35
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.2 COMPLIANCE WITH RESPONSE TIMES AND MILESTONES**…… 35
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.3 EMPLOYEES ARE ENCOURAGED TO TRY NEW IDEAS**…….. 36
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.4 SATISFACTION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS**…… 37
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.5 ADEQUACY OF TRAINING FOR EMPLOYEES**...…… 38
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.6 MANAGEMENT-EMPLOYEE COMMUNICATIONS**…… 39
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.7 EMPLOYEES' SATISFACTION WITH JOB TOOLS**……..…… 39
  - **OBJECTIVE 5.8 JOB OFFERS ACCEPTED BY FIRST-CHOICE CANDIDATES**…..…. 40

SECTION 3: ACRONYMS…….. 41

Overview

Since 2005, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has been reporting a select set of performance measures to the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTH) on a quarterly basis. The quarterly reports submitted to the BTH include the "vital few" performance measures (represented in this report by the Key Dashboard Indicators) that Caltrans has identified which reflect the goals and objectives in Caltrans' Strategic Plan. Caltrans has taken the lead among the BTH Departments in expanding the use of the Performance-Based Management System (PBMS) as the system for reporting the "vital few" performance measures to the BTH via electronic means. The PBMS for BTH is a data warehouse reporting system deployed via a secure web portal that supports the BTH's performance improvements initiative. Currently, five of the thirteen Departments/Offices under the BTH umbrella have adopted the PBMS as an online tool to provide select performance measures to BTH.

In addition to the "vital few" performance measures, other measures have now been developed to guide Caltrans in its efforts to implement its new five-year Strategic Plan as well as its annual Operational Plan. This report provides these additional performance measures along with the "vital few" previously reported to the BTH. The performance measures reported herein align with the current objectives identified in the Caltrans' Strategic Plan and/or Operational Plan. The objectives were set by the Strategic Planning Work Group based on each measure's historical trend and baseline data that were presented to the Work Group during the development of the Strategic Plan. The baseline for each measure was generally established using the data available during the spring of 2007.

This report consists of two major sections:
The first section presents the key dashboard indicators for the performance measures that are identified in the Strategic Plan and/or Operational Plan. For a quick glimpse of the current status of the measures relative to their respective goals, current data and targets are depicted in the form of gauges on a dashboard to represent the progress of the respective measures.

The second section provides a series of data points spanning over multiple quarters, calendar years or fiscal years. The series of data points are presented in graphical charts to provide management with a tool to track the trends and monitor the progress of the specific measures, so that appropriate adjustments can be made en route to achieving the strategic goals and objectives.

Caltrans will continue to refine and develop appropriate measures for each of its strategic goals and objectives. These measures will be included in future reports as they are developed. Additionally, Caltrans will continue to develop the processes for collecting the necessary performance data that are useful for reporting. Future reports will also include the most updated information as they become available and will reflect new processes as they are developed.

Highlights of This Quarter's Achievements

This report includes a total of 58 performance measures to support the goals and objectives that are identified in the Caltrans' Strategic Plan and Operational Plan. There are two new measures (PM 2.1b - Percent of good (operating) detectors (CMIA corridors) & PM 4.4a - Percentage of projects that have an updated Environmental Commitments Records and a Certificate of Environmental Compliance at project close out) being reported for the first time. The two remaining measures are currently in various stages of data collection process and the status of each of these measures is reported herein.

There are 32 measures that have updated data for this quarter since they were previously reported in the last quarter. These updates are reflected in the revised charts and/or are indicated in the footnotes (or in the comments column for the dashboard gauges). Highlights include meeting and/or exceeding targets in:

PM 1.2 - The number of work-related fatalities in a calendar year;

PM 1.3 - The number of work-related injuries and illnesses;

PM 2.1a - Statewide vehicle hours of delay;

PM 3.4 - Total construction costs of projects at Proposed Final Estimate (PFE) as a percentage of total original contract allotment;

PM 4.2b - Timely use of funds;

PM 4.2c - Percent of invoices issued to individuals or entities that owe the Department money prepared within 30 calendar days of receipt of documentation;

PM 4.2d - Percent of payments made to vendors and other government agencies within the time limits imposed by the Prompt Payment Act or as specified in the contract;

PM 4.2e - Processing employee payments within 10 working days of the receipt of the Travel Expense Claims (TECs);

PM 5.3 - Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that employees are encouraged to try new ideas and new ways of doing things to improve Caltrans; and,

PM 5.6 - Percent of Caltrans employees who rate Caltrans management as good or very good at being open and honest in communications with employees.

Those measures which did not meet their targets this quarter include:

PM 2.1b - Percent of good (operating) detectors (CMIA corridors);

PM 2.1c - Percent of good (operating) detectors (overall);

PM 2.1d - Percent of detection coverage (CMIA corridors);

PM 2.1e - Percent of detection coverage (overall);

PM 2.2b - Percent of major incidents cleared in less than 90 minutes;

PM 2.3a - Total ridership on intercity rail;

PM 2.3b - Farebox Ratio on intercity rail;

PM 2.4b - Percent of available funds used for Mass Transportation projects that pass through Caltrans to local recipients;

PM 3.2a - Project approval and environmental documents (PA/ED) – percent of projects;

PM 3.2b - Right of Way Certification (R/W) – percent of projects;

PM 3.2c - Ready to List (RTL) – percent of projects;

PM 3.2d - Construction Contract Acceptance (CCA) – percent of projects;

PM 3.2e - Cooperative Agreements – percent executed within 60 days of Headquarters' approval;

PM 3.5a - Percent difference between total low bids and total of all engineers' estimates;

PM 3.5b - Percent of projects with low bid within +/- 10% of engineer's estimates;

PM 4.4a - Percentage of projects that have an updated Environmental Commitments Records and a Certificate of Environmental Compliance at project close out;

PM 4.7a - Percentage of equipment that is available to the user (fleet uptime);

PM 5.2a - Request for Authorization to Proceed" packages submitted by local agencies that are reviewed and processed by Caltrans and are ready for submittal to FHWA;

PM 5.2b - Percent of encroachment permits approved within the statutory 60-day limit;

PM 5.5 - Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that the training they have received at Caltrans has adequately prepared them for the work they do;

PM 5.7 - Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the availability of the tools necessary to do their job; and,

PM 5.8 - Percent of first-choice candidates that accept the Department's entry-level job offers.

Measures still under development and where data is not yet available include:

PM 2.2a - Percent variation from predicted travel time (with reliable real-time detection); and,

PM 3.3 - Percent of projects that meet their approved purpose and need at project completion.

The measures with annual or biennial data collection cycles will be updated as the latest data becomes available. For those annual measures that are reported by fiscal year (FY), FY refers to the fiscal year for the State of California which starts on July 1 and ends on June 30 of the following year, unless indicated otherwise (e.g. FFY refers to a federal fiscal year which begins October 1 and ends September 30).

Web Site and Contact

The most current report of Caltrans' Performance Measures is posted on the Internet at Caltrans' home page, at http://www.dot.ca.gov/ (under "**Highlights**", the link to the document is titled "*Latest Report of Caltrans' Performance Measures*"). Caltrans' performance report for the quarter ending December 2007 was the first edition made available to the public and it was published on the Internet in March 2008. The first public edition and subsequent quarterly editions of the performance report will continue to be available for download on the Internet, at http://www.dot.ca.gov/perf/.

Previous editions of Caltrans' performance reports from earlier quarters and fiscal years (including earlier internal editions) are available on the Intranet site for the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement (OSPPM), at http://onramp.dot.ca.gov/hq/osppm/ (note that this Intranet site is only accessible from within Caltrans' internal network). Also posted on the OSPPM's Intranet site are information about Caltrans' Strategic Plan, Operational Plan, and Action Plan.

The performance measures presented in this report are generally compiled from the information provided by various Caltrans divisions or offices that collected data for their respective areas of responsibilities, as well as data compiled from other external sources. The data sources are credited on the respective graphical charts and where applicable, any additional resources are also indicated in the footnotes for the specific measures. Based on the data compiled from various sources, the author created and designed all the graphs and charts that are presented in Section 2 of this report. If you find any deficiency in the graphical representation of the data, or if you have any questions or concerns about the performance measures reported herein, please contact the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement by sending an e-mail to Steve Guenther, steve_guenther@dot.ca.gov.

Section 1: Key Dashboard Indicators

Only the most updated data for key dashboard indicators are shown in Section 1 of this report. For more comprehensive details of these indicators and other performance measures, please refer to Section 2 of this report.

The key indicators in Section 1 are presented as dashboard gauges for a quick glimpse of the current status of the measures. The dashboard gauges are generally divided into bands of green and red. The green band represents the potential levels of performance within the target range. The red band represents the area where the measure falls outside of the target range. When a specific measure hits the target or is within the green band on the dashboard, the arrow on the gauge will turn green. Likewise, the arrow will turn red when the measure falls short of the target range. These at-a-glance gauges are designed to show the latest status of the measure based on a snapshot in time – either it is the latest quarter, calendar year, or fiscal year, where the data are available.

In most cases, the current data represent the latest information available for the quarter. However, some of the data are only collected and reported on an annual basis (by calendar year or fiscal year). For these annual measures, the gauges will only be updated once a year and no quarterly updates will be reported.

The dashboard gauges presented in this section were originally developed for the Performance-Based Management System. Due to the limitation of the software tool being utilized to develop the dashboard gauges, the numerical value shown on the scale of the gauges only increases in one direction – i.e., clockwise only. As such, the green bands on the gauges are not consistently shown on the left side of the scale; and likewise, the red bands are not always shown on the right side of the scale either. The green band appears on the left side of the scale when the desired target for a specific measure is *less* than a threshold limit. Conversely, the green band appears on the right side of the scale when the desired target is *greater* than a specified threshold limit.

Although the dashboard gauges in their current form are displayed in bands of green and red only, it is not intended to indicate that all measures are absolute – i.e., either pass or fail to meet their respective targets. It is recognized that there are cases where it may be more meaningful to display yellow bands on the gauges for certain measures that are progressing towards meeting or beating their respective targets. However, currently there isn't a universal way to determine what an acceptable level of progress is for each measure that will warrant a display of yellow band on the dashboard. It is anticipated that the dashboard gauges as presented now (with green and red bands only) will spur further interest from the affected stakeholders and data owners of each measure to come forward and propose the acceptable ranges of yellow bands for their respective measures. Once we have a consensus on the acceptable levels of progress for each measure, future updates of the appropriate performance measures will reflect yellow bands on the dashboard gauges.

Safety Goal – *Provide the safest transportation system in the nation for users and workers.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
PM 1.1 Traveler Safety – Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (MVMT) on the California state highway system. 	1.10	1.00	0.94	This is an annual measure reported by calendar year. Figure for current data represents calendar year 2007. The baseline of 1.10 fatalities per 100 MVMT was based on the latest data available (2005 data) when the strategic goal was first established. The fatality rate on the California state highway system has fluctuated from 1.08 in 2003, 1.02 in 2004, 1.10 in 2005, to 1.01 in 2006.
PM 1.2 Worker Safety – Number of work-related fatalities in a calendar year. 	2	0	0	This measure is reported by calendar year. There no fatalities reported through the first quarter of 2009 (January-March), which is reflected by the figure shown under current data. The baseline was established from the number of fatalities in calendar year 2006. There were 3 fatalities in calendar year 2007. No fatalities were reported for a period of 17 months between the last fatality in 2006 (on April 4, 2006) and the first fatality in 2007 (on September 25, 2007).

Mobility Goal – *Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
PM 2.2b Percent of major incidents cleared in less than 90 minutes. 	32	60	25	This measure is reported on a quarterly basis. Figure for current data represents the third quarter (January-March) of fiscal year 2008/09. There were 194 major incidents reported in this quarter, of which 49 were cleared in 90 minutes or less. The average clearance time for this quarter was 3 hours 11 minutes, which represents a decrease of four minutes from the previous quarter (October-December). The baseline was established from the January-March quarter in 2007. Note: Major incidents are defined as those requiring 30 minutes or more to clear.
PM 2.3a Total ridership on the State-supported intercity rail – Number of passengers on the Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin and Capitol Corridor. 	1,249,152	1,323,458	1,138,174	This measure is reported quarterly. Figure for current data represents ridership for the first quarter (January-March) of calendar year 2009. Baseline is actual ridership for the same quarter in the prior year. Target is seasonally adjusted based on annual corridor business plans, and this quarter's ridership for January-March 2009 was 86% of the seasonally adjusted target. Ridership decreased by 110,978 from the same quarter in the prior year. Quarterly ridership is subject to seasonal influences, and summer months (July-September) typically have the highest ridership. Total ridership for calendar year 2008 was 5,580,773, a 10.6% increase over the total ridership for calendar year 2007.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
Delivery milestones for capital projects. Current data represents the percent of projects that met the planned delivery milestones.				Actual delivery compared to the planned delivery through the fiscal year quarter.
PM 3.2a Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED)[1] – Percent of projects. 	93	100	86.4	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline is the fourth quarter data for FY 2005/06. Figure for current data represents delivery of 108 out of 125 planned milestones through the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March).
PM 3.2b Right of Way (R/W) Certification[2] – Percent of projects. 	99	100	96.0	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline is the fourth quarter data for FY 2005/06. Figure for current data represents delivery of 237 out of 247 planned milestones through the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March).
PM 3.2c Ready to List (RTL)[3] – Percent of projects. 	99	100	96.9	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline is the fourth quarter data for FY 2005/06. Figure for current data represents delivery of 248 out of 256 planned milestones through the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March), as specified in Director Kempton's Contracts for Delivery with the 12 Districts.
PM 3.2d Construction Contract Acceptance (CCA)[4] – Percent of projects. 	88	100	91.6	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline is the fourth quarter data for FY 2005/06. Figure for current data represents delivery of 152 out of 166 planned milestones through the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March).

Notes:
1. The PA/ED milestone represents completion of preliminary engineering and environmental analyses and investigations for the project alternatives under investigation, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); state and federal approval of a final Environmental Document (if required); selection of a preferred alternative; and approval of the selected project through the Project Report.
2. At the R/W Certification milestone, certification is made that all R/W activities (i.e., appraisals, acquisitions, relocation assistance, utility coordination, etc.) have been completed in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, per 23 CFR 635.309(c)(1), (2), or (3).
3. The RTL milestone is a point at which projects are ready to be advertised to attract bids from the contractors.
4. CCA means that all construction project work has been completed in accordance with all the requirements of the contract.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
Delivery milestones for capital projects. Current data represents the percent of projects that met the planned delivery milestones.				Actual delivery compared to the planned delivery through the fiscal year quarter.
PM 3.2e Cooperative agreements – Percent executed within 60 days of Headquarters' approval. 	40	100	52%	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline reflects the percent of cooperative agreements in FY 2006/07 that were executed within 60 days of Headquarters' approval. Figure for current data represents percent executed within 60 days through the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March). Out of a total of 60 agreements executed in January through March 2009, 31 (or 52%) were executed within 60 days of Headquarters' approval, 12 (or 20%) were executed within 61 to 180 days, and 17 (or 28%) were executed beyond 180 days.
PM 3.5a Percent difference* between total low bids and total of all engineer's estimates. *Percent difference = 100% × (Total Low Bids - Total Engineer's Estimates) ÷ (Total Engineer's Estimates).	4.5	± 5.0	- 26.5%	This measure is reported quarterly. Figure for current data represents the third quarter of FY 2008/09, and reflects 193 projects with bids opened in January-March 2009, with total low bids of more than $354 million. Caltrans received an average of 8.1 bidders per project in the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09. For comparison, the percent difference for last quarter (October-December 2008) was -26.0%. Baseline reflects the cumulative data for FY 2005/06 (July 2005 - June 2006).

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
PM 3.5b Percent of projects with low bid within ±10% of engineer's estimate. 	33.5	50	10.9 %	This measure is reported quarterly. Figure for current data represents the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March), as compared to 18.2% as reported in the last quarter (October-December 2008). Out of a total of 193 bids in the third quarter, 21 were within +/- 10%. Target is at least 50% of the projects have a low bid within ±10% of the engineer's estimate. Baseline reflects the cumulative data for FY 2005/06 (July 2005 - June 2006).

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
PM 4.1a Pavement condition – Percent of distressed lane miles. 	28	<30	26	This measure is reported annually by calendar year. Baseline represents data for calendar year 2005 and current data reflects calendar year 2007. Percent of distressed lane miles has decreased from 28% in 2005 to 26% in 2007. (Note: 2006 pavement survey was delayed to 2007). Calendar year 2008 data is expected by the end of May 2009.
PM 4.2a Federal subvention formula funds obligated for local projects (on/off State highway system) – Percent of funds obligated. 	100	100	104	This measure is reported annually by federal fiscal year (FFY), with a target of obligating 100% of available funds at the end of the FFY. Available funds are based on projection at the beginning of FFY. Baseline is the obligational authority (OA) for local projects used by the State of California in FFY 2006. Data for the current quarter, which reflects delivery of Local OA through the third quarter of FFY 2009, is $404 million or 37.2% vs. $390 million or 35.2% through the second quarter of FFY 2008.
PM 4.2d Percent of payments made to vendors and other government agencies within the time limits imposed by the Prompt Payment Act or as specified in the contract. 	99	99	99.7	This measure is reported quarterly. Baseline was established from the second quarter of 2006. Figure for current data represents the third quarter of FY 2008/09 (January-March). Met performance target for the quarter (274,137 of 275,140 payments were made within the time limits). This quarter's result marginally higher than the previous quarter's results where 99.6% (274,137 of 275,140) of payments were made within the time limits.

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Current Data	Comments
PM 5.2a "Request for Authorization to Proceed" packages submitted by local agencies that are reviewed and processed by Caltrans and are ready for submittal to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – Percent processed within 30 days of receiving the complete and accurate request. 	93	100	96	This measure is reported quarterly. The baseline was established using the quarterly data reported for January-March 2008. Quarterly target is 100%. Current data represents the second quarter of FFY 2009 (January-March). Prior to beginning work on the federal-aid highway system for which federal reimbursement will be sought, a local agency must receive federal "Authorization to Proceed" from the FHWA. This performance measure indentifies the percentage of complete and accurate "Request for Authorization to Proceed" that are received, reviewed and processed by Caltrans within 30 days.
PM 5.4a Percent of external survey respondents who said Caltrans was doing a good or excellent job. User Survey: 	User Survey: 53	User Survey: 61 (or equals to 115% of 53)	User Survey: 55	This measure is expected to be updated biennially, depending on the frequency of external customer survey. Baseline of 53% for user survey was based on the 2001 Caltrans External Customer Survey – Telephone Survey (quantitative results were compiled from user survey, but only qualitative results were available from stakeholder survey). There was no comparable survey question in the 2005 external customer survey. The target is to increase by 15% (or 115% from the baseline) the percentage of external customers who are satisfied with Caltrans services. Figures for current data represent overall results from the 2007 External Survey of Transportation Users and Stakeholders. For the stakeholder survey, since no quantitative data was available when the target was originally set, the 2007 survey result established the baseline.
Stakeholder Survey: 	Stakeholder Survey: 68	Stakeholder Survey: 78 (or equals to 115% of 68)	Stakeholder Survey: 68	

Section 2: Trends and Progress of Performance Measures

This section presents the data points for each performance measure as a series of line graphs or bar charts spanning over multiple reporting cycles. The reporting cycles for each measure may be in terms of quarters, calendar years or fiscal years, as applicable to each specific measure. For those measures with annual (or biennial) data collection, the graphical charts will only be updated annually (or biennially) and no quarterly updates will be provided.

These charts are intended to provide a graphical depiction of the various performance measures over several reporting cycles. As the series of data points are plotted over time, they serve as a good management tool to track the historical trends of the measures and to project future performance.

Where the targets of specific measures are identified in the objectives or in the annual operational plans, these targets are plotted over the same graphs and they are used as a yardstick to gauge the progress of the specific performance measures. The progress can be monitored and appropriate adjustments may be made periodically by management to ensure that the measures are moving ahead towards meeting or beating the strategic goals and objectives.

Safety Goal – Provide the safest transportation system in the nation for users and workers.

Objective 1.1 – By 2008, reduce the fatality rate on the California state highway system (SHS) to 1.00 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled and continuously reduce annually thereafter toward a goal of the lowest rate in the nation.

PM 1.1 Traveler Safety – Fatalities per 100 MVMT on the California state highway system.



Data Sources: *National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; and **Division of Traffic Operations.

Notes: *1. Data for U.S.A. and California (all roads) is taken from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. FARS contains data on a census of fatal traffic crashes within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**2. Data for the California State Highway System (SHS) is provided by the Division of Traffic Operations. Data for 2007 indicates that traffic fatality rate on the California SHS has hit an all-time low, dipping below the SHS target of 1.00 fatality per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (MVMT). This measure is reported on an annual basis and current data represents calendar year 2007, the latest data available.

Objective 1.2 – Each year, ensure zero work-related fatalities.

PM 1.2 Worker Safety – Number of work-related fatalities.



Data Source: Division of Human Resources/Office of Health and Safety Services.

Notes: 1. No fatalities were reported for a period of 17 months between the last fatality in 2006 (April 4, 2006) and the first fatality in 2007 (September 25, 2007).

*2. No fatalities reported for the first quarter (January-March) of 2009.

Safety Goal – Provide the safest transportation system in the nation for users and workers.

Objective 1.3 – By 2012, reduce the work-related injury and illness incident rate for transportation workers by 25%.

PM 1.3 Worker Incident Rate – Work-related injuries and illnesses in previous 12 months per 200,000 employee hours.



Data Source: Division of Human Resources/Office of Health and Safety Services.

Notes: *1. 2009 figure (6.91) reflects the incident rate (IR) through the first quarter (January-March) of 2009. The first quarter 2009 Incident Rate (IR) is a 6.2% reduction from CY 2008 IR.

2. A steady downward trend in IR is continuing.

3. IR has been previously reported to BTH on a quarterly basis since 2005. The 2004 IR was originally reported to the BTH as 8.12, which was used as a baseline to set the 2008 target IR. The 2008 target is a 10% reduction from the baseline of 8.12, to be achieved by the end of 2008.

4. IR is subject to being updated to reflect late reporting of incidents from the field. Employees may seek medical attention weeks or sometimes months after the initial exposure to an incident that didn't require immediate medical attention. The 2004 IR has since been updated to 8.29 and it is now less susceptible to changes than more recent IR for 2005 and 2006. (2007 figure has been updated from 7.52 in the previous report).

5. Based on consultation with the Office of Health and Safety Services (under the Division of Human Resources), and for consistency and continuity with the original target set for 2008 (as previously reported to the BTH), the 2012 target identified in the Strategic Plan is based on 25% reduction from the baseline IR in 2004. Using the originally established baseline of 8.12, 2012 target is 75% of 8.12, i.e. 6.09 (this figure has been updated to be consistent with the "Safety Statistics for Year 2007" memo from the Deputy Director for Administration and Information Technology).

Mobility Goal – Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.

Objective 2.1 – By 2012, reduce daily vehicle hours of delay by 30,000 hours throughout the transportation system.

PM 2.1a Statewide daily vehicle hours of delay (DVHD).



Notes: *1. Travel during the 2008 calendar year was greatly affected by the recent economic downturn and elevated fuel costs. It is anticipated that the economy will rebound and traffic congestion (DVHD) will return to normal levels. The transportation management system strategies represent an institutional change over time. The benefits will be realized through the way Caltrans (and our local transportation and transit agency partners) manage our pieces of the transportation system. The measure of success will be a reduction in traffic congestion (DVHD) as the economy improves and travel demand returns.

2. 2000-2005 figures are reported in the 2005 State Highway Congestion Monitoring Program (HICOMP) Report, based on congestion data on California urban freeway segments with a history of recurrent congestion. Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay (DVHD) figures for 2006 and 2007 are 560,362 and 581,674, respectively.

3. DVHD is an aggregate by delay threshold which is the amount of extra time spent by all the vehicles over and above the time it takes to traverse a link at the threshold speeds of 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60 miles per hour (mph). Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) corridors are not fully equipped with detection at this time in order to monitor DVHD by corridor.

4 The baseline DVHD of 558,143 hours as reported in the Governor's Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) was derived from 2002 data and projected into 2005, whereas the 530,091 DVHD reported in the 2005 HICOMP Report was derived from actual data collected in 2005.

2012 target is a reduction of 30,000 hours from the baseline DVHD of 558,143 hours (referred to as "today's levels" in the SGP). This is consistent with the SGP's 2016 target of reducing DVHD by 100,000 hours, while accomodating growth in population and the economy over the next few years. 2009-2011 targets are projected reduction of DVHD before the 2012 target is achieved.

PM 2.1b Percent of good (ope rating) detectors (CMIA corridors).



Notes: 1. The number provided was manually compiled and represents the percent good on 3/31/09.

2. The automatic roll up of corridor data and the range in the percentage of good detection will be available in the next quarter of reporting.

Mobility Goal – Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.

PM 2.1c Percent of good (operating) detectors (overall).



Notes: 1. Measure was reported for the first time in the second quarter (Q2) of 2007.
2. The figures shown above represent the percent good as of the end of each quarter.
3. The percent good varied from 69 to 77 percent over Q1 (January-March) of 2009.

PM 2.1d Percent of detection coverage (CMIA corridors).



Notes: 1. This measure was reported for the first time in Q2 of 2008. 2009-Q1 data represents January-March 2009.
2. The percentage represents the existing detection relative to the CMIA corridor buildout of 3277 detection stations. The buildout is comprised of existing, programmed and proposed detection stations.

PM 2.1e Percent of detection coverage (overall).



Notes: 1. This measure was reported for the first time in the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2007.
2. The percentage represents the existing detection relative to the projected buildout of 8446 detection stations in the year 2012. The buildout is comprised of existing, programmed, and proposed detection stations. However, due to the ever changing urban/rural boundary line, the programmed and proposed may require revision on an annual basis.

Mobility Goal – Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.

Objective 2.2 – By 2012, increase reliability by 10% throughout the transportation system.

PM 2.2a Percent variation from predicted travel time (with reliable real-time detection).

Status: Per Division of Traffic Operations, the methodology for comparing predicted travel time (at traffic management centers) and actual travel time measured in PeMS has not been established at this time. Therefore, the first target has been set for FY 2009/10.

PM 2.2b Percent of major incidents cleared in less than 90 minutes.



Notes: 1. There were 194 Major incidents reported in the Major Incident Database in the January-March 2009 quarter (Q3 of Fiscal Year 2008/09) of which 49 were cleared in 90 minutes or less. The average clearance time was 3 hours 11 minutes.

2. Major incidents are defined as those requiring 30 minutes or more to clear. Quarterly report is subject to seasonal influences (i.e., weather, holiday season, etc.). Data gathered is related to clearance times only and no evaluation of causes is provided for incidents less than four hours. However, an evaluation process for this category of incidents is being developed. To remedy the situation, Caltrans is in the process of revising data collection methods and software in conjunction with new policies in the field between California Highway Patrol (CHP) and Caltrans. Caltrans and the CHP will be considering additional improvements as a result of the California Highway Incident Management Summit and Workshops.

Mobility Goal – Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.

Objective 2.3 – By 2012, increase intercity rail ridership on the State-supported routes by 28%.

PM 2.3a Intercity rail ridership by route (Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin, and Capital Corridor), and total ridership for the three routes.



Notes: *1. With 2006 total ridership as a baseline (4,773,813 riders), 2008 target is 104% of baseline; 2009 target is 108% of baseline; 2010 target is 112% of baseline; 2011 target is 120% of baseline; and 2012 target is 128% of baseline (or 6.110 million riders).

2. Ridership numbers published in the California State Rail Plan are based on the Federal fiscal years, and are different from the numbers shown above.

3. Ridership for January-March 2009 (1,138,174) was 86% of the seasonally adjusted target. Ridership decreased by 110,978 from the same quarter in the prior year. Ridership on the San Joaquin Route is down 1.7%; on the Capitol Corridor, down 4.8%; and on the Pacific Surfliner Route, down 13.5%. Primarily due to the poor economy, marketing is being increased, particularly on the Pacific Surfliner Route.

PM 2.3b Farebox ratio for intercity rail (Pacific Surfliner, San Joaquin, and Capital Corridor).



Notes: *1. Projected figures for FFY 2009 through FFY 2012 are excerpted from the 2007/08 to 2017/18 edition of the California State Rail Plan. A drop in the projected figures are an indication of an increase in service and operating expenses.

2. Actual figures for FFY 2002 to FFY 2007 are taken from prior editions of the California State Rail Plan.

3. Farebox ratio is defined as operating revenue divided by operating expenses, and is a measure of the cost effectiveness of the service.

4. Farebox data for January - March 2009 not yet available. Average farebox ratio for all three routes was 49.5% in the latest available quarter (October - December 2008). The farebox ratio for October-December 2007 was 52.6 percent, so the farebox ratio has decreased by 3.1 percentage points from the same quarter in 2007.

Mobility Goal – Maximize transportation system performance and accessibility.

Objective 2.4 – By 2012, reduce single occupancy vehicle (SOV) commute trips by 5%.

PM 2.4a Single occupancy vehicle as a percentage of total commute trips in California.



Data Sources: U.S. Census, 1990 and 2000; American Community Survey, 2002-2007.

Notes:
1. With 2005 data as a baseline, targets for 2008-2012 vary between 99% and 95% of the baseline.
2. The 2005 American Community Survey was the latest data available when the target was originally set.
3. Categories of commute trips include: drove alone (or single occupant vehicle (SOV)), carpooled, public transportation, walked, bicycle, motorcycle, other means, and worked at home.
4. Public transportation category included taxicab in the 1990 and 2000 Census, and in the 2002 and 2003 American Community Survey (ACS). Since the 2004 ACS, however, taxicab has been excluded from the public transportation category and grouped with "other means".
5. Data is subject to sampling variability. In addition, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error.

PM 2.4b Percent of available funds used for Mass Transportation projects that pass through Caltrans to local recipients.



Data Source: Division of Mass Transportation.

Notes: *1. Beginning in Q1 of FY 2007/08, the methodology has changed to track the running total of funds processed and passed to local agencies through the quarter. Previously, only projects that were active during the quarter were calculated and projects that were completed before the quarter began were omitted from the calculation.

2. Pass through rate for the fourth quarter (Q4) of FY 2006/07 was 92% due to the delay in passage of the Federal budget which caused subsequent delay in payment authorization.
3. In Q1 of FY 2008/09, the State Grants allocation dropped to $62 million as compared to $482 million in Q1 of FY 2007/08 (although the Federal funds were being allocated and encumbered at a similar rate as last year). The decrease of $420 million in allocated and encumbered State funds has lowered the overall pass through rate for Q1, Q2, and Q3 of FY 2008/09.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Objective 3.1 – By 2012, impact the overall cost to deliver capital projects by:
a. Reducing the support to capital ratio to 32% or lower;
b. Reducing the overhead cost to 13%.

PM 3.1a **Capital outlay support cost to capital cost ratio (at Construction Contract Acceptance [CCA] milestone).**



Notes: 1. Support cost includes project development and construction administration costs.
2. The ratio is calculated on an annual basis (using five years of normalized data) to manage the overall year-to-year programwide trends.
3. The ratio is sensitive to the fluctuation of capital value. A significant increase in capital value for FY 2005/06 caused the ratio to go down; and likewise, a significant decrease in capital value for FY 2006/07 primarily resulted in a higher ratio.

PM 3.1b **Percent overhead cost.**



Notes: 1. This measure is being reported for the first time in FY 2007/08.
2. The percentage represents capital outlay support's (COS) functional overhead, calculated on the basis of hours per person years (PYs) instead of dollars. In other words, each hour of project-direct support generated approximately 0.163 hours of COS indirect support.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Objective 3.2 – Each fiscal year, meet 100% of project delivery milestones.

PM 3.2a **Percent delivery of Project Approval / Environmental Document (PA/ED) milestone.**



*1. Q3 figure represents delivery of 108 out of 125 planned PA/ED milestones cumulative through the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

2. The PA/ED milestone represents completion of preliminary engineering and environmental analyses and investigations for the project alternatives under investigation, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); state and federal approval of a final Environmental Document (if required); selection of a preferred alternative; and approval of the selected project through the Project Report. Final project design cannot be initiated until the PA/ED milestone has been achieved.

PM 3.2b **Percent delivery of planned Right of Way (R/W) Certification milestone.**



Notes: 1. Q3 figure represents delivery of 237 out of 247 planned R/W Certification milestones for the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

2. At the R/W Certification milestone, certification is made that all R/W activities (i.e., appraisals, acquisitions, relocation assistance, utility coordination, etc.) have been completed in accordance with 23 CFR 635.309(c)(1), (2), or (3).

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

PM 3.2c **Percent delivery of planned Ready To List (RTL) milestone.**



Notes: 1. Figures for FY 2005/06 through FY 2007/08 represent delivery of planned RTL milestones as specified in Director Kempton's Contracts For Delivery with the 12 districts.

*2. Q3 figure represents delivery of 248 out of 256 planned RTL milestones cumulative through the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

3. Caltrans completed the plans, specifications and estimates for 100 percent of the 294 projects scheduled for RTL in FY 2007/08, with a total value of $3.3 billion. In the prior year (FY 2006/07), all of the 286 projects planned for RTL milestones were also delivered on time.

4. Over the past three fiscal years (2005/06 through 2007/08), Caltrans had promised to deliver 754 major projects with a construction value of more than $8.3 billion. 753 of those projects were delivered on time, which translates into a 99.9 percent delivery record over a three-year period.

5. A project is considered RTL when the Project Engineer certifies that all applicable design, right of way, environmental, regulatory and statutory conditions have been addressed in the plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E). The product at RTL is a draft construction contract that is ready to list for advertisement pending funding approval and contract document reproduction.

PM 3.2d **Percent delivery of planned Construction Contract Acceptance (CCA) milestone.**



Notes: *1. Q3 figure represents delivery of 152 out of 166 planned CCA milestones cumulative through the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

2. CCA means that Caltrans has determined that all construction project work has been completed in accordance with all the requirements of the contract.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

PM 3.2e **Number and percent of cooperative agreements executed within 60 days of signing authorizing document.**



*Note: Q3 figures reflect data through the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09. Out of a total of 60 agreements executed in Q3, 31 (or 52%) were executed in 60 days or less, 12 (or 20%) were executed within 61 to 180 days, and 17 (or 28%) took more than 180 days to execute.

Objective 3.3 – By 2012, ensure 100% of projects meet their approved purpose and need at project completion.

PM 3.3 **Percent of projects that meet their approved purpose and need at project completion.**

Status: A process to collect this data is under development.

Objective 3.4 – Each year, ensure that the total construction costs of projects do not exceed 100% of their total original allotment.

PM 3.4 **Total construction costs of projects at Proposed Final Estimate (PFE) as a percentage of total original contract allotment.**



Notes: 1. Original contract allotment = the bid amount + contingency + state furnished material + supplemental work funds.
2. Excluding four toll bridge contracts from the FY 2007/08 data reduces the percentage from 113% to 94%.
*3. Q3 figure reflects data through the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

Delivery Goal – *Efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services.*

Objective 3.5 – Each year, keep the total of all low bids within ± 5% of the total of all engineers' estimates.

PM 3.5a **Percent difference between total low bids and total engineer's estimates.**



Data Source: Division of Engineering Services/Office Engineer.

Notes: 1. Figures include all bid-opened projects. Some projects may have more than one bid opening.
2. Percent difference = 100% × (Total Low Bids - Total Engineer's Estimates) ÷ (Total Engineer's Estimates)
*3. 193 projects were opened to bidders in Q3 (January-March) of FY 2008/09, with more than $354 million in total low bids.
4. In Q3 of FY 2008/09, Caltrans received an average of 8.1 bidders per project. Efforts to attract more contractors to bid on Caltrans' projects have resulted in more bidders per project (average 8.0 for first 3 quarters of FY 2008/2009, highest since data corrected from FY 1991/1992) and reduced capital project cost, saving millions of dollars.

5. In FY 2003/04, the 28.7% difference between total low bids and total engineer's estimates was primarily due to a single project, the Self Anchored Suspension Bridge (San Francisco - Oakland Bay Bridge). If this project were excluded, the percent difference would be only +3.8%.

PM 3.5b **Percent of projects with low bid within ±10% of engineer's estimate; and Percent of projects with low bid greater than 110% of engineer's estimate.**



Data Source: Division of Engineering Services/Office Engineer.

Notes: 1. Figures include all bid-opened projects, except for Minor B or emergency contracts. The cost limit for Minor B projects ($147,000 for 2008-2009) is defined by California Public Contract Code, Section 10105.
*2. Q3 figure reflects projects with bid opening in the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.
**3. Target is at least 50% of the projects have a low bid within ±10% of the engineer's estimate.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Objective 4.1 – By 2012, ensure that distressed pavement does not exceed 30% of the system's lane miles.

PM 4.1a **Pavement Condition – Percent of distressed lane miles.**



Notes: 1. Strategic Plan baseline for distressed lane miles is 28%, based on 2005 data.

*2. 2006 pavement survey was delayed to 2007. The percentage shown for 2006 is interpolated.

**3. Figures shown in red are forecast for pavement distress levels in 2008-2012, based on current State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funding for pavement projects. FY 2008/09 data is expected in the 4th Quarter of 2008/09.

4. Meeting the stated target of 30% by 2012 will require a significant increase in SHOPP funding for pavement projects.

Objective 4.2 – Each year, ensure that 100% of Caltrans' financial resources are available when and where needed.

PM 4.2a **Percent of federal subvention formula funds obligated for local projects (on/off State highway system).**



Notes: 1. Q1-Q3 figures reflect progress towards meeting the Federal fiscal year-end target of obligating 100% of available funds. Historical trends indicate that during the first two quarters of the FFY, the obligation of projects is typically low and it increases in the third quarter with a large number of projects being obligated at the end of the FFY.

2 Figure for Q4 of FFY 2008 represents the percent delivery of local obligational authority (OA) from October 2007 to September 2008, including the delivery of 100% of the $1.1 billion of formula OA available for the FFY, and the additional $42 million of August Redistribution formula OA provided for local projects. The total OA delivered for the FFY would increase to 109% if the additional $55 million of special non-formula Bridge OA were included in the calculation.

3. Delivery of Local OA through the second quarter of FFY 2009 is $404 million or 37.2% vs. $390 million or 35.2% through the second quarter of FFY 2008. Typically OA Delivery is relatively low in the first two quarters of the FFY.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

PM 4.2b **Timely use of funds – Percent of unexpended obligational authority (OA) balance that is deemed inactive and subject to quarterly review.**



Notes: 1. An inactive project is defined as a project with no financial activity in the past 12 months. Inactive projects, subject to quarterly review, are based on the criteria detailed in the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR Part 630.106).

2. The target was revised from 15% to 10% as the percentage of inactive projects had declined from a high of 18% in Q2 of FFY 2007 to the low of 9% in Q3 of FFY 2008.

*3. Figure for Q4 of FFY 2008 was 3% above the target, primarily due to a single project with an unexpended balance of over $97 million. If the project were excluded, the percentage would only be 9.6%. The percentage fluctuates as the unexpended OA increases toward the end of the FFY, as more projects are obligated.

4. Goal exceeded for Q2 (January-March) 2009. Significant reduction from previous quarter (6.5%). Emphasis on preventative measures using the Look Ahead Reports diligence by local agencies to invoice projects that get on the Inactive Projects list has caused a dramatic decrease to well below desired target level.

PM 4.2c **Percent of invoices issued to individuals or entities that owe the Department money prepared within 30 calendar days of receipt of documentation.**



*Note: Q3 figure reflects 7,929 of 7,929 invoices that were prepared within 30 calendar days in the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

PM 4.2d **Percent of total payments made to vendors and other government agencies within the time limits imposed by the Prompt Payment Act or as specified in the contract.**



*Note: Q3 figure reflects 237,545 of 238,240 payments that were made within the time limits imposed in the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

PM 4.2e **Percent of employee payments processed within 10 working days of receipt of Travel Expense Claim (TEC) by Accounting.**



*Note: 1. The lack of an enacted State budget in Q1 of FY 2008/09 prevented payments of TECs within 10 working days during the first quarter (July - September) of 2008.

2. The target of 100% was reached in the third quarter (January-March) of FY 2008/09.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Objective 4.3 – By 2012, increase maintenance level of service (LOS) scores to:
80 in Litter and Debris;
95 in Striping;
95 in Guardrail;
87 for overall roadway level of service.

PM 4.3a **Maintenance LOS in Litter and Debris;**
PM 4.3b **Maintenance LOS in Striping;**
PM 4.3c **Maintenance LOS in Guardrail;**
PM 4.3d **Maintenance LOS for overall roadway.**



Notes: 1. Maintenance operational plan for FY 2007/08 calls for holding the overall roadway LOS at 87. It is anticipated that it will be difficult to hold the overall roadway LOS at current level due to under-investment in roadway maintenance/rehabilitation over the past five years.
2. The overall roadway LOS rating is an average of all roadway elements (travelway, drainage, roadside and traffic guidance) levels of service.
*3. Annual LOS targets for FYs 2008-2012 are shown in dashed lines.
4. FY 2007/08 data reflect LOS reviews conducted on or about June 30, 2008.

Objective 4.4 – Each year, ensure environmental commitments are documented and implemented on 100% of projects.

PM 4.4a **Percentage of projects that have an updated Environmental Commitments Records and a Certificate of Environmental Compliance at project close**



Notes: 1. Data represents FY 2007/08 and is reported on an annual basis.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Objective 4.5 – Each year, dispose of 100% of the parcels identified as excess in the annual Real Property Retention Review.

PM 4.5 **Percent of parcels identified in the Excess Land Disposal Plan and disposed of.**



Notes: 1. The 2007 Excess Lands Disposal Plan was an 18-month plan (7/1/06 through 12/31/07). By the end of 2007, 629 out of 640 parcels had been disposed of.

2. The 2008 Excess Land Disposal Plan was combined with the 2007 Excess Land Disposal Plan in July 2007, for a combined commitment of 1,140 parcels to be disposed of through the end of December 2008. A total of 1150 parcels, or 101% of the 2008 target, were sold through the fourth quarter of 2008. For the first quarter of 2009, 124 parcels, or 38% of the 2009 target 325 parcels, were sold from July 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009.

Objective 4.6 – Identify all critical infrastructure deficiencies for facilities by 2010 and remediate 25% of the deficiencies by 2012.

PM 4.6 **Percent of facilities with critical infrastructure deficiencies remediated.**



Notes: 1. Reported for the first time for FY 2007/08, with 8.3% remediated cumulatively.

2. Target is to remediate critical infrastructure deficiencies in two out of eight office facilities (25%).

3. The Department of Finance (DOF) denied the FY 2008/09 Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal to mitigate critical infrastructure deficiencies in District 1 headquarters building. The DOF action delayed the District 1 project by one year. The DBFS will meet the 25% target by initiating additional critical infrastructure projects in Headquarters.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Objective 4.7 – Manage Caltrans' assets (human resource, information, facilities, and equipment) efficiently and effectively to ensure that 100% of its authorized resources are protected and available when and where needed.

PM 4.7a **Percentage of equipment that is available to the user (fleet uptime).**



Notes: 1. Equipment uptime data is collected on a nightly basis, seven days per week.
2. Average uptime for FY 2007/08 (Q1-Q4) was 88.09%.
3. Uptime percentages based on data from Fleet Management System.

PM 4.7b **Percent approval rating of the Legal Division from an annual performance survey of senior Department managers.**



Note: 1. Surveys were sent to Deputy Directors, District Directors, Deputy District Directors, and Division Chiefs in January for calendar year 2008. 43 of the 148 surves were returned. 95% of the ratings were "good" or better. Overall average rating was 4.19 on a 5 point scale. (4="Superior") Key points learned were: provide aditional contract support.

PM 4.7c **Percent of the tort, eminent domain, and contract cases in which Legal Division obtains favorable results.**



Note: 1. In FY 2007/08, Legal Division achieved 97% success rate for tort, 95% for eminent domain, and 58% for contract litigation. Legal staff is working with departmental staff on strategies to increase the success rate for contract litigation.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

PM 4.7d **Percent of external audits identified in the annual service plan that are completed.**



Note: 1. In FY 2007/08, External Audits Section completed 258 audits in comparison to the 257 identified in its Plan of Service.

PM 4.7e **Percent of mandated audits that are completed.**



Notes: 1. A&I Program's FY 2006/07 plan of service was prepared subject to having the budgeted resources available. As such, A&I pojected that it could complete 12 mandated audits within the fiscal year, even though the mandatory due dates of some of these mandated audits were in FY 2007/08. However, A&I's Internal Audit Division lost staff to other State agencies during the year. Due to not having the projected level of resources, A&I accomplished 89.1% of the plan of service operational audits. A&I completed all of the mandated audits with due dates within the FY 2006/07; and carried over the balance of mandated audits that have due dates in FY 2007/08.

2. Mandated audits are: Department of General Services contract, Cal-Card delegation authority, and FISMA cycles. FISMA (Financial Integrity and State Manager's Accountability) Act of 1983 requires A&I to assess whether internal acounting and administrative controls are operating in a satisfactory manner and communicate results to management.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

Objective 4.8 – By 2012, reduce the number of distressed bridges to 5% of all bridges.

PM 4.8a **Bridge Condition – Number and percent of distressed bridges.**



Data Source: Division of Maintenance.

Notes: 1. Distressed bridges represent those with identified rehabilitation needs. Bridges with scour and seismic needs were included as distressed bridges beginning in FY 2007/08. Excluding bridges with scour and seismic needs, the number of distressed bridges in FY 2007/08 was 809.

*2. FY 2011/12 target is based on the stated objective for the year 2012. Annual targets for FY 2008/09 through FY 2010/11 will be dependent upon funding level for each of those years.

3. Data are reported annually and represent State-owned bridges only.

PM 4.8b **Bridge Condition – Network bridge health index (BHI) number.**



Data Source: Division of Maintenance.

Note: Data are reported annually and represent State-owned bridges only.

Stewardship Goal – *Preserve and enhance California's resources and assets.*

PM 4.8c **Bridge Condition – Percent of State-owned bridges classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete (SD/FO).**



Notes: 1. The term "structurally deficient" should not be misconstrued to mean a bridge is in danger of collapsing. Structurally deficient means the bridge needs repairs to prevent minor problems such as minor cracks, erosion, peeling paint, pot hole, etc. from becoming more serious.

2. Over the last few years, 14% of State highway bridges are classified as structurally deficient and functionally

3. The SD/FO designation includes only those bridges eligible for federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds.

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

Objective 5.1 – Each year, ensure that the attrition rate at Caltrans does not exceed 4%.

PM 5.1 **Employee Attrition Rate – Percent.**



Notes: 1. Attrition is total separations in a FY divided by employee count at the beginning of FY.
2. Total number of separations and employee count exclude intermittent employees.

Objective 5.2 – Each year, ensure 100% compliance with response times and scheduled milestones for Local Assistance, oversight, and permits, as negotiated with our local partners and other submitting entities.

PM 5.2a **Percent of "Request for Authorization to Proceed" packages submitted by local agencies that are reviewed and processed by Caltrans and are ready for submittal to FHWA within 30 days of receiving the complete and accurate request.**



Notes: 1. Prior to beginning work on the federal-aid highway system for which federal reimbursement will be sought, a local agency must receive federal "Authorization to Proceed" from the FHWA. This performance measure indentifies the percentage of complete and accurate "Request for Authorization to Proceed" packages submitted by local agencies that are received, reviewed and processed by Caltrans to the FHWA within 30 days.

2. Q2 2009 (January-March) represents a 4% increase over the prior quarter, which was 92%.

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

PM 5.2b **Percent of encroachment permits approved within the statutory 60-day limit.**



Note: 1. This measure was reported for the first time in Q4 (April-June data) of FY 2007/08.
2. The number provided (91) represents the percentage of encroachment permits approved within the statutory 60 day limit during the January-March 2009 quarter (Q3 of FY 2008/09). The data is taken from the Encroachment Permit Management System (EPMS), which was implemented in January 2008. Those permits that exceeded 60-day approval were due to multiple review cycles and pending responses from the applicant.
3. The EPMS along with the future E-permitting system in a few years hence will allow for more accurate statewide tracking of encroachment permit approvals. The Feasibility Study Report for E-permitting is being updated to be consistent with the Information Technology Capitol Plan.

Objective 5.3 – By 2012, increase by 15% the percentage of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that employees are encouraged to try new ideas and new ways of doing things to improve Caltrans.

PM 5.3 **Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that employees are encouraged to try new ideas and new ways of doing things to improve Caltrans.**



Notes: *1. No comparable survey questions in the 1999 and 2002 Employee Surveys.
2. Favorable result from the 2006 Employee Survey was 39%, which established the baseline for improvements.
**3. 2008 target represents 105% of 39; 2010 target represents 110% of 39; and 2012 target represents 115% of 39.

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

Objective 5.4 – By 2012, increase by 15% the percentage of external stakeholders who are satisfied with Caltrans services.

PM 5.4a **Percent of survey respondents who said Caltrans was doing a good or excellent job.**



Notes: *1. No quantitative data was available for stakeholder responses in the 2001 External Customer Survey. Hence, the survey result from the 2007 Stakeholder Survey segment established the baseline for the stakeholder portion of the External Customer Survey.

**2. A slightly different survey question was used in the 2005 External Customer Survey (see PM 5.4b).

***3. 2007 figures are based on the "overall" responses from the respective User Survey and Stakeholder Survey segments of the 2007 External Customer Survey.

4. The 2009 target for the User Survey represents 108% of 53 (baseline from the 2001 data), whereas the 2009 target for the Stakeholder Survey represents 108% of 68 (baseline from the 2007 data). The 2012 targets represent 115% of 53 for the User Survey and 115% of 68 for the Stakeholder Survey, respectively.

5. Target years are based on the expectation of the availability of new External Customer Survey results.

PM 5.4b **Percent of survey respondents who said Caltrans was doing a good or excellent job in fulfilling its mission of improving mobility across California.**



Notes: *1. A slightly different survey question was used in the 2001 External Customer Survey (see PM 5.4a).

**2. Based on responses from the User Survey segment of the 2007 External Customer Survey.

3. The 2012 target represents 115% of 39 (or 15% improvement from the 2005 baseline of 39). The 2007 External Customer Survey result already exceeded the target of 15% improvement from the 2005 baseline.

4. Previous reports showed an improvement of 21% from 2005 to 2007, which was calculated from the actual unrounded percentages of 39.4% in 2005 and 47.9% in 2007, i.e. (47.9 - 39.4) ÷ 39.4 × 100% = 21%.

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

PM 5.4c **Percent of survey respondents who said: "Over the last two years, Caltrans' performance has improved, gotten worse, stayed about the same, or don't know."**



Notes: 1. No quantitative data was available for stakeholder responses in the 2005 External Customer Survey.
*2. Based on responses from the User Survey segment of the 2007 External Customer Survey.
**3. Based on responses from the Stakeholder Survey segment of the 2007 External Customer Survey.
4. The response rate for "improved" in the 2007 User Survey is an increase of 54% from the 2005 External Customer Survey (i.e. 25.0 is 154% of 16.2). This increase has already exceeded the stated target (in Objective 5.4) of 15% improvement from the baseline of 16.2 (i.e. 115% of 16.2 is only 18.6).

Objective 5.5 – By 2012, increase by 5% the percentage of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that the training they have received at Caltrans has adequately prepared them for the work they do.

PM 5.5 **Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that the training they have received at Caltrans has adequately prepared them for the work they do.**

Notes: 1. Based on the (2006) survey firm's internal data: U.S. Norm = 57%, P65 Norm = 66%. U.S. Norm represents the 50th percentile, whereas P65 Norm represents the 65th percentile of the general working population in the U.S.
*2. 2008 target represents 101% of 63; 2010 target represents 103% of 63; and 2012 target represents 105% of 63 (or 5% improvement from the 2006 baseline of 63).

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

Objective 5.6 – Increase the percentage of Caltrans employees who rate Caltrans management as good or very good at being open and honest in communications with employees, by (from baseline) 15% in 2008, 30% in 2010, and 50% in 2012.

PM 5.6 **Percent of Caltrans employees who rate Caltrans management as good or very good at being open and honest in communications with employees.**



Notes: 1. Favorable result from the 2006 Employee Survey was 37%, which established the baseline for improvements.
2. Based on the 2006 survey firm's internal data: U.S. Norm = 52%, P65 Norm = 57%. U.S. Norm represents the 50th percentile, whereas P65 Norm represents the 65th percentile of the general working population in the U.S.
*3. No comparable survey questions in the 1999 and the 2002 Employee Surveys.
**4. 2008 target represents 115% of 37; 2010 target represents 130% of 37; and 2012 target represents 150% of 37 (or 50% improvement from the baseline of 37).

Objective 5.7 – By 2012, increase by 15% the percentage of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the availability of the tools necessary to do their job.

PM 5.7 **Percent of Caltrans employees who agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the availability of the tools necessary to do their job.**

Notes: 1. Favorable result from the 2006 Employee Survey was 61%, which established the baseline for improvements.
2. Based on the 2006 survey firm's internal data: U.S. Norm = 67%, P65 Norm = 76%. U.S. Norm represents the 50th percentile, whereas P65 Norm represents the 65th percentile of the general working population in the U.S.
*3. No comparable survey questions in the 1999 and the 2002 Employee Surveys.
**4. 2008 target represents 105% of 61; 2010 target represents 110% of 61; and 2012 target represents 115% of 61 (or 15% improvement from the baseline of 61).

Service Goal – *Promote quality service through an excellent workforce.*

Objective 5.8 – By 2012, increase by 20% the percentage of first-choice candidates that accept the Department's entry-level job offers.

PM 5.8 **Percent of first-choice candidates that accept the Department's entry-level job offers.**



Notes:
1. The baseline of 81% was an average of February - March 2008 data.
2. The target is 120% of the baseline (or 20% improvement over the baseline of 81%).
3. Division of Human Resources sent the Hiring Quality Assessment Survey to hiring supervisors. Of the 41 responses received for the second quarter of FY 2008/09, 33 (or 80.5%) indicated that they were able to hire their first choice candidate.
4. Sufficient data for July 2008 does not exist due to issues concerning our surveymonkey.com subscription. Sufficient data for August 2008 does not exist due to the State's hiring freeze.

ACRONYMS

(ACS) American Community Survey

(A&I) Audits and Investigations Program

(BHI) Bridge Health Index

(CCA) Construction Contract Acceptance

(CEQA) California Environmental Quality Act

(CHP) California Highway Patrol

(CMIA) Corridor Mobility Improvement Account

(COS) Capital Outlay Support

(DEA) Division of Environmental Analysis

(DVHD) Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay

(EPMS) Encroachment Permit Management System

(FARS), Fatality Analysis Reporting System

(FY) Fiscal Year (July 1-June 30)

(FFY) Federal Fiscal Year (October 1 – September 30)

(FHWA) Federal Highway Administration

(HBP) Highway Bridge Program

(HICOMP) State Highway Congestion Monitoring Program Report

(IR) Incident Rate

(LOS) Level Of Service

(MVMT) Million Vehicle Miles Traveled

(NEPA) National Environmental Policy Act

(OA) Obligational Authority

(PEAR) Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report

(PeMS) Performance Monitoring System

(PFE) Proposed Final Estimate

(PS&E) Plans, Specifications, And Estimate

(PYs) Person Years

(RTL) Ready To List

(R/W) Right of Way

(SD/FO) structurally deficient or functionally obsolete

(SGP) Strategic Growth Plan

(SHOPP) State Highway Operation and Protection Program

(SHS) State Highway System

(SOV) Single Occupant Vehicle

(STEVE) Standard Tracking and Exchange Vehicle for Environmental System tool

(TEC) Travel Expense Claim