

**Federal Lands Transportation Program
Guidelines for FY 2016 Investment Strategy
(Competing)**

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide the eligible Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs), who are not authorized set funding amounts in Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, with guidance for developing their FY2016 Federal Lands Transportation Program (FLTP) investment strategy(ies).

Path Forward Under FAST Act

The new FAST Act provides an opportunity for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and applicable partners to apply lessons learned from Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act. In that spirit, FHWA has elected to create two, aligned guideline documents, one for partners whose allocation amounts are cited in FAST and this one for partners where the Secretary decides on funding amounts. This document applies to the:

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM),
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE),
- Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), and
- prospective independent federal agencies with natural resource and land management responsibilities

Although the *transportation* performance goal areas will be the same in both documents for both sets of partners, the intent and subsequent methodologies for telling an agency's performance story do differ. For partners who do not receive a known sum of funds annually per FAST, it is FHWA's intent, barring any extenuating circumstances, to simplify the process by requesting a multi-year strategy in subsequent fiscal years. However, for this first year under FAST, we are initiating a single year evaluation process for multiple reasons; namely, the addition of a new, known partner BOR, the uncertainty with other independent federal agencies who may be eligible for this program, and the late start of FAST implementation within FY16. We realize the importance of allocating funds in a timely manner to ensure the next construction season can be realized. Moving forward with a single year approach followed by a multi-year methodology will minimize risk and allow existing partners to continue advancing their efforts.

Investment Strategies

Per 23 U.S.C. § 203 and amended by the FAST Act, coupled with FHWA's interpretation, all eligible recipients under the FLTP submit an application describing how the use of FLTP funds will advance "performance management" including the goals of the Secretary of Transportation and Secretary of the respective FLMA. Applications will be referred to as "investment strategies" to more accurately describe their contents. A specific investment strategy format or structure is not provided in legislation therefore this guidance identifies the content and framework for the BLM, COE, BOR, and eligible federal independent agencies. The investment strategies are forward-looking and are (will be) complemented by partners'

annual accomplishment reports. The framework described herein required both consistency and flexibility as we consider partners funded at different levels while also considering the past experience of each partner. Partners' performance progress and strategies will be scalable based on these key factors.

*Partners are asked to develop their investment strategies using the "Elements" listed below and are asked to tailor their proposals using one or more funding scenarios within the \$22M authorized amount in FY2016. The use of the elements will promote a consistent framework for each partner to describe their inventory, performance goals, measures, targets and/or strategies. Please note the strength of partners' investment strategies will be assessed using the evaluation criteria below and point system in the right-hand columns. FHWA will review your responses and apply scores based on the criteria below for allocation purposes. In addition, we will review partners' investment strategies to ensure they support the intent of USC 23 Section 203 as amended by the new FAST Act. Under MAP-21 and now strengthened in FAST, the law cites *performance management* and the Department of Transportation's (DOT's) and FLMA Secretaries' performance goals as criteria on the uses of program funds.*

- The available funding will be awarded in the ratio that each FLMA point total bears to all of the points scored by the FLMAs.
(Note: It is FHWA's intent to set-aside a small portion of funds for prospective federal agencies deemed eligible to compete for funds. In the event no contact has occurred with FHWA by an independent federal agency, the funds will be made available to the BLM, COE and BOR based on the funding percentages approved by the FHWA Administrator.)

ELEMENT 1 - FLTP System Definition (Citation - USC 23 Sec 203 (b) (2) (c))

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

System Definition

Under this section, please describe, at a high level, the part of your public transportation system to be included in your National Federal Lands Transportation Facility Inventory as defined in 23 U.S.C. Section 203(c). This includes public highways, roads, bridges, trails, or transit systems. *(Note: By separate correspondence, FLH will be requesting your detailed inventory data for roads, trails and transit systems. For bridges, partners use the NBIS as the official repository. For public highways and roads, minimum route identification data attributes were identified in a FLH memorandum dated September 30, 2014. Partners are at liberty to use additional route ID attributes than those reflected in the memorandum for their own purposes.)* For this investment strategy, please describe your current status and planned efforts related to identifying your paved, native and/or gravel roads using the minimum route ID standards for your FLTP system only. Address how your system definition strategies will support FHWA's minimum data standards and milestones.

Evaluation:

Element	How this will be evaluated for FY 2016
<p>1. System Definition:</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which the system is adequately defined based on the latest guidance including minimum route ID standards.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if addressed generally, or not at all, at the time of investment strategy submittal; • 1 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for identifying a partner’s <i>entire FLTP inventory</i> in the investment strategy submittal; • 2 if up to 50% of the estimated FLTP inventory will be defined during the fiscal year, including roads using minimum route ID standards; and • 3 if 51-100% of the estimated FLTP inventory will be defined during the fiscal year, including roads using minimum route ID standards.

ELEMENT 2 – State of Good Repair of Transportation Facilities

(Citation - USC 23 Sec 203 (b) (2) (B) (I) (I))

Paved, Native, and/or Gravel Road Condition – Based on the collaborative effort with partners over the past 18 months on examining road condition collection methodologies, the FHWA/FLH strongly encourages partners to use one of the collection methodologies listed below for the long-term. In doing so, all partners will be moving toward a more consistent approach. Consequently, we will be better positioned to administer the program together, leverage and pool resources, and/or articulate a consistent performance story to one another and external parties.

If your desired approach over the life of FAST deviates from the list below, please describe its benefits. We recognize some partners may be using these methods now while others may not. FHWA is cognizant of the inter-relationships of road asset data to other asset management and maintenance systems employed by FLMAs and other federal agencies, i.e., evolving to a new standard has larger internal budgeting implications. We are fully prepared to work with each partner individually to tailor a plan that is realistic, scalable and acceptable to all parties using the methodologies below. (Note: The technical details and questions associated with the road condition standards will be addressed separately.)

Collection Methodology for Paved Roads

- a. University of Wisconsin’s Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) tool for Asphalt Roads - <http://www.apa-mi.org/docs/Asphalt-PASERManual.pdf>, 0-10 rating schema
- b. Pavement Condition Rating (PCR)

- i. Detailed Manual
- ii. Simplified Manual and/or
- iii. Automated Data Collection Vehicle
- iv. Note: Detailed information on PCR will be provided separately. If partners elect to use an automated data collection vehicle, they are requested to coordinate the effort from inception with FLH since there is no industry standard.

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

Collection Methodology for Native and Gravel Roads

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

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

Note: We encourage all partners to use the rating descriptions of Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor for long-term system reporting. The “roll-up” values and descriptions of what may constitute an Excellent vs Good, as an example, is a conversation and collaborative action that we intend to have with all FLTP partners over the next year.

For the purposes of this effort and if available, please include any existing baseline FLTP paved, native and/or gravel road condition information. Please differentiate between paved and unpaved roads. Based on your proposed funding scenario(s), please indicate how FLTP investments will impact your baseline road condition data. (Note: We recognize a more comprehensive, multi-year road condition collection effort is needed to accurately describe changes in overall network condition. For the purposes of this effort, please describe the impacts on road condition as best you can, e.g., output-based results/projected miles of improved roads using FY16 funds.)

Evaluation:

Element	How this will be evaluated for FY 2016
<p>State of Good Repair of Transportation Facilities</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which baseline road condition data will be collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH in FY16.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if no effort will be made to collect baseline road condition data in FY16; • 1 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for roads; • 2 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for roads and if up to 10% of baseline road condition data will be collected on their entire FLTP network using one of the methodologies above; or • 3 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for roads and if up to 25% of baseline road condition data will be collected on their entire FLTP network using one of the methodologies above.

ELEMENT 3 - Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies (Citation - USC 23 Sec 203 (b) (2) (B) (i) (II))

Describe how your current bridge inspection protocols meet the requirements of the national bridge inspection system, and your methods for storing and reporting the data to FHWA.

Describe how you incorporate, or would incorporate, these data into a management system.

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

Element	How this will be evaluated for FY 2016
<p>Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which baseline bridge data is collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH in FY16.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if no effort has been made to comply with existing bridge inventory and inspection regulations via the National Bridge Inventory System (NBIS); • 1 if FLMAs provide baseline bridge data including number of public bridges total, number of bridges on their FLTP, and a summary of their bridge conditions (e.g., # and/or % of structurally deficient and % in good, fair and poor condition); • 2 if FLMAs provide baseline bridge data including number of public bridges total, number of bridges on their FLTP, and a summary of their bridge condition (e.g., # and/or % of structurally deficient and % in good, fair and poor condition) and a general description of how they plan to address their high risk bridges; and • 3 if FLMAs provide baseline bridge data including number of public bridges total, number of bridges on their FLTP, and a summary of their bridge condition (e.g., # and/or % of structurally deficient and % in good, fair and poor condition), bridge condition targets based on funding scenarios, and a detailed plan on how they plan to address their high risk bridges.

ELEMENT 4 - Improvement of Safety (Citation - USC 23 Sec 203 (b) (2) (B) (i) (III))

Please describe your plans to collect and report safety crash data (fatalities and serious injuries) and other information to influence your FLTP programming decisions. The extent and type of safety crash data partners collect vary and may include information on: number of fatalities and/or serious injuries, location of crashes, nature of crash (run-off-the-road, intersection, wildlife collision), causal factors (infrastructure-related and/or behavioral (alcohol related, visual impairment). Describe how you incorporate, or plan to incorporate, these data into a management system. If baseline safety data and/or other information are available, please provide the information and your projections on how the baseline data may change based on the level of investments requested within your investment strategy.

For partners who may have very few crashes and contend transportation safety is not a high risk area on their lands, please include evidence-based processes, e.g., safety data, incident management procedures, local law enforcement reports, you employ to support this conclusion. Put plainly, how do you know if you do/do not have a safety problem on your FLTP inventory?

Evaluation:

Element	How this will be evaluated for FY 2016
<p>Improvement of Safety</p> <p>This element gauges the degree to which baseline crash data (fatalities and serious injuries) will be collected, reviewed for quality assurance, analyzed, and/or reported to FLH in FY16. (*Note: For partners who state safety is not a risk on their FLTP roads, the evaluation factors now include actions that allow these partners to produce evidence based information to support their safety story, i.e., not be unfairly penalized via evaluation points because their roads pose no serious safety concerns.)</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 if no effort will be made to collect baseline road safety data in FY16; • 1 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety OR *if existing evidence-based safety data, reports, and/or studies on a modest sample size of your FLTP can be provided that reflects a risk level; • 2 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety, initial processes are developed to compile existing and/or collect new safety data at the project and/or network level OR *if existing evidence-based data, reports, and/or studies safety data on a significant percentage of your FLTP can be provided that reflects a risk level; or • 3 if a timeline and high level plan for data collection are included for road safety initial processes are developed to compile existing and/or collect new safety data at the network level and progress can be described on the development of a formal Safety Management System, OR *if existing evidence-based data, reports, and/or studies safety data on your entire FLTP can be provided that reflects a risk level.

ELEMENT 5 - Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency (Citation - USC 23 Sec 203 (b) (2) (B) (iii))

Please identify your Department’s and/or agency’s related performance goals and how they support long range, performance-based planning and programming processes. Within this description, please provide information that supports Title 23 criteria that FLTP facilities provide access to high use recreation destination points and/or federal economic

generators on your lands. Within the description and if available, please include baseline data as of October 1, 2015 and any targets at the end of FY2016. Describe how you incorporate, or will incorporate, your agency's performance goal information into your planning and programming processes.

Element	How this will be evaluated for FY 2016
<p>Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency</p> <p>This element encourages partners to describe your goals, planning and programming processes, and information on high use recreation destination locations/federal economic generators and how your FLTP facilities support access to them.</p>	<p>Points will be distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 if partner offers no agency specific goals and their relationship to transportation planning; and no information is provided that describes the linkages between FLTP facilities and high use recreation areas and federal economic generators; <li>• 1 if partner’s goals align with an official FLMA planning document other than a long range transportation plan and/or high level information (e.g., list) is provided that describes the linkages between FLTP facilities and high use recreation areas and federal economic generators; <li>• 2 if there is alignment between partner’s goals and internal FLMA planning document(s) including 1 long range transportation plan; partners can describe how the use of these plan(s) inform partner’s programming decisions; and more granular data (e.g., maps) are provided that describes the linkages between FLTP facilities and high use recreation areas and federal economic generators; or <li>• 3 if there is substantial alignment between partner’s goals and FLMA’s national and/or regional/state long range transportation plans; the use of the plans inform partner’s programming decisions; and the partner can provide detailed information (e.g., destination locations with GIS supporting data) that show linkages between FLTP facilities and high use recreation areas and federal economic generators.

Annual Accomplishments Report

To successfully administer a performance based program, metric data is needed to gauge progress and/or shortcomings. FLMAs are asked to provide an annual accomplishment report that identifies the outputs and/or outcomes associated with Title 23 funds. In the report, partners are asked to share specifically the annual progress they are making in achieving initiatives that support a long-term performance-based program and/or performance targets, i.e., is your annualized target data trending in the right? FLH understands certain performance data may not be fully available on an annual basis. Guidelines on the format of the report are included here. Revisions were made to simplify the process and collect data once for multiple purposes.

(Note: At the conclusion of FY18, we highly encourage all partners to possess and report high quality, complete performance data since this data will be used to inform Congress, Office of Management and Budget and other stakeholders in preparation of the next Act.)

Award

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

Federal Lands Transportation Program Timeline

Timeframe	Deliverable/Action
December 4, 2015	President signs FAST – a 5 year authorization Act
Early January 2016	FLH provides investment strategy guidance to partners and requests partners' FY16 proposal(s) within 3 business weeks from the distribution date. Clarification discussions ensue between FLH and partners, as needed, on the guidance.
February 2016	Within 1 week of proposal deadline date, a FLH team will evaluate partners' proposals and submit recommendations for the FHWA Administrator's review and approval.
Feb./March 2016	Partners are notified of the funding allocation amounts (%s) approved by the Administrator.
April 1, 2016	FLMA provides FY2015 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA
May 2016	FLH provides a draft copy of a multi-year FY2017-2018 FLTP Evaluation Guidance document and seeks comments from partners. FLH meets with partners to discuss revisions to FY17-18 FLTP Evaluation Guidance document. Note: This is a multi-year effort resulting in funding allocations across two fiscal years, i.e., once funds are made available by Congress in whole or in part in each FY.
June 2016	FLH distributes final FY17-18 Evaluation Guidance to partners and issues a call for their FY17-18 Investment Strategy Proposals.
July 2016	FHWA completes evaluation of the partners' proposals and the team's FY17-18 allocation recommendations are forwarded to the FHWA Administrator for review and approval.
Sept. 2016	Partners are notified of the funding allocation amounts (%s) approved by the Administrator.
Oct. 2016	FY17 FLTP funds are made available following the passage of the FY 2017 appropriations Act and/or CR
April 1, 2017	FLMA provides FY2016 Annual Accomplishment Report to FHWA

Note: A separate multi-year approach is proposed for FYs 2019-2020 including up to one year of a FAST extension into 2021.

Annual FLTP Accomplishment Report Template

Partners are encouraged to describe their accomplishments in alignment with Elements 1-3 above within the body of the guidance document. In our collective efforts to streamline reporting between our offices for multiple efforts, e.g., FLTP accomplishment reports, annual President's budget, FHWA's Condition and Performance Report to Congress, we identified additional information below that is typically used by FLH to respond to a multitude of requests. We encourage partners to augment their accomplishment stories with the data cited below as well.

1. System Definition: No additional information needed above and beyond what was described under Section 1.
2. State of Good Repair: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. Paved roads, in terms of:
 - i. Funds obligated; and
 - ii. Outputs – What was the number of projects, number of miles, and types of work;
 - b. Unpaved, native and gravel roads, in terms of:
 - i. Funds obligated; and
 - ii. Outputs – What was the number of projects, number of miles, type of work; or
3. Reduction of Bridge Deficiencies: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. Funds obligated on bridge only projects
4. Improvement of Safety: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 2 include:
 - a. Funds obligated on safety specific projects; and
 - b. Outputs – e.g., How many safety-specific projects were completed and/or new processes or agreements employed; new relationships developed with other key stakeholder groups such as law enforcement, first responders; number of roadside safety audits; safety meetings/summits held to educate and share best practices among practitioners.
5. Resource and Asset Management Goals of the Secretary of the Respective Federal Land Management Agency: Additional data reported to stakeholders by FLH beyond what was described in Section 3 include:
 - a. Funds obligated; and
 - b. Outputs – What was the number of projects funded, type of work
6. Program Administration (*Note: In an effort to consolidate multiple calls for data and information from partners throughout the year, this request is being added to the Accomplishment Report.*)

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

- The number of full time employees (Headquarters and Field) needed for program management and their cumulative salaries including leave reserve and benefits;

- Support (e.g., training, outreach); and
- Travel

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

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