



Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

JIM BOXOLD
SECRETARY

LONG RANGE PROGRAM PLAN

Florida Department of Transportation

Tallahassee

September 22, 2015

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Office of Policy and Budget
Executive Office of the Governor
1701 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001

JoAnne Leznoff, Staff Director
House Appropriations Committee
221 Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

Cindy Kynoch, Staff Director
Senate Committee on Appropriations
201 Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Dear Directors:

Pursuant to Chapter 216, Florida Statutes, our Long Range Program Plan (LRPP) for the Florida Department of Transportation is submitted in the format prescribed in the budget instructions. The information provided electronically and contained herein is a true and accurate presentation of our mission, goals, objectives and measures for the Fiscal Year 2016-17 through Fiscal Year 2020-21. The internet website address that provides the link to the LRPP located on the Florida Fiscal Portal is <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/lrpp>. This submission has been approved by Jim Boxold, Secretary of Florida Department of Transportation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Boxold".

Jim Boxold
Secretary

Florida Department of Transportation

Long Range Program Plan for Fiscal Years 2016-2017 Through 2020-2021

September 30, 2015

Department of Transportation
Mission

Mobility, Economic Prosperity, Preservation

The department will provide a safe transportation system that ensures the *MOBILITY* of people and goods, enhances *ECONOMIC PROSPERITY*, and *PRESERVES* the quality of our environment and communities.

Florida Department of Transportation Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Projection Tables

GOAL #1 Preserve and manage a safe, efficient transportation system.

OBJECTIVE 1A: Ensure that 80 percent of pavement on the State Highway System meets department standards.

OUTCOME: Percentage of State Highway System pavement meeting department standards.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
80.1%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%

Projected targets are set in s. 334.046(4), F.S.

OBJECTIVE 1B: Ensure that 90 percent of FDOT-maintained bridges meet department standards while keeping all FDOT-maintained bridges open to the public safe.

OUTCOME: Percentage of FDOT-maintained bridges which meet department standards.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
93.8%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

Projected targets are set in s. 334.046(4), F.S.

OBJECTIVE 1C: Ensure the State Highway System is maintained in acceptable physical condition (maintenance rating of 80).

OUTCOME: Maintain condition rating of the State Highway System as measured against the department's maintenance standards.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
84	80	80	80	80	80

Projected targets are set in s. 334.046(4), F.S.

GOAL #2 Enhance Florida's economic competitiveness, quality of life and transportation safety.

OBJECTIVE 2A: Provide a state highway system as part of a transportation infrastructure for the movement of people and goods.

OUTCOME: Total budget for intrastate highway construction and arterial highway construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract.

Baseline FY 2004-05	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
\$8,710,069	\$15,194,101	\$12,420,996	\$14,195,011	\$42,141,211	Not Available

Florida Department of Transportation Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Projection Tables

OBJECTIVE 2B: Increase the availability of public transportation.

OUTCOME: Transit ridership growth twice the average rate of population growth.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
1.22	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95

GOAL #3 Organizational excellence by promoting and encouraging continuous improvement.

OBJECTIVE 3A: Deliver the work program.

OUTCOME: Percentage of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
99.3%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

This outcome is also monitored by the Florida Transportation Commission.

OBJECTIVE 3B: Provide executive leadership and administrative support for department programs.

OUTCOME: Administrative costs as a percent of the department's total budget.

Baseline FY 2004-05	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
0.86%	<2.0%	<2.0%	<2.0%	<2.0%	<2.0%

OBJECTIVE 3C: Efficiently collect tolls.

OUTCOME: Operational cost per toll transaction.

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
\$0.16	<\$0.16	<\$0.16	<\$0.16	<\$0.16	<\$0.16

Linkage To Governor's Priorities

The Florida Department of Transportation recognizes and supports the Governor's three priorities for building a better Florida: Improving Education, Economic Development and Job Creation, and Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida.

Consistent with the goals of the Florida Transportation Plan and the Governor's priorities to grow the economy and create jobs, the department maintains three goal areas:

- Preserve and manage a safe, efficient transportation system;
- Enhance Florida's economic competitiveness, quality of life and transportation safety; and
- Organizational excellence by promoting and encouraging continuous improvement.

Viable, multimodal transportation systems are crucial for continued diversification of Florida's economy. The design and implementation of transportation systems are likewise crucial for community development and family living. The mission of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) supports the Governor's three priorities, which states: *"The department will provide a safe transportation system that ensures the mobility of people and goods, enhances economic prosperity and preserves the quality of our environment and communities."*

The efficient mobility of people and goods throughout Florida is paramount to the mission of the department and squarely at the center of the department's work program. Florida has invested billions of dollars in roads, airports, transit facilities and services, seaports and other elements of the transportation system. Through accountability budgeting and innovative financing tools, FDOT can provide a greater return on investment and create conditions for the private sector to invest and advance construction projects. Florida's multimodal transportation system must provide state-of-the-art infrastructure that is interconnected and efficient.

The table below relates the Governor’s priority focus areas to the department’s mission statement and identifies the department’s goals and programs which are linked to these priorities. The Department has no goals or programs that link to “Reduce Taxes” or “Phase out Florida’s Corporate Income Tax.”

Governor’s Priority 1 – Improving Education		
Priority Focus	Goals & Objectives	Programs & Initiatives
World Class Education	Enhance Florida’s economic competitiveness, quality of life and transportation safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support transportation systems in urbanized and rural areas • Sponsor University Research • Safe Paths/Routes to School

Governor’s Priority 2 – Promoting Economic Development and Job Creation		
Priority Focus	Goals & Objectives	Programs & Initiatives
Focus on Job Growth and Retention	<p>Preserve and manage a safe, efficient transportation system</p> <p>Enhance Florida’s economic competitiveness, quality of life and transportation safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short and long term impacts of the Work Program • Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Multimodal Passenger & Freight Mobility ○ Seamless and Secure Transportation Systems • Financing alternatives such as public/private partnerships • Enhance regional planning • Freight Mobility and Trade Plan implementation • Develop a Freight Network
Regulatory Reform	Preserve and manage a safe, efficient transportation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor Carrier Size and Weight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overweight/oversize permitting process

Governor’s Priority 3 – Maintaining Affordable Cost of Living in Florida		
Priority Focus	Goals & Objectives	Programs & Initiatives
Accountability Budgeting	<p>Organizational excellence by promoting and encouraging continuous improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver the Work Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiently collect tolls • Leveraging funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Financing alternatives such as public/private partnerships • Production Management
Reduce Government Spending	<p>Organizational excellence by promoting and encouraging continuous improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiently collect tolls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing alternatives such as public/private partnerships • Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

Trends and Conditions

Pursuant to s. 339.155, F.S., the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is responsible for developing the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and updating it every five years. This long-term plan enables all transportation partners to work toward a future transportation vision addressing both today's challenges and tomorrow's opportunities. The FTP, developed based on public and partner outreach, defines transportation goals, objectives, and strategies. The FTP focuses on how transportation investments and decisions should support Florida's future economic prosperity, quality of life, and quality places, and on the performance of the transportation system, including safety and security, maintenance and operation, and mobility and connectivity.

Pursuant to s. 334.046(2), F.S., the FDOT has established the following mission statement:

"The department will provide a safe transportation system that ensures the mobility of people and goods, enhances economic prosperity and preserves the quality of our environment and communities."

The mission statement and FTP goals set a high standard for the FDOT. The goals and objectives in the FTP form a policy framework to guide crucial planning and investment in Florida's transportation system, which must respond to growth in a manner that strengthens the economy, provides mobility choices for all and supports our environment and communities.

Currently, the department is in the process of updating the FTP. This process is guided by a 35-member FTP/SIS Steering Committee. Members of the steering committee represent transportation agencies and providers, regional and local governments, business and economic development interests, and community and environmental interests. This plan is expected to have three elements:

- The Vision Element, released in August 2015, provides a longer-term view of major trends, uncertainties, opportunities, and desired outcomes shaping the future of Florida's transportation system during the next 50 years.
- The Policy Element, to be completed in December 2015, will define goals, objectives, and strategies for Florida's transportation future over the next 25 years. The Policy Element is the core of the FTP and provides guidance to state, regional, and local transportation partners in making transportation decisions.
- The Implementation Element, which will be completed in 2016, will define the roles of state, regional, and local transportation partners in implementing the FTP, including specific short- and medium-term actions and performance measures.

The Vision Element identifies seven goal areas that will be the focus of the Policy Element:

- Safety and security for residents, visitors, and businesses.
- Agile, resilient, and quality transportation infrastructure.
- Efficient and reliable mobility for people and freight.
- More transportation choices for people and freight.
- Transportation solutions that support Florida's global economic competitiveness.
- Transportation solutions that support quality places to live, learn, work, and play.
- Transportation solutions that enhance Florida's environment and conserve energy.

During the update process, similar themes were identified as are identified and carried forward from the 2060 FTP – safety, maintenance of existing infrastructure, mobility, and economic competitiveness. This is in line with the mission statement for the department and shows consistency among the key goal areas which reflect the values for the state. These goal areas also help track implementation. Other existing topics such as aligning community development and environmental stewardship, providing more modal choices, and understanding transportation's relationship with public health and energy use received more attention than in previous plans. In addition, several new ideas have emerged and are also reflected in the goal areas shown above. These include focus on talent and workforce needs within the transportation industry, improving customer service, more efficiency in regulatory processes, and ability to quickly respond to changes in innovation and technology.

Invest in Florida's transportation system to compete in the global economy


The relationship between transportation and the economy is interdependent. A robust transportation network can drive economic vitality, while a strong economy creates demand for travel and transport and can be leveraged to generate revenue for maintenance and expansion of the system. Florida's economic competitiveness depends heavily on the ability of the state's communities and environment to attract and retain businesses and skilled workers and to attract visitors. A healthy economy, in turn, provides job opportunities, boosts incomes, and provides public and private resources to invest in transportation as well as environmental and community resources. The levels of accessibility, mobility and interconnectivity that transportation networks provide can help or hinder Florida's status as a competitive economic force in both domestic and global markets.

The state's transportation system plays an important role in maintaining its economic health. As a key component of our state's productivity, it impacts the economy in many ways. Some of the major factors influencing the role of transportation in Florida's economy are:

- our position as a peninsula in the far corner of the continental United States,
- serving as a global tourist destination,
- the importance of global trade,
- the state's emphasis on technology and innovation industries, and
- having active agricultural, military and mining sectors


As the 22nd largest state geographically, with the third highest population, Florida faces an ever increasing demand to effectively move people and goods, within Florida, nationally, and globally. Efficient and reliable connectivity to global markets, between Florida's diverse regions and within regions is essential in promoting the state's economic competitiveness. Home to the nation's 2nd largest foreign trade zone network, Florida would have the 21st largest economy in the world if it were a separate nation. Labor, business, and consumer markets in the state are increasingly organized at a regional level, as a result of connections between clusters of inter-related industries and other economic assets such as universities, research labs and military bases. Florida's investments in transportation services and infrastructure contribute directly to the economic health of the state. The pervasiveness of transportation in the economy results in spending on transportation being a significant contributor to jobs and economic activity in the state, both directly and indirectly.

The Role of Transportation in Florida's Economy



The department's study, *Macroeconomic Analysis of Florida's Transportation Investments* (posted in January 2015) estimates that every dollar invested in transportation in Florida results in a return of \$4.40 in long term benefits to residents and businesses.

Employment in Florida by Region, 2013



Source: Enterprise Florida

The number of jobs within the state has surpassed the prior peak of 2007. Many factors influence the length and strength of an economic recovery. However, new Managed Lane facilities, improvements to several Seaports and other transportation improvements put Florida in a favorable position for continued growth.

Florida's large population demands increasing volumes of consumer goods. Today's multi-modal freight system moves a remarkable diversity of goods, ranging from heavy commodities such as phosphate, coal and cement to high value items such as flowers, jewelry and cell phones. Airfreight is critical for high-value commodities while heavy commodities are moved through other modes – highway, seaport and rail systems.

The state's transportation system also plays an important role in domestic and international trade. The overwhelming share of Florida's trade moves to and from Latin America and the Caribbean, through the state's seaports and airports. Trade values are worth over \$150 billion every year. Total trade value was \$153.2 billion in 2014, with \$58.6 billion in Florida-originated exports.

As one of the main drivers of the Florida economy, tourism is another sector that benefits directly from a well-connected transportation system. Almost 100 million visitors come to Florida each year, with approximately half arriving by air. Those arriving by air, water, or rail must use a car or transit to reach most destinations during their stay in

Florida. Over the last decade, Florida tourists have spent an annual average of \$65 billion in taxable services in tourism/recreation. In 2014, the spending reached over \$82 billion.

Not only does transportation enable the economy to operate, but investment in transportation infrastructure and services directly affects the quality of life for present and future Floridians. Investments in Florida's transportation system are vital to businesses, residents, tourists and trading partners. Making the right transportation investments now can improve our position in the global economy and make Florida less vulnerable to future recessions. To compete successfully for dynamic businesses, productive people and other resources, Florida must have a well-planned and adequately funded transportation system addressing accessibility and mobility needs. Florida's transportation system must be able to successfully move increasing numbers of residents and tourists, as well as transport goods, within Florida and to and from the United States and international markets.

Enhancing quality of life and promoting responsible environmental stewardship

Responding to the challenges of population growth and a growing economy creates pressures on energy supplies, air quality, water supply and quality, wetlands, and wildlife habitats. The challenge is to provide transportation infrastructure and services in a manner that minimizes environmental consequences. Accomplishing this involves a host of actions ranging from optimizing the productivity of travel through transportation network and land use design to following responsible practices in the construction and operation of transportation.

Quality of life in Florida, which can be positively or adversely affected based on how the transportation system is developed within the human and natural environment, can significantly impact the state's economic viability. While Florida's desirability as a place to locate new business development is linked to its connectivity and accessibility, it is also linked to how the transportation system fits into the communities it serves. Additionally, transportation's environmental impacts on water and air quality must be balanced with meeting mobility needs.

Effective transportation planning and investment can support many of the qualities desired in a community. Transportation decisions must reflect community characteristics and values with a strong emphasis on engaging citizens in shaping future choices. Transportation system design must take into account the many factors affecting Florida's quality of life. Transportation planning and decision-making, including project selection, should also be integrated and coordinated with land use, water and natural resource planning and management.

A key consideration in the decision making process should be the evaluation of the benefits of a proposed transportation action and potential impacts to communities. To the maximum extent feasible, transportation projects should be designed and built to be compatible and consistent with community visions. The identification and resolution of a

full range of environmental concerns should occur early in the transportation planning and project development process.

All public and private entities who plan, develop, or operate transportation facilities share responsibility for ensuring that transportation decisions promote responsible environmental stewardship. Coordination of transportation and resource planning and management is the responsibility of federal, state, regional, and local transportation and environmental resource agencies, working through well-established partnerships. Addressing energy, air and water quality goals involves additional partners at the federal, state, regional, and local levels, as well as the private sector.

The Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process has been developed to assist in identifying all of these resources. ETDM allows more involvement earlier in the planning process through community outreach and consultation with resource agencies. The Master Plans and Action Plans for upgrades to existing Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Multimodal Corridors will be keyed to the ETDM screening process ensuring all pertinent issues in the transportation corridor are addressed.

Transportation has direct impacts on both the human and the natural environment resulting from vehicles and their byproducts, and from transportation infrastructure such as roads and parking. Transportation investments can have indirect impacts by affecting development patterns, which can subsequently affect the environment. A sustainable transportation system supports and encourages healthy ecosystems; connectivity to communities; a sound economy; mobility options; the efficient movement of people, goods and services; and minimized consumption of non-renewable resources.


A safe and secure transportation system

Transportation safety, security, and emergency management require collaboration among multiple entities at the federal, state, regional and local levels, including some agencies whose primary focus is not transportation.

Transportation system safety lead roles fall upon FDOT and the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles at the state level, and metropolitan planning organizations and local governments at the regional/local level. Security lead roles include the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration, other designated federal agencies and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, with FDOT and other transportation partners in a shared role focused on improving security of the transportation system.

Transportation safety has been regarded as one of the highest goals for transportation policy. Every year tens of thousands of fatalities occur on the nation's highway systems. In 2014, 2,494 people died on Florida's highways, an increase of .03% from 2012. This makes Florida's 2013 fatality rate (per 100 million vehicles miles of travel) 1.25


compared to a national rate of 1.10. Pedestrian, bicyclist, and motorcyclist fatalities each increased in 2013, by 5.29%, 16.38%, and 4.47% respectively.



The department recognizes that to carry its mission in the 21st Century, the department's standards and approaches for planning, designing, constructing, reconstructing, and operating transportation facilities must address the needs and interactions of all users of the transportation network across many contexts. The department launched a pedestrian safety campaign called "Alert Today, Alive Tomorrow ... Safety Doesn't Happen by Accident!" The campaign intends to increase public awareness regarding pedestrian safety through television public service announcements, social media channels, transit advertising, and local education and enforcement activities. In September 2014, the department adopted a complete streets policy and is developing a framework to implement policies and professional practices to ensure streets are safe for people of all ages and abilities, balance the needs of different modes of travel, and support local land uses, economies, cultures and natural environments.

In November 2012, the FDOT, in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and representatives from all segments of Florida's traffic safety community, released the 2012 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Florida's SHSP is a statewide, data-driven plan addressing the "4 E's" of safety – engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response. The plan's goal is to achieve a five percent annual reduction in the actual number of fatalities and serious injuries rather than a reduction in the rate. Using the five-year averages from 2006 to 2010 as a baseline, the 2012 SHSP goal is to reduce fatalities from 2,904 to 2,028 for 2013 to 2017, and reduce serious injuries from 24,338 (2006 to 2010) to 16,996 for 2013 to 2017.


Florida has one of the largest transportation systems in the U.S. with over 121,000 miles of roadway used by almost 16 million licensed drivers. Ensuring the safety of this system for all roadway users is a top priority for the Florida DOT and its many safety partners. The 2012 SHSP is the catalyst Florida’s safety stakeholders will use to drive our fatalities down through a multidisciplinary, comprehensive, data-driven approach. All of Florida’s agencies and safety partners participating in implementation of the 2012 SHSP are committed to succeed in reducing fatalities and serious injuries on our roadways.



Source: Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

Adequate and cost-effective maintenance and preservation of transportation assets

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), “A Pavement Preservation program consists primarily of three components: preventive maintenance, minor rehabilitation (non-structural), and some routine maintenance activities. An effective pavement preservation program can benefit state transportation agencies by preserving investment on the National Highway System and other Federal-aid roadways, enhancing pavement performance, ensuring cost-effectiveness, extending pavement life, reducing user delays, and providing improved safety and mobility.” By its standard, “the distinctive characteristics of pavement preservation activities are that they restore the function of the existing system and extend its service life, not increase its capacity or strength.”



The taxpayers of Florida have made a huge investment in transportation infrastructure. The department has primary jurisdiction over the State Highway System. Although this system consists of 12,116 (10 percent) of the 122,392 public road centerline miles in the state, it carries 54% of the traffic. One of the department's main responsibilities is keeping the State Highway System in acceptable physical condition. To achieve this, the department resurfaces roads, repairs or replaces bridges, and conducts routine maintenance activities such as mowing, litter removal, maintenance of pavement markers and sign replacement. Regular maintenance and preservation of the transportation system keep it operating efficiently, extends its useful life, and delays the need for costly reconstruction or replacement.


By any estimate, it would cost billions of dollars to replace these transportation facilities, even without buying the right-of-way. Just like the family car, the transportation system requires significant continued investment to keep the *existing* facilities in good operating condition. This makes good economic sense, as well. Proactive maintenance helps transportation facilities operate efficiently, helps ensure people and freight can travel safely and reliably, and delays the need for costly reconstruction or replacement by keeping transportation assets in a state of good repair.

The 2000 Legislature recognized the importance of being fiscally responsible in taking care of transportation facilities by amending section 334.046(4)(a), F.S., to read:

Preservation – Protecting the state's transportation infrastructure investment.

Preservation includes:

1. *Ensuring that 80 percent of the pavement on the State Highway System meets department standards;*
2. *Ensuring that 90 percent of department maintained bridges meet department standards; and*
3. *Ensuring that the department achieves 100 percent of the acceptable maintenance standard on the state highway system.*



The department currently allocates resources to first meet these requirements. The graph above shows recent performance in each of these areas. Each area continues to exceed the standards set by the Legislature. The Road Information Program (TRIP) research group in its July 2015 report, “Bumpy Roads Ahead: America’s Roughest Rides and Strategies to Make our Roads Smoother,” rated the pavement condition of 138 urban areas with a population of 250,000 and above. Of the 75 urban areas with a population of 500,000 and more, three Florida urban areas were among the ten areas with the best pavement conditions: Jacksonville (1st – 6%), Orlando (6th – 8%) and Tampa-St. Petersburg (10th – 10%). In its May 2015 report, “Rural Connections: Challenges and Opportunities in America’s Heartland,” TRIP graded Florida’s rural roads the 2nd best maintained among the states with 71% in good condition and only 3% of its rural bridges were structurally deficient.

The need to improve mobility and connectivity for people and freight

Florida provides an abundance of opportunities to its residents, visitors, and businesses, including a desirable climate, moderate cost of living, and extensive resources that foster a century-long trend of migration to the Sunshine State. The levels of accessibility, mobility, and inter-connectivity that transportation networks provide can help or hinder Florida’s status as a competitive economic force in both domestic and global markets.

Florida's economic competitiveness depends on efficient, affordable, and reliable movement of people and goods. The best solution must be identified for moving people or freight between major trip origins and destinations, often involving multiple facilities, modes, or jurisdictions. A principal objective of the state transportation system is to

connect centers of population and employment in a way that enables economic health and supports the public welfare by meeting the needs for emergency evacuation, military transportation, international commerce, and related public purposes. Transportation decisions must increase transportation choices and modal options that provide accessibility to and connectivity among Florida's economic, community and recreational assets.

Numerous agencies at the federal, state, regional and local levels are responsible for meeting mobility needs for both people and freight. Transportation planning and investment responsibilities are shifting over time from the agencies that own or operate individual facilities to partnerships that work together to plan and implement at the statewide, regional or local levels. FDOT is the lead agency responsible for interregional, interstate and international mobility but must work closely through shared decision making with modal partners, other state agencies, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and local governments to meet these needs. Regional entities - ranging from regional transportation authorities to MPO alliances to regional visioning alliances - play the lead role in identifying and addressing regional mobility needs, in partnership with FDOT and local governments. While there is a great need for local input, our economy and business investments are made regionally. FDOT is seeking to transition Florida's planning process to focus on regional and metropolitan transportation issues.

Strategic Intermodal System

In 2003, the Florida Legislature established the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) to enhance Florida's transportation mobility and economic competitiveness. The SIS is a statewide network of high-priority transportation facilities, including the State's largest and most significant airports, spaceport, public seaports, freight rail terminals, passenger rail and intercity bus terminals, rail corridors, waterways and highways. These facilities represent the state's primary means for moving people and freight between Florida's diverse regions, as well as between Florida and other states and nations. The SIS is Florida's highest statewide priority for transportation capacity improvements.

SIS facilities are designated through the use of objective criteria and thresholds based on quantitative measures of transportation and economic activity. These facilities meet high levels of people and goods movement and generally support major flows of interregional, interstate, and international travel and commerce. Facilities that do not meet the established criteria and thresholds for SIS designation, but may in the future are referred to as Emerging SIS. These facilities experience lower levels of people and goods movement but demonstrate strong potential for future growth and development.

The SIS focuses on complete end-to-end trips, rather than individual modes or facilities. The SIS plays a key role in defining roles and responsibilities in the planning and managing of Florida's transportation system – where the state is focused on international, interstate, statewide and interregional transportation service and

strengthened regional partnerships provide a structure for identifying and implementing regional priorities.

Florida's SIS was established to enhance economic competitiveness and mobility by focusing limited state resources on those transportation facilities that are critical to Florida's economy and quality of life. Specifically, the SIS supports Florida's economic growth and competitiveness by reducing business costs for transportation and logistics; enhancing access to domestic and global markets; emphasizing the types of transportation services required by trade, technology and other targeted industries; and improving accessibility to all of Florida's regions, including both urban and rural areas.

Improvements to the SIS enable greater access and connectivity from the highway and rail systems to the state's most critical seaports, airports, and other terminals. The SIS also supports intermodal solutions along key trade and economic corridors. Finally, the SIS addresses the needs of Florida's businesses, residents and visitors by providing a more efficient transportation system that includes more choices and greater flexibility.

In 2009, FDOT updated the SIS Strategic Plan in cooperation with a wide range of statewide, regional, and local partners, extending a broad circle of consensus. Currently, FDOT is updating the SIS Policy Plan in conjunction with the update of the Florida Transportation Plan and in cooperation with a wide range of statewide, regional, and local partners. A 22 member Advisory Group is providing guidance to the FTP/SIS Steering Committee. Members of the advisory group and the steering committee represent transportation agencies and providers, regional and local governments, business and economic development interests, and community and environmental interests.

FDOT is conducting extensive partner and public involvement in support of the plan update. The SIS Policy Plan will focus on the three objectives that align with the statutory intent of the SIS including:

- Interregional connectivity: Increase the efficiency and reliability of connectivity between Florida's economic regions and between Florida and other states and nations
- Intermodal connectivity: Expand, integrate, and connect transportation choices for interregional trips
- Economic development: Provide transportation systems to support Florida as a global hub for trade, tourism, talent, innovation, and investment

As of July 2015, the following is the current system summary:

Designated SIS and Emerging SIS Facilities		
Facility Type	SIS	Emerging SIS
Commercial airports/General aviation relievers	7	10
General aviation relievers	2	-
Spaceports	2	-
Deepwater seaports	7	5
Passenger terminals	26	9
Rail freight terminals	5	2
Rail corridors (miles)	1,700	420
Waterways (miles)	1,950	312
Highways (miles)	3,603	762
All Connectors (miles)	542	-
Urban Fixed Guideway Corridors (miles/stations)	61	-
Military Access Facilities (connectors)	6	-


Totals include Planned facilities. TBD = to be determined.

Future Corridors

Today's transportation system serves over 19 million residents, 98 million visitors, and vast movements of freight within and across the state's border. By 2040, Florida's transportation system will need to serve a projected population of 26 million residents, over 150 million visitors annually, and a monumental increase in freight movement. Vehicle miles of travel are expected to increase slightly, transit trips by 40 percent, air travel will more than double and freight tonnage will increase by 69 percent.

To respond to future growth in demand, the department has undertaken efforts in advancing the state's future corridors. A major initiative of the department is the cooperative effort between FDOT and its partners to plan for major statewide transportation corridors that are needed over the next 50 years to maintain Florida's economic competitiveness and improve connectivity between Florida and other states and nations and among Florida's regions. A statewide transportation corridor is one that connects Florida to other states or connects broad regions within Florida, generally by high-speed, high-capacity transportation facilities such as interstate highways or other limited-access roadways, major rail lines, and major water-ways. These corridors may also involve multiple modes of transportation as well as other linear infrastructure such as pipelines and telecommunications or utility transmission lines. FDOT has developed a three stage process for planning future statewide corridors.

Future Corridors Planning Process



The benefits of early planning for future corridors includes better coordination of long-range transportation and development plans and visions to identify and meet a growing demand for moving people and freight. Building upon the Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) review process, concept studies in priority study areas are developed to provide a long range framework to guide future investment decisions in the study area over the next 50 years, and after completion of the concept report specific segments are evaluated for feasibility prior to moving specific projects forward to environmental screening and project development.

MAP-21

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) was enacted on July 6, 2012 as Public Law 112-141. The Act extended federal highway and transit programs through federal fiscal year 2014. The Act has been extended three times. Federal transportation revenue currently provides about one-quarter of the statewide funding for the Department's 5-year Work Program. The law:

1. Authorizes an estimated \$1.835 billion in formula highway funding to Florida in federal fiscal year 2013, \$1.851 billion in 2014, and \$1.828 billion in 2015. The MAP-21 programs are likely to be extended into 2016 at current funding levels but long-term stable funding has not been identified.
2. Provides opportunities for more efficient and effective ways to finance needed projects by consolidating many previous federal programs and avoiding Congressional project earmarks.
3. Recognizes the need to consider tolling as a viable funding option for adding capacity to existing infrastructure.
4. Contains several features to speed up the delivery of transportation projects.
5. Calls for the establishment of a National Freight Network and National Freight Strategic Plan.

For more information please visit the FDOT web site at:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/map21>.

Threat Analysis

Providing mobility – meeting Floridians’ need to move people and freight – is transportation’s most essential function. In order to achieve this goal, a few factors affecting mobility need to be considered:

- Florida’s forecasted growing population and visitors will generate additional demand for travel via all modes of passenger and freight transportation.
- There is also an increasing demand for costly specialized transportation services, such as those serving transportation disadvantaged residents and seniors.
- Recent trends show economic activity and the demand for transportation will grow even faster than Florida’s population over the next 20 years. By 2040, the transportation system will need to serve over 26 million residents, and a substantial increase in freight movement and tourism.
- Changing technology will have a profound impact in moving people and freight.
- Over half of urban freeway miles are moderately or severely congested during peak traffic periods.

The department realizes additional roadways, by themselves, will not solve our congestion problems. The solution to the congestion problem is a diverse set of options requiring funding commitments, as well as a variety of changes in the ways transportation systems are used. Travel choices, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and land use must be considered.

Many of Florida’s economic forecasts, especially for tourism and imports/exports, are tied directly to the provision of an adequate infrastructure. In order for Florida to remain competitive and continue to be a desirable place to live, visit and do business with; it is important that investment continues to be made in transportation infrastructure.

Another area of concern is Florida’s aging population, which is unique among the states. We have, and will continue to have, a significantly higher proportion of senior population than other states. This presents special challenges for transportation system safety and the provision of mobility services to those who may not be able to maintain independent movement. At the same time, changing travel behaviors of the Millennials and evolving new technologies also present new challenges and opportunities to transportation planning.

Safety remains a concern. Florida’s fatality rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled) has improved but is still higher than the national average. Florida also has high fatality rates for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorcyclists.

Attention to improving the security of transportation facilities has increased since September 11, 2001. Federal and state legislation imposing significant security measures at airports, seaports and other passenger and freight facilities nationwide has impacted the efficient movement of passengers and freight throughout the state and created additional financial pressures for transportation agencies. Hurricanes and other

national disasters have also highlighted the importance of effective emergency response and the vulnerability of the transportation system to major disruptions.

These trends and conditions will need to be addressed if Florida is to “*provide a safe transportation system that ensures the mobility of people and goods, enhances economic prosperity, and preserves the quality of our environment and communities.*”

Performance Measures and Standards - LRPP Exhibit II

Performance Measures and Standards LRPP Exhibit II

Department: Transportation Department No.: 55				
Transportation Systems Development		Code: 55100100		
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers)
Transit ridership growth twice the average rate of population growth	1.78%	-.28%	1.95%	2.56%
Number of annual passenger trips for transit	279,714,215	277,450,034	283,668,418	284,552,755
Number of right-of-way parcels acquired (Turnpike not included)	1,466	1,318	1,466	1,845
Number of right-of-way projects certified ready for construction (Turnpike not included)	69	75	75	69
Average cost per one-way trip provided for transportation disadvantaged*	\$25.00	\$24.00	\$25.00	\$28.00
Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)*	8,500,000	8,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Number of passenger enplanements	71,000,000	72,000,000	73,000,000	74,000,000
Number of cruise passenger embarkments and disembarkments at Florida ports	16,100,000	Est. 16,100,000	16,000,000	16,125,000

Notes:

*Number of one-way trips provided (Transportation Disadvantaged) only include CTD trips, not Medicaid trips. These Transportation Disadvantaged performance measures data are based on FDOT funded trips, excluding AHCA funds.

Performance Measures and Standards

LRPP Exhibit II

Highway Operations	Code: 55150200			
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of state highway system pavement meeting department standards	80%	92%	80%	80%
Percentage of FDOT-maintained bridges which meet department standards	90%	95%	90%	90%
Maintenance condition rating of state highway system as measured against the department's maintenance standards	80%	86%	80%	80%
Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings	less than 1%	less than 1%	less than 1%	less than 1%
Number of commercial vehicle weighings	20,000,000	23,030,259	20,000,000	20,000,000
Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike not included)	41,340	41,452	41,550	41,700
Total budget for intrastate highway construction and arterial highway construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract	\$8,841,800	\$10,096,354	\$13,682,017	\$15,194,101
Percentage increase in number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days, holidays and special events)	less than 20%	7.1%	less than 20%	Less than 20%
Number of motor vehicle fatalities per 100 million miles traveled	<1.5	1.25	<1.5	<1.5

Note: Based on a 2006 Office of Inspector General performance measures audit, it was determined that the terms “projects”, “contracts” and “lettings” are used interchangeably in FDOT performance reporting. Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing and highway capacity improvements only include actual projects.

Performance Measures and Standards LRPP Exhibit II

Department: Transportation Department No.: 55				
Highway Operations	Code: 55150200			
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers)
Percentage of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let	95%	97%	95%	95%
Percentage increase in final amount paid for completed construction contracts over original contract amount	less than 10%	2.5%	less than 10%	less than 10%
Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike not included)	2,576	2,981	2,200	1,740
Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike not included)	199	285	157	147
Number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike not included)	45	70	78	43
Number of bridges let to contract for replacement (Turnpike not included)	17	14	13	21

Executive/Support Services	Code: 55150500/55180100			
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers)
Percent of agency administrative and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	<2% / <12%	1.07% / <12.08%	<2% / <12%	<2% / <12%

Note: Based on a 2006 Office of Inspector General performance measures audit, it was determined that the terms “projects”, “contracts” and “lettings” are used interchangeably in FDOT performance reporting. Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing and highway capacity improvements only include actual projects.

Performance Measures and Standards LRPP Exhibit II

Florida's Turnpike Enterprise	Code: 55180100			
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2015-16 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2014-15 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2015-16 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2016-17 Standard (Numbers)
Operational cost per toll transaction*	less than \$0.16	\$0.12	less than \$0.16	less than \$0.16
Operational cost per dollar collected	less than \$0.19	\$0.11	less than \$0.19	less than \$0.19
Number of toll transactions	792,000,000	893,280,513	830,000,000	921,000,000
Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike only)	98	79	81	144
Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike only)	38	55	0	0
Number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike only)	3	1	0	2
Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike only)	2,138	2,213	2,210	2,270

***Note:** The Department's Cost Per Transaction (CPT) measure reflects shared operating costs associated with the Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) SunPass prepaid toll program. There are certain toll transactions processed by FTE on behalf of the Central Florida Expressway (CFX). Such transactions occur when SunPass accountholders drive on CFX toll roads. While the results of the CPT measure, as reported herein, include the associated costs of processing CFX toll transactions, the Department includes only FTE transactions when performing the calculation of its CPT. The Department is actively working on replacing the existing SunPass back-office system with a Centralized Customer Service System (CCSS) and executing a joint agreement with three other Florida toll authorities, including CFX. Upon implementation of the new CCSS, it is anticipated that all SunPass customer transaction costs will be shared amongst the four agencies. Additionally, the Department is in discussions with CFX regarding an interim arrangement for the Authority to reimburse the Department for its share of current SunPass transaction processing costs. Upon implementation, the costs reported by the Department for the CPT measure will appropriately reflect FTE-related transaction costs only, as the costs for processing SunPass transactions for CFX will have been reimbursed to the Department.

Note: Based on a 2006 Office of Inspector General performance measures audit, it was determined that the terms "projects", "contracts" and "lettings" are used interchangeably in FDOT performance reporting. Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing or highway capacity improvements only include actual projects.

**Assessment of Performance for
Approved Performance
Measures - LRPP Exhibit III**

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation
Program: Transportation Systems Development
Service/Budget Entity: Transportation System Development
Measure: Number of right-of-way parcels acquired (Turnpike not included)

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,466	1,318	-148	10%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The reason for the appearance that the parcel acquisition performance measure to acquire 1,466 parcels was not met is attributable to the fact that the 1,318 parcels reported as acquired only represent those parcels that were either negotiated or condemned. When we do our internal summary of parcels acquired it consists of parcels negotiated, condemned and voided. For fiscal year 2014/2015 there were 256 parcels voided. When these 256 parcels are added to 1,318 parcels acquired via negotiations and condemnations, the total is 1,574 which puts us in the position that we exceeded the measure.

*Voided Parcel – A parcel, for any valid Departmental reason, which is no longer considered to be a necessity in support of the proposed transportation project and therefore the ownership interest, all subordinate interests, and the parcel have been voided.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

No recommendations at this time.

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT			
Department: <u>Transportation</u>			
Program: <u>Transportation Systems Development</u>			
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Transportation Systems Development</u>			
Measure: <u>Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)</u>			
Action:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards			
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
8,500,000	8,000,000	-500,000	5.9%
Factors Accounting for the Difference:			
Internal Factors (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors		<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity	
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities		<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training	
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
Explanation:			
As of 2/28/15, the Commission is no longer managing Medicaid Non-Emergency Transportation. This change reduces coordination efforts which we anticipate will increase future cost of one-way trips. The number of one-way trips provided (Transportation Disadvantaged) only include CTD trips, not Medicaid trips. These Transportation Disadvantaged performance measures data are based on FDOT funded trips, excluding AHCA funds.			
External Factors (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable		<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems	
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change		<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster	
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem			
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission			
Explanation:			
Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):			
<input type="checkbox"/> Training		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
Recommendations:			
No recommendations at this time			

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation
Program: Transportation Systems Development
Service/Budget Entity: Transportation Systems Development
Measure: Transit ridership growth twice the average rate of population growth

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1.78	-.28	-2.06	116%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

All internal factors were met. The performance measure for 2014/15 was not met because of external factors (see below).

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Over the previous 5 years, transit ridership growth rate increased at a rate that exceeded twice the average rate of population growth. However, in 2014 transit ridership declined slightly. This is a result of a combination of several external factors that include an improving economy, cheaper fuel, an increase in population, younger people entering the workforce and traveling for work and taking on family responsibilities, an increase in vehicle miles traveled on all state roads, and a natural adjustment after years of rapid expansion in ridership. As a result, transit ridership did not grow at twice the average rate of population growth in 2014 and therefore the approved standard was not met.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Continue to provide technical assistance and funding to support transit agencies in order to meet and/or exceed the adopted performance measure in the future.

Recommendations:

No recommendations at this time

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation
Program: Transportation Systems Development
Service/Budget Entity: Transportation Systems Development
Measure: Number of annual passenger trips for transit

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
279,714,215	277,450,034	-2,264,181	1%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

All internal factors were met. The performance measure for 2014/15 was not met because of external factors (see below).

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Considering the rapid growth of the number of transit passenger trips over the previous ten years (22 percent growth), the number of annual passenger trips declined by a small amount in 2014 from the previous year. This is consistent across several Transit Agencies, including Metro Dade Transit, which declined by approximately ½ of a percent. The decline is the result of a dynamic combination of many external factors including: an improving economy, cheaper fuel, an increase in population, younger people entering the workforce and traveling for work and taking on family responsibilities, an increase in vehicle miles traveled on all state roads, and a natural adjustment after years of rapid expansion in ridership. As a result these external factors, the standard for 2014 was not met.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Continue to provide technical assistance and funding to transit agencies in order to meet and/or exceed the adopted performance measure in the future.

Recommendations:

No recommendations at this time

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation
Program: Highway Operations
Service/Budget Entity: Highway Operations
Measure: Number of bridges let to contract for replacement (Turnpike not included)

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
17	14	-3	18%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

A total of three bridges were deferred from FY2015 to FY 2016. One deferral was to allow for completion of right of way acquisition and two were deferred to avoid traffic congestion due to ongoing bridge construction in the area.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

No recommendations at this time

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service/Budget Entity: Highway Operations

Measure: Total budget for intrastate highway construction and arterial highway construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$8,841,800	\$10,096,354	\$1,254,554	N/A

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The budget for FY2015 had not been requested when the FY2015 Approved Standard was estimated back in 2013.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

No recommendations at this time

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Transportation

Program: Executive/Support Services

Service/Budget Entity: Executive/Support Services

Measure: Percent of agency administrative and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions

Action:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<2% / <12%	1.07% / <12.08%	.08	.01%

Factors Accounting for the Difference:

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Explanation:

The department increased Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) by 11 in Executive Leadership/Support Services to improve contract administration and liaison work with our local partners and legislative members.

The department also reduced Highway Operations workforce by 126 FTE, which is consistent with the department's efforts to deliver the Work Program with fewer maintenance/construction FTEs and more contract administrators handling our work through private sector opportunities.

This effectively increases the percentage of administrative costs and positions compared to total agency positions and costs.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission | |

Explanation:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

Re-evaluate the approved standard with the continued policy of privatization of the workforce.

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT																							
Department: <u>Transportation</u>																							
Program: <u>Florida Turnpike Enterprise</u>																							
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Florida Turnpike Enterprise</u>																							
Measure: <u>Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike only)</u>																							
Action:																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards																							
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference																				
98	79	-19	19%																				
<p>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</p> <p>Internal Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>FY2015 lane mile estimate was provided in August 2013. As FY2015 approached and based on more recent pavement condition data, it was determined that a need existed to resurface 79 lane miles.</p> <p>External Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Training</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Technology</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>No recommendations at this time</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster	<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem		<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission		<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						

Performance Measure Assessment

LRPP Exhibit III

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT																							
Department: <u>Transportation</u>																							
Program: <u>Florida Turnpike Enterprise</u>																							
Service/Budget Entity: <u>Florida Turnpike Enterprise</u>																							
Measure: <u>Number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike only)</u>																							
Action:																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure		<input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards																							
Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference																				
3	1	-2	67%																				
<p>Factors Accounting for the Difference:</p> <p>Internal Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Two bridges originally scheduled for repair in FY2015 were advanced to FY2014</p> <p>External Factors (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Training</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Technology</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Personnel</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>No recommendations at this time</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster	<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem		<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission		<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						
<input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)																						

Performance Measure Validity and Reliability - LRPP Exhibit IV

Performance Measure Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Right-of-way parcels acquired (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Right-of-Way Office, Florida Department of Transportation. Data is obtained from the Right-of-Way Management System (RWMS).

It is important to note that the standard used for FY 2009/10 is developed from the second year of a two-year projection developed at the beginning of FY 2008/09. Because the projection is well in advance of the time when detailed project information is available, it is subject to change. This change is noticeable in the difference between these standards and the plan published by the Transportation Commission that is completed immediately prior to publication. The projection for parcels to be acquired in the second year is based on estimates of right of way needs. Typically, at the time the department is making the projection for the second year, the associated construction projects are in the fourth or fifth year of the work program. The projects are still in the preliminary engineering phase and design work has not yet or has just recently been started. Right of way requirements have not yet been set, title work has not been completed, and right of way maps including the designation of parcels have not been prepared. As design work progresses, right of way requirements are better defined and better estimates of the number of parcels necessary for each project can be made. Additionally, since the associated construction projects are in the outer years of the work program, the schedules frequently change due to local government input or funding constraints. This impacts the schedule for the right of way segment of these projects. The department anticipates requesting an update to the standard immediately prior to the beginning of FY 2014/15 when better information is available and the standard can be made more meaningful.

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of the total number of right-of-way parcels acquired (excluding Turnpike projects) but not of the amount of effort or funding needed to acquire them. Other data are needed to evaluate the number of actual acquisitions compared to the number needed to let projects on time.

Since no construction contract is let, with the exception of design-build contracts, until all right-of-way parcels needed for the project are acquired and certified as "clear" (ready for construction to proceed), an efficient and economically effective right-of-way

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

program is an essential component of productivity. On design-build contracts, the right of way necessary for construction of the project or any portion thereof, must be certified as “clear” prior to the start of construction activities.

In the usual production cycle of a road or bridge, the necessary right-of-way is acquired immediately prior to the start of construction. When feasible, the department acquires needed right-of-way farther in advance of construction - purchasing now, rather than later when value has appreciated, land that will be needed for planned future roads or for widening existing roads.

Reliability: Based on the importance of this information, there are extensive reviews by Central Office and District staff of the monthly results published in the Production Management Report. These reviews ensure the reliability of the data.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Number of right of way projects certified ready for construction (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Right-of-Way Office, Florida Department of Transportation. Data is obtained from the Central Office Right-of-Way files containing documents which certify readiness of projects for construction.

It is important to note that the 2-year “Requested Standard” used for FY 2015/16 is developed from the second year of a two-year projection developed at the beginning of FY 2014/09. Because the projection is well in advance of the time when detailed project information is available, it is subject to change. This change is noticeable in the difference between these standards and the plan published by the Transportation Commission that is completed immediately prior to publication. The projection for projects to be certified in the second year is based on associated construction projects typically in the third or fourth year of the work program and sometimes later. The projects are still in the design phase and right of way requirements may not yet have been established, title work may not yet be completed, and right of way maps may not yet have been prepared. As design work progresses, right of way requirements are better defined and a better estimate for certification of the right of way can be made. Additionally, since the associated construction projects are in the outer years of the work program, the schedules frequently change due to local government input or funding constraints. This impacts the schedule for the right of way segment of these projects. The department anticipates requesting an update to the standard immediately prior to the beginning of FY 2014/15 when better information is available and the standard can be made more meaningful.

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of the total number of projects (excluding Turnpike projects) certified as ready for construction but not of the amount of effort or funding needed to acquire the parcels needed for each project.

Since no construction contract is let, with the exception of design-build contracts, until all right-of-way parcels needed for the project are acquired and certified as “clear” (ready for construction to proceed), an efficient and economically effective right-of-way

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

program is an essential component of productivity. On design-build contracts, the right of way necessary for construction of the project or any portion thereof, must be certified as “clear” prior to the start of construction activities.

In the usual production cycle of a road or bridge, the necessary right-of-way is acquired immediately prior to the start of construction. When feasible, the department acquires needed right-of-way in advance of construction - purchasing now, rather than later when value has appreciated, land that will be needed for planned future roads or for widening existing roads.

Reliability: Based on the importance of this information, there are extensive reviews by central office and district staff of the monthly results published in the Production Management Report. These reviews ensure the reliability of the data.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Transit ridership growth twice the average rate to population growth.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Freight, Logistics and Passenger Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. Population data is from the Florida Legislature's Office of Economic and Demographic Research, the U.S. Census Bureau and the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida. Population data used to calculate the requested standards are from the Office of Economic and Demographic Research projections.

Local transit agencies collect ridership data. Data for this measure is extracted from reports required by the Federal Transit Administration.

It is important to note that there is about a 15 to 17 month lag in the data. That is, the actual transit ridership data for the federal fiscal year which just ended is not available until December of the next year. Population data for the calendar year which just ended is not available until the following February.

Validity: One of the major transportation development concerns is responding to the need for transportation systems to support the state's growing population. A comparison of the transit ridership growth to the growth rate of the population as a whole is a logical way to address this concept. It will demonstrate whether the use of public transit is keeping up with or exceeding population growth.

Reliability: The population data for prior years is an estimate that decreases in reliability as time passes since the last decennial census. Projections for future years are similarly degraded by the passage of time and are generally less reliable than estimates.

The ridership data is validated by the federal government.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Number of annual passenger trips for transit.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Freight, Logistics and Passenger Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. Local transit agencies collect ridership data. Data for this measure is extracted from reports required by the Federal Transit Administration.

It is important to note that there is a 12 month lag in the data. That is, the actual data for the calendar year which just ended is not available until December.

Validity: Transit ridership is a common measure of transit performance, but it may not measure the department's performance. The department acts as a partner in the provision of transit service, but does not operate transit systems.

Reliability: While we have no reason to question the reliability of the measure, source documentation or standards, we were not able to verify data outside the control of FDOT. The data are subject to a lag time for audited reports of up to three years. The data is validated by the federal government.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged. Each county in Florida has a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) that is required to submit an Annual Operating Report to the Commission by September 15 each year. Each CTC Report includes information related to the number of trips provided for the transportation disadvantaged in their service area.

Each CTC logs the number of trips provided according to the following categories: fixed route, ambulatory, non-ambulatory, stretcher, and school bus. This measure includes only those requested trips provided with funds from the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund.

It is important to note that there is a 5 – 6 month lag in the data. That is, the actual data for the fiscal year which just ended is not available until December or January.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of the number of trips provided for the transportation disadvantaged. However, it is important to note that the department is only one of a variety of entities which provide funding to the Community Transportation Coordinators who provide transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged in their area.

Reliability: The commission has a system of checks and balances to ensure the financial information reported by the CTCs is accurate and reliable.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Number of passenger enplanements.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Freight, Logistics and Passenger Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. Department estimates are based on actual historical data from the Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.

It is important to note that there is a 21 month lag in the data. That is, the actual data for the calendar year 2013 will not be available until the Fall of 2015.

Validity: We have no reason to question the validity of the measure, source documentation or standards.

It is important to note that the work done by the Department of Transportation has very little, if any, impact on the number of passenger enplanements. As a result, it is not a valid measure of the Transportation Systems Development Program.

Reliability: We have no reason to question the reliability of the measure, source documentation or standards.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Number of cruise embarkations and disembarkations at Florida ports.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Freight, Logistics and Passenger Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. The data is obtained from the annual Florida Seaport Mission Plan published by the Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Council and the individual seaports located in Florida.

It is important to note that there is a five to six month lag in the data. That is, the actual data for the fiscal year which just ended is not available until January 2015.

Validity: We have no reason to question the validity of the measure, source documentation or standards, but we were not able to verify data outside the control of the Florida Department of Transportation.

It is important to note that this measure is not within the control of the department. As a result, it is not a valid measure of the Transportation Systems Development Program.

Reliability: We have no reason to question the reliability of the measure, source documentation or standards, but we were not able to verify data outside the control of the Florida Department of Transportation.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Transportation Systems Development

Service: Transportation Systems Development

Measure: Average cost per one-way trip provided for transportation disadvantaged.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged. Each county in Florida has a Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) that is required to submit an Annual Operating Report to the Commission by September 15 each year. The Annual Operating Report includes information related to the costs incurred and the number of trips provided by the CTC and its contractors in providing trips for the transportation disadvantaged. Each CTC logs the number of trips provided according to the following categories: fixed route, ambulatory, non-ambulatory, stretcher, and school bus. Requested trips include all categories mentioned above except for fixed route.

The measure is the total costs incurred by CTCs and coordination contractors in providing requested trips for the transportation disadvantaged in their area divided by the number of requested trips provided. This measure does not include administrative costs associated with the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged. It is important to note that Community Transportation Coordinators receive funding from various entities, examples include: US Department of Transportation; Department of Children and Families; Agency for Health Care Administration; Department of Elder Affairs; Department of Education; etc.

The Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged compiles the information included in each Annual Operating Report into their Annual Performance Report.

It is important to note that there is a 5 – 6 month lag in the data. That is, the actual data for the fiscal year which just ended is not available until December or January.

Validity: The measure is a valid measure of the average cost per paratransit trip.

Reliability: The Commission has a system of checks and balances to ensure the financial information reported by the CTCs is accurate and reliable.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Department: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service/Budget Entity: Highway Operations

Measure: Total budget for intrastate highway construction and arterial highway construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. This measure is the total budget for Intrastate Highway Construction and Arterial Highway Construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract. The budget figures are obtained from the Program & Resource Plan. The number of lane miles let to contract is obtained from the Program Objectives & Accomplishments Report (PO&A). Actual prior year and projected future year data is obtained from the July Adopted Work Program.

Validity: This measure does not provide a true indication of the department's average construction cost. Funds are included in the total budget portion which do not add lane miles. Examples of work funded out of this category which do not add lane miles include but are not limited to: interchanges, intersections, lanes reconstructed, landscaping, drainage improvements, rest areas, overhead signing, etc. In addition, the size and complexity of projects are just two factors which have a great effect on the actual cost of a particular project. As a result, the figures reported may vary significantly from year to year.

Reliability: The measure is reliable in that the measuring procedure, obtaining data from the PO&A, will yield the same results on repeated trials.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Intrastate highway lane miles contracted for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.”

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of intrastate highway lane miles (excluding the Turnpike) to be constructed to increase highway capacity.

The Work Program Administration (WPA) system contains the projects and schedules for capacity improvements. The WPA system also provides other project information and costs. Districts select capacity improvement projects based on 1) local government priority and 2) department-determined needs.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, amending the work program and work program Instructions for programming and coding information correctly for inclusion in the work program. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the Districts and Central Office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and the Transportation Commission’s Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Arterial highway lane miles contracted for highway capacity improvements.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.”

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of arterial highway lane miles to be constructed to increase highway capacity.

The Work Program Administration (WPA) system contains the projects and schedules for capacity improvements. The WPA system also provides other project information and costs. Districts select capacity improvement projects based on 1) local government priority, and 2) department-determined needs.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the adopted work program, developing the work program, amending the work program and work program instructions for programming and coding information correctly for inclusion in the work program. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the Districts and Central Office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and the Transportation Commission’s Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Lane miles contracted for resurfacing (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Includes lane miles let to contract which are off the State Highway System. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July 1 Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.”

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (excluding the Turnpike).

The Pavement Condition Survey (PCS), Roadway Characteristics Inventory (RCI) system, and Pavement Management Reporting System (PAVMARS) contain information related to pavement condition and characteristics. They are used to develop projects which are entered into the Work Program Administration (WPA) system. The WPA system contains the projects and schedules for the Resurfacing Program. The WPA also includes other project information and costs. The Districts prioritize resurfacing projects for inclusion in the work program from Pavement Condition Survey reports which identify deficient pavement segments.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, and amending the work program and work program instructions for collecting the appropriate information for inclusion in the work program. There are also user manuals for the systems used to collect the data for these measures. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the Districts and Central Office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee, district and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and in the Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Number of motor vehicle fatalities per 100 million miles traveled.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Safety Office, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The annual traffic facts book, "Traffic Crash Facts," from the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles provides the data. There is a 10 - 11 month lag in when this information is available as this report is published annually by a third party in the summer following the calendar year covered. The relevant data element in that document is derived from two sources: 1) long-form crash reports submitted by local and state law enforcement agencies and 2) an estimate for total highway travel by vehicles submitted by FDOT.

Local and state law enforcement agencies supply copies of relevant crash reports to the department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles year-round. Relevant crashes include only those more severe crashes which, by law, must be reported using the so-called long form. A long-form report must be filed when a motor vehicle crash: (1) resulted in death or personal injury; or (2) involved one or more of the following conditions; (a) leaving the scene of a crash involving damage to an occupied vehicle or property, or (b) driving while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, chemical substances, or controlled substances, or with an unlawful blood alcohol level. Other crashes may be reported using a long-form. For 1998 data and prior, a highway crash fatality, under state rules, must be the direct result of a motor vehicle crash and occur within 90 days of the crash. Federal rules establish a 30-day time period for crash-related deaths, so federal reports normally show a slightly smaller number of fatalities. The state recently modified its definition of what constitutes a highway crash fatality to make it consistent with the federal definition. Beginning with 1999 data, a highway crash fatality must be the direct result of a motor vehicle crash and occur within 30 days of the crash.

The number of fatalities alone is not a good measure as it fails to take into account the role of exposure. The nationally recognized way to compensate for exposure, or the level of risk, is to report the number of fatalities in reference to the amount of travel. To produce a number that is convenient to use, the fatality measure is reported as the number of fatalities per 100 million miles of travel. It is the rate, not the number, of

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

fatalities being examined by this measure. The required normative denominator is vehicle miles of travel (VMT).

Daily VMT (DVMT) is the product of multiplying the length of a highway segment by the annual average daily traffic (AADT) estimate for the segment. AADT is the estimate for total annual traffic divided by 365 and may not be an actual volume observable on any day. For example, it could be the average of busy weekdays and low volume weekend days in a central business district, or an opposite pattern near a beach resort. AADT is a point estimate; i.e., it is estimated for a given place on the road based on traffic counts taken at the point, with some adjustments. The highway segment for which the AADT estimate is applicable is determined according to perceived homogeneous traffic conditions. The statewide annual VMT estimate is the sum of all highway segment DVMT estimates multiplied by 365.

In most cases, the process of making an AADT estimate begins when one- and two-day traffic counts are taken once a year. The location of these counts is held fairly constant from year to year. The raw traffic count must be adjusted to derive an AADT estimate. For the State Highway System, the agency uses an AADT estimating method endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration and covered by an American Society for Testing and Materials standard. For the State Highway System, each distinct highway segment must have one traffic counting location which is monitored for two days at least once every three years. District staffs determine homogeneous highway segments and counting locations following established guidelines. Years in which a traffic count is not taken at a given location have AADT estimated based on changes in traffic along adjacent highway segments. Most Districts count every site every year in order to fully address any local travel changes. Since the statistical variance at almost all sites is greater than the average annual change in traffic, one-year changes in AADT estimates are usually not statistically significant.

Each point in the AADT estimating process adds an amount of uncertainty to the final result. The national standard is to have 90% of AADT estimates within 10% of their true value. The agency checks to see if the standard is met by taking sample counts and producing AADT estimates at sites which are continuously monitored to see if the same result is derived. The agency has consistently met the standard for the State Highway System. At worst, then, the VMT-based fatality rate for the State Highway System is off no more than 10%. Of course, the selected performance measure is not limited to the State Highway System; it includes all roads in the state. State roads comprise about 10% of the public roads in the state. VMT estimates for roads off the state system are not developed with the same level of statistical sophistication. The statistical accuracy of AADT estimates for higher classification roads under local jurisdiction is not as good as those on the State Highway System, but overall still meets established accuracy standards. AADT estimates for lower classification roads under local jurisdiction are estimated using functional classification guidelines.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

It is also important to note that while the State Highway System comprises a little more than 10% of the total public road mileage in the state, it carries approximately 2/3 of the traffic.

Validity: The department is responsible for designing, constructing and maintaining more than 12,000 miles of state roads. Approximately 103,000 miles of road are the responsibility of cities and counties and about 2,000 miles are the responsibility of various federal agencies. Outside the State Highway System, the department provides only leadership and financial assistance, not actual performance of safety activities. Nevertheless, a comprehensive measure of highway safety is important in defining where agency efforts should be applied.

The overall objective of the State Highway System is to move people and goods safely within the state. This outcome measure is a direct monitor of how safely the highway system meets that objective. It is also an ultimate outcome measure for the net impact of keeping the roads and bridges on the State Highway System in good condition. The measure goes beyond agency responsibilities to cover all public roads and is thus an effective tool for monitoring needs throughout the entire roadway network.

Reliability: The number of persons killed in motor vehicle crashes is highly reliable given the thoroughness of law enforcement investigations. However, the number of fatalities alone is not a good measure as it fails to take into account the role of exposure. The nationally recognized way to compensate for exposure, or the level of risk, is to report the number of fatalities in reference to the amount of travel. To produce a number that is convenient to use, the measure is reported as the number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles of travel (VMT).

Even though there are shortcomings in the VMT estimates, the fatality rate performance measure is reliable. To the extent that the problem of VMT estimation is historical and is expected to extend into the foreseeable future, it is relatively constant and does not detract from the ability of this performance measure to indicate state trends.

It is important to note that the method of calculating VMT on public roads that are not on the State Highway System has been improved. The result was a larger off-system VMT (and lower fatality rate) than would be expected from historical trends.

An independent variable to use as a "reality check" is the number of fatalities and the number of fatal crashes. Since all states use the same methodology, VMT estimation issues are not considered significant when making state-to-state comparisons, which is another form of quality checks.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent of state highway system pavement meeting department standards.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation, using reports prepared by the Pavement Management Section of the latest annual Pavement Condition Survey (PCS). The State Materials Office (SMO) in Gainesville collects the PCS data. The condition of Florida pavements is measured annually through the Pavement Condition Survey conducted by the Pavement Evaluation Section of the SMO. Pavements are rated on a scale of 0 to 10 (with 10 being the best) in each of three categories: ride smoothness, pavement cracking, and wheel path rutting.

The condition rating scales were set by a statewide committee of pavement engineers so that a rating of six or less in any of the three rating categories would constitute a deficient pavement segment. The lone exception to this is that, with a posted speed limit of 45 mph or less, a segment's ride rating must be five or below to be considered deficient. Priority scheduling is given to roads with the most severe deficiencies. Good condition is defined as meeting department standards and there is no immediate need for resurfacing.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of the percentage of State Highway System pavement in good condition. Road pavements require periodic resurfacing; however, the frequency of resurfacing depends on the volume of traffic, type of traffic (heavier vehicles cause more "wear and tear"), pavement material variability and weather conditions.

Resurfacing preserves the structural integrity of highway pavements and includes pavement resurfacing, pavement rehabilitation, and minor reconstruction. Failure to timely resurface a road results in damage to the road base, necessitating costly reconstruction work in addition to resurfacing.

Reliability: Good condition is defined as meeting department standards. A separate pavement evaluation process done for federal reporting purposes provides a range of descriptive terms based on a scale of 0-5: very good, good, fair, mediocre, and poor.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

This single-number rating method relies heavily on ride condition, which is a generally poor indicator of structural pavement integrity in Florida due to our lack of freeze-thaw cycles. Thus, direct comparison to national data as a reliability check is not always reliable given the differences in methodology and rating scale. Any such comparison would require that 'poor' be related to 'bad' and other pavements be considered 'good' (i.e. acceptable) under the state definition.

External reality checks, such as comparisons to national data, are not necessary due to internal quality controls. Pavement condition is determined by a statewide team, thereby eliminating any bias and chance for District-to-District variations in rating methods. The present agency short range objective is to keep the proportion of State Highway System road pavements which meet department standards at 80%.

The agency long range objective is to preserve the State Highway System. Improvements in survey methodology and instrumentation may occur as technology increases the accuracy of measurements. The data on which the pavement condition outcome is based should remain reliable.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent of FDOT-maintained bridges which meet department standards.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget and the State Maintenance Office, Florida Department of Transportation. The data is derived from the annual bridge inventory from the State Maintenance Office. Meeting standards: The percentage of structures on the State Highway System having a condition rating of either good or excellent – for bridge components of substructure, superstructure and deck; or the culvert condition rating.

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of the percentage of state-maintained bridges in good condition. No FDOT-maintained bridge will ever remain open to traffic with a known structural defect that renders it unsafe. Thus, there are no FDOT-maintained bridges in an unsafe condition, only bridges that may need work to prolong their useful life, or bridges that must be replaced because they have exhausted their useful life. This performance measure directly monitors the success of agency Bridge Repair and Replacement Programs, the objective of which is to keep FDOT-maintained bridges in good condition.

Reliability: The measure is reliable in that the mechanics of the data collection process are uniform throughout the state and the data is accurately and consistently recorded.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent increase in number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days, holidays and special events).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Construction Office, Florida Department of Transportation. The department tracks construction contract data through its computerized Contracts Reporting System. Once the department and construction firm contract for construction of a road or bridge project and construction commences, the contract time (number of days to complete the project established by the department) and contract amount (cost of the project established by lowest responsible bid) may be adjusted due to a variety of factors. These factors include time lost due to rain or other inclement weather conditions, unanticipated environmental or soil conditions (e.g. discovery of hazardous waste on site), design changes or omissions, and equipment, material, or workforce-related problems of the construction contractor.

The original contract time will predictably increase due to time extensions granted for inclement weather conditions. These increases are excluded from the performance measure since they are unavoidable. Beyond “weather days,” additional time is granted for a variety of other reasons, including extra work, special events (i.e. parades), plan or design changes, material testing delays, and utility relocation delays. Additional days are granted by the department through time extensions, which grant additional time only, and through supplemental agreements, which authorize additional work and often necessitate additional days. The bulk of added days are authorized through supplemental agreements.

Validity: The comparison of final contract time to original contract time is a valid indicator of overall construction contracts management.

The Contract Reporting System (CRS), the Supplemental Agreement (SA) Tracking System, and the Time Tracking System are used to collect information for this performance measure. The purpose of the CRS is to facilitate the preparation of itemized construction progress payments, supplemental agreements to contracts and final estimates while providing management reports that show construction progress by contractor, district, fund, etc. The purpose of the SA Tracking System and the Time

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Tracking System is to provide the department with documentation on the reason for a specific amount for the SA as well as identifying and documenting the party that should share in the responsibility for the additional cost. For the purpose of this performance measure, a completed project is a project for which the “passed date” has been entered into the system by the District Final Estimates staff. The “passed date” is the date the job was, in effect, paid for, which means all contract items have been paid out and there are no outstanding issues such as claims.

Information is collected from the CRS, the SA Tracking System, and the Time Tracking System to obtain the percentage increase in the number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days). Using these systems, the Office of Construction tracks the contract number, work program item number, lead project number, original days, present days, days used, number of time extensions, contractor (name and vendor number), letting date, final accepted date, and passed date. CRS and the SA Tracking System are used to determine the percent increase in amount paid for construction over original contract amount. The SA Tracking system lists out the work orders making up any supplemental agreements. This includes the amount of the work order, the number of days, the premium cost for the work done, the responsible party for the premium cost, and the reason for the work order. The Time Tracking system lists the time extension work orders with the days and a “reason code” for the work order. Using these systems, the Office of Construction tracks the contract number, WPI number, lead project number, original contract amount, present contract amount, total of approved SAs, regular work to date, contractor (name and vendor number), letting date final accepted date, and passed date.

A monthly edit report is generated to check for inconsistencies between the SA Tracking and Time Tracking systems and CRS. This checks to determine if the total amount and days in CRS match the information in the SA Tracking and Time Tracking system. It also checks the validity of the reason code and if the responsible party has been identified. Quarterly, a detailed report is sent to the districts for their review. Any needed changes are made in the district. Once the changes have been made by the district, the information is closed out. Changes can be made for the next quarter, but they will not be reflected in the current quarterly report. Only appropriate staff with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in the systems that gather data for these measures. Quality Assurance Reviews are performed which review the actual documents to ensure accuracy of data entry.

Reliability: The data reflected in this measure is captured in the department’s Contract Reporting System. The system is stable and has been in use for a number of years. Data from this system can be expected to be consistent and reliable over time.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent increase in final amount paid for completed construction contracts over original contract amount.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Construction Office, Florida Department of Transportation. The department tracks construction contract data through its computerized Contracts Reporting System. Once the department and construction firm contract for construction of a road or bridge project and construction commences, the contract time (number of days to complete the project established by the department) and contract amount (cost of the project established by lowest responsible bid) may be adjusted due to a variety of factors. These factors include time lost due to rain or other inclement weather conditions, unanticipated environmental or soil conditions (e.g. discovery of hazardous waste on site), design changes or omissions, and equipment, material or workforce-related problems of the construction contractor.

This measure compares the original contract amount to the final project cost. Increases in cost frequently occur due to authorization of additional work as the project progresses. Significant cost increases could result in delaying planned projects and could indicate a problem in quality of design plans and specifications or in contract management.

The public expects that a project will be delivered “within budget and on schedule.” It is important to assess how well the department manages its construction contracts as it relates to containment of cost and time increases. As explained above, however, some increases are beyond the department’s control.

Validity: The comparison of final contract cost to original contract cost is a valid indicator of overall construction contract management.

The Contract Reporting System (CRS), the Supplemental Agreement (SA) Tracking System, and the Time Tracking System are used to collect information for this performance measure. The purpose of the CRS is to facilitate the preparation of itemized construction progress payments, supplemental agreements to contracts and final estimates while providing management reports that show construction progress by

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

contractor, district, fund, etc. The purpose of the SA Tracking System and the Time Tracking System is to provide the department with documentation on the reason for a specific amount for the SA as well as identifying and documenting the party that should share in the responsibility for the additional cost. For the purpose of this performance measure, a completed project is a project for which the “passed date” has been entered into the system by the District Final Estimates staff. The “passed date” is the date the job was, in effect, paid for, which means all contract items have been paid out and there are no outstanding issues such as claims.

Information is collected from the CRS, the SA Tracking System, and the Time Tracking System to obtain the percentage increase in the number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days). Using these systems, the Office of Construction tracks the contract number, work program item number, lead project number, original days, present days, days used, number of time extensions, contractor (name and vendor number), letting date, final accepted date and passed date. CRS and the SA Tracking System are used to determine the percent increase in amount paid for construction over original contract amount. The SA Tracking system lists out the work orders making up any supplemental agreements. This includes the amount of the work order, the number of days, the premium cost for the work done, the responsible party for the premium cost and the reason for the work order. The Time Tracking system lists the time extension work orders with the days and a “reason code” for the work order. Using these systems, the Office of Construction tracks the contract number, WPI number, lead project number, original contract amount, present contract amount, total of approved SAs, regular work to date, contractor (name and vendor number), letting date, final accepted date and passed date.

A monthly edit report is generated to check for inconsistencies between the SA Tracking and Time Tracking systems and CRS. This checks to determine if the total amount and days in CRS match the information in the SA Tracking and Time Tracking system. It also checks the validity of the reason code and if the responsible party has been identified. Quarterly, a detailed report is sent to the districts for their review. Any needed changes are made in the district. Once the changes have been made by the district, the information is closed out. Changes can be made for the next quarter, but they will not be reflected in the current quarterly report. Only appropriate staff with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in the systems that gather data for these measures. Quality Assurance Reviews are performed which review the actual documents to ensure accuracy of data entry.

Reliability: The data reflected in this measure is captured in the department’s Contract Reporting System. The system is stable and has been in use for a number of years. Data from this system can be expected to be consistent and reliable over time.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.” Lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements on the Turnpike are not included in this measure.

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of lane miles to be constructed to increase capacity on the State Highway System (excluding the Turnpike).

The Work Program Administration (WPA) system contains the projects and schedules for capacity improvements. The WPA system also provides other project information and costs. Districts select capacity improvement projects based on 1) local government priority and 2) department-determined needs.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, amending the work program and work program instructions for programming and coding information correctly for inclusion in the work program. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the Districts and Central Office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and the Transportation Commission’s Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation.

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of overall progress in completing planned work program construction projects.

Data for the percent of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let is captured to ensure the department is delivering the projects contained in the current year of the Adopted Work Program. The data collected for this measure is used in the preparation of the Performance Report used in the Executive Board Meeting. The information is also used in the Florida Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review of the Department of Transportation which reports the status of this performance measure.

"Projects planned for letting" is based on the construction projects included in the current year of the Adopted Work Program. Staff in the Production Management Office review the Adopted Work Program to determine which construction projects are planned for letting. The districts inform Production Management Office staff which construction projects should not be included in the list because of concerns about being able to produce them in the current year. Based on these decisions, the construction projects planned for letting are included in the Production Management Performance Report. Any construction projects included in the Adopted Work Program but not in the list of construction projects planned for letting are included in the August report as "Adopted, but Excluded" projects.

Production Management Office staff receive and review an Executive Bid Summary package monthly. District and Design/Build contracts are also tracked and commitments recorded when the reports show approved amounts. This package identifies which construction projects have been let in the current month.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, and amending the work program and work program instructions for collecting the appropriate information in the work program. There is also a procedure for Production Performance reporting. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only appropriate staff with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in the systems that gather the data for this measure. Additionally, the Florida Transportation Commission is required by statute to monitor, at least quarterly, the efficiency, productivity, and management of the department, using performance and production standards developed by the Commission. One of the measures the Florida Transportation Commission monitors is the percent of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let.

The Office of Inspector General verified the information included in the Florida Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review of the Department of Transportation matches the information in the year-end Production Management Performance Report.

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls in place and its use in the Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Number of bridges contracted for repair (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.” Turnpike bridges are not included in this measure.

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of agency use of contracts for bridge repair (excluding Turnpike bridges).

The number of bridges let to contract for repair is compiled from the FDOT Work Program Administration computer system, which is the department’s source of commitment and financial information for projects undertaken by the department. The term “number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike not included)” refers to the number of bridges committed to construction contract for either repair or rehabilitation work to correct structural deterioration related problems.

Reliability: The measure is reliable and consistent due to the elaborate review process employed in developing the work program.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Number of bridges contracted for replacement (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. The figure includes local bridges as well as those on the State Highway System. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July 1 Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term “contracted” refers to the moment the contract is “let” or “committed.” Turnpike bridges are not included in this measure.

Validity: The measure is valid as an overall indicator of the agency use of contracts for bridge replacement (excluding Turnpike bridges). It should be noted that the size, complexity, and cost of bridge replacement projects vary widely. Thus, this measure is not valid as a direct workload indicator for workload or budget needs.

The number of bridges let to contract for replacement is compiled from the FDOT Work Program Administration computer system, which is the department’s source of commitment and financial information for projects undertaken by the department. The number of bridges let to contract for replacement includes bridges scheduled for replacement because the bridge is structurally deficient, posted for weight restriction or is more economical to replace rather than repair or rehabilitate.

Reliability: The measure is reliable and consistent due to the elaborate review process employed in developing the work program.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Maintenance condition rating of state highway system as measured against the department's maintenance standards.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Maintenance Office, Florida Department of Transportation. The quality and effectiveness of the agency's routine maintenance program is systematically and uniformly evaluated by the Maintenance Rating Program (MRP). The department's objective is to achieve and maintain an annual maintenance rating of 80.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of the maintenance condition of the State Highway System. The Maintenance Rating Program has been used by the department since 1985.

Florida law requires the department to provide routine and uniform maintenance of the State Highway System. Routine maintenance encompasses highway repair (e.g. repairing potholes, patching), roadside upkeep (e.g. mowing, litter removal), drainage management, and traffic services (e.g. road signs, striping). Adequate and uniform road maintenance on a statewide basis is essential for ensuring the optimum safety, preservation and aesthetic condition of the transportation system.

Reliability: The maintenance condition rating is a long-standing internal management tool. A formal statistical review of the MRP by Florida State University found that the Maintenance Rating Program produces statistically valid indicators of the overall condition of the State Highway System. The rating is reliable.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Commercial vehicle weighings.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Motor Carrier Size and Weight, Florida Department of Transportation. The source of commercial vehicle weight law enforcement data is the agency's Office of Motor Carrier Size and Weight, which operates fixed weigh stations on major highways. Truck weight laws apply to all vehicles, commercial or otherwise; however, the term 'commercial vehicle' is used to indicate that the area of emphasis is the large trucks used by businesses. Counts are maintained on a daily basis on both total number of vehicles weighed and the number of enforcement actions taken.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of that which it purports to measure: the number of commercial vehicle weighings performed. Commercial vehicles are weighed at weigh stations providing a "screening" service for law enforcement, weighing more than 99 percent of the total trucks and accounting for approximately 62 percent of the dollar amount of overweight penalties (fines) collected. This is because truck operators who know that their routes will take them through a weigh station do not intentionally overload; therefore, the amounts of excess weights and resulting penalties are comparatively small, with few exceptions.

Reliability: The data supporting this performance measure is reliable because of the process controls that are in place. The controls ensure that data is consistently reported.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike not included).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Transportation Statistics Office, Florida Department of Transportation. December Mileage Report for the State Highway System. The figure for out-years are estimated based on the number of new lane miles on the State Highway System (excluding the Turnpike).

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of the number of lane miles on the State Highway System (excluding the Turnpike).

Reliability: Data supporting the performance measure is reliable. Procedures are in place to ensure accurate data collection, and quality control activities are conducted on an ongoing basis.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Highway Operations

Service: Highway Operations

Measure: Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed and WIM scales.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Motor Carrier Size and Weight, Florida Department of Transportation. These measures are derived by dividing the number of trucks cited for weight law violations by the total number of vehicles weighed at fixed enforcement sites. The source of commercial vehicle weight law enforcement data is the agency's the Office of Motor Carrier Size and Weight, which operates fixed weigh stations on major highways. Truck weight laws apply to all vehicles, commercial or otherwise; however, the term "commercial vehicle" is used to indicate that the area of emphasis is the large trucks used by businesses. Counts are maintained on a daily basis on both total number of vehicles weighed and the number of enforcement actions taken.

Validity: The measure reports the percent of commercial motor vehicle weighings which showed the vehicle was overweight. It is important to note that vehicles observed with the Weigh in Motion technology as being overweight are weighed via a fixed scale to confirm the vehicle is actually overweight. It should also be noted that not all commercial vehicles on the highway are weighed.

Initially, the number of cited overweight vehicles may go up as enforcement efforts take effect. Later, as the increased risk of discovery becomes widely known, the number of overweight vehicles—and, thus, the number of citations—should decline. However, since it is likely that the number of weighed vehicles is expected to increase more rapidly due to technological advances, the measure as stated is likely to decline. Comparison of this measure to others will be necessary to provide a complete picture.

The program provides enforcement of laws and agency rules which regulate the weight, size, safety, and registration requirements of commercial vehicles operating on the highway system. Through the use of a statewide network of weigh station facilities and patrol personnel utilizing portable scales, commercial vehicle traffic is monitored for compliance with legislatively established requirements.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Reliability: Collection of the necessary input data is a long-established process with substantial supervisor review. The input data are considered to be reliable. Rapid increases in vehicle weighings due to technical advances (e.g. weigh-in-motion devices) are likely to reduce the percent of vehicles found in violation even if the number of such vehicles increases. This causes the measure to be incomplete if presented without also reporting the input data values and their trends over time.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Executive Direction/Support Services

Service: Executive Direction/Support Services

Measure: Percent of agency administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Source and Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. The first part of this measure is the percent of the agency administration and support costs compared to total agency costs. The second part of the measure is the percent of the agency administration and support positions compared to total agency positions.

Data are obtained from the Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem (LAS/PBS).

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of that which it purports to measure: the percent of agency administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions.

Reliability: The data supporting this performance measure is reliable because of the process controls that are in place. The controls ensure that data is consistently reported.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Operational cost per toll transaction.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Toll Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. The data is from standard reporting systems. The measure is calculated by dividing the total cost of toll operations by the number of vehicle toll transactions during a given fiscal year.

This measure reflects shared operating costs associated with the Florida Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) SunPass pre-paid toll program. There are certain other toll transactions processed by FTE on behalf of Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX). Such transactions occur when SunPass accountholders drive on CFX toll roads. While the results of the CPT measure, as reported herein, include the associated costs of processing CFX toll transactions, the department includes only FTE transactions when performing the calculation of its CPT. The department is actively working on replacing the existing SunPass back-office system with a Centralized Customer Service System (CCSS) and executing a joint agreement with three other Florida toll authorities, including CFX. Upon the implementation of the new CCSS, it is anticipated that all SunPass customer transaction costs will be shared amongst the four agencies. Additionally, the department is in discussions with CFX regarding an interim arrangement for the Authority to reimburse the department for its share of current SunPass transaction processing costs. Upon implementation, the costs reported by the department for the CPT measure will appropriately reflect the FTE-related transaction costs only, as the costs for processing SunPass transactions for CFX will have been reimbursed to the department.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of that which it purports to measure: the operational cost per toll transaction. The operational cost for toll facilities as it relates to the volume of transactions at these facilities is a direct measure of the efficiency of operations.

This measure will allow the agency to monitor collection costs relative to demand. Lower operational costs means that more funds are available for maintenance, debt service payments and improvements to the system.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Reliability: This measure is the result of dividing the total operational cost of toll collection activities (capital costs are not included) by the number of transactions (which is the output measure). An indicator of the validity and reliability of operational cost is the on-going process of reviewing expenditures in relation to the operating budget and to planned expenditures. Variances are reported to the Disbursement Office for review. An indicator of the validity and reliability of toll transaction data is the process used to balance estimated toll collections to the number of toll transactions and the daily bank deposit. Significant variances are reported to the Office of Toll Transactions and are reviewed and audited.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Toll transactions.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Toll Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. Data is obtained from the Toll Collections System Data Base.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of that which it purports to measure: the number of toll transactions. This measure is one of the data elements used in calculating the operational cost per toll transaction, which is a direct measure of the efficiency of operations.

The measure appropriately captures the number of toll transactions. It is used in calculating the operational cost per toll transaction, which is a direct measure of the efficiency of toll operations.

Toll revenues are used to pay debt service on bonds issued for construction and maintenance of a facility. After the bonds are paid off, toll revenues are used for facility maintenance and other transportation purposes. To the extent that operational costs to collect tolls increase, less net toll revenue is available for debt service or other purposes.

Since tolls are fees paid by toll facility users who have an expectation that the maximum amount of tolls collected be used to pay off the debt or for other transportation improvements, toll collection costs should be contained and carefully managed.

Reliability: An indicator of the validity and reliability of toll transaction data is the process used to balance estimated toll collections to the number of toll transactions and the daily bank deposit. Significant variances are reported to the Office of Toll Transactions and are reviewed and audited.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike only).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term "contracted" refers to the moment the contract is "let" or "committed."

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of lane miles (on the Turnpike) let to contract for resurfacing.

The Pavement Condition Survey (PCS), Roadway Characteristics Inventory (RCI) system, and Pavement Management Reporting System (PAVMARS) contain information related to pavement condition and characteristics. They are used to develop projects which are entered into the Work Program Administration (WPA) system. The WPA system contains the projects and schedules for the Resurfacing Program. The WPA also includes other project information and costs. The Districts prioritize resurfacing projects for inclusion in the work program from Pavement Condition Survey reports which identify deficient pavement segments.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, and amending the work program and work program instructions for collecting the appropriate information for inclusion in the work program. There are also user manuals for the systems used to collect the data for these measures. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the districts and central office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee, district and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and in the Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike only).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Transportation Statistics Office, Florida Department of Transportation. December Mileage Report for the Turnpike portion of the State Highway System. Figure for out-years are estimated based on the number of new lane miles on the Turnpike expected to be open to traffic.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of the number of lane miles on the Turnpike portion of the State Highway System.

Reliability: Data supporting the performance measure is reliable. Procedures are in place to ensure accurate data collection, and quality control activities are conducted on an ongoing basis.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Operational cost per dollar collected.

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Toll Operations, Florida Department of Transportation. The data is from standard reporting systems. The measure is calculated by dividing the total cost of toll operations by the total amount collected during a given fiscal year.

Validity: The measure is a valid indicator of that which it purports to measure: the operational cost per dollar collected. Any fluctuations in this measure will be primarily a result of toll rate changes and not operational factors. As a result, the measure is not a valid indicator of Toll Operations performance.

Reliability: An indicator of the validity and reliability of operational cost is the on-going process of reviewing expenditure in relation to the operating budget and to planned expenditures. Variances are reported to the Disbursement Office for review. There are a number of sources for determining the reliability of dollars collected, including bank statements, deposit transmittal forms and FLAIR revenue reports.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike only).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term "contracted" refers to the moment the contract is "let" or "committed."

Validity: The measure is valid with regard to the number of lane miles to be constructed to increase highway capacity on the Turnpike.

The Work Program Administration (WPA) system contains the projects and schedules for capacity improvements. The WPA system also provides other project information and costs. Districts select capacity improvement projects based on 1) local government priority, and 2) department-determined needs.

Procedures are documented for maintaining the Adopted Work Program, developing the work program, amending the work program and work program instructions for programming and coding information correctly for inclusion in the work program. Source documents are authorized and projects in the work program are subjected to extensive review. Only work program development staff in the districts and central Office with valid user IDs and passwords have access to input or change data in WPA. A review committee and Office of Work Program staff validate the data entered into the system. Automated measures are in place to detect errors and provide a trail of activity in the systems. Data output is also reviewed and exceptions are reported.

Reliability: The information is reliable and consistent due to the controls discussed above that are in place and its use in the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report and the Transportation Commission's Performance and Production Review.

Performance Validity and Reliability

Exhibit IV

Agency: Florida Department of Transportation

Program: Florida's Turnpike Systems

Service: Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

Measure: Bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike only).

Action:

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

Data Sources And Methodology: Office of Work Program & Budget, Florida Department of Transportation. Data obtained from the Program Objectives and Accomplishments Report. Actual prior year and projected future year data from the July Adopted Work Program.

For the purposes of this report, the term "contracted" refers to the moment the contract is "let" or "committed."

Validity: The measure is valid as an indicator of agency use of contracts for Turnpike bridge repair.

The number of Turnpike bridges let to contract for repair is compiled from the FDOT Work Program Administration computer system, which is the department's source of commitment and financial information for projects undertaken by the department. The term "number of Turnpike bridges let to contract for repair" refers to the number of Turnpike bridges committed to construction contract for either repair or rehabilitation work to correct structural deterioration related problems.

Reliability: The measure is reliable and consistent due to the elaborate review process employed in developing the annual work program.

**Associated Activities Contributing to
Performance Measures - LRPP Exhibit V**

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
Program: Transportation Systems Development		
1	Number of right-of-way parcels acquired (Turnpike not included)	ACT5300 Right of way land ACT5320 Right of way support
2	Number of right-of-way projects certified ready for construction (Turnpike not included)	ACT5300 Right of way land ACT5320 Right of way support
3	Transit ridership growth twice the average rate of population growth	ACT5380 Transit ACT5400 Transportation Disadvantaged ACT5500 Public Transportation Operations
4	Average cost per one-way trip provided for transportation disadvantaged	ACT5400 Transportation Disadvantaged
5	Number of passenger enplanements	ACT5360 Aviation ACT5440 Intermodal
6	Number of annual transit passenger trips for transit	ACT5380 Transit ACT5400 Transportation Disadvantaged ACT5500 Public Transportation Operations
7	Number of cruise embarkations and disembarkations at Florida ports	ACT5440 Intermodal ACT5460 Seaports ACT5480 Seaport Development and Access Debt Service
8	Number of one-way trips provided (transportation disadvantaged)	ACT5400 Transportation Disadvantaged

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
Program: Highway Operations		
9	Maintenance condition rating of state highway system as measured against the department's Maintenance standards	ACT5540 Routine Maintenance ACT5220 Materials Testing & Research
10	Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that were overweight: fixed scale weighings	ACT5580 Motor Carrier Size and Weight
12	Number of commercial vehicle weighings	ACT5580 Motor Carrier Size and Weight
15	Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike not included)	ACT5540 Routine Maintenance
16	Total budget for intrastate highway construction and arterial highway construction divided by the number of lane miles let to contract	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways
17	Number of motor vehicle fatalities per 100 million miles traveled	ACT5100 Highway Safety Construction ACT5580 Motor Carrier Size and Weight ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways ACT5520 Bridge Inspection ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges ACT5220 Materials Testing & Research ACT5060 Resurface Roads ACT5540 Routine Maintenance
18	Percentage of state highway system pavement meeting department standards	ACT5060 Resurface Roads ACT5220 Materials Testing & Research
19	Percentage of FDOT-maintained bridges which meet department standards	ACT5520 Bridge Inspection ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
20	Percentage increase in number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days (less weather days, holidays and special events)	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways ACT5520 Bridge Inspection ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges
21	Percentage increase in final amount paid for completed construction contracts over original contract amount	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways ACT5520 Bridge Inspection ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges
22	Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike not included)	ACT5060 Resurface Roads
23	Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike not included)	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways
24	Percentage of construction contracts planned for letting that were actually let	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways ACT5520 Bridge Inspection ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges
25	Number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike not included)	ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges
26	Number of bridges let to contract for replacement (Turnpike not included)	ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
Florida's Turnpike Enterprise Toll Operations		
27	Operational cost per toll transaction	ACT5600 Toll Operations
28	Operational cost per dollar collected	ACT5600 Toll Operations
29	Number of toll transactions	ACT5600 Toll Operations
30	Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing (Turnpike only)	ACT5060 Resurface Roads
31	Number of lane miles let to contract for highway capacity improvements (Turnpike only)	ACT5020 Intrastate Highways ACT5040 Arterial Highways
32	Number of bridges let to contract for repair (Turnpike only)	ACT5080 Repair and Replace Bridges
33	Lane miles maintained on the State Highway System (Turnpike only)	ACT5540 Routine Maintenance

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
Executive Direction and Support Services		
34	Percent of agency administrative and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	ACT0010 Executive Direction ACT0020 General Counsel/Legal ACT0030 Legislative Affairs ACT0040 External Affairs ACT0050 Cabinet Affairs ACT0060 Inspector General ACT0070 Communications/Public Information ACT0080 Director of Administration ACT0090 Planning and Budgeting ACT0100 Finance and Accounting ACT0110 Personnel Services/Human Resources ACT0120 Training ACT0130 Mail Room ACT0140 Print Shop ACT0150 Records Management ACT0160 Supply Room ACT0170 Property Management ACT0180 Contract Administration ACT0190 Grants Management ACT0200 Procurement ACT0210 Fixed Capital Outlay ACT0300 IT - Executive Direction ACT0310 IT - Administrative Services

Identification of Associated Activities Contributing to Performance Measures

Exhibit V

Measure Number	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2008-09 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
		ACT0320 IT - Application Development/Support ACT0330 IT - Computer Operations ACT0340 IT - Network Operations ACT0350 IT - Desktop Support ACT0370 IT - Asset Acquisition ACT0400 Purchase of IT Services from the State Technology Office ACT0430 Payment of Pensions, Benefits and Claims ACT0370 IT - Asset Acquisition

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Glossary of Terms

2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP): A statewide plan that defines Florida's 50-year long range transportation goals and objectives.

Access Management: The control and regulation of the spacing and design of driveways, medians, median openings, traffic signals and intersections on arterial roads to improve safe and efficient traffic flow on the road system.

Activity: A unit of work which has identifiable starting and ending points, consumes resources, and produces outputs. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and September 30 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Advance Acquisition: The acquisition of real property rights for use on a transportation corridor in advance of the fiscal year in which right of way acquisition would normally occur. This is done to take advantage of favorable prices or the availability of land and to preclude further development that would make the property more costly to the public.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act which represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings. For a complete listing of all appropriation categories, please refer to the ACTR section in the LAS/PBS User's Manual for instructions on ordering a report.

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

Congestion: Highway congestion results when traffic demand approaches or exceeds the available capacity of the transportation facility(ies).

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Controlled Access Facility: A roadway where the spacing and design of driveways, medians, median openings, traffic signals and intersections are strictly regulated by consideration of such factors as traffic volume, number of lanes and adjacent land use.

D3-A: A legislative budget request (LBR) exhibit which presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units which are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

Demand Management: A set of strategies that promote increased efficiency of the transportation system by influencing individual travel behavior.

Ecosystem Management: An integrated, flexible approach to management of Florida's biological and physical environments conducted through the use of tools such as planning, land acquisition, environmental education and pollution prevention. This management approach is designed to maintain, protect and improve the State's natural, managed and human communities.

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

Federal-Aid Highway: Those highways eligible for assistance under Title 23 of the United States Code, which does not include those functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors.

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs and renovations to real property which materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use, and including furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

High-Occupancy Vehicle: Any vehicle carrying two or more passengers. The term usually refers to private vehicles.

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word "measure."

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Intelligent Transportation Systems: A wide range of advanced technologies and ideas, which, in combination, can improve mobility and transportation productivity, enhance safety, maximize the use of existing transportation facilities, conserve energy resources and reduce adverse environmental effects.

Intermodal: Relating to the connection between any two or more modes of transportation.

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAS/PBS: Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; issue instructions and reports concerning zero-based budgeting; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to s. 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

Level of Service: A qualitative assessment of a road's operating conditions. For local government comprehensive planning purposes, level of service means an indicator of the extent or degree of service provided by, or proposed to be provided by, a facility based on and related to the operational characteristics of the facility. Level of service indicates the capacity per unit of demand for each public facility.

Long Range Component: The long range part of the Florida Transportation Plan, updated at least every five years, or more often as needed, to reflect changes in issues and Florida's long range transportation goals and objectives for the ensuing 50 years.

Long-Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

Metropolitan Planning Organization: An organization made up of local elected and appointed officials responsible for developing, in cooperation with the state, transportation plans and programs in metropolitan areas containing 50,000 or more residents. MPOs are responsible for the development of transportation facilities that will function as an intermodal transportation system and the coordination of transportation planning and funding decisions.

Mobility: The degree to which the demand for the movement of people and goods can be satisfied. Mobility is measured in Florida by the quantity, quality, accessibility and utilization of transportation facilities and services.

Mode: Any one of the following means of moving people or goods: aviation, bicycle, highway, paratransit, pedestrian, pipeline, rail (commuter, intercity passenger and freight), transit, space and water.

Multimodal Transportation: Denotes the use of more than one mode to serve transportation needs in a given area.

Narrative: Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

Nonrecurring: Expenditure or revenue which is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

Outcome: See Performance Measure.

Output: See Performance Measure.

Outsourcing: Means the process of contracting with vendor(s) to provide a service or an activity and there is a transfer of management responsibility for the delivery of resources and the performance of those resources. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services which support the agency mission.

Partners, Transportation: Those parties with interests in transportation facilities and services including the public, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, public and private sector users and providers, Native American Nations, the Florida Department of Transportation and other federal and state agencies.

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Pass Through: Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g. local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent, and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. ***NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range planning.***

Percent of Standard: When used in reference to the Maintenance Program, this refers to the percentage of the acceptable department standard achieved. For the Maintenance Program, the "maintenance rating" goal is 80, and is based on the department's evaluation of its performance using the Maintenance Rating Program. If the department achieves a rating of 80, this is reported as achieving 100% of the standard.

Performance Ledger: The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.
- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.
- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

Policy Area: A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients which reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Primary Service Outcome Measure: The service outcome measure which is approved as the performance measure which best reflects and measures the intended outcome of a service. Generally, there is only one primary service outcome measure for each agency service.

Preservation: Actions taken to protect existing natural and human environments, investments and mobility options.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Program: A set of services and activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals and objectives based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act by a title that begins with the word “Program.” In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. “Service” is a “budget entity” for purposes of the LRPP.

Program & Resource Plan: A 10-year plan that establishes financial and production targets for Florida Department of Transportation programs, thereby guiding program funding decisions to carry out the goals and objectives of the FTP.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency’s mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

State Highway System: A network of approximately 12,000 miles of highways owned and maintained by the state or state-created authorities. Major elements include the Interstate, Florida’s Turnpike and other toll facilities operated by transportation authorities, and arterial highways.

Transit: Mass transportation by bus, rail or other conveyance that provides general or special services to the public on a regular and continuing basis. Transit does not include school buses or charter or sightseeing services.

Transportation Corridor: Any land area designated by the state, a county or a municipality which is between two geographic points and which area is used or is suitable for the movement of people and goods by one or more modes of transportation, including areas necessary for management of access and securing applicable approvals and permits.

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Transportation Disadvantaged: Those persons who, because of disability, income status or age, are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation services.

Transportation Management Association: An organization which helps solve transportation problems by encouraging businesses and governments to implement ridesharing and demand management strategies.

Tri-Rail: A commuter rail system in Southeast Florida operated by the Tri-County Commuter Rail Authority between West Palm Beach and Miami.

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

Vehicle Miles Traveled: On highways, a measurement of the total miles traveled in a given area for a specified time period. It is calculated by multiplying the number of vehicles by the miles traveled in a given area or on a given highway during the time period. In transit, it is calculated by multiplying the number of vehicles by the miles traveled on a given area or on a different route, line, or network during the time period.

Work Program: The five-year listing of all transportation projects planned for each fiscal year by the Florida Department of Transportation, as adjusted for the legislatively approved budget for the first year of the program.

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

Acronyms

AADT	Annual average daily traffic
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
BEBR	Bureau of Economic and Business Research
CEI	Construction Engineering and Inspection
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CIP	Capital Improvements Program Plan
CITS	Consultant Invoice Transmittal System
CRS	Contract Reporting System
CTC	Community Transportation Coordinator
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DMS	Department of Management Services
DOT/FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation/Florida DOT
EOG	Executive Office of the Governor
ETDM	Efficient Transportation Decision Making
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FCO	Fixed Capital Outlay
FFMIS	Florida Financial Management Information System
FHP	Florida Highway Patrol
FLAIR	Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem
F.S.	Florida Statutes
FTP	Florida Transportation Plan
GAA	General Appropriations Act

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

GR	General Revenue Fund
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
IOE	Itemization of Expenditure
IT	Information Technology
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
LAN	Local Area Network
LAS/PBS	Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem
LBC	Legislative Budget Commission
LBR	Legislative Budget Request
L.O.F.	Laws of Florida
LOS	Level of Service
LRPP	Long-Range Program Plan
MAN	Metropolitan Area Network (Information Technology)
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century Act
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MRP	Maintenance Rating Program
NASBO	National Association of State Budget Officers
NEPA	The National Environmental Policy Act
OPB	Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OTTED	Office of Tourism, Trade and Economic Development
PAVMARS	Pavement Management Reporting System
PBPB/PB2	Performance-Based Program Budgeting
PCS	Pavement Condition Survey

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

P&RP	Program & Resource Plan
RCI	Roadway Characteristics Inventory
SA	Supplemental Agreement
SHS	State Highway System
SIS	Strategic Intermodal System
STO	State Technology Office
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TCS	Trends and Conditions Statement
TF	Trust Fund
TMA	Transportation Management Association
TRIP	Transportation Regional Incentive Program
TRW	Technology Review Workgroup
VMT/DVMT	Vehicle Miles of Travel/Daily VMT
WAGES	Work and Gain Economic Stability (Agency for Workforce Innovation)
WAN	Wide Area Network (Information Technology)
WPA	Work Program Administration
ZBB	Zero-Based Budgeting