



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

605 Suwannee Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450
(850) 410-5800 • www.dot.state.fl.us/inspectorgeneral

Robert E. Clift
Inspector General

Performance Measure Assessment Advisory Report No. 12P-3001

February 19, 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of our annual audit plan, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted a Performance Measures Assessment pursuant to Section 20.055(2), Florida Statutes (F.S.). We assessed the validity and reliability of three performance measures reported in the 2012/2013 Department of Transportation's (department) Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the 2010/2011 Fiscal Year (FY). The three performance measures assessed were:

Responsible Office	Performance Measure Reviewed	Valid	Reliable
Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged	1. Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)	Yes	Yes
	2. Average cost per requested one-way trip for transportation disadvantaged	No	No
Office of Maintenance	3. Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings	Yes	Yes

We determined that of the two Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) performance measures, only the performance measure: Number of one-way trips provided, was valid and reliable. The CTD performance measure: Average cost per requested one-way trip for transportation disadvantaged, was not valid and not reliable. While the CTD currently has policies and procedures which provide a reasonable basis for the accurate and reliable collection of performance measure data, the lack of detailed performance measure procedures may have contributed to the lack of clarity for the 2010/2011 performance measures. In addition, the data used to calculate the average cost per requested one-way trip is actually based on the number of one-way trips "provided," not "requested."

We determined the Office of Maintenance's performance measure, which is reported by Motor Carrier Size and Weight (MCSAW), is both valid and reliable. With this determination, we found that detailed performance measure procedures are needed to ensure consistency in future reporting years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION</u>	3
<u>PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY</u>	4
<u>RESULTS OF REVIEW</u>	
Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged	5
Office of Maintenance - Motor Carrier Size and Weight	8
<u>APPENDIX</u>	
A. Management Response	11
<u>DISTRIBUTION, PROJECT TEAM AND STATEMENT OF ACCORDANCE</u>	16

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Government Accountability and Performance Act of 1994 requires state agencies to implement performance-based program budgeting, which includes establishing legislatively approved performance measures and standards. Additionally, Section 216.013, F. S., requires state agencies to develop a Long Range Program Plan that is policy based, priority driven, accountable and developed through careful examination and justification of all agency programs. The statute requires the submission of the LRPP, including prior year performance data, no later than September 30 of each year.

Section 20.055(2)(b), F. S., requires the Office of Inspector General (OIG) to assess the validity and reliability of the performance measure information reported by the department and make recommendations for improvement. To comply with these requirements, we reviewed three legislatively approved 2010/2011 FY performance measures included in the department's 2012/2013 LRPP. The three measures were selected judgmentally based on the last review date.

For this assessment, we used the following definitions from the 2012/2013 LRPP:

Validity - The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

Reliability - The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

As part of our assessment, we reviewed each responsible office's performance measure procedures and the department's LRPP and identified the intended purpose for each measure under review. We also reviewed prior reports to determine when each measure was last assessed and the results of that assessment.

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The **purpose** of this engagement was to meet the statutory requirement to assess the validity and reliability of legislatively approved performance measures.

The **scope** of the advisory assessed the validity and reliability of three performance measures reported in the department's 2012/2013 LRPP for the 2010/2011 FY.

The LRPP submitted by the department included 34 performance measures, most of which have not changed in several years. Since the performance measures have remained relatively unchanged, our reviews in recent years have focused on an assessment of selected measures.

We assessed the following performance measures:

1. Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged);
2. Average cost per requested one-way trip for transportation disadvantaged; and
3. Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings.

The **methodology** included:

- reviewing prior years working papers and reports;
- reviewing applicable statutes, rules and procedures;
- interviewing appropriate department staff regarding processes; and
- reviewing data sources, data collection and reporting processes, measure definitions and methodologies.

RESULTS OF REVIEW

As shown in the table below and detailed on the following pages, we determined:

- two of the three performance measures provide a valid measure of department performance; and
- two of the three performance measures provides reliable data that supports what is being measured.

Responsible Office	Performance Measure Reviewed	Valid	Reliable
Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged	1. Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)	Yes	Yes
	2. Average cost per requested one-way trip for transportation disadvantaged	No	No
Office of Maintenance	3. Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings	Yes	Yes

Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged

1. Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)

According to the LRPP, each Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) logs the number of trips provided according to five categories: fixed route, ambulatory, non-ambulatory, stretcher and school bus. This measure includes only those trips provided with funds from the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund (TDTF). However, it is important to note that the department is only one of a variety of entities which provide funding to the CTCs who provide transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged in their service area.

Prior Assessment:

In 2008 OIG advisory memorandum No. 08P-0001, this measure was determined to be a valid indicator of the number of one-way trips provided to the transportation disadvantaged using funds from the TDTF. The data collection methodology for this measure was determined to be consistent and the measure reported what it claimed to measure. In addition, there was reasonable assurance that the data was reliable.

Current Assessment:

We determined this measure is a valid indicator of the number of one-way trips provided. We also determined the performance measure process has the necessary controls to provide reliable data. However, the 2010/2011 FY data reported in Exhibit II of the department's 2012/2013 LRPP is actually 2009/2010 FY data. Additionally, we identified opportunities for improvement in the areas of CTD performance measure procedures and LRPP clarification.

Recommendation:

We recommend the Executive Director for the CTD update the performance measure procedures to include, at a minimum; what the measure is intended to show and why it is important, specific sources of information and how data are collected, how the measure is calculated and identification of any data limitations. Additionally, we recommend the Office of Policy Planning Director work with the Executive Director of the CTD to request changes to the LRPP, to provide that accurate data descriptions are included going forward.

2. Average cost per requested one-way trip

Each CTC logs the number of trips provided according to five categories: fixed route, ambulatory, non-ambulatory, stretcher and school bus. Requested trips include all categories mentioned above except for fixed route, per LRPP instructions. This measure is the total costs incurred by CTCs and contractors in providing requested trips for the transportation disadvantaged in their area, divided by the number of requested trips provided.

Prior Assessment:

In 2008 OIG advisory memorandum No. 08P-0001, this measure was determined not to be a valid indicator of the average cost per requested one-way trip. The average cost was based on the number of one-way trips "**provided**," not "**requested**". However, the data collection methodology was consistent and there was reasonable assurance the data was reliable.

Current Assessment:

For the same reason stated in the 2008 OIG advisory memorandum, we determined this performance measure is not a valid indicator of the average cost per **requested** one-way trip. Additionally, we found that based on what is stated in the LRPP this performance measure was not correctly calculated due to fixed trips and trips funded by non-CTD trust fund sources being included in the calculation. For these combined reasons, we determined this performance measure process does not have the necessary controls to provide reliable data.

Similar to our assessment of the performance measure: Number of one-way trip provided (transportation disadvantaged), the 2010/2011 FY data reported in Exhibit II of the department's 2012/2013 LRPP is actually 2009/2010 FY data.

Recommendation:

We recommend the Office of Policy Planning Director work with the Executive Director of the CTD to continue to request the wording of this performance measure be changed from “requested” to “provided” one-way trips. Additionally, we recommend the Executive Director for the CTD update the performance measure procedures to the same level of detail as recommended for the performance measure: Number of one-way trips provided. Furthermore, we recommend the Office of Policy Planning Director work with the Executive Director of the CTD to request changes to the LRPP, to provide that accurate data descriptions are included going forward.

Office of Maintenance - Motor Carrier Size and Weight

3. Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings

According to the LRPP, this measure is derived by dividing the number of trucks cited for weight violations by the total number of vehicles weighed at fixed enforcement sites. The source of the commercial vehicle weight law enforcement data is the agency's MCSAW¹, which operates fixed weigh stations on major highways. Truck weight laws apply to all vehicles, commercial or otherwise; however, the term "commercial vehicle" is used to indicate that the area of emphasis is the large trucks used by businesses.

Prior Assessment:

In 2006 OIG advisory memorandum No. 06P-0009, this measure was determined to be a valid indicator of the percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings. However, inconsistencies were evidenced between the Weigh-In-Motion (WIM) counts and the data manually reported by the weigh stations. The reporting process, although consistently used, lacked adequate flow charts, process narratives and automation. Additionally, the formula used in calculating this measure appeared to be inconsistent with the intent of the measure because of the lack of clear distinction between weighed and weighings. Even though the title states "commercial vehicles weighed" the calculation used the formula for commercial vehicles weighings.

Current Assessment:

We determined this performance measure is a valid indicator of the percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings. We also determined the performance measure process has the necessary controls to provide reliable data. However, we identified three opportunities for improvement in the area of measure formula and title, procedures and data reporting.

MCSAW Opportunities for Improvement

A. Measure Formula and Title

For the performance measure: Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings, there is not a clear distinction between Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV) weighed and CMV weighings.

- CMV weighed is the number of CMVs that are weighed on all scales.
- CMV weighings is the number of times a CMV is weighed. This is because some CMVs are weighed more than once.

¹ Motor Carrier Size and Weight (MCSAW) is new to the Office of Maintenance. Senate Bill 2000 appropriated the move of Motor Carrier Compliance July 1, 2011, from the Department of Transportation (department) to the Department of Highway Safety and the Florida Highway Patrol. The weigh stations and their operations remain under department control.

The formula used in calculating the measure appears to be inconsistent with the intent of the measure title because of the lack of a clear distinction between weighed and weighings. Even though the title states “commercial vehicles weighed” the calculation uses the formula for CMV weighings.

In response to our inquiry, department management indicated for the period in review, the 2010-2011 FY, this issue was not addressed. The Statewide Scale Operations Manager stated this issue was corrected for the 2011-2012 FY performance measure calculations, by using only the WIM vehicle count for weigh stations with a WIM scale, and using the static scale count at the seven weigh stations which do not have a WIM scale. This will give an accurate measure of the percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight.

Recommendation

We recommend the Statewide Scale Operations Manager amend the performance measure procedures to include a clear distinction between the formula for the number of commercial vehicles weighed and the number of commercial vehicles weighings.

B. Measure Procedures

MCSAW does not have written procedures in place which provide specific instruction for the calculation and reporting of the performance measure: Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings. Additionally, the procedures for supervisor reconciliations of the weigh station vehicle counts are not documented.

Recommendation

We recommend the Statewide Scale Operations Manager implement procedures which provide specific instruction for the calculation of the performance measure: Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings. These procedures should include, at a minimum; what the measure is intended to show and why it is important, specific sources of information and how data are collected and reported, how the measure is calculated and identification of any data limitations.

In addition, we recommend the Statewide Scale Operations Manager create specific instructions and details of the vehicle count data reconciliation process to be included in a set of performance measure procedures and implement these procedures statewide.

C. Data Reporting Process

The performance measure reporting process lacked automation and/or data accuracy controls. The reporting process is an elaborate system of Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. The reporting process starts with the weight inspectors manually collecting and inputting their shift data into a spreadsheet. To perform the performance

measure data reporting process, individual weigh station data is combined on a monthly basis and sent to either the Lake City Office or the South Florida Office. Once the data is obtained at the Lake City Office (or South Florida Office), the data is cut and pasted from multiple spreadsheets into one master file containing all the data. This is a manual process and there are no additional accuracy checks. The manual entry and multiple copying and pasting and lack of documentation can lead to errors in the data and/or performance measure calculations.

Recommendation

We recommend the Statewide Scale Operations Manager improve data collection by continuing their efforts to develop additional quality assurance reviews (QAR) to the data collection process. These QAR functions could include assigning a second person to review the weigh station reports and re-perform the performance measure calculations.

We recommend the Statewide Scale Operations Manager take advantage of any future opportunities to gain efficiency and accuracy through automation of the data reporting process.

APPENDIX A – MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

The following response was received from Bob Romig, State Transportation Development Administrator on February 10, 2013.

I have reviewed the draft report and concur with the recommendation for the Office of Policy Planning to work with the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged regarding a wording change to a performance measure related to the cost per one-way trip. It is my understanding that the Executive Director of the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged has agreed that the measure should be changed to read “Average cost per one-way trip provided for transportation disadvantaged”. Accordingly, the Office of Policy Planning will make appropriate changes to the Long Range Program Plan to provide that accurate data descriptions are included.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Bob

Bob Romig
State Transportation Development Administrator
605 Suwannee Street, MS 57
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0450
Phone: (850) 414-5251 Cell: (850) 545-5240
E-mail: bob.romig@dot.state.fl.us



MEMORANDUM

FDOT – MOTOR CARRIER SIZE AND WEIGHT
Keith Westphal, Statewide Scale Operations Manager

DATE: February 15, 2013
TO: Sarah Hall, Deputy Director of Audits
FROM: Keith Westphal, Statewide Scale Operations Manager *K.A. ✓*
COPIES: Tim Lattner, Patrick Craig
SUBJECT: OIG # 12P-3001

I'm in receipt of and have reviewed your Performance Measure Assessment Advisory Report (OIG # 12P-3001). I was pleased with your finding that the Motor Carrier Size and Weight (MCSAW) performance measure was **VALID** and **RELIABLE**.

The report noted three recommendations or opportunities for improvement to ensure consistency in future reporting years. I have reviewed your recommendations with selected supervisory personnel on my staff and my immediate supervisor. Our response to each recommendation is listed below.

Performance Measure: *Percent of Commercial Vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scales weighings*

OIG Recommendation #1: OIG recommends the Statewide Scale Operations Manager amend the performance measure procedures to include a clear distinction between the formula for the number of commercial vehicles **weighed** and the number of commercial vehicles **weighings**.

MCSAW Response: We concur with the recommendation.

MCSAW will recommend a wording change to the performance measure to eliminate confusion or we will clearly define, by procedure, the subtle difference between weighed and weighings.

Implementation Timeline: 30 – 90 days

OIG Recommendation #2: OIG recommends the Statewide Scale Operations Manager implement procedures which provide specific instruction for the calculation of the performance measure. These procedures should include, at a minimum; what the measure is intended to show and why it is important, specific sources of information and how the data are collected and reported, how the measure is calculated and identification of any data limitations. In addition, we recommend the creation of specific

MCSAW FORM 775-A10-07
REV. 10/2011
PAGE 1 OF 2

instructions and details of the vehicle count data reconciliation process to be included in a set of performance procedures and implement these procedures statewide.

MCSAW Response: We concur with the recommendation.

MCSAW will develop a comprehensive procedure that encompasses factors listed in the report. The procedure will be drafted and tested before being implemented statewide.

Implementation Timeline: 120 – 190 days

OIG Recommendation #3: OIG recommends the Statewide Scale Operations Manager improve data collection by continuing to develop additional quality assurance reviews (QAR) to the data collections process. These QAR functions could include assigning a second person to review the weigh stations reports and re-perform the performance measure calculations.

MCSAW Response: We concur with the recommendation.

MCSAW will develop a quality assurance review process that utilizes a second person to review weigh station reports and re-perform the performance measure calculation. This process will be codified in the new procedure.

Implementation Timeline: 120 – 190 days

In closing, we look forward to working with you as we implement the recommended changes.



Florida Commission for the
**Transportation
Disadvantaged**

Rick Scott
Governor

David Darm
Chairman

Mike Willingham
Vice Chairman

Steve Holmes
Executive Director

February 14, 2013

Mr. Kristofer B. Sullivan, CIA, CISA
Director of Audit
Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street, MS-44
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Mr. Sullivan,

We appreciate the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) review of the validity and reliability for two of the Commission's performance measures reported in the Department of Transportation's 2012/2013 Long Range Program Plan. We especially want to thank Patrick Craig and Sarah Hall for their professionalism in conducting the audit.

We concur with the findings and recommendations for the performance measure "number of one-way trips provided."

- On February 14, while working in collaboration with the Office of Policy Planning, we recommended a change to the Data Sources and Methodology for the "number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)" performance measure. This change will provide the reader a better understanding of the measure.
- We are developing a performance measure procedures guide which will include, at a minimum; what each measure is intended to show, why the measure is important, sources of information, how data are collected, how measures are calculated, and identification of any data limitations. We estimate to have this measure included in the guide by June 1, 2013.

We concur with the findings and recommendations for the performance measure "average cost per requested one-way trip."

- On February 8, we approved the Office of Policy Planning language changing the performance measure to "average cost per-one way trip provided for transportation disadvantaged" and updating the Data Sources and Methodology section to more accurately describe the data.

Mr. Kristofer B. Sullivan, CIA, CISA
February 14, 2013
Page 2

- We are developing a performance measure procedures guide which will include, at a minimum; what each measure is intended to show, why the measure is important, sources of information, how data are collected, how measures are calculated, and identification of any data limitations. We estimate to have this measure included in the guide by June 1, 2013.

We look forward to continuing to work with the OIG to improve programs and services.

Sincerely,



Steven E. Holmes
Executive Director

DISTRIBUTION, PROJECT TEAM AND STATEMENT OF ACCORDANCE

Action Official Distribution:

Steve Holmes, Executive Director, Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged
Keith Westphal, Statewide Scale Operations Manager, Motor Carrier Size & Weight
Robert Romig, State Transportation Development Administrator

Information Distribution:

Ananth Prasad, P.E., Secretary of Transportation
Brian Blanchard, P.E., Assistant Secretary for Engineering and Operations
Tom Byron, P.E. Chief Engineer
Tim Lattner, P.E., Director, Office of Maintenance
Brian Watts, Performance Monitoring Coordinator, Office of Policy Planning
David Darm, Chairman of Florida CTD
Karen Somerset, Assistant Executive Director, CTD

Project Team:

Engagement was conducted by Patrick Craig, Audit Team Leader
Connie Davis, Auditor
Under the supervision of:
Sarah Beth Hall, Audit Manager; and
Kris Sullivan, Director of Audit
Approved by: Robert E. Cliff, Inspector General

Statement of Accordance

The mission of the department is to provide a safe transportation system that ensures the mobility of people and goods, enhances economic prosperity, and preserves the quality of our environment and communities.

The mission of the Office of Inspector General is to promote integrity, accountability and process improvement in the Department of Transportation by providing objective fact-based assessments to the DOT team.

This work product was prepared pursuant to Section 20.055, Florida Statutes, in accordance with the applicable Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspectors General as published by the Association of Inspectors General and the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing as published by the Institute of Internal Auditors, Inc.

This report is intended for the use of the agency to which it was disseminated and may contain information that is exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Do not release without prior coordination with the Office of Inspector General.

Please address inquiries regarding this report to the department's Office of Inspector General at (850) 410-5800.