

# **FHWA Division Office Forms re: Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)**

## **Annual Review (by Division HPMS Coordinator) Due December 15th.**

The annual review of the HPMS program by each Division Office includes four components:

- (1) Status Report and Certification;
- (2) HPMS Program Activity Assessment;
- (3) documentation and discussion of review activities identified through either the status report or program assessment; and
- (4) annual reporting.

Instructions for filling out the forms may be found at  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/hpms/reviewguide.cfm>.

Complete and sign the following forms and attach additional information as necessary.

Email the forms to:  
[HPInfoMail@dot.gov](mailto:HPInfoMail@dot.gov) with a cc: to [robert.rozycki@dot.gov](mailto:robert.rozycki@dot.gov).

Questions?  
Contact Robert Rozycki of the FHWA Office of Highway Policy Information  
[robert.rozycki@dot.gov](mailto:robert.rozycki@dot.gov)  
(202) 366-5059

# **(State name) FHWA Division Office HPMS Review - Status Report & Certification**

(Annually by December 15th, complete and sign this form, the risk assessment, and attach additional information as necessary. Email the form to [HPInfoMail@dot.gov](mailto:HPInfoMail@dot.gov) and to [robert.rozycki@dot.gov](mailto:robert.rozycki@dot.gov))

**STATUS REPORT** – Answers (Y/N) to these questions should be reflected in rating each activity on the HPMS Program Activity Risk Assessment form (Page 8).

## **Geographical Information System (GIS)/Linear Referencing System (LRS) Adequacy**

- \_\_\_ State maintains an accurate, up-to-date – as driven – GIS/LRS.
- \_\_\_ The LRS/GIS represents and correlates with the State’s Enterprise Management Systems.
- \_\_\_ Federally-Aided Routes are included.
- \_\_\_ All Public Roads are included (ARNOLD).

## **Data Submittal**

- \_\_\_ State completed its data submittal by June 15 with no major deficiencies.
- \_\_\_ State’s submittal letter adequately explains recurring conditions, edits, changes and improvements being made in data collection procedures and processing data?

## **Office of Highway Policy Information (OHPI) memo to Division Office concerning current year HPMS submittal**

- \_\_\_ The HPPI Data Memo has been fully discussed and understood by both the Division and State?  
Dated response forwarded to OHPI including discussion of implementation \_\_\_\_\_  
Resolution of other comments in correspondence and discussions \_\_\_\_\_

## **SPR Work Program**

- \_\_\_ Current levels of SPR funding are adequate.
- \_\_\_ State has requested additional resources for data collection, system improvement or staffing.
- \_\_\_ Process improvements identified, reflected in an action plan, and fully supported in SPR or State work programs.

## **Quality Assurance**

- \_\_\_ The State has a quality assurance program concerning all data provided for HPMS.
- \_\_\_ The data reported in HPMS directly reflect current enterprise information systems.
- \_\_\_ A Field Inventory Review has been conducted within the past year to verify data is coded properly and reflects current conditions, and all problems/issues have been rectified.

## **Traffic Data**

- \_\_\_ Have all the necessary counts taken place on the Federal-Aid System to accurately represent traffic volume for the data year, per the TMG? Do traffic volume trends reasonably reflect ATR data?
- \_\_\_ Do the trends in VMT by functional class appear reasonable compared to adjoining functional class groups and prior year’s data?

When was the last time your office did a process review of the State’s traffic monitoring program to assure that procedures are adequate and are being applied to all data for HPMS? (This is more than just the TMS/H review; it should follow the guidelines in Attachments D and E.) \_\_\_\_\_

## **Pavement Data**

- \_\_\_ IRI data been provided and updated within the last 1 or 2 years as required.
- \_\_\_ When was the last time your office did a process review of the State’s pavement data program to assure that procedures are adequate and are being applied to all data for HPMS? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Is the State maintaining the locational integrity of pavement data over time?

## **Sample Adequacy**

- \_\_\_ The State conducted a sample adequacy review this year, explaining results and changes in number of samples or when last review was conducted.

When was the last time your office did a process review of sample adequacy to assure that procedures are adequate and are being applied to all data for HPMS? \_\_\_\_\_

The following apportionment factors for the Federal-Aid Highway Program are derived from HPMS. They can be found in the HPMS 8.0 software, *Extent and Travel Report*. Please verify this information and enter it below. Each FHWA Division must certify that this information as reported in HPMS is accurate and verified.

**FC = Functional Classification**

**Apportionment Factors:**

**Interstate Principal Arterial, FC = 1**

Lane-miles: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual VMT: \_\_\_\_\_

**Non-Interstate Principal Arterial FC = 2, 3**

Lane-miles: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual VMT: \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal Arterial FC = 1, 2, 3**

Lane-miles: \_\_\_\_\_

**Federal-aid Highway FC = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Urban 6**

Lane-miles: \_\_\_\_\_

Annual VMT: \_\_\_\_\_

**ANNUAL CERTIFICATION**

I certify that the State's HPMS submittal and the information in this review are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and there is no evidence of submission of false data, which would be in violation of U.S.C., Title 18, Section 1020. Furthermore, I certify that this data is valid and suitable for use in the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds, performance measurement, and condition and performance reporting to Congress.

\_\_\_\_\_  
FHWA Division Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

----- HPMS Program Activity Risk Assessment -----

Activity	Poor 0 point	Fair 5 points	Good 10 points	Outstanding 20 points	Score (points)
<b>GIS/LRS Adequacy. Met ARNOLD Requirement</b>	GIS/LRS is not adequately maintained and/or does not reflect the entire Federal Aid System. An All Public Road, Dual Carriageway GIS/LRS was not submitted.	GIS/LRS is maintained and does reflect the entire Public Road System. May not be integrated with the DOT Enterprise or completely up to date. Local Road LRS may not be tested or attributed.	GIS/LRS is maintained and does reflect the entire Public Road System. It is integrated with the DOT enterprise but may not be completely up to date. All dual carriageway (divided) roads may not be represented. The Local Road LRS is tested and can be attributed.	GIS/LRS is well maintained and does reflect the entire Public Road System with dual carriageways. It is integrated with the DOT enterprise and is completely up to date. The entire network is used as the primary roadway component to a Statewide geospatial framework.	
<b>Data Submittal</b>	Late with incomplete mileage and VMT data, other major data issues are not explained.  Submittal comments are brief and general. Many resubmittals have occurred.	By June 15 <sup>th</sup> , complete mileage & VMT data, major issues explained or data resubmittal.  Submittal comments are not adequate to explain all issues identified. 1 or 2 resubmittals have occurred.	By June 15 <sup>th</sup> , complete data and minor observation comments.  Submittal comments explain recurring validations and any other issues. No more than one resubmittal.	By June 15 <sup>th</sup> , no negative observations or comments.  Submittal comments explain minor issues, edits, and changes in procedures and processes. No resubmittal.	
<b>SPR Work Program</b>	Decreased or inadequate funding or no priorities for data collection, including staff, training or equipment	Adequate funding, some recognition of needs and new activities, but still no changes in staff, training or equipment.	Adequate or increased funding, more staff and training for selected activities, achieving HPMS Field Manual Data Requirements.	State's data program efforts are well funded, fully supporting all data requirements as described in the HPMS Field Manual.	
<b>Quality Assurance</b>	Minimal quality assurance, off-state system issues, many coding error messages.	Basic quality assurance program for short term solutions including off-state system issues, some coding error messages explained in submittal comments.	Quality assurance program implemented and coordinated with all data providers, minor isolated problems.	Quality assurance program documented, funded, and no major data coding problems found. Data quality is assured prior to loading in the HPMS software.	
<b>Traffic Data</b>	Current year data provided with no statistical or verifiable explanation for anomalies and unusual trends for many locations. Many OHPI comments. Many unusual/unexplained travel/traffic issues.	Current year data provided with acceptable statistical justification for anomalies and unusual trends locations. Local Road summary data is submitted but may have statistical or trend issues. Still have many OHPI comments.	Current year Traffic/Travel data provided for Federally Aided highways, and Local Roads (Summary). Acceptable statistical justification for anomalies and unusual trends. Minor/few OHPI comments.	Current year Traffic/Travel data provided for Federally Aided highways, and Local Roads (Summary). Trends are consistent and the data is statistically accurate. No OHPI comments.	
<b>Pavement Data</b>	Complete data provided, on-state system updated on an infrequent cycle, off-state system data incomplete, and many OHPI noted issues. Does not meet MAP-21 based performance measure requirements. SPR focus is necessary.	Complete data provided, on-state system updated on a 2 or more year cycle, plan developed for complete off-state system data, many OHPI noted issues, still does not meet MAP-21 based performance measure requirements. SPR focus may be required.	Complete data provided and collected with supporting explanations where data differs from the HPMS Field Manual guidance, all current 1-2 year data. Few OHPI comments. Marginally meets MAP-21 based Performance measure requirements. SPR focus not necessary. The appropriate pavement data items are being reported in 1/10 <sup>th</sup> of a mile sections.	Complete data provided and collected in accordance with Field Manual, all current 1-2 year data, where required, No OHPI comments. Fully meets the performance measure requirements as intended under MAP-21. The appropriate pavement data items are being reported in 1/10 <sup>th</sup> of a mile sections.	
<b>Sample Adequacy</b>	Many samples have not been developed where required (sample adequacy); some volume groups have no samples where at least one is required. Many samples are not populated with the required sections data. Many OHPI comments/concerns.	An incomplete sample panel has been submitted, the adequacy issues are minor. A few Volume Groups still have no samples developed where at least one is required. Spotty necessary section data has been provided to fill the samples.	A full Sample panel has been developed; e.g., the panel is fully adequate. Still some minor sample populating issues.	Sample revisions not needed or were made addressing all deficiencies and OHPI comments. Samples are fully populated.	
<b>Total Score (140 max)</b>					
<b>Activity(ies) Identified for Review:</b> (Less than 10, more than one activity should be considered)					

**State**                      **Date Year**                      **(Attach to your Status Report & Certification)**                      **Date of Assessment**

Email the form to [HPInfoMail@dot.gov](mailto:HPInfoMail@dot.gov) and [robert.rozycki@dot.gov](mailto:robert.rozycki@dot.gov)