

Transportation Performance Management MPO FAQs from FHWA FL/FDOT/MPO One on One Discussions, Fall 2018

Topics:

Performance Measures & Targets (MT)	1
Data & Reporting (DR)	4
Safety (S)	8
Asset Management Plan & Freight Plan (AF).....	11
Transit (T).....	12
Documentation (D)	13
Additional Resources	18

Transportation Performance Management MPO FAQs

Performance Measures & Targets (MT)

MT-1. What options do MPOs have for establishing targets? What does it mean if the MPOs support the State's targets?

- MPOs can either support the State target or choose to adopt an MPO Target when establishing targets.

If the MPO supports the State target, then the MPO:

- agrees to support the target number that FDOT establishes for a measure based on knowledge of MPO area baseline data;
- the MPO target number is the same number as the State target number (i.e. State target number = MPO target number);
- the MPO plans and program projects that contribute to the State target number; and,
- the MPO will document the State's target in the LRTP and describe whether the State was able to achieve that target based on data for past condition and performance.

If the MPO adopts an MPO Target, then the MPO:

- MPO evaluates the data and sets a number for their planning area;
- the MPO target number is NOT the same number as the State target number (i.e. State target number \neq MPO target number);
- the MPO plans and program projects that contribute to the MPO target number; and,
- the MPO will document the target in the LRTP and describe whether the MPO was able to achieve that target based on data for past condition and performance.

In addition, for PM1, 2, and 3, 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3)(i) provides two target establishment options for MPOs: (1) MPOs establish their own target or (2) support the relevant State DOT target.

For clarification, the State's relevant target is not necessarily the same as the State's statewide target. Under the regulations, FHWA allows State DOTs to establish additional targets (to the Statewide target) for any of the proposed measures, for any number and

combination of urbanized areas and for the non-urbanized area. This approach is intended to give State DOTs flexibility when establishing targets and to aid State DOTs in accounting for differences in urbanized areas and the non-urbanized area. This flexibility is provided in the System Performance, Safety, and Pavement/Bridge rules. Therefore, the MPOs' option to support the State DOT target may be for an additional State target for an urbanized area that is relevant to the MPO. Consequently, it is important and required that the State DOTs coordinate target setting with the MPOs. Please note that for the Safety Performance Measure, FDOT did not establish additional targets (see S-1 for additional information).

MT-2. Can MPOs still have local performance measures and targets? If so, how does that align with the with federal PMs/targets?

- Yes, MPOs may have locally-developed performance measures and targets. However, this would be in addition to the federally identified measures that MPOs are required to address. While in some cases it may be helpful for MPOs to indicate how locally-developed measures support the TPM performance measures and targets, the MPOs must be sure to clearly distinguish between those measures/targets that are locally-developed versus those required by federal rulemaking so as not to confuse the public. (See the MT-1 for additional information regarding establishing targets)

MT-3. FDOT's 2- and 4-year targets for the System Performance, Bridge, and Pavement Measures are due on May 20, 2018 and the MPO's 4-year targets are due 180 days later. Do the MPOs also need to establish 2-year targets?

- No, MPOs only set a 4-year target, within 180 days of FDOT setting their 2- and 4-year targets.

MT-4. If FDOT identifies targets at an earlier date, will the 180-day clock starts ticking on that date?

- Yes, that is true with the exception of the safety target. MPO safety targets are due annually by February 27 regardless of when FDOT submitted their HSIP report. For the other three sets of measures (System Performance, Bridge, and Pavement), the target date may change based on when FDOT sets their associated target. So, if FDOT sets one or more of these targets prior to May 20, 2018, then the MPO target(s) will be due earlier than Nov 16, 2018. They will be due within 180 days from the date FDOT set their target(s).

MT-5. What is the definition of "emergency event?" See Footnote #2 on Performance Measures Dashboard handout.

- "Emergency event" means a natural disaster or catastrophic failure resulting in an emergency declared by the Governor of the State or an emergency or disaster declared by the President of the United States – 23 CFR 667.3

MT-6. What does '*technical correction on due date forthcoming' mean? See the Performance Measures Dashboard handout.

- This situation refers to the due date in the rule for the state to set their System Performance Measure targets. The final rule that was published stated a specific due date - Feb 20,

2018. However, a correction to the rule will be forthcoming that says the target is due 1 year from the effective date, to align this due date with the other target setting dates, which is-May 20, 2018.

MT-7. Will the MPOs that are a TMA have one target for all Performance Measures or will they just have the individual MPO Performance Measures?

- Each MPO is responsible for setting targets for each performance measure for their respective metropolitan planning area as defined in 23 CFR 450.104. A single TMA target for each measure is not required. If multiple MPOs serve in a TMA area, we suggest coordination occur with neighboring MPOs when setting the target. For PM1, 2, and 3, FDOT has the option to set targets in addition to the statewide targets for urbanized area(s) and also for the non-urbanized area.

MT-8. If FDOT administers all funds, why is it necessary for the MPOs to develop performance targets?

- The Final Planning Rule establishes that the statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes must provide for the use of a performance-based approach to decisionmaking in support of the national goals described in 23 U.S.C. 150(b) and the general purposes described in 49 U.S.C. 5301. The final rule requires that States, MPOs, and operators of public transportation establish targets in key national performance areas to document expectations for future performance and that States, MPOs, and operators of public transportation must coordinate the targets that they set for key areas.

MT-9. Will there be additional funding for possible increases in project costs to support implementing the performance measures?

- While no additional funding is specifically provided to implement the performance measures, FHWA expects that a performance based approach will result in significant benefits, although they are not easily quantifiable. The changes will yield greater accountability because MAP-21 mandated reporting increases in visibility and transparency. While there will be costs associated with the new requirements that represent a change to current practices of State DOTs and MPOs, FHWA assumes that there will be no overall change in the total amount of expenditure on highway projects by State DOTs and MPOs. Instead, FHWA assumes that States and MPOs will choose a different mix of projects or delay some projects, relative to what they would have done without the performance measures approach, in order to fund projects that help to meet performance goals. There will be some costs to delaying or foregoing some projects, but there will be benefits from projects that are prioritized to meet performance goals. FHWA believes that the benefits will surpass this threshold. Therefore, the benefits of performance measure implementation are anticipated to outweigh the costs.

Data & Reporting (DR)

DR-1. What data will the MPOs be required to collect? What data will FDOT provide? Who at FDOT will be providing the data to the MPOs?

- FDOT and the MPOs will need to coordinate to determine data collection needs.

DR-2. Local jurisdictions in the region don't understand the pavement data. Are local jurisdictions going to have to measure pavement? How is the process for the pavement performance measure going to work? May possibly need some education efforts from FDOT.

- FDOT collects all the NHS pavement data and has made a commitment to make all the data available to the MPOs. Be sure to coordinate with your FDOT District for any training needs.

DR-3. Does the MPO report their targets to the FDOT District or Central Office?

- FDOT will be working with MPOAC to determine the process for reporting and submittal.

DR-4. How should the MPO report the information that is being requested? Will there be a standard template or guide?

- FDOT will be working with MPOAC to determine the process and templates for reporting and submittal.

DR-5. Could the MPO include information in their ICAR agreement since they will updating it in January. FDOT wants to come up with one agreement, working with MPOAC, that all MPOs agree on (versus 27 individual agreements).

- Updating the ICAR agreement is an acceptable option open to FDOT and the MPOs. FDOT will be working with MPOAC to determine the process and templates for reporting and submittal.

DR-6. Is pavement target for all public roads or NHS?

- The pavement target is limited to both the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS, not for all public roads.

DR-7. Who is responsible for collecting pavement data on local roads/roads off the state highway system?

- The pavement target is focused on NHS roadways. The NHS does not include local roads or roads off the state highway system. FDOT will collect the pavement data for all of the NHS system.

DR-8. How often will the MPO need to provide updates for Performance Measures (Annually, Every two years)? How should the MPO report the information that is being requested? Will there be a standard template or guide?

- The MPOs need to report baseline condition/performance and progress toward the achievement of their targets for all TPM performance measures in the **system performance report** in the LRTP. This report is updated during regular updates of the LRTP. Currently, there is no standard template or guide for development of the system performance report. See DR-13 for additional information on target setting time frames. FDOT will be working with MPOAC to determine the process and templates for reporting and submittal of targets.

DR-9. Why is PM2 separated out into Bridge and Pavement measures, but PM3 (system performance, freight, CMAQ) is included together?

- A key reason why the NHPP-NHS system performance, NHFP-Interstate freight performance, and the CMAQ-congestion/delay performance are included together is because the associated performance measures under these subparts of the PM3 all work off of the same travel time data set and NHS reporting segments that are defined by FDOT/MPOs for the HPMS. Whereas, Bridge and Pavement work off of different (bridge and pavement) data sets in the HPMS.

DR-10. What resources are available for calculating Travel Time Reliability (TTR)?

- The resource for obtaining the NPRMDS travel time data set is through the RITIS website: nprmds.ritis.org. There are now two levels of data analytic tools that are integrated with the NPRMDS access. There is no cost to access and extract this data, but there is a cost to use the analytic tools.

The **MAP-21 PM3 Data Analytics** tools includes the capabilities to compute, visualize, and download all of the PM3 metrics and sub-metric data required to be reported. This includes an “easy button” functionality that will allow agencies to immediately create all of the necessary files and deliverables to FHWA. Training modules are also built in.

MPA Coverage of NHS for MPO only (based on the MPA Population) ranges from \$45,000/5 years to \$90,000/5 years. There is no usage or user limits. Florida State Coverage of NHS (set price based on NHS Mileage) is \$180,000. There is no usage or user limits and includes MPO access.

The **Deep-Dive NPRMDS Analytics** tools that provide agencies the ability to conduct advanced level analytics into their system performance including problem identification, before-and-after studies for various operational events, congestion scans, animated trend maps, statistical reports, interactive graphics, user-delay calculations, and bottleneck ranking. Training modules are also built in.

MPA Coverage of NHS plus optional additional NPRMDS segments for MPO only is similarly based on the MPA Population, and on the options selected. There is no usage or user limits. Florida State Coverage of NHS plus optional additional NPRMDS segments is based on total

NHS Mileage, with additional cost for options selected is \$180,000. There is no usage or user limits and includes MPO access.

More information about these tools are available here: <http://www.tpm-portal.com/wp-content/uploads/cpbm/20171214-slides.pdf>

DR-11. What are the data collection requirements and performance measure calculations for the first performance period of the pavement performance measure?

- As described in the [Performance Measures & Asset Management Plan -Key Implementation Dates](#) timeline (pages 4 & 15) and 23 CFR 490.309, the first “full distress and IRI” data collection cycle **starts on January 1, 2018 for the Interstate System pavement measure**. For the purpose of implementing Interstate pavement condition measures, State DOTs collect IRI, rutting, faulting, cracking percent, and inventory data elements for full-extent Interstate System on an annual basis in accordance with 23 CFR 490.309 and 23 CFR 490.311.

Additionally, **for non-Interstate NHS the first “full distress and IRI” data collection cycle starts January 1, 2020 and needs to be completed by December 31, 2021**. State DOTs collect IRI, rutting, faulting, cracking percent and inventory data elements for full-extent non-Interstate NHS in accordance with 23 CFR 490.309 and 23 CFR 490.311. Please note, States can collect and submit the full spectrum of data on the non-interstate NHS earlier if they so choose. Additionally, States are required to collect IRI, rutting, faulting, cracking percent and inventory data elements for the full-extent of the non-Interstate NHS on at least a biennial frequency for all subsequent data collection cycles. [See 23 CFR 490.307 & 490.309]

There is some confusion on the above noted dates as well as the data used for calculation of performance measures for the first performance period due to an error in 23 CFR 490.313(e). As indicated in the final rule preamble, FHWA only intended 23 CFR 490.313(e) to describe how the Overall condition for non-Interstate NHS pavements would be determined during a transition period. The reference to Interstate pavements was inadvertently added. FHWA intended the regulation to read as follows:

(e) State DOTs shall not be subject to paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section for Pavements until after the data collection cycle ending December 31, 2021, for the non-Interstate NHS. During this transition period, the Overall condition for all pavement types will be based on IRI rating, as described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, or on PSR as described in paragraphs (c)(4) or (d)(4) of this section.

DR-12. What is the overall process for reviewing performance results? Does FHWA review/approve? Is this completely between FDOT and the MPOs? What happens if targets are not met?

- While FHWA will determine whether FDOT has met or made significant progress toward meeting targets, it will not directly assess MPO progress toward meeting targets. However, FHWA will review MPO performance as part of ongoing transportation planning reviews, including certification reviews and the Federal Planning Finding associated with the approval

of the STIP. If an MPO does not meet or achieve its established targets, the MPO is encouraged to develop a statement that describes how the MPO will work with the State and other partners to meet targets during the next performance period.

If FDOT does not meet its safety targets or show significant progress toward target achievement, there are actions that are needed, such as completing action plans to achieve targets and requiring a minimum level of federal funds be used for projects. Please see S-2 for additional information on the Safety targets.

If FDOT does not meet the minimum pavement condition threshold for each determination, the penalty is that the State must obligate the NHPP funds and use STP funds to address Interstate pavement conditions. Please see 23 CFR 490.317 for additional information.

If FDOT does not meet the bridge minimum condition level for 3 consecutive years, State must set aside and obligate NHPP funds for eligible projects on bridges on the NHS. Please see 23 CFR 490.313 for additional information.

If FDOT does not make significant progress toward achieving its system performance targets, specifically the NHPP or NHFP targets, then FDOT will need to describe what actions they will take for improvement in the Biennial Performance Report. These plus additional reporting requirements for the NHFP in this circumstance are indicated in 23 CFR 490.109(f).

DR-13. Will there be any guidance for resetting/revising targets? Is there a set timeframe?

- The cycle for setting new performance measure targets varies by performance measure. For PM1, targets are established annually and cannot be adjusted once they are submitted by FDOT in the HSIP annual report (unless approval is granted by FHWA). The PM2 and 3 targets are set every four years. For PM2 and PM3, FDOT also is required to set a 2-year target. The four-year targets may be adjusted at the mid-point of the Performance Period. 2-year targets may not be adjusted. See 23 CFR 450.209 for additional information. FHWA will work with you to determine an appropriate approach on target setting and revisions until further guidance is issued that provides a framework.

DR-14. Can the MPOs access NBIS and HPMS data?

- The MPOs cannot access the HPMS data directly. They can work with the FDOT District Office and the District can provide them the data they need. It will be in the form of the Roadway Characteristic Inventory (RCI) data, since FDOT's Transportation Data and Analytics office (TDA) converts the RCI into HPMS for submittal to FHWA. The MPOs can access the NBI data in the state bridge management system by contacting the District to set up an account.

Safety (S)

S-1. What does it mean if an MPO “supports” FDOT’s safety targets?

- Please see MT-1 and the [MPO Safety Performance Fact Sheet for more information](#). An MPO may support a State’s performance targets which supports the State’s efforts at achieving those targets (i.e. FDOT’s “0” target), or the MPO adopts its own quantifiable performance targets. Either way, the MPO is establishing targets.

S-2. Having Safety Targets of 0 - will the MPOs be penalized for not meeting them?

- FHWA will assess at the state level whether or not the State has made significant progress toward achieving their safety performance targets. If a State does not meet or make significant progress toward meeting its targets, then FDOT must 1) use obligation authority equal to the annual HSIP apportionment only for HSIP projects and 2) submit an annual HSIP Implementation Plan that describes actions the State will take to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its subsequent targets. Please see 23 CFR 490.211 and 23 USC 148 for additional information.

Note the dates will change each year. For example, in 2019, FHWA will assess the progress on the 2018 targets. If determined that the targets were not achieved nor significant progress has been made, in FY2021, the HSIP projects must be funded based on the 2017 apportionment and the implementation plan is required in June 2020.

S-3. What are FDOT’s “interim” Safety targets?

- The Safety performance measure rule does not define nor accept “interim” Safety target. While FDOT chooses to have interim targets, these targets are not recognized under the federal performance measure requirements. Safety targets are set annually. The MPOs will need to pick a number for their targets (zero, or something different), but may use narrative language to explain the rationale for their targets. While FDOT and many MPOs have vision zero and other aspirational goals or targets, the purpose of the annual safety target is to address the rolling 5-year average from 2014-2018 for fatalities, serious injuries, etc. FDOT has chosen their targets for this 2014-2018 period as zero. Thus, FDOT has chosen their target to go from approximately 2700 (2012-2016 baseline in fatalities) to zero for their 2014-2018 rolling average. Please see MT-1 and DR-13 for additional information.

S-4. What is the Baseline Safety Data and reporting for 2012-2016? When is the first report due?

- The baseline safety data is from 2012 to 2016, which will provide a 5-year rolling average for FDOT and the MPOs. The targets that are set are also based on a 5-year rolling average from 2014-2018. In Florida, 2012 through 2014 were all in the **2400’s** in terms of fatalities. Conversely, in 2015, Florida had **2939** fatalities and **3174** in 2016. In 2017, Florida

had about 1500 fatalities through June, so the numbers seem to be trending to around 3000 again.

A separate baseline report is not required for safety. However, in August 2017, FDOT included baseline data in annual HSIP report. While FDOT reports their safety targets to FHWA in their annual HSIP report, MPOs do not report their safety targets directly to FHWA. Rather, the FDOT and the MPO mutually agree on the manner in which the MPO reports the targets to FDOT. Whether an MPO agrees to support a State safety target or adopts its own safety target, the MPO must include baseline safety performance, safety targets and progress toward achieving safety targets in the *system performance report* in the LRTP. The system performance report is one of the requirements if an MPO adopts or amends their LRTP after May 27, 2018.

S-5. How do the performance measures affect roadway design as it relates to safety (i.e. complete streets)?

- TPM does not have a direct impact on roadway design as it relates to safety. However, complete streets may be a strategy used to address crashes that results in support for the safety performance measures. There are safety benefits, such as traffic calming, pedestrian safety measures, etc. which, when implemented, should decrease fatalities and injuries.

S-6. If the MPOs bridges/pavement are in good condition, can they use bridge/pavement money to support safety projects (essentially using funds where their need is greatest)?

- TPM should drive the funding investment to where it is needed most and provide data to justify MPO funding decisions. Please see the *Guide to Federal-Aid Programs and Projects* for details on funding programs, flexibility, and eligibility criteria (<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/federalaid/projects.cfm>). TPM is a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. The application of the TPM approach by FDOT and the MPOs ensures that investments are performance-driven and outcome based.

S-7. If the MPO establishes its own HSIP target, would the MPO then include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the LRTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets?

- Although some FHWA resources mention an “HSIP target” which was intended to be interchangeable with a “safety target”, the Florida Division will only be referencing the “Safety target” in our communications. To clarify, MPOs would establish safety targets either through supporting FDOT’s targets or adopting their own as noted in MT-1. FDOT also establishes safety targets, and documents them in the HSIP annual report. HSIP is a federal funding type, directed to aid in reducing fatalities and serious injuries. Having said that, yes, the MPO would include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the safety targets identified in the LRTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP with those safety targets.

S-8. Are there any Best Practices or Guidance that the MPO can get from FHWA and FDOT on how others are incorporating Performance Measures for Safety & Security?

- FDOT and MPOAC developed a template for documenting performance measures in the TIP. A roundtable with a panel of early adopters could certainly be considered.

S-9. How can MPO consultants get safety data from partners who are unwilling to share that information?

- FDOT has committed to providing the safety fatality data to the MPOs.

S-10. The MPO's next TIP will be adopted by the MPO Board July 2018. Our understanding is that the TIP will have to address Safety Performance Measures. The FDOT Work Program was developed and approved in October 2017 and our 2018 TIP will be developed based on the October 2017 FDOT Work Program. If the July 2018 TIP needs to be modified to address the new Safety Performance Measures, it will be inconsistent with the FDOT Work Program (from October 2017) which did not address Safety Measures. The question is: If this occurs, how would/should this inconsistency be addressed since they both will represent the same time period? Will FDOT have to amend their Work Program to address Safety Performance Measures? Or, will the inconsistencies remain until FDOT develops their new Work Program in December 2018? Or, will something else need to be done?

- MPOs must establish safety targets no later than February 27 of each year. The requirements do not address how FDOT and the MPOs program projects. While the S/TIP is required to address performance measures, the FDOT Work Program is not required to do the same, as that is a Florida process. However, the projects in the Work Program will support the project priorities in the S/TIP. We defer to the coordination required between FDOT and the MPOs as to how and when FDOT chooses to modify the Work Program, coordinate with the MPOs and communicate those changes.

S-11. Do MPOs in other states have input on how safety funds are programmed, or are safety funds managed by the State DOT, as they are in Florida?

- Very few states sub-allocate HSIP funds to the MPOs, which means most state's HSIP funds are managed by the State DOT. The level of input that the MPOs have with the State DOT regarding safety funds is dependent on the relationship the MPOs have with the District Safety Engineers. However, TPM is designed to foster increased collaboration between the MPOs and the State DOTs. There are several federal funding categories eligible for safety projects. The focus should be on planning and programming projects that improve safety, not the availability of HSIP funds. MPOs can and should use other eligible funds to address safety issues as needed.

Asset Management Plan & Freight Plan (AF)

AF-1. The Freight Plan date of Dec. 4 2017 on the table below refers to the State Freight Plan (not to freight “targets”) – perhaps the word “target” should be removed from the (“target”, plan, etc.) after the “FDOT Due Date.” See the Performance Measures Dashboard handout.

- The row being referenced is for the “FDOT Due Date” and it combines several responsibilities for FDOT. Depending the column, it may be a target or a plan. The state Freight Plan is due by Dec 4, 2017 (Federal Register notice published Oct 14, 2016) and the performance targets for freight are due by May 20, 2018 (Jan 18, 2017 Federal Register notice).

AF-2. Is the FDOT Asset Management Plan adopted by April 30, 2018 (table) or June 30, 2019 (footnote)? See the Performance Measures Dashboard handout.

- By April 30, 2018 –FDOT submits initial plans describing asset management plan processes. By June 30, 2019 –FDOT submits fully compliant asset management plans. For more information see the [Asset Management Plans & Processes Fact Sheet](#).

AF-3. What are the elements of the state freight plan and asset management plan that need to be adopted by May 27th? Are the MPOs participating in those processes?

- 23 CFR 450.306(d)(4) - An MPO shall integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in: (i) the State asset management plan for the NHS and (vi) appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan. This requirement is triggered by any LRTP amended or adopted **on or after** May 27, 2018.

MPOs should coordinate with FDOT regarding participation in the development of the State Freight Plan and asset management plan.

AF-4. Can the MPOs get an extension on the MPO target due date for the Asset Management Plan from FHWA?

- MPOs are not required to establish targets for the State Asset Management Plan. However, they are required to integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in the Asset Management Plan. This requirement is triggered by any LRTP amended or adopted on or after May 27, 2018. FHWA has no flexibility to grant extensions to the dates set in the TPM final rules.

AF-5. To-date we have no communication traffic (e-mail, etc.) on the State Freight Plan, which is due on December 4, 2017. What is the status of this effort?

- FDOT has submitted their State Freight Plan and it was approved by FHWA in February 2018. The plan can be found at the following link: <https://freightmovesflorida.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/FMTP-FHWA-FAST-Act-Addendum-Jan-2018.pdf>

Transit (T)

T-1. What are the implications of the performance measures for the transit providers and is there anything that the MPO needs to do to help the transit providers be prepared?

- Please reference FTA's [Performance Based Planning Webinar/PowerPoint](#) for more information. The webinar explored legislative requirements for performance-based planning and featured speakers from MPOs and transit agencies working to develop transit asset management plans and set state of good repair performance targets.

T-2. 450.310(d) – Transit representation in TMAs – Do the MPO's bylaws have to specifically identify the representation?

- The FAST Act and the Planning regulations require that there be transit representation on the policy board of a TMA MPO, as well as local elected officials, appropriate State officials, and officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area. The designation of these officials and representatives shall be determined by the MPO according to the bylaws or enabling statute of the organization. Subject to the bylaws or enabling statute of the MPO, a provider of public transportation may also serve as a representative of a local municipality. Officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation, shall have responsibilities, actions, duties, voting rights, and any other authority commensurate with the other officials on the MPOs policy board. If the MPO bylaws do not describe representation on the MPO, then the representation on the MPO policy board (including transit representation) should be documented in some other format that is used by the MPO.

T-3. How are transit providers being included? Will this "Master Agreement" being developed between MPOAC and FDOT include the transit providers/agencies or just the MPOs?

- The MPOs, FDOT, and the Transit providers must jointly agree upon and develop written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to the data, performance measures and targets. FDOT or the MPOAC can provide more clarification on the specifics of the document.

T-4. In Broward, Miami Dade Transit and Tri-Rail also operate in Broward County and we have direct recipient providers – does the MPO have to include all of them in the agreement or does the agreement only cover Broward County transit providers?

- If the transit provider receives funding programmed by the MPO in its TIP and the LRTP, then the transit provider should share its Transit Asset Management Plan and performance targets with the MPO, and the MPO should include those targets and reference those plans in their next update of the TIP and Long Range Plan (after October 2018). The purpose of the updated agreements or other written documentation, as specified by 23 CFR 450.314(h), is to document the process in which the sharing of information for transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, and the reporting of performance is to be used in tracking progress towards meeting targets among the transit providers and State DOT and MPOs.

So basically, if the transit provider has projects and funding programmed by the MPO in its plans and TIP's, they should be included in the agreement and consulted with during the agreement development for performance based planning and target setting.

T-5. What is the time frame for the Transit Asset Management Plan? What is the due date for it? From what we understand from our transit provider, the due dates for the Transit Asset Management Plan have passed and yet the transit provider said they will not have theirs finished until October 2018.

- The Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan is actually due October 1, 2018. So, your transit provider has not missed the TAM due date. The due dates that have passed were to set the targets for State of Good Repair (due January 1, 2017) and to provide those targets to the MPO and FDOT (by July 1, 2017).

T-6. Is there any guidance on how to model private transit systems, such as Uber?

- Uber is not a public transit provider and is not eligible to receive federal funds, so it should not be considered as part of the agreement.

Documentation (D)

D-1. How do the MPOs document the linking investments to performance targets? Should this documentation be: Narrative or Quantitative? Paragraph or Appendix? The MPOs would like FHWA guidance and/or examples on how to do so.

- FHWA is working on guidance on how MPOs should document a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the LRTP, and linking investment priorities to those performance targets.

In general, this description of effect should be at a systems or program level and not at the level of individual projects. As a minimum, it should discuss the federally required performance measures, the MPO performance targets, and the effect that the program of projects in the TIP would have toward achieving the federally required performance targets. It should be consistent with and include or reference the goals, objectives, strategies, performance measures and targets in the LRTP and in other plans and processes as they relate to the federally required performance targets in the LRTP and the program of projects in the TIP. Other plans and processes include the asset management plans for highways and for transit, the freight plan, highway and transit safety plans (SHSP, HSIP, and public transportation agency safety plan(s)), the congestion management process (CMP), the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program performance plan, and other safety and security plans and programs. The documentation in the TIP shall include a description of the effect of the program of projects in the TIP on meeting the performance targets in the LRTP. The requirement to assess the effect of the TIP in achieving performance targets only has to be done at the time the TIP is updated, it does not have to be updated with a TIP amendment.

Whether the MPO supports the FDOT target or adopts their own, the MPO is required to document what targets are being used in the planning process. The MPO will also need to explain what they did in the LRTP and TIP development process to move the program toward the targets set. For example, did the MPO (or FDOT) alter their project selection or prioritization process to favor projects they believe will help move toward achievement of the stated targets? Did the MPO (or FDOT) make any specific effort to engage new stakeholders or experts to learn what they can do to move toward target achievement?

Additionally, after the first LRTP and TIP cycles, the MPO will also tell how the program of projects from the prior LRTP and TIP performed. Did the MPO (or FDOT) achieve the targets? If not, what progress was made?

FHWA anticipates that MPOs and States will be reviewing their project selection criteria for their S/TIP and their LRTP. In doing so, the performance or asset management information should be built into these criteria, so the project's contribution and investment decision are tied together, as projects are selected, prioritized, and advanced for implementation.

The performance based discussion and documentation placed within the TIP or LRTP is at the MPO's discretion. Placing the discussion in the body of the document or in an appendix are both acceptable, whichever way best fits within the MPO's products.

D-2. How should MPOs document the setting of the targets (agreement, resolution, etc.)? Will there be some sort of template on what the resolution would look like for consistency across the MPOs?

- FDOT and the MPOs have flexibility as to the documentation and process used for setting targets, as long as the targets are made publicly available once they are set. Setting the targets in the LRTP is one strategy. However, most MPOs are not due to amend their LRTPs

before the targets are required to be set. Therefore, there is flexibility as to the documentation and processes that can be used. Once selected, the measures and targets will need to be described and discussed in the LRTP, the condition and performance of the system evaluated in the system performance report, and the TIP will need to describe the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets and linking investment priorities. Please see MT-1 and D-1 for additional information.

Please note that the process for establishing and documenting targets and the requirement for developing a written agreement are two different, although related, processes. The Final Planning Rule requires that a written agreement be developed cooperatively by MPO(s), State(s), and transit provider(s) describing their mutual responsibilities for carrying out performance based planning and programming in metropolitan areas [23 CFR 450.314(h)]. The agreements are to include written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS. These agreements describe the overall coordination process, not just the setting of targets.

D-3. Does the Board need to approve the targets? If so, does it need to be a formal action, such as a resolution?

- The regulations do not specify that a specific board action or resolution is required. We would defer to the MPO's bylaws and practices as to how they choose to commit the MPO when establishing a target by the applicable due dates, as long as the targets are made publicly available once they are set. Note that by committing to a target, the MPO will be using this target in their performance-based approach to planning and the MPO will need to explain what they did in the LRTP and TIP development process to move the program toward the targets set.

D-4. What happens if there are circumstances (not meeting quorum, canceled meeting, etc.) that the Board can't meet or vote by February 27, 2018. Can the TPOs establish the targets and then receive Board approval at later date?

- We would defer to the MPO's bylaws and practices as to how they choose to commit the MPO when establishing the target by the applicable due dates.

D-5. Does the TIP need to document how each project supports the performance measures, or is it the TIP as a whole?

- No, This description should be at a systems or program level and not at the level of individual projects. Please see D-1 for additional information.

D-6. Is incorporating the measures and targets into the TIP an administrative modification or an amendment? Does this documentation need to be specifically in the TIP or can it be a separate document or appendix?

- The MPO does not need to have a separate action to incorporate the measures and targets into the TIP. In all likelihood, the MPO will need to process a TIP Amendment (after May 27, 2018), which would then trigger the need to incorporate the measures and targets into the TIP. The MPO could then incorporate the appropriate performance measure language as required as part of the amendment. If an amendment is not needed, then the MPO will be adopting a new TIP that will contain the necessary information.

Once incorporated into the TIP, if there are no significant changes to the performance measure discussion, future changes could be handled by modification.

The performance based discussion and documentation placed within the TIP or LRTP is at the MPO's discretion. Placing the discussion in the body of the document or in an appendix are both acceptable, whichever way best fits within the MPO's products. We do not recommend having the performance discussion as a separate document.

D-7. If the S/TIP is expected to meet the associated PM requirements and the LRTP has not yet been updated, the narrative in the two documents will not be consistent. 23 CFR 450.326(d) – A description of the anticipated effect of the TIP towards achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan linking investment priorities to those performance targets. Will FHWA require the MPOs to amend their LRTPs, thus triggering incorporation of performance measures in the LRTP? See Footnote #3 on the Performance Measures Dashboard handout.

- No, FHWA will not require the MPOs to amend their LRTPs to ensure consistent narrative with the TIPs. Due to the timing of implementing the performance measures and LRTP update schedules, it is possible that an MPO's TIP may contain performance measure documentation before the LRTP.

D-8. How often do the MPOs need to update their TIPs, due to the New Performance Measures (Annually or Every 2 Years)?

- TIPs will continue to be updated annually per the current practice. TPM does not impact how often the TIPs need to be updated.

D-9. The MPO is looking for guidance from FDOT on new TIP being adopted in June. Do they need to change their project prioritization process?

- Please see D-1 and S-10 for additional information.

D-10. FDOT Districts are constantly asking the MPOs to amend their TIPs, sometimes for very small projects, which could unnecessarily trigger requirements. Are there certain thresholds for these amendments?

- The scope, cost, and timing thresholds requiring an amendment of the S/TIP have not changed due to the performance measure requirements. The thresholds can be found at: http://www.fdot.gov/workprogram/Federal/stip_amendment.shtm

D-11. Once the new regulations are effective and assuming the TIP/LRTP does meet the new requirements, will the MPO have to reevaluate and/or adjust its assessment of the effect of the TIP in achieving the targets whenever it completes a TIP amendment? Similarly, will the MPO have to update the evaluation of the condition and performance of the transportation system in the LRTP if they complete an LRTP Amendment?

- The TIP shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the LRTP, linking investment priorities to those performance targets. The requirement to assess the effect of the TIP in achieving performance targets only has to be done at the time the TIP is updated, it does not have to be updated with a TIP amendment.

The LRTP shall include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the (federally required) performance targets, including progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data. This requirement only has to be met at the time that the LRTP is updated, it does not have to be updated when the LRTP is amended.

D-12. Will there be MPOs Best Planning Practices for some of the earlier adoption LRTPs?

- FHWA's [TPM Noteworthy Practices](#) webpage features several case studies of state and local agencies successfully implementing innovative approaches to Transportation Performance planning, implementation, and evaluation. Any current and future best practices are available on this webpage. A roundtable with a panel of early adopters could certainly be considered.

D-13. Is there anything new that FHWA will be looking to see in reference to the two new planning factors?

- The MPO is required to address several planning factors as a part of its planning processes. The two new planning factors should be treated like all other planning factors. The degree of consideration and analysis of the factors should be based on the scale and complexity of the area's issues and will vary depending on the unique conditions of the area. Efforts should be made to think through and carefully consider how to address each factor.

D-14. How do the performance measures affect the UPWP? Do the New Planning Factors need to be included in each specific task of the UPWP, how should this be referenced?

- During the development of the UPWP, MPOs should consider the products and associated timeframes, costs, and staff/consultant resources needed to implement the new performance measures. This consideration could impact planning tasks related to long- and short-range transportation planning, transit, regional coordination, data collection, program administration, training, etc.

In addition to the eight planning factors established under MAP-21, the FAST Act added two new planning factors that must be considered during the planning process (see 23 CFR 450.306(b)). Typically, MPOs reference the planning factors in a matrix format that identifies how the planning factors are addressed by the various UPWP planning tasks. The planning factors do not need to be included in each specific task of the UPWP.

Additional Resources

For additional resources and guidance on TPM, please visit the following websites:

- FHWA Florida Division TPM Website: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fldiv/tpm.cfm>
- FHWA Transportation Performance Management: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/>
- FTA Performance-Based Planning Resources: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/performance-based-planning>
- FHWA TPM Toolbox: <https://www.tpmtools.org/>
- AASHTO TPM Portal: <http://www.tpm-portal.com/>
- AASHTO TPM Timeline Tool: <http://timeline.tpm-portal.com/nchrptimeline/>