

**Federal Lands Transportation Program
Guidelines for FY 2016 - 2020 Investment Strategy
(Non-competing)**

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide the eligible Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs), who are authorized set funding amounts in Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, with guidance for developing their multi-year Federal Lands Transportation Program (FLTP) investment strategy(ies). As recipients of your strategies, one of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) stewardship roles is to ensure the use of FLTP funds are supporting the intent of USC 23 Section 203 as amended by the new FAST Act. Under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and now strengthened in FAST, the law cites performance management and the Department of Transportation's (DOT's) and FLMAs Secretaries' performance goals as criteria on the uses of program funds. The Headquarters Office of Federal Lands Highway's (HFL) review of your investment strategies will be viewed through this lens and will help facilitate future conversations with individual partners. In addition, the new FAST Act provides an opportunity for FHWA and applicable partners to apply lessons learned from MAP-21. In that spirit, we have elected to create two, aligned guideline documents for partners with authorized funding in FAST and partners whose allocations are decided by the Secretary. Although the *transportation* performance goal areas will be the same in both documents for both sets of partners, the intent and subsequent methodologies for telling one's performance story do differ. For partners who receive a set sum annually, it is FHWA's intent to simplify the process by requesting a multi-year strategy for FYs 2016-2020, i.e., the authorization period of FAST. To complement the investment strategies, annual accomplishment reports will be requested from each partner.

Investment Strategies

Per 23 U.S.C. § 203 and amended by the FAST Act, coupled with FHWA's interpretation, all eligible recipients under the FLTP submit an application describing how the use of FLTP funds will advance "performance management" including the goals of the Secretary of Transportation and Secretary of the respective FLMA. Applications will be referred to as "investment strategies" to more accurately describe their contents. A specific investment strategy format or structure is not provided in legislation therefore this guidance identifies the content and framework for the National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). The multi-year investment strategies are forward-looking and are complemented by partners' annual accomplishment reports. The framework described herein required both consistency and flexibility as we consider partners funded at drastically different levels while also considering the past experience of each partner. Partners' performance progress and strategies will be scalable based on these key factors.

Elements

Partners are asked to develop their investment strategies using the "Elements" listed below. The use of the elements will promote a consistent framework for each partner to describe their inventory and performance goals, measures, targets and/or strategies.

ELEMENT 1 – FLTP System Definition

Performance-based planning is essential to the success of the FLTP. The planning process examines short and long term investment goals and strategies while setting performance management expectations. Data collection, analysis, and reporting aid in the effort to make informed decisions in situations where competing priorities are a reality.

System Definition

Under this section, please define the part of your transportation system to be included in your National Federal Lands Transportation Facility Inventory as defined in 23 U.S.C. Section 203(c). This includes public highways, roads, bridges, trails, or transit systems. *(Note: By separate correspondence, FLH requests your detailed inventory data for roads, trails and transit systems. For bridges, partners use the NBIS as the official repository. For public highways and roads, minimum route identification data attributes were identified in a FLH memorandum dated September 30, 2014. Partners are at liberty to use additional route ID attributes than those reflected in the memorandum for their own purposes.)* For this investment strategy, please describe your current status and planned efforts related to identifying your paved, native and/or gravel roads using the minimum route ID standards for your FLTP system only, i.e., not all FLMA-owned public roads. Address how your system definition strategies will support FHWA's minimum data standards and milestones.

All partners currently possess historic data that defines the location of your road network. If you plan to significantly change your approach over the next 3 years, please describe your efforts and the benefits you anticipate.

ELEMENT 2 – Secretary of Transportation's Performance Goal Areas

1. State of Good Repair

Paved, Native, and/or Gravel Roads – Based on the collaborative effort with partners over the past 18 months on examining road condition collection methodologies, the FHWA/FLH strongly encourages partners to use one of the collection methodologies listed below for the long-term. In doing so, all partners will be moving toward a more consistent approach. Consequently, we are better positioned to administer the program together, leverage and pool resources, and/or articulate a consistent performance story to one another and external parties. If your desired approach over the life of FAST deviates from the list below, please describe its benefits. We recognize some partners may be using these methods now while others may not. And, FHWA is very cognizant of the inter-relationships of road asset data to other asset management and maintenance systems employed by FLMAs, i.e., evolving to a new standard has larger internal budgeting implications. We are fully prepared to work with each partner individually to tailor a plan that is realistic, scalable and acceptable to all parties using the methodologies below. (Note: The technical details and questions associated with the road condition standards will be addressed separately.)

Collection Methodology for Paved Roads

- a. University of Wisconsin’s Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) tool for Asphalt Roads - <http://www.apa-mi.org/docs/Asphalt-PASERManual.pdf>, 0-10 rating schema
- b. Pavement Condition Rating (PCR)
 - i. Detailed Manual
 - ii. Simplified Manual and/or
 - iii. Automated Data Collection Vehicle
 - iv. Note: Detailed information on PCR will be provided separately. If partners elect to use an automated data collection vehicle, they are requested to coordinate the effort from inception with FLH since there is no industry standard.

The above proven methods allow for flexibility using sophisticated/expensive options where warranted and less expensive dashboard procedures.

Collection Methodology for Native and Gravel Roads

- a. University of WI’s PASER tool for native/gravel roads – 1 to 4; http://epdfiles.engr.wisc.edu/pdf_web_files/tic/manuals/Unimproved-PASER_01.pdf/.
- b. The use of the PASER-like model that leverages Pavement Condition Rating manual simplified/detailed methodologies (0-10) being employed by the FWS and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

In your strategy, please describe the steps you will employ to collect all or partial segments of your FLTP using the road standards above. If a transition strategy is anticipated, please describe your approach including timeframes.

If applicable and available, please include your *baseline* FLTP paved, native and/or gravel road condition(s) information using Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor or other rating approach now employed. Using the FAST authorization sums as an indicator, please include your *target* condition(s) of the entire FLTP road inventory at the close of FY2020. Please differentiate between paved and unpaved roads. For the USFS, if this data is unavailable, please describe the steps you will be taking over the course of the next two FYs to fulfill this reporting requirement. Note: We encourage all partners to use the rating descriptions of Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor for long-term system reporting. The “roll-up” values and descriptions of what may constitute an Excellent vs Good, as an example, is a conversation and collaborative action that we intend to have with all FLTP partners over the next year. For the purposes of this effort, please use your own agency’s rating standards of what constitutes Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor (or closest equivalent method).

2. Safety

Please describe your plans to collect and report safety crash data (fatalities and serious injuries) data to influence FLTP programming decisions. The extent and type of safety crash data partners collect vary and may include information on: number of fatalities and/or serious injuries, location of crashes, nature of crash (run-off-the-road, intersection, wildlife collision), causal factors (infrastructure-related and/or behavioral (alcohol related, visual impairment). For partners who may have very few crashes and contend transportation safety is not a high risk area on their lands, please include evidence-based processes, e.g., safety data, incident management procedures, local law enforcement reports, you employ to support this conclusion. Put plainly, how do you know if you do/do not have a safety problem on your FLTP inventory?

If partners possess baseline safety data, please include the information in your strategy along with your FY2020 target for improving safety.

3. Bridge Condition

FAST officially allows the continued use of FLTP funds to be used on public bridges outside your FLTP inventory. Please provide the baseline number of public bridges owned and operated by your agency including public bridges outside your FLTP inventory. This number should mirror the number in the National Bridge Inventory System. Within the FY2016 baseline data, please include the number or percent of bridges that are *structurally deficient*. Please include the target number and percentage of structurally deficient bridges at the conclusion of FY2020.

ELEMENT 3 - Secretary of Interior's or Agriculture's Performance Goals

1. Please identify your Department's and/or agency's related performance goals. Within the description and if available, please include baseline data as of October 1, 2015 and your targets at the end of FY2018.
2. Describe how you incorporate, or will incorporate, DOT, DOI and/or DOA performance goal information into your performance-based planning and programming processes.

ELEMENT 4 – Additional FLTP Criteria

Please provide information (list and/or maps) that demonstrates the linkages between your high use federal recreation areas and/or federal economic generators and your FLTP facilities that provide access to them.

ELEMENT 5 – Annual Accomplishments Report

To successfully administer a performance based program, metric data is needed to gauge progress and/or shortcomings. FLMAs are asked to provide an annual accomplishment report that identifies the outputs and/or outcomes associated with Title 23 funds. In the report, partners are asked to share specifically the annual progress they are making in achieving their 5 year, FY2020 targets, i.e., is your annualized target data trending in the right direction to preclude any surprises at the conclusion of FY 2020. FLH understands certain performance data may not be fully available on an annual basis. At the conclusion of FY18, we highly encourage all partners to possess and report high quality, complete performance data since this data will be used to inform Congress, OMB and other stakeholders in preparation of the next Act. Guidelines on the format of the report are included here. Revisions were made to simplify the process and collect data once for multiple purposes.

Federal Lands Transportation Program Timeline

Timeframe	Deliverable/Action
December 4, 2015	President signs FAST – a 5 year authorization Act
December 2015	FLH provides multi-year investment strategy guidance to partners and requests partners’ multi-year strategy <u>by March 7, 2016</u> . FLH works with FHWA’s budget office to compute the FY2016 allocation sums considering the requirements in FAST and USC 23. Regular discussions between FLH HQS programming staff and partners occur. Funding will be made available based on current processes and S&O instructions. Funding allocations will not be impacted based on the timing of receipt of the Investment Strategies from partners.
March - Apr 2016	FLH-FLMA will hold a face to face meeting at the senior executive level to discuss partner’s multi-year investment strategy.
August 2016 - 2020	Partner provides FLH with FY Annual Accomplishment Report

Annual FLTP Accomplishment Report Template

Partners are encouraged to describe their accomplishments in alignment with Sections 1 through 4 above within the body of the guidance document. In our collective efforts to streamline reporting between our offices for multiple efforts, e.g., FLTP accomplishment reports, annual President's budget, FHWA's Condition and Performance Report to Congress, we identified additional information below that is typically used by FLH to respond to a multitude of requests. We encourage partners to augment their accomplishment stories with the data cited below as well.

1. System Definition: No additional information needed above and beyond what was described under Section 1.
2. Secretary of Transportation's Performance Goal Areas
 - a. State of Good Repair: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - i. Paved roads, in terms of:
 1. Funds obligated; and
 2. Outputs – What was the number of projects, number of miles, and types of work;
 - ii. Unpaved, native and gravel roads, in terms of:
 1. Funds obligated; and
 2. Outputs – What was the number of projects, number of miles, type of work; or
 - b. Safety: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - i. Funds obligated on safety specific projects; and
 - ii. Outputs – e.g., How many safety-specific projects were completed and/or new processes or agreements employed; new relationships developed with other key stakeholder groups such as law enforcement, first responders; number of roadside safety audits; safety meetings/summits held to educate and share best practices among practitioners.
 - c. Bridges: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - i. Funds obligated on bridge only projects
3. Secretary of Interior's or Agriculture's Performance Goal Areas by Agency
 - a. Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 3 include:
 - i. Funds obligated; and
 - ii. Outputs – What was the number of projects funded, type of work
4. Additional FLTP Criteria
 - a. Additional data for internal stewardship and oversight purposes by FLH, beyond what was described in Section 4, include:
 - i. Any lists and/or maps of high use recreation destination areas or federal economic generators within your federal estates and corresponding FLTP routes.

5. Program Administration (*Note: In an effort to consolidate multiple calls for data and information from partners throughout the year, this request is being added to the Accomplishment Report.*)

Under this section, all partners are asked to estimate the overall costs associated with managing the FLTP in the current FY, including:

- The number of full time employees (Headquarters and Field) needed for program management and their cumulative salaries including leave reserve and benefits;
- Support (e.g., training, outreach); and
- Travel

The allocation of FLTP funds to be used for program administration will be prioritized to ensure salaries are covered and the program can continue uninterrupted.

If notable unobligated balances were realized in a particular FY, please describe the strategies you intend to employ to address them.