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# 1 - Purpose

This document provides language that Florida’s metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) may incorporate in Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) System Performance Reports to meet the federal transportation performance management rules. Updates or amendments to the LRTP must incorporate a System Performance Report that addresses these measures and related information no later than:

* May 27, 2018 for Highway Safety measures (PM1);
* October 1, 2018 for Transit Asset Management measures;
* May 20, 2019 for Pavement and Bridge Condition measures (PM2);
* May 20, 2019 for System Performance measures (PM3); and
* July 20, 2021 for Transit Safety measures.

MPOs may incorporate this template language and adapt it as needed as they update their LRTPs. In most sections, there are two options for the text, to be used by MPOs supporting statewide targets or MPOs establishing their own targets. Areas that require MPO input are highlighted in yellow. Input will range from simply adding the MPO name and adoption dates to providing MPO-specific information such as descriptions of strategies and processes.

The document is consistent with the Transportation Performance Measures Consensus Planning Document developed jointly by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC). The Consensus Planning Document outlines the minimum roles of FDOT, the MPOs, and the public transportation providers in the MPO planning areas to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable in satisfying the transportation performance management requirements promulgated by the United States Department of Transportation in Title 23 Parts 450, 490, 625, and 673 of the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR).

This document is organized as follows:

* Section 2 provides a brief background on transportation performance management;
* Section 3 covers the Highway Safety measures (PM1);
* Section 4 covers the Pavement and Bridge Condition measures (PM2);
* Section 5 covers System Performance measures (PM3);
* Section 6 covers Transit Asset Management (TAM) measures; and
* Section 7 covers Transit Safety measures.

# 2 - Background

Pursuant to the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) Act enacted in 2012 and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) enacted in 2015, state departments of transportation (DOT) and MPOs must apply a transportation performance management approach in carrying out their federally required transportation planning and programming activities. The process requires the establishment and use of a coordinated, performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals for the federal-aid highway and public transportation programs.

On May 27, 2016, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (The Planning Rule).[[1]](#footnote-1) This rule details how state DOTs and MPOs must implement new MAP-21 and FAST Act transportation planning requirements, including the transportation performance management provisions.

In accordance with the Planning Rule, the [insert name of MPO] must include a description of the performance measures and targets that apply to the MPO planning area and a System Performance Report as an element of its LRTP. The System Performance Report evaluates the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to required performance targets, and reports on progress achieved in meeting the targets in comparison with baseline data and previous reports. For MPOs that elect to develop multiple scenarios, the System Performance Report also must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified targets.[[2]](#footnote-2)

There are several milestones related to the required content of the System Performance Report:

* In any LRTP adopted on or after May 27, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Highway Safety (PM1) measures;
* In any LRTP adopted on or after October 1, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Transit Asset Management measures;
* In any LRTP adopted on or after May 20, 2019, the System Performance Report must reflect Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) and System Performance (PM3) measures; and
* In any LRTP adopted on or after July 20, 2021, the System Performance Report must reflect Transit Safety measures.

The [insert name of MPO] 20XX-20YY Long-Range Transportation Plan was adopted on [insert date of adoption]. Per the Planning Rule, the System Performance Report for the [insert name of MPO] is included for the required Highway Safety (PM1), Bridge and Pavement (PM2), System Performance (PM3), Transit Asset Management, and Transit Safety targets [include Transit Safety if the LRTP will be adopted on or after July 20, 2021].

# 3 - Highway Safety Measures (PM1)

Effective April 14, 2016, the FHWA established five highway safety performance measures[[3]](#footnote-3) to carry out the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These performance measures are:

1. Number of fatalities;
2. Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
3. Number of serious injuries;
4. Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT; and
5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

FDOT publishes statewide safety performance targets in the HSIP Annual Report that it transmits to FHWA each year. Current safety targets address calendar year2021. For the 2020 HSIP annual report, FDOT established statewide at “0” for each performance measure to reflect Florida’s vision of zero deaths.

The [insert name of MPO] adopted/approved safety performance targets on [insert date]. Table 3.1 indicates the areas in which the MPO is expressly supporting the statewide target developed by FDOT, as well as those areas in which the MPO has adopted a target specific to the MPO planning area. [MPO inserts**** ****in the appropriate column for each safety performance measure. If MPO is supporting all statewide targets or adopting its own targets for every measure, this table could be omitted.]

**Table 3.1. Highway Safety (PM1) Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Target** | **[Insert MPO name] agrees to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the FDOT safety target of zero** | **[Insert MPO name] has adopted a target specific to the MPO Planning Area** |
| Number of fatalities |  |  |
| Rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT |  |  |
| Number of serious injuries |  |  |
| Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT |  |  |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries. |  |  |

Statewide system conditions for each safety performance measure are included in Table 3.2, along with system conditions in the [insert name of MPO] metropolitan planning area. The latest safety conditions will be updated annually on a rolling five-year window and reflected in subsequent system performance reports to track performance over time in relation to baseline conditions and established targets. [MPO inserts the following table if supporting FDOT safety performance targets.]

**Table 3.2. Highway Safety (PM1) Conditions and Performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Measures** | **Florida Statewide Baseline Performance**  **(Five-Year Rolling Average)** | | | | **Calendar Year 2021 Florida Performance Targets** |
| **2012-2016** | **2013-2017** | **2014-2018** | **2015-2019** |
| Number of Fatalities | 2,690.0 | 2,827.0 | 2,973.4 | 3,110.6 | 0 |
| Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT | 1.33 | 1.36 | 1.40 | 1.43 | 0 |
| Number of Serious Injuries | 20,877.2 | 20,943.0 | 20,737.0 | 20,166.4 | 0 |
| Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT | 10.37 | 10.14 | 9.77 | 9.29 | 0 |
| Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries | 3,361.6 | 3,371.4 | 3,410.4 | 3,401.8 | 0 |

[MPO inserts the following table if the MPO established its own safety targets. In discussion MPO may indicate support for Vision Zero concept if appropriate and rationale for setting its own targets.]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Measures** | **[insert MPO name] Baseline Performance**  **(Five-Year Rolling Average 20xx-20xx)** | **Calendar Year 2021 [insert MPO name] Planning Area Performance Targets** |
| Number of Fatalities |  |  |
| Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million VMT |  |  |
| Number of Serious Injuries |  |  |
| Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT |  |  |
| Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries |  |  |

**Baseline Conditions**

Opportunity for the MPO to discuss baseline conditions. The example below is from a previous Broward MPO TIP[[4]](#footnote-4). MPOs that include a table similar to this should use the most recent data available:

*After FDOT set its Safety Performance Measures targets in 2018, both FDOT and the Broward MPO established 2017 Baseline Safety Performance Measures. To evaluate baseline Safety Performance Measures, the most recent five-year rolling average (2013-2017) of crash data and VMT were utilized. Table 3-2 presents the Baseline Safety Performance Measures for Florida and Broward MPO.*

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated

In 2020, FHWA completed an assessment of target achievement for FDOT’s 2018 safety targets, based on actual five-year averages for each measure for 2014-2018. Per FHWA’s PM1 rule, a state has met or made significant progress toward its safety targets when at least four of the targets have been met or the actual outcome is better than the baseline performance. Based on FHWA’s review, Florida did not make significant progress toward achieving its safety targets. Both the total number of fatalities and the fatality rate increased. The total number of serious injuries has begun to decline on a five-year rolling average basis, while the serious injury rate has declined steadily over this timeframe. Based on these trends, Florida is making progress towards achieving the targets established for serious injuries but not yet for fatalities or non-motorized users. As required by FHWA, FDOT developed an HSIP Implementation Plan to highlight additional strategies it will undertake in support of the targets. The HSIP Implementation Plan documents Florida’s HSIP funding and project decisions for the upcoming fiscal year to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its safety performance targets in subsequent years.

As documented in the HSIP Implementation Plan, Florida received an allocation of approximately $155 million in HSIP funds during the 2018 state fiscal year from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019, and fully allocated those funds to safety projects. FDOT used these HSIP funds to complete 391 projects, which address the safety categories of intersections, lane departure mitigation, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and other programs representing emphasis areas in Florida’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

FDOT’s State Safety Office works closely with FDOT districts and regional and local traffic safety partners to update the HSIP annually. Historic, risk-based, and predictive safety analyses are conducted to identify appropriate proven countermeasures to reduce fatalities and serious injuries associated with Florida’s SHSP emphasis areas, resulting in a list of projects that reflect the greatest needs and are anticipated to achieve the highest benefit. While these projects and the associated policies and standards may take years to be implemented, they are built on proven countermeasures for improving safety and addressing serious crash risks or safety problems identified through a data-driven process. Florida continues to allocate all available HSIP funding to safety projects. FDOT’s HSIP Guidelines provide detailed information on this data-driven process and funding eligibility.

**Trends Analysis**

Opportunity for the MPO to discuss trends in safety performance and comparison with targets, either statewide targets or MPO targets if the MPO set them. This discussion could address how safety performance in the region compares to statewide, trend data for recent years, etc. The MPO could discuss general safety analysis or activities conducted in the support of the LRTP, such as the examples below:

Example below is from the Broward MPO:

*The process used to develop the MPO’s Long-Range Transportation Plan includes analysis of safety data trends, including the location and factors associated with crashes with emphasis on fatalities and serious injuries. These data are used to help identify regional safety issues and potential safety strategies for the LRTP and TIP.*

Or the MPO can provide specific trends data or maps. Example below is from a recent Broward MPO TIP (and could also be used for an MPO’s LRTP):

*The MPO uses crash data tracking fatalities and serious injuries in Broward County to analyze past trends and identify regional safety issues. Tracking these measures will help to estimate the effectiveness of future MPO transportation investment, as reflected in the TIP. Table 3-3 shows the changes in Safety Performance Measures for Broward MPO from 2013 through 2017. The measures shown in Table 3-3 were calculated by following the same methodology as that used to calculate the baseline conditions.*
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**Coordination with Statewide Safety Plans and Processes**

The [insert name of MPO] recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the [insert name of MPO 20xx] LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are available and described in other state and public transportation plans and processes; specifically the Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), the Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP).

* Florida’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), published in March 2021, specifically embraces Target Zero and identifies strategies to achieve zero traffic deaths and serious injuries. The SHSP was updated in coordination with Florida’s 27 MPOs and the Florida’s Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC). The SHSP development process included review of safety-related goals, objectives, and strategies in MPO plans. The SHSP guides FDOT, MPOs, and other safety partners in addressing safety and defines a framework for implementation activities to be carried out throughout the state. Florida’s transportation safety partners have focused on reducing fatalities and serious injuries through the 4Es of engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency response. To achieve zero, FDOT and other safety partners will expand beyond addressing specific hazards and influencing individual behavior to reshaping transportation systems and communities to create a safer environment for all travel. The updated SHSP calls on Florida to think more broadly and inclusively by addressing four additional topics, which could be referred to as the 4Is: information intelligence, innovation, insight into communities, and investments and policies
* The HSIP is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The program is managed by the Central Office with District staff performing project activities such as conducting safety studies, project scoping, public involvement, and coordinating with production staff on programming safety projects. To be eligible for HSIP funds, safety improvement projects must address a SHSP emphasis area, be identified through a data-driven process, and contribute to a reduction in fatalities and serious injuries
* Transportation projects are identified and prioritized with the MPOs and non-metropolitan local governments. Data are analyzed for each potential project, using traffic safety data and traffic demand modeling, among other data. The FDOT Project Development and Environment Manual requires the consideration of safety when preparing a proposed project’s purpose and need, and defines several factors related to safety, including crash modification factor and safety performance factor, as part of the analysis of alternatives. MPOs and local governments consider safety data analysis when determining project priorities.

**LRTP Safety Priorities**

The [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP increases the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users as required. The LRTP aligns with the Florida SHSP and the FDOT HSIP with specific strategies to improve safety performance focused on prioritized safety projects, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety enhancements, and traffic operation improvements to address our goal to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

The LRTP identifies safety needs within the metropolitan planning area and provides funding for targeted safety improvements. The [insert name] MPO has developed a project selection process that [insert MPO placeholder description of selection/prioritization process. The process may include an assessment that gives preference to projects with increased safety performance and/or will result in the prioritization of projects that are likely to reduce fatalities and serious injuries. The text could discuss how priorities are set for safety-specific program, as well as how safety is considered as a potential factor in setting priorities for other programs.]

The [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP will provide information from the FDOT HSIP annual reports to track the progress made toward the statewide safety performance targets. The MPO will document the progress on any safety performance targets established by the MPO for its planning area.

Example below is from the Miami Dade TPO:

*The Miami-Dade 2040 LRTP emphasizes the TPO’s commitment to safety through the goals identified in the plan. One of the LRTP’s goals is to Increase Safety, which includes the following objectives:*

* *Reduce roadway & multimodal crashes,*
* *Improve safety on facilities & in operations, and*
* *Provide safe and easy pedestrian and non-motorized travel.*

*There are numerous projects listed in the 2040 LRTP that will help improve safety of the Miami-Dade transportation system, including: capacity and operational improvements, redesigns of roadway segments, grade separations, transportation systems management and operation (TSM&O), roadway and access improvements, adding truck lanes, and reconstruction projects. For a complete list of projects, please see Chapter 6 of the Miami-Dade 2040 LRTP;* [*http://www.miamidade2040lrtp.com/*](http://www.miamidade2040lrtp.com/)*.*

*The Miami-Dade 2040 Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan serves as the non-motorized transportation element of the 2040 LRTP. The vision of the Miami-Dade 2040 Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan is to enhance the accessibility, safety, public health, social equity, environment, and overall quality of life within Miami-Dade County by creating interconnected bicycle and pedestrian friendly communities throughout the county—with safety being a key component of the plan. A snapshot of the number of projects by Priority, improvement type, and funding allocation by priority and phase from the 2040 LRTP are summarized in Figure 6: Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects by Improvement Type and Priority and Figure 7: Allocation of Bicycle/Pedestrian Funding by Priority and Phase (Thousands YOE $) on the next page.*

Example below is from the River to Sea TPO:

*The River to Sea TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to stated performance objectives, and that establishing this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the LRTP directly reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other public transportation plans and processes, including:*

* *Project Ranking Criteria in the 2040 LRTP (January 2016) – Improving transportation safety has been an emphasis area for the River to Sea TPO for many years. In the assessment of prioritization of projects considered for the 2040 LRTP, the TPO considered additional weighting for improvements that address safety concerns on the transportation network (see Chapter 2 and 6 of the 2040 LRTP).*
* *Incorporation of Measures in Project Ranking Criteria (Ongoing) – The TPO has a long history of emphasizing safety in the prioritization of transportation projects as a weighted factor in the criteria used to rank projects during the annual call for projects.*
* *Interagency Partnering (Ongoing) – For many years, the River to Sea TPO has participated in various partnerships to promote safety awareness and to identify and address safety concerns throughout the community. This includes involvement in the Community Traffic Safety Teams and Safe Kids Coalition.*
* *Congestion Management Process and Plan (October 2018) - The congestion management process requires the establishment and use of a coordinated, performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals for the federal-aid highway and public transportation programs. In addition to congestion resulting from traffic volume, this report incorporated additional transportation measures used in performance management.*
* *Roadway Safety Evaluation & Improvement Study (September 2018) – Building upon a crash analysis performed in 2017, this study developed a process to identify and mitigate the causes of crashes at high crash locations throughout the planning area.*

If the MPO developed multiple scenarios when creating the LRTP, the system performance report must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of highway safety and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the highway safety performance targets. FHWA/FTA guidance for completing this preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, federal guidance has not yet been issued.

FHWA and FTA also encourage (but do not require) MPOs that developed multiple scenarios to consider a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for the federal performance measures, and a scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures as possible.

# 4 - Pavement and Bridge Condition Measures (PM2)

## Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures and Targets Overview

In January 2017, USDOT published the Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures Final Rule, which is also referred to as the PM2 rule. This rule establishes the following six performance measures:

1. Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition;
2. Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition;
3. Percent of non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) pavements in good condition;
4. Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition;
5. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in good condition; and
6. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in poor condition.

The four pavement condition measures represent the percentage of lane-miles on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS that are in good condition or poor condition. The PM2 rule defines NHS pavement types as asphalt, jointed concrete, or continuous concrete. Five metrics are used to assess pavement condition:

* International Roughness Index (IRI) - an indicator of roughness; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements;
* Cracking percent - percentage of the pavement surface exhibiting cracking; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements;
* Rutting - extent of surface depressions; applicable to asphalt pavements only;
* Faulting - vertical misalignment of pavement joints; applicable to jointed concrete pavements only; and
* Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) – a quality rating applicable only to NHS roads with posted speed limits of less than 40 miles per hour (e.g., toll plazas, border crossings). States may choose to collect and report PSR for applicable segments as an alternative to the other four metrics.

For each pavement metric, a threshold is used to establish good, fair, or poor condition. Using these metrics and thresholds, pavement condition is assessed for each 0.1 mile section of the through travel lanes of mainline highways on the Interstate or the non-Interstate NHS. Asphalt pavement is assessed using the IRI, cracking, and rutting metrics, while jointed concrete is assessed using IRI, cracking, and faulting. For these two pavement types, a pavement section is rated good if the ratings for all three metrics are good, and poor if the ratings for two or more metrics are poor.

Continuous concrete pavement is assessed using the IRI and cracking metrics. For this pavement type, a pavement section is rated good if both metrics are rated good, and poor if both metrics are rated poor.

If a state collects and reports PSR for any applicable segments, those segments are rated according to the PSR scale. For all three pavement types, sections that are not good or poor are rated fair.

The good/poor measures are expressed as a percentage and are determined by summing the total lane-miles of good or poor highway segments and dividing by the total lane-miles of all highway segments on the applicable system. Pavement in good condition suggests that no major investment is needed and should be considered for preservation treatment. Pavement in poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is needed due to either ride quality or a structural deficiency.

The bridge condition measures refer to the percentage of bridges by deck area on the NHS that are in good condition or poor condition. The measures assess the condition of four bridge components: deck, superstructure, substructure, and culverts. Each component has a metric rating threshold to establish good, fair, or poor condition. Each bridge on the NHS is evaluated using these ratings. If the lowest rating of the four metrics is greater than or equal to seven, the structure is classified as good. If the lowest rating is less than or equal to four, the structure is classified as poor. If the lowest rating is five or six, it is classified as fair.

The bridge measures are expressed as the percent of NHS bridges in good or poor condition. The percent is determined by summing the total deck area of good or poor NHS bridges and dividing by the total deck area of the bridges carrying the NHS. Deck area is computed using structure length and either deck width or approach roadway width.

A bridge in good condition suggests that no major investment is needed. A bridge in poor condition is safe to drive on; however, it is nearing a point where substantial reconstruction or replacement is needed.

Federal rules require state DOTs and MPOs to coordinate when setting pavement and bridge condition performance targets and monitor progress towards achieving the targets. States must establish:

* Four-year statewide targets for the percent of Interstate pavements in good and poor condition;
* Two-year and four-year targets for the percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good and poor condition; and
* Two-year and four-year targets for the percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good and poor condition.

MPOs must establish four-year targets for all six measures. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the statewide targets or establish their own quantifiable targets for the MPO’s planning area.

The two-year and four-year targets represent pavement and bridge condition at the end of calendar years 2019 and 2021, respectively.

## Pavement and Bridge Condition Baseline Performance and Established Targets

This System Performance Report discusses the condition and performance of the transportation system for each applicable target as well as the progress achieved by the MPO in meeting targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports. Because the federal performance measures are new, performance of the system for each measure has only recently been collected and targets have only recently been established. Accordingly, this first [insert MPO name] LRTP System Performance Report highlights performance for the baseline period, which is 2017. FDOT will continue to monitor and report performance on a biennial basis. Future System Performance Reports will discuss progress towards meeting the targets since this initial baseline report.

Table 4.1 presents baseline and 2019 performance for each PM2 measure for the State and for the MPO planning area as well as the two-year and four-year targets established by FDOT for the State.

[If the MPO set its own PM2 targets, enter the targets in the right-hand column in Table 4.1. If the MPO did not set its own PM2 targets, delete the right-hand column.]

**Table 4.1. Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) Performance and Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Measures** | **Statewide (2017 Baseline)** | **Statewide 2019 Actual** | **Statewide 2-year Target (2019)** | **Statewide 4-year Target (2021)** | **[MPO name] (2017 Baseline)** | **[MPO name] 2019 Actual** | **[MPO name] 4-year Target**  **(2021)** |
| Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition | 66.1% | 68.0% | n/a | ≥60% |  |  |  |
| Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition | 0.0% | 0.5% | n/a | <5% |  |  |  |
| Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good condition | 44.0% | 41.0% | ≥40% | ≥40% |  |  |  |
| Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition | 0.4% | 0.3% | <5% | <5% |  |  |  |
| Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good condition | 67.7% | 65.6% | ≥50% | ≥50% |  |  |  |
| Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in poor condition | 1.2% | 0.5% | <10% | <10% |  |  |  |

FDOT established the statewide PM2 targets on May 18, 2018. In determining its approach to establishing performance targets for the federal pavement and bridge condition performance measures, FDOT considered many factors. FDOT is mandated by Florida Statute 334.046 to preserve the state’s pavement and bridges to specific standards. To adhere to the statutory guidelines, FDOT prioritizes funding allocations to ensure the current transportation system is adequately preserved and maintained before funding is allocated for capacity improvements. These statutory guidelines envelope the statewide federal targets that have been established for pavements and bridges.

In addition, MAP-21 requires FDOT to develop a Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) for all NHS pavements and bridges within the state. The TAMP must include investment strategies leading to a program of projects that would make progress toward achievement of the state DOT targets for asset condition and performance of the NHS. FDOT’s TAMP was updated to reflect MAP-21 requirements in 2018 and the final TAMP was approved on June 28, 2019.

Further, the federal pavement condition measures require a new methodology that is a departure from the methods currently used by FDOT and uses different ratings and pavement segment lengths. For bridge condition, the performance is measured in deck area under the federal measure, while the FDOT programs its bridge repair or replacement work on a bridge by bridge basis. As such, the federal measures are not directly comparable to the methods that are most familiar to FDOT.

In consideration of these differences, as well as the unfamiliarity associated with the new required processes, FDOT took a conservative approach when setting its initial pavement and bridge condition targets.

FDOT collects and reports bridge and pavement data to FHWA each year to track performance and progress toward the targets. Statewide, pavement and bridge data for 2019 show slight changes compared to the 2017 baseline. For Interstate pavement, the percent in good condition increased, although the percent in poor condition also increased, although only slightly. For non-Interstate NHS pavement, the percent in good condition decreased, as did the percent in poor condition. For bridges, the percent in good condition declined slightly, as did the percent in poor condition. For all measures with two-year targets, performance in 2019 exceeded the established targets, and in early 2021, FHWA determined that FDOT made significant progress toward the pavement and bridge two-year targets.

In the [insert name of MPO] region, [insert summary of performance. For example, Non-Interstate pavement in good condition increased/decreased from x% to y%, while bridges in good condition increased/decreased from…].

[Use this language for MPOs that support all six state PM2 targets:]

The [insert name of MPO] agreed to support FDOT’s pavement and bridge condition performance targets on [insert date]. By adopting FDOT’s targets, the [insert name of MPO] agrees to plan and program projects that help FDOT achieve these targets.

[Use this language for MPOs that establish one or more MPO PM2 targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] established the four-year pavement and bridge condition targets shown in Table 4.1 for the MPO’s planning area. In setting the MPO’s targets for the pavement and bridge condition performance measures, [insert MPO name] considered many factors.

[Insert a discussion and relevant data here on rationale for the MPO setting its own target(s). If applicable, highlight whether baseline performance in the MPO area is different than statewide performance, and factors that account for the difference. Discuss the MPO’s decision making process that led to establishing quantifiable MPO targets that are different than the statewide target.

[Use the following language for both types of MPOs.]

The [insert name of MPO] recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the [insert name of MPO 20xx] LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other state and public transportation plans and processes, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan.

* The FTP is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida’s transportation future. It defines the state’s long-range transportation vision, goals, and objectives and establishes the policy framework for the expenditure of state and federal funds flowing through FDOT’s work program. One of the seven goals defined in the FTP is Agile, Resilient, and Quality Infrastructure.
* The Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) explains the processes and policies affecting pavement and bridge condition and performance in the state. It presents a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving these assets effectively throughout their life cycle.

The [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP seeks to address system preservation, identifies infrastructure needs within the metropolitan planning area, and provides funding for targeted improvements. [Briefly discuss key goals, objectives, strategies, programs, initiatives, etc. in the LRTP, and in any other MPO plans or studies if applicable (e.g., special studies, corridor studies) that address pavement and bridge condition].

On or before October 1, 2020, FDOT will provide FHWA and the [insert name of MPO] a detailed report of pavement and bridge condition performance covering the period of January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2019. FDOT and the [insert name of MPO] also will have the opportunity at that time to revisit the four-year PM2 targets.

If the MPO developed multiple scenarios when creating the LRTP, the system performance report must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved pavement and bridge condition and performance and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the PM2 performance targets. FHWA/FTA guidance for completing this preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, federal guidance has not yet been issued.

FHWA and FTA also encourage (but do not require) MPOs that developed multiple scenarios to consider a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for the federal performance measures, and a scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures as possible.

# 5 - System Performance, Freight, and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program Measures (PM3)

## System Performance/Freight/CMAQ Performance Measures and Targets Overview

In January 2017, USDOT published the System Performance/Freight/CMAQ Performance Measures Final Rule to establish measures to assess passenger and freight performance on the Interstate and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS), and traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions in areas that do not meet federal National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The rule, which is referred to as the PM3 rule, requires MPOs to set targets for the following six performance measures:

***National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)***

1. Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable, also referred to as Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR);
2. Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable (LOTTR);

***National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)***

1. Truck Travel Time Reliability index (TTTR);

***Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)***

1. Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED);
2. Percent of non-single occupant vehicle travel (Non-SOV); and
3. Cumulative 2-year and 4-year reduction of on-road mobile source emissions (NOx, VOC, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) for CMAQ funded projects.

In Florida, only the two LOTTR performance measures and the TTTR performance measure apply. Because all areas in Florida meet current NAAQS, the last three measures listed above pertaining to the CMAQ Program do not currently apply in Florida.

LOTTR is defined as the ratio of longer travel times (80th percentile) to a normal travel time (50th percentile) over all applicable roads during four time periods (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, and weekends) that cover the hours of 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. each day. The LOTTR ratio is calculated for each roadway segment, essentially comparing the segment with itself. Segments with LOTTR ≥ 1.50 during any of the above time periods are considered unreliable. The two LOTTR measures are expressed as the percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS system that are reliable. Person-miles consider the number of people traveling in buses, cars, and trucks over these roadway segments. To obtain person miles traveled, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for each segment are multiplied by the average vehicle occupancy for each type of vehicle on the roadway. To calculate the percent of person miles traveled that are reliable, the sum of the number of reliable person miles traveled is divide by the sum of total person miles traveled.

TTTR is defined as the ratio of longer truck travel times (95th percentile) to a normal travel time (50th percentile) over the Interstate during five time periods (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, weekend, and overnight) that cover all hours of the day. TTTR is quantified by taking a weighted average of the maximum TTTR from the five time periods for each Interstate segment. The maximum TTTR is weighted by segment length, then the sum of the weighted values is divided by the total Interstate length to calculate the Travel Time Reliability Index.

The data used to calculate these PM3 measures are provided by FHWA via the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS). This dataset contains travel times, segment lengths, and Annual Average Daily Travel (AADT) for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS roads.

The PM3 rule requires state DOTs and MPOs to coordinate when establishing performance targets for these measures and to monitor progress towards achieving the targets. FDOT must establish:

* Two-year and four-year statewide targets for percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable;
* Four-year targets for the percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable[[5]](#footnote-5); and
* Two-year and four-year targets for truck travel time reliability

MPOs must establish four-year performance targets for all three measures within 180 days of FDOT establishing statewide targets. MPOs establish targets by either agreeing to program projects that will support the statewide targets or setting quantifiable targets for the MPO’s planning area.

The two-year and four-year targets represent system performance at the end of calendar years 2019 and 2021, respectively.

## PM3 Baseline Performance and Established Targets

The System Performance Report discusses the condition and performance of the transportation system for each applicable PM3 target as well as the progress achieved by the MPO in meeting targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports. Because the federal performance measures are new, performance of the system for each measure has only recently been collected and targets have only recently been established. Accordingly, this [insert MPO name] LRTP System Performance Report highlights performance for the baseline period, which is 2017, and for 2019. FDOT will continue to monitor and report performance on a biennial basis. Future System Performance Reports will discuss progress towards meeting the targets since this initial baseline report.

Table 5.1 presents baseline and 2019 performance for each PM3 measure for the state and for the MPO planning area as well as the two-year and four-year targets established by FDOT for the state.

[If the MPO set its own PM3 targets, enter the targets in the right-hand column in Table 5.1. If the MPO did not set its own PM3 targets, delete the right-hand column.]

**Table 5.1. System Performance and Freight (PM3) - Performance and Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Measures** | **Statewide (2017 Baseline)** | **Statewide 2019 Actual** | **Statewide 2-year Target (2019)** | **Statewide 4-year Target (2021)** | **[MPO name] (2017 Baseline)** | **[MPO name] 2019 Actual** | **[MPO name] 4-year Target (2021)** |
| Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable | 82.2% | 83.4% | ≥75.0% | ≥70.0% |  |  |  |
| Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable | 84.0% | 87.0% | n/a | ≥50.0% |  |  |  |
| Truck travel time reliability index (TTTR) | 1.43 | 1.45 | ≤1.75 | ≤2.00 |  |  |  |

FDOT established the statewide PM3 targets on May 18, 2018. In setting the statewide targets, FDOT reviewed external and internal factors that may affect reliability, conducted a trend analysis for the performance measures, and developed a sensitivity analysis indicating the level of risk for road segments to become unreliable within the time period for setting targets. One key conclusion from this effort is that there is a lack of availability of extended historical data with which to analyze past trends and a degree of uncertainty about future reliability performance. Accordingly, FDOT took a conservative approach when setting its initial PM3 targets.

FDOT collects and reports travel time data to FHWA each year to track performance and progress toward the reliability targets. The percentage of person-miles that are reliable increased from 2017 to 2019 on both the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS. The truck travel time reliability index declined slightly between the 2017 baseline and 2019. For each measure, the 2019 actual performance exceeded the applicable two-year targets. In early 2021, FHWA determined that FDOT made significant progress toward each of the two-year targets.

[Use the following language for MPOs that support all three statewide PM3 targets:]

The [insert name of MPO] agreed to support FDOT’s PM3 targets on [insert date]. By adopting FDOT’s targets, the [insert name of MPO] agrees to plan and program projects that help FDOT achieve these targets.

[Use this language for MPOs that establish one or more MPO PM3 targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] established the four-year targets shown in Table 5.1 for the MPO’s planning area. In setting the MPO’s PM3 target(s), [insert MPO name] considered many factors.

[Insert a discussion and relevant data here on rationale for the MPO setting its own target(s). If applicable, highlight whether baseline reliability performance in the MPO area is different than statewide performance, and factors that account for the difference. Discuss the MPO’s decision making process that led to establishing quantifiable MPO targets that are different than the statewide target.]

[Use the following language for both types of MPOs.]

The [insert name of MPO] recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to established performance objectives, and that this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the [insert name of MPO 20xx] LRTP reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other state and public transportation plans and processes, including the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan.

* The FTP is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida’s transportation future. It defines the state’s long-range transportation vision, goals, and objectives and establishes the policy framework for the expenditure of state and federal funds flowing through FDOT’s work program. One of the seven goals of the FTP is Efficient and Reliable Mobility for People and Freight.
* The Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan presents a comprehensive overview of the conditions of the freight system in the state, identifies key challenges and goals, provides project needs, and identifies funding sources. Truck reliability is specifically called forth in this plan, both as a need as well as a goal.

The [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP seeks to address system reliability and congestion mitigation through various means, including capacity expansion and operational improvements. [Briefly discuss key goals, objectives, strategies, programs, initiatives, etc. in the LRTP that address reliability and congestion, and in any other MPO plans or studies if applicable. Include relevant information and strategies from the CMP, TSMO approaches, managed lanes, TDM approaches, etc. if applicable.]

On or before October 1, 2020, FDOT will provide FHWA and the [insert name of MPO] a detailed report of performance for the PM3 measures covering the period of January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2019. FDOT and the [insert name of MPO] also will have the opportunity at that time to revisit the four-year PM3 targets.

If the MPO developed multiple scenarios when creating the LRTP, the system performance report must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of system reliability and freight travel and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the PM3 performance targets. FHWA/FTA guidance for completing this preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, federal guidance has not yet been issued.

FHWA and FTA also encourage (but do not require) MPOs that developed multiple scenarios to consider a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for the federal performance measures, and a scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures as possible.

# 6 - Transit Asset Management Measures

**Transit Asset Performance**

On July 26, 2016, FTA published the final Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule. This rule applies to all recipients and subrecipients of Federal transit funding that own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets. The rule defines the term “state of good repair,” requires that public transportation providers develop and implement TAM plans, and establishes state of good repair standards and performance measures for four asset categories: equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities. The rule became effective on October 1, 2018.

Table 6.1 below identifies performance measures outlined in the final rule for transit asset management.

**Table 6.1. FTA TAM Performance Measures**

| **Asset Category** | **Performance Measure and Asset Class** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Equipment | Percentage of non-revenue, support-service and maintenance vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark |
| 1. Rolling Stock | Percentage of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have either met or exceeded their useful life benchmark |
| 1. Infrastructure | Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions |
| 1. Facilities | Percentage of facilities within an asset class rated below condition 3 on the TERM scale |

For equipment and rolling stock classes, useful life benchmark (ULB) is defined as the expected lifecycle of a capital asset, or the acceptable period of use in service, for a particular transit provider’s operating environment. ULB considers a provider’s unique operating environment such as geography and service frequency.

Public transportation agencies are required to establish and report transit asset management targets annually for the following fiscal year. Each public transit provider or its sponsors must share its targets, TAM, and asset condition information with each MPO in which the transit provider’s projects and services are programmed in the MPO’s TIP.

MPOs are required to establish initial transit asset management targets within 180 days of the date that public transportation providers establish initial targets. However, MPOs are not required to establish transit asset management targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, subsequent MPO targets must be established when the MPO updates the LRTP.

When establishing transit asset management targets, the MPO can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish its own separate regional transit asset management targets for the MPO planning area. In cases where two or more providers operate in an MPO planning area and establish different targets for a given measure, the MPO has the option of coordinating with the providers to establish a single target for the MPO planning area, or establishing a set of targets for the MPO planning area that reflects the differing transit provider targets.

To the maximum extent practicable, transit providers, states, and MPOs must coordinate with each other in the selection of performance targets.

The TAM rule defines two tiers of public transportation providers based on size parameters. Tier I providers are those that operate rail service or more than 100 vehicles in all fixed route modes, or more than 100 vehicles in one non-fixed route mode. Tier II providers are those that are a subrecipient of FTA 5311 funds, or an American Indian Tribe, or have 100 or less vehicles across all fixed route modes, or have 100 vehicles or less in one non-fixed route mode. A Tier I provider must establish its own transit asset management targets, as well as report performance and other data to FTA. A Tier II provider has the option to establish its own targets or to participate in a group plan with other Tier II providers whereby targets are established by a plan sponsor, typically a state DOT, for the entire group.

*[Note: MPO has the option of including this paragraph and Table 6.2 for context, or may just identify those Tier II providers in the MPO planning area that participated in the FDOT Group TAM Plan, if any.]* A total of 18 transit providers participated in the FDOT Group TAM Plan and continue to coordinate with FDOT on establishing and reporting group targets to FTA through the National Transit Database (NTD) (Table 6.2). These are FDOT’s Section 5311 Rural Program subrecipients. The Group TAM Plan was adopted in October 2018 and covers fiscal years 2018-2019 through 2021-2022. Updated targets were submitted to NTD in March 2021.

**Table 6.2. Florida Group TAM Plan Participants1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| District | Participating Transit Providers |  |
| 1 | Central Florida Regional Planning Council |  |
| 2 | Baker County Transit  Big Bend Transit2  Levy County Transit  Nassau County Transit | Ride Solution  Suwannee River Economic Council  Suwannee Valley Transit Authority |
| 3 | Big Bend Transit2  Calhoun Transit  Gulf County ARC  JTRANS | Liberty County Transit  Tri-County Community Council  Wakulla Transit |
| 4 | *No participating providers* |  |
| 5 | Marion Transit  Sumter Transit |  |
| 6 | Key West Transit |  |
| 7 | *No participating providers* |  |

**1** The Central Florida Regional Planning Council now handles transit service in DeSoto County, so DeSoto-Arcadia Regional Transit no longer included in the list of providers. Good Wheels, Inc. is no longer in business.

**2** Provider service area covers portions of Districts 1 and 2

The MPO has the following Tier I and Tier II providers operating in the region:

List providers and indicate for each if it is a Tier I or Tier II provider. For Tier II providers, indicate those that are participating in FDOT’s Group TAM Plan.

Example from River to Sea TPO LRTP:

*The River to Sea TPO planning area is served by three (3) transit service providers: Flagler County Public Transit (FCPT), Votran, and SunRail. Votran and SunRail are considered Tier I providers and, as such, each must develop a TAM Plan. FCPT is considered a Tier II provider and thus is included in a group TAM plan developed by the FDOT Public Transit Office in Tallahassee.*

[Use this language for MPO that supports public transportation provider targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] agreed to support [transit provider’s] transit asset management targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the transit provider targets. *Revise paragraph as needed to list all relevant provider and the date(s) of MPO action.*

Text for Tier I provider or Tier II provider that is not part of the FDOT Group TAM Plan:

The [insert transit agency] established the transit asset targets identified in Table 6.3 on [insert date]:

Include Table 6.3 below to list transit asset management targets. Repeat the table for each transit provider. Targets are established by asset class; therefore, tables need to include only the asset classes that apply in the region.

The transit asset management targets are based on the condition of existing transit assets and planned investments in equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities. The targets reflect the most recent data available on the number, age, and condition of transit assets, and expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets. The table summarizes both existing conditions for the most recent year available, and the targets [augment text as needed].

**Table 6.3. FTA TAM Targets for [insert transit provider name]**

| **Asset Category Performance Measure** | **Asset Class** | **FY 20xx Asset Condition** | **FY 20xx Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rolling Stock** | | | |
| Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB | Articulated Bus | X | % |
| Bus | X | % |
| Mini-Bus | X | % |
| Van | X | % |
| Etc. | X | % |
| **Equipment** | | | |
| Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB | Non Revenue/Service Automobile | X | % |
| Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles | X | % |
| Maintenance Equipment | X | % |
| Etc. | X | % |
| **Infrastructure** | | | |
| % of track segments with performance restrictions (applicable only for Tier I providers) | Guideway Elements | X | % |
|  | Power & Signal Elements | X | % |
|  | Track elements |  | % |
| **Facilities** | | | |
| Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale | Administration | X | % |
| Maintenance | X | % |
| Parking Structures | X | % |
| Passenger Facilities | X | % |
| Shelter | X | % |
| Storage | X | % |
| Etc. | X | % |

Text for Tier II provider that is part of FDOT’s group TAM Plan:

[Transit provider] is part of the Group TAM Plan for Fiscal Years 2018/2019-2021/2022 developed by FDOT for Tier II providers in Florida and coordinates with FDOT on reporting of group targets to NTD. The FY 2020 asset conditions and 2021 targets for the Tier II providers are shown in Table 6.4.

The statewide group TAM targets are based on the condition of existing transit assets and planned investments in equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities over the next year. The targets reflect the most recent data available on the number, age, and condition of transit assets, and expectations and capital investment plans for improving these assets during the next fiscal year.

As required by FTA, FDOT will update this TAM Plan at least once every four years. FDOT will update the statewide performance targets for the participating agencies on an annual basis and will notify the participating transit agencies and the MPOs in which they operate when the targets are updated. [augment text as needed].

**Table 6.4. FDOT Group Plan Transit Asset Management Targets for Tier II Providers**

| **Asset Category - Performance Measure** | **Asset Class** | **FY 2020 Asset Conditions** | | **FY 2021 Performance Target** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revenue Vehicles** | | | | | |
| Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) | Automobile | 28.6% | | ≤28% | |
| Bus | 17.0% | | ≤16% | |
| Cutaway Bus | 14.1% | | ≤14% | |
| School Bus | 100% | | ≤75% | |
| Mini-Van | | 26.6% | | ≤26% | |
| SUV | | 18.2% | | ≤18% | |
| Van | | 47.9% | | ≤47% | |
| **Equipment** | | | | | |
| Age - % of equipment or non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) | Non Revenue Automobile | 66.7% | | ≤66% | |
| Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles | 7.1% | | ≤7% | |
| **Facilities** | | | | | |
| Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale | Passenger/Parking Facilities | 0% | | ≤0% | |
| Administration/ Maintenance Facilities | 0% | | ≤0% | |

[Use this language for MPO that establishes its own TAM targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] established transit asset targets for the MPO planning area, as summarized in Table 6.5:

**Table 6.5.[insert MPO name] Transit Asset Management Targets**

| **Asset Category - Performance Measure** | **Asset Class** | **FY 20XX Asset Condition** | **FY20xx Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Revenue Vehicles | | | |
| Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB | Articulated Bus | X | % |
| Bus | X | % |
| Mini-Bus | X | % |
| Van | X | % |
| Etc. | X | % |
| Equipment | | | |
| Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their ULB | Non Revenue/Service Automobile | X | % |
| Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles | X | % |
| Maintenance Equipment | X | % |
| Etc. | X | % |
| Infrastructure | | | |
| % of track segments with performance restrictions (applicable only for Tier I providers) | Guideway Elements | X | % |
| Power & Signal Elements | X | % |
| Track Elements | X | % |
| Facilities | | | |
| Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale | Administration | n/a | % |
| Maintenance | n/a | % |
| Parking Structures | n/a | % |
| Passenger Facilities | n/a | % |
| Shelter | n/a | % |
| Storage | n/a | % |
| Etc. | n/a | % |

These targets for the MPO planning area reflect the targets established by list names of individual transit providers(s) through their Transit Asset Management Plans, as well as the statewide targets established by FDOT for those providers participating in the Group Transit Asset Management Plan, which includes the following provider(s) in the MPO planning area: list names of individual transit providers(s). Add discussion of how the MPO established regional targets from these individual provider targets; for example, did the MPO weight the targets by the relative size of each transit provider’s assets?

[All MPOs include the remaining section:]

**TAM Performance**

If data are available, discuss TAM performance trends and progress toward achieving targets. These data would most likely come from the transit providers’ asset management plans. At this point most providers will probably have only initial (baseline) data. In future LRTP updates, additional TAM performance data and targets will be available to allow a fuller discussion of trends and progress toward achieving targets. The MPO may also choose to reference the investment prioritization section of a transit provider’s TAM and link the provider’s investment priorities to the MPO’s LRTP.

The [insert name of MPO] recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to stated performance objectives, and that establishing this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the LRTP directly reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other public transportation plans and processes, including the [insert relevant reports], and the current [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP.

To support progress towards TAM performance targets, transit investment and maintenance funding in the [20xx LRTP] totals $XX million, approximately XX percent of total LRTP funding and XX percent of requested [insert transit agency] funding for transit preservation. Improving the State of Good Repair (SGR) of capital assets is an overarching goal of this process.

If the MPO developed multiple scenarios when creating the LRTP, the system performance report must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of transit assets and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the transit asset performance targets. FHWA/FTA guidance for completing this preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, federal guidance has not yet been issued.

FHWA and FTA also encourage (but do not require) MPOs that developed multiple scenarios to consider a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for the federal performance measures, and a scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures as possible.

# 7 - Transit Safety Performance

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published a final Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTSAP) rule and related performance measures as authorized by Section 20021 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP– 21). The PTASP rule requires operators of public transportation systems that receive federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 to develop and implement a PTASP based on a safety management systems approach. Development and implementation of PTSAPs is anticipated to help ensure that public transportation systems are safe nationwide.

The rule applies to all operators of public transportation that are a recipient or sub-recipient of FTA Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program funds under 49 U.S.C. Section 5307, or that operate a rail transit system that is subject to FTA’s State Safety Oversight Program. The rule does not apply to certain modes of transit service that are subject to the safety jurisdiction of another Federal agency, including passenger ferry operations that are regulated by the United States Coast Guard, and commuter rail operations that are regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.

**Transit Safety Performance Measures**

The transit agency sets targets in the PTASP based on the safety performance measures established in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NPTSP). The required transit safety performance measures are:

1. Total number of reportable fatalities.
2. Rate of reportable fatalities per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
3. Total number of reportable injuries.
4. Rate of reportable injuries per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
5. Total number of reportable safety events.
6. Rate of reportable events per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
7. System reliability - Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

Each provider of public transportation that is subject to the federal rule must certify that its SSPP meets the requirements for a PTASP, including transit safety targets for the federally required measures. Providers initially were required to certify a PTASP and targets by July 20, 2020. However, on April 22, 2020, FTA extended the deadline to December 31, 2020 to provide regulatory flexibility due to the extraordinary operational challenges presented by the COVID-19 public health emergency. On December 11, 2020, FTA extended the PTASP deadline for a second time to July 20, 2021.

Once the public transportation provider establishes targets, it must make the targets available to MPOs to aid in the planning process. MPOs have 180 days after receipt of the PTASP targets to establish transit safety targets for the MPO planning area. In addition, the [insert MPO name] must reflect those targets in any LRTP and TIP updated on or after July 20, 2021.

In Florida, each Section 5307 and 5311 transit provider must develop a System Safety Program Plan (SSPP) under Chapter 14-90, Florida Administrative Code. FDOT technical guidance recommends that Florida’s transit agencies revise their existing SSPPs to be compliant with the new FTA PTASP requirements.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The following transit provider(s) operate in the [insert MPO name] planning area: [list providers(s)]. Of these, [insert name of provider(s) subject to the PTASP requirements] is/are responsible for developing a PTASP and establishing transit safety performance targets annually.

The [insert transit agency] established the transit safety targets identified in Table 7.1 on [insert date]:

Include Table 7.1 to list the transit safety targets established by the transit provider(s). Note that this table is an example; the MPO should adapt the table to their specific situation. If more than one provider in the MPO area established transit safety targets, the MPO may include a separate table for each provider or one table that combines the providers, as shown in the example below. Because transit safety targets are established by transit mode, the table may include additional modes not shown below or may list fewer modes. Transit providers also choose the units they use to express the fatality rate, injury rate, and safety events rate measures. For example, a provider may use total annual vehicle revenue miles (VRM) or per 100,000 VRM. The units should be specified in the table. The MPO also may include relevant details from the provider’s PTASP, as needed.

**Table 7.1. Transit Safety Performance Targets for [insert names of transit provider(s)]**

| **Transit Mode** | **Fatalities (total)** | **Fatalities (rate)** | **Injuries (total)** | **Injuries (rate)** | **Safety Events (total)** | **Safety Events (rate)** | **System Reliability** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transit Provider 1** | | | | | | | |
| Fixed Route Bus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Bus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Transit Provider 2** | | | | | | | |
| Fixed Route Bus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paratransit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[Use this language for MPO that supports public transportation provider targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] agreed to support [insert transit provider’s name] transit safety targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the targets.

[Use this language for MPO that establishes its own transit safety targets:]

On [insert date], the [insert MPO name] established transit safety targets for the MPO planning area. Table 7.2 presents the [insert MPO name] transit safety targets.

**Table 7.2. [Insert MPO name] Transit Safety Performance Targets**

| **Transit Mode** | **Fatalities (total)** | **Fatalities (rate)** | **Injuries (total)** | **Injuries (rate)** | **Safety Events (total)** | **Safety Events (rate)** | **System Reliability** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fixed Route Bus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Bus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The targets for the MPO planning area reflect the targets established by [list name(s) of individual transit providers(s)] through their Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan(s). Add discussion of how/why the MPO established regional targets from the individual provider targets; for example, did the MPO use a weighted average of safety performance from the various providers?

[All MPOs include the remaining section:]

**Transit Safety Performance**

If data are available, discuss transit safety performance trends. Data and narrative should be available in the transit providers’ PTASP. At this time, most providers will probably have only initial (baseline) data. In future LRTP updates, additional transit safety performance data and targets will be available to allow a fuller discussion of trends and progress toward achieving targets.

The [insert name of MPO] recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to stated performance objectives, and that establishing this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the LRTP directly reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other public transportation plans and processes, including the [insert PTASP reference and other relevant reports], and the current [insert name of MPO] 20XX LRTP. The PTASP should identify safety issues and safety risk mitigation strategies that can be summarized here.

To support progress towards transit safety performance targets, transit investment and safety funding in the [20xx LRTP] totals $XX, approximately XX percent of total LRTP funding and XX percent of requested [insert transit agency] funding.

If the MPO developed multiple scenarios when creating the LRTP, the system performance report must include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of transit safety and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the transit safety targets. FHWA/FTA guidance for completing this preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, federal guidance has not yet been issued.

FHWA and FTA also encourage (but do not require) MPOs that developed multiple scenarios to consider a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for the federal performance measures, and a scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures as possible.

1. The Final Rule modified the Code of Federal Regulations at 23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Guidance from FHWA/FTA for completing the preferred scenario analysis is expected in the future. As of March 2021, no guidance has been issued. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 23 CFR Part 490, Subpart B [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Broward MPO Transportation Improvement Plan, FY 2020-2024, adopted July 11, 2019, revised May 14, 2020. <https://www.browardmpo.org/images/WhatWeDo/TIP%20FY%2020-24%20revision%205-14-2020.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Beginning with the second performance period covering January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2025, two-year targets will be required in addition to four-year targets for the percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. FDOT Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Guidance Document for Transit Agencies. Available at <https://www.fdot.gov/transit/default.shtm> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)