SUPPORTING STATEMENT A

ASSESSMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
AGENCY NEEDS, CAPABILITIES AND CAPACITY

INTRODUCTION

This is to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) three-year approval for the information collection entitled, Assessment of Transportation Performance Management Needs, Capabilities and Capacity.

Part A. Justification

1. Circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

The FHWA will collect information on the current state-of-the-practice, data, methods, and systems used by state, metropolitan, regional, local, and tribal transportation agencies entities to support their transportation performance management (TPM) processes in accordance with Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) §§1106, 1112-1113, 1201-1203; 23 USC 119, 134-135, and 148-150, as amended by the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. This information will also be used to develop and deliver existing and future Federal Highway Programs through successful partnerships, value-added stewardship, and risk-based oversight. Underpinning this effort will be a renewed focus on enhancing organizational capacity, which translates into having a skilled workforce and supporting systems that are optimally positioned and equipped to deliver the FHWA's mission.

In sum, this collection of information is necessary to establish a baseline to assess the following three research questions:

1. Is FHWA and its partners are making progress implementing TPM best practices that relate to MAP-21 and FAST-Act performance provisions?
2. What is the effectiveness of both 1) performance-based planning and programming processes and 2) TPM processes, and 3) asset management Processes.
3. What additional resources do FHWA's partner agencies need to advance the state-of-the-practice?

Currently, FHWA and its partners are unable to satisfactorily answer those questions using empirical data because FHWA and its partners do not have good research data on the processes transportation agencies use to achieve their desired performance outcomes. It is believed that while state departments of transportation and metropolitan planning organizations have a general understanding of TPM practices and have begun implementation, it will be beneficial to have a better understanding of their specific capabilities, progress, and challenges.

In the document, "National TPM Implementation Review Survey Design and Questions," which was included as part of this information collection request, survey questions are listed by sections (sections A-J) and further broken down by sub-sections. Sections A (TPM General), B (Performance-based Programming), and C (Asset Management) get to the heart of answering research questions #1, #2, and #3 by seeking information that will illustrate the quality of the processes FHWA's partners are using to achieve performance outcomes.

Sections D-J (performance measure areas such as Safety, Pavement, Bridge, etc.), seeks to provide more nuanced answers to research questions #1 and #3 by asking technical, subject-matter specific performance measure related questions. Within sections D-J, those type of questions are grouped into the following five subsections:

Staffing
Performance
Measures
Target Setting
Planning and Programming
Monitoring and Reporting

The information collected will illustrate which performance measure areas are further along with implementing best practices and which will need greater technical assistance and investments in tools/resources.

2. <u>How, by whom, and for what purpose is the information to be used</u>.

The information will be collected via an internet-based survey and will be used to better understand agency processes, TPM capabilities, and current technical assistance needs so that FHWA can provide targeted and effective support to these agencies. Technical assistance developed from the information collected will take the form of guidance, additional research, peer exchanges and training, tool development, and applied research. FHWA's contractor has built a draft survey instrument using survey gizmo, which is ready for testing with partners prior to deploying the survey.

FHWA will also use the information collected to inform how it implements the performance provisions of MAP-21 and the FAST Act, making programmatic changes in how it provides stewardship and deploys technical assistance to its partnerships.

Additionally, information collected will also be used to help FHWA supplement the following statutory reports to Congress that were due in October 2017 on the effectiveness of performance-based planning and programming processes and transportation performance management:

Report on Performance-based Planning Processes: 23 U.S.C. §§ 134(l)(2)
2) Report. -Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the MAP–21, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report evaluating—

(A) the overall effectiveness of performance-based planning as a tool for guiding transportation investments;
(B) the effectiveness of the performance-based planning process of each metropolitan planning organization under this section;
(C) the extent to which metropolitan planning organizations have achieved, or are currently making substantial progress toward achieving, the performance targets specified under this section and whether metropolitan planning organizations are developing meaningful performance targets; and
(D) the technical capacity of metropolitan planning organizations that operate within a metropolitan planning area of less than 200,000 and their ability to carry out the requirements of this section.

Performance-based Planning Processes Evaluation Report: 23 U.S.C. §§ 135(h)(2))
(2) In general.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the MAP–21, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report evaluating—

i. the overall effectiveness of performance-based planning as a tool for guiding transportation investments; and
ii. the effectiveness of the performance-based planning process of each State.

3. Extent of automated information collection.

The information will be collected via an internet-based survey and automated self-assessment tools. All information will be collected and stored electronically.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

There is no duplication or existing source for the information to be collected. FHWA has conducted an extensive literature review of previously collected data and found no uniform source of data available for all agencies.

5. Efforts to minimize the burden on small businesses.

This information collection does not involve small businesses.

6. Impact of less frequent collection of information.

Without these data FHWA will not be in a position to properly support state and regional agencies. Instead, data will have to be collected on an agency-by-agency bases causing massive inefficiencies. Collection of this data would also be duplicated by several non-governmental agencies interested in using such data if FHWA does not step in and standardize the information collection process. FHWA will also not be in a position to satisfactorily answer the numerous inquiries it receives from the Government Accountability Office on how well FHWA's partners are implementing transportation performance management.

7. Special Circumstances. EXPLAIN ANY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WOULD CAUSE AN INFORMATION COLLECTION TO BE CONDUCTED IN A MANNER:

There are no special circumstances associated with this information collection.

8. Compliance with 5 CFR 1320.8(d).

The FHWA published a 60-day Federal Register notice (Docket No. FHWA-2015-0013) on June 23, 2015 (80 FR, pages 36039 – 36040) and a follow-up 30-day Federal Register notice (Docket No. FHWA-2016-0010) on March 30, 2016 (81 FR, pages 17758-17760), which both solicited public comments on our intent to seek approval for this information collection. The ICR has been revised to address comments received during both the 30-day and 60-day federal register notices. To allow for additional stakeholder comments, FHWA extended the second federal register notice an additional 30 days (the docket closed on May 31, 2016). As part of the supporting documents section for this ICR, FHWA provided a document summarizing public comments on this ICR.

Throughout the survey and the ICR, FHWA carefully refers to the "state-of-the-practice" or "performance provisions" not "rulemaking implementation." This was done intentionally to separate the complex rulemaking activities from the survey design conversations with stakeholders. Activities related to rulemaking could not be discussed at that time due to open NPRM comment periods. However, we made it clear to stakeholders that regardless of what the finally rulemakings where, FHWA intended to support them in advancing the state-of-the practice for TPM because that was the intent of MAP-21 and the FAST Act.

9. Payment or gifts to respondents.

No payments or gifts are provided to respondents.

10. Assurance of confidentiality.

Respondents' individual responses are considered confidential and will not be shared with the public or non-essential USDOT staff unless permission is provided by the respondent. While the data collected will be formatted to produce different types of reports, the identity of the responding agencies will be protected unless permission to disclose is provided by the agency. This is necessary to protect the integrity of the responses. During our public comments, several stakeholders expressed that confidentially was important if USDOT wanted to receive "honest" responses.

11. Justification for collection of sensitive information.

None of the information required is of a sensitive or private nature.

12. Estimate of burden hours for information requested.

Respondents: The 460 respondents estimate is based on soliciting input from 52 State Transportation Agencies (STA) and 408 Metropolitan Transportation Organizations (MPOs).

Frequency: Agencies will be solicited to provide information via a survey 1 time every two years.

Estimated Average Burden per Response: The estimated average annual burden hours is up to 22 hours per response during a year with a survey/questionnaire request.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: The estimated total annual burden hours for all respondents (52 states and 408 MPOs) is estimated to be 9,200 burden hours (460 respondents (each State/MPO agency is treated as a single response) x 22 burden hours) per year with survey/questionnaire requests.

Professional Staff Time during a Survey Year:

- 20 hours/respondent × 460 respondents × 1 questionnaire during a survey year =*9,200 hours*

Clerical Staff Time during a Survey Year:

- 2 hours/respondent × 460 respondents × 1 questionnaire during a survey year =*920 hours*

Total: 10,120 hours during a survey year.

NOTE: For this OMB approval cycle we will collect information in year 1 and again in year 3, for a total of 20,240 hours. For ROCIS entry purposes we will divide all totals by 3.
Total Respondents = 920 (307 annually)
Burden Response = 22 hours
Total Hours = 20,240 hours (6,754 annually)

13. Estimate of the total annual costs burden.

The aggregated associated salary cost to all respondents (460) during a survey year is estimated to be $486,993 based on an average salary of $38 per hour (approximately $79,000 per year) for professional staff and $18 per hour (approximately $37,000 per year) for clerical staff. Disaggregated, the total average annual cost per respondent during a survey year is estimated to be $1,058.68.

The 2015 mean hourly rate for transportation professionals is the average of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' median hourly rates for Urban and Regional Planners ($32.80), Civil Engineers ($39.53), and Management Analysts ($39.10), rounded up to the nearest whole dollar. The 2015 mean hourly rate for clerical staff is the Bureau of Labor Statistics' median hourly rate for Secretaries and Administrative Assistants ($17.55) rounded up to the nearest whole dollar.

The burden hours and costs are illustrated below.

Professional Staff Cost during a Survey Year:

- All respondents: 9,200 hours × $38 per hour = $349,600
  - Per respondent: (20 x $38= $760)

Clerical Staff Cost during a Survey Year:

- All respondents: 920 hours × $18 per hour = $16,560
  - Per respondent (2 hours × $18 per hour = $36)

Total Annual Cost during a Survey Year:

- Subtotal Direct Salaries (Professional + Clerical) $366,160
- Overhead/fringe benefits at 33%: $120,833
- Total annual respondents cost during survey year: $486,993

- Total average annual cost per respondent during survey year: $1,058.68, multiplied by 2 survey years = 2,117.36

14. <u>Estimates of costs to the Federal Government</u>.

The cost to the Federal Government consists of the staff time and related expenses to review survey responses and provide general oversight. The Government will incur an annual estimated cost per survey of approximately $102,805, as follows:

Federal Professional staff time:

1/12 FTE per year (173.33 hours) at an average salary of $115,544 ($55.55 per hour) for a GS-14.

Federal direct salary cost per year:	$ 9,628.48 (173.33 hours x $55.55)
Overhead/fringe benefits at 33%:	3,177.40
Total annual professional staff cost:	$ 12,805 multiplied by 2 survey years = 25,610

Firm-fixed price contract cost for related task cost: $90, 000

Total cost estimated to federal government: $115,610 (divided by 3 = 38,537)

15. <u>Explanation of the program change or adjustments</u>.
There are no program changes or adjustments.

16. <u>Publication of results of data collection</u>.

The aggregated results of the survey will be published and publicized on the FHWA website, and to the extent practicable, incorporated within FHWA's TPM Toolbox website (underdevelopment at www.tpmtools.org). An analysis report will summarize the results of the assessment including key findings that can be used to inform the TPM Implementation effort. Given that the report audience is internal and external stakeholders, only aggregated information will be included in the assessment report. Reports for individual respondents will be developed as needed and shared upon request to those outside of USDOT upon receiving permission from the respondents.

17. <u>Approval for not displaying the expiration date of OMB approval</u>.

Approval for not displaying the expiration date is not being requested.

18. <u>Exceptions to the certification statement</u>.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement for this information collection.