

# **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

## **PART ASSESSMENTS<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>This document contains details of the most recent program assessments as of the date the 2005 Budget was published (February 2004). Programs originally assessed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change. Programs not reassessed are presented in this document in the form of reprints of the original worksheets and are footnoted "FY 2004 Budget".

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Page</b>
FAA Air Traffic Services.....	Adequate.....	3
FAA Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport Improvement Program)..	Moderately Effective.....	12
Federal Lands.....	Moderately Effective.....	21
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program.....	Moderately Effective.....	33
FHWA Highway Infrastructure.....	Moderately Effective.....	43
Hazardous Materials Transportation.....	Moderately Effective.....	56
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Grant Program..	Moderately Effective.....	67
New Starts.....	Moderately Effective.....	75
Railroad Safety Program (RSP).....	Moderately Effective.....	88
Research, Engineering & Development.....	Effective.....	102

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%  
 Explanation: The FAA's Air Traffic Service provides guidance and control to aviation, ensuring the safe operation of the nation's aviation system.  
 Evidence: Title 49 USC, Subtitle 7, Part A, Section 40103 "Sovereignty and use of airspace".
- 1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%  
 Explanation: FAA's regulation and control of national airspace provides safe access and efficient use of that airspace to the flying public.  
 Evidence: 44,117 flights handled by ATC in 2002. 19,572 airports in 2002. As of 2002, controller work force of 17,501 employees, and 2,864 employees at Flight Service Stations. Administrator's Fact Book - March 2003. 12,000 employees maintain 41,000 pieces of equipment at over 6,000 facilities. Airway Facilities FY 2002 Performance Plan.
- 1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%  
 Explanation: The FAA manages most of the commercial aircraft flown in the national airspace. Air traffic services are not provided by any other Federal, state or private entity.  
 Evidence: 44,117 flights handled by ATC in 2002. 19,572 airports in 2002. As of 2002 controller work force of 17,501 employees, and 2,864 employees at Flight Service Stations. Administrator's Fact Book - March 2003
- 1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%  
 Explanation: The FAA provides air traffic services using the most appropriate design at this time - direct communications between pilots and air traffic controllers. Some of the communication is by voice and some is automated.  
 Evidence: There is no evidence that another approach would be more efficient/effective.
- 1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%  
 Explanation: ATS is designed to provide air traffic control services directly to airline pilots and airports through constant communication with pilots and daily conference calls with beneficiaries.  
 Evidence:
- 2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES      Question Weight: 12%  
 Explanation: The FAA and Air Traffic Services (ATS) new strategic plan has goals through 2008.  
 Evidence: FAA Flight Plan 2004 - 2008, <http://www2.faa.gov/apo/strategicplan/>

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

- 2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation: The FAA and Air Traffic Services (ATS) new strategic plan has goals through 2008.
- Evidence: FAA Flight Plan 2004 - 2008, <http://www2.faa.gov/apo/strategicplan/>
- 2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation: Air Traffic Services (ATS) have a limited number of annual goals that directly link to DOT's long-term goals. These goals are quantifiable. New strategic plan includes long term goal through 2008. ATS does not have efficiency measures.
- Evidence: DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan. Airway Facilities FY 2003 Performance Plan and Airway Facilities Performance Report FY 2002, FAA Flight Plan 2004 - 2008 ( <http://www2.faa.gov/apo/strategicplan/>)
- 2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation: The annual goals contain baseline data.
- Evidence: DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan. Airway Facilities FY 2003 Performance Plan and Airway Facilities Performance Report FY 2002, FAA Flight Plan 2004 - 2008 (<http://www2.faa.gov/apo/strategicplan/>)
- 2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation: Management at headquarters work with airlines, airports and the staff in the centers and regions to achieve the goals of the FAA. FAA works closely with airports and airlines to ensure that the system is working efficiently - daily conference calls are one approach. Air traffic managers are able to remove a controller from a workstation for performance reasons and send them to retraining.
- Evidence: Air Traffic Management has daily conference calls with airlines, centers and regions to review activities of the previous day and plan the current day with recognition of performance goals. Air Traffic Management staff assert that managers can send controllers to retraining although DOT IG report, "Operational Errors and Runway Incursions: Progress Made but the number of incidents is still high and presents serious safety risks - April 2003, states that FAA does not require air traffic controllers to receive training after incidents.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** GAO and the DOT IG have conducted many evaluations of Air Traffic Services (ATS) - operational errors and runway incursions, labor distribution reporting, and workers compensation. As a result of these evaluations, ATS has undertaken an aggressive program in the Southern Region to understand the workers compensation problem and how they can bring some of these individuals back into the work force. FAA is in the process of reviewing the many MOU's with labor unions. Final outcomes of the IG and GAO recommendations cannot be determined at this time.

**Evidence:** DOT IG Operational Errors and Runway Incursions - April 2003. DOT IG - Workers Compensation Traumatic Injury Claims - January 17, 2003. GAO Air Traffic Control - Impact of Revised Personnel Relocation Policies Is Uncertain - October 2002. DOT IG Top Management Challenges - January 17, 2003. DOT IG Air Traffic Services - Planned Labor Distribution Reporting - October 2001. GAO reports: Air Traffic Control - FAA Needs To Better Prepare for Wave of Controller Attrition. <http://www.gao.gov>. FAA Order - Air Traffic Quality Assurance 7210.56C lists the FAA's authority in the area of retraining, DOT IG - FAA s Management of and Control over Memorandums of Understanding ([http://www.oig.dot.gov/show\\_pdf.php?id=1165](http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=1165))

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** In 2004 and 2005, FAA attempted to submit a budget that linked performance to budget request. Unfortunately the document needs more work.

**Evidence:** FY 2004 President Budget and FY 2004 FAA congressional justification.

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FAA has had a strategic planning process since 1997. Over time they have revised their goals to better measure their performance. For example, the on-time, capacity and efficiency measures have been fine tuned so that they provide linkages to the overall DOT goals. They have also used the data and results to initiate new programs e.g. Spring/Summer plan to address delays. While FAA is cognizant of its strategic planning limitations, the ATS organization is working to improve their performance in this area. FAA is currently developing a new strategic plan to guide the organization under the new Administrator. The Operational Evolution Plan - FAA's long term strategy on capacity.

**Evidence:** Operational Evolution Plan <http://www1.faa.gov/programs/oepl/INDEX.htm>. Cite new strategic plan. Airway Facilities FY 2002 Performance Report

**3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

**Explanation:** ATS collects daily information on runway incursions and operational errors at centers and towers. Headquarter staff make sure that regional officials are aware of problems. Daily telcons with representatives evaluate recent activities. Monthly meetings with senior ATS management discuss problem areas and discuss solutions. The ASP database contains many of their metrics. Airway Facilities (AF) has a Operational Results Team which reviews planning and resources while monitoring progress on performance goals. This team meets monthly to discuss AF activities.

**Evidence:** The ASP database contains useful information but ATS is not using the information from the metrics to manage. Airway Facilities Operational Results Team Charter. Aviation Safety Statistical Handbook - February 2003. Monthly FLASH reports.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: ATS executives at headquarters, regions and centers receive compensation based on Short Term Incentive (STI) contracts. They are held accountable for performance results and schedules but not cost. These annual agreements include performance measures on runway incursions, operational errors and airport efficiency. Program partners such as contractors, grantees, and airports are not held accountable for cost and performance. The employees of these managers - air traffic controllers are not held accountable for performance and cost.

Evidence: STI contracts. FAA Strategic Plan Supplement for FY 2002 with information on STI's ([http://www.api.faa.gov/sp02\\_sup/02sp-sup-web/Implemt.htm](http://www.api.faa.gov/sp02_sup/02sp-sup-web/Implemt.htm)) Contract Tower operations are conducted at a fixed price, should costs increase, the contract operator is not reimbursed.

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: ATS monitors obligations on a bi-weekly basis. Funds are obligated in a timely basis and for the intended purpose. 80% of ATS funds are for salaries and expenses.

Evidence: The Associate Administrator for ATS meets with service directors and budget staff each month to review spending against financial plans. These reviews ensure that shortfalls are managed. Airway Facilities Operational Results Team also monitors spending closely.

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Program does not have efficiency measures or targets. Lacks cost effectiveness in program execution. FAA is currently undertaking an A-76 of the Flight Service Station program which is part of ATS. Review is scheduled to be completed in FY 2004. Airway Facilities is in process of reviewing cost data on long-term radar sites and is sharing cost data with regions.

Evidence: FAA memo's on long-range radar cost issues - May 1, 2003. Link to FAA's competitive sourcing web site ([http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html\\_budget/html\\_cs/index.html](http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html_budget/html_cs/index.html)) Link to FAA's cost accounting ([http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html\\_infotech/cas/index.html](http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html_infotech/cas/index.html))

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: FAA's Air Traffic Services organization is the only provider of air traffic control to commercial aviation in the US.

Evidence:

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: FAA has one material internal control weakness reported by KPMG and one material weakness reported under the FFMIA process but they do not relate to ATS. Financial management systems do not meet statutory requirement - expect to convert to Delphi in Q1 2004. ATS is also not fully utilizing cost accounting system but it hopes within the next few years to make better use of the data.

Evidence: Link to FAA's financial web site with links to audit reports ([http://www2.faa.gov/aba/html\\_finst.html](http://www2.faa.gov/aba/html_finst.html).)

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

**Explanation:** The ATS organization is aware of its management challenges and has taken steps to improve its management challenges. The Configuration Management Group (ACM) evaluates FAA Research and Acquisitions (ARA) and ATS to determine what can be done to improve the programs. ACM uses IG and GAO input in planning its program evaluations. FAA is also working to implement two of the IG's top management challenges (1) runway incursions and Ops errors, and (2) reversing spiraling operating costs. FAA is working to improve their performance and hold down costs. FAA's work on the Operational Evolution Plan (OEP) is another example of its efforts to improve management issues. The OEP is FAA's ten-year plan to improve in 4 areas: airport arrival and departure rates, en route congestion, airport weather conditions, and en route severe weather.

**Evidence:** Link to ACM reports. <http://www2.faa.gov/acm/acm10/reports.htm> Link to Operational Evolution Plan Executive Summary [http://www1.faa.gov/programs/oep/Executive%20Summary/nas\\_oep\\_Jan\\_28.pdf](http://www1.faa.gov/programs/oep/Executive%20Summary/nas_oep_Jan_28.pdf)

**4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In the last three years, FAA has met its top-level commercial aviation fatal accident rate goal - contributed strongly to by this program - but has had mixed success in meeting runway incursion, and operational error safety goals; and on-time flight arrival, airport throughput, and airport capacity mobility goals. In 2002, FAA met its runway incursion, flights arriving on-time, airport throughput efficiency, and airport capacity goals, but it did not meet its operational errors goal. Prior to 2002, FAA met only one of these goals. FAA is currently working to develop long-term goals (5 - 10 years).

**Evidence:** US DOT performance plan FY 2004

**4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Over the last few years, FAA has had problems meeting its goals. 2002 is the first year that FAA met two of four goals listed in this PART. FAA met its runway incursion and flights arriving on-time goal but missed its operational errors goal in 2002. As a result of 9/11, traffic was down so it is hard to say how this decline affected FAA's ability to meet its goals.

**Evidence:** US DOT performance plan FY 2004

**4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Program received a no in question 3.4. ATS continues to experience challenges in the area of efficiencies/cost effectiveness. In addition, ATS does not have an efficiency measure.

**Evidence:** April 9, 2003 Testimony DOT IG "Cost Control Issues for the Federal Aviation Administration's Operations and Modernization Accounts" [http://www.oig.dot.gov/item\\_details.php?item=1069](http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=1069)

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	83%	40%	

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** FAA compares favorably to Eurocontrol - air traffic manager and architect of air traffic management systems throughout Europe (41 states). Report concluded that FAA en-route centers are more cost effective than Eurocontrol.

**Evidence:** Performance Review Commission - Performance Review Report PRC 6. May 2003.( [www.eurocontrol.int](http://www.eurocontrol.int)). FAA report: The World's Safest Aviation System: Comparing Fatal Hull Loss Accident Rates Among Countries and Regions.

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**      Answer: SMALL EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Both the DOT Inspector General and the General Accounting Office have reviewed many ATS activities - workers compensation, air traffic controller pay issues, payroll, and safety concerns. Reports are generally critical of ATS inability to contain costs and suggest that performance can be improved.

**Evidence:** DOT IG "Top Management Challenges - DOT" January 17, 2003; DOT IG Operational Errors and Runway Incursions" April 3, 2003 ([http://www.oig.dot.gov/show\\_pdf.php?id=1064](http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=1064)) "Workers Compensation Traumatic Injury Claims" January 17, 2003. ([http://www.oig.dot.gov/show\\_pdf.php?id=970](http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=970))

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

---

**Measure:** Number of Operational Errors. (When air traffic controllers allow planes to come too close together in the air.)  
**Additional Information:** Measures the most severe operational errors

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		674	
2002	568	662	
2003	642		
2004	629		
2005	610		
2006	595		
2007	579		
2008	563		

**Measure:** Number of highest risk runway incursions (potential collisions on the ground).  
**Additional Information:** Measures high risk runway incursions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		53	
2002	53	37	
2003	44		
2004	33		
2005	32		
2006	30		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

---

**Measure:** Number of highest risk runway incursions (potential collisions on the ground).

**Additional Information:** Measures high risk runway incursions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2007	28		
2008	27		

**Measure:** Percent of flights arriving on-time

**Additional Information:** Increase On-Time Performance at the 35 OEP airports (32 large hubs in 2002, 2003)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		76.2	
2002	77.2	82.3	
2003	78.2		
2004	82.1		
2005	82.2		
2006	82.68		
2007	83.16		
2008	83.64		

**Measure:** Airport Arrival Efficiency Rate

**Additional Information:** Increase the ratio of flight arrivals to the lesser of flight demand or airport capacity at 35 OEP airports

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		94.9	
2002	95.25	96.2	

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FAA Air Traffic Services  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

---

**Measure:** Airport Arrival Efficiency Rate

**Additional Information:** Increase the ratio of flight arrivals to the lesser of flight demand or airport capacity at 35 OEP airports

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2003	95.49		
2004	95.67		
2005	95.76		
2006	95.85		
2007	95.93		
2008	96		

**Measure:** Airport Daily Arrival Capacity (in thousands of landings)

**Additional Information:** Increase the daily arrival capacity at the 35 OEP airports (32 large hub airports in 2002, Honolulu excluded in 2003)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b>
2001	46.6	46.6	
2002	46.6	47	
2003	49.12		
2004	51.33		
2005	52		
2006	52.21		
2007	53.6		
2008	53.6		

## OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

### *Competitive Grant Programs*

**Name of Program: FAA Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport Improvement Program)**

**Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The purpose is to maintain a safe and efficient nationwide system of public use airports that meets the present and future needs of civil aeronautics.	Title 49, Chapter 471 U.S.C.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The AIP program addresses capacity needs at airports as well as safety and security needs. Through federal funding, FAA is able to encourage airports to address issues that are of a national priority. Through annual funding in appropriations bills, Congress reiterates the program's importance. The AIP program is part of the FAA's mission to address the growing capacity needs.	DOT Performance Report FY 2000 and Performance Plan FY 2002	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	While AIP is critical to spur aviation safety, efficiency, and economic growth, large airports would continue to operate without AIP funds. Large airports rely on AIP funds for 20% of their construction costs. The smaller airports in the national airport system, 96% of all airports, rely on AIP for over 80% of their funding. If AIP were removed, many airports would be unable to comply with safety and system efficiency requirements, and would be at risk of closure. Approximately 60% of all AIP funding goes to the smaller airports.	-----	20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Federal funding creates partnerships with airports to achieve mutually agreeable goals. Since the Federal government operates the airspace and maintains air traffic control operations and technology, it is important that the Federal government play a large role in the capacity needs on the ground. Large and medium hubs need the Federal investment to signal to the private sector that the program is viable. Bond issuers and private financing organizations view AIP funds as a form of guarantee that the projects will be complete. FAA asserts that airports would not make adequate investments in safety and noise without federal funding and oversight.	Bond issuers and private financing institutions view AP funds as a form of a guarantee that the projects will be complete and fully funded. FAA asserts that airports would not make adequate investments in safety and noise without federal funding and oversight.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Regulation may be more efficient, but grants are more effective in producing results that match FAA goals. Grants that fund safety and system efficiency promote partnerships, giving airports ownership in solving problems. FAA has improved the tools it uses to select projects for funding.	FAA believes that the funding creates partnerships that make change possible. Regulation would place FAA in an adversarial role.	20%	0.2
<b>Total Section Score</b>					<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>

<b>Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)</b>						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	AIP does have long-term goals that focus on outputs. These goals link to FAA's performance goals that include both GPRA and supplemental goals that are outcome oriented.	FAA's long term goals are: 1) bring all 520 runway safety areas to standard, as practicable, by 2007, 2) support new runway construction to increase capacity at large hubs by 5% over 5 years, 3) reduce the number of persons exposed to high levels of noise by 50,000 over 5 years and 4) keep at least 93% of all active airfield pavement in fair or better condition at all times. Goals are included in Office of Airports Performance Goals for FY 2002 document ( <a href="http://intranet.faa.gov/arp/pdfs/02goals8.doc">http://intranet.faa.gov/arp/pdfs/02goals8.doc</a> )	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	AIP has annual goals that tie to the cumulative long - term goals. These goals are output oriented but they are linked to FAA's performance goals that are outcome oriented.	FAA's long term goals are: 1) upgrade 65 runway safety areas to standard, as practicable, 2) support new runway construction to increase capacity at large hubs by 1% a year, 3) reduce the number of persons exposed to high levels of noise by 10,000 a year and 4) keep at least 93% of all active airfield pavement in fair or better condition at all times. Goals are included in Office of Airports Performance Goals for FY 2002 document ( <a href="http://intranet.faa.gov/arp/pdfs/02goals8.doc">http://intranet.faa.gov/arp/pdfs/02goals8.doc</a> .)	14%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	There is no requirement for grantees to directly link their activities to program goals. In developing each year's funding plan, airports update their 3-year capital improvement plan to bring it in line with the national plan. The airports' plans mark their progress in meeting commitments to the development necessary for the national airport system.	Airports Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) Order, <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf">http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf</a>	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	Two separately budgeted programs that are interrelated to the AIP are the F&E and Homeland Security Programs. The AIP is collaboratively coordinated with these programs in the appropriate offices of FAA and TSA, respectively, in order that the airport development and planning under AIP complements the navigational aids under F&E and the TSA approved airport security plans and installations. There are also many cases of collaboration with FHWA and FTA on key intermodal transportation projects. In addition, joint grant announcements occur through OST coordination with military agencies for the use of MAP funds at joint-use airports and with the Economic Development Agency on airport development projects.	---	14%	0.1
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	Yes	GAO and the IG conduct regular evaluations of the AIP program. While these reviews are not scheduled on a regular basis, GAO and the IG have completed 7 reviews over the last 5 years on the AIP program.	FY 2003 President's Budget and Congressional justifications. An example of a recent report includes: GAO report April 2002 "Aviation Finance: Distribution of Airport Grant Funds Complied with Statutory Requirements." Notice from the IG's office that they are conducting a review of FAA financing issues as well as airport financing ( <a href="http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=648">http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=648</a> )	14%	0.1
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	No	The AIP budget is aligned based on AIR-21 funding levels and identifies the split between grants and personnel. The FAA intends to work towards aligning the budget with performance.	AIR-21, FY 2003 President's Budget	14%	0.0

		<b>Ans.</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Evidence/Data</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
<b>Questions</b>						
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	FAA conducts periodic reviews reflected in the U.S. DOT Performance Plan to determine if the intended outcomes are achieved. In FY 2002, the FAA evaluated the AIP noise set-aside program. The evaluation revealed the need to ensure that noise exposure maps be as recent and accurate as possible to aid programming decisions under the AIP. Starting with the FY 2003 program, regional Airports division managers will be required to ensure that 100% of all AIP programming decisions are based on noise contours that are reasonable representations of the current and/or five-year forecast conditions at airports applying for grants from the noise set-aside. As a result of the accident in AR, an AIP long-term goal was established to bring all runway safety areas at certificated airports up to standard, as practicable, by 2007.	DOT Performance Plan and Report. See the following web site for more information on the noise program. ( <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/environmental/index.cfm?ARNav=enviro#noise">http://www.faa.gov/arp/environmental/index.cfm?ARNav=enviro#noise</a> ) The aircraft accident at Little Rock, AR in which a commercial airliner ran off of the end of the runway and collided with objects in the runway safety area brought about a re-evaluation of the policy on objects in the runway safety area.	14%	0.1

<b>Total Section Score</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71%</b>
----------------------------	-------------	------------

<b>Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)</b>						
		<b>Ans.</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Evidence/Data</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
<b>Questions</b>						
1	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	No	The AIP program follows statutory guidance as well as FAA internal guidance to manage the program. However, because of the lead time involved in airport construction the program cannot constantly adjust program priorities to manage the program. Outcomes from grants are often years away so it is hard to make decisions in a timely fashion.	AIR-21 (P.L. 106-181)	9%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Program managers are responsible for achieving results and the performance measures are built into personnel evaluations.	Managers annual performance evaluations are based on how well their organization met the goals.	9%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Yes, the budget office ensures that funds are obligated in a timely manner. The AIP program traditionally obligates 100% of available funds. Any unobligated funds are carried forward. The AIP makes sure that recoveries are processed accordingly.	GAO report April 2002 "Aviation Finance: Distribution of Airport Grant Funds Complied with Statutory Requirements." FY 2003 President's Budget Submission	9%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	No	The program's performance plan does not include efficiency measures and targets. The program is operated in an efficient manner but it is not due to internal program procedures.	-----	9%	0.0
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	No	The AIP program is one part of the larger Airports line of business within FAA. However, the AIP appropriation request covers more than just AIP, it also funds the administrative costs of the Airports office. FAA is in the process of developing a cost accounting system that will be able to track costs by activity.	FY2003 President's Budget Submission	9%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The program is free of material internal control weaknesses. However, the program has experienced difficulty with erroneous payments. DOT has established a recovery audit system to reduce the number of erroneous payments.	OIG report on FAA's financial statements for FY 2001 and 2000 ( <a href="http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=712">http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=712</a> )	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Airports office internal performance goals have been used to address weaknesses in managing AIP project costs and timeliness of completion. One of these goals requires that 70% of all grant offers be based on actual bids. Timeliness is managed through goals for project completions. Staff from headquarters meet with regional airport directors to discuss how the program can improve its effectiveness.	FAA Annual performance goals and DOT Performance Plan.	9%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	<i>Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?</i>	Yes	In developing the ACIP, (an internal funding plan), the staff reviews airport plans for development and decides which projects are of greater priority. The ACIP process involves individual airports, state officials and headquarters staff. Congressional earmarking is a problem.	The Airports Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) Order ( <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf">http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf</a> )	9%	0.1
9 (Co 2.)	<i>Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?</i>	Yes	The FAA uses a numerical system as one tool for prioritizing airport development for discretionary projects. In addition, airports must submit grant applications to FAA to spend their formula funds. All airports are aware of the selection criteria and FAA requirements.	The Airports Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) Order ( <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf">http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf</a> )	9%	0.1
10 (Co 3.)	<i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i>	Yes	The AIP program office in headquarters together with the regional staff keep in regular contact with airports across the US. Grantees must also submit applications in order to receive their formula funds so FAA is aware of their activities.	The Airports Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) Order ( <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf">http://www.faa.gov/arp/publications/orders/acip/5100-39.pdf</a> ), and the NPIAS. ( <a href="http://www.faa.gov/arp/planning/npias/index.cfm?ARPnav=npias">http://www.faa.gov/arp/planning/npias/index.cfm?ARPnav=npias</a> )	9%	0.1
11 (Co 4.)	<i>Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i>	No	FAA tracks performance on grant activity from the airports. However, only the grant announcements are made available to the public. Performance data are used internally for the ACIP and NPIAS formulations.	-----	9%	0.0
<b>Total Section Score</b>					<b>100%</b>	<b>64%</b>

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

**Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)**

1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Yes	The program is making progress towards its long term goals. For FY 2001, the annual accomplishments will allow the Airport's office to make their long term goal.	See accomplishments below.	20%	0.2
---	---	-----	---	----------------------------	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Eliminate airport conditions as cause for aircraft accidents and for security breaches.</p> <p>Target: 520 by 2007</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward As of FY 2001, 139 Runway safety areas have been brought to standard. (cumulative) goal:</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Reduce the number of persons exposed to high levels of noise by 50,000 over 5 years.</p> <p>Target: 50,000 people over 5 years</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward As of FY 2001, 32,314 persons no longer exposed to high levels of noise. (cumulative) goal:</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Keep at least 93% of active airfield pavement in fair or better condition.</p> <p>Target: 93% of all pavement</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward As of FY 2001, 94.5% of all airfield pavement was in fair or better condition. goal:</p>					

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Yes	The Airport's office met or exceeded its annual performance goals.	See accomplishments below.	20%	0.2
---	--	-----	--	----------------------------	-----	-----

<p>Key Goal I: Upgrade runway safety areas to full standards</p> <p>Performance Target: In FY 2001 the annual goal was 65 runway safety areas.</p> <p>Actual Performance: In FY 2001, 68 runway safety areas were brought to standard.</p>					
<p>Key Goal II: Reduce the number of persons exposed to high levels of noise by 10,000.</p> <p>Performance Target: 10,000 people a year</p> <p>Actual Performance: In FY 2001, 18,813 persons were no longer exposed to high levels of noise.</p>					
<p>Key Goal III: Keep at least 93% of active airfield pavement in fair or better condition.</p> <p>Performance Target: 93% of all pavement</p> <p>Actual Performance: In FY 2001, 94.5% of all airfield pavement was in fair or better condition.</p>					

	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Ans.</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Evidence/Data</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Small Extent	FAA has improved the cost-effectiveness and efficiency in program execution. For instance, the FAA used more automated financial databases and delegated authority to the regions, reducing the number of headquarters personnel assigned to funds control and eliminating the need for paper ledgers for the national program. Under AIR 21, AIP funding levels have risen but staffing has remained flat. In the future, FAA will achieve further efficiencies by permitting direct data entry from local airport sponsors and states and through use of contractors.	Annual reports to Congress, annual year-end clean audits. Program is receiving a score of "small extent" because many of their management efficiencies are still in the design and planning stages and have not been implemented yet.	20%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	The AIP program compared to FHWA Federal-aid highway program has well established procedures for monitoring airport projects funded under the AIP program. Before an airport can move forward with a project, it must meet with FAA to discuss responsibilities of all parties.	DOT Management Challenges report ( <a href="http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=87">http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=87</a> )	20%	0.2
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Large Extent	The GAO and OIG have audited various aspects of the AIP regularly to gauge its effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. An April 2002 GAO report concluded that the management of AIP complied with requirements. OIG's June 1998 report and GAO's May 1999 report provided similar findings. When audits recommend changes or improvements, FAA has made adjustments. After the release of GAO's June 1994 report on the AIP Reliever Airport Set-Aside Funds, FAA changed the way it was distributing funds to reliever airports.	GAO report April 2002 "Aviation Finance: Distribution of of Airport Grant Funds Complied with Statutory Requirements. (GAO - 02-283). This program is receiving a score of "large extent" because many of the GAO and IG's reports only look at specific portions of the AIP program.	20%	0.1
<b>Total Section Score</b>					<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Federal Lands Highway (FLH) program purpose is to (1) ensure effective and efficient funding and administration for a coordinated program of public roads and bridges serving Federal and Indian lands; (2) to provide needed transportation access for Native Americans; and (3) to protect and enhance our Nation's resources.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway program purpose is stated in the Federal Lands Highway Business Plan 2003 - 2007.

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The FLHP addresses the specific transportation needs, from a national perspective, of the Federal lands which are not a state or local government responsibility. The Federal lands highways (about 160,000 miles of public roads) connect with the National Highway System to provide safe and seamless routes for travel to and within Federal and Indian lands. Federal and Indian lands cover one-third of the Nation's land area. Recent condition surveys of park roads, forest highways, refuge roads, Indian reservation roads, and bridges note recent improvement in conditions, but indicate that thousands of miles of roads and hundreds of bridges need improvement or replacement in order to ensure access to and a coordinated program of public roads. NOTE: Some Federal agencies, such as DOI, transform their pavement condition ratings into asset management systems that also nationally evaluate the status of buildings, construction equipment, and other capital items. States tend to focus on transportation-related items.

**Evidence:** Appendix E of the FHWA 1999 Conditions and Performance Report provides information on road and bridge conditions (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/1999cpr/report.htm>). More current information is provided in the Federal agency TEA-21 reauthorization resource papers prepared in fiscal years 2002 and 2003. Other sources of information that discuss program needs are included in the various needs assessment reports and the finalized proposed rule making for management systems.

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** As mentioned above, the FLHP provides funding for a coordinated program of public roads that serve the transportation needs of the Federal lands which are not a state or local government responsibility. These highways are critical to the survival and quality of life of tribal communities and other small towns located within these lands. They also connect visitors to the vast number of historic and recreation sites as well as connect tribal housing, schools, health care, and employment centers. The program also fulfills the important role of redistributing Federal transportation funds among Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMA) to ensure mobility and safety throughout 30 percent of the Nation. The Federal program is especially important in 13 western States, some of which have relatively low fiscal capacity and small populations. The FLHP funds are used by the FLMAs for preliminary engineering, design and construction of projects. Maintenance is not a FLHP-eligible item. Maintenance of existing roads and bridges is funded by appropriations directly to these FLMAs.

**Evidence:** The 2002 Conditions & Performance report indicates that Congress uses this program as the major funding tool to make investments in transportation projects serving Federal and Indian lands. Congress provides separate road and bridge maintenance funding through annual appropriations acts using general funds.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**1.4**            **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?**            Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** FLHP funds are distributed to each class of Federal lands highways (forest highways, public land highways, Indian reservation roads, park road and parkways, and refuge roads). Project selection is delegated to the local owners and users (FLMAs, Indian tribes, and States) of the transportation systems, according to three-year transportation improvement plans (TIPs). The projects included in the TIPs are selected based on relative need. Management systems are also used to identify and prioritize projects. The Public Lands Discretionary program has experienced some eligibility issues and bias in earmarking of various projects. While project selection was once based on competition, the program has now become 100% earmarked. FHWA has addressed this by eliminating this discretionary program through the Administration's reauthorization proposal (the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003, or SAFETEA).

**Evidence:** Sections 202 and 204 of Title 23 define who selects the projects for each class of Federal lands highways and the criteria to be used. The methods of distributing funds for each class are defined either in section 202 or in policy issued by FHWA or its partners. The requirements to develop three-year transportation improvement plans and management systems are defined in section 204.

**1.5**            **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?**            Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program ensures a connected system of roads that serve local, regional, and national needs by providing resources to each of the land management agencies responsible for 590,000 miles of public roads and highways. Resources effectively reach intended beneficiaries through formula and allocation distribution processes. Several road types owned by the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Corps, and other DOD agencies do not receive dedicated funding and have to compete for funds under a discretionary category. However, this Public Lands Discretionary program is fully earmarked by Congress each year. This issue is being addressed in the SAFETEA reauthorization bill. In the design of the new proposed safety and recreational roads categories, FHWA has proposed the distribution of these program funds to the FLMAs based on performance and results.

**Evidence:** The beneficiaries of the FLH program are the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Native American tribes and villages through coordination with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The SAFETEA proposal would also make the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Defense, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers eligible for percentages of FLH program safety and/or recreational road funding (section 1804 of the SAFETEA bill). Four bills (S. 2884, S. 2906, S. 310,6 and S. 3132) were introduced in the 107th Congress to establish new funding programs to address transportation needs in rural areas of Federal lands.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?**      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The Federal Lands Highway program is a small and complementary program within the Federal Highway Administration. While FLH activities contribute to the overall FHWA performance goals, the FLH program also has a specific purpose, established by Congress in 1982 (see 1.1). FLH has two long-term performance measures that relate specifically to the first stated program purpose -- to ensure the effective and efficient funding and administration for a coordinated program of public roads and bridges. For its other stated program purposes, FLH contributes to the related FHWA long-term performance measures for mobility and environment. FLH also contributes to additional FHWA and DOT long-term measures, including safety. FLH contributes by collecting and reporting data on condition and performance of road systems, but FLMAs are primarily responsible for the activities associated with these measures.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway program purpose and long-term performance measures are stated in the Federal Lands Highway Business Plan 2003 - 2007 (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/flh/index.htm>); FHWA Performance Plans.

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?**      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The baselines for the FLH long-term measures have been established through several years of recording data and are ambitious. In addition to working toward achieving FLH's specific targets, FLH also contributes to FHWA's and DOT's long-term targets and "vital few" initiatives as described in the FHWA performance plans.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway Business Plan 2003 - 2007 and the 1998 FHWA strategic plan. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/flh/bizplan.htm>  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/olsp/strategicplans.htm>

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?**      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FLH has annual performance measures that assess the program's progress in achieving both the FLH-specific long-term goals and the FHWA long-term goals, to which FLH contributes indirectly. The measures are based on results from customer surveys. While these outcome measures are acceptable, the addition of output measures (e.g., number of training sessions provided to Native American tribes) could augment the program's annual measures of performance.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Performance Plan 2003 contains the annual performance measures that help to meet long-term goals. The FHWA annual performance plan states annual performance measures to assess progress in achieving long-term goals. Condition and performance measures are described in the FLH Business Plan 2001 - 2005. These have since been turned over to the appropriate FLMAs. The FLH 2003 - 2007 Business Plan has new performance measures that specifically pertain to the FLH program.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?**      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The baselines for the FLH annual measures have been established through several years of recording data and the targets are ambitious. The target of 85% for use in the survey measures was developed in consultation with the national survey consultant group, International Research Institute, Inc. of Fairfax, VA.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway Business plans 2001 - 2005, 2003 -2007, and the Federal Lands Highway Performance Plan 2003.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.5      Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Although they are not required to commit to FLH and FHWA long-term and annual goals, program partners are encouraged to share these goals and FLH has reasonably obtained partner buy-in. Through its joint administration with FLMAs of federally-owned roads, FLH assists partners in accomplishing their missions by providing transportation solutions. Through Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) with FLMAs, FLH is able to clarify program responsibilities and influence partners to commit to FLH and FHWA goals. In coordinating the FLH program with FLMAs, FHWA stresses the importance of national goals of improving safety, reducing congestion, and protecting the environment. FLH is also sponsoring a performance measurement steering committee to coordinate the transportation performance measures among FLMAs, in an effort to develop common measures. Also, in support of the President's National Park Legacy program, FLH and the National Park Service are coordinating their commitments to further improve the transportation infrastructure within the national parks.

**Evidence:** FLMAs, States, and tribes report data on number of injuries and fatalities, percent of travel under congested conditions, and the physical condition of roads and bridges. Partners submit information on highway conditions to NHTSA and FHWA for the National Bridge Inventory on a regular basis. NHTSA collects information on highway related injuries and fatalities. MOAs provide written documentation of FLMA responsibilities and commitments. FLMA strategic plans, while not specifically focused on transportation issues, also reference safety and mobility (access) goals.

**2.6      Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**      Answer: NO                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** While independent evaluations have been conducted for selected portions of the program, there are no comprehensive, regularly scheduled, independent evaluations currently conducted. Both the Departments of the Interior and Transportation Inspector General have evaluated Federal bridges and the Indian Reservation Roads activities. GAO has issued a report on the use of Indian Reservation road administrative funds. Federal Lands has sponsored other independent evaluations in the past, including program reviews by Booze-Allen and peer reviews conducted by the American Society of Civil Engineers. Results from these evaluations have been used to improve program processes.

**Evidence:** IG and GAO reports: [No. 00-I-597] Independent Auditors Report on Bureau of Indian Affairs Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1999; [No. 99-i-959] Audit Report on Deferred Maintenance, National Park Service; [No.TR-1998-079] Inspection of Federally Owned Bridges; [No. 96-I-870] Final Audit Report on the Road Construction Program, Bureau of Indian Affairs; GAO/AIMD-00-285R BIA's Use of Highway Trust Fund Resources; GAO/RCED-98-14 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE Review of Project Selection for Five Discretionary Programs; RCED-97-160R Forest Service: Construction of National Forest Roads.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.7      Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Although FLHP is authorized on a 6-year basis and has not implemented a cost-accounting system, beginning in FY 2004, FHWA has provided a performance-based budget to Congress. FLHP reinforces the linkages between performance and budget through the Administration's reauthorization proposal, SAFETEA. Within this proposal, FLHP has based the allocation of safety and recreational road funding on performance results.

**Evidence:** FY 2004 budget submission. Also, in support of the safety goal through reauthorization, FLH is proposing to develop and fund a highway safety program for the FLMAs (section 1804 of the proposed SAFETEA legislation).

**2.8      Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FLH has taken significant steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies, which includes revising adopting long-term and annual goals as well as relevant targets, and measures based on its experience gained as a GPRA pilot. FLH has also revised its strategic planning chapter. With the new business plan these goals and measures have been refined.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway Business plans 2001 - 2005 and 2003 -2007; and revised FLH manual chapter on strategic planning.

**3.1      Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FLH collects information on program delivery, program administration, customer satisfaction, injuries, and fatalities, as well as roadway and bridge conditions on a regular basis. While existing authorizing language for the program does not allow much flexibility in using this information to make resource reallocations, the information is used to manage the program in other ways. For example, collected performance information is used during the "August redistribution" process to move funds from agencies whose projects have not met schedules to others that are ready to be awarded. Also, information is used to assign workload for staff and contractors, as was done for mega-projects. Further, performance requirements are proposed in SAFETEA for the new safety and recreational roads programs, for which funds to the FLMAs would be distributed based on performance results.

**Evidence:** The FHWA Performance Plan and the Conditions and Performance report publish data on performance that is routinely collected from the Federal partners and States (forest highways). Condition information is also reported in Federal agency reauthorization resource papers. Section 1804 of the proposed SAFETEA legislation.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.2      Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FLMAs and States (forest highways) are generally held accountable by the nature of the formulas and set amounts for each funding category. FLH requires additional financial accountability and reporting of obligations by partners. FLH program managers are held accountable to their commitments through FHWA's performance appraisal system and those who do not perform are relegated to other support roles. Regional FLMA management holds their local planners accountable for completing their share of the overall FLH program. If projects miss deadlines, they are not constructed and returned to the queue of projects to again compete with other projects from across the country. As per their contract, contractors must meet schedule and performance requirements and are subject to fines for not doing so. Contractors who do not meet their contract requirements and/or are found guilty of waste, fraud, and abuse may lose their license and can be barred from bidding on government jobs.

**Evidence:** FLH works with FLMAs and States (forest highways) to develop transportation improvement program and projects. FHWA has MOUs with other Federal agencies for most FLH program funding categories and tri-party agreements with States for forest highways. Indian tribes perform activities and projects funded through the Indian reservation road program under P.L. 93-638 contracts and agreements.

**3.3      Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The majority of funds for this program are obligated in a timely manner. Public lands highway funding earmarked for projects by Congress is occasionally not obligated in a timely manner because funding is earmarked before projects are ready to begin. Nearly all of the funds for this program are spent for the intended purpose. Some small amounts of Indian Reservation Road funds were mismanaged, but these occurrences are an anomaly.

**Evidence:** SF 133 reports and FHWA account reports on FHWA, Federal agencies, and State (forest highways and public lands highways) obligations show that almost all funding is obligated in a timely manner.

**3.4      Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The program's performance plans include efficiency measures and targets. In FY 2000, FHWA identified 35 positions as potentially available for competitive sourcing and successfully converted to contract 15% of those positions in accordance with OMB guidance. In its FY 2002 inventory, the FHWA identified 245 positions that were in commercial functions, of which 14 positions reside within FLH. FHWA and FLH are pursuing a goal of competing between 40 and 50 percent of the FY 2002 inventory positions beginning in FY 2004. In addition to the President's Management Agenda challenge that drives the Competitive Sourcing initiatives, FLH historically contracts a large percent (40%) of its program activities. The requirement to use consultant services has been driven by FTE requirements and not necessarily by cost benefit comparisons.

**Evidence:** FHWA and FLH Performance Plans contain detailed performance measurements. FHWA also has business cases for its relevant programs. Cost information comparing Federal workforce versus consultant services is available in every FLH division office. Project managers prepare their preliminary engineering design cost estimates based on whether the job is to be designed within the office or by outside contractors. Prices vary between consultants and the date of their indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** Program partners coordinate their maintenance and improvement activities with the FLH program funded projects that they administer. FHWA collaborates and coordinates with its division offices, other Federal agencies, States, local governments, and transportation organizations. FHWA works closely with NHTSA and FMCSA on safety and freight programs and with EPA on strategic planning and environment programs. FHWA also sponsors local meetings and outreach programs.

**Evidence:** DOT strategic and performance plans.

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA uses effective financial management practices in administering program funds. FHWA is in the process of updating their DAFIS financial management system with a new DELPHI system. FLH, through the FHWA Budget office, is also involved in implementing a new managerial cost accounting program. All of these financial programs have strong error prevention features.

**Evidence:** FHWA's erroneous payments rate is less than one percent and the program has received clean audits in recent years.

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA has implemented a new financial management system and a protocol for identifying and recovering erroneous payments. FLH also participates in the dashboard performance measurement system initiated by Administrator Peters. This system gives top management a monthly view of the progress and performance of the agency on key focus areas.

**Evidence:** FHWA has provided a detailed description of its erroneous payments program. The new financial management system tracks comprehensive financial data.

**3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA has sufficient oversight capacity and receives information from Federal agencies, Indian tribes and States (forest highways and public lands highways) on their Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) and planning activities. FLH and partner staff conduct field reviews of selected project and program activities. FLH is also participating in the agency's incorporation of risk management techniques in selecting partner program areas that are prime for review.

**Evidence:** FHWA has published an oversight policy, and the Conditions & Performance Report and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) provide information on grantee activities.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.BF2**      **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The program collects performance data on an annual or bi-annual basis. Most partners contribute to this data collection. FLH also collects some of this data for its program partners. The FLH program makes its performance data available to the public via its four websites and through its various publications.

**Evidence:** Partners submit information on highway conditions to FLH and bridge conditions to the National Bridge Inventory on a regular basis. NHTSA collects information on highway related injuries and fatalities. Condition information is found in the Conditions and Performance report and Federal agency resource papers. Web sites: <http://www.wfl.fhwa.dot.gov>; <http://www.cflhd.gov>; <http://www.efl.fhwa.dot.gov>; <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/flh>.

**4.1**      **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**      Answer: LARGE EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** While the program has not met all of its long-term performance goals, it has made adequate progress in achieving these outcome goals. The change in results between 2001 and 2002 for measures #1 and #2 is a result of redefinition of costs. The new measures cover all funding that passes through the FLH program including reimbursable funds for work performed for other Federal agencies). The 2001 measure only covered funding allocated to the program.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway Business plans 2001 - 2005, 2003 -2007.

**4.2**      **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**      Answer: LARGE EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** While the program has not met all of its annual performance goals, it has shown progress towards meeting targets. Some baselines, targets and measures were recently revised to reflect the experience gained as a GPRA pilot.

**Evidence:** The Federal Lands Highway Business plans 2001 - 2005, 2003 -2007; draft FLH manual chapter on performance measures; historical data from 1989 to present.

**4.3**      **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**      Answer: LARGE EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The FLH has demonstrated its improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness. In 2000, FLH completed a benchmarking study to optimize its use of contractor services. This study compared outsourcing costs and benefits for 12 State DOTs and several consulting firms. Based on the model developed from this study, FLH is fine-tuning its organizational structure to improve its program delivery effectiveness.

**Evidence:** FLH 2000 Benchmarking Study and FLH annual reports.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant                      Direct Federal

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	67%	Effective

**4.4**                      **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**                      Answer: YES                      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In the course of delivering engineering services to other Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs), FLH makes use of in-house staff, consulting firms, and various State highway departments. While production results vary on a project-by-project basis, FLMA customer satisfaction survey results indicate that for a variety of reasons, they prefer to have their projects designed and constructed by FLH in-house processes.

**Evidence:** Customer satisfaction surveys.

**4.5**                      **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**                      Answer: SMALL EXTENT                      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Internal documents such as the FHWA Performance Plan, the Conditions and Performance Report, and Federal agency resource papers provide good analysis but are not independent. IG and GAO reports tend to focus on particular aspects of the program, but they do not provide a comprehensive evaluation of the program in relation to specific performance measures. FLH has in the past requested and received peer reviews conducted by the American Society of Civil Engineers and Booz & Allen. In coordination with their FLMA partners, FLH also conducts bi-annual user surveys. The results of these surveys help FLH focus on specific program improvements. While these external reviews indicate that certain aspects of the program are relatively effective and also help the FLH program effectively improve their performance, they are not specifically focused on systematic program reviews.

**Evidence:** IG and GAO reports: [No. 00-I-597] Independent Auditors Report on Bureau of Indian Affairs Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1999; [No. 99-i-959] Audit Report on Deferred Maintenance, National Park Service; [No.TR-1998-079] Inspection of Federally Owned Bridges; [No. 96-I-870] Final Audit Report on the Road Construction Program, Bureau of Indian Affairs; GAO/AIMD-00-285R BIA's Use of Highway Trust Fund Resources; GAO/RCED-98-14 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE Review of Project Selection for Five Discretionary Programs; RCED-97-160R Forest Service: Construction of National Forest Roads. ASCE Peer Review reports. Booz-Allen program evaluation report. User survey reports.

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Program Delivery Costs (measure/targets adjusted and redefined in FY 2002). This metric measures the percent of funds to deliver projects to construction.

**Additional Information:** Percent of funds to deliver projects to construction. Measure adjusted and redefined in FY 2002.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001	<28%	<29%	
2002	<28%	<29%	
2007	<25%		

**Measure:** Percent of Funds Obligated (measure/targets adjusted and redefined in FY 2002). This metric measures the percent of obligations completed during a fiscal year.

**Additional Information:** Percent of obligations completed during the fiscal year. Measure adjusted and redefined in FY 2002.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001	100%	98%	
2002	100%	98%	
2007	80-85%		

**Measure:** Employee Survey Results

**Additional Information:** Based on a score of 0-100

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	>85%	59.4%	
2002	>85%	61%	
2003	>85%		
2004	>85%		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Employee Survey Results

**Additional Information:** Based on a score of 0-100

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2005	>85%		

**Measure:** Program Administration Customer Satisfaction

**Additional Information:** Based on a score of 0-100

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	>85%	75.1%	
2002	>85%	73%	
2003	>85%		
2004	>85%		
2005	>85%		

**Measure:** Project Development Customer Satisfaction. This measure assesses customers rating of performance by a score of 0 to 100.

**Additional Information:** Based on a score of 0-100

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	>85%	>85%	
2002	>85%	>85%	
2003	>85%		
2004	>85%		
2005	>85%		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Federal Lands  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Completed Project Customer Satisfaction

**Additional Information:** Based on a score of 0-100

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	>85%	83.5%	
2002	>85%	84.5%	
2003	>85%		
2004	>85%		
2005	>85%		

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) is consistent with authorizing legislation to reduce commercial motor vehicle (CMV)-involved crashes, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective state CMV safety programs and is in close alignment with the agency mission of saving lives and reducing injuries by preventing truck and bus crashes.

**Evidence:** Motor carrier safety grant program was authorized by the Surface Transportation Safety Act of 1982 (STAA), and reauthorized by Section 4003 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21, 112 Stat. 395-398) and Section 103 of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (MCSIA). (Authority: 49 U.S.C. 31100-31104, 31108, 31136, 31140-31141, 31161, 31310-31311, 31502; and 49 CFR 1.48. Regulation: 49 CFR Part 350.) MCSAP is consistent with authorizing legislation to reduce commercial motor vehicle (CMV)-involved crashes, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective state CMV safety programs. MCSAP aligns closely with the agency mission of saving lives and reducing injuries by preventing truck and bus crashes and DOT Highway Safety performance and Safety strategic goals reflected in the DOT Strategic and Performance Plans.

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Trucks are over-represented in fatal highway crashes. About 12% of all people killed in motor vehicle incidents are involved in a crash with a large truck, yet trucks represent only 4 percent of registered vehicles and about 7 percent of the vehicle-miles of travel.

**Evidence:** Aspects of Large Truck Safety have been identified as management challenges by GAO and DOT/OIG. DOT OIG recommendations (TR-1999-01) are specifically addressed in sections 206, 208, 217, and 222 of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act (MCSIA, 1999).

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Enlisting the efforts of state agencies greatly expands the resources available for and broadens the reach of safety enforcement. FMCSA authorization includes regulation of interstate (and foreign/border) motor vehicle transportation. State involvement extends enforcement to intrastate commerce. The MCSAP maintenance of effort requirements (see 49 CFR Part 350.301) ensure these federal grant funds do not supplant state funds for commercial vehicle safety efforts.

**Evidence:** GAO (GAO-02-495) confirms the complementarity of federal and MCSAP-supported state programs. FMCSA is the only federal agency that addresses and remediates the causes of commercial motor vehicle crashes and resulting injuries and fatalities. Prior to 1982, few states and no federal agencies focused on commercial vehicle safety issues including vehicle defects, motor carrier compliance or special driver requirements. Unlike NHTSA's state grant program that focuses on educational traffic safety efforts, MCSAP grants provide for direct state motor carrier enforcement activities.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In 2003, FMCSA harmonized its CMV safety goal in a consolidated Department of Transportation's highway safety goal with NHTSA and FHWA. MCSAP has been a key contributor to reversing the trend in commercial motor vehicle fatalities in recent years. Results and evidence support the program's effectiveness. Program initiatives aimed at improving the focus and effectiveness of the MCSAP program are being considered in the context of surface transportation reauthorization.

**Evidence:** Despite significant progress, motor carrier safety continues to be a persistent national problem. In recent years, approximately 5,000 people a year have been killed in highway incidents involving large trucks. MCSAP has proven effective at marshalling state enforcement activity, providing a safety multiplier, and encouraging consistency of enforcement protocols; extending enforcement of FMCSRs and safe practices.

**1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** MCSAP is a central element in a coordinated strategy to reduce fatalities in crashes involving large trucks. Without MCSAP and coordinating strategies, it could be expected that fatalities would increase along with the increases in traffic and exposure. The program's impact is evidenced in the difference between potentially increasing fatalities and the actual reductions realized, the delta represents lives saved.

**Evidence:** MCSAP supports state-conducted motor carrier safety activities to ensure compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs), including compliance reviews, roadside inspections, and traffic enforcement. MCSAP grants to states contribute, with other safety mitigation strategies/programs (including partnership, outreach, information/research, education, rulemaking, compliance, and enforcement), as an integral part of a coordinated strategy to increase compliance with FMCSRs and reduce crashes, fatalities, and injuries. MCSAP-supported state-level motor carrier safety interventions have contributed to reduced fatalities each of the past five years (1997-2002), a reduction of more than 9% over the timeframe. This improvement has been accomplished in the face of annual increases in commercial motor vehicle miles traveled (VMT), estimated at approximately 3.4% per annum. The large truck fatality rate has been reduced from 2.7 per million CVMT to 2.28\* over the same period.

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The program has one specific long-term goal - to reduce the rate of fatalities in crashes involving large trucks. This long-term goal has been translated into specific performance targets and is directly tied to the DOT's Safety strategic goal and Highway Safety performance goal.

**Evidence:** The program's ambitious long-term goal is to reduce the rate of large truck fatalities to 1.65 fatalities per 100 million CVMT by 2008. This goal translates to a 41% reduction in the number of fatalities between 1996 and 2008. Related to this overarching goal, the agency also tracks as indicators the number of fatalities and persons injured in crashes involving large trucks, and the rate of persons injured in crashes involving large trucks.

**Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)**

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	88%	88%	60%	

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The agency manages to annual targets for reduction of fatality rate, and monitors fatalities and injuries and injury rate as leading indicators. The agency also establishes and tracks its progress toward accomplishment of annual performance targets for programmatic outputs, including federal- and state-conducted compliance reviews and roadside inspections. Annual performance targets are established for combined federal/state roadside inspections and federal compliance reviews. State recipients of the MCSAP program are required to create Commercial Vehicle Safety Plans (CVSPs) that must address 5 essential MCSAP performance elements, which contribute to the agency's long-term goals, including roadside inspections, compliance reviews, traffic enforcement, data, and public education. Data timelines and quality standards are established and tracked.

**Evidence:** The FMCSA's long-term safety objective is to reduce the rate of truck related fatalities to 1.65 per 100 million Commercial Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT), by the year 2008. This goal equates to a 41% reduction in rate of fatalities from those experienced in 1996. FMCSA sets annual performance targets for achieving this reduction and is on track towards achieving the 1.65 long-term goal, having reduced the number of truck related fatalities and rate of truck-related fatalities every year for the past five years. Targets for essential operational program outputs, including those supported by the MCSAP program, are addressed in the agency's annual performance plan and budget.

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** States address five MCSAP safety performance elements in their Commercial Vehicle Safety Plans (CVSPs)/grant applications. In addition, in order to qualify for incentive funding, states agree to specific safety performance objectives ("Reduce the number of fatal accidents involving large trucks" and "Reduce the large-truck-involved fatal accident rate", among others) that link to agency goals. The FMCSA tracks the performance of each state with regard to the outcome goal of reducing truck-related fatalities and accidents in each state, and tracks their progress in achieving these goals.

**Evidence:** GAO (GAO-02-495) confirms that annual state plans include quantifiable performance objectives and measures and strategies and specific activities for achieving the objectives. The MCSAP program office sends out an annual planning memorandum to its state partners that outline the performance goals for the upcoming fiscal year. Since 2000, all state MCSAP CVSPs were required to be prepared in a performance-based format. Risk-based training has been and remains readily available for any state in prioritizing goals and assigning resources. In addition, qualification for special incentive funding requires state adoption of specific performance objectives for: reduction of fatal accidents, reduction of CMV-involved fatality rate, CDL verification, and inspection and accident data timelines.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The baselines and targets that the MCSAP program contributes to are contained in the FMCSA's annual integrated performance budget and performance plans and reports.

**Evidence:** The ambitious target for the program is to reduce the rate of truck related fatalities to 1.65 per 100 million Commercial Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT), by the year 2008. This goal equates to a 41% reduction in rate of fatalities from the baseline fatality rate of 2.81 fatalities per 100 million CVMT in 1996.

**Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)**

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	88%	88%	60%	

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** States address five MCSAP safety performance elements in their Commercial Vehicle Safety Plans (CVSPs)/grant applications. In addition, in order to qualify for incentive funding, states agree to specific safety performance objectives ("Reduce the number of fatal accidents involving large trucks" and "Reduce the large-truck-involved fatal accident rate", among others) that link to agency goals. The FMCSA tracks the performance of each state with regard to the outcome goal of reducing truck-related fatalities and accidents in each state, and tracks their progress in achieving these goals.

**Evidence:** GAO (GAO-02-495) confirms that annual state plans include quantifiable performance objectives and measures and strategies and specific activities for achieving the objectives. The MCSAP program office sends out an annual planning memorandum to its state partners that outline the performance goals for the upcoming fiscal year. Since 2000, all state MCSAP CVSPs were required to be prepared in a performance-based format. Risk-based training has been and remains readily available for any state in prioritizing goals and assigning resources. In addition, qualification for special incentive funding requires state adoption of specific performance objectives for: reduction of fatal accidents, reduction of CMV-involved fatality rate, CDL verification, and inspection and accident data timelines.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Every year, the FMCSA engages an outside, independent organization to review the effectiveness of the activities funded by the MCSAP program and assess the contribution of these activities towards the agency's outcome goals. The Volpe National Transportation Systems Center annually evaluates and issues reports on the effectiveness of safety mitigation strategies (FMCSA Safety Program Performance Measures - Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model, February 2002; FMCSA Safety Performance Program Performance Measures - Intervention Model: Roadside Inspection and Traffic Enforcement Effectiveness Assessment, December 2001). Published reports are available on-line at: <http://ai.volpe.dot.gov/ProgramMeasures/PM/PerfMeas.asp>.

**Evidence:** Evaluation of the effectiveness of safety enforcement operations is conducted annually by the: (1) Roadside Inspection and Traffic Enforcement Intervention Model and (2) Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model. In 2001, 83% of MCSAP funding supported state-conducted safety enforcement interventions; roadside inspections (58%), traffic enforcement (18%), and compliance reviews (7%). The 2002 Roadside Inspection and Traffic Enforcement Intervention Model estimates that in 2000, 12,668 crashes were avoided, resulting in 544 lives saved and 8,681 injuries avoided as a result of roadside inspection and traffic enforcement. The 2002 Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model estimates that in 2000, 1,500 crashes were avoided, 64 lives saved, and 1,028 injuries avoided attributable to compliance reviews. MCSAP has been reviewed by GAO (GAO-02-495, Regulatory Programs: Balancing Federal and State Responsibilities, 3/02) and DOT OIG (AS-FH-4-012, 6/94 and TR-1999-091, 4/99). DOT OIG emphasizes the importance of strong enforcement to ensuring motor carrier safety.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The FMCSA has developed a set of logic models, included in its annual integrated performance budget, that details the alignment between funding for all programs, including the MCSAP program, and performance on agency strategic goals. The impact of funding, policy and legislative changes are reflected in the budget submission. The MCSAP program has contributed to achieving reduced fatalities five consecutive years (1998-2002), despite annual increases in CVMT. Injuries have been reduced for two consecutive years.

**Evidence:** In the logic models contained in the agency's annual integrated performance budget, MCSAP funding aligns with the agency safety program objective "Support state enforcement, regulatory compatibility, technology deployment, and safety information capabilities" which links to the performance goal "Save lives and reduce injuries by preventing truck and bus crashes", which links, in turn, to the DOT Highway Safety performance goal and ultimately to the Safety strategic goal.

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The agency has integrated its performance planning and reporting with its budget process and has a strong strategic planning process. The only potential deficiency in the strategic planning process for the MCSAP program is that the state government agencies that receive MCSAP funding are not under the agency authority since they are state, not Federal, agencies. However, the FMCSA actively works to mitigate this structural weakness by including state officials in the strategic planning process. The agency has tasked each state Division Administrator to develop specific, performance-based plans for their FMCSA Division in coordination with their state counterparts. The MCSAP program coordinated with the states is a major contributor to FMCSA's overall strategy aimed at reducing large truck-related fatalities and injuries.

**Evidence:** MCSAP is identified in the FMCSA's annual integrated performance budget, performance plans, and reports. Program evaluations are conducted to inform the strategic planning process, which are aimed at identifying deficiencies in the strategic planning of the program. Identified deficiencies are being addressed as part of an ongoing process to revise the agency's strategic plan. Specifically, in FY 2004, FMCSA will engage programs in a comprehensive evaluation process identifying and addressing challenges which affect the attainment of annual performance goals.

**3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** MCSAP program managers receive monthly data quality and timeliness reports. Information is also received regarding state-level rulemaking that affects compatibility. Ensuring compatibility of state regulations with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) is a key program goal. MCSAP funding is conditioned upon state adoption and enforcement of state laws that are compatible with the FMCSRs, as such, it contributes to elevating regulatory and enforcement standards across the country.

**Evidence:** The Timeliness of Uploads Report and the Data Non-Match Reports from MCMIS (Motor Carrier Management Information System) are used to quickly identify upload deficiencies, thus allowing remedial action. State rulemaking information provided to the program by the state or field staff enables the agency to take appropriate action to remedy potential compatibility issues.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The MCSAP program has been strategically designed to incorporate incentive grants for those grantees that demonstrate improvement in identified safety and program performance factors. Moreover, in those instances where program partners (i.e. grantees) do not have compatible CMV safety laws and regulations pertaining to interstate commerce, mechanisms are in place to reduce and/or withhold MCSAP funding. The States Safety Plans are scrutinized by MCSAP staff to ensure adherence to established funding eligibility criteria.

**Evidence:** FMCSA State Division Administrators prepare monitoring plans for each grant program. In addition, reimbursement vouchers are scrutinized to ensure that costs are reasonable and fall within the Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan (CVSP) budget.

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Funds are obligated by FMCSA State Division Administrators upon receipt of the allocation memo. MCSAP funds are spent by the states in accordance with the approved CVSP.

**Evidence:** MCSAP program managers monitor the obligation activity for timeliness on a regular basis. FMCSA State Division Administrators review all reimbursement vouchers to ensure that claimed expenses are in conformance with the budget submitted with the approved CVSP. Any questionable expenditures are immediately resolved with state partners.

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

**Explanation:** In addition to formula grants, MCSAP makes available incentive grants to states adopting specific safety performance improvement objectives. Incentive funds are awarded to states demonstrating performance improvement with regard to specific performance goals. The incremental performance advances represent efficiencies in program delivery.

**Evidence:** GAO (GAO-02-495) recognizes MCSAP financial incentives provided to states achieving reductions in CMV fatal accident rates. State incentive grant funding requires state performance improvement with regard to the following specific safety goals: (1) reduce the number of fatal accidents involving large trucks, (2) reduce the large-truck-involved fatal accident rate or maintain a rate that is among the lowest 10% of all MCSAP recipients, (3) verify commercial driver's licenses during all roadside inspections, (4) Upload CMV inspection data in accordance with current FMCSA policy guidelines, and (5) upload CMV accident reports in accordance with current FMCSA policy guidelines.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** MCSAP grants are directly integrated into the FMCSA's coordinated motor carrier safety strategy, along with motor carrier partnership, outreach, information/research, education, rulemaking, compliance, and enforcement program activities, which all contribute to the achievement of motor carrier safety outcomes. Together, the spectrum of mitigation activities leverages the effectiveness of each individually. At the same time, FMCSA motor carrier programs complement and collaborate with highway and transportation safety programs of DOT, FHWA, NHTSA, various associations, and state partners to achieve shared safety objectives. The very purpose of MCSAP grants are to collaborate and coordinate truck-related safety activities between the Federal government and the states.

**Evidence:** Planning for/integration of MCSAP goals in broader agency fatality and injury outcomes is manifest in the agency performance budget and performance reports, with accountability for performance cascaded through the organization (HQ and Field) via a network of performance accountability contracts. Department of Transportation-level collaboration is reflected in the consolidated Highway Safety planning in the DOT Strategic Plan and performance metrics and monitoring in the DOT Performance Budget. In addition, MCSAP implementing regulations require states to coordinate their CVSPs with state highway safety programs under Title 23 USC (see 49 CFR 350.211).

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** There have been no internal control weakness reported by auditors. A DAFIS and voucher review process has been established to ensure payment for the appropriate purpose and prevention of erroneous payments.

**Evidence:** Each FMCSA program office is responsible for internally tracking all obligations and reconciling obligations against the monthly DAFIS reports. Budget and Finance division, in turn, works closely with FHWA Finance office to resolve any funding issues, report DAFIS discrepancies for correction, maintain funding codes and allotments, and ensure prompt payment of all invoices.

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The effectiveness of essential program compliance/enforcement interventions is evaluated on an annual basis to inform strategy development and resource allocation decisions. Program evaluation findings are reviewed in the development of annual agency and Departmental strategic and performance plans and reports.

**Evidence:** The FMCSA strives for continuous improvement in its management and has an active evaluation program aimed at improving program effectiveness, efficiency and agency performance. When the MCSAP program staff identifies management deficiencies in areas such as strategic staffing management and financial resource allocation, they initiate corrections and/or modification to management plans and practices. Periodic leadership meetings, including forums with State partners and industry interest groups, are held to vet identified program issues and to develop strategies for incorporating corrections into ongoing management operations.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	88%	60%	Effective

**3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FMCSA State Division Administrators establish monitoring plans to review states performance activities submitted in the CVSP. This plan includes site visits to ensure program conformance with the CVSP. States submit quarterly performance reports that document completion of projected activities and goals. Progress and final vouchers contain expenditure details which ensure resources are used for the purposes identified in the state's CVSPs.

**Evidence:** Narrative quarterly performance reports, provided by state, documentation of periodic site visits by division staff, and review of expense vouchers for funds used for their designated purpose.

**3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Program performance data (inspections, crashes, and compliance reviews) are electronically uploaded to the Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS). This data is available to the public from the from the FMCSA website. Progress in reducing motor carrier crashes, fatalities, and injuries is reported in the FMCSA and DOT annual performance reports, and periodic press releases.

**Evidence:** The agency's annual report data is available through the Analysis and Information (A&I) website (<http://ai.volpe.dot.gov/>), including information on the number of inspection reports, crash reports, and compliance reviews submitted by the states.

**4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In 2003, FMCSA harmonized its CMV safety goal in a consolidated Department of Transportation's highway safety goal with NHTSA and FHWA. The agency's long-term safety goal is to reduce the large truck fatality rate 41% from 1996 to 2008, to a rate of 1.65. In the face of increased exposure owing to annual increases in commercial motor vehicle miles traveled (CVMT), fatalities involving large trucks have been reduced each of the past five years. Injuries and injury rates that the agency tracks as leading indicators have also been reduced. Robust state safety programs and enforcement interventions supported by MCSAP are important factors in saving these lives and avoiding these injuries.

**Evidence:** The agency achieved its target for large truck fatality rate in 2002 of 2.28 bettering the agency target of 2.32. Trends for all of the agency's leading indicators are encouraging, suggesting agency mitigation strategies are on target and having a positive impact and follows an increase of 2.6% in commercial vehicles miles traveled. This rate improvement interprets to 1,138 lives saved in 2002.

**4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** MCSAP program goals link and contribute to the accomplishment of the motor carrier safety long-term outcome goal of reducing CMV-related fatality rate. The program is advancing in its achievement of specific program-level goals.

**Evidence:** The program manages to intermediate outcomes of (1) compatibility with FMCSRs, (2) quality and timeliness of state safety data, and (3) completion of motor carrier compliance reviews.

**Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)**

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	88%	88%	60%	

**4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** While MCSAP grant funds have increased incrementally since establishment of the agency's baseline targets in FY 1998, overhead expenses funded under the agency's limitation on administrative expenses have not grown above annual inflation factors.

**Evidence:** The downward trend in large truck-related fatality rate, and achievement of the agency 2002 large truck fatality rate target in 2002, has been achieved without increasing administrative overhead costs beyond annual inflation factors.

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Several agencies within the Federal government strive to reduce fatalities. Within the Department of Transportation, NHTSA, FHWA, and FMCSA share the highway fatality goal since each of the three agencies have a responsibility to improve safety on our nation's highways. With achievement of the agency large truck fatality rate target in 2002, progress toward reduction of truck-related fatalities and injuries is tracking with Departmental objectives. Data supporting DOT Highway Safety measures for all highway modal administrations are housed in NHTSA FARS.

**Evidence:** The agency has achieved its target for large truck fatality rate reduction in 2002. Despite annual increases in VMT and CVMT, fatalities and injuries in crashes involving large trucks have been reduced. Large-truck-related fatality and injury rates have also been reduced. Results are reflected in the DOT FY 2003 Performance Plan/FY 2001 Performance Report.

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Rigorous program effectiveness evaluations of the major operational compliance/enforcement activities supported by MCSAP are conducted annually by the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center reports on the effectiveness of safety mitigation strategies (FMCSA Safety Program Performance Measures - Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model, February 2002; FMCSA Safety Performance Program Performance Measures - Intervention Model: Roadside Inspection and Traffic Enforcement Effectiveness Assessment, December 2001) are available on-line at: <http://ai.volpe.dot.gov/ProgramMeasures/PM/PerfMeas.asp>.

**Evidence:** Aspects of MCSAP have been reviewed by GAO (GAO-02-495) and DOT OIG (AS-FH-4-012, TR-1999-091). The effectiveness of compliance reviews, roadside inspections, and traffic enforcement in reducing crashes, fatalities, and injuries is evaluated on an annual basis using the: (1) Intervention Model and (2) Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model. These evaluation models yield annual estimates of crashes avoided, injuries avoided, and lives saved attributable to these interventions. Additional information about the Intervention Model and the Compliance Review Impact Assessment Model accompany this assessment as attachments.

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Grant Program

**Agency:** Department of Transportation

**Bureau:** Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

---

**Measure:** Large Truck Fatalities per 100 Million Commercial Vehicle Miles Traveled (CVMT)

**Additional Information:** The goal is to reduce the rate of large truck-related fatalities per 100 million commercial vehicle miles traveled (CVMT) 41% from 1996 to 2008, resulting in a rate of 1.65 per 100 million CVMT.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2008	<1.65		

**Measure:** Large Truck Fatalities per 100 million per CVMT

**Additional Information:**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	<2.45	2.45	
2002	<2.32	2.28	
2003	<2.19		
2004	<2.07		
2005	<1.96		

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Federal-Aid Highway program provides national policy leadership and federal financial and technical assistance to States to construct and maintain a national system of roads and bridges.

**Evidence:** The Federal-Aid Highways program mission as stated in the FHWA strategic plan. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/fhplan.html>

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The need for a Federal-Aid Highway program was pronounced during the construction of the national interstate system of highways. Today, this program still provides a substantial share of funding for highway projects. It also provides valuable technical assistance and sets national standards and guidelines.

**Evidence:** The FHWA Conditions and Performance Report states that local and state governments rely on the federal government for 21 percent of their highway funding. Federal funds account for 41 percent of total outlays for highway capital projects. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/2002cpr/index.htm>

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Federal-Aid Highway program ensures a connected system of roads that serve regional and national needs. It also fulfills the important role of redistributing funds among the States to ensure mobility and safety throughout the country. This Federal program is especially important in large land area, low population States, and in States with relatively low fiscal capacity. The nature of the Federal-Aid Highway program stresses State flexibility in the application of the various program funds. While the Administration designates focus areas through legislation, individual project selection is done by the States. FHWA does infer influence on the selection of projects through environmental and eligibility approvals. Stewardship agreements between FHWA Division Offices and State transportation departments define the roles and responsibilities between the two parties and outline procedures that ensure funds spent result in an improved/enhanced highway infrastructure that supports a safe and efficient transportation system.

**Evidence:** The Federal-Aid Highway program accounts for about 21 percent of all highway funding (federal, state, local) and about 41 percent of spending on highway capital projects. State and local governments fund the remainder. While State and local governments contribute more spending on highways than the federal government, approximately 43 percent of all VMT and 70 percent of all freight travel occur on the 163,000-mile road network of the NHS. It is unclear if State/locals could pick up taxes/spending if the federal program were eliminated, although surveys have indicated that States would not increase taxes and spending. Federal influence is evidenced in their approval of environmental clearance documents and in the approval of the States financially constrained list of approved projects (STIP). Stewardship Agreements between FHWA every State highway department, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/2002cpr/index.htm>

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** From a financial perspective, funds made available to FHWA are immediately reallocated to the States. Funding that is going to be obligated during a fiscal year is returned to FHWA during August and reallocated to States that can make use of them. From a program perspective, FHWA is devolving more power to the States and increasing their financial flexibility through legislation to provide States with more efficient/effective mechanisms to accomplish the goals of increasing safety and improving mobility. However, with respect to effectiveness, several of the goals work at cross purposes. Decreasing congestion, increases vehicle speeds and the likelihood and severity of crashes. Flexibility in the design of the program allows every State to balance goal resources based on their particular needs. FHWA monitors program effectiveness through financial and program management requirements on major projects. One measure of program efficiency is through their environmental stewardship focus on reducing environmental document completion times.

**Evidence:** Funding procedures used by the FHWA as described in the Financing of Federal-Aid Highways <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/reports/finfedhy.html>. Increased State flexibility described in various sections of Title 1 from ISTEA through TEA-21 through our latest Reauthorization proposals. Organizational excellence measures for program effectiveness and efficiency as described are contained in the FY 2004 performance plan.

**1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The majority of the program funds resources, over 98% of the \$31 billion is either apportioned or allocated to the States in accordance with established legislation. These funds are obligated by the States in accordance with their approved transportation improvement programs. While the program's design provides enormous flexibility to the States, the Administration maintains stewardship and oversight control and often directs priorities through reauthorization and appropriation bills.

**Evidence:** Annual apportionment formulas and distribution tables. Allocation tables. Approved State transportation improvement programs lists. Reauthorization proposal that doubles the Federal focus (\$1 billion) on safety.

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The program has outcome related performance goals that relate to mobility/congestion and safety. These goals were developed and refined in a year long goal evaluation process introduced by the new FHWA Administrator. These three primary focus areas include reducing the number or highway related injuries and fatalities, limiting the percent of travel under congested conditions and improving environmental stewardship and streamlining activities. The program also has national security goals related to infrastructure security and defense mobilization.

**Evidence:** FHWA's strategic plan and their annual performance plan state these goals. These goals are ambitious, focus on outcomes and reflect the purpose of the program. While the safety and environmental goals strive to save lives and reduce pollution, the mobility-related goals for congestion only aim to slow the rate of growth. According to the 2002 Condition and Performance Report, a 17.5% increase in program funding is required to maintain the overall condition and performance of the existing highway system. A 65% increase would be required to address all congestion, safety, environmental, condition and performance issues.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Several of FHWA's targets and timeframes for its long-term measures are extremely ambitious. Specifically targets in Safety, congestion mitigation and environmental stewardship and streamlining. As reported in their performance plans, FHWA has baseline information in these program areas that go back at least seven years. The stewardship and oversight measure for the financial and management of major projects is a new item this year with baselines to be established.

**Evidence:** The FHWA annual performance plan identifies annual performance targets and existing baselines that measure progress in achieving the agency's long term goals.

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The program has annual performance targets that measure progress toward achieving long term programmatic goals (such as safety, environment and mobility). The program also has two efficiency outcome goals; one that measures the timeliness of completing environmental processes, and the other that measures schedules and costs on major projects. FHWA will commit to investigate the feasibility of a similar cost and scheduling measure based on statistical sampling for use on other projects built by State highway departments with FHWA funding.

**Evidence:** FHWA annual performance plan.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** With the exception of several newly implemented goals, FHWA has solid baselines and ambitious targets established for all its annual measures. In the safety, mobility and environment programs, the baselines extends back to 1996. FHWA's goals require coordination with other Federal agencies and extensive amounts of stewardship and oversight with States and local transportation entities. Improving highway safety, reducing congestion and improving environmental procedures are all extremely complex and interrelated processes with no direct and simple solutions.

**Evidence:** The FHWA annual performance plan identifies annual performance targets and existing baselines that measure progress in achieving the agency's long term goals.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The partners of FHWA in the Federal-Aid Highway program are the States and, to a lesser extent, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Many of FHWA's goal areas are established and funded by legislation that is created by State senators and representatives. Through this legislation, States are required to report to FHWA data on the number of injuries and fatalities, percent of travel under congested conditions, and the physical condition of roads and bridges. While FHWA does not require a formal commitment, States are encouraged to share and work toward these goal of improving highway safety and increasing mobility. As part of their Stewardship agreements, individual FHWA Division offices meet with their State counterparts and work to align FHWA's specific goals with State transportation initiatives.

**Evidence:** As their contribution to FHWA's goals, States submit information on highway conditions to the Highway Performance Monitoring System and the National Bridge Inventory on a regular basis. NHTSA collects information from States on highway related injuries and fatalities. Evidence of FHWA and State integration of goals and resource alignment can be seen on various FHWA Division office and State highway department web pages. Specifically FL, KY and IN.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**      Answer: NO      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** While independent evaluations have been conducted for selected portions of the program, there are no comprehensive, regularly scheduled, independent evaluations currently conducted. In the past five years, FHWA has received over 60 GAO audits on various parts of the Federal-aid Highway program. Specifically, there have been audits on FHWA's stewardship and oversight of major projects, and on FHWA's major programs in safety, environmental, and congestion. GAO also annually reports on FHWA's performance and accountability when they issue their Management Challenges and Program Risks report. The Office of Inspector General performed over 37 audit activities during the past five years with at least 10 of these occurring during the past year. The primary focus of these audits have been the stewardship and oversight of major projects.

**Evidence:** GAO regularly evaluates the performance of the Interstate system. For example, a May 2002 GAO report, entitled "Interstate Physical Conditions Have Improved, but Congestion and Other Pressures Continue," evaluates the goals and performance of FHWA's highway infrastructure program.  
<http://www.gao.gov>      /[http://www.oig.dot.gov/docs\\_by\\_area.php?area=24](http://www.oig.dot.gov/docs_by_area.php?area=24)

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Although Federal-aid highway programs are authorized on a 6-year basis and FHWA has not implemented a cost-accounting system, beginning in FY 2004, FHWA has provided a performance-based budget to Congress. In addition, FHWA budgets for all direct and indirect costs associated with administering this program at the Federal level. FHWA reinforces the linkages between performance and budget through the Administration's reauthorization proposal, SAFETEA. In support of the FHWA safety goal, the agency intends to double the amount it spends on highway safety through its reauthorization proposal. Despite the Administration's efforts toward budget and performance integration through its budget submittals and reauthorization proposal, there is only minor evidence that when Congress sets these funding levels every six years that they relate them to program goals.

**Evidence:** FHWA budget justification and Congressional Justifications. Section 1402 of the Administration's SAFETEA reauthorization proposal would double safety funding levels.

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FHWA has taken significant steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies, which includes adopting long-term and annual goals as well as relevant targets and measures. With each performance plan, these goals and measures have been refined. During FY 2003, FHWA has added goals and the corresponding measures the relate to the Administration's emphasis on safety, congestion mitigation and environmental stewardship. FHWA has taken active steps in correcting deficiencies as determined by the GAO management challenges directed at major project stewardship and oversight.

**Evidence:** DOT's FY 2004 Budget submission reflects integration of budget planning and performance planning processes. In addition, the department's reauthorization proposal makes strategic principles the basis of the proposal. The FHWA has documented their goals and objectives at correcting specific management challenges for major project oversight within the Department's 2003-2008 Strategic Plan.

**3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** States regularly report program performance data to DOT on injuries and fatalities, roadway performance and conditions, and environmental measures. FHWA uses this data to develop program priorities, most notably under the Vital Few initiative, which attempts to improve local performance where large deficiencies exist. To date, FWHA has begun working with State partners to develop baseline performance information on local transportation programs. FHWA division offices also use performance data to focus their efforts on areas where individual States need to improve. FHWA could still improve its data collection and management, however. Multi-year authorizing language does not allow DOT to use data to make resource reallocations or to manage the program in other ways. Further, FEMIS, the State financial reporting system to DOT, does not accept performance data. DOT also does not require that States report on cost and schedule performance of their projects. The IG notes that FHWA's information system only tracks costs data on individual contracts, making it difficult to determine the reasons for overall project costs increases.

**Evidence:** OIG Testimony, Management of Cost Drivers on Federal aid Highway Projects, May 8, 2003;

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA does not hold Federal managers accountable for the performance of individual projects (for example cost and schedule overruns) or of State highway programs. Further, FHWA does not penalize States for poor program performance (e.g., poor safety ratings, cost overruns, or schedule slippages) on Federally-sponsored projects. States receive Federal highway dollars according to static formula regardless of results. An exception is that FHWA can withhold funds if a State fails to meet air quality requirements in a non-attainment area. At the contractor level, States may hold construction contractors accountable for not meeting terms of their contracts by withholding payments. Contractors found guilty of waste, fraud, and abuse are debarred and are permanently prevented from bidding on government contracts.

**Evidence:**

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA obligates funds quickly to the states, and there are few cases of fraud or illegal mismanagement of funds. After FHWA apportions Federal-aid funds, States have not always spent funds in a timely manner, though FHWA has taken corrective steps recommended by the IG. Additionally, funding for Congressional earmarks is not always obligated quickly because Congress sometimes provides money long before a project is ready to begin or because the project is not a high priority for local communities.

**Evidence:** DOT IG Report on Inactive Obligations, Sept. 24, 2001.

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA has not defined measures that show whether the organization delivers its program efficiently or cost-effectively. FHWA has undertake some processes that likely contribute to a better run organization, such as competitive sourcing. In recent years, FHWA directly converted six positions from government employees to contractors, and it plans to conduct a public-private competition of 120 positions in 2004. Going forward, FHWA has proposed a pilot program in SAFETEA that would demonstrate the benefits of performance based management.

**Evidence:**

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA collaborates and coordinates with other Federal agencies, States, local governments, and transportation organizations. FHWA works closely with NHTSA and FMCSA on safety and freight programs and with EPA on strategic planning and environment programs. FHWA also sponsors local meetings and outreach programs.

**Evidence:** FHWA works with division offices to develop work plans with States. FHWA also enters into MOUs with other Federal agencies (e.g., planning). In the safety areas, refer to Title 23 Sections 157 (seat belt) 163 (drinking and driving) and section 402 (highway safety programs).

**Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)**

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	88%	56%	60%	

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** Overall, FHWA's has good financial management practices. FHWA's system for reimbursing the states is highly automated where States report financial data through an on line system -- FEMIS -- to DOT, which promptly processes financial transactions. In terms of program oversight, FHWA could do more to ensure that all State highway programs have financial management systems in place that can track project cost and schedule information. For example, the IG reported that FHWA staff did not question State reports of low rates of erroneous payments. At the Federal level, FHWA recently installed a new financial management system--DELPHI-- that will more accurately report financial data than the old system--DAPHIS-- which is not FASB compliant. FHWA is also in the initial planning stages of developing a cost accounting system that will feed into DELPHI. The system will allow States to link spending on projects to DOT's larger performance goals, which the current system cannot do.

**Evidence:** OIG Report, Report on Inactive Obligations, September 24, 2001 [http://www.oig.dot.gov/show\\_pdf.php?id=582](http://www.oig.dot.gov/show_pdf.php?id=582)

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA responds to the recommendations of the IG and GAO for improving its program management. Moreover, FHWA leadership recognizes a major challenge of the organization is to improve management oversight of States highway programs, including oversight of higher level management and financial issues, and it has take some steps in this direction. For example, FHWA now works closely with States on project plans for large projects, and it has started tracking cost growth on all projects of \$10 million or more. Further, it is reviewing the project cost estimating practices of States and using risk analysis to identify potential cost overruns. Still, to prevent cost and schedule overruns, FHWA must make program stewardship and oversight a central organizational goal. To do so, FHWA needs to restructure the composition of its workforce to bolster project management and cost estimating skills. Today, FHWA's oversight mission is not clear to program staff, owing to the program's authorization that delegates most program administrative responsibilities to the States.

**Evidence:** FHWA Administrator Mary Peters Testimony before the Senate T and I Committee 2/27/03 <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pressroom/test030227.html>IG testimony; GAO Testimony, Cost and Oversight of Major Highway and Bridget Projects--Issues and Options, May 8, 2003.

**3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?**

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FWHA field staff work very closely with State highway departments providing technical assistance and approving changes to different aspects of a project. Yet until very recently, FWHA has not focused on project and financial oversight, leading to insufficient knowledge about whether Federal funds are used efficiently and effectively. As evidence, the DOT IG reports that FHWA has generally centered with low level issues such as approving change orders, and that this focus has prevented the agency from spotting larger cost issues. There have been cases, for example, where FHWA was surprised by announcements of significant costs increases on major projects, despite reviewing many low level change orders. The IG notes that FHWA's information system only tracks costs for contracts rather than projects. The IG has repeatedly seen unreliable cost estimates that have resulted in substantial cost increases. Further, the IG has found that cases where statewide transportation plans are unrealistic and of little value, despite being reviewed by FHWA. Additionally, GAO reported in May of 2002 that it has previously found that cost growth on major projects and that neither FWHA nor State highway departments tracked the reasons for this. FWHA is now attempting to improve its financial oversight, though its efforts are not yet complete.

**Evidence:** OIG Testimony, Management of Cost Drivers on Federal aid Highway Projects, May 8, 2003; GAO Testimony, Cost and Oversight of Major Highway and Bridget Projects--Issues and Options, May 8, 2003.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**3.BF2**      **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**      Answer: NO      Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FHWA only shares nationally aggregated performance data with the public, which limits its usefulness for the public. Although States report information on system conditions and performance, safety, and environmental data to FHWA, FHWA does disclose State data. Further, FHWA does not collect performance data regarding project costs and schedules from the States. Some States publicly report on the status of a major project through websites, but this is not a FHWA requirement.

**Evidence:** An example of how one State keeps the public aware of their costs, schedules, and performance on Virginia DOT's website.  
<http://virginiadot.org/projects/dashboard-intro.asp>;

**4.1**      **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program has made adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals. When annual targets have been missed they have been missed by a very small percentage. Note: Goals based on FHWA's proposed FY 2004 Performance Plan and Report. Goals reported in the measurement section of this report are all outcome based.

**Evidence:** FHWA's Performance Plan and Report contains the annual targets for each performance measure and data that shows progress being made to achieve long term goals.

**4.2**      **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**      Answer: LARGE EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program has met a majority of their annual performance targets over the past three years. When targets have been missed they have been missed by a very small percentage. Note: Goals based on FHWA FY 2004 Performance Plan and Report. During the past year, FHWA has added additional goals in the areas of stewardship and oversight.

**Evidence:** FHWA's Performance Plan and Report contains the annual targets for each performance measure.

**4.3**      **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**      Answer: NO      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program does not have measures through which to demonstrate improved efficiency or cost effectiveness. Still, FHWA is on track to meet its competitive sourcing goals and it is working to streamline environmental assessment activities. Other efficiencies measures are currently being developed.

**Evidence:** FHWA's Performance Plan and Report contains the annual targets for each performance measure.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	56%	60%	Effective

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In some regards, various aspects of the FHWA Federal Aid program could be compared to other DOT modal Administrations. Specifically; the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, National Highway Safety Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. The FHWA coordinates and aligns many of their goal activities with these Administrations specifically in the areas of safety and mobility.

**Evidence:** PART ratings for 2004. DOT's ranking in external evaluation of Performance plans. FHWA's budget / goal integration offered as government example.

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**      Answer: SMALL EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Internal documents such as the FHWA Performance Plan and the Conditions and Performance Report provide good analysis but are not independent. IG and GAO reports focus on particular aspects of the program, and in those areas provide a comprehensive evaluation of the program in relation to specific performance measures. However, no comprehensive evaluations of the program as a whole are being conducted.

**Evidence:** Specific GAO reports the focus on national level activates include: GAO-03-225 (management challenges); GAO-03-764T (major projects) GAO-03-735T (congestion pricing) GAO-03-474 (oversight of State safety programs); GAO-03-398 9project completion times);GAO-03-338R (environmental reviews). Various specific reports are not number but cover the areas of management of large projects; project financial plans; CMAQ and alternative-fuel vehicles, and duplicate payments.

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Traffic related fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

**Additional Information:** Highway related fatalities and injuries per 100 million vehicle-miles-of-travel. Long term goals is to reduce fatalities by 20% by 2008 from a baseline of 41,501 in 1998 (1.6 fatalities per 100 million VMT in 1998).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	1.5	1.51	
2002	1.4	1.51	
2003	1.4		
2004	1.38		
2005	1.38		

**Measure:** Median time (in months) to complete environmental impact statements and environmental assessments for DOT funded infrastructure projects

**Additional Information:** This measure contributes to goal of reducing pollution and other adverse environmental effects of transportation.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2004	35		
2005	30		

**Measure:** Transportation capability assessment for readiness index score

**Additional Information:** DOT's security score is based on the following scale: A=90-100; B=80-89; C=70-79.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2003		59	
2004	82		
2005	87		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

**Measure:** Percent of vehicle miles traveled on National Highway System (NHS) with acceptable pavement smoothness

**Additional Information:** The condition of the NHS affects wear-and-tear on vehicles, fuel consumption, travel time, congestion, and comfort, as well as public safety. DOT continuously measures the condition of the nation's highways and bridges.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001		90.9	
2002	92	91.6	
2003	92.5		
2004	93		
2005	93.5		

**Measure:** Percent of travel under congested conditions

**Additional Information:** DOT measures the percent of traffic on freeways and major arterial streets in major urban areas moving at less than free flow speeds. In the future, congestion is forecasted to increase. DOT's goal is to slow the annual growth rate of congestion to 0.7 percent.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001		30.4	
2002	30.9	31.1	
2003	31.6		
2004	32.3		
2005	32.5		

**Measure:** Median time to complete and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

**Additional Information:** In FY 2004, the target is to decrease the median completion time for all EIS projects to 48 months.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001		54	
2002			

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Median time to complete and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

**Additional Information:** In FY 2004, the target is to decrease the median completion time for all EIS projects to 48 months.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2003	51		
2004	48		

**Measure:** Percent of schedule milestones and cost estimates for major Federally funded transportation infrastructure projects

**Additional Information:** DOT's target is to achieve 95% of schedule or miss by less than 10%.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2002	95	85	
2003	95		
2004	95		

**Measure:** 12-month average number of area transportation emissions conformity lapses

**Additional Information:** DOT attempts to minimize the number of area transportation conformity lapses through improved integrated transportation and air quality planning. The transportation conformity process is designed to ensure that emissions from an area transportation system are consistent with Clean Air Act goals.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		6	
2002	6	6	
2003	6		
2004	6		
2005	6		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** FHWA Highway Infrastructure

**Agency:** Department of Transportation

**Bureau:** Federal Highway Administration

---

**Measure:** Ratio of wetland replacement resulting from Federal-aid highway projects

**Additional Information:** This measure contributes to goal of reducing pollution and other adverse environmental effects of transportation.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	1.5	2.1	
2002	1.5	2.7	
2003	1.5		
2004	1.5		
2005	1.5		

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program purpose, as stated in the Federal Hazardous Materials Transportation authorizing legislation, is: Planning Grants: to make grants to States and Indian tribes-(A) to develop, improve, and carry out emergency plans under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11001 et seq.), including ascertain if flow patterns of hazardous material on lands under the jurisdiction of the State or Indian tribe, and between lands under the jurisdiction of the State or Indian tribe and lands of another State or Indian tribe; and (B) to decide on the need for a regional hazardous material emergency response team. Training Grants: to make grants to States and Indian tribes to train public sector employees to respond to accidents and incidents involving a hazardous material.

**Evidence:** 49USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130; 42 USC 11001 et seq.; North American Emergency Response Guide Book; Number of hazardous materials serious incidents (<http://hazmat.dot.gov/hmep/hmepcong.pdf>).

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Under Federal law, DOT has the exclusive right to regulate safety, including security, of the transportation of hazardous materials in commerce. When hazardous materials incidents occur, the responsibility to mitigate the incident falls on local first responders, many of whom are poorly funded volunteer fire fighters. The HMEP grant program funds planning and training activities to prepare first responders at the State and local level, and is the only Federal program that provides funds to assist communities in planning for and responding to hazardous materials incidents that may occur within their jurisdictions. Other programs provide more specific assistance to first responders. For instance, the recently expanded Firefighter Assistance Grant program is a discretionary program, where localities apply for grants for equipment (e.g., fire engines), and training related to operating the equipment.

**Evidence:** HMEP Report to Congress, 1998 (<http://hazmat.dot.gov/HMEP/hmepcong.pdf>). The number of local responders is approximately 2 million, all of whom require refresher training annually, at a minimum (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/firstresponders>).

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** RSPA's HMEP grant program is unique in that it supplements hazmat planning and training at the local level, to reduce both the occurrence and the consequences of serious hazmat incidents. The section 5116 funds are the only Federal funds available to all 50 states, Puerto Rico, DC, the territories, and Indian tribes for these purposes.

**Evidence:** 49USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130; GAO Report "Hazardous Materials Training: DOT and Private Sector Initiatives Generally Complement Each Other," July 2000.

**1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Because all funding provided is allocated to grantees according to a risk-based formula, States, territories, and Indian tribes can be confident of funds availability. States may then distribute funds based on their perceived needs. RSPA believes that States are most knowledgeable in allocating Federal funds according to their needs and priorities. RSPA obligates funds during the last week of the fiscal year, so that funds are available to be reimbursed on the first day of the following fiscal year.

**Evidence:** 49USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130 HMEP Report to Congress, 1998 (<http://hazmat.dot.gov/HMEP/hmepcong.pdf>)

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Funds allocated to States and Territories are then assigned to individual jurisdictions, at the discretion of the State or Territory. States are required by law to pass through at least 75% of the funds to local jurisdictions.

**Evidence:** 49USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130 Grantees certify that at least 75% of all grant funds are passed on to local and regional authorities who are responsible for hazmat responder training, exercises and regional planning (outputs).

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The DOT Hazardous Materials Safety program has a specific, readily identifiable and understood, and measurable national goal which is directly focused on reducing the consequences caused by hazmat incidents on the nation's transportation system, as measured by the number of serious hazmat incidents per year. Our long-term goal is to reduce serious hazardous materials incidents to no more than 488 in FY 2008, a 15% reduction from FY 2000.

**Evidence:** DOT 2004 Performance Plan and RSPA FY 2004 Budget Submission to Congress. DOT FY 2005 Performance Plan will contain the long-term (2008) outcome goal contained in the measures tab.

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The long-term outcome goal covering DOT's entire hazmat safety program (including this grant program) is ambitious, especially since the funding for this program has been held level at \$14.3 million. The target is based on historic performance data, and the FY 2008 outcome target of 488 will be a stretch for RSPA.

**Evidence:** RSPA FY 2004 Congressional Justification.

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** RSPA's hazmat safety program, which is the Federal regulatory aspect of DOT's overall hazmat safety program, shares DOT's overall goal for 2008 of 488 incidents. The authorized purpose of these grants is to train local first responders to handle hazmat incidents safely, and thereby contribute to achieving the national serious incident goal. The HMEP grant program contributes to the serious hazmat incident goal by reducing the potential for an incident to become serious and/or reducing the severity of a serious incident. The program does not have an efficiency measure, as the small size of the program would result in few, if any, savings through such a measure.

**Evidence:** DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan and FY 2002 Performance and Accountability Report and all FY 2003--2005 RSPA budget submissions. RSPA performance plan is integrated with its Congressional Justification material.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** While the overall DOT hazmat program's long-term outcome measure is ambitious, the four specific output targets for the HMEP grant program are being held constant because program funding has been held level at \$14.3 million. The four output targets are based on past historical performance at the \$14.3 million funding level. While actual outputs have fluctuated above and below the target levels, on average they have not deviated far, implying that the output performance targets are appropriate.

**Evidence:** DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan and FY 2002 Performance and Accountability Report and all FY 2003--2005 RSPA budget submissions. RSPA performance plan is integrated with its Congressional Justification material.

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: No Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** While RSPA's partners are committed to reducing the number and consequences of hazmat incidents on the roadways, states are not required to specifically address, nor are states required to track, their progress toward agency goals. In their application for HMEP grants, the States specify target audiences to be trained at the awareness, operations and specialist levels. Also, local emergency planning committees detail the tasks to be funded with HMEP grants. These plans are not directly tied to the agency's long-term hazmat incident goal.

**Evidence:** Local emergency response plans; commodity flow studies.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: No Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** No independent evaluations of sufficient scope are conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness. Currently, the agency relies on achieving their performance goals to assess performance information. The agency does not have an independent evaluation to evaluate if the program could be improved or become more effective.

**Evidence:** Evaluations are not scheduled by independent, unbiased parties with no conflict of interest, such as every two to five years, on a periodic basis, or on a reasonable time schedule. GAO Report "Hazardous Materials Training: DOT and Private Sector Initiatives Generally Complement Each Other," July 2000; <http://www.lepcinfoexchange.com/docs/rc00190.pdf>

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** RSPA's FY 2003-2005 budgets clearly tie and justify resource requests to the long-term outcome and output measures.

**Evidence:** FY 2003-2005 RSPA budget submissions.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The HMEP grant program was created by Congress in the early 1990s, as a grant program with significant grantee discretion. However, information about its performance and effectiveness, plus support of the states, has allowed RSPA to take the grants through successive planning processes in order to make the program more effective in meeting Federal, state, and local needs, in the information required through the annual application process as well as the end-of-year performance reporting.

**Evidence:** 49USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130; 42 USC 11001 et seq.; Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grant Program DRAFT: Application Kit

**3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Summary reports from states, territories, and Indian tribes communicate the progress of the programs at the local level. Information feeding the summary reports are submitted by the grantees.

**Evidence:** Form 269 Financial Status Reports, Form 270; Semi-annual grant workshops serve to share lessons learned and best practices among grantees.

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The HMEP program is required by authorizing legislation, annual appropriations, and anti-deficiency requirements to assure grants conform to cost limitations. Grantees are responsible for monitoring their sub-grantees, and may refuse funding to local agencies in future years for program inadequacies.

**Evidence:** 49 USC Chapter 51, Section 5116; 49 CFR Parts 101.1-110.130; 42 USC 11001 et seq. Form 269 Financial Status Reports, Form 270

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Federal funds are obligated just before the beginning of the fiscal year, using funds collected in past years from the hazmat registration program. Any deficiencies found by the Single Audit Act audits or any other deficiencies identified in program reviews are required to be addressed along with any correction action that was taken.

**Evidence:** Audit Reports

**Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)**

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The program distributes \$14.3 million, the largest proportion allocated among 70 grantees. The program does not utilize outside contractors, and automated records are confined to spreadsheets that justify disbursements in the accounting system. Thus there is little opportunity for such efficiencies.

Evidence: NA

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The grant program conducts two workshops per year for the benefit of grantees. At these meetings, grantees can discuss successes and challenges within their jurisdictions. Grant staff also provide assistance with grant applications and suggest improvements via online telephone support.

Evidence: The program manager participates in monthly meetings of subcommittees on training of the National Response Team. The NRT is made up of 16 federal agencies, each with responsibilities and expertise in various aspects of emergency response to pollution incidents.

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The grant program is included in the Single Audit of all grantees and no material internal weaknesses have been identified by the auditors. If any weaknesses are identified, they are immediately corrected.

Evidence: The program uses adequate financial management practices in executing the grants awarded to each state, territory, and Native American tribe. Each payment request is scrutinized for errors, proper matching amounts and funding available. Each payment is subtracted from a summary sheet in the grants unit and then at the accounting office, providing a strong double check. Finally, the payment request with Automated Clearing House (ACH) sheet is forwarded to the Oklahoma City accounting office for payment.

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: As deficiencies are identified, they are immediately addressed and closed out when corrective measures are in place.

Evidence: Internal controls instituted at the program's inception, such as the process described in 3.6, have evolved to highlight program deficiencies quickly and mitigate them upon discovery.

**3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: States are required to submit a HMEP grant application detailing proposed activities. Actual expenditures are tracked by headquarters staff. The HMEP staff holds regular technical assistance sessions to help grantees identify deficiencies and take corrective measures. These activities provide adequate oversight.

Evidence: HMEP Grant Program Application Kit

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**3.BF2**     **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**     Answer: Yes     Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Each grantee is required to submit an annual report on the results of their program. These reports are then aggregated to form an annual output measure.

Evidence: RSPA Hazardous Materials EP Grants Program Fact sheet (<http://hazmat.dot.gov/hmep/hmepfact.htm>).

**4.1**     **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**     Answer: LARGE EXTENT     Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The DOT-wide hazmat strategic goal of reducing the serious hazmat incident rate is close to being achieved. RSPA and the Department are continuing to work to continue to achieve that goal. The HMEP grant program supports that goal. Within limits set by legislation, the grant program has reached a steady state level of accomplishments--for example, completion of 3,700 emergency plans and 900 exercises. Accomplishment of this goal depends on the agency's partners states, local jurisdictions, private sector and safety organizations.

Evidence: FY 2001 actual and FY 2002 preliminary actual number of serious hazardous material incidents.

**4.2**     **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**     Answer: YES     Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: While the program partners do not have to achieve annual performance goals to receive grants, the Department met or exceeded its annual performance targets for the number of serious incidents in 1999, 2000, and 2001. States and local communities are actively supporting this goal.

Evidence: Key measures, such as the number of responders trained, are measured and reported on a regular basis. FY 1999-2001 actual and FY 2002 preliminary actual outcome data.

**4.3**     **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**     Answer: NA     Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The grant program has continually improved its cost effectiveness since its inception. Starting with a staff of four professionals plus an administrative support contract, the program is now run by two staff members with only minor additional administrative support.

Evidence: The hours of burden in processing grant data has been significantly decreased from \$525,000 to \$200,000 at an approximate cost saving of \$325,000 annually.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration  
**Type(s):** Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	88%	75%	Effective

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** The HMEP grant program is unique, in that it is the only Federal program that provides funds to assist communities in planning for and responding to hazardous materials incidents that may occur within their jurisdictions. Thus there is no other Federal program with similar purpose or goal. Other programs provide general assistance to first responders. For instance, the recently expanded Firefighter Assistance Grant program is a discretionary program, where localities apply for grants for equipment (e.g., fire engines), and training related to operating the equipment. The HMEP grant program deals exclusively in responding to hazmat incidents occurring during transportation.

**Evidence:** HMEP Report to Congress, 1998; GAO Report "Hazardous Materials Training: DOT and Private Sector Initiatives Generally Complement Each Other," July 2000.

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** Though independent evaluations of this program have not been conducted, RSPA completed a program review in 1998. The assessment concluded that the grants were a critical part of the national strategy to reduce the hazardous materials incident rate. The grants have assured that state and local program focused on key hazmat issues in a consistent manner. The program has achieved the intent of Congress, and has played a leadership role. The grants have not supplanted the much larger program share allocated by states, communities, and the private sector.

**Evidence:** HMEP Report to Congress, 1998; GAO Report "Hazardous Materials Training: DOT and Private Sector Initiatives Generally Complement Each Other," July 2000.

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration

---

**Measure:** Number of serious hazardous materials incidents.  
**Additional Information:**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001		585	
2002	523	411 (prelim.)	
2003	515		
2004	509		
2005	503		
2006	498		
2007	493		
2008	488		

**Measure:** Hazmat responders trained. This measure reflects one aspect of the universe of DOT activities conducted to achieve the DOT-wide goal of reducing serious hazardous materials incidents.  
**Additional Information:** Standard classroom training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		166,921	
2002	184,000	209,035	
2003	184,000		
2004	184,000		
2005	184,000		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration

---

**Measure:** Hazmat responders trained. This measure reflects one aspect of the universe of DOT activities conducted to achieve the DOT-wide goal of reducing serious hazardous materials incidents.

**Additional Information:** Standard classroom training.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2006	184,000		
2007	184,000		
2008	184,000		

**Measure:** Emergency plans completed. This measure reflects one aspect of the universe of DOT activities conducted to achieve the DOT-wide goal of reducing serious hazardous materials incidents.

**Additional Information:**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		3,998	
2002	3,700	2,939	
2003	3,700		
2004	3,700		
2005	3,700		
2006	3,700		
2007	3,700		
2008	3,700		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration

---

**Measure:** Number of local emergency planning committees supported.  
**Additional Information:** Committees assisted by funding and/or technical assistance.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		1,538	
2002	1,600	1,880	
2003	1,600		
2004	1,600		
2005	1,600		
2006	1,600		
2007	1,600		
2008	1,600		

**Measure:** Exercises conducted.  
**Additional Information:** Operational/field training for public sector employees to respond to accidents and incidents involving hazardous materials.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001		934	
2002	900	1,086	
2003	900		
2004	900		
2005	900		
2006	900		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Hazardous Materials Transportation  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Research and Special Programs Administration

---

**Measure:** Exercises conducted.

**Additional Information:** Operational/field training for public sector employees to respond to accidents and incidents involving hazardous materials.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2007	900		
2008	900		

## OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

### Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Grant Program

#### Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The Section 402 program was established "to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries and property damage." Section 405: "The Secretary shall make grants under this section to States that adopt and implement effective programs to reduce highway deaths and injuries resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles." Section 410: "The Secretary shall make grants to States that adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals driving while under the influence of alcohol." Section 411: "The Secretary shall make grants to States that adopt and implement effective programs to improve the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, and accessibility of the data of the State that is needed to identify priorities for national, State, and local highway and traffic safety programs."	23 USC Chapter 4, Revised June 9, 1998; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 405; 23 CFR Part 1345; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 410; 23 CFR Part 1313; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 411; 23 CFR Part 1335	20%	0.2
2 <i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Motor vehicle crashes claimed the lives of 42,116 in 2001 and injured over 3 million. In 2001, 60% of passenger vehicle occupants killed in crashes were not restrained. There were 17,448 alcohol-related deaths. Adequate data systems are needed to capture highway safety data and track performance.	Press Release August 7, 2002. Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) Data 2001; FARS Reports	20%	0.2
3 <i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	All Agency funding provided by formula to the States is designed to provide countermeasures for highway safety problems such as impaired driving and occupant protection issues. States prepare an annual highway safety plan that details programs and activities designed to address problems identified in their problem identification that will have an impact on fatality and injury reduction.	The fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled decreased to 1.52 in 2001, down from the 2000 rate of 1.53. [Uniform Procedures - Regulation 23 CFR, Part 1200; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 405; 23 CFR Part 1345; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 410; 23 CFR Part 1313; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 411; 23 CFR Part 1335]	20%	0.2
4 <i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	The Agency's highway safety program is unique in that it covers the full range of highway safety activities designed to reduce traffic injuries and death among all populations. The Section 402 are the only Federal funds available to all 50 states, Puerto Rico, DC, the territories and the Native American tribes through the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the broad range of highway safety programs.	[23 CFR Part 1200; 23 USC Chapter 4, Sections 405, 410 and 411]. NHTSA "Budget in Brief" and DOT Performance Plan.	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	While each state that submits an application consisting of a Performance Plan, listing objective and measurable highway safety goals, receives a grant, not all states benefit from targeted safety incentive grants. Only the states that have implemented certain safety laws receive incentive grants. Those states that do not implement the laws are not rewarded - or assisted - by receiving grants. All of these highway safety grants to States could be re-designed as a consolidated performance-based program to reduce administrative burden.	Current crash and injury data collection capabilities preclude an accurate assessment of program focus. There is not a study that shows that the NHTSA grant program is designed to optimally address the interest, problem or needs of states that are not receiving the incentive grants. [23 CFR Part 1200; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 405; 23 CFR Part 1345; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 410; 23 CFR Part 1313; 23 USC Chapter 4 Section 411; 23 CFR Part 1335]	20%	0.0
<b>Total Section Score</b>				<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>

**Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)**

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	Yes	The major highway safety grant programs authorized by Congress to assist states and local communities, and managed by NHTSA, have a specific, readily identifiable and understood, and measurable meaningful national goal which is directly focused on reducing death and injury caused by motor vehicle crashes on the nation's roadways.	The agency's specific strategic goal is to reduce the highway fatality rate to 1.0 deaths per 100 million miles of vehicle travel (VMT) by the year 2008. [DOT 2003 Performance Plan/2001 Performance Report; Year 2000 Traffic Safety Facts]	14%	0.1
2 <i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The various grants programs to support state and local highway safety have annual performance goals which inform states and NHTSA about progress toward the national goal. The national goal for 2001 was a rate of 1.5 deaths per 100 VMT, which was successfully achieved. The authorized purpose of these grants is to reduce the traffic safety toll annually in each state, and thereby contribute to achieving the national highway fatality rate goal.	[DOT FY 2003 Performance Plan/2001 Performance Report].	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3 <i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	No	While NHTSA's partners are committed to reducing injuries and fatalities on the roadways, and the state-specific objectives all link logically to agency long-term goals, states are not required to specifically address, nor are states required to track their progress toward agency goals. In their application for safety grants, the States prepare an annual Highway Safety Plan and Performance Plan that describes activities using grant funds that they plan to implement as countermeasures designed to meet their own, state-specific, highway safety goals. These plans do not have to commit to the agency's long-term goals.	23 CFR Part 1200	14%	0.0
4 <i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	The highway safety grants which support state and local highway safety efforts are closely aligned and coordinated with other major highway safety work at all levels of government – Federal, state and local – plus the private sector and safety advocate organizations. NHTSA works closely on traffic safety problems with the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration and other DOT modes. NHTSA also works with other Federal organizations, including CPSC, NTSB, HHS, CDC and the Healthy People 2010 consortium. All of these efforts have the common purpose of reducing the motor vehicle crashes, death and injury, and the highway fatality rate.	Coordination of programs is achieved by requiring that all States reflect all highway safety grant funds in their Annual Highway Safety Plans. This assures funding from different sources can support important programs, while avoiding duplication of activities. [23 CFR Part 1345, Part 1313, and Part 1335]	14%	0.1
5 <i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	No independent evaluations of sufficient scope are conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness. Currently, the agency relies on achieving their performance goals to assess performance information. The agency does not have an independent evaluation (outside of the agency or states) to evaluate if the program could be improved or become more effective.	Evaluations are not scheduled by independent, non-biased parties with no conflict of interest, such as every two to five years, on a periodic basis or on a reasonable time schedule.	14%	0.0
6 <i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	NHTSA's annual budget is designed to indicate how agency program and grant resources are aligned, planned and programmed in the key areas of highway safety, including Section 403 programs, various highway safety performance and incentive grants, related research and development, and supporting safety data analysis. The budget is designed along the lines of the agency's major legislative authorities, and changes in funding, policy and legislation and impacts are analyzed and explained in relevant budget sections.	NHTSA FY 2003 Budget Request to Congress	14%	0.1

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The agency has had time, performance information, and support of the states, to take the grant process through successive planning processes to reflect safety requirements and effectiveness in meeting state and local programmatic needs. The grant program has evolved into a more effective, performance-based initiative that allows states to plan and administer the grants in line with both their unique safety needs and overall safety priorities	Strategic plans published by NHTSA in the 1990s have guided the overall agency efforts. This includes the first strategic plan which articulated 11 outcome and performance goals, and the 1998 updated strategic plan. [NHTSA Strategic Plan, November 1994; NHTSA Strategic Plan Update, September 1998; DOT Strategic Plan, July 2000]	14%	0.1

<b>Total Section Score</b>				<b>100%</b>	<b>71%</b>
----------------------------	--	--	--	-------------	------------

**Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)**

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	This past May, many States joined in the Click It or Ticket (CIOT) campaign designed to increase seat belt use through high visibility enforcement and a media campaign. Part of the model CIOT campaign included telephone and Bureau of Motor Vehicle surveys designed to assess the timeliness and recognition of the campaign. In addition, States conduct an annual seat belt observation survey using NHTSA approved methodology to obtain their State's seat belt use rate. The Agency also conducts a National Occupant Protection Use Survey (NOPUS) to determine annual seat belt use rates. FARS data is collected from States and published each year.	NOPUS Report, State Seat Belt Use Rate Research Note, Evaluation of May 2002 Seat Belt Mobilization; Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) Reports	11%	0.1
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	No	The agency does not have incentives for managers and program partners that would encourage corrections in deficient programs. If the performance goals are not met, managers and program partners are not held accountable to the cost, schedule and performance results.		11%	0.0
3 <i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Federal funds are obligated when they are received. Through the Grants Tracking System (GTS), the agency has immediate access to see when funds are obligated and expended, and to which highway safety program area.	23CFR Part 1200; Grant Tracking System	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4 <i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	The Grants Tracking System (GTS) has helped maintain efficiencies, cost effectiveness. Expanded use of the Web to include the Highway Safety Program Grant Management Manual.	Grant Management Manual on the Web.	11%	0.1
5 <i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	The full cost of each annual grant program is known and fully reflected in the agency's budgets. The agency's annual budget submissions to the DOT Secretary, OMB and to the Appropriations Committees list the complete cost of the safety programs funded by the grants, including separately identifiable supporting costs borne by the agency. Congress has established a formula for allocating basic grants to each state, thus the full level of funding for each state is known. Changes in funding and programs are readily identifiable in the information provided by the states.	FY 2003 NHTSA Budget Submissions	11%	0.1
6 <i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The Grant program is included in the Single Audit of all grantees and no material internal weaknesses have been identified by the auditors. Annually, the agency's Regional Offices review select transactions of the agency's grantees to ensure validity of the payments. In addition, each year, each of NHTSA's 10 Regional Offices do a management internal control review of their offices. If any weaknesses are identified, they are immediately corrected.	23 CFR Part 1200, GTS System	11%	0.1
7 <i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Grants Tracking System (GTS) was designed to replace the manual accounting system with a computerized system that would expedite transmission of financial data and reduce entry errors, which were common in the manual system. The GTS was also designed to help streamline the States' fiscal management process and reduce the workload associated with meeting Federal reporting requirements.	23 CFR Part 1200	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
(B 1 <i>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</i> )	Yes	States are required to submit an annual Highway Safety Plan detailing proposed activities. Actual expenditures are tracked through the GTS system. Regional Office staff perform management reviews, make on-site reviews to visit State offices and project sites. Competitive grant monies awarded to the States are incorporated into the Highway Safety Plan and expenditures are tracked through the GTS system.	23 CFR Part 1200; Regional Management Reviews	11%	0.1
(B 2 <i>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</i> )	Yes	Each grantee is required to submit an Annual Report on the results of their program. These are available to the public. Also, NHTSA publishes annual data from the Fatal Analysis Reporting System (FARS) that indicate a grantee's highway safety performance.	23 CFR Part 1200; Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) Reports	11%	0.1

<b>Total Section Score</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89%</b>
----------------------------	-------------	------------

**Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)**

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	Large Extent	The strategic goal of reducing the highway fatality rate currently stands at the rate of 1.5 deaths per 100 VMT, which was the goal for 2001. The long-term outcome goal is 1.0 fatalities per 100 million VMT by 2008. The progress toward achieving the goal is measurable, and is analyzed and reported each year. This rate has been coming down on a steady basis since the inception of the state and community safety grant program in the mid 1960s. Accomplishment of this goal depends in large part on the continued progress of the agency's partners – states, local jurisdictions, private sector and safety organizations – in addressing such crucial problems as alcohol impairment, non-use of safety belts, non-use and incorrect usage of appropriate child restraints, excessive vehicle speeds, failure to wear motorcycle helmets, pedestrian crashes and other key issues.	DOT FY 2003 Performance Plan/FY 2001 Performance Report	20%	0.1

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Reduce highway fatality rate to 1.0 per 100 million VMT by 2008  Target: For 2003, target is 1.4.  Actual Progress achieved Have met targets for 1999, 2000, and 2001.  toward goal:</p>
---

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2 <i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Large Extent	While the program partners do not have to achieve annual performance goals to receive grants, the Department met its annual performance targets for the highway fatality rate in 1999, 2000, and 2001. States and local communities are actively supporting achievement of the highway fatality reduction goal, yet they are not required to meet and often do not achieve NHTSA's performance goals. NHTSA's partners' programs are strictly performance and criteria based, and as such are assessed to measure their rate of	DOT FY 2003 Performance Plan/FY 2001 Performance Report	20%	0.1
<p>Key Goal I: Reduce highway fatality rate to 1.0 per 100 million VMT by 2008  Performance Target: For 2003, target is 1.4.  Actual Performance: Have met targets for 1999, 2000, and 2001.</p>					
3 <i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent	There are some administrative difficulties in administering the grants and the agency needs to become more efficient and cost effective. Recent management improvements include the Grant Tracking System (GTS) - which converted a cumbersome and costly manual grant system to an electronic grant system. Since it interfaces with the DOT/DELPHI accounting system, it has significantly reduced manpower. In addition, this system was designed to meet Presidential initiatives, such as submission of grant documents electronically and to interface with the centralized E-Grant Application system currently being developed.	The hours of burden in processing grant data has been significantly decreased from 31,601 hours to 570 at an approximate cost saving of \$1,000,000 annually.	20%	0.1
4 <i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	Several agencies within the Federal government strive to reduce unintentional injuries. Within the Department, NHTSA, FHWA, and FMCSA share the highway fatality goal since each have a responsibility to improve safety on our nation's highways. FMCSA has an additional goal of reducing heavy truck fatalities by 50 percent by 2008. They are progressing with that goal. HHS works to reduce alcohol-related fatalities and other unintentional injuries. The Healthy People 2010 Consortium has established objectives for 2010. The agencies involved are working to achieve those objectives.	DOT FY 2003 Performance Plan/FY 2001 Performance Report	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 <i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Large Extent	Though independent evaluation of this program have not been conducted, the agency has undertaken national evaluations of the impact of state and community grants in order to determine whether it is effective in addressing major national safety issues, and whether measurable results are being achieved. The assessment concluded that the grants were a critical part of the national strategy to reduce the highway fatality rate. The grants had assured that state and local program focused on key national issues. The grants had achieved the intent of Congress, and that grants played a leadership role, but did not supplant the much larger (98 percent) program share allocated by states, communities and the private sector. It also reported major progress in numerous crucial safety areas, such as alcohol safety, occupant protection, police enforcement, traffic records, emergency medical services, and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorcycle riders. The agency conducts evaluations of specific traffic safety countermeasures through its Office of Research, Evaluation, and Traffic Records.	Highway Safety Assessment: A Summary of Findings in Ten States, June 1998; Development and Evaluation of a Comprehensive Program to Reduce Drinking and Impaired Driving Among College Students, February 2002; Identification and Referral of Impaired Drivers Through Emergency Department Protocols DOT HS 809 412, February 2002; Evaluation of Maryland, Oklahoma and the District of Columbia's Seat Belt Law Change to Primary Enforcement, DTNH-22-97-D-05018, January 2001. These are just a few examples. The agency has been conducting evaluations of safety countermeasures for over 20 years.	20%	0.1
<b>Total Section Score</b>				<b>100%</b>	<b>74%</b>

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Major Capital Investment Program (New Starts) is a competitive, discretionary grants program that allocates funds for public transit systems including light rail, commuter rail, subway and heavy rail, and rapid bus projects in an objective manner based on established criteria.

**Evidence:** The New Starts program is a requirement under Title 49, United States Code, Section 5309. Well established rating and ranking criteria is included in Major Capital Investment Projects; Final Rule published December 7, 2000. Section 5309(e) states: "the Secretary may approve a grant or loan for a capital project for a new fixed guideway system or extension of an existing fixed guideway system if the project is justified based on a review of its mobility improvements, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness, and operating efficiencies; and supported by an acceptable degree of local financial commitment."

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The New Starts Program provides funding to allow cities to construct transit projects. These projects are proposed to address transportation problems, improve access and mobility, promote economic development, alleviate congestion, improve air quality, and provide transportation alternatives. The 2002 Conditions and Performance Report estimates that an average of \$5.7 billion in 2000 dollars will be needed for transit asset expansion in order to maintain conditions and performance. These capital intensive projects require funding beyond the Federal formula resources. The discretionary nature of the New Starts program allows funding to be allocated only to the most meritorious projects and only when funds are necessary to construct them.

**Evidence:** There are 28 projects under construction and 60 in planning and project development. The demand for the Federal share of New Starts funds is increasing as cities nationwide determine that transit can address their mobility and congestion problems. Transit also helps address air quality issues and can be part of a State's plan to get back in attainment with EPA air standards. According to a study in St Louis, a Metro Link light rail train removes 125 cars from the roads representing and a commuter rail train removes 200 cars from the roadways.

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The NSP is a program that complements the efforts and responsibilities at the State and local level. NSP is the only federal program to provide guaranteed capital funds for new transit projects. The construction of new transit systems is a capital intensive investment that cannot be adequately supported by State and local funds only. If these federal funds were eliminated, States and local governments would be unlikely to be able to raise adequate resources to construct new construction project.

**Evidence:** States raise capital investment funds for transit through the issuance of bonds. Certificates of participation (COPs) are tax-exempt bonds issued by State entities that are generally secured with revenues that are expected to be earned from the equipment that the COP funds are used to purchase. Guaranteed funding levels and the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) mechanism in NSP have allowed public transportation agencies to borrow from the capital markets by issuing bonds. Under TEA-21 (1998-2003), the capital markets reflected clear willingness to underwrite bonds secured solely with an FFGA. Between 1999 and 2002, FFGAs have leveraged over \$1.5 billion in capital markets funding at very favorable ratings (A+ to A-). Without the federal involvement through NSP, it is unlikely that these investment grade rates could have been attained.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The New Starts program has evolved over three decades in the effort to reflect and improve. There is no strong evidence that a different approach would be more efficient or effective.

**Evidence:** The New Starts program has been building since the mid-1970's. The first Policy Statement was in 1976 that introduced a process-oriented approach. In each subsequent publication of policy changes (the latest being the Final Rule on New Starts in December 2000), requirements for project justification and adherence to and refinement of rating and ranking criteria have been incorporated. These criteria require more sophisticated planning techniques and measures of success of New Starts projects in the following areas: capital costs, operating costs, system utilization (including ridership levels, service levels, user characteristics, trip purpose, etc.) General Accounting Office (GAO) and Inspector General (OIG) reports and studies have supported the program design. The Final Rule, Major Capital Investment Projects was published December 7, 2000 includes a summary of the history from the early 1970's first policy statement through the 1980's Major Urban Mass Transportation Capital Investments to incorporation the direction of the authorizations of the transit assistance program in STURRA - 1987, ISTEA - 1992 and TEA-21 - 1999.

**1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The New Starts Program was designed to help cities and local jurisdictions design and construct transit projects. FTA relies on a multiple measure approach regarding the evaluation of projects before the federal funding commitment is ever considered. FTA provides the technical assistance and oversight of the New Starts Program; requiring New Starts grantees to engage in one of the most rigorous financial planning, project development, and engineering processes in government.

**Evidence:** The New Starts Program evaluation and rating process results in Congress supporting 91% of FTA's recommendations for proposed New Starts projects annually. The remaining funds are earmarked by Congress to address special interests. There is no evidence that there is another method that would provide a better outcome. However, FTA has identified 4 goals for refining the New Starts Program. The 4 goals are: Leverage the Federal dollar more effectively; sharpen the focus on project outcome; manage risk more explicitly; emphasize getting ahead of congestion.

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FTA has three specific long term program measures: 1) Cost Containment of constructing New Starts projects. 2) Mobility Improvements, as measured by forecast user benefits (travel time savings) of New Starts projects under FFGAs. 3) Increasing Ridership, as measured by the demonstrated and sustained increase in corridor transit ridership after the implementation of New Starts projects. Because ridership data is gathered FTA-wide, FTA currently uses a linkage between a completed NSP project and ridership data in the region to assess the success of NSP in supporting the FTA-wide goal of increasing ridership.

**Evidence:** 1) FTA Executive Core Accountabilities; 2) Annual New Starts Report publishes the forecasted mobility benefits for each system 3) Before and After Study Requirement established in FTA's Final Rule on Major Capital Investments, published December 2000. The Before and After Studies will collect meaningful performance data, including ridership, service levels, etc. Further, program measures are aligned to FTA's overall long-term goals of increased ridership and mobility benefits, which are included in its Performance Plan.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FTA's long term targets are generally ambitious because they either exceed the Department of Transportation's targets or historical experience. For instance, both FTA's cost containment measure and target are more ambitious than DOT-wide long term target for cost containment. FTA's long-term target for its cost containment measure -- 100% of all NSP projects with Full Funding Grant Agreements that meet cost estimates within 5% of its original agreement. DOT's cost containment measure is percent of major federally-funded projects (\$1 billion or above) that meet cost estimates established in project agreements, or miss them by less than 10%. DOT's target is 95%. FTA's ridership goal in the DOT Strategic Plan and the FTA Executive Core Accountabilities is 2% increase in annual ridership for the largest 150 transit markets, normalized for changes in the economy, (notably employment levels). Since 1991, the ridership growth for the largest 150 transit markets has averaged 0.41%. While there is a cyclical nature of these trends, long term goal of maintaining a 2% increase in ridership is quite ambitious.

**Evidence:** DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan, National Transit Database, FTA's Executive Core Accountabilities for senior and SES managers.

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FTA's annual performance measures and targets are inextricably linked to its long term goals for the NSP program. Further, these annual targets enable project and senior managers to assess whether long term goals can be met. 1) Cost containment: Progress reports on project adherence to cost estimates are provided quarterly to the Administrator and Executive Management Team 2) Mobility Improvements: Projected (normalized) increase in user benefits (travel time savings) among the FFGA projects will be analyzed in comparison to the FFGA projects in the previous year, 3) Demonstrated increase in corridor transit ridership after implementation of each New Starts project, based on the results of required Before and After Studies.

**Evidence:** Progress reports on the cost containment of New Starts FFGAs are submitted quarterly for review to the Administrator, Deputy and the Executive Management Team. Information on user benefits, and other measures of mobility are evaluated for each candidate project annually, and used in FTA's decision to award an FFGA. The results of the required Before and After Studies will improve the current ridership data by gathering actual ridership after project completion as compared to projected ridership during the planning stages of the project. Such information will enable FTA to better assess the direct impact of NSP projects.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** FTA's annual targets for its measures are ambitious for the same reason its long-term goals are ambitious -- the targets either exceed DOT-wide targets for cost-containment or they exceed historical annual experience nationwide. (See explanation in Question 2.2 for specific reasons why these annual targets are ambitious). FTA is also working to develop better measures such as Cost effectiveness -- the incremental cost of the project divided by hours of travel-time savings (transportation system user benefits). Cost is defined as the estimated annualized capital cost (not including financing costs) plus annual operating and maintenance costs. Transportation system user benefit is defined as all annual travel-related benefits in terms of hours saved by all users of the transit system (both existing riders and new riders).

**Evidence:** FTA's Executive Core Accountabilities, DOT FY 2003 and FY 2004 Performance Plans.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** All partners commit to and work toward the long term goals of the program. Since the NSP is a competitive grant program, there is a minimum level of "buy-in" that must be ensured before there is a federal commitment of funds thru a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). 1) Cost Containment: The FFGA instrument establishes a ceiling for Federal participation in a New Starts project, meaning that any cost-overruns must be met with local resources. 2) Mobility Improvements: FTA rates most favorably those projects which demonstrate the largest mobility improvements, in terms of user benefits (travel time savings), per their annualized costs. 3) Increasing Ridership is the most basic measure of a project's success in meeting the transportation needs in a given corridor. Increasing ridership further results in larger farebox revenues to offset the cost of providing the service. Finally, in order for FTA to sign the full funding grant agreement, the grantee must also agree to pay for an independent study that compares ridership and transit user benefits before and after the project.

**Evidence:** The Annual Report on New Starts includes: New Starts Criteria Reporting Instructions. Project sponsors report and are projects are measured by their contribution to: 1) Mobility - Hours of Transportation System User Benefits Low-Income Households Served and Employment Near Stations; 2) Environment - Change in Pollutant Emissions Change in Energy Consumption; and 3) Cost-effectiveness - Incremental Cost per Hour of Transportation System User Benefit. Monthly project management oversight reports require FTA and its consultants to be in very close contact with these projects so that grantees long term goals are communicated.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Both the General Accounting Office and the DOT Office of the Inspector General conduct reviews and assessments of the New Starts program. On an annual basis, GAO reports to Congress on the effectiveness of the ratings process as well as overall program implementation. As a result of these annual analyses, FTA has implemented improvements to the ratings process. In addition, the Inspector General has conducted periodic reviews of New Starts program management documentation. These reviews have applauded the strength of FTA's New Starts program oversight program, as noted in the Inspector General's testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations on March 13, 2003.

**Evidence:** By April 30 each year, the General Accounting Office is required, by statute, to review the New Starts processes and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and the implementation of such processes and procedures. Also, at FTA's recommendation, the DOT Inspector General conducts spot reviews of the documentation developed by the New Start project management oversight contractors.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 4%

**Explanation:** FTA's Congressional Budget Justification for FY 2004 was not aligned by performance. However, FTA's FY 2004 Budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reflected a demonstrated effort to link budget and performance and both OMB. However, DOT has submitted a FTA budget that is integrated with performance for FY 2005. FTA, in its FY 2004 proposal has also begun to streamline its account structure to better align with performance by making NSP its own account.

**Evidence:** FTA's FY 2004 Budget submission to OMB; FTA's FY 2005 Congressional Justification.

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** FTA continually strives to improve its evaluation of candidate New Starts projects so that we better understand project merits and fund only the most promising of fixed guideway investments. Working with the transit industry, which was generally dissatisfied with FTA's old cost effectiveness measure of "cost per new rider," FTA developed the more inclusive measure of "cost per hour of user (mobility) benefits" which captures travel time benefits to ALL transit riders, not just new riders. FTA's Final Rule on Major Capital Investment Projects (December 2000) reflects additional improvements to FTA's evaluation process, based on input from the transit community. FTA's New Starts and Construction Roundtable series and technical workshops provide additional opportunities to discuss evaluation procedures and technical methods for project planning. This has resulted in a number of important guidance documents aimed at improving the planning and development of major transit capital investment projects.

**Evidence:** Final Rule on Major Capital Investment Projects (December 2000). New Starts Criteria Reporting Instructions (June 2002); FY 2004 Annual Report on New Starts. Planning guidance documents. FTA also holds regular meetings with senior executives to address any deficiencies in the NSP projects. As a result of earlier strategic planning meetings, the FTA Core Accountabilities were established to increase the level of accountability for FTA's senior management. Two of the four Core Accountabilities, namely project planning and oversight and ridership, have direct applicability to the New Starts program.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** FTA regularly collects quality data that is used to assess program and program manager performance. FTA collects information on project merits (mobility, cost effectiveness, air quality (AQ) benefits, land use) and financial plans (New Starts criteria) in order to evaluate candidate projects and make resource allocation decisions. FTA also collects data from the National Transit Database to serve as baseline for FTA. Beginning February 2002, FTA will collect performance data and analysis from sponsors of all FFGA projects which compare travel conditions and costs before and after implementation of the project, as well as predicted vs actual impacts. FTA will then use this information to measure program performance and develop a research program for improving technical planning methods. During project development, FTA's Project Management Oversight (PMO) contractors perform site visits and submit monthly reports on grantees progress. Financial Management Oversight (FMO) contractors also collect and analyze information on project and grantee finances.

**Evidence:** Annual New Starts project submissions, requests for project sponsors to enter to preliminary stages of planning or final design, and results of FTA evaluations, published in the Annual Report on New Starts; National Transit Database; Final Rule on Major Capital Investment Projects (December 2002); PMO guidance; PMO contractors perform site visits and submit monthly reports on grantees progress; New Starts Criteria Reporting Instructions; financial planning guidance; "Before and After Study" requirement from grantees and FTA guidance. FTA also plans to collect performance data and analysis from sponsors of all FFGA projects which compare travel conditions and costs before and after implementation of the project, as well as predicted vs actual impacts. FTA will then use this information to measure program performance and develop a research program for improving technical planning methods.

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** The program and FTA overall has set up an infrastructure that holds both Federal and non-federal partners accountable. Candidate grantees are held accountable for the development of good projects vis a vis FTA's evaluation process, which identifies and rates favorably only the best projects. Grantees are held accountable to costs and schedule according to the full funding grant agreement instrument. FTA manages an oversight program to ensure grantee accountability in implementing the project. FTA executive core accountabilities include cost estimation and oversight.

**Evidence:** FTA Circular 5200, Full Funding Grant Agreement Guidance; Monthly independent project management oversight reports, FTA's Executive Core Accountabilities.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** New Starts funds are obligated in a timely manner due to the structure of our Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs). The FFGA Attachment 6 includes yearly funding requirements to allow for orderly and timely completion of the project, and FTA requests the Attachment 6 amount in each year's budget request to Congress. Also, the funds appropriated are spent for their intended purpose because our network of Program Management Oversight (PMOs) and Financial Management Oversight (FMOs) contractors closely monitors grantees to ensure this.

**Evidence:** Based on FTA's analysis of the obligation rate of New Starts projects over the last 10-years, an average of 93% of New Starts funds are obligated within the first year following the appropriations year. Project management oversight contractors (PMOs) and financial management oversight contractors (FMOs) work with regional offices and headquarters staff through audits to ensure that grantees are spending the New Starts funds appropriated to them for their intended purpose. Reports are filed quarterly that contain this assessment. Monitoring of the Tren Urbano, Puerto Rico, project construction is an example where FTA withheld funding based on a questionable use of resources. In 2000, PMOs and FMOs noted serious problems with the reporting of actual expenditures on this project, and how actual expenditures compared to the intended use of resources. FTA promptly withheld funds and provided technical assistance to the grantee. The grantee has since filed acceptable financial plans, and the funds have been released.

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** FTA integrates cost effectiveness and efficiency throughout the execution of the New Starts program. First, cost effectiveness of candidate projects is a major evaluation factor; the better the cost effectiveness, generally the higher the rating. FTA also considers other project benefits (mobility, air quality, land use, etc.). FTA manages over \$45 million in oversight (FMO and PMO) program resources to ensure efficient program management and execution. FTA is currently awarding new PMO contracts with innovative performance based elements. FTA has implemented an advanced "Fast Track" database to help manage new starts program data. Second, because cost containment is a core executive accountability, there is an internal incentive to constantly improve.

**Evidence:** New Starts criteria reporting instructions; results of project evaluations (New Starts Report); PMO and FMO guidance and reports; performance-based contracts for project management oversight and financial management oversight; FTA's internal executive core accountabilities.

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** New Starts program requires coordination with State and local entities as well as other federal programs due to the way the program is structured by law. FTA's evaluation process favorably considers State and local match of New Starts funds that exceed the minimum match as required by law, thus providing an incentive to project sponsors to leverage other Federal, local, and state funding. The average New Starts share of project costs (for projects with full funding grant agreements or proposed full funding grant agreements in FY 2004) is 48%. Project sponsors routinely include other federal and transit formula resources, which further requires collaboration.

**Evidence:** Annual Report on New Starts. The initial phases of New Starts projects are funded with other transit resources, usually the sec. 5307 Formula Grants funds. Based on current statistics, 16% of funding for New Starts projects is from Formula Grants.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** There are no material internal control weaknesses reported by auditors directly related to the New Starts program. In fact, both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and DOT Inspector General have been favorable in their assessment of FTA's project management and financial management oversight program. Further, FTA, which was on GAO's high risk list in the early 1990's, was removed on the list by early 2000. GAO attributed this primarily to the improvements FTA made in its grant oversight. OIG has called FTA's project and financial management of its grants "a sound approach".

**Evidence:** GAO report GAO-01-253 "Major Management Challenges and Program Risks", DOT Inspector General testimony (March 13, 2003)

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** FTA is continually updating guidance on the reporting and evaluation of New Starts criteria, including the introduction of improved measures for cost effectiveness and mobility. The GAO has reviewed FTA's New Starts evaluation process every year during TEA-21, and consistently finds it to be an objective and meaningful process. The Inspector General has reviewed FTA's oversight program and has found it much improved. FTA also issues guidance and methods to develop better projects. Finally, FTA is getting more, and more experienced staff to provide technical assistance to project sponsors and to evaluate proposed projects.

**Evidence:** Various guidances, as previously described GAO Reports RCED-99-113; RCED-00-149; GAO -01-987; GAO-02-603, GAO-01-253;

**3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** All projects are evaluated for merit based on a rigorous evaluation process, and only recommended projects are proposed for funding. As noted, this process is high profile and is reviewed by GAO on an annual basis.

**Evidence:** FTA New Starts criteria reporting instructions; Annual New Starts Report.

**3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** FTA has a project management oversight program to monitor the project development of ALL candidate New Starts sponsors. These PMO contractors perform site visits and submit monthly reports on progress. Both the PMO and Financial management contractors perform detailed reviews at critical milestones. At even earlier stages of development, FTA staff reviews plans and products of the planning process to ensure adherence to good planning practice, and FTA employs specialized contractors to review technical work such as travel forecasts.

**Evidence:** PMO and FMO guidance; PMO quarterly and monthly reports; FMO financial capacity reviews.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration  
**Type(s):** Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	95%	100%	67%	Effective

- 3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation:** All FTA evaluations of candidate projects are published annually. FTA collects, compiles and disseminate the performance information in the Annual New Starts Report. FTA now requires each FFGA sponsor to conduct a Before and After Study to measure the impacts of New Starts investment on ridership, service level, and other information. This information will be collected and disseminated once each system has been built. Additional system-wide performance information is collected (e.g., the National Transit Database) on an annual basis and made available publicly and used by industry and universities for national transit analysis. New Starts project progress reports are provided to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the OIG, and GAO on a quarterly basis.
- Evidence:** The Annual Report on New Starts collects performance information annually as required by the New Starts Criteria Reporting Instructions. Project sponsors report and are projects are measured by their contribution to: 1) Mobility - Hours of Transportation System User Benefits Low-Income Households Served and Employment Near Stations; 2) Environment - Change in Pollutant Emissions Change in Energy Consumption; and 3) Cost-effectiveness - Incremental Cost per Hour of Transportation System User Benefit.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%
- Explanation:** FTA has made significant improvements in the last two years in developing ambitious long term goals and the infrastructure to collect and to ensure that the data is meaningful and reliable. Although these improvements are relatively new and still under development, FTA has provided evidence to show that they are well underway to succeed. Specifically, 1) Cost Containment - since fall of 2002, FTA's executive core accountability has included annual cost containment target of 100% of all New Starts projects with a full funding grant agreement within 5% of total cost as delineated in the contract agreement. Since the development of this target, FTA has met the goal. Before 2002, FTA used the DOT-wide target of a more refined definition of ridership that controls for economic variables. However, FTA has provided historical data (1993-2001) on regional ridership trends of urban areas where a New Starts project was opened during that timeframe. Data shows increases in ridership (as defined by passenger miles traveled) increased an average of 10.3% a year after the project or segment was completed. The increased ridership trends continue years after the completion of the New Starts project for all ten of the urban areas. To validate the true impact of NSP on ridership, FTA now (beginning in 2001) requires each FFGA sponsor to conduct a Before and After Study to measure the impacts of the New Starts investment on, among other things, ridership.
- Evidence:** FTA's core accountabilities raises management focus on cost controls. The Executive Management Team's performance depends on bringing New Starts projects in on time and on budget. This approach: 1) creates a more disciplined approach to project costing from inception through construction, 2) improves the New Starts overall ratings, 3) emphasizes risk assessment practices, 4) incorporates innovative procurement practices, and 5) supports best practices and peer review. For mobility improvements, see New Starts final rule and annual report on New Starts for information about the new user benefits measure. The final rule also establishes the Before and After data collection and Study requirement; see also draft Before and After Study guidance. Internal FTA reports and National Transit Database.



## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration

---

**Measure:** Percent of projects under Full Funding Grant Agreements that have current total cost estimates that do not exceed baseline cost by more than 5%. 25 projects are being tracked on a monthly basis. Historic data from 1997-2002 shows that of the 13 projects completed, two were over budget.

**Additional Information:** This measure is focused on cost containment to ensure that projects are completed on time and on budget. For illustrative purposes, we have included a target for 2002, and prior years, that previously did not exist.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual (Efficiency Measure)
1997-2002	85%	85%	
2002	85%	85%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		

**Measure:** Ridership: The percent change in transit passenger-miles traveled per transit market, adjusted for employment levels. (new measure of ridership established in FY 2003).

**Additional Information:** This measure is geared towards increasing transit ridership in every community, while recognizing the impact of economic conditions on ridership. In FY 2001 total passenger miles traveled was used. In FY 2002 the measure of "cumulative" average change in transit passenger miles traveled per transit market was used. However the data to support it did not exist. In 2001 we exceeded our annual target. If total passenger miles traveled was used for FY 2002 the target was 47.5 billion whereas the actual was 47.1 billion (unadjusted for impacts based on the economy). New Starts projects appear to have a significant impact on transit ridership, contributing to FTA's long-term goal of increased ridership. An analysis of the New Starts projects opening between 1994 and 2000 showed that, on average, ridership growth for UZAs in the year that they had a New Starts open was 10.3 percent.\*

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	44.8	46.3	
2002 *	3.5%		
2003	2.0%		
2004	2.0%		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration

**Measure:** Transportation System User Benefits (Travel Time Savings): Maintain increase normalized forecast user benefits attributable to all transit riders (and in the future, all transit and highway users) caused by the New Start investment, as measured by a comparison of executed FFGAs in one 6-year period and a previous 6-year period.

**Additional Information:** Because user benefits is a new measure implemented in FY 2003, the first period's baseline is only now being developed. The first opportunity to perform this measurement will be FY 2015.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2010-2015	increase		
2016-2022	increase		
2023-2028	increase		
2029-2034	increase		

**Measure:** Ridership: To maintain continual increase of 2 percent in transit passenger-miles traveled per transit market, adjusted for employment levels (This new measure of ridership was established in FY 2003. In 2002, the measure was not adjusted for employment levels and in 2001 the measure was passenger miles traveled (in billions) ). In 2001, the measure was "total passenger miles traveled".

**Additional Information:** This measure is geared towards increasing transit ridership in every community, while recognizing the impact of economic conditions on ridership. For illustrative purposes, we have included a target for 2002, and prior years, that did not exist until it was established in 2003.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	44.8	46.3	
2002	3.5%	2.9%	
2003	2.0%		
2004	2.0%		

**Measure:** Ensure that all New Starts projects are completed within 5 percent of its total estimated capital cost as outlined in the full funding grant agreement. Therefore, the target for each given year reflects the New Starts projects that are completed for that year.

**Additional Information:** New Starts projects are multiyear projects that take anywhere from 5 to 10 years to complete. The purpose of the annual targets serves both ensure that FTA is on track to achieving this long-term target and also for executives to be held accountable for corrective action.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
1997-2002	85%	85%	

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** New Starts  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Transit Administration

**Measure:** Ensure that all New Starts projects are completed within 5 percent of its total estimated capital cost as outlined in the full funding grant agreement. Therefore, the target for each given year reflects the New Starts projects that are completed for that year.

**Additional Information:** New Starts projects are multiyear projects that take anywhere from 5 to 10 years to complete. The purpose of the annual targets serves both ensure that FTA is on track to achieving this long-term target and also for executives to be held accountable for corrective action.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2003	100%		
2004	100%		
2005	100%		

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**1.1 Is the program purpose clear?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The Railroad Safety Program (RSP) promulgates, administers, and enforces the Federal laws and regulations designed to promote safety on the Nation's railroads. FRA's oversight focuses on five safety "disciplines" -- track, equipment, operating practices, signals, and hazardous materials.

**Evidence:** FRA's authorizing statutes include: Title 49 USC Chs. 201-213 (railroad safety program); Title 49 USC Ch. 51 (transporting of hazardous materials); and 49 CFR Sec 1.49 delegates authority to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

**1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The hazards posed by trains are very real, with thousands of rail-related injuries and fatalities occurring annually to railroad employees, car and truck passengers, and rail trespassers.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA's "Railroad Safety Statistics." See FRA Safety Website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety).

**1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program is the only Federal regulator of railroad safety nationwide, though FRA works regularly with other relevant Federal transportation agencies, including the Federal Highway Administration, Transportation Security Administration, and the Occupational Health and Safety Administration. FRA works closely with the private sector since the RSP ensures safety of the rail system by overseeing the safety programs of individual private railroads. Additionally, FRA collaborates with States by certifying their rail safety inspectors for those States with safety programs (30 States have rail safety programs).

**Evidence:**

**1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** The program is designed to encourage regulatory compliance by the railroads and promote safety improvements. Through inspections, railroad audits, and enforcement tools that include civil penalties, the program balances enforcement action with cooperative approaches. The program also supports educational outreach efforts through its highway-rail grade crossing program. FRA's primary challenge in managing the safety program is to give the appropriate weighting to its cooperative efforts with the railroads and to its regulatory enforcement work.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA's Safety Assurance and Compliance Program (SACP). See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp.htm). 2) DOT IG Follow-up Audit of Safety Assurance and Compliance Program (2-8-02 and 4-18-02). 3) FRA's Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC). See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety). Click on RSAC. 4) Compliance Agreements. 5) Focused Enforcement, e.g., FRA's Switching Operations Fatality Analysis. See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sofa/index.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sofa/index.htm).

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Through focused inspections, safety audits, and a variety of enforcement tools, RSP resources directly target serious safety problems. FRA uses its Accident/Incident data along with its inspection findings to plan inspections as specified in its focused enforcement guidance document. FRA's main resource management challenge is to monitor the condition of the nation's entire rail system with a limited number of rail inspectors. Another challenge is to effectively target highway-rail grade crossing resources, including collecting better data on how States currently spend their Federal grade crossing dollars.

**Evidence:** 1) IG Memorandum, Follow-up audit of safety and assurance and compliance program, April 18, 2002.2) For SACP, see FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp).3) For grade crossing, see FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/90hrc.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/90hrc.htm).4) For OLI, see FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/oli](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/oli).5) For RSAC, see FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/rsac](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/rsac).6) For safety data, see FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/safetydata](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/safetydata).

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The RSP has five specific long-term performance measures that reflect its mission and support the critical outcome goals established by DOT to improve transportation safety nationwide. These measures concern reducing rail-related fatalities, injuries, train accidents, highway-rail grade crossing accidents, and rail hazmat releases.

**Evidence:** 1) DOT Strategic Plan 2003-2008. See website <http://Stratplan.dot.gov>.2) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. See website [www.dot.gov](http://www.dot.gov).3) DOT Performance Plan - FY 2004. See website [www.dot.gov/perfplan2004/index.htm](http://www.dot.gov/perfplan2004/index.htm).4) FRA FY 2004 Budget.5) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003. See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/about/FRAstrategic\\_plan\\_.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/about/FRAstrategic_plan_.htm).

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FRA adjusts its targets annually based on past performance, projected program resources, and the expectation of being able to meet targets.

**Evidence:** 1) DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan. 2) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. 3) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003.

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The RSP has five distinct, quantifiable, annual performance measures that demonstrate its progress toward achieving the long-range goals set by DOT, as noted above.

**Evidence:** 1) DOT Strategic Plan 2003-2008. 2) DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan. 3) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. 4) FRA FY 2004 Budget. 5) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FRA adjusts its targets annually based on past performance, projected program resources, and the expectation of being able to meet targets.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA FY 2003 and 2004 Budgets. 2) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. 3) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FRA partners with several stakeholders in the public and private sectors. States work with the FRA to enforce Federal rail safety regulations (30 States with rail safety programs employ 160 safety inspectors). Operation Lifesaver, a national, nonprofit education and awareness program, receives FRA funds for rail crossing safety and railroad rights-of-ways campaigns. At the Federal level, FRA and FHWA cooperatively manage the highway rail-grade crossing program, which is funded from FHWA resources. Further, the freight railroads and labor unions help evaluate private companies safety programs and develop strategies for system-wide improvements through SACP and RSAC.

**Evidence:** 1) Before participation can begin, each State agency must enter into an agreement with FRA for the exercise of specified authority. This agreement may delegate investigative and surveillance authority regarding all or any part of Federal railroad safety laws. 2) Operation Lifesaver, Inc., Contract/Agreement.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** FRA has not arranged for independent evaluations of the safety program's design and effectiveness. However, FRA has some mechanisms for receiving feedback on its performance such as RSAC, which reviews major regulatory programs in collaboration with industry stakeholders. FRA has also hired an independent contractor to perform human capital analysis of FRA's five railroad safety inspection disciplines.

**Evidence:** 1) RSAC minutes. See: [http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac\\_doc.htm](http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac_doc.htm). 2) DOT Human Capital Plan. See: [http://dothr.ost.dot.gov/About\\_Us/Human\\_Capital\\_Plan/human\\_capital\\_plan.html](http://dothr.ost.dot.gov/About_Us/Human_Capital_Plan/human_capital_plan.html).

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The FRA FY 2004 Budget request to Congress directly linked its five annual performance goals to budget data. FRA could improve the transparency of the budget request by distinguishing funding for the rail safety program including SACP, RSAC, the rail crossing program, and rail inspectors.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA FY 2004 Budget. See: <http://www.dot.gov/bib2004/fra.html>

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** The RSP annually reviews and adjusts or updates its performance goals and measures. It is currently assessing the effects of reducing its long-range and annual goals from five to three to more meaningfully support the DOT Safety Strategic Goal.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003. See [www.fra.dot.gov/about/fra\\_strategic\\_plan.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/about/fra_strategic_plan.htm). 2) DOT Strategic Plan 2000-2005. 3) DOT Strategic Plan 2003-2008. See <http://stratplan.dot.gov>.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**2.RG1**    **Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?**    Answer: YES    Question Weight: 11%

**Explanation:** Each regulation clearly articulates a problem statement for a specific safety issue and explains how the rule elements will solve the stated problem. When feasible, each of the rule's elements are priced separately and its benefits identified. The consensus process within the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC) also ensures a sharp focus on results. Individual working groups within RSAC are assigned to certain regulatory tasks. Each working group is comprised of knowledgeable representatives of stakeholder organizations and FRA, and the products of their deliberations may be reported to the full committee only by consensus.

**Evidence:** 1) Report on DOT Significant Rulemakings. See <http://regs.dot.gov/report2.htm>.

**3.1**    **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**    Answer: YES    Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** FRA collects monthly accident and fatality data from the nation's railroads, including data by county on the location of trespassing deaths, which is the leading type of rail fatality. The data is posted on FRA's website. DOT uses the data to improve program performance, including through a focused inspection methodology that has successfully reduced injuries and fatalities of train and engine service employees. Further, using HAZMAT data, FRA created a Safety Action Plan for shippers with the highest number hazard material incidents. Also, FRA managers develop annual Action Plans for every class 1 railroad based on safety information. Despite this work, FRA could improve its data collection and management efforts. For example, the OIG found that FRA SACP team leaders frequently didnt use accident and fatality data when developing profiles of individual railroads, and FRA didnt always use data on railroad safety inspections for program management. Also, DOT currently does not collect information on how States use their FHWA/FRA highway rail grade crossing funds.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA's "Rail Safety Statistics." See FRA website at <http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/officeofsafety>. 2) OIG Audit, Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Safety, September 30, 1999. 3) OIG Audit Report, Safety Assurance and Compliance Program, Sept 30, 1998. See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety/sacp.htm). 4) FRA primary databases are: Accident/incidents, Inspection data and the Highway-rail grade crossing inventory. See FRA website at: <http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/officeofsafety>.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** Program managers and FRA's Regional Administrators are held accountable for the success of the program and the proper administration of the regional offices. Importantly, safety performance data contributes to personnel evaluations of regional administrators, inspectors, specialists, and SACP managers. Further, FRA regional offices develop annual Regional Action Plans outlining how they will achieve their performance goals. FRA management compiles monthly Regional Performance Measures data to monitor the progress of the regions in achieving Agency goals. Additionally, State inspectors must complete a specified number of inspections each year. Ultimately, railroads are responsible for their safety records and are held accountable by civil penalties imposed by FRA. In 2002, FRA collected more than \$7.8 million in penalties from railroads and hazardous materials shippers.

**Evidence:** 1) Annual Regional Action Plans.2) Quarterly Assessments by FRA Administrator and Deputy Administrator of FRA Regional Administrators.3)Inspection Day Policy.

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** The FRA budget officer and the FRA Administrator conduct reviews semi-annually to ensure that funds have been obligated in a timely manner and for their intended purpose. Also, an extensive Annual Advance Procurement process requires every program manager to identify funding needs for any project greater than \$100k, which is then reviewed by the contracting officer and the Administrator to ensure linkage to the Strategic Plan and the budget's intended purpose.

**Evidence:** 1) Annual Advance Procurement Plan.      2) FRA budget officer and administrator mid-year and end-of-year financial reviews.

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**      Answer: NO      Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** FRA's safety program does not routinely measure program execution efficiency or effectiveness. Still, through its competitive sourcing efforts and information technology initiatives, FRA is attempting to improve the productivity of its safety inspectors. FRA has committed to develop an efficiency or effectiveness measure for its 2004 performance plan.

**Evidence:** 1) IT/competitive sourcing initiative. See: <http://www.eps.gov/spg/DOT/FRA/OAGS/DTFR53-03-R-00004/SynopsisP.htm>.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** FRA works with several Federal programs on a regular basis, particularly in the development of rail safety regulations. For example, FRA and RSPA developed regulations for transporting hazardous materials by rail, which FRA then enforces. FRA and DHS are working together to delineate their responsibilities for rail security issues. Going forward, FRA will work with FWHHA, FMCSA, and NHTSA to improve DOT's data collection on highway-rail grade crossings.

**Evidence:** 1) State Rail Safety Participation Program. See FRA website [www.fra.dot.gov/safety](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety). 2) State Railroad Safety Technical Training Funding Agreement. 3) Operation Lifesaver, Inc., Grant Agreement. 4) RSPA relationship yields current, consistently enforced hazardous materials regulations. 5) FRA/FTA Joint Statement of Agency Policy July 10, 2000. 6) OIG Audit Report - Safety Assurance and Compliance Program, Sept 30, 1998.

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** The Department's IG audit of FRA's financial statements and the Department's consolidated financial statements found that the financial statements were fairly presented in all material respects, and conformed with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. No material internal control weaknesses were cited or discovered. FRA was the pilot agency within DOT for implementing the department's new financial accounting system, DELPHI.

**Evidence:** DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report; DOT IG Report FI-2003-018 (Jan.27, 2003).

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** For example, responding to GAO and OIG report recommendations that the program be more data driven, in 2001 FRA instituted a focused inspection methodology to reduce injuries and fatalities of train and engine service employees. Using data that disclosed specific tasks that railroad employees are engaged in when such fatalities occurred, inspectors focused their human factor monitoring activities on these tasks. Since the initiative began, there has been a reduction in injuries and fatalities related to those tasks. FRA is now developing similar strategies for improving other aspects of railroad safety.

**Evidence:** 1) "Safety Assurance and Compliance Program" forums between FRA managers and railroad officials. 2) Leadership Development Programs. 3) Regular use of Federal Executive Institute. 4) "360" Management Reviews. 5) "Coaching" programs for senior program managers. 6) Responsibility-Based Safety Enforcement Policy.

**3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

**Explanation:** FRA's has two programs specifically intended to elicit input on FRA's rail safety program from key stakeholders. The Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC) involves all segments of the rail community on significant safety regulatory issues. The RSAC consists of 27 voting entities representing hundreds of companies and organizations. The SACP is a partnering effort between FRA and individual railroads to collaboratively identify and correct root causes of problems across a railroad. The program supplements the enforcement efforts of FRA safety inspectors.

**Evidence:** Information on RSAC regulatory issues, meetings, contacts, etc., is located on FRA's public web site and distributed via notices in the Federal Register. See [http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac\\_doc.htm](http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac_doc.htm).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	89%	91%	67%	

- 3.RG2 Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: All significant safety regulations under the RSP prepare regulatory impact analyses, if required under EO 12866; regulatory flexibility analyses, if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA; and cost-benefit analyses, if required under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. All analyses complied with OMB guidelines.
- Evidence: See the electronic docket DMS at DMS.DOT.GOV. FRA posts the Regulatory Evaluations/Regulatory Impact Analysis and Cost Benefits in the electronic docket for public access. Two examples are FRA-1999-6439-12: Regulatory Evaluation for the Train Horn Rule (NPRM) and FRA-2001-11068-13: Regulatory Evaluation of Drug and Alcohol Use.
- 3.RG3 Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: In accords with DOT's Regulatory Policies and Procedures, E.O. 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), and Sec. 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, FRA conducts reviews of its rules that (1) have been published within the last 10 years and (2) have a significant economic impact on small entities. FRA publishes a semiannual list in the Federal Register of any such rules that it will review during the year. The DOT's Regulations Council reviews each agenda and DOT has created an Internet site that provides general information for the public about its rulemaking responsibilities and activities.
- Evidence: 1) DOT Semiannual Regulatory Agenda (May 27, 2003).
- 3.RG4 Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: The FRA, working with interested industry parties, formulates regulations that direct resources towards efficiently achieving safety improvement goals. FRA's cost/benefit analyses demonstrate that in every case it has chosen the regulatory option that produces the greatest benefit at the lowest cost among the reasonably available options. FRA safety regulations are designed to significantly reduce railroad operation hazards to railroad employees and the general public.
- Evidence: FRA performs a cost/benefit analysis for every rule, and solicits comments from all stakeholders on its assumptions, calculations, and conclusions, including FRA's efforts to achieve program goals and maximize net benefits. FRA considers all serious comments and makes appropriate changes in the Final Rule and its accompanying cost/benefit analysis. In addition, OMB reviews each FRA rule and accompanying cost/benefit analysis to ensure that FRA gives high priority to the selection of the most cost-beneficial option. For example, FRA received over 3,000 comments on a proposed regulation to establish standards for the use of train horns at highway-rail grade crossings. The proposed rule permitted quiet zones where communities could prohibit the sounding of train horns if they instituted supplemental safety measures. Many commenters noted the high cost of implementing supplemental safety measures at grade crossings that have a historically low risk of accidents. As a result, FRA modified the proposed rule to make accident history a criterion for determining the need for supplemental safety measures.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** Overall, safety trends have been positive. Since the late 1980s, FRA's five primary safety indicators show significant improvements, despite increases in rail traffic. For example, rail related injuries per million train miles has fallen from 45 in 1987 to 15 in 2002 and rail hazmat releases per billion hazmat ton miles has fallen from 20 in 1996 to 11 in 2001. During this time train miles increased from 581 million to 728 million.

**Evidence:** 1) DOT Strategic Plan 2003-2008. See website <http://Stratplan.dot.gov>. 2) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. See website [www.dot.gov](http://www.dot.gov). 3) DOT Performance Plan - FY 2004. See website [www.dot.gov/perfplan2004/index.htm](http://www.dot.gov/perfplan2004/index.htm). 4) FRA FY 2004 Budget. 5) FRA Strategic Plan 2000-2003. See FRA website at [www.fra.dot.gov/about/FRAstrategic\\_plan\\_.htm](http://www.fra.dot.gov/about/FRAstrategic_plan_.htm).

**4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** In recent years, FRA has not met all of its annual performance goals, though has come close in most cases. Since the late 1980s, safety indicators have shown significant improvement, but in recent years gains have tapered off. Because railroads by now have taken obvious steps to improve safety, marginal improvements are today harder to achieve.

**Evidence:** 1) FRA FY 2004 Budget, in which the collected data was used to set new performance goals. 2) DOT FY 2004 Performance Plan. 3) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report. 4) "Switching Operations Fatality Analysis" data. 5) FRA's "Railroad Safety Statistics." See FRA Safety Website at [www.fra.dot.gov/safety](http://www.fra.dot.gov/safety). Click on Safety Data.

**4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** FRA currently lacks established efficiency and effectiveness measures for program delivery, but has committed to developing efficiency and effectiveness measures for FY 2004. FRA has taken steps to improve program delivery, particularly through recent IT investments that have made rail safety inspectors more productive by reducing the time required to process and retrieve data from FRA's data bases.

**Evidence:** Examples of IT investments include a safety data website that allows rail safety inspectors to access data instantly rather than having to wait weeks. Also, FRA has custom software that allows inspectors to submit inspection reports from a PC rather than by paper, which has reduced input errors and processing time. The system edits that data entered, does cross validation checks, and provides immediate correction of inspection data. The system was launched nationwide in 1996. Further, FRA inspectors now use Palm PDAs to record track conditions and upload data to a PC. Track inspectors are furnished with a CD disk that is downloaded into their Palm, allowing them to quickly locate defects recorded by track geometry vehicles. This advance has reduced the amount of time inspectors spend locating defects.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration  
**Type(s):** Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	89%	91%	67%	Effective

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**      Answer: NA      Question Weight: 0%

**Explanation:** The RSP is the primary Federal regulator of railroad safety nationwide. It is uniquely charged with ensuring that the Nation's railroads operate safely. Therefore, it is difficult to find a suitable comparison. No other Federal agency is designed by law or regulation to cover the broad safety operations of railroads.

**Evidence:** 1) Title 49 USC Chs. 201-213 (railroad safety program). 2) Title 49 USC Ch. 51 (transport hazardous materials). 3) 49 CFR Sec 1.49 delegates authority to the Federal Railroad Administration. 4) DOT FY 2002 Performance & Accountability Report.

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**      Answer: SMALL EXTENT      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** A full review of FRA's safety program has not been conducted for several years. The most recent indicate that FRA needs to make better use of data in managing its programs, but FRA also is making efforts to improve. A 1999 report noted progress in reducing grade-crossing accidents and fatalities, and improvements in some aspects of the Safety Assurance and Compliance Program. Also, DOT's IG noted last year that, "FRA is moving in the right direction in better using the information developed in the SACP process," and that there is improved accountability and consistency in the SACP. The IG noted the evolving nature of SACP, "with improvements being added to FRA's safety program."

**Evidence:** 1) The Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Safety Report was issued on Sept. 30, 1999. See: [http://www.oig.dot.gov/item\\_details.php?item=223](http://www.oig.dot.gov/item_details.php?item=223). The report on the Safety and Compliance Program was issued on Sept. 30, 1998. 2) April 2002 Follow-up Audit by DOT IG of Safety Assurance and Compliance Program.

**4.RG1 Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 20%

**Explanation:** FRA receives qualitative feedback on the impact of its regulations through the RSAC program. Industry stakeholders including organized labor and railroads discuss the effectiveness and design of current and new regulations. FRA uses this information when updating its regulations and designing its enforcement efforts.

**Evidence:** The RSAC meets quarterly. Meeting minutes are available at [http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac\\_doc.htm](http://rsac.fra.dot.gov/rsac_doc.htm).

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration

---

**Measure:** Rail-related Fatalities Per Million Train Miles

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of rail-related fatalities per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	1.23	1.36	
2002	1.2	1.3	
2003	1.25		
2004	1.22		
2005	1.21		

**Measure:** Rail Hazmat Releases Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of hazardous-materials releases by rail mode per billion hazmat ton-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	10.2	11.34	
2002	10.12		
2003	10.1		
2004	10.09		
2005	10		

**Measure:** Rail-related Injuries Per Million Train Miles

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of rail-related injuries per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	13.92	15.44	

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration

---

**Measure:** Rail-related Injuries Per Million Train Miles

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of rail-related injuries per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2002	13.04	14.99	
2003	14.8		
2004	14.5		
2005	14.45		

**Measure:** Train Accidents Per Million Train-Miles

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of train accidents per million train-miles

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	3.29	4.25	
2002	4.06	3.66	
2003	3.63		
2004	3.6		
2005	3.59		

**Measure:** Grade Crossing Accidents Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of highway-rail grade crossing accidents per (million train-miles times trillion vehicle-miles-traveled).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	1.39	1.63	
2002	1.39	1.5	
2003	1.4		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration

---

**Measure:** Grade Crossing Accidents Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of highway-rail grade crossing accidents per (million train-miles times trillion vehicle-miles-traveled).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2004	1.29		
2005	1.28		

**Measure:** Rail Hazmat Releases Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of hazardous-materials releases by rail mode per billion hazmat ton-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2001	10.2	11.34	
2002	10.12		
2003	10.1		
2004	10.09		
2005	10		

**Measure:** Rail-related Fatalities Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of rail-related fatalities per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	1.23	1.36	
2002	1.2	1.3	
2003	1.25		
2004	1.22		
2005	1.21		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration

---

**Measure:** Rail-related Injuries Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of rail-related injuries per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	13.92	15.44	
2002	13.04	14.99	
2003	14.8		
2004	14.5		
2005	14.45		

**Measure:** Train Accidents Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of train accidents per million train-miles.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	3.29	4.25	
2002	4.06	3.66	
2003	3.63		
2004	3.6		
2005	3.59		

**Measure:** Grade Crossing Accidents Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of highway-rail grade crossing accidents per (million train-miles times trillion vehicle-miles-traveled).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2001	1.39	1.63	

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Railroad Safety Program (RSP)  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Railroad Administration

---

**Measure:** Grade Crossing Accidents Rate

**Additional Information:** This measure tracks FRA's performance in reducing the number of highway-rail grade crossing accidents per (million train-miles times trillion vehicle-miles-traveled).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2002	1.39	1.5	
2003	1.4		
2004	1.29		
2005	1.28		

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

- 1.1 Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation: FAA's Research, Engineering & Development (R,E&D) program conducts aviation safety research on: (1) fire and smoke resistance technologies; (2) aircraft maintenance and structural technologies; (3) the relationship between human factors and aviation accidents; and (4) air traffic control.
- Evidence: Federal Aviation Act (P.L. 85-726); Title 49, Subtitle VII, Aviation Safety Research Act (P.L. 100-591); Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508).
- 
- 1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation: The FAA is the sole certification authority for the United States aviation community; R,E&D provides the research and information necessary for the FAA to regulate and create standards for industry, which leads to a reduction of the aviation fatal accident rate.
- Evidence: Federal Aviation Act (P.L. 85-726), Title 49, Subtitle VII; Aviation Safety Research Act (P.L. 100-591); FAA Strategic Plan; R&D Strategy.
- 
- 1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation: The program is solely a unique FAA function, and no other organization duplicates this program; FAA does research to establish standards in the aviation community. The FAA is the sole certification authority for the industry. If the program did not exist, no other public or private organization could take its place.
- Evidence: Federal Aviation Act (P.L. 85-726), Title 49, Subtitle VII, Aviation Safety Research Act (P.L. 100-591); R&D Strategy; National Aviation Research Plan; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; National Aviation Weather Initiatives.
- 
- 1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation: The program engages both internal and external stakeholders to provide input and assessment of the program on a regular basis. R,E&D also leverages its external partners for people, skills and resources. For example, its Centers of Excellence partners from academia and industry provide R,E&D with matching resources for aviation-related R&D.
- Evidence: National Aviation Research Plan/REDAC Recommendations; R&D Portfolio Development Process, Guidance/Reference Document; FAA Joint Resource Council Process; The Product Development Team for In-Flight Icing, 2001 Plan.
- 
- 1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 20%
- Explanation: R,E&D supports the FAA's operational, regulatory, and oversight functions, which, in turn, directly support the flying public. Unlike other federal research programs, each research project focuses on a particular high-priority regulatory activity.
- Evidence: National Aviation Research Plan/REDAC Recommendations; R&D Strategy; Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee and Subcommittee Recommendations and Reports; R&D Portfolio Development Process, Guidance/Reference Document; FAA Joint Resource Council Process; The Product Development Team for In-Flight Icing, 2001 Plan

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

**2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?**      Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D program has specific long-term performance measures, tied to specific research programs/projects that support accomplishment of long-term national and agency goals. As one example, as part of the FAA goal to reduce the fatal accident rate, the Weather Research Program has a performance measure to develop 5 turbulence forecast products that allow pilots to avoid hazardous flight conditions improving safety and ensuring efficient airspace use by 2008.

**Evidence:** R,E&D Budget Linkage sheet; National Research Plan for Aviation Safety, Security, Efficiency, and Environmental Compatibility; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; National Aviation Research Plan; ARA Annual Performance Plan (<http://www2.faa.gov/ara/perform/>); ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Plan Goal Reports

**2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?**      Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D program's annual goals are ambitious. The long-term research goals are mapped to multi-year objectives, which help track the progress of the research through the establishment of annual milestones.

**Evidence:** FAA Strategic Plan; R&D Strategy; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; ARA Annual Performance Plan; ARA SES Short-Term Incentives; Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance Business Management Handbook; FAA In-flight Icing Plan; In-Flight Icing PDT (#4) Technical Direction, FY 2002

**2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?**      Answer: Yes      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D program has annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals. Progress toward these goals are measured quarterly.

**Evidence:** ARA Annual Performance Plan; ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Goal Reports; ARA SES Short-term Incentives, DOT and FAA Strategic Plans, DOT Performance Plan, FAA Strategic Plan Supplement.

**2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?**      Answer: YES      Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** The program develops baselines and ambitious targets, in conjunction with sponsors and partners, for all of its annual measures.

**Evidence:** ARA Annual Performance Plan; ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Goal Reports; ARA SES Short-term Incentives; National Aviation Research Plan

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

**2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** All partners commit to the annual and long-term program goals through a variety of means, such as MOU's, SOW's, Joint Councils, and management plans. Regularly scheduled reviews are conducted to ensure compliance and progress.

**Evidence:** Memorandums of Understanding; FAA Grants Order; ARA Goal 2 (Human Factors) Integration in Research and Acquisition, Project Deliverables and Status Report; FAA/NASA Management Plan; Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance Business Management Handbook; Statement of Work: Fracture Mechanics Properties Standards; FAA Joint Resource Council Process.

**2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** There are many regular and ad-hoc reviews of the program, including: 1) annually, research sponsors review program outcomes and outputs, prioritize and plan research efforts, and make decisions about the program; 2) the R,E&D Advisory Committee (REDAC), comprised of representatives from industry, universities, other agencies, users, and associations, reviews research and makes recommendations about budget and program priorities and merit; 3) external groups, such as the National Academy of Science, review program and results; 4) research is presented at international conferences and in Technical Reports available to the external research community.

**Evidence:** National Aviation Research Plan/REDAC Recommendations; National Academy of Science and Transportation Research Board Publications; The AVR R&D Requirements Process; Program Planning Team Documents; and R&D Portfolio Development Process, Guidance/Reference Document.

**2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** Last year, R,E&D's Budget request related FAA Strategic goals to resource requests (all direct and indirect costs). Unfortunately, the FAA draft document needed more work and we expect that it will submit a performance-based request this year.

**Evidence:** FY 2004 Budget, FY 2004 FAA Congressional Justification.

**2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

**Explanation:** Realizing the need for a R&D strategy to guide program investments, in FY 2002, FAA published its first five-year R&D Strategy. R,E&D is now examining the programs/projects in the National Aviation Research Plan and mapping them to the R&D Strategy to identify potential gaps in the strategic planning process and to evaluate any gaps to determine the appropriate corrective action, i.e., revision to the Strategy or revision of the Research Plan.

**Evidence:** R&D Strategy; Draft R&D Strategy Assessment; R&D Portfolio Development Process: Lessons Learned; R&D Executive Board Portfolio Development Process Project Management Plan

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

- 2.RD1**     **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?**     Answer: Yes     Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation:** In addition to continued reviews by FAA management, research sponsors, and the REDAC subcommittees, each research area works closely with customers and other agencies to ensure continuing relevance of the work. In addition, the program receives continuous external review to ensure that it is meeting customer needs by: meeting with the users; seeking feedback; presenting progress reports at public forums and science reviews; publishing and presenting technical papers; obtaining formal peer validation of science; training specific users on product usage; and maintaining and sharing lessons learned.
- Evidence:** Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee and Subcommittee Recommendations and Reports; Interagency Agreement, Number DTFA01-98-Z-020024 Between the FAA and NOAA; Integrated Icing Forecast Algorithm 9IIFA) Assessment at Regional Airlines -- Final Report; FAA Current Icing Potential (CIP) and Forecast Icing Potential (FIP) Regional Airlines Benefit Analysis; Commercial Aviation Safety Team (CAST) documents.
- 2.RD2**     **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?**     Answer: Yes     Question Weight: 10%
- Explanation:** Program priorities are determined in concert with internal/external reviews conducted by the REDAC, internal sponsors, and national and Departmental guidance, such as from OMB. Priorities are also outlined in the DOT Research Development, and Technology Plan, as well as in the FAA Strategic Plan and the ARA Performance Plan. Using external input, the R&D Executive Board, through a documented process and working through program planning teams, provides budget guidance for budget planning and allocation.
- Evidence:** R,E&D Budget Linkage sheet; R&D Executive Board Portfolio Development Process Project Management Plan; National Aviation Research Plan; R&D Strategy; DOT Research, Development, and Technology Plan; ARA Annual Performance Goals; Joint Resource Council Process; Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee and Subcommittee Recommendations and Reports; The AVR R&D Requirements Process; Decision-Based Weather Needs for the Air Route Traffic Control Center Management Unit.
- 3.1**     **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**     Answer: Yes     Question Weight: 12%
- Explanation:** The goals in the annual ARA Performance Plan are tracked and reported on quarterly. In addition, projects within the program regularly collect performance information from partners and use it to manage the program and improve performance.
- Evidence:** ARA Annual Performance Plan; ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Plan Goal Reports; ARA Goal 2 (Human Factors)--Project Deliverables & FY 02 Status Report; FAA/NASA Wake Turbulence Research Management Plan; FAA/NASA Joint University Program reviews; COE Program reviews.

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

**3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** Program managers are responsible for achieving results and performance measures are included into performance evaluations and annual work plans. In addition, through program and business plans, as well as contractual arrangements and grant language, and through formal agreements, such as Memorandums of Understanding/Agreement, program managers hold partners accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results.

**Evidence:** ARA Short-Term Incentives; ARA Goal 2 (Human Factors): Project Deliverables & FY 02 Status Report; FAA/NASA Wake Turbulence Research Management Plan.

**3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The FAA Budget Office ensures that all program funds are obligated in a timely manner in accordance with the program plan. The R,E&D program traditionally obligates 95% of it funds in the first year and unobligated funds are carried forward. Obligations are reviewed monthly, quarterly, and at the end of each fiscal year; corrective action is taken as necessary.

**Evidence:** ARA Monthly Financial and Personnel Reports

**3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** R,E&D's performance plan does not include efficiency measures and targets. However, there are many efficiencies realized through assessment of program performance. The program also gains tremendous cost effectiveness through its Centers of Excellence Program, which provide matching funds from non-federal sources, enabling the program to leverage industry sources to help finance critical safety research. Furthermore, the program uses a labor distribution reporting system, which tracks the personnel hours and costs an employee is working on a project.

**Evidence:** Core Compensation Program information is on-line at [http://www1.faa.gov/corecomp/plans\\_policies.cfm](http://www1.faa.gov/corecomp/plans_policies.cfm); COE brochure; COE program reviews

**3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D program actively collaborates with its external partners on related programs and to leverage program funding. For example, the FAA/NASA Interagency Air Traffic Management Integrated Product Team and the FAA/NASA Aviation Safety Program share resources and conduct joint planning to achieve common aviation goals.

**Evidence:** FAA/NASA Interagency Air Traffic Management Integrated Product Team Integrated Plan; FAA/NASA Integrated Safety Research Plan; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; FAA/NASA MOUs and MOAs; The National Plan for Civil Aviation Human Factors: An Initiative for Research and Application (FAA, NASA, DOD); FAA/NASA Wake Turbulence Management Plan; FAA/NASA Roadmaps

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

**3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The program is free of material internal control weaknesses. Monthly accounting reports monitor fiscal status, the financial system has on-line, real-time inquiry capability for reporting and monitoring obligations. In FY 2004, FAA will implement a new cost accounting system that will strengthen financial management by allowing R,E&D to view plans versus and actual at various reporting levels, directly within the accounting system, and on a real-time basis; drill-down to the individual accounting transaction level; and reduce accounting errors.

**Evidence:** OIG report on FAA's financial statements for FY 2001-2002; FAA Performance and Accountability Report, Independent Audit Report, Financial Statements; all docs can be found on-line [http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html\\_fm/finst.html](http://www1.faa.gov/aba/html_fm/finst.html)

**3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** In response to R,E&D's human capital issues, FAA conducted an organizational assessment and found skill gaps in the areas of project/program management, leadership, and systems engineering. As a result, core curricula and training were instituted in these areas. Human Factors (HF) specialists were needed in integrated program teams, and, subsequently, HF specialists were hired and placed on those teams.

**Evidence:** R&D Executive Board Portfolio Development Process Project Management Plan; Draft R&D Strategy Assessment; ICIP documentation.

**3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 12%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D program allocates 100 percent of its funding (less some congressional direction) using a competitive process that ensures good science, proper use of public funds, and is consistent with Circular A-11. Once awarded, contract and grant progresses are regularly evaluated against scientific and technical criteria to ensure quality. Criteria are defined and reviewed internally and with external partners.

**Evidence:** Circular A-11; FAA's Acquisition Management System; FAA Grant Order; Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee and Subcommittee Recommendations and Reports; Center of Excellence Program documents; Small Business and Innovative Research Program.

**4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D Program is making significant progress in achieving its long-term goals. For FY 2002, the annual accomplishments will allow the R,E&D Program to meet or surpass its long-term goals.

**Evidence:** R,E&D Budget Linkage sheet; National Research Plan for Aviation Safety, Security, Efficiency, and Environmental Compatibility; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; National Aviation Research Plan; ARA Annual Performance Plan (<http://www2.faa.gov/ara/perform/>); ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Plan Goal Reports

**4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** The R,E&D Program met or exceeded its annual performance goals.

**Evidence:** R,E&D Budget Linkage sheet; National Research Plan for Aviation Safety, Security, Efficiency, and Environmental Compatibility; FAA Operational Evolution Plan; National Aviation Research Plan; ARA Annual Performance Plan; ARA Quarterly and Annual Performance Plan Goal Reports

## Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration  
**Type(s):** Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	90%	88%	92%	

**4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**

Answer: LARGE  
EXTENT

Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** Although R,E&D's performance plans do not include efficiency measures or targets, the FAA has succeeded in a number of efforts that make conducting its research more efficient by reducing costs and increasing outputs. For example, R,E&D reduced overhead FTE from 27% to 13% in four years; reduced correspondence processing time from 9,050 minutes to 170 minutes per grant award; and expanded outputs of research per unit cost through Centers of Excellence, which require 50/50 cost sharing.

**Evidence:** FAA/NASA Interagency Air Traffic Management Integrated Product Team Integrated Plan; FAA/NASA Integrated Safety Research Plan; R&D Portfolio Development Process: Lessons Learned; R&D Portfolio Development Process, Guidance/Reference Document; R&D Executive Board Portfolio Development Process Project Management Plan; R&D Strategy Assessment (draft); FY 1999 Hammer Award; FTE data years FY 2000-2003.

**4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**

Answer: NA

Question Weight: 0%

**Explanation:** There are no evaluations comparing R,E&D to other research programs.

**Evidence:**

**4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 25%

**Explanation:** The program is reviewed by an external advisory committee, the congressionally-mandated Research, Development and Engineering Advisory Committee, as well as external bodies, such as the National Academy of Science. These groups believe the Program is effective and achieving good results. The Advisory Committee also meets with NASA's research advisory committee once a year to ensure their is no duplication of effort and that resources are focused on high priority national research goals.

**Evidence:** Research, Development and Engineering Advisory Committee recommendations and subcommittee reports; National Academy of Science and Transportation Research Board Publications; R&D conference proceedings; FAA Technical Reports.

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

---

**Measure:** Turbulence forecast products developed that allow pilots to avoid hazardous flight conditions while improving safety and ensuring efficient airspace use.  
**Additional Information:** On average, turbulence causes 45 accidents, 100 injuries, and 40 fatalities with costs exceeding \$135M per year

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2008	6		

**Measure:** Turbulence-forecast products developed (linked to long-term target to develop five new turbulence forecast products by 2008)  
**Additional Information:** 2002 Target--Develop clear turbulence product above 20,000 ft in experimental use. 2003 Target--Develop clear turbulence product above 20,000 ft fully operational. 2004 Target--Develop clear turbulence product above 10,000 ft. 2006 Target--Develop convective induced turbulence product. 2007 Target--Develop mountain wave turbulence product. 2008 Target--Develop clear turbulence produce for all altitudes.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2002	1	1	
2004	1		
2006	1		
2007	1		
2008	1		

**Measure:** In-flight icing and freezing precipitation aloft forecast products developed that allow pilots to avoid hazardous flight conditions while improving airspace use.  
**Additional Information:** Icing is a major safety issue for general aviation and small commuter aircraft; On average icing causes 24 accidents and 31 fatalities per year.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2008	6		

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

**Measure:** In-flight icing and freezing precipitation aloft products developed (linked to long-term target to develop six new in-flight icing and freezing precipitation products by 2008).

**Additional Information:** 2002 Target--Implement year round product guidance and severity/icing type forecasts.2004 Target--Develop forecast icing product.2006 Target--Develop current icing potential severity product. 2007 Target--Develop forecast icing potential, Alaska product.2008 Target--Develop terminal scale forecasting product.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2002	1	1	
2006	1		
2007	1		
2008	1		

**Measure:** New technologies, procedures, test methods, and criteria developed for preventing accidents that result from hidden in-flight fires and fuel tank explosions.

**Additional Information:** Fire caused approximately twenty percent of the 1,153 fatalities on U.S. transport airlines between 1981-1990.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Long-term
2008	1		

**Measure:** Technologies, procedures, test methods, and criteria for preventing accidents that result from hidden in-flight fires and fuel tank explosions (linked to long-term target)

**Additional Information:** 2002 Target--Fabricate and install nitrogen inerting system in 747SP for ground-based inerting of the center wing; Test a seat fabric fiber to determine if it provides a 50% reduction in heat; Propose a technical standard order for flammability test on airline blankets; Finish research on full-scale test evaluation of cargo compartment fire suppression system.2003 Target-- Develop and demonstrate thermoset resin for cabin panels with factor of 10 reduction in heat release rate and draft technical report describing results; Conduct 40 hours of flight tests on FAA inerting system using an Airbus A320 and Boeing 747; Draft 2 technical reports describing fuel tank inerting research progress.2004 Target--Draft report comparing fuel tank inerting concentrations during A320 flight tests with model predictions; Conduct 30 hours of flight tests on FAA inerting system in NASA 747 (Edwards AFB). 2005 Target--Draft report describing FAA/NASA inerting system flight tests and fuel vapor measurements; Develop and demonstrate a thermoplastic for cabin molded components with factor of 10 reduction in heat release rate and draft a report describing results .2006 Target--Develop and demonstrate a seat foam with a factor of ten reduction in heat release rate and draft report describing results.2007 Target--Develop and demonstrate a seat fabric fiber with a factor of ten reduction in heat release rate and draft a report describing the results.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2002	Complete	Complete	

## PART Performance Measurements

**Program:** Research, Engineering & Development  
**Agency:** Department of Transportation  
**Bureau:** Federal Aviation Administration

**Measure:** Technologies, procedures, test methods, and criteria for preventing accidents that result from hidden in-flight fires and fuel tank explosions (linked to long-term target)

**Additional Information:** 2002 Target--Fabricate and install nitrogen inerting system in 747SP for ground-based inerting of the center wing; Test a seat fabric fiber to determine if it provides a 50% reduction in heat; Propose a technical standard order for flammability test on airline blankets; Finish research on full-scale test evaluation of cargo compartment fire suppression system.2003 Target-- Develop and demonstrate thermoset resin for cabin panels with factor of 10 reduction in heat release rate and draft technical report describing results; Conduct 40 hours of flight tests on FAA inerting system using an Airbus A320 and Boeing 747; Draft 2 technical reports describing fuel tank inerting research progress.2004 Target--Draft report comparing fuel tank inerting concentrations during A320 flight tests with model predictions; Conduct 30 hours of flight tests on FAA inerting system in NASA 747 (Edwards AFB). 2005 Target--Draft report describing FAA/NASA inerting system flight tests and fuel vapor measurements; Develop and demonstrate a thermoplastic for cabin molded components with factor of 10 reduction in heat release rate and draft a report describing results .2006 Target--Develop and demonstrate a seat foam with a factor of ten reduction in heat release rate and draft report describing results.2007 Target--Develop and demonstrate a seat fabric fiber with a factor of ten reduction in heat release rate and draft a report describing the results.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<b>Measure Term:</b> Annual
2004	Complete		
2005	Complete		
2006	Complete		
2007	Complete		