

Federal Lands Transportation Program Instructions for FY 2019-2020 Investment Strategy (Competition)

Updated Version: May 8, 2018

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide the eligible Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs), who are not authorized set funding amounts in Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, with instructions for developing their FY 2019-2020 Federal Lands Transportation Program (FLTP) investment strategies.

Scope

This document applies to the:

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM),
- Bureau of Reclamation (BOR),
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE),
- Presidio Trust Corporation (Presidio) and
- Other independent federal agencies (IFAs).

It is FHWA's intent, barring any extenuating circumstances, to continue the strategy proposed in the previous guidance document of requesting a three-year strategy that will extend through the rest of the FAST Act and cover a one year potential extension. If the FAST Act extends beyond a year, a meeting will be convened to discuss options.

Investment Strategies

Per 23 U.S.C. § 203 and FHWA's interpretation, all eligible recipients under the FLTP submit an application describing how FLTP funds will advance "performance management" and 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 document identifies the content and framework for the BLM, BOR, COE, and Presidio Trust to apply for FLTP funding. The investment strategies are forward-looking and are complemented by partners' annual accomplishment reports.

The framework described herein require consistency and flexibility. Partners' performance progress and strategies will be scalable per the partner's funding levels and program performance.

Partners are asked to develop their investment strategies using the elements and/or sub-elements listed below. These elements are consistent with 23 U.S.C. § 203. They should tailor their proposals using one or more funding scenarios within the combined \$47M authorized amount for FY 2019 and FY 2020. The use of the elements will promote a consistent framework for each partner to describe their inventory, performance goals, measures, targets and/or strategies. (Note: The scores for elements 1 will be weighted equally to elements 2-4, i.e., even though element 1 has three sub-elements.)

Evaluation of Partners’ Investment Strategies

The strength of partners’ investment strategies will be assessed using the evaluation criteria and point system in the right-hand columns below. FHWA will review responses and apply scores equally per the criteria. The available funding will be awarded in the ratio that each partner point total bears to all the points scored by the competing organizations.

FHWA considers the partner’s needs and requirements holistically across all competing partners. The addition of Presidio introduced new considerations that compelled us to rethink our funds distribution methodology. The Presidio consists of one campus of approximately 1700 acres with a small transportation network. Its deferred maintenance backlog is significantly smaller than the backlogs of the other FLMA’s located in multiple states with hundreds of units. Also, there may still be eligible IFAs that could be included in this competition. Including them mid-term would require a new competition that would be disruptive to the stability we’re trying to achieve with a multi-year competition.

Consequently, to promote consistency across all units on the requirements of the program cited in law, the Presidio Trust will continue to provide a multi-year Investment Strategy that communicates how they intend to address the rating criteria that supports a performance-based program. Unlike the other competing partners and in consideration of lessons learned and new analysis, the Presidio Trusts’ allocation will be capped at 8% annually (approximately \$2M) and subject to lop-off similar to other FLTP partners.

If additional IFAs request participation in the program – and are approved –they will participate in the program as indicated in the table below:

IFA description	FY approved into FLTP	Competition Pool	FY it can compete
Small IFA located in 2 states and a limited number of units	2019, after competition	8%	2020
Small IFA located in 2 states and a limited number of units	2020	8%	2021*
Large IFA located in more than 2 states and many units	2019	92%	2020
Large IFA located in more than 2 states and many units	2020	92%	2021*

*New FLMA’s can participate if a long-term extension of FAST Act is enacted

Please note FHWA does not anticipate any new IFAs will be added to the program; there has not been any outreach by independent agencies to FHWA inquiring about their possible

inclusion in the program. The changes above are forward leaning to allow for possible scenarios during the remaining years of the FAST Act.

In the absence of any new IFAs added to the program, the approved allocation percentages for competing partners and 8% allocation to the Presidio will apply to the balance of the FAST Act and any extensions of the Act.

ELEMENT 1 – FLTP System Definition¹

Under this section, please describe the part of your public transportation system to be included in your National Federal Lands Transportation Facility Inventory as defined in 23 U.S.C. §203(c). This includes public highways, roads, bridges, trails, or transit systems.

Concisely describe the success you have made to date and/or planned efforts related to identifying your paved, native and/or gravel roads using the minimum route ID standards for your FLTP system only. Address how your system definition strategies will support FHWA’s minimum data standards and milestones.

Evaluation:

Element 1	How this will be evaluated for FYs 2019-2020
<p>1. System Definition:</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which the FLTP road system has been and/or will be defined by the end of FY 2020, per the latest FHWA guidance, including FHWA’s updated minimum route ID standards.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if progress made to date has resulted in less than 25% of your FLTP road inventory identified using FHWA’s minimum attributes; • 1 if over 25% of your FLTP has been identified and up to 75% of the estimated FLTP inventory will be defined by the end of FY 2020, using FHWA’s minimum route ID standards; • 2 if over 50% of your FLTP has been identified and up to 100% of the estimated FLTP inventory will be defined by the end of FY 2020, using FHWA’s minimum route ID standards; and • 3 if 100% of your FLTP has been identified to date using FHWA’s minimum route ID standards. <p>Note: To support your response, please include documentation that demonstrates progress made to date and projected to accomplish, e.g., FLTP inventory, Project Agreement/Project Management Plan, Statement of Work (SOW).</p>

¹ USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (c)

ELEMENT 2 - Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency²

Identify your organization’s related performance goals. Describe the laws, regulations, policies, or other documents where these goals are established and how these goals work their way into your long range, performance-based planning and programming processes.

Evaluation

Element 2	How this will be evaluated for FYs 2019-2020
<p>Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which each respective partner has identified its own resource and asset management goals and will pursue them in FY 2019 and 2020.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if agency specific goals are not addressed; • 1 if the partner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifies its own resource and asset management goals including collection, reporting and target setting procedures. • 2 if the partner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifies its own resource and asset management goals including collection, reporting and target setting procedures; and ○ Describes the laws, regulations, policies, or other documents where these goals are established. • 3 if the partner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Satisfies requirements in “2” above and describes how these goals have been integrated into its long range, performance-based transportation planning and programming processes.

² USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (B) (iii)

ELEMENT 3 – Transportation Planning

Under this element, please discuss how transportation planning will guide programming decisions and project selection through FY 2020.

Element 3	How this will be evaluated for FYs 2019-2020
<p>Transportation planning</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which transportation planning will guide performance-based programming decisions and project selection through FY 2020.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if the partner has not begun development of a National and/or regional long range transportation plan (LRTP); • 1 if the partner has identified and communicated to FHWA how they intend to satisfy long range transportation planning requirements, begun development of a National and/or regional LRTP; and anticipate completing up to 75% of the plan(s) by the end of FY 2020; • 2 if the partner has identified and communicated to FHWA how they intend to satisfy long range transportation planning requirements, begun development of a National and/or regional LRTP; and projects completion and distribution of the plan(s) by the end of FY 2020. • 3 if the partner currently uses unit, regional or national LRTP(s) that inform performance-based programming decisions at their unit and/or regional levels. <p>Note: To support your response, please include documentation that demonstrates progress made to date or projected to accomplish, e.g., LRTP, LRTP drafts, Project Agreement/Project Management Plan, SOW.</p>

ELEMENT 4 – Transportation Goals³

SUB-ELEMENT 4.1 – State of Good Repair of Transportation Facilities⁴

Paved, Native, and/or Gravel Road Condition – The FHWA/FLH strongly encourages partners to use one of the collection methodologies listed below. In doing so, all partners will be moving toward a more consistent approach, we will be better positioned to administer the program together, leverage and pool resources, and/or articulate a consistent performance story to one another and external parties.

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 Wisconsin’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. University of Wisconsin’s PASER tool for gravel roads – <https://www.ctt.mtu.edu/sites/default/files/resources/paser/gravelpaser.pdf>, 1-5 rating schema.
- c. The use of the PASER-like model that leverages Pavement Condition Rating manual simplified/detailed methodologies (0-10).

Note: We encourage all partners to use the rating descriptions of Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor for long-term system reporting.

Using the methods above, provide a baseline of FLTP paved, native and/or gravel road condition information, and the percentage it represents against your FLTP road inventory. Please differentiate between paved and unpaved roads. Indicate how FLTP investments will impact your baseline road condition data per your proposed different funding scenarios.

(Note: We recognize a more comprehensive, multi-year road condition collection effort is needed to accurately describe changes in overall network condition. For the purposes of this effort, please describe the impacts on road condition as best you can, e.g., output-based results/projected miles of improved roads using FY 2019- 2020 fund levels.)

³ USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (B) (i)

⁴ USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (B) (i) (I)

Evaluation:

Sub-Element 4.1	How this will be evaluated for FYs 2019-2020
<p>State of Good Repair of Transportation Facilities</p> <p>This element gauges how much of the FLTP road inventory will have data collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH in FY 2019- 2020 using methodologies above.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0 if no road condition data was collected and reported to FHWA using the methodologies above by the end of FY 2018;• 1 if up to 10% of road condition data has been collected and reported to FHWA by June 15, 2018 and/or an agreement can be produced that includes the SOW requirement to collect up to 40% of FLTP road condition data by the end of FY 2020;• 2 if 11-20% of road condition data has been collected and reported to FHWA by June 15, 2018 and/or an agreement can be produced that includes the SOW requirement to collect up to 75% of FLTP road condition data by the end of FY 2020; or• 3 if over 20% of road condition data has been collected and reported to FHWA by June 15, 2018 and/or an agreement can be produced that includes the SOW requirement to collect, analyze, and make publicly available up to 100% of FLTP road condition data by the end of FY 2020, if applicable.

SUB-ELEMENT 4.2 - Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies⁵

Under this sub-element, describe how your current bridge inspection protocols meet the requirements of the National Bridge Inventory System (NBIS), and your methods for storing and reporting the data to FHWA. Also, describe how you incorporate, or would incorporate, these data into a management system.

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 all public bridges owned and operated by your agency including public bridges outside your FLTP inventory. This number should mirror the number in the NBIS.

Within the baseline data, please include the number or percent of bridges that are *structurally deficient*. Within your proposal, describe how the number and/or percentage of structurally deficient bridges will be impacted based upon your investment amount scenarios. Include the target number and percentage of structurally deficient bridges by the end of FY 2020.

Evaluation:

Sub-Element 4.2	How this will be evaluated for FY 2019- 2020
<p>Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which baseline bridge data is collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH in FY 2019- 2020.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if no effort has been made to comply with existing bridge inventory and inspection regulations via the NBIS; • 1 if FLMAs provide baseline bridge data including number of public bridges total, number of bridges on their FLTP, and a summary of their bridge conditions (e.g., the number and/or percentage of structurally deficient and percent in good, fair and poor condition on all public bridges in NBIS. • 2 if FLMAs provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requirements in #1 above; ○ A <i>general</i> description of how they plan to address their high-risk bridges. • 3 if FLMAs provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requirements in #2 above; ○ bridge condition targets based on funding scenarios, and ○ a <i>detailed</i> plan on how they plan to address their high-risk bridges.

⁵ USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (B) (i) (II)

SUB-ELEMENT 4.3 - Improvement of Safety⁶

Concisely describe your plans to collect and report safety crash data – fatalities and serious injuries – and other information to influence your 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, like head-on, run-off-the-road, intersection, wildlife collision, or other,
- Causal factors, like infrastructure-related or behavioral.

Describe how you incorporate, or plan to incorporate, these data into a management system. If baseline safety data and/or other information are available, please provide the information and your projections on how the baseline data may change based on the level of investments requested within your investment strategy.

For partners who may have very few crashes and contend transportation safety is not a high-risk area on their lands, 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 you do not have a safety problem on your FLTP inventory?

Evaluation:

Sub-Element 4.3	How this will be evaluated for FY 2019-2020
<p>Improvement of Safety</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which baseline crash data (fatalities and serious injuries) will be collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH by the end of FY 2018.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if no effort will be made to collect baseline road safety data in FY 2019- 2020; • 1 if FLMAs provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety OR ○ existing evidence-based safety data, reports, and/or studies on FLTP road facilities (up to 25%) that reflects the risk level. • 2 if FLMAs provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety, ○ initial processes are developed to compile existing and/or collect new safety data at the project and/or network level OR

⁶ USC 23 §203 (b) (2) (B) (i) (III)

Sub-Element 4.3	How this will be evaluated for FY 2019-2020
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ existing evidence-based data, reports, and/or studies on FLTP road facilities (26 - 70%) that reflects the risk level. • 3 if FLMAAs provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety; ○ initial processes are developed to compile existing and/or collect new safety data at the network level; ○ progress can be described on the development of a formal Safety Management System based on documentation, e.g., SOW; ○ OR existing evidence-based data, reports, and/or studies on FLTP road facilities (over 71%) that reflects the risk level.

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 initiatives that support a long-term performance-based program and/or performance targets, i.e., is your annualized target data trending in the right direction?

FLH understands certain performance data may not be fully available on an annual basis. Guidelines on the format of the report are included here. Revisions were made to simplify the process and collect data once for multiple purposes.

(Note: By the end of FY 2018, we highly encourage all partners to possess and report high quality, complete performance data since this data will be used to inform Congress, Office of Management and Budget and other stakeholders in preparation of the next Act.)

Award

Each FLMA will receive written notification of their respective allocation amount once authorized by the Secretary of Transportation.

Federal Lands Transportation Program Timeline

Timeframe	Deliverable/Action
January 2018	FLH provided a draft copy of a multi-year FY 2019-2020 FLTP Evaluation Guidance document and seeks comments from partners. FLH meets with partners to discuss revisions to FY 2017-2018 FLTP Evaluation Guidance document. Note: This is a multi-year effort resulting in funding allocations across two fiscal years, i.e., once funds are made available by Congress in whole or in part in each FY.
April 1, 2018	FLMA provides FY 2017 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA
May 1, 2018	FLH distributes final FY 2019-2020 Evaluation Guidance to partners and issues a call for their FY2019-2020 Investment Strategy Proposals.
June 31, 2018	Partners submit their FY2019-2020 Investment Strategy Proposals.
July 2018	FHWA completes evaluation of the partners' proposals and the team's FY2019-2020 allocation recommendations are forwarded to the FHWA Administrator for review and approval.
October 2018	Partners are notified of the funding allocation amounts (as a percentage of the total) approved by the Administrator.
November 2018	FY 2019 FLTP funds are made available following the passage of the FY 2019 appropriations Act and/or CR
April 1, 2019	FLMA provides FY 2018 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA
October 2019	Partners are notified of the funding allocation amounts (as a percentage of the total) approved by the Administrator.
November 2019	FY 2020 FLTP funds are made available following the passage of the FY 2020 appropriations Act and/or CR
April 1, 2020	FLMA provides FY 2019 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA
September 2020	Passage of new transportation act, or extension of FAST Act.
October 2020	If the FLTP still exists, partners are notified of the funding allocation amounts (as a percentage of the total) approved by the Administrator.
November 2021	If the FLTP still exists, FY 2021 FLTP funds are made available following the passage of the FY 2021 appropriations Act and/or CR
December 2021	Decision by stakeholders on how best to move forward
April 1, 2022	FLMA provides FY 2021 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA, if applicable

Annual FLTP Accomplishment Report Template

Partners are encouraged to describe their accomplishments in alignment with elements 1-4 above within the body of the instructions. 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. State of Good Repair: Additional data reported from stakeholders to FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. Paved roads, in terms of:
 - i. Funds obligated;
 - ii. The number of projects, number of miles, and types of work; and/or
 - iii. The overall change in the condition of the road network.
 - b. Unpaved, native and gravel roads, in terms of:
 - i. Funds obligated; and/or
 - ii. The number of projects, number of miles, type of work;
3. Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies: Additional data reported from stakeholders to FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. Funds obligated on bridge only projects;
 - b. Number of bridge projects; and/or
 - c. The overall change in the condition of the bridge network
4. Improvement of Safety: Additional data reported from stakeholders to FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. If known, funds obligated for safety improvements;
 - b. The number of safety-specific projects completed;
 - c. New processes or agreements employed;
 - d. New relationships developed with other key stakeholder groups such as law enforcement and first responders;
 - e. number of roadside safety audits; and/or
 - f. safety meetings/summits held to educate and share best practices among practitioners.
5. Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency: Additional data reported from stakeholders to FLH beyond what was described in Section 3 include:
 - a. Funds obligated; and

- b. Outputs – What was the number of projects funded, type of work
6. Planning - Additional data reported from stakeholders to FLH beyond what was described in Section 3 include:
- a. Number of LRTPS completed at the national, regional, and/or unit level;
 - b. Internal procedures on how regions/units may change their programming decisions based on performance-based planning and programs, i.e., what's changed?
7. 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.

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