

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

2:00p.m. April 13, 2016
Cape Coral City Hall Building Room 220A
1015 Cultural Park Boulevard
Cape Coral, Florida 33990



AGENDA

Call to Order

Roll Call

New Business

1. Public Comments on New Business Items
2. +Overview of the End of Year Audit for FY 2014/2015 (CLA)
3. +Discussion on the Regional Transportation Alliance Summit (Don Scott)
4. Update on the Sales Tax Referendums from other Communities in Florida (Don Scott)
5. Discussion on the National Transportation Performance Management (TPM) Implementation Review Survey (Don Scott)
6. MPO Project Update (Don Scott)

Other Business

7. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
8. Announcements
9. Information and Distribution Items

Adjournment

* Action Items + May Require Action

All meetings of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) are open to the public. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact Mr. Johnny Limbaugh at the Lee MPO 48 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 330-2242; if you are hearing or speech impaired call (800) 955-8770 Voice / (800) 955-8771 TDD. Or, e-mail jlimbaugh@leempo.com.

The MPO's planning process is conducted in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes. Any person or beneficiary who believes he has been discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, or familial status may file a complaint with the Lee County MPO Title VI Coordinator Johnny Limbaugh at (293) 330-2242 or by writing him at P.O. Box 150045, Cape Coral, Florida 33915-0045.

OVERVIEW OF THE END OF YEAR AUDIT FOR FY 2014/2015

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Provide an overview of the FY 2014/2015 end of year audit (**attached**).

The MPO's audit firm, CliftonLarsonAllen LLP, will be at the meeting to provide an overview of the audit and answer questions.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
AND REGULATORY REPORTS**

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TABLE OF CONTENTS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT	1
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS	4
BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	
STATEMENT OF NET POSITION	9
STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES	10
BALANCE SHEET – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS	11
RECONCILIATION OF THE BALANCE SHEET – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS TO THE STATEMENT OF NET POSITION	12
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS	13
RECONCILIATION OF THE STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS TO THE STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES	14
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	15
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
SCHEDULE OF PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THE NET PENSION LIABILITY	32
SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS	33
OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	34
NOTES TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	35
REGULATORY REPORTS	
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH <i>GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS</i>	37
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS THAT COULD HAVE A DIRECT AND MATERIAL EFFECT ON EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM, ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE, AND ON THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL WARDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133	39
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS	41

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

MANAGEMENT LETTER BASED ON RULE 10.554(1)(I) OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA	45
APPENDIX A – PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT	49



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP
CLAconnect.com

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cape Coral, Florida

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities and general fund of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the MPO's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors' judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

Opinions

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities and general fund of the MPO as of June 30, 2015, and the respective changes in financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Emphasis of a Matter

As described in Note 5 and Note 7 to the financial statements, during the year ended June 30, 2015, the MPO adopted the provisions of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement (GASBS) No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions – an Amendment of GASB Statement No. 27*, which was subsequently amended by GASBS No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date*. As a result of implementation of GASBS No. 68, the MPO reported a restatement for the change in accounting principle. The auditors' opinion was not modified with respect to this restatement.

Other Matters

Required Supplementary Information

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the management's discussion and analysis, as listed on the table of contents, be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the MPO's basic financial statements. The schedule of expenditures of federal awards, as required by U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*, is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The schedule of expenditures of federal awards is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relate directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization

Other Reporting Required by *Government Auditing Standards*

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated March 16, 2016, on our consideration of the MPO's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the result of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the MPO's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Fort Myers, Florida
March 16, 2016

MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

The Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO) serves as the transportation planning agency for Lee County, Florida (the County). It is responsible for transportation planning in Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel, Estero and unincorporated Lee County, Florida. The MPO's mission is to provide leadership in planning and promoting a comprehensive intermodal surface transportation system that will provide for regional mobility, encourage a positive investment climate and foster sustainable development sensitive to community and natural resources. The MPO receives funding from Federal Highway Administration, the Florida Department of Transportation, the State of Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, the Federal Transit Administration and the local jurisdictions.

The MPO's financial report presents a narrative overview and an analysis of the financial activities of the MPO as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015. The prior period information available is for the period July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

Financial Highlights

- The assets and deferred outflows of resources of the MPO exceeded its liabilities and deferred inflows of resources at June 30, 2015 by \$25,499 (net position). The unrestricted portion of \$13,604 may be used to meet the MPO's ongoing obligations to its constituents. The reduction in net position from the previous year can be attributed to an increase in funding commitments to ongoing MPO projects, as well as the adoption of the new pension standards, which caused the MPO to recognize a net pension liability of \$170,045 at June 30, 2015.
- As of June 30, 2015, the MPO's general fund reported an ending fund balance of \$237,129.

Overview of the Financial Statements

This discussion and analysis is intended to serve as an introduction to the MPO's basic financial statements. These basic statements consist of three sections: government-wide financial statements, fund financial statements, and notes to the financial statements.

Government-Wide Financial Statements

The government-wide financial statements provide both long-term and short-term information about the MPO's overall financial status. These statements use a format similar to a private sector business. They include a statement of net position and a statement of activities.

The statement of net position presents information on the MPO's assets and liabilities. Net position, the difference between these assets and liabilities, are a useful way to measure the MPO's financial health.

The statement of activities presents information showing how the MPO's net position changed during this fiscal year. All of the current year's revenues and expenses are accounted for in the statement of activities regardless of when cash is received or paid. This statement separates program revenue (charges for services, grants, and contributions) from general revenue (including taxes), which shows the extent to which each program must rely on taxes for funding.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Overview of the Financial Statements (Continued)

Fund Financial Statements

Traditional users of governmental financial statements will find the fund financial statements presentation more familiar. A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. The MPO, like other governments, uses fund accounting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance-related legal requirements. The MPO uses a general fund to account for all activities of the MPO.

Governmental Funds

Governmental funds are used to account for essentially the same functions reported as governmental activities in the government-wide financial statements. However, this set of financial statements focuses on events that produce near-term inflows and outflows of spendable resources as well as on the balances of spendable resources available at the end of the fiscal year and is a narrower focus than the government-wide financial statements.

By comparing functions between the two sets of statements for governmental funds and governmental activities, readers may better understand the long-term impact of the government's near-term financing decisions. Both the governmental fund balance sheet and the governmental fund statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balance provide a reconciliation to facilitate this comparison.

Budgetary information is not included in the accompanying financial statements as the MPO is not required to legally adopt a budget for its General Fund.

Notes to Basic Financial Statements

The notes provide additional information that is essential to a full understanding of the data provided in the government-wide and fund financial statements. The notes to basic financial statements can be found on pages 15 through 31 of this report.

Government-Wide Financial Analysis

As noted earlier, changes in net position over time can be a useful indicator of a government's financial position. As of fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, the assets of the MPO exceeded liabilities by \$25,499.

At the end of the current fiscal year, the MPO reported positive balances in all categories of net position.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Government-Wide Financial Analysis (Continued)

Following is a summary of the MPO's net position as of June 30, 2015 and 2014:

	2015	2014
Cash	\$ 286,240	\$ 70,315
Grants Receivable	500,317	427,685
Prepaid Expenses	12,842	15,002
Capital Assets, Net	11,895	14,599
Total Assets	811,294	527,601
Deferred Outflows of Resources	127,461	-
Accounts Payable	539,721	122,267
Accrued Payroll and Other Liabilities	22,549	12,966
Net Pension Liability	170,045	-
Compensated Absences	48,143	51,285
Total Liabilities	780,458	186,518
Deferred Inflows of Resources	132,798	-
Investment in Capital Assets	11,895	14,599
Unrestricted	13,604	326,484
Total Net Position	\$ 25,499	\$ 341,083

Governmental activities decreased the MPO's net position by \$315,584 during the year ended June 30, 2015. Of this total decrease in net position, \$156,612 related to the MPO's adoption of the provisions of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement (GASBS) No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions – an Amendment of GASB Statement No. 27*, which was subsequently amended by GASBS No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date*. As a result of implementation of GASBS No. 68, the MPO reported a restatement for the change in accounting principle.

Following is a summary of the MPO's statement of activities for the years ended June 30, 2015 and 2014, respectively:

	2015	2014
REVENUES		
Program Revenues:		
Transportation Grants	\$ 1,930,245	\$ 1,393,509
Intergovernmental	72,057	70,034
Other Income	-	119
Total Revenues	2,002,302	1,463,662
EXPENSES		
Transportation and General Government	2,133,415	1,339,870
INCREASE (DECREASE) IN NET POSITION	\$ (131,113)	\$ 123,792

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Government-Wide Financial Analysis (Continued)

The MPO obtains its grant revenue from several different sources. The MPO receives Federal Planning dollars (PL funding) for operations and planning tasks, receives TIGER Grant funding for the Design/Build project, Federal Transit Administration funding for transit planning activities, and State Transportation Disadvantaged Planning funds to fund the planning tasks involved with the Transportation Disadvantaged Program. The MPO also receives local government funding through assessments that are used to for general operations, as the federal and state grant programs listed above reimburse the MPO for specific expenditures. The MPO also seeks other state and federal grants and funding (SU) to fund specific projects such as the recent transit studies.

Financial Analysis of the MPO's Fund

As noted earlier, the MPO uses fund accounting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance related legal requirements. Governmental funds provide information on near-term inflows, outflows, and balances of spendable resources. This information is useful in assessing the MPO's financing requirements.

The MPO reports a single governmental fund, which is the general fund. All of the MPO's fund balance in the general fund is either nonspendable or unassigned.

Other Economic Factors

The MPO has an agreement with Lee County, Florida and LeeTran to use up to 20% of the yearly allocation of Section 5305 funds for MPO transit related projects. Based on the current funding allocations, this equates to about \$50,000 in transit planning funding.

In 2013, the MPO was awarded \$10,470,000 in TIGER grant funding from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) that is currently being used for the design and construction of bicycle, pedestrian and transit improvements.

In addition, the MPO is currently developing a Cape Coral Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for \$152,000 and a Round-a-bout Feasibility Study for \$400,000 that is being funded with Federal (SU) dollars.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Requests for Information

This financial report is designed to provide a general overview of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's finances for all those with an interest in the government's finances. Questions concerning any of the information provided in this report or requests for additional financial information should be addressed as follows:

Don Scott
Executive Director
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization

USPS Mail:
P.O. Box 150045
Cape Coral, Florida 33915-0045

Physical Address:
815 Nicholas Parkway East
Cape Coral, FL 33990

BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
STATEMENT OF NET POSITION
JUNE 30, 2015**

	Governmental Activities
ASSETS	
Cash	\$ 286,240
Grants Receivable	500,317
Prepaid Expenses	12,842
Capital Assets, Net	11,895
Total Assets	811,294
DEFERRED OUTFLOWS OF RESOURCES	
Pension Related Amounts	127,461
Total Assets and Deferred Outflows of Resources	938,755
LIABILITIES	
Accounts Payable	539,721
Accrued Payroll and Other Liabilities	22,549
Due in More than One Year:	
Net Pension Liability	170,045
Compensated Absences	48,143
Total Liabilities	780,458
DEFERRED INFLOWS OF RESOURCES	
Pension Related Amounts	132,798
Total Liabilities and Deferred Inflows of Resources	913,256
NET POSITION	
Investment in Capital Assets	11,895
Unrestricted	13,604
Total Net Position	\$ 25,499

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

	Governmental Activities
PROGRAM EXPENSES	
Transportation:	
Personal Services	\$ 356,785
Operating Expenses	1,772,241
Depreciation	4,389
Total Program Expenses	2,133,415
PROGRAM REVENUES	
Charges for Services	72,057
Transportation Grants	1,930,245
Total Program Revenues	2,002,302
DECREASE IN NET POSITION	(131,113)
Net Position, Beginning of Year, as Restated (Note 7)	156,612
NET POSITION, END OF YEAR	\$ 25,499

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BALANCE SHEET – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS
JUNE 30, 2015**

	General Fund
ASSETS	
Cash	\$ 286,240
Grants Receivable	500,317
Prepaid Expenses	12,842
Total Assets	\$ 799,399
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES	
LIABILITIES	
Accounts Payable	\$ 539,721
Accrued Payroll and Other Liabilities	22,549
Total Liabilities	562,270
FUND BALANCES	
Nonspendable	12,842
Unassigned	224,287
Total Fund Balances	237,129
Total Liabilities and Fund Balances	\$ 799,399

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
RECONCILIATION OF THE BALANCE SHEET – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS
TO THE STATEMENT OF NET POSITION
JUNE 30, 2015**

Total Governmental Fund Balance	\$	237,129
Amounts reported for governmental activities in the Statement of Net Position are different because:		
Capital assets used in governmental activities are not financial resources and, therefore, are not reported in the fund statements		11,895
Deferred outflows of resources related to net pension liabilities do not have a current financial resources focus and, therefore, are not recognized in the governmental fund statements		127,461
Deferred inflows of resources related to net pension liabilities do not have a current financial resources focus and, therefore, are not recognized in the governmental fund statements		(132,798)
Long-term liabilities, including net pension liability and compensated absences, are not due and payable in the current period and, therefore, are not reported in the fund statements		<u>(218,188)</u>
Net Position of Governmental Activities	\$	<u><u>25,499</u></u>

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND
CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

	<u>General Fund</u>
REVENUES	
Transportation Grants	\$ 1,930,245
Intergovernmental	72,057
Total Revenues	<u>2,002,302</u>
 EXPENDITURES	
Current:	
Personal Services	369,017
Operating Expenditures	1,772,241
Capital Outlay	1,684
Total Expenditures	<u>2,142,942</u>
 NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE	 (140,640)
 Fund Balance, Beginning of Year	 <u>377,769</u>
 FUND BALANCE, END OF YEAR	 <u><u>\$ 237,129</u></u>

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
RECONCILIATION OF THE STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES – GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS
TO THE STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Net Change in Fund Balance - Governmental Funds	\$ (140,640)
Amounts reported for governmental activities in the Statement of Activities are different because:	
Governmental funds report capital outlays as expenditures. However, in the Statement of Activities, the cost of those assets is allocated over their estimated useful lives and reported as depreciation expense.	
Capital Outlays During Fiscal Period	1,684
Depreciation Expense During Year	(4,389)
Some expenses reported in the Statement of Activities do not require the use of current financial resources and, therefore, are not reported as expenditures in the fund statements	
Change in Compensated Absences During Year	3,142
Net effect of pension related expenses which decrease net position and contributions subsequent to the measurement date which increase net position	<u>9,090</u>
Change in Net Position of Governmental Activities	<u><u>\$ (131,113)</u></u>

See accompanying Notes to Basic Financial Statements.

NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 1 ORGANIZATION AND REPORTING ENTITY

The Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO), was established in 1977 following the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1974. The MPO is authorized pursuant to Florida Statutes, Section 339.175. Historically the MPO's operations were included within the net position and activities of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, who had provided office space and administrative services to the MPO. On December 21, 2011, the MPO separated from the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council and became an independent entity.

The task of the MPO is to develop plans, policies and priorities that guide local decision making on transportation issues. Principal responsibilities include the development of a 20-year Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), a five-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and related transportation planning studies and projects.

The MPO is governed by a sixteen member board of elected officials representing municipal governments and the Lee County Board of County Commissioners. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 1 Office is also represented on the board by the District Secretary or designee who is a non-voting member. The MPO's Executive Director oversees the MPO's daily operations and reports to the board. The MPO has considered any entities for which it has oversight, and there are none meeting the criteria for inclusion in their financial statements.

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation

The financial statements of the MPO have been prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as applied to government units. GASB is the accepted standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles in the United States of America. The more significant of the government's accounting policies are described below.

Government-Wide and Fund Financial Statements

The government-wide financial statements (i.e., the statement of net position and the statement of activities) report information on all activities of the government. The MPO only has governmental activities and does not engage in any business-type activities.

The statement of activities demonstrates the degree to which the direct expenses of a given function or segment is offset by program revenues. Direct expenses are those that are clearly identifiable with a specific function or segment. Program revenues include operating grants and intergovernmental revenues supplied by Lee County, Florida (the County) and municipalities within the County. General revenues include investment earnings, miscellaneous income, and other revenues not considered to directly support program activities.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Government-Wide and Fund Financial Statements (Continued)

Separate financial statements are provided for governmental funds. Fund financial statements are presented for the MPO's general fund.

Measurement Focus, Basis of Accounting, and Financial Statement Presentation

The government-wide financial statements are reported using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of related cash flows. Grants and similar items are recognized as revenue as soon as all eligibility requirements imposed by the provider have been met.

Governmental fund financial statements are reported using the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized as soon as they are both measurable and available.

Revenues are considered to be available when they are collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to pay liabilities of the current period. For this purpose, the MPO considers revenues to be available generally if they are collected within 60 days of the end of the current fiscal period, unless collections are delayed beyond a normal time of receipt due to unusual circumstances. Expenditures generally are recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting.

Budgets

Budgetary information is not included in the accompanying financial statements as the MPO is not required to legally adopt a budget for its general fund.

The MPO prepares a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) every two years, which identifies the planning budget and planning activities to be undertaken within the following four categories: administration, systems monitoring, systems planning, and project planning. The MPO is required to have the UPWP approved and submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation by May 15th of every other year.

Deposits and Investments

Cash includes amounts on hand and in demand deposit accounts. The MPO does not have a written investment policy. Rather, it has adopted the guidelines for the investment of public funds in excess of amounts needed to meet current operating expenses, in accordance with Section 218.415, Florida Statutes. As of June 30, 2015, the MPO had no investments.

Receivables

No substantial losses are anticipated from present receivable balances, therefore, no allowance for uncollectible accounts is deemed necessary.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Capital Assets

Capital assets are reported in governmental activities in the government-wide financial statements. Capital assets are recorded at their historical cost if purchased. Donated capital assets are recorded at estimated market value at the date of donation. For the fund financial statements capital assets are not capitalized in the funds used to acquire or construct them. Instead, capital acquisition and construction are reflected as expenditures in governmental funds.

The costs of normal maintenance and repairs that do not add to the value of the asset or materially extend asset lives are not capitalized.

The MPO's computer software and equipment are depreciated using the straight-line method over the following estimated useful lives:

<u>Assets</u>	<u>Estimated Useful Life</u>
Office Equipment	5 Years
Computer Software and Equipment	3 Years

Compensated Absences

It is the MPO's policy to permit regular full-time and regular part-time employees to accumulate earned but unused vacation benefits, which will be paid to employees upon separation from service if they meet certain criteria. Compensated absences are accrued on an hourly basis per bi-weekly pay period based on number of years of continuous service; the liability for compensated absences is reported in the government-wide financial statements, which generates a reconciling item between the governmental funds and the government-wide financial statement presentation. A total of \$39,587 of vacation benefits were earned, \$20,361 were used, and \$51,285 were rolled forward from the previous year, resulting in an ending compensated absences balance of \$48,143 for the year ended June 30, 2015.

Pensions

In the government-wide statement of net position, liabilities are recognized for the MPO's proportionate share of each pension plan's net pension liability. For purposes of measuring the net pension liability, deferred outflows/inflows of resources, and pension expense, information about the fiduciary net position of the Florida Retirement System (FRS) defined benefit plan and the Health Insurance Subsidy (HIS) and additions to/deductions from FRS's and HIS's fiduciary net position have been determined on the same basis as they are reported by the FRS and HIS plans. For this purpose, plan contributions are recognized as of employer payroll paid dates and benefit payments and refunds of employee contributions are recognized when due and payable in accordance with the benefit terms. Investments are reported at fair value.

LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Deferred Outflows/Inflows of Resources

In addition to assets, the statement of financial position reports a separate section for deferred outflows of resources. This separate financial statement element, *deferred outflows of resources*, represents a consumption of net position that applies to a future period(s) and so will *not* be recognized as an outflow of resources (expense/expenditure) until then. The deferred outflows of resources reported in the MPO's statement of net position represent changes in actuarial assumptions, the net difference between projected and actual earnings on Health Insurance Subsidy Program investments, changes in the proportion and differences between the MPO's contributions and proportionate share of contributions, and the MPO's contributions subsequent to the measurement date, relating to the Florida Retirement System Pension Plan and the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program. These amounts will be recognized as increases in pension expense in future years.

In addition to liabilities, the statement of financial position reports a separate section for deferred inflows of resources. This separate financial statement element, *deferred inflows of resources*, represents an acquisition of net position that applies to a future period(s) and so will *not* be recognized as an inflow of resources (revenue) until that time. The deferred inflows of resources reported in the MPO's statement of net position represent the difference between expected and actual economic experience, the net difference between projected and actual earnings on Florida Retirement System Pension investments, and changes in the proportion and differences between the Council's contributions and proportionate share of contributions relating to the Florida Retirement System Pension Plan and the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program. These amounts will be recognized as reductions in pension expense in future years.

Fund Balance

Governmental fund equity is classified as fund balance. Nonspendable fund balances are balances that cannot be spent because they are either (a) not in spendable form or; (b) legally contractually required to be maintained intact. Spendable fund balances are further segregated into five separate categories, based on a hierarchy of spending constraints.

- **Restricted**: Amounts that can be spent only for the specific purposes stipulated by: (a) external resource providers (i.e., granting agencies such as Florida Department of Transportation, Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration or similar external entities); or (b) imposed by law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation.
- **Committed**: Amounts that can be used only for the specific purposes determined by a formal action of the MPO's governing board, the MPO's highest level of decision-making authority. Commitments may be changed or lifted only by the MPO's governing board taking the same formal action that imposed the constraint originally.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Fund Balance (Continued)

- **Assigned:** Amounts that include spendable fund balance amounts established by the Executive Director of the MPO that are intended to be used for a specific purpose that are neither considered restricted or committed.
- **Unassigned:** This classification represents fund balance that has not been restricted, committed, or assigned to specific purposes. The MPO's entire spendable fund balance in the general fund is classified as unassigned.

Although the MPO does not have a formal spending prioritization policy, it is assumed that in instances when expenditures are incurred for purposes for which amounts in either restricted or unrestricted fund balance classifications could be used, restricted fund balance would be spent first. Remaining unrestricted fund balance would be spent as follows: committed amounts would be reduced first, followed by assigned amounts, and then unassigned.

Net Position

Net position represents the difference between assets and liabilities in the government-wide financial statements. Net position invested in capital assets consists of capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation. The MPO does not have any related long-term debt used to acquire capital assets. Net position is reported as restricted in the government-wide financial statements when there are limitations imposed on their use through external restrictions imposed by creditors, grantors, laws or regulations of other governments.

New Accounting Pronouncements

For the year ended June 30, 2015, the financial statements include the impact of adoption of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement (GASBS) No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions – An Amendment of GASB Statement No. 27* (GASBS 68), and GASBS No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date – an Amendment of GASB Statement No. 68* (GASBS 71).

GASBS 68 addresses accounting and financial reporting for pensions provided to governmental employees through pension plans that are administered by trusts. The Council participates in the Florida Retirement System that is administered by the state of Florida. Under this standard, the Council is required to report a net pension liability, pension expense, and pension-related deferred inflows and outflows, of resources based on its proportionate share of the collective amounts for all the governments in the Florida Retirement System. GASBS 71 is required to be applied simultaneously with the provisions of GASBS 68. The objective of this Statement is to address an issue regarding application of the transition provisions of GASBS 68. The issue relates to amounts associated with contributions, if any, made by a state or local government employer or non-employer contributing entity to a defined benefit pension plan after the measurement date of the government's beginning net pension liability.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 3 DEPOSITS

At June 30, 2015, the book balance of the MPO's deposits was \$286,240, and the bank balance was \$308,962. The difference between book and bank balances is due to outstanding checks.

The bank balance is insured by federal depository insurance and, for any amount in excess of such federal depository insurance, is collateralized pursuant to Chapter 280, Florida Statutes. Under this Chapter, in the event of default by a participating financial institution (a qualified public depository), all participating institutions are obligated to reimburse the government for the loss.

NOTE 4 CAPITAL ASSETS

Capital asset activity for the year ended June 30, 2015 is summarized as follows:

	Balance September 30, 2014	Additions	Deletions	Transfers	Balance September 30, 2015
Capital Assets not being Depreciated:					
Construction in Progress	\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (9,000)	\$ -
Capital Assets being Depreciated:					
Furniture and Equipment	13,028	1,684	-	9,000	23,712
Less: Accumulated Depreciation for:					
Furniture and Equipment	7,429	4,388	-	-	11,817
Total Capital Assets, being Depreciated, Net	5,599	(2,704)	-	9,000	11,895
Capital Assets, Net	\$ 14,599	\$ (2,704)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,895

Depreciation expense for the year ended June 30, 2015 was \$4,388.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 5 JOINT PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT FOR FEDERAL TRANSIT

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5305 funds are allocated to the MPO for transit planning tasks that are identified in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and the MPO's annual approved FTA grant application. In the past, the MPO had passed these funds through to the Transportation Authority of Lee County, Florida (LeeTran) to conduct the various transit planning tasks identified in the UPWP. Under an Interlocal agreement with LeeTran, the MPO has now begun spending up to 20% of the funds on transit planning activities with the remainder allocated to LeeTran funded transit planning activities. During the year ended June 30, 2015, the MPO spent \$47,200 on transit related consultant funded projects and LeeTran spent a total of \$182,073 of the 5305 funds.

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS

Background

The Florida Retirement System (FRS) was created by Chapter 121, Florida Statutes, to provide a defined benefit pension plan for participating public employees. The FRS was amended in 1998 to add the Deferred Retirement Option Program under the defined benefit plan and amended in 2000 to provide a defined contribution plan alternative to the defined benefit plan for FRS members effective July 1, 2002. This integrated defined contribution pension plan is the FRS Investment Plan. Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, established the Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy (HIS) Program, a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan, to assist retired members of any State-administered retirement system in paying the costs of health insurance.

Essentially all regular employees of the MPO are eligible to enroll as members of the State-administered FRS. Provisions relating to the FRS are established by Chapters 121 and 122, Florida Statutes; Chapter 112, Part IV, Florida Statutes; Chapter 238, Florida Statutes; and FRS Rules, Chapter 60S, Florida Administrative Code; wherein eligibility, contributions, and benefits are defined and described in detail. Such provisions may be amended at any time by further action from the Florida Legislature. The FRS is a single retirement system administered by the Florida Department of Management Services, Division of Retirement, and consists of the two cost-sharing, multiple-employer defined benefit plans and other nonintegrated programs. A comprehensive annual financial report of the FRS, which includes its financial statements, required supplementary information, actuarial report, and other relevant information, is available from the Florida Department of Management Services' Web site (www.dms.myflorida.com).

The MPO's pension expense totaled \$27,609 for both the FRS Pension Plan and HIS Plan for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015.

LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan

Plan Description

The Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (FRS Plan) is a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan, with a Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) for eligible employees. The general classes of membership are as follows:

- *Regular Class* – Members of the FRS who do not qualify for membership in the other classes.
- *Elected County Officers Class* – Members who hold specified elective offices in local government.
- *Senior Management Service Class (SMSC)* – Members in senior management level positions.
- *Special Risk Class* – Members who are special risk employees, such as law enforcement officers, meet the criteria to qualify for this class.

Employees enrolled in the FRS Plan prior to July 1, 2011, vest at 6 years of creditable service and employees enrolled in the FRS Plan on or after July 1, 2011, vest at 8 years of creditable service. All vested members, enrolled prior to July 1, 2011, are eligible for normal retirement benefits at age 62 or at any age after 30 years of service, except for members classified as special risk who are eligible for normal retirement benefits at age 55 or at any age after 25 years of service. All members enrolled in the FRS Plan on or after July 1, 2011, once vested, are eligible for normal retirement benefits at age 65 or any time after 33 years of creditable service, except for members classified as special risk who are eligible for normal retirement benefits at age 60 or at any age after 30 years of service. Employees enrolled in the FRS Plan may include up to 4 years of credit for military service toward creditable service. The FRS Plan also includes an early retirement provision; however, there is a benefit reduction for each year a member retires before his or her normal retirement date. The FRS Plan provides retirement, disability, death benefits, and annual cost-of-living adjustments to eligible participants.

DROP, subject to provisions of Section 121.091, Florida Statutes, permits employees eligible for normal retirement under the FRS Plan to defer receipt of monthly benefit payments while continuing employment with an FRS participating employer. An employee may participate in DROP for a period not to exceed 60 months after electing to participate, except that certain instructional personnel may participate for up to 96 months. During the period of DROP participation, deferred monthly benefits are held in the FRS Trust Fund and accrue interest. The net pension liability does not include amounts for DROP participants, as these members are considered retired and are not accruing additional pension benefits.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (Continued)

Benefits Provided

Benefits under the FRS Plan are computed on the basis of age and/or years of service, average final compensation, and service credit. Credit for each year of service is expressed as a percentage of the average final compensation. For members initially enrolled before July 1, 2011, the average final compensation is the average of the 5 highest fiscal years' earnings; for members initially enrolled on or after July 1, 2011, the average final compensation is the average of the 8 highest fiscal years' earnings. The total percentage value of the benefit received is determined by calculating the total value of all service, which is based on the retirement class to which the member belonged when the service credit was earned. Members are eligible for in-line-of-duty or regular disability and survivors' benefits. The following chart shows the percentage value for each year of service credit earned:

<u>Class, Initial Enrollment, and Retirement Age/Years of Service:</u>	<u>% Value</u>
Regular Class members initially enrolled before July 1, 2011	
Retirement up to age 62 or up to 30 years of service	1.60
Retirement up to age 63 or up to 31 years of service	1.63
Retirement up to age 64 or up to 32 years of service	1.65
Retirement up to age 65 or up to 33 years of service	1.68
Regular Class members initially enrolled on or after July 1, 2011	
Retirement up to age 65 or up to 33 years of service	1.60
Retirement up to age 66 or up to 34 years of service	1.63
Retirement up to age 67 or up to 35 years of service	1.65
Retirement up to age 68 or up to 36 years of service	1.68
Elected County Officers	3.00
Senior Management Service Class	2.00
Special Risk Regular	
Service from December 1, 1970, through September 30, 1974	2.00
Service on and after October 1, 1974	3.00

As provided in Section 121.101, Florida Statutes, if the member is initially enrolled in the FRS before July 1, 2011, and all service credit was accrued before July 1, 2011, the annual cost-of-living adjustment is 3% per year. If the member is initially enrolled before July 1, 2011, and has service credit on or after July 1, 2011, there is an individually calculated cost-of-living adjustment. The annual cost-of-living adjustment is a proportion of 3% determined by dividing the sum of the pre-July 2011 service credit by the total service credit at retirement multiplied by 3%. FRS Plan members initially enrolled on or after July 1, 2011, will not have a cost-of-living adjustment after retirement.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (Continued)

Contributions

The Florida Legislature establishes contribution rates for participating employers and employees. Effective July 1, 2011, all FRS Plan members (except those in DROP) are required to make 3% employee contributions on a pretax basis. The contribution rates attributable to the MPO, effective July 1, 2014, were applied to employee salaries as follows: regular employees 7.37%, county elected officials 43.24%, senior management 21.14%, and DROP participants 12.28%. The MPO's contributions to the FRS Plan were \$32,855 for the year ended June 30, 2015.

Pension Costs

At June 30, 2015, the MPO reported a liability of \$76,760 for its proportionate share of the FRS Plan's net pension liability. The net pension liability was measured as of June 30, 2014, and the total pension liability used to calculate the net pension liability was determined by an actuarial valuation as of July 1, 2014. The MPO's proportion of the net pension liability was based on the MPO's contributions received by FRS during the measurement period for employer payroll paid dates from July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014, relative to the total employer contributions received from all of FRS's participating employers. At June 30, 2014, the MPO's proportion was 0.00126% which was an increase of 0.00049% from its proportion measured as of June 30, 2013.

For the year ended June 30, 2015, the MPO recognized pension expense of \$20,509 for its proportionate share of FRS's pension expense. In addition, the MPO reported its proportionate share of FRS's deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources from the following sources:

Description	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Differences Between Expected and Actual Economic Experience	\$ -	\$ 4,750
Changes in Actuarial Assumptions	13,293	-
Net Difference Between Projected and Actual Earnings on Pension Plan Investments	-	128,048
Changes in Proportion and Differences Between Lee MPO Contributions and Proportionate Share of Contributions	70,252	-
District Contributions Subsequent to the Measurement Date	32,855	-
Total	<u>\$ 116,400</u>	<u>\$ 132,798</u>

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (Continued)

Pension Costs (Continued)

\$32,855 reported as deferred outflows of resources related to pensions resulting from MPO contributions to the FRS Plan subsequent to the measurement date will be recognized as a reduction of the net pension liability in the year ended June 30, 2016. Other amounts reported as deferred outflows and inflows of resources related to pensions will be recognized as an increase (decrease) in pension expense as follows:

<u>Year Ending June 30,</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2016	\$ (10,998)
2017	(10,998)
2018	(10,998)
2019	(10,998)
2020	(10,998)
Thereafter	5,739

Actuarial Assumptions

The total pension liability in the July 1, 2014, actuarial valuation was determined using the following actuarial assumptions, applied to all periods included in the measurement:

Inflation	2.60% per year
Salary Increases	3.25%, Average, Including Inflation
Investment Rate of Return	7.65%, Net of Pension Plan Investment Expense, Including Inflation

Mortality rates were based on the Generational RP-2000 with Projection Scale BB. The actuarial assumptions used in the July 1, 2014, valuation were based on the results of an actuarial experience study for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2013.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (Continued)

Actuarial Assumptions (Continued)

The long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was not based on historical returns, but instead is based on a forward-looking capital market economic model. The allocation policy's description of each asset class was used to map the target allocation to the asset classes shown below. Each asset class assumption is based on a consistent set of underlying assumptions, and includes an adjustment for the inflation assumption. The target allocation, as outlined in the FRS Plan's investment policy and best estimates of arithmetic and geometric real rates of return for each major asset class are summarized in the following table:

Asset Class	Target Allocation	Annual Arithmetic Return	Compound Annual (Geometric) Return	Standard Deviation
Cash	1.00%	3.11%	3.10%	1.65%
Intermediate-Term Bonds	18.00%	4.18%	4.05%	5.15%
High Yield Bonds	3.00%	6.79%	6.25%	10.95%
Broad US Equities	26.50%	8.51%	6.95%	18.90%
Developed Foreign Equities	21.20%	8.66%	6.85%	20.40%
Emerging Market Equities	5.30%	11.58%	7.60%	31.15%
Private Equity	6.00%	11.80%	8.11%	30.00%
Hedge Funds / Absolute Return	7.00%	5.81%	5.35%	10.00%
Real Estate (Property)	12.00%	7.11%	6.35%	13.00%
Totals	100.00%			
Assumed Inflation - Mean		2.60%		13.00%

Discount Rate

The discount rate used to measure the total pension liability was 7.65% for the FRS Plan. The projection of cash flows used to determine the discount rate assumed that employee and employer contributions will be made at the rate specified in statute. Based on that assumption, each of the pension plan's fiduciary net position was projected to be available to make all projected future benefit payments of current active and inactive employees. Therefore, the long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was applied to all periods of projected benefit payments to determine the total pension liability.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Florida Retirement System Pension Plan (Continued)

Pension Liability Sensitivity

The following presents the MPO's proportionate share of the net pension liability for the FRS Plan, calculated using the discount rate disclosed in the preceding paragraph, as well as what the MPO's proportionate share of the net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate one percentage point lower or one percentage point higher than the current discount rate:

Description	1% Decrease	Current Discount Rate	1% Increase in Discount Rate
FRS Plan Discount Rate	6.65%	7.65%	8.65%
Lee MPO's Proportionate Share of the FRS Plan Net Pension Liability	\$ 328,311	\$ 76,760	\$ (132,483)

Pension Plan Fiduciary Net Position

Detailed information about the FRS Plan's fiduciary's net position is available in a separately-issued FRS Pension Plan and Other State-Administered Systems Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. That report may be obtained through the Florida Department of Management Services website at <http://www.dms.myflorida.com>.

Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program

Plan Description

The Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program (HIS Plan) is a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan established under Section 112.363, Florida Statutes, and may be amended by the Florida Legislature at any time. The benefit is a monthly payment to assist retirees of State-administered retirement systems in paying their health insurance costs and is administered by the Florida Department of Management Services, Division of Retirement.

Benefits Provided

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, eligible retirees and beneficiaries received a monthly HIS payment of \$5 for each year of creditable service completed at the time of retirement, with a minimum HIS payment of \$30 and a maximum HIS payment of \$150 per month, pursuant to Section 112.363, Florida Statutes. To be eligible to receive a HIS Plan benefit, a retiree under a State-administered retirement system must provide proof of health insurance coverage, which may include Medicare.

Contributions

The HIS Plan is funded by required contributions from FRS participating employers as set by the Florida Legislature. Employer contributions are a percentage of gross compensation for all active FRS members. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, the contribution rate was 1.26% of payroll pursuant to section 112.363, Florida Statutes. The MPO contributed 100% of its statutorily required contributions for the current and preceding 3 years.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program (Continued)

Contributions (Continued)

HIS Plan contributions are deposited in a separate trust fund from which payments are authorized. HIS Plan benefits are not guaranteed and are subject to annual legislative appropriation. In the event the legislative appropriation or available funds fail to provide full subsidy benefits to all participants, benefits may be reduced or canceled. The MPO's contributions to the HIS Plan were \$3,843 for the year ended June 30, 2015.

Pension Costs

At June 30, 2015, the MPO reported a liability of \$93,285 for its proportionate share of the HIS Plan's net pension liability. The net pension liability was measured as of June 30, 2014, and the total pension liability used to calculate the net pension liability was determined by an actuarial valuation as of July 1, 2014. The MPO's proportion of the net pension liability was based on the MPO's contributions received during the measurement period for employer payroll paid dates from July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014, relative to the total employer contributions received from all participating employers. At June 30, 2014, the MPO's proportion was 0.000998%, which was an increase of 0.000051% from its proportion measured as of June 30, 2013.

For the year ended June 30, 2015, the MPO recognized pension expense of \$7,100 for its proportionate share of HIS's pension expense. In addition, the MPO reported its proportionate share of HIS's deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources from the following sources:

Description	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Differences Between Expected and Actual Economic Experience	\$ -	\$ -
Changes in Actuarial Assumptions	3,318	-
Net Difference Between Projected and Actual Earnings on HIS Program Investments	45	-
Changes in Proportion and Differences Between Lee MPO Contributions and Proportionate Share of Contributions	3,855	-
District Contributions Subsequent to the Measurement Date	3,843	-
Total	<u>\$ 11,061</u>	<u>\$ -</u>

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program (Continued)

Pension Costs (Continued)

\$3,843 reported as deferred outflows of resources related to pensions resulting from MPO contributions to the FRS Plan subsequent to the measurement date will be recognized as a reduction of the net pension liability in the year ended June 30, 2016. Other amounts reported as deferred outflows and inflows of resources related to pensions will be recognized as an increase (decrease) in pension expense as follows:

<u>Year Ending June 30,</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2016	\$ 1,092
2017	1,092
2018	1,092
2019	1,092
2020	1,092
Thereafter	1,760

Actuarial Assumptions

The total pension liability in the July 1, 2014, actuarial valuation was determined using the following actuarial assumptions, applied to all periods included in the measurement:

Inflation	2.60% per year
Salary Increases	3.25%, Average, Including Inflation
Municipal Bond Rate	4.29%

Mortality rates were based on the Generational RP-2000 with Projection Scale BB. The actuarial assumptions used in the July 1, 2014, valuation were based on the results of an actuarial experience study for the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2013.

Discount Rate

The discount rate used to measure the total pension liability was 4.29% for the HIS Plan. In general, the discount rate for calculating the total pension liability is equal to the single rate equivalent to discounting at the long-term expected rate of return for benefit payments prior to the projected depletion date. Because the HIS benefit is essentially funded on a pay-as-you-go basis, the depletion date is considered to be immediate, and the single equivalent discount rate is equal to the municipal bond rate selected by the HIS Plan sponsor. The Bond Buyer General Obligation 20-Bond Municipal Bond Index was adopted as the applicable municipal bond index.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 6 DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS (CONTINUED)

Retiree Health Insurance Subsidy Program (Continued)

Pension Liability Sensitivity

The following presents the MPO's proportionate share of the net pension liability for the HIS Plan, calculated using the discount rate disclosed in the preceding paragraph, as well as what the MPO's proportionate share of the net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate one percentage point lower or one percentage point higher than the current discount rate:

Description	1% Decrease	Current Discount Rate	1% Increase in Discount Rate
HIS Plan Discount Rate	3.29%	4.29%	5.29%
Lee MPO's Proportionate Share of the HIS Plan Net Pension Liability	\$ 106,105	\$ 93,285	\$ 82,585

Pension Plan Fiduciary Net Position

Detailed information about the HIS Plan's fiduciary's net position is available in a separately-issued FRS Pension Plan and Other State-Administered Systems Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. That report may be obtained through the Florida Department of Management Services website at <http://www.dms.myflorida.com>.

NOTE 7 CHANGE IN ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLE

During the year ended June 30, 2015, the MPO adopted GASB Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*, and the related GASB Statement No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date—an amendment of GASB Statement No. 68*. These pronouncements require the restatement of the June 30, 2014 net position of the governmental activities as follows:

	<u>Governmental Activities</u>
Net Position, June 30, 2014, as Previously Reported	\$ 341,083
Cumulative Affect of Application of GASB 68, Net Pension Liability	(215,443)
Cumulative Affect of Application of GASB 71, Deferred Outflow of Resources for MPO Contributions Made to the Plan Subsequent to the Measurement Date During Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2014	30,972
Net Position, June 30, 2014, as Restated	<u>\$ 156,612</u>

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 8 DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN

The MPO's employees can voluntarily participate in the MPO's Deferred Compensation Plan. The MPO offers a deferred compensation plan created in accordance with the Internal Revenue Code Section 457. The plan, available to all MPO employees, permits them to defer a portion of their salary until future years. The deferred compensation is not available to employees until termination, retirement, death or unforeseeable emergency. The employee contributions to the plan were \$18,712 for the year ended June 30, 2015. The MPO does not make any contributions on behalf of employees in this plan.

NOTE 9 COMMITMENTS

The MPO has entered into contracts with several transportation engineering firms and planning consultants in order to fulfill the work programs under various grants administered by the State of Florida. Uncompleted portions of these contracts, which are not required to be fully spent as of June 30, 2015 total approximately \$196,000. Although these contracts represent commitments of the MPO, the great majority of revenues expended under these will, in turn, be reimbursable under grants already awarded to the MPO.

In December 2011, the MPO entered into a four-year lease agreement for office space with the City of Cape Coral, Florida. At expiration of the term, the lease will automatically renew for one-year terms. Either party may terminate the lease agreement with at least six months notice in writing at any time during the lease term. The MPO's scheduled rent payments are \$300 per month, paid on or before the first day of every month throughout the lease term. Future minimum rental payments are \$3,600 per year for the remainder of the lease term.

REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
 SCHEDULE OF PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THE
 NET PENSION LIABILITY
 YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Proportion of the Net Pension Liability	0.001258050%
Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability	\$ 76,760
Covered-Employee Payroll	\$ 292,632
Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability (Asset) as a Percentage of Its Covered-Employee Payroll	26.23%
Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the total Pension Liability	96.09%

Note: The Amounts Presented for Each Fiscal Year were Determined as of June 30.

Note: Information is required to be presented for 10 years. However, until a full 10-year trend is compiled, the Lee MPO will present information for only those years for which information is available.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF CONTRIBUTIONS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

	<u>2015</u>	<u>2014</u>
Contractually Required Contribution	\$ 32,855	\$ 27,557
Contributions in Relation to the Contractually Required Contribution	(32,855)	(27,557)
Contribution Deficiency (Excess)	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>
Covered-Employee Payroll	\$ 308,556	\$ 292,632
Contributions as a Percentage of Covered Employee Payroll	10.65%	9.42%

*The Amounts Presented for Each Fiscal Year were Determined as of June 30.

Note: Information is required to be presented for 10 years. However, until a full 10-year trend is compiled, the Lee MPO will present information for only those years for which information is available.

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

FEDERAL GRANTOR / PASS THROUGH GRANTOR AWARD	Federal CFDA Number	Federal Grant Number	Award Amount	Program Expenditures	Transfers to Subrecipients
<i>U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration</i>					
<u>Pass through Florida Department of Transportation:</u>					
Highway Planning and Construction					
Metropolitan Planning Program					
Federal Section 112 (PL) Funds	20.205	PL-0261 (012)-423642- 1-14-01 A5176	\$ 862,171	\$ 599,181	\$ -
<u>Pass through Florida Department of Transportation:</u>					
Metropolitan Planning Program					
JPA - SU Funds for Transit Bus Pullout Study	20.205	430883-1-18-01 AR540	124,000	121,626	-
<u>Pass through Florida Department of Transportation:</u>					
Metropolitan Planning Program					
JPA - SU Funds for Transit Bus Queue Study	20.205	430884-1-18-01 AR541	55,000	54,529	-
<u>Direct</u>					
National Infrastructure Investments					
Tiger Discretionary Grants	20.933	DTFH6114G00006	10,473,900	892,918	-
<u>Pass through Florida Department of Transportation:</u>					
Metropolitan Transportation Planning					
Section 5305	20.505	410115-1-14 23 AQR15	601,372	229,273	182,073
Total Federal Awards			<u>\$ 12,116,443</u>	<u>\$ 1,897,527</u>	<u>\$ 182,073</u>

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounting policies and presentation of the schedule of expenditures of federal awards of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO) have been designed to conform to the accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, and the reporting and compliance requirements of U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations* (OMB Circular A-133).

Reporting Entity

Federal awards received directly from federal agencies, the State of Florida or pass-through entities are included to satisfy the audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133. The schedule of expenditures of federal awards includes all federal awards that the MPO earned for the year ended June 30, 2015. The MPO also expended \$32,719 of state financial assistance for the year ended June 30, 2015. However, a schedule of expenditures of state financial assistance is not required to be included because the MPO did not expend greater than \$500,000 throughout the fiscal year, as stipulated under Section 215.97, Florida Statutes, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General of the State of Florida.

Below represents a breakdown by project of state financial assistance expended for the year ended June 30, 2015:

STATE GRANTOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	State CSFA Number	State Project Number	Award Amount	Program Expenditures	Transfers to Subrecipients
<i>State of Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</i>					
<i>Direct Program:</i>					
Planning Grant	55.002	432029-1-14-01 ARH83	\$ 32,719	\$ 32,719	\$ -
Total State Financial Assistance			<u>\$ 32,719</u>	<u>\$ 32,719</u>	<u>\$ -</u>

Basis of Accounting

Basis of accounting refers to when expenditures are recognized in the accounts and reported in the financial statements. Basis of accounting relates to the timing of the measurements made, regardless of the measurement focus applied. The accrual basis of accounting is followed for the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and state financial assistance.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
NOTES TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

NOTE 2 CONTINGENCIES

Grant monies received and disbursed by the MPO are for specific purposes and are subject to review and audit by the grantor agencies. Such audits may result in requests for reimbursement due to disallowed expenditures. Based upon prior experience, the MPO does not believe that such disallowances, if any, would have a material effect on the financial position of the MPO.

REGULATORY REPORTS



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP
CLAconnect.com

**INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER
FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS
BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS***

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cape Coral, Florida

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the governmental activities and the general fund of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the MPO's basic financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated March 16, 2016.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the MPO's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the MPO's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the MPO's internal control.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified. We did identify certain deficiencies in internal control, described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as 2015-001 that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the MPO's financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

Responses to Findings

The MPO's responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The MPO's responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and, accordingly, we express no opinion on them.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the result of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the MPO's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the MPO's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Fort Myers, Florida
March 16, 2016

**INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS
THAT COULD HAVE A DIRECT AND MATERIAL EFFECT ON EACH
MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE
IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133**

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cape Coral, Florida

Report on Compliance for the Major Federal Program

We have audited the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's (the "MPO") compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the *OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2015. The MPO's major federal program is identified in the summary of auditors' results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs.

Management's Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to its federal program.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for the MPO's major federal program based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the MPO's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for the major federal program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the MPO's compliance.

Opinion on the Major Federal Program

In our opinion, the MPO complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2015.

Report on Internal Control Over Compliance

Management of the MPO is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the MPO's internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for its major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the MPO's internal control over compliance.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A *material weakness in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, we identified a certain deficiency in internal control over compliance, as described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as item 2015-002, that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

The MPO's response to the internal control over compliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The MPO's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the result of that testing based on the requirements of OMB Circular A-133. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Fort Myers, Florida
March 16, 2016

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

SECTION I – SUMMARY OF AUDITORS’ RESULTS

<u>Financial Statements</u>	<u>Results</u>
Type of auditors’ report issued:	Unmodified
Internal control over financial reporting:	
Material weakness(es) identified?	No
Significant deficiencies identified not considered to be a material weakness(es)	Yes
Noncompliance material to financial statements noted?	No

<u>Awards</u>	<u>Federal</u>
Internal control over major programs:	
Material weakness(es) identified?	No
Significant deficiencies identified not considered to be a material weakness(es)	Yes
Type of auditors’ report issued on compliance for major programs?	Unmodified
Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with – Circular A-133 section .501 (a)	Yes

Identification of Major Programs

<u>Federal</u>	<u>Name of Program or Cluster</u>	
CFDA 20.205	Highway Planning and Construction	
CFDA 20.933	National Infrastructure Investments	
		<u>Federal</u>
Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs:		\$300,000
Auditee qualified as low-risk auditee?		No

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS (CONTINUED)
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

SECTION II – FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS

This section identifies the material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and instances of noncompliance related to the financial statements that are required to be reported in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*.

CURRENT YEAR COMMENTS

2015-001 Year-End Closing Procedures

The MPO is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all financial records and related information, including properly recording accruals of revenues and expenses at the end of the reporting period.

Condition

Adjustments relating to accrued payroll, professional services costs, and grant revenues were required to appropriately present the MPO's financial statements.

Cause

During the performance of our audit procedures, we noted that expenses relating to payroll and fees for professional services incurred at or near year-end were not accrued in the proper period. Furthermore, federal grant revenues earned in the subsequent fiscal year were incorrectly recorded in the current fiscal year. Adjustments to these revenue and expense accounts and related receivables and liabilities were required to correct these errors.

Effect

Unadjusted expense and liability balances were understated and unadjusted revenue and receivable balances were overstated as of and for the year ending June 30, 2015. These misstated balances were subsequently corrected as a result of audit procedures.

Recommendation

We recommend that the MPO strengthen its year-end closing process to include additional reviews of all accounts that would have a material impact on the financial statements throughout the year. Specifically, the review should include verification that 1) payroll expense reported within the trial balance provided by the MPO's accountant agrees to the payroll expense balance reported within the payroll registers and includes a calculation for payroll expenses to be accrued and reported at the end of the fiscal year 2) disbursements made 60 to 90 days subsequent to year end are evaluated for proper inclusion or exclusion within current year accounts payable and other accrued expenses 3) grant revenues are properly reconciled to expenditures reported on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) for each fiscal year ended.

Views of Responsible Officials

We agree that the close-out process related to the reporting of all accounts at the end of the year needs to be improved to accurately record this information. The MPO accountant and Executive Director are responsible for ensuring that these expenses are recorded correctly and reviewed to ensure that this happens. The MPO has recently drafted an RFP for advertisement for accounting services to assist the MPO with all of our fiscal needs to ensure that the MPO's fiscal requirements are met and that these issues are resolved.

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS (CONTINUED)
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

SECTION III – FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS – MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

This section identifies the audit findings required to be reported by Section .501(a) of Circular A-133 as well as any abuse finding involving federal awards that is material to a major program.

CURRENT YEAR COMMENTS

2015-002 Timesheet Records

CFDA Number – 20.205

Program Title – Highway Planning and Construction

CFDA Number – 20.933

Program Title – National Infrastructure Investments – Tiger Discretionary Grants

Compliance Requirement - Timesheet Records

Criteria

The MPO is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all grant reimbursement request documentation, including calculating the proper amount of payroll-related costs allocated to each applicable task within the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Condition

Errors were detected in the calculations of payroll costs.

Questioned Costs

None

Context

5 out of 12 monthly reimbursement requests were selected for testing the Highway Planning and Construction Program, and deviations were detected within 4 of the 5 months subjected to testing. 1 out of 2 monthly payroll reimbursement requests were selected for testing for the National Infrastructure Investments Program.

Cause

Certain formulas within the spreadsheets used to calculate payroll costs by task contained errors due to rows that were added to the spreadsheets during the year to account for new grant activity (namely the TIGER grant).

Effect

Within the sample tested, the net result of all discrepancies identified was approximately \$1,285 of allowable payroll-related costs for which reimbursement was not requested.

Recommendation

We recommend that the MPO implement a more robust preparation and review process to ensure that the calculations of monthly hours for each task code multiplied by applicable wage rate are complete and accurate to submission to the granting agency for reimbursement.

LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS (CONTINUED)
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

**SECTION III – FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS – MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS
(CONTINUED)**

CURRENT YEAR COMMENTS (CONTINUED)

2015-002 Timesheet Records (Continued)

CFDA Number – 20.205

Program Title – Highway Planning and Construction

CFDA Number – 20.933

***Program Title – National Infrastructure Investments – Tiger Discretionary Grants
Compliance Requirement - Timesheet Records***

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

As of the end of the fiscal year, the MPO is now using a timesheet program to resolve the issues we were previously having with the payroll cost reporting. The timesheet vendor is Replicon and it has been set up to match our Unified Planning Work Program tasks where we can process reports in a consistent manner. Previously, the MPO's timesheet process was using an excel spreadsheet that led to the errors noted and back in February of 2015 we began a process to change over to a Microsoft Project program but this did not give us the results we were looking for so we ended up going with the Replicon timesheet program.

Person Responsible for Corrective Action

The Executive Director, Donald Scott and the Project Manager Johnny Limbaugh are responsible for implementing the timesheet program.

Anticipated Completion Date

The implementation of the new timesheet system was implemented as of July 1, 2015.

PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS –

SECTION III –MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

2014-003 Timesheet Records

CFDA Number – 20.205

Program Title – Highway Planning and Construction

Condition

Errors were detected in the calculations of payroll costs.

Current Year Status

Refer to current year finding 2015-002 – Timesheet Records.

SECTION IV- OTHER MATTERS

See Corrective Action Plan within the finding reporting under Part III above.



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP
CLAconnect.com

MANAGEMENT LETTER BASED ON RULE 10.554(1)(i) OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cape Coral, Florida

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the financial statements of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO), as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, and have issued our report thereon dated March 16, 2016.

Auditor's Responsibility

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of State and Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*; and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Florida Auditor General.

Other Reports and Schedule

We have issued our Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of the Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, Independent Auditors' Report on Compliance with Requirements that Could Have a Direct and Material Effect on Each Major Federal Program and on Internal Control Over Compliance in Accordance with OMB Circular A-133, Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs; and Independent Accountant's Report on an examination conducted in accordance with *AICPA Professional Standards*, Section 601, regarding compliance requirements in accordance with Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General.. Disclosures in those reports and schedule, which are dated March 16, 2016, should be considered in conjunction with this management letter.

Prior Audit Findings

Section 10.554(1)(i)1., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we determine whether or not corrective actions have been taken to address findings and recommendations made in the preceding annual financial audit report. Refer to Appendix A – Prior Year Findings and Recommendations, which addresses whether corrective actions have been taken to address findings and recommendations made in the preceding annual financial report.

Official Title and Legal Authority

Section 10.554(1)(i)5., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that the name or official title and legal authority for the primary government and each component unit of the reporting entity be disclosed in this management letter, unless disclosed in the notes to the financial statements. This information has been included in the notes to the basic financial statements.

o



An independent member of Nexia International

Financial Condition

Section 10.554(1)(i)5.a. and 10.556(7), Rules of the Auditor General, require that we apply appropriate procedures and report the results of our determination as to whether or not the MPO has met one or more of the conditions described in Section 218.503(1), Florida Statutes, and identification of the specific condition(s) met. In connection with our audit, we determined that the MPO did not meet any of the conditions described in Section 218.503(1), Florida Statutes.

Pursuant to Sections 10.554(1)(i)5.c. and 10.556(8), Rules of the Auditor General, we applied financial condition assessment procedures. It is management's responsibility to monitor the MPO's financial condition, and our financial condition assessment was based in part on representations made by management and the review of financial information provided by same.

Annual Financial Report

Section 10.554(1)(i)5.b. and 10.556(7), Rules of the Auditor General, require that we apply appropriate procedures and report the results of our determination as to whether the annual financial report for the MPO for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, filed with the Florida Department of Financial Services pursuant to Section 218.32(1)(a), Florida Statutes, is in agreement with the annual financial audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. In connection with our audit, we determined that these two reports were in agreement.

Special District Component Units

Section 10.554(1)(i)5.d, Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we determine whether or not a special district that is a component unit of a county, municipality, or special district, provided the financial information necessary for proper reporting of the component unit, within the audited financial statements of the county, municipality, or special district in accordance with Section 218.39(3)(b), Florida Statutes. The MPO does not have any component units.

Other Matters

Section 10.554(1)(i)2., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we address in the management letter any recommendations to improve financial management. In connection with our audit, we did not have any such recommendations.

Section 10.554(1)(i)3., Rules of the Auditor General, requires that we address noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements, or abuse, that have occurred, or are likely to have occurred, that have an effect on the financial statements that is less than material but which warrants the attention of those charged with governance. In connection with our audit, we did not have any such findings.

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization

Purpose of this Letter

Our management letter is intended solely for the information and use of the Legislative Auditing Committee, members of the Florida Senate and the Florida House of Representatives, the Florida Auditor General, Federal and other granting agencies, the MPO's Board of Directors, and applicable management, and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Fort Myers, Florida
March 16, 2016

**LEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
APPENDIX A – PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015**

Prior Year Findings		Current Year Status		
		Cleared	Partially Cleared	Not Cleared
Finding Reference #	Comment			
2014-001	Outstanding Checks	X		
2014-002	Year-End Closing Procedures			X (See current year finding 2015-001 within the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs)
2014-003	Timesheet Records			X (See current year finding 2015-002 within the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs)



CliftonLarsonAllen LLP
CLAconnect.com

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT

Board of Directors
Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Cape Coral, Florida

We have examined Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's compliance with Section 218.415, Florida Statutes, regarding the investment of public funds during the year ended June 30, 2015. Management is responsible for Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's compliance with those requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's compliance based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization's compliance with specified requirements.

In our opinion, Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization complied, in all material respects, with the aforementioned requirements for the year ended June 30, 2015.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Auditor General, State of Florida, and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'CliftonLarsonAllen LLP'.

CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Fort Myers, Florida
March 16, 2016

DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE SUMMIT

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Provide input on the FDOT District One MPO Chair's summit that will be considering the formation of an alliance of transportation planning agencies.

At a recent Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO Board meeting, there a discussion regarding the formation of a regional alliance of District One transportation planning agencies. This alliance would be patterned off of similar alliances that exist in the Central Florida and Tampa Bay areas that have been successful in dealing with regional transportation issues. **Attached** is a letter from the Chair of the Charlotte-Punta Gorda MPO requesting that the MPO Chairs and Staff Directors from District One schedule a meeting date and time to get together to discuss the proposed alliance. The formation of an alliance is also being supported by the Florida Department of Transportation.



Charlotte County-Punta Gorda METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

East Port Environmental Campus

25550 Harbor View Road, Suite 4, Port Charlotte, FL 33980-2503 (PH) (941) 883-3535 (F) 883-3534

E-Mail: office@ccmpo.com

Website: www.ccmpo.com

Commissioner Christopher G. Constance
Chairman

Robert M. Herrington
Director

March 15, 2016

Commissioner Brian Hamman, Chair
Lee County MPO
815 Nicholas Parkway East
Cape Coral, FL 34243

RE: FDOT District One MPO Chair's Summit

Chairman Hamman,

As you know the six MPO/TPO staffs in FDOT District One, meet quarterly through the Coordinated Urban Transportation Studies (CUTS) meetings. The discussion at these meetings revolves around common transportation planning activities of the staffs.

At a recent meeting of the Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO Board, members suggested that a letter go to the Chairs of all District One MPO/TPOs to propose a possible meeting to consider formation of an alliance of the District One transportation planning agencies. The goal would be to coordinate regional transportation planning. Similar alliances exist in both the Central Florida and Tampa Bay areas and FDOT staff has agreed to support such an effort given the success demonstrated by these alliances regarding regional transportation issues.

The Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO is asking that each of the MPO/TPOs consider this invitation for the Chairs and Staff Directors to meet and if acceptable, forward possible meeting dates that you might be available to our Director, Robert Herrington. A centralized meeting location will be selected at a later date.

Your consideration of this proposal is greatly appreciated and I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Commissioner Christopher Constance, Chair
Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO

CC: Donald Scott, Director
Lee County MPO

UPDATE ON THE SALES TAX REFERENDUMS FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES IN FLORIDA

DISCUSSION ITEM:

As discussed at the last meeting, staff is currently reaching out to our previous political consultants to present and answer questions, at a mutual time that works, on seeking a successful ballot initiative in Florida (and what has led to unsuccessful initiatives). In the meantime, staff has been following Florida specific sales tax ballot initiatives that are going forward or being discussed with the intent of going forward this November. Staff will provide additional information on these ballot measures at the meeting and they include:

- Broward County – Penny sales tax for mass transit, synchronized traffic signals, complete streets and repaving projects (dueling proposals are being discussed between the County and the Cities).
- Duval County – Extension and repurposing of the current infrastructure sales tax to cover pension costs.
- Marion County – Sales tax referendum for public safety equipment and transportation capital and road rehabilitation projects.

DISCUSSION ON THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW SURVEY

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Under MAP-21 and the recently approved FAST Act Federal transportation bill there are new requirements for transportation performance management to ensure the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. The use of the data is expected to be used to better inform transportation planning and programming decisions. The new performance aspects of the Federal Aid program will allow the FHWA to better communicate a national performance story and to more reliably assess the impacts of federal funding investment. As a part of this process, the FHWA has produced a lengthy survey (**attached**) to gain information on what State's, MPO's and local jurisdictions are currently doing in regards to data collection, methods of collection, assessing performance etc. Currently the FHWA is seeking comments on the survey before it is finalized but we have provided a draft copy of the survey to the Executive Committee to provide an idea on the type of information that is being asked for and to also bring attention to how this may drive the expenditure of federal transportation funding in the future.

National TPM Implementation Review Survey Design and Draft Questions

Overview

The primary goal of the National Transportation Performance Management (TPM) Implementation Review is to gather information about the application of performance management, performance based-planning and programming principles, and other MAP-21 performance provisions at State Departments of Transportation (State DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The National TPM Implementation Review will seek to provide quantitative and coded qualitative data from open ended questions that can be summarized to spur further discussion of the resource and guidance needs of transportation agencies. It is believed that State DOTs and MPOs have a general understanding of TPM practices and have begun implementation, but it will be beneficial to have a better understanding of specific capabilities, progress, challenges and needs. The review will collect data from State DOT and MPO staff regarding:

- Self-assessments of their capabilities to implement performance management and status of their current practice;
- Perceived priorities of different aspects of performance management;
- Understood benefits and drawbacks of TPM practices;
- Identification of key challenges of TPM implementation from the perspective of the Partner Organizations;
- Assessment of needs and interest in receiving training, guidance resources, and technical assistance;
- Preferences among alternative means for providing capacity building and training; and
- Evaluation of TPM components by specific performance areas (e.g., safety, bridge, pavement).

The web survey instrument for the National TPM Implementation Review will consists of the following sections:

- A. TPM General (*directed at the principal contacts at the State DOTs, and MPOs regarding TPM in general*)
- B. Performance-based Planning and Programming (*directed at Subject Matter Expert (SMEs)*)
- C. Asset Management (*directed at SMEs*)
- D. TPM by Performance Area: Safety (*directed at SMEs*)
- E. TPM by Performance Area: Bridge (*directed at SMEs*)
- F. TPM by Performance Area: Pavement (*directed at SMEs*)
- G. TPM by Performance Area: Freight (*directed at SMEs*)
- H. TPM by Performance Area: Congestion/Mobility/System Performance (*directed at SMEs*)
- I. TPM by Performance Area: On-road Mobile Source Emission (*directed at SMEs*)
- J. TPM by Performance Area Supplement: Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair (***directed only at State DOTs and MPOs with Transit Oversight***)

For each of the performance area sections listed above (D-J), a set of 22 common questions will be used and organized into the following subsections:

Subsection	Example questions
Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your agency have staff dedicated to TPM responsibilities?
Data & Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your agency have data analytic tools to help with developing measures, setting targets, programming and monitoring results?
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the measures developed by an agency included in the LRTP?
Target Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your agency develop short term quantifiable targets that can be used to guide program investment decision making?
Planning and Programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you been able to successfully use a performance based justification to acquire additional funds to support transportation needs?
Monitoring & Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are performance results communicated?

Subsection	Example questions
Capacity building needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please indicate the areas that your agency will likely need assistance for TPM practices?

In addition to the transit questions in Section J, Section A also contains a transit supplement section aimed at capturing additional transit TPM information.

In addition to the common set of questions, a limited number of performance area specific questions will be included as warranted.

In the administered online survey, each set of performance area questions along with a set of common questions, will be “self-contained” so they can be delegated to the appropriate subject matter experts. A responding agency will have the option to delegate sections of the survey by performance area via email. The designated survey contact for that agency will have the ability to review the entire survey before submitting it to FHWA. This is discussed in more detail in [Part 2](#) of this document.

The remainder of this document is divided into two parts:

[Part 1](#) lists the draft questions proposed for the National TPM Implementation Review Survey and [Part 2](#) outlines the Data Collection and Analysis Design of the survey. Use the following table of contents to navigate through the document.

Table of Contents

National TPM Implementation Review Survey Design and Draft

Questions..... 1

 Overview 1

Section A: TPM Questions..... 10

A1. To comply with federal requirements, State DOTs and MPOs may need to implement transportation performance management practices. Generally speaking, how prepared do you feel to carry out the following components of a TPM practice?10

A2. For your agency, how important do you feel each of the ten TPM components are for your agency? ..11

A3. Which of the ten TPM components do you expect will be the biggest challenge for your agency to carry out?.....11

A4. On what TPM components should FHWA be developing technical support to help your agency?11

A5. To address the need for technical training identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most? (check all that apply)12

A6. What do you think of Transportation Performance Management as a business practice? (*check the box, on either on right or the left, next to the word you agree with the most*).....12

A7. Select and describe the option(s) that best aligns with how your agency is staffed to support transportation performance management. (*check all that apply*)12

A8. What number of Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) would you estimate are focused on performance management activities? _____13

A9. If your AGENCY has a reporting website please provide the URL: _____13

A10. For each of the performance management functions listed below please indicate: your agency’s need for tools; your agency’s ability to competently carry out the function; and how important the function is to your agency in managing performance.13

A11. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? (Check all that apply)13

A12. Does your agency have oversight of Transit and Public Transportation entities? (Yes/NO) If Yes, please answer the questions in the Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair Supplement Questions and throughout the remainder of the survey.13

A13. Select and describe the option that best aligns with how your agency is staffed to support transportation performance management in the areas of *Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair*.14

A14. On what TPM components should FTA be developing technical support to help your agency? Please identify the one role that should receive FTAs highest priority for technical support (column 1), second highest priority (column 2), and third highest priority (column 3).....14

A15. To address the need for technical training identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most? (check all that apply)14

Section B- PBPP Questions 15

B1. How does your agency incorporate PBPP into its LRTP? (check all that apply)15

B2. Indicate the degree to which the LRTP/Strategic Business Plan (SBP) impacts actual investment decisions for the following areas (Please rate the level of linkage between program investments and the performance outcome they intend to achieve using a 1(No linkage) to 5(Strong Linkage) scale.)15

B3. For the following plans, indicate if there is a connection to PBPP elements in the LRTP. For example, do these plans and the LRTP share goals, measures, targets or strategies? (check all that apply)16

B4. How does your agency incorporate PBPP into its STIP/TIP? (check all that apply)16

B5. Indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statement: “Your agency has a plan that identifies the strategies and/or investments that will be made to achieve specific targets in the following performance areas:”16

B6. Does your agency use measures in other non-highway modes to evaluate performance? (check all that apply)17

B7. How does your agency evaluate the outcomes of its transportation planning and programming processes? (Check all that apply)17

B8. Rate your sense of the readiness of your agency to effectively carry out a performance-based planning and programming approach using the scale below (select one):17

B9. In general, how would you describe your agency’s coordination with other planning organizations (the State DOT, MPO(s), Rural Transportation Planning Organization(s) (RTPO[s]), Tribal Organizations, operators of public transportation, and local agencies) to establish performance measures and targets for the state using the scale below? (select one)18

B10. Have you realized any benefits (quantitative or qualitative) in using performance-based planning and programming? (Please check all that apply)18

B11. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has the PBPP process been as a tool for:*18

B12. To improve your agency’s effectiveness in using PBPP as a tool for the purposes identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?19

C. Highway Asset Management20

C1. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate to what extent your agency has documented the following Asset Management Plan activities (1-no at all documented to 5-Completely documented):20

C2. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate the degree to which the Performance-based Planning and Programming processes support each of the following Asset Management practices in your Agency (1-No linkage) to 5-Strong Linkage):20

C3. Has your agency/organization implemented or is planning to implement an Asset Management System (please check one)?21

C4. Please check the management systems your agency/organization currently has, along with the status of each system within an overall Asset Management framework (please check all that apply):21

C5. Please indicate if your agency collects data for each of the following roadway assets types and specify the data collection method (check all that apply).....22

C6. On a scale of 1 to 4, how important do you feel each of the following Asset Management decision processes are for your agency/organization (1-not at all important to 4-very important)22

C7. On a scale of 1 to 4, please rate the following criteria according to their level of importance for selecting projects that are candidates for funding and implementation within your agency/organization (1-not at all important to 4-very important):.....22

C8. Do you think that the above criteria that are used by an agency in order to select between different projects or groups of projects are or should be uniform and consistent for all types of different roadway assets (please click one)?.....23

C9. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate your agency’s technical capacity to carry out the following Asset Management decision-support activities (1-No Capabilities to 5-Expert level Capabilities):.....23

C10. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? Check all that apply24

C11. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate the degree to which your agency’s policies and guidance is linked to or supports implementing the following Asset Management practices (1-No linkage to 5-Strong Linkage).24

C12. How does your agency evaluate the outcomes of its transportation AM practices?25

C13. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has your Asset Management p been as a tool for guiding transportation investments (1-nonexistent to 5-very highly effective)25

C14. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has the AM process been as a data collection tool for(1-nonexistent to 5-very highly effective):*25

C15. To address the need for AM technical training identified what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?26

Sections D to J: Common Performance Area Questions.....27

TPM STAFFING 27

CommonQ1. On a scale of 1-5, rate that impact that implementing federal performance management requirements to related PERFORMANCE AREA X will have on staff resources (1-No Impact to 5-High Impact).	27
DATA & ANALYSIS	27
CommonQ2. How do you obtain data relevant for PERFORMANCE AREA X performance management (select all that apply)?	27
CommonQ3. With respect to data collection, what criteria did your agency use to determine whether or not to outsource PERFORMANCE AREA X data collection or rely on 3 rd party data? (select all that apply) ..28	28
CommonQ4. With respect to Data Analysis, what criteria did your agency use to determine whether or not to outsource PERFORMANCE AREA X data analysis? (select all that apply).....	28
CommonQ5. Does your agency have data analytic tools to help with processing and managing data, calculating measures, setting targets, programming and monitoring results for PERFORMANCE AREA X? ..28	28
CommonQ6.For each of the performance management functions listed below please indicate your agency's need for tools; your agency's ability to competently carry out the function; and how important the function is to your agency in managing PERFORMANCE AREA X.	28
CommonQ7. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? (Check all that apply)	29
D. SPECIFIC TO SAFETY: DATA & ANALYSIS.....	29
D1. What percentage of public roads are covered by your crash database?	29
D2. Have HSIP funds addressed "off state" system needs adequately?	29
D3. Typically how long does it take for crash data from all public roads to be entered into your Statewide crash database?	29
D4. Which agencies do you cooperate with to gather crash data?.....	30
D5. Does your agency collect and analyze data to assess overall program-level benefits of the HSIP?	30
D6. To what extent does your agency have current or projected railroad traffic?	30
E. SPECIFIC TO BRIDGE: DATA & ANALYSIS.....	30
E1. Who conducts the National Bridge Inspection Standards safety inspections of non-State owned NHS bridges?	30
E2. How does your agency handle the National Bridge Inspection Standards responsibilities for border bridges (bridges that cross State borders)?.....	30
F.Specific to PAVEMENT: DATA & Analysis.....	31
F1. Is pavement data collected in both directions?*	31
F2. How often is pavement data collected on the National Highway System?.....	31
F3. Who acquires pavement data on non-State owned NHS Routes?	31
G.SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: DATA & ANALYSIS	31
G1. What data do you use in the freight performance measurement and performance-based planning processes?	31
H.SPECIFIC TO CONGESTION/MOBILITY/SYSTEM PERFORMANCE: DATA & ANALYSIS	32

H1. Do you have any programs in place to count the number of pedestrians and cyclists that use your transportation system?	32
H2. What data do you use in the Congestion/Mobility/System Performance measurement and performance-based planning processes?.....	32
J. SPECIFIC TO TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR SUPPLEMENT: DATA AND ANALYSIS	32
J1. Do you have ready access to data to understand TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR in your area? If yes, describe and explain.....	32
J2. Does your agency collect data on TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR outside the National Transit Database?	32
PERFORMANCE MEASURES	32
CommonQ8. Are the <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> measures used by your agency incorporated into the following activities?	32
CommonQ9. The AGENCY tracks leading <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> indicators (leading indicators are metrics that often correlate to a change in performance before a trend can be dedicated using a performance measure) on a regular basis to assess progress in the achievement of longer term outcomes	33
CommonQ10. When establishing your chosen <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance measures, did current data availability factors influence what measures were established? If yes, please describe briefly if your agency is planning new, more meaningful, measures in the future when data becomes more readily available.....	33
G.SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: PERFORMANCE MEASURES	33
G2. Does your freight performance measurement include truck parking?.....	33
G3. Have you developed freight performance measure in the following modes?*.....	33
H.SPECIFIC TO Congestion/Mobility/System Performance: PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	34
H3. Which Congestion/Mobility/System Performance related performance measures does your agency produce?.....	34
TARGET SETTING.....	34
CommonQ11. When establishing targets for <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> , what is the level of coordination with other entities in selecting targets.....	34
CommonQ12. Your agency has developed short term quantifiable <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance targets that can be used to guide program investment decision making	35
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING.....	35
CommonQ13. Indicate the degree to which <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance targets impacts actual investment decisions	35
CommonQ14. Select your current capability to predict the outcome of <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> programming decisions on the following scale:	35
CommonQ15. Does your agency conduct evaluate the before and after performance outcomes on completed <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> projects?	36
CommonQ16. Select your current capability: To what extent do you coordinate with other investment decision making entities on the development of investment plans and the programming of <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> projects?	36

CommonQ17. Have you been able to successfully use a performance based justification to acquire additional funds to support <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> transportation needs? Please Explain	36
D.SPECIFIC TO SAFETY: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING:	36
D7. What criteria are used to prioritize safety projects for programming and implementation? (<i>Check all that apply</i>)	36
D8. To what extent does the your agency effectively coordinate with the SHSO on HSIP efforts?	37
E.SPECIFIC TO BRIDGE: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	37
E3. Describe impact of expansion of National Highway System on the State agency Bridge programs.	37
F.SPECIFIC TO PAVEMENT: PLANNING & PROGRAMMING.....	37
F4. What criteria are used to prioritize pavement projects for programming and implementation? Check all that apply.....	37
F5. Describe impact of expansion of National Highway System on the State agency pavement programs. .37	
G.SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	38
G2. Does your agency have a MAP-21 compliant Statewide Freight Plan?.....	38
I.SPECIFIC TO ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING	38
I1. Do you currently or regularly develop quantitative emissions estimates for your CMAQ projects?	38
I2. How do you plan to transition to quantitative emissions estimates?.....	38
I3. Some project types have historically never had a quantitative emissions estimate, such as public education, marketing, and operating assistance. How do you plan to quantify these benefits?	38
I4. How do you capture benefits and report emissions benefits for a group of projects or bundle of projects? (select the most applicable response)	38
J.SPECIFIC TO: TRANSIT SAFETY AND TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR SUPPLEMENT:.....	39
J3. Does your agency have a plan that addresses TRANSIT SAFETY?	39
J4. Does your agency have a transit asset management plan that addresses TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR?	39
MONITORING, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING	39
CommonQ18. With what frequency does your AGENCY routinely report INTERNALLY on performance outcomes and progress made toward the achievement of specific targets of performance?	39
CommonQ19. With what frequency does your AGENCY routinely report EXTERNALLY on <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance outcomes and progress made toward the achievement of specific targets of <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance?.....	39
CommonQ20. How are the <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> performance results (outcomes, progress meeting targets, etc.) communicated?.....	40
CAPACITY BUILDING.....	40
CommonQ21. Please indicate the areas that your agency will likely need assistance for TPM practices related to <i>PERFORMANCE AREA X</i> .(check all that apply)	40

CommonQ22. To address the need for TPM technical training related to *PERFORMANCE AREA X* identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?.....40

Outline of the National TPM Implementation Review Data Collection and Analysis Design.....42

- National TPM Implementation Participants 43
 - State DOT Data Collection: 43
 - MPO Data Collection: 44
 - Follow-Up Data Collection 45
 - Respondent Selection within Partner Organizations: 45
 - Advantages of this approach:46
 - Disadvantages of this approach:46
- National TPM Implementation Assessment Process 46
 - State DOT Assessment:..... 46
 - MPO Assessment:..... 47
 - State DOT and MPO Assessment Results Analyses & Report: 47
 - Follow-up State DOT and MPO Assessments:..... 47
 - Follow-up State DOT and MPO Assessment Analysis & Report 48
- Selection of data collection mode..... 48
- Selection of survey data collection software..... 48
- National TPM Implementation Assessment and Follow-up Assessment Content 49
- Survey Question Construction 51
 - Bias limitation and detection..... 52
 - Testing the Draft Survey 52
- Analysis of Results 52
 - Data review..... 52
 - Tabulations 53
 - Analyses 53
 - Survey Data Files and Tabulation 53
 - FHWA’s National TPM Implementation Assessment Report 53

Section A: TPM Questions

FHWA defines Transportation Performance Management (TPM) as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. In short, Transportation Performance Management (TPM):

- Is systematically applied in a regular ongoing process.
- Provides key information to help decision makers -- allowing them to understand the consequences of investment decisions across multiple markets.
- Supports the improvement of communications between decision makers, stakeholders and the traveling public.
- Encourages the development of targets and measures in cooperative partnerships and based on data and objective information.

The FHWA Office of TPM has developed a TPM Framework that is comprised of the following 10 components:

Component	Definition
Strategic direction	The establishment of an agency's direction through well-defined goals and objectives and a set of aligned performance measures.
Target Setting	The use of baseline data, information on possible strategies, funding constraints, and forecasting tools to collaboratively set targets.
Performance-based planning	The use of agency goals, objectives, and performance trends to drive the development of strategies and priorities in mid and long range plans.
Performance-based programming	The use of strategies and priorities to guide the allocation of resources to projects selected to achieve goals, objectives, and targets.
Reporting & communication	The products, techniques, and processes used to communicate performance information to different audiences for maximum impact
Monitoring & adjustment	Processes to track and evaluate actions taken and outcomes achieved that establish a feedback loop to adjust planning, programming, and target setting decisions.
External collaboration	Established processes to engage and collaborate with agency partners and stakeholders on planning/visioning, target setting, programming, data sharing, and reporting.
Data Usability & Analysis	The existence of useful and valuable data sets and analysis capabilities, provided in usable, convenient forms to support TPM.
Data Management	The means by which an organization efficiently plans, collects, creates, organizes, uses, controls, stores, disseminates and disposes of data to ensure that the value of the data is understood and fully exploited.
Organization & Culture	Institutionalization of a performance management culture within the organization, as evidenced by leadership support, employee buy-in, and embedded organizational structures and processes that support performance management.

A1. To comply with federal requirements, State DOTs and MPOs may need to implement transportation performance management practices. Generally speaking, how prepared do you feel to carry out the following components of a TPM practice?

TPM Component	1-not at all prepared	2-somewhat unprepared	3-moderately prepared	4-very well prepared
Strategic direction	()	()	()	()
Target Setting	()	()	()	()
Performance-based planning	()	()	()	()

TPM Component	1-not at all prepared	2-somewhat unprepared	3-moderately prepared	4-very well prepared
Performance-based programming	()	()	()	()
Reporting & communication	()	()	()	()
Monitoring & adjustment	()	()	()	()
External collaboration	()	()	()	()
Data Usability & Analysis	()	()	()	()
Data Management	()	()	()	()
Organization & Culture	()	()	()	()

A2. For your agency, how important do you feel each of the ten TPM components are for your agency?

TPM Component	1- not important at all	2- somewhat unimportant	3- somewhat important	4- very important
Strategic direction	()	()	()	()
Target Setting	()	()	()	()
Performance-based planning	()	()	()	()
Performance-based programming	()	()	()	()
Reporting & communication	()	()	()	()
Monitoring & adjustment	()	()	()	()
External collaboration	()	()	()	()
Data Usability & Analysis	()	()	()	()
Data Management	()	()	()	()
Organization & Culture	()	()	()	()

A3. Which of the ten TPM components do you expect will be the biggest challenge for your agency to carry out?

*Please rate how challenging each TPM component will be for your agency from 0 to 10, where "10" (*Biggest Challenge*) means that you feel your agency does not have the skills or resources to address that aspect of TPM at all and "0" (*Not a Challenge*) means that your agency sees no challenge in fulfilling that TPM component.

TPM Component	(0)Not a challenge to Biggest Challenge (10)										
Strategic direction	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Target Setting	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Performance-based planning	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Performance-based programming	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Reporting & communication	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Monitoring & adjustment	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
External collaboration	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Data Usability & Analysis	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Data Management	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Organization & Culture	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

A4. On what TPM components should FHWA be developing technical support to help your agency?

* Please identify the one role that should receive FHWA's highest priority for technical support (column 1), second highest priority (column 2), and third highest priority (column 3).

Select Top 3 TPM Component Priorities (1st, 2nd, 3rd)	1st	2nd	3rd
Strategic direction			
Target Setting			
Performance-based planning			
Performance-based programming			
Reporting & communication			
Monitoring & adjustment			
External collaboration			
Data Usability & Analysis			
Data Management			
Organization & Culture			

A5. To address the need for technical training identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most? (check all that apply)

- Specific training/workshops
- Courses (NHI or similar),
- Guidance
- Guidebooks
- Webinars,
- Performance Plans and Documents Templates
- Tools
- Other:

A6. What do you think of Transportation Performance Management as a business practice? (check the box, on either on right or the left, next to the word you agree with the most)

()	Easy vs. Challenging	()
()	Practical vs. Impractical	()
()	Creative vs. Ordinary	()
()	Important vs. Unimportant	()
()	Inflexible vs. Accommodating	()
()	Groundbreaking vs. Outmoded	()
()	Wasteful vs. Efficient	()

A7. Select and describe the option(s) that best aligns with how your agency is staffed to support transportation performance management. (check all that apply)

	TPM Staffing
()	Dedicated performance management staff
()	Existing organizational unit
()	Temporary implementation group
()	Committee structure
()	Other

Please elaborate on how your organization is staffed or plans to its self to support transportation performance management: _____

A8. What number of Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) would you estimate are focused on performance management activities? _____

A9. If your AGENCY has a reporting website please provide the URL: _____

A10. For each of the performance management functions listed below please indicate: your agency’s need for tools; your agency’s ability to competently carry out the function; and how important the function is to your agency in managing performance.

Function	Need for tools (y/n)	Agency competency (1 to 5)	Importance to Agency (1-not at all important to 4-very important)
Producing graphical and map displays	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Conducting project level benefit-cost alternative analysis	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Conducting system level investment scenario analyses	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Comparing trade-offs across projects, investment scenarios, and performance areas	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Creating internal operational dashboards	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Creating externally facing dashboards	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Reporting progress and performance outcomes on websites	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3
Communicating/Messaging performance results to public and stakeholders	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4

A11. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? (Check all that apply)

- Available staff
- Available data
- Lack of staff skills
- Funding
- Limited time or resources for training
- Availability of Final Rules
- All of the above

A12. Does your agency have over sight of Transit and Public Transportation entities? (Yes/NO)If Yes, please answer the questions in the Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair Supplement Questions and throughout the remainder of the survey.

Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair Supplement

A13. Select and describe the option that best aligns with how your agency is staffed to support transportation performance management in the areas of *Transit Safety and Transit State of Good Repair*.

TPM Staffing for Transit	Transit Safety	Transit State of Good Repair
Dedicated performance management staff	()	()
Existing organizational unit	()	()
Temporary implementation group	()	()
Committee structure	()	()
Other	()	()

A14. On what TPM components should FTA be developing technical support to help your agency? Please identify the one role that should receive FTAs highest priority for technical support (column 1), second highest priority (column 2), and third highest priority (column 3).

Select Top 3 TPM Component Priorities for Transit (1st, 2nd, 3 rd)	1st	2nd	3rd
Strategic direction			
Target Setting			
Performance-based planning			
Performance-based programming			
Reporting & communication			
Monitoring & adjustment			
External collaboration			
Data Usability & Analysis			
Data Management			
Organization & Culture			

A15. To address the need for technical training identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most? (*check all that apply*)

- Specific training/workshops
- Courses (NHI or similar),
- Guidance
- Guidebooks
- Webinars,
- Performance Plans and Documents Templates
- Tools
- Other:

Section B- PBPP Questions

The following questions pertain specifically to PBPP and to your agency's use of PBPP in the transportation planning process.

PBPP Definition: Performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) refers to the application of performance management within the planning and programming processes of transportation agencies to achieve desired performance outcomes for the multimodal transportation system. This includes processes to develop a range of planning products undertaken by a transportation agency with other agencies, stakeholders, and the public as part of a 3C (cooperative, continuing, and comprehensive) process.

It includes development of these key elements:

- Long range transportation plans (LRTPs) or Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs),
- Other plans and processes: e.g., Strategic Highway Safety Plans, Asset Management Plans, the Congestion Management Process, CMAQ Performance Plan, Freight Plans, Transit Agency Asset Management Plans, and Transit Agency Safety Plan,
- Programming documents, including State and metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs and TIPs).

PBPP attempts to ensure that transportation investment decisions in long-term planning and short-term programming of projects are based on an investment's contribution to meeting established goals. [Source: **FHWA PBPP guidebook**; http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/performance_based_planning/]

B1. How does your agency incorporate PBPP into its LRTP? (check all that apply)

- The LRTP includes performance measures linked to the plan's vision, goals, or objectives
- The LRTP includes performance measures corresponding to MAP-21 national goals
- The LRTP includes performance measures corresponding to goals in addition to the national goals specified under MAP-21
- The LRTP performance measures are linked to project selection or screening criteria for STIP/TIP programming
- The LRTP evaluates multiple scenarios based on established performance measures
- The LRTP sets performance targets for goals
- The LRTP includes a monitoring plan for evaluating the results of LRTP investments using performance measures
- All of the above
- None of the above
- Not sure

B2. Indicate the degree to which the LRTP/Strategic Business Plan (SBP) impacts actual investment decisions for the following areas (Please rate the level of linkage between program investments and the performance outcome they intend to achieve using a 1(No linkage) to 5(Strong Linkage) scale.)

Performance Area	1-No linkage	2-Minor Linkage	3-Some Linkage	4-Moderate Linkage	5-Strong Linkage
Highway Safety	()	()	()	()	()
Transit Safety	()	()	()	()	()
Pavement	()	()	()	()	()
Bridge	()	()	()	()	()
Transit State of Good Repair	()	()	()	()	()
Congestion/Mobility/System Performance	()	()	()	()	()
CMAQ On-Road Mobile Source Emissions	()	()	()	()	()
Freight	()	()	()	()	()

B3. For the following plans, indicate if there is a connection to PBPP elements in the LRTP. For example, do these plans and the LRTP share goals, measures, targets or strategies? (check all that apply)

Performance Plan	Goals	Measures	Targets	Strategies	Unclear
Strategic Highway Safety Plan	()	()	()	()	()
Asset Management Plan	()	()	()	()	()
Congestion Management Process	()	()	()	()	()
CMAQ performance plan	()	()	()	()	()
Freight Plans	()	()	()	()	()
Transit Agency Asset Management Plan	()	()	()	()	()
Transit Agency Safety Plan	()	()	()	()	()

B4. How does your agency incorporate PBPP into its STIP/TIP? (check all that apply)

- The LRTP goals and performance measures are reflected in STIP/TIP project selection or screening
- Priorities or rating of proposed STIP/TIP investments are determined or informed by performance measures
- The STIP/TIP evaluates alternative investment scenarios based on LRTP goals and performance measures
- The results of STIP/TIP investments are monitored using performance measures
- STIP/TIP project selection or screening includes a discussion as to how the investment program will achieve targets

B5. Indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statement:

“Your agency has a plan that identifies the strategies and/or investments that will be made to achieve specific targets in the following performance areas:”

Performance Area	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Somewhat Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Somewhat Agree	5-Strongly Agree
Highway Safety	()	()	()	()	()
Transit Safety	()	()	()	()	()
Bridge	()	()	()	()	()
Pavement	()	()	()	()	()
Transit State of Good Repair	()	()	()	()	()

Performance Area	1-Strongly Disagree	2-Somewhat Disagree	3-Neutral	4-Somewhat Agree	5-Strongly Agree
Congestion/Mobility/System Performance	()	()	()	()	()
CMAQ On-Road Mobile Source Emissions	()	()	()	()	()
Freight	()	()	()	()	()

B6. Does your agency use measures in other non- highway modes to evaluate performance? (check all that apply)

- Amtrak/Freight Rail
- Transit Rail
- Transit Bus
- Aviation
- Waterways/Shipping
- Passenger/ Auto Ferries
- Hiking/Biking Trails
- Bike/Pedestrian
- Other State Transportation Agencies (STA) areas: _____

B7. How does your agency evaluate the outcomes of its transportation planning and programming processes? (Check all that apply)

- The agency regularly monitors the effect of project and strategies funded in the STIP/TIP
- The agency reports on progress towards achieving performance targets
- The agency applies the evaluation of investment effectiveness in future programming decisions
- Congestion Management Program annual reporting
- The Agency DOES NOT identify the outcomes they want from the transportation planning and programming process

B8. Rate your sense of the readiness of your agency to effectively carry out a performance-based planning and programming approach using the scale below (select one):

Rating	Scale
()	Low - In general, the STA has not integrated performance into their planning and investment decision making and will need considerable assistance to carry out a performance-based federal program
()	Moderate - STA needs to build capacity and develop better tools/processes to carry out a performance-based federal program in a majority of the performance areas
()	High - STA is prepared to carry out a performance-based federal program in some of the areas of performance
()	Very High - STA is prepared to carry out a performance-based federal program in all areas of performance

B9. In general, how would you describe your agency's the coordination with other planning organizations (the State DOT, MPO(s), Rural Transportation Planning Organization(s) (RTPO[s]), Tribal Organizations, operators of public transportation, and local agencies) to establish performance measures and targets for the state using the scale below? (*select one*)

Rating	Scale
()	Nonexistent – State DOT and other planning organizations/agencies do not communicate effectively
()	Ineffective - State DOT and other planning organizations/agencies communicate but are not aware of each other's view of performance expectations for the region
()	Somewhat Effective – State DOT and other planning organizations/agencies share their respective performance expectations but do not collaborate on a shared vision for the region
()	Highly Effective – State DOT and other planning organizations/agencies collaboratively work together to program investments that support generally shared performance expectations. Absent agreements, each implements programs based on shared expectations.
()	Very Highly Effective – State DOT and other planning organizations/agencies work together in a collaborative manner to decide on performance expectations for a region. All agree to program investments in support of this shared expectation of performance

B10. Have you realized any benefits (quantitative or qualitative) in using performance-based planning and programming? (*Please check all that apply*)

- The planning process is improved
- The planning process has a greater influence on decisions
- New or enhanced focus on measurable results
- Improved results – “better decisions”
- Improved transparency and credibility of process
- Improved understanding of process by partners, public, and stakeholders
- Greater acceptance of plans and projects by partners, public, and stakeholders
- Other (describe): _____

B11. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has the PBPP process been as a tool for:*

PBPP process	1- Nonexistent	2- Ineffective	3- Somewhat Effective	4-Highly Effective	5-Very Highly Effective
Guiding transportation investments	()	()	()	()	()
Encouraging meaningful Collaboration between the MPO and state DOT, public transit, and other partner agencies	()	()	()	()	()
Setting direction in the LRTP (strategic direction, goals, priorities, policies)	()	()	()	()	()
Selecting or screening alternative projects for STIP/TIP	()	()	()	()	()
Communicating results	()	()	()	()	()
Evaluating the results of policies, investments, and strategies	()	()	()	()	()

PBPP process	1- Nonexistent	2- Ineffective	3- Somewhat Effective	4-Highly Effective	5-Very Highly Effective
Improving understanding and support for the planning process	()	()	()	()	()
Encouraging participation by stakeholders and the public in the planning process.	()	()	()	()	()

B12. To improve your agency’s effectiveness in using PBPP as a tool for the purposes identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?

- Specific training/workshops
- Courses (NHI or similar),
- Guidance
- Guidebooks
- Webinars,
- Performance Plans and Documents Templates
- Tools
- Other:

C. Highway Asset Management

FHWA defines asset management is a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving physical assets, with a focus on engineering and economic analysis based upon quality information, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.

Each State is required to develop a risk-based asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) to improve or preserve the condition of the assets and the performance of the system. While the required risk-based asset management plan specifies pavements and bridges on the NHS in 23 U.S.C. § 119(e)(4), 23 U.S.C. 119(e)(3) (MAP-21 § 1106) requires USDOT to encourage States to include all infrastructure assets within the highway right-of-way. Examples of such infrastructure assets include: pavement markings, culverts, guardrail, signs, traffic signals, lighting, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) infrastructure, rest areas, etc., in the asset management plan.

C1. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate to what extent your agency has documented the following Asset Management Plan activities (1-no at all documented to 5-Completely documented):

Asset Management activities	1-Not at all Documented	2- Beginning to Document	3-Somewhat Documented	4-Significantly Documented	5-Completely Documented
Summary listing of the pavement and bridge assets on the National Highway System in the State, including a description of the condition of those assets	()	()	()	()	()
Asset management objectives and measures;	()	()	()	()	()
Performance gap identification	()	()	()	()	()
Lifecycle cost and risk management analysis,	()	()	()	()	()
A financial plan	()	()	()	()	()
Investment strategies	()	()	()	()	()

C2. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate the degree to which the Performance-based Planning and Programming processes support each of the following Asset Management practices in your Agency (1-No linkage) to 5-Strong Linkage):

Asset Management practices	1-No linkage	2-Minor Linkage	3-Some Linkage	4-Moderate Linkage	5-Strong Linkage
Long-range plan includes an evaluation of capital, operational, and modal alternatives to meet system deficiencies.	()	()	()	()	()

Asset Management practices	1-No linkage	2-Minor Linkage	3-Some Linkage	4-Moderate Linkage	5-Strong Linkage
Capital versus maintenance expenditure tradeoffs are explicitly considered in the preservation of assets like pavements and bridges.	()	()	()	()	()
Capital versus operations tradeoffs are explicitly considered in seeking to improve traffic movement.	()	()	()	()	()
Long-range plan provides clear and specific guidance for the capital program development process.	()	()	()	()	()
Criteria used to set program priorities, select projects, and allocate resources are consistent with stated policy objectives and defined performance measures	()	()	()	()	()
Preservation program budget is based upon analyses of least-life-cycle cost rather than exclusive reliance on worst-first strategies.	()	()	()	()	()
A maintenance quality assurance study has been implemented to define levels of service for transportation system maintenance	()	()	()	()	()

C3. Has your agency/organization implemented or is planning to implement an Asset Management System (please check one)?

- Yes, it has already implemented an Asset Management System.
- No, it does not plan to implement an Asset Management System.
- It is planning to implement an Asset Management System but it does not have one yet.
- Don't know.

C4. Please check the management systems your agency/organization currently has, along with the status of each system within an overall Asset Management framework (please check all that apply):

Stand-alone management system:	Integrated within Asset Management framework			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pavement (PMS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Planned	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> Bridge (BMS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Planned	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> Highway Safety (SMS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Planned	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know

Stand-alone management system:	Integrated within Asset Management framework			
<input type="radio"/> Traffic Congestion (CMS)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Planned	<input type="radio"/> Don't know
<input type="radio"/> Public Transportation Facilities and Equipment (PTMS)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Planned	<input type="radio"/> Don't know
<input type="radio"/> Intermodal Transportation Facilities and Systems (ITMS)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Planned	<input type="radio"/> Don't know
<input type="radio"/> Maintenance Management (MMS)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Planned	<input type="radio"/> Don't know

Please list any other management systems used by your agency/organization:

C5. Please indicate if your agency collects data for each of the following roadway assets types and specify the data collection method (check all that apply).

Roadway Assets:	Data Collection Method:		
<input type="radio"/> Drainage	<input type="radio"/> Manual*	<input type="radio"/> Automatic**	<input type="radio"/> Both
<input type="radio"/> Roadside Assets	<input type="radio"/> Manual	<input type="radio"/> Auto	<input type="radio"/> Both
<input type="radio"/> Pavements	<input type="radio"/> Manual	<input type="radio"/> Auto	<input type="radio"/> Both
<input type="radio"/> Bridge	<input type="radio"/> Manual	<input type="radio"/> Auto	<input type="radio"/> Both
<input type="radio"/> Traffic Items	<input type="radio"/> Manual	<input type="radio"/> Auto	<input type="radio"/> Both
<input type="radio"/> Special Facilities	<input type="radio"/> Manual	<input type="radio"/> Auto	<input type="radio"/> Both
* Manual data collection involves two or more data collectors that record the data either with pen or most recently with hand-held computers.			
** Automatic data collection involves the use of some type of data collection vehicle or equipment, e.g., video cameras, laser sensors, etc. to capture, store, and process the collected data			

C6. On a scale of 1 to 4, how important do you feel each of the following Asset Management decision processes are for your agency/organization (1-not at all important to 4-very important)

Asset Management Decision Processes	1- not important at all	2- somewhat unimportant	3- somewhat important	4- very important
Policy formulation	()	()	()	()
Performance evaluation and monitoring	()	()	()	()
Fiscal planning	()	()	()	()
Program optimization and trade-offs	()	()	()	()
Development of alternatives (for sustaining assets through their life-cycle)	()	()	()	()
Impact analysis	()	()	()	()
Performance-based budgeting	()	()	()	()
Project selection	()	()	()	()
Resource allocations	()	()	()	()
Program delivery/project implementation	()	()	()	()
Audit, reporting and communication	()	()	()	()

C7. On a scale of 1 to 4, please rate the following criteria according to their level of importance for selecting projects that are candidates for funding and implementation within your agency/organization (1-not at all important to 4-very important):

Project Selection Criteria	1- not important at all	2- somewhat unimportant	3- somewhat important	4- very important	Don't know
Available budget earmarked funds	()	()	()	()	()
Project significance	()	()	()	()	()
Usage of the project	()	()	()	()	()
Proximity of the project to major urban areas	()	()	()	()	()
Ease/difficulty of implementation	()	()	()	()	()
Engineering parameters (including asset condition)	()	()	()	()	()
Geographic distribution of projects/funds	()	()	()	()	()
Distribution among asset types	()	()	()	()	()
Public demands/user opinion	()	()	()	()	()
Environmental consideration	()	()	()	()	()
User costs/benefits	()	()	()	()	()
Agency costs/benefits	()	()	()	()	()
Community costs/benefits	()	()	()	()	()

Please list up to three other criteria important for project selection within your agency/organization: _____

C8. Do you think that the above criteria that are used by an agency in order to select between different projects or groups of projects are or should be uniform and consistent for all types of different roadway assets (please click one)?

Yes.

No.

Don't know.

If Yes please explain why: _____

C9. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate your agency's technical capacity to carry out the following Asset Management decision-support activities (1-No Capabilities to 5-Expert level Capabilities):

Asset Management decision-support activities	1-No capabilities	2- Basic level capabilities	3-Interim level capabilities	4-Advanced level capabilities	5-Expert level capabilities
Calculate and report actual system performance;	()	()	()	()	()
Identify system deficiencies or needs	()	()	()	()	()
Rank candidate projects for the capital program	()	()	()	()	()

Asset Management decision-support activities	1-No capabilities	2- Basic level capabilities	3-Interim level capabilities	4-Advanced level capabilities	5-Expert level capabilities
Forecast future system performance given a proposed program of projects	()	()	()	()	()
Forecast future system performance under different mixes of investment levels by program category.	()	()	()	()	()
Monitors actual system performance and compares these values to targets projected for its capital preservation program	()	()	()	()	()
Monitors actual system performance and compares these values to targets projected for its capital improvement program	()	()	()	()	()
Monitors actual system performance and compares these values to targets projected for its maintenance and operations program.	()	()	()	()	()

C10. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? Check all that apply

- Available staff
- Available data
- Lack of staff skills
- Funding
- Limited time or resources for training
- Availability of Final Rules
- All of the above

C11. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate the degree to which your agency’s policies and guidance is linked to or supports implementing the following Asset Management practices (1-No linkage to 5-Strong Linkage).

Policies and guidance related to Asset Management	1-No linkage	2-Minor Linkage	3-Some Linkage	4-Moderate Linkage	5-Strong Linkage
Policy guidance supports preservation of existing infrastructure assets.	()	()	()	()	()

Policies and guidance related to Asset Management	1-No linkage	2-Minor Linkage	3-Some Linkage	4-Moderate Linkage	5-Strong Linkage
Policy guidance encourages resource allocation and project selection based on cost-effectiveness or benefit/cost analysis	()	()	()	()	()
Policies support a long-term, life-cycle approach to evaluating investment benefits and costs.	()	()	()	()	()
Policy guidance on resource allocation allows our agency sufficient flexibility to pursue a performance-based approach.	()	()	()	()	()
Our agency has a business plan or strategic plan with comprehensive, well-defined goals and objectives to guide resource allocations	()	()	()	()	()
Our agency's goals and objectives are linked to specific performance measures and evaluation criteria for resource allocation	()	()	()	()	()

C12. How does your agency evaluate the outcomes of its transportation AM practices?

- The agency regularly monitors the effect of project and strategies funded in the STIP/TIP
- The agency reports on progress towards achieving performance targets
- The agency applies the evaluation of investment effectiveness in future programming decisions
- Congestion Management Program annual reporting

C13. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has your Asset Management p been as a tool for guiding transportation investments (1-nonexistent to 5-very highly effective)

- 1: Nonexistent
- 2: Ineffective
- 3: Somewhat Effective
- 4: Highly effective
- 5: Very Highly Effective

C14. On a scale of 1 to 5 how effective has the AM process been as a data collection tool for(1-nonexistent to 5-very highly effective):*

AM process	1-Nonexistent	2-Ineffective	3-Somewhat effective	4-Highly effective	5-Very highly Effective
Completing and keeping an up-to-date inventory of your major assets.	()	()	()	()	()

AM process	1- Nonexistent	2- Ineffective	3-Somewhat effective	4-Highly effective	5-Very highly Effective
Collecting information on the condition of your assets.	()	()	()	()	()
Collecting information on the performance of your assets (e.g. serviceability, ride quality, capacity, operations, and safety improvements).	()	()	()	()	()
Improving the efficiency of data collection (e.g., through sampling techniques, use of automated equipment, other methods appropriate to our transportation system).	()	()	()	()	()
Establishing standards for geographic referencing that allow us to bring together information for different asset classes.	()	()	()	()	()

C15. To address the need for AM technical training identified what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?

- Specific training/workshops
- Courses (NHI or similar),
- Guidance
- Guidebooks
- Webinars,
- Performance Plans and Documents Templates
- Tools
- Other: _____

Sections D to J: Common and Specific Performance Area Questions

Common questions that will be asked for all 8 performance areas (including the transit supplementary questions) are grouped in this section. Questions in the section are also grouped thematically by following 6 subsections:

- Staffing
- Data & Analysis
- Performance Measures
- Target Setting
- Programming
- Monitoring & Reporting
- Capacity building needs

In the administered online survey, each set of performance area questions will be “self-contained” so they can be delegated to the appropriate subject matter experts.

TPM STAFFING

CommonQ1. On a scale of 1-5, rate that impact that implementing federal performance management requirements to related **PERFORMANCE AREA X will have on staff resources (1-No Impact to 5-High Impact).**

1-No Impact	2. Minor Impact	3. Some Impact	4. Moderate Impact	5-High Impact
()	()	()	()	()

Please Explain _____

DATA & ANALYSIS

CommonQ2. How do you obtain data relevant for **PERFORMANCE AREA X performance management (select all that apply)?**

No data	Collect own data	Purchase data	Provided by 3rd party	Collaboration with Partner agency	Evaluating outsourcing data collection
[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

CommonQ3. With respect to data collection, what criteria did your agency use to determine whether or not to outsource *PERFORMANCE AREA X* data collection or rely on 3rd party data? (select all that apply)

- Cost-effectiveness
- Scope of data collection requirements
- Availability of qualified contractors
- Capability of in-house data collection teams
- Experiences of other agencies that have out-sourced data collection
- Coordination with other agencies
- Not applicable
- Other (please specify): _____

CommonQ4. With respect to Data Analysis, what criteria did your agency use to determine whether or not to outsource *PERFORMANCE AREA X* data analysis? (select all that apply)

- Cost-effectiveness
- Scope of data analysis requirements
- Availability of qualified contractors
- Capability of in-house data analysis teams
- Experiences of other agencies that have out-sourced data analysis
- Coordination with other agencies
- Not applicable
- Other (please specify): _____

CommonQ5. Does your agency have data analytic tools to help with processing and managing data, calculating measures, setting targets, programming and monitoring results for *PERFORMANCE AREA X*?

Yes, extensive set of analytic tools	Yes, some analytic tools	No	Not sure
()	()	()	()

CommonQ6. For each of the performance management functions listed below please indicate your agency’s need for tools; your agency’s ability to competently carry out the function; and how important the function is to your agency in managing *PERFORMANCE AREA X*.

Function	Need for tools (y/n)	Agency competency (1 low – 5 very high)	Importance to Agency (1-not at all important to 4-very important)
Collecting, processing, reviewing, and managing data	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Developing performance models and forecasting trends	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Assessing and developing system-wide targets	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Selecting and programming projects	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4
Evaluation and analysis of performance results	(y/n)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4

CommonQ7. What specific limitations constrain you from considering the activities listed in the previous question? (Check all that apply)

- Available staff
- Available data
- Lack of staff skills
- Funding
- Limited time or resources for training
- Availability of Final Rules
- All of the above

D. SPECIFIC TO SAFETY: DATA & ANALYSIS

D1. What percentage of public roads are covered by your crash database?

- () 0 – 20%
- () 21 – 40%

D2. Have HSIP funds addressed “off state” system needs adequately?

- No, local needs are not considered.
- Minimally, token amount of HSIP funds flow to locals, but not enough based on crash data
- Marginally, some HSIP funds flow to locals, but not enough based on crash data
- Yes, the distribution of HSIP funds between state and “off State” system matches the distribution of crash data

D3. Typically how long does it take for crash data from all public roads to be entered into your Statewide crash database?

- Over 1 year
- 9 – 12 months
- 6 – 9 months
- 3 – 6 months
- 0 – 3 months

D4. Which agencies do you cooperate with to gather crash data?

- Counties
- Cities
- Federal agencies
- Tribes
- Other States
- Other (please specify): _____

D5. Does your agency collect and analyze data to assess overall program- level benefits of the HSIP?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

D6. To what extent does your agency have current or projected railroad traffic?

- The State has extensive data on the current railroad traffic and extensive data on the projected railroad traffic.
- The State has extensive data on the current railroad, but little to no data on the projected railroad traffic.
- The State has little to no data on the current railroad traffic, but extensive data on the projected railroad traffic.
- The State has little to no data on the current railroad traffic and little to no data on the projected railroad traffic.

E. SPECIFIC TO BRIDGE: DATA & ANALYSIS

E1. Who conducts the National Bridge Inspection Standards safety inspections of non-State owned NHS bridges?

- State
- Owner Agency
- Not Sure

E2. How does your agency handle the National Bridge Inspection Standards responsibilities for border bridges (bridges that cross State borders)?

- Written agreement
- Periodic meetings
- Do Nothing
- Not Sure
- 41 – 60%

- 61 – 80%
- 81 – 100%

F. Specific to PAVEMENT: DATA & Analysis

F1. Is pavement data collected in both directions?*

Route Location	Yes, full extent	Yes, partial extent	No	Not sure
On Interstate Routes?	()	()	()	()
On other Routes?	()	()	()	()

F2. How often is pavement data collected on the National Highway System?

- Annually
- Biennially
- Varies by data item

F3. Who acquires pavement data on non- State owned NHS Routes?

- State
- Owner Agency
- Don't Know

G. SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: DATA & ANALYSIS

G1. What data do you use in the freight performance measurement and performance-based planning processes?

- Probe data
- NPMRDS
- FAF
- AADT/HPMS
- Other (please specify): _____

H.SPECIFIC TO CONGESTION/MOBILITY/SYSTEM PERFORMANCE: DATA & ANALYSIS

H1. Do you have any programs in place to count the number of pedestrians and cyclists that use your transportation system?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

H2. What data do you use in the Congestion/Mobility/System Performance measurement and performance-based planning processes?

- Probe data
- NPMRDS
- FAF
- AADT/HPMS
- Other (please specify): _____

J. SPECIFIC TO TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR SUPPLEMENT: DATA AND ANALYSIS

J1. Do you have ready access to data to understand TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR in your area? If yes, describe and explain.

- Yes
- No

J2. Does your agency collect data on TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR outside the National Transit Database?

- Yes, Annually
- Yes, Biennially
- Yes, _____
- No

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

CommonQ8. Are the *PERFORMANCE AREA X* measures used by your agency incorporated into the following activities?

Activity	Yes	No
Included in LRTP	()	()
Prioritizing Projects	()	()
Monitoring and Analysis	()	()
Reporting	()	()

CommonQ9. The AGENCY tracks leading **PERFORMANCE AREA X indicators (leading indicators are metrics that often correlate to a change in performance before a trend can be dedicated using a performance measure) on a regular basis to assess progress in the achievement of longer term outcomes**

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
()	()	()	()	()

CommonQ10. When establishing your chosen **PERFORMANCE AREA X performance measures, did current data availability factors influence what measures were established? If yes, please describe briefly if your agency is planning new, more meaningful, measures in the future when data becomes more readily available.**

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

G.SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

G2. Does your freight performance measurement include truck parking?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

G3. Have you developed freight performance measure in the following modes?*

	Yes	No	Not sure
Highway	()	()	()
Rail	()	()	()
Marine	()	()	()
Air	()	()	()

H.SPECIFIC TO Congestion/Mobility/System Performance: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

H3. Which Congestion/Mobility/System Performance related performance measures does your agency produce?

- Congestion
- Reliability
- Delay
- Incident management
- Signal system
- Other (please specify): _____

TARGET SETTING

CommonQ11. When establishing targets for PERFORMANCE AREA X, what is the level of coordination with other entities in selecting targets.

Rating	Scale
()	Nonexistent – State DOT and other organizations/agencies impacted by PERFORMANCE AREA X do not communicate effectively
()	Moderate - State DOT and organizations/agencies impacted by PERFORMANCE AREA X communicate but are not aware of each other's view of performance expectations for the region
()	Somewhat Effective – State DOT and other organizations/agencies impacted by PERFORMANCE AREA X share their respective performance expectations but do not collaborate on a shared vision for the region
()	Generally Effective – State DOT and other organizations/agencies impacted by PERFORMANCE AREA X collaboratively work together to program investments that support generally shared performance expectations. Absent agreements, each implements programs based on shared expectations.
()	Very Effective – State DOT and other organizations/agencies impacted by PERFORMANCE AREA X work together in a collaborative manner to decide on performance expectations for a region. All agree to program investments in support of this shared expectation of performance

CommonQ12. Your agency has developed short term quantifiable *PERFORMANCE AREA X* performance targets that can be used to guide program investment decision making

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
()	()	()	()	()

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

CommonQ13. Indicate the degree to which *PERFORMANCE AREA X* performance targets impacts actual investment decisions

Please select the current the level of linkage between program investments and the performance target using a 1 to 5 scale.

1. No link	2. Minor Linkage	3. Some Linkage	4. Moderate Linkage	5. Strong Linkage
()	()	()	()	()

CommonQ14. Select your current capability to predict the outcome of *PERFORMANCE AREA X* programming decisions on the following scale:

1 – accurate data driven models	2 – empirical based models	3 – predictions based on historical trends	4 – unable to predict outcomes
()	()	()	()

CommonQ15. Does your agency conduct evaluate the before and after performance outcomes on completed *PERFORMANCE AREA X* projects?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
()	()	()	()	()

CommonQ16. Select your current capability: To what extent do you coordinate with other investment decision making entities on the development of investment plans and the programming of *PERFORMANCE AREA X* projects?

No Coordination	Limited Coordination	Moderately Coordinated	Completely Coordinated	N/A
()	()	()	()	()

CommonQ17. Have you been able to successfully use a performance based justification to acquire additional funds to support *PERFORMANCE AREA X* transportation needs? Please Explain

- ()No
- ()Yes
- ()Partially

D.SPECIFIC TO SAFETY: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING:

D7. What criteria are used to prioritize safety projects for programming and implementation? (Check all that apply)

- Effectiveness assessment of similar program/strategy (e.g., HSIP evaluation affects future project selection)
- Cost
- Project readiness
- SHSP
- All crashes with no indication of safety

- Only fatal crashes
- Only fatal and serious injury crashes
- All crashes with weighting to reflect severity
- None
- Other (please specify): _____

D8. To what extent does your agency effectively coordinate with the SHSO on HSIP efforts?

- 1: Nonexistent – State DOT and SHSO do not communicate effectively
- 2: Ineffective - State DOT and SHSO communicate but are not aware of each other's view of Safety performance expectations for the region
- 3: Somewhat Effective – State DOT and SHSO share their respective safety performance expectations but do not collaborate on a shared vision for the region
- 4: Highly Effective – State DOT and SHSO collaboratively work together to program investments that support generally shared Safety performance expectations. Absent agreements, each implements programs based on shared expectations.
- 5: Very Highly Effective – State DOT and SHSO work together in a collaborative manner to decide on Safety performance expectations for a region. All agree to program investments in support of this shared expectation of performance

E.SPECIFIC TO BRIDGE: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

E3. Describe impact of expansion of National Highway System on the State agency Bridge programs.

- Massive –Major changes to funding and project prioritization efforts?
- Significant – Changes to planning and management but little impact on funding.
- Moderate –Minor adjustments to State programs and funding program essentially unchanged

F.SPECIFIC TO PAVEMENT: PLANNING & PROGRAMMING

F4. What criteria are used to prioritize pavement projects for programming and implementation? Check all that apply

- Greatest need of attention
- Scheduled treatment interval
- Single year prioritization
- Multi-year prioritization
- Incremental cost benefit
- other

F5. Describe impact of expansion of National Highway System on the State agency pavement programs.

- Massive –Major changes to funding and project prioritization efforts?

Significant – Changes to planning and management but little impact on funding.

Moderate –Minor adjustments to State programs and funding program essentially unchanged

G.SPECIFIC TO FREIGHT: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

G2. Does your agency have a MAP- 21 compliant Statewide Freight Plan?

Yes

No

Not Sure

I.SPECIFIC TO ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE: PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

I1. Do you currently or regularly develop quantitative emissions estimates for your CMAQ projects?

Yes

Sometimes

No

Not Sure

I2. How do you plan to transition to quantitative emissions estimates?

I am waiting for FHWA to develop a toolkit for estimating emissions

I have a contractor on board to help develop emissions estimates

My staff has the technical capabilities to develop quantitative estimates

I have no plan to transition from the current qualitative analyses

Other (please specify): _____

I3. Some project types have historically never had a quantitative emissions estimate, such as public education, marketing, and operating assistance. How do you plan to quantify these benefits?

I am waiting for FHWA to tell me how to estimate emissions for these types of projects

I have a contractor on board to help develop emissions estimates for these types of projects

My staff has the technical capabilities to determine the best way to quantify emissions for these types of projects

I have no plan to start developing quantitative emissions estimates for these types of projects

I have no plan to transition from the current qualitative analyses

Other (please specify): _____

I4. How do you capture benefits and report emissions benefits for a group of projects or bundle of projects? (select the most applicable response)

I didn't know we could group projects

- Only report qualitative benefits
- Based on some assumptions about co-benefits from the group of projects
- Other (please specify): _____

J. SPECIFIC TO: TRANSIT SAFETY AND TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR SUPPLEMENT:

J3. Does your agency have a plan that addresses TRANSIT SAFETY?

- Yes
- No
- Underway
- Not Sure

J4. Does your agency have a transit asset management plan that addresses TRANSIT STATE OF GOOD REPAIR?

- Yes
- No
- Underway
- Not Sure

MONITORING, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING

CommonQ18. With what frequency does your AGENCY routinely report INTERNALLY on performance outcomes and progress made toward the achievement of specific targets of performance?

No Internal Reporting	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Other
()	()	()	()	Specify

CommonQ19. With what frequency does your AGENCY routinely report EXTERNALLY on **PERFORMANCE AREA X performance outcomes and progress made toward the achievement of specific targets of **PERFORMANCE AREA X** performance?**

No External Reporting	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Other

No External Reporting	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Other
()	()	()	()	Specify

CommonQ20. How are the *PERFORMANCE AREA X* performance results (outcomes, progress meeting targets, etc.) communicated?

Method	Internal	External
Management Meetings	()	()
Quarterly reports	()	()
Dashboards	()	()
Annual Reports	()	()
Fact Sheets	()	()
Action Plans	()	()
Newsletters	()	()
Other	()	()

CAPACITY BUILDING

CommonQ21. Please indicate the areas that your agency will likely need assistance for TPM practices related to *PERFORMANCE AREA X*.(check all that apply)

- Data usability & analysis
- Data management
- Performance measure development
- Target setting
- Connecting system performance information to various transportation plans
- Linking performance information to programming decisions
- Performance monitoring
- Performance reporting & communication
- External collaboration
- Organizational and cultural resistance to TPM practices

CommonQ22. To address the need for TPM technical training related to *PERFORMANCE AREA X* identified in the previous question, what capacity building format would benefit you and other agency staff members the most?

- Specific training/workshops
- Courses (NHI or similar),
- Guidance
- Guidebooks

- Webinars,
- Performance Plans and Documents Templates
- Tools
- Other: _____

Outline of the National TPM Implementation Review Data Collection and Analysis Design

The primary goal of the National Transportation Performance Management (TPM) Implementation Review is to gather information about the application of performance management, performance based-planning and programming principles, and other MAP-21 performance provisions at State Departments of Transportation (State DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The data collection effort will help identify training and capacity-building resources to support the implementation of TPM practices across the transportation industry. The data collection effort will be administered twice; first in 2016 and again in either 2017 or 2018 so that progress in the development and application of TPM capabilities may be measured, and so that additional capacity building tools can be created. As stated in the 60 day Federal Register Notice published 6/23/2016, the intention of the National TPM Implementation Review is to establish a baseline to assess:

1. Implementing MAP-21 performance provisions and related TPM best practices; and
2. The effectiveness of performance-based planning and programming processes and transportation performance management.

The second National TPM Implementation Review will be conducted several years later and will be used to assess FHWA and its partners' progress addressing any gaps or issues identified during the first review. The findings from the first review will be used in a pair of statutory reports to Congress due in 2017 on the effectiveness of performance-based planning and programming processes and transportation performance management (23 U.S.C. 119, 134(l)(2)- 135(h)(2)). The findings from the second review will be used in a subsequent follow-up report. It is important to note that this is not a compliance review. The overall focus of the National TPM Implementation Review is on the TPM and performance-based planning processes used by STAs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), not the outcomes of those processes.¹

TPM implementation will require State Dots and MPOs to collaborate with FHWA on the development of transportation performance measures related to national goals. The State DOTs and MPOs will then need to work with FHWA to operationalize these performance measures by developing performance targets and determine what constitutes significant progress. Transportation agencies will also be required to report on and explain performance results. Across all aspects of TPM, the State DOTs and MPOs will need to work collaboratively with each other and with FHWA, and they will need to collect, maintain, and manage the performance data.

The National TPM Implementation Review will seek to provide quantitative and coded qualitative data from open ended questions that can be summarized to spur further discussion of the resource and guidance needs of transportation agencies. It is believed that State DOTs and MPOs have a general understanding of TPM practices and have begun implementation, but it will be beneficial to

1 <http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FHWA-2015-0013-0001>

have a better understanding of specific capabilities, progress, challenges and needs. The assessment will collect data from State DOT and MPO staff regarding:

- Self-assessments of their capabilities to implement performance management and status of their current practice;
- Perceived priorities of different aspects of performance management;
- Understood benefits and drawbacks of TPM practices;
- Identification of key challenges of TPM implementation from the perspective of the Partner Organizations;
- Assessment of needs and interest in receiving training, guidance resources, and technical assistance;
- Preferences among alternative means for providing capacity building and training; and
- Evaluation of TPM components by specific performance areas (e.g., safety, bridge, pavement).

The analysis of the assessment results will provide quantitative assessments and comparative analyses of the:

- Partner Organizations' readiness to implement TPM;
- Partner Organizations perceived usage and their perception of the effectiveness of the performance-based planning and programming process
- Gap analysis identifying disconnects between TPM principles and agency capabilities; and
- Partner Organizations' prioritization of potential capacity building and training efforts.

The following is an outline of the assessment data collection plan.

National TPM Implementation Participants

Survey Sampling: The assessment will be based on:

- A census (100 percent sample) of 52 State Departments of Transportation (DOTs),
- A stratified random sample² of urbanized areas from which metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) will be drawn, and
- Follow-up data collection with the same respondent organizations in 2017 or 2018.

State DOT Data Collection: As the assessment will seek to include all State DOTs, no formal sampling strategy will be required for this respondent group. A recent preliminary assessment of the state transportation agencies by FHWA had full participation, so we expect that we will have a high response rate of 80 percent or more. With a response rate of 80 percent (42 agencies), the 90 percent confidence level margin-of-error for population proportion estimates would be at most plus or minus 6 percent. With a response rate of 90 percent (47 agencies), the 90 percent confidence level margin-of-error for population proportion estimates would be less than plus or minus 4 percent. We believe this minimum response would adequately enable FHWA to identify

² With a stratified random sample strategy, we divide sampling units into separate groups (strata) that are likely to have less variability within them than the overall sampling population has. Then, each group is randomly sampled separately. Weighting of results is required to account for the sizes of the strata and differential sampling rates, but the stratified sampling increases the efficiency of the sample, so results can be more precise than for a simple random sample.

and quantify state transportation agency levels of readiness, areas of concern, and training and resource needs.

MPO Data Collection: The MPO survey participants will be drawn from urbanized area strata based on the represented metropolitan areas' population, air quality characteristics, and planning organization representation. Since many regulatory requirement thresholds are related to area population and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) air quality conformity assessments, these thresholds are likely to reflect differences in the surveyed agencies' level of sophistication and exposure to performance management based planning concepts.

The urbanized area strata will include:

- Stratum 1: Areas of more than one million population;
- Stratum 2: Areas of less than one million population that have air quality non-attainment issues;
- Stratum 3: Areas of between 200,000 and one million population that do not have air quality non-attainment issues;
- Stratum 4: Areas represented by MPOs with less-than-200,000 population that do not have air quality non-attainment issues;

The sampling frame for this assessment will be finalized through the combination of several available federal databases:

- Census Bureau Urbanized Area List;
- the MPO database maintained by FHWA; and
- EPA Greenbook, which records air quality conformity issues by region.

Based on our preliminary processing of these sources, the populations of urbanized areas by strata are about the following:

- Stratum 1 – 50 regions;
- Stratum 2 – 63 regions;
- Stratum 3 – 112 regions; and
- Stratum 4 – 183 regions.

These population estimates will be reviewed and corrected prior to final sample selection to ensure that the assignment of regions by type is accurate, but by using these estimates for planning for the sampling, we would propose to sample:

- Stratum 1 – include all 50 regions in sample;
- Stratum 2 – include all 63 regions in sample;
- Stratum 3 – include 100 regions in sample;
- Stratum 4 – include 120 regions in sample;

The lower sampling rates for the third and fourth strata are proposed for the practical purpose of ensuring that valid contacts can be identified for all assessment participants. In previous MPO surveying efforts, delivering email invitations to the most relevant personnel at smaller agencies was more difficult because of higher staff turnover and greater complexity in organizational structures and agency hosting arrangements.

The MPOs from the selected regions in strata 1 to 4 will be contacted to complete the survey. A recent web-based survey of Census data specialists at MPOs conducted for AASHTO yielded a response rate of 27 percent. Another recent survey of MPOs conducted for FHWA regarding the organizational structure of the agencies had a response rate of 36 percent. The National TPM Implementation Assessment is expected to have a comparatively strong response rate, because of the importance of the data collection topic to the mission of the MPOs and because of the full range of survey design measures that will be employed to minimize non-response bias that are described in later sections below, most notably:

- The survey topic will be of greater importance to the target respondents, the agencies' Executive Directors, as the topic will affect many of the agencies' business practices;
- The survey invitation will come from a more prominent sender from FHWA;
- We will seek to have pre-notification, and hopefully endorsement, of the data collection effort be provided by national planning organizations, such as NARC and AMPO, and by State DOTs;
- The survey pre-notification and follow-up protocols will be robust and will include both email and telephone contact.

Because of these survey data collection features, we are expecting that the MPO survey response rate will be in the 35 to 45 percent range. For planning, we assume a response rate of 35 percent, though we will seek to achieve the highest possible rate. The 35 percent rate would yield about 117 valid responses.

At this level of return, the 90 percent confidence level margin-of-error for population proportion estimates would be at most plus or minus 6 percent. We believe this minimum response would adequately enable FHWA to identify and quantify MPO levels of readiness, areas of concern, and training and resource needs.

Follow-Up Data Collection: A follow-up survey of the same partner organizations will be conducted in 2017 or in 2018. Respondents from the initial State DOT and MPO assessments will be re-contacted for the follow-up assessment. When organizations that complete the initial assessment do not respond to the follow-up assessment, we will seek to identify and recruit similar organizations that did not participate in the initial data collection (either because they were not sampled or because they refused to be included in the initial effort) to participate in the follow-up. The resulting follow-up assessment sample will allow for longitudinal analyses (with attrition replacement).

Respondent Selection within Partner Organizations: One of the important challenges of the National TPM Implementation Assessment will be to identify the best people within the sampled agencies from whom to collect information. The initial State DOT contacts will be the individuals previously identified by FHWA for the previous initial assessments.

The default MPO principal points-of-contact will be the Executive Directors. However, as part of the State DOT assessment, we will ask the State DOT contact for the names and contact information of MPO staff from sampled urbanized areas within the state that she or he believes will be best able to respond to the MPO assessment. We will also ask for input from AMPO.

Each of the partner organization assessments will be seeking information that may reside with multiple staff members at the State DOTs and MPOs. Consequently, a survey strategy that involves

multiple points of contact will be required. The approach envisioned is to send the main survey invitation to the key points-of-contact, described above, and allow them to complete the subsections of the survey themselves or to identify others in the Agency or Department that should complete the program topic area specific subsections of the survey.

Advantages of this approach:

- More likely to capture data from the staff members that are knowledgeable of specific Agency or Department capabilities
- Multiple perspectives from each Agency or Department can better identify specific issues and concerns
- Increased interest in the TPM implementation and in the Assessment effort throughout the Agencies and Departments

Disadvantages of this approach:

- Potential biases may be introduced by letting the primary respondents select the subsection respondents
- Multiple perspectives from each Agency or Department could be contradictory
- Potential difficulty in gaining perspectives on prioritization between different roles and responsibilities to implement TPM requirements within program areas

In our view, the benefit of reaching the most knowledgeable staff outweighs any potential biases introduced by having the main respondents select the subsection respondents. The multiple perspective approach also reflects the fact that TPM touches on many disciplines within an Agency or State DOT. To address prioritization across the many roles and responsibilities associated with TPM requirements within the system performance areas, the survey will include general prioritization questions for the main respondent to answer, and more specific subsection questions for other sub-respondents.

National TPM Implementation Assessment Process

The data collection effort will consist of the following steps:

State DOT Assessment:

- FHWA Office of TPM and Division Office staff will alert State DOT contacts that a web-based survey is being developed that will help with determining needs and priorities for TPM training, guidance resources, and technical assistance
- The project team will develop an invitation email with a link to the State DOT survey. The FHWA OPM Director will send the email invitation with a link to the main survey to the State DOT contacts
- If no response is received after seven days, an automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to the State DOT contacts
- After seven more days, a second automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to non-respondents
- If still no response is received, the project team will place a telephone call reminder asking the State DOT contact to either complete the web-based survey or to set up an appointment to complete it by phone

- As part of the main survey, the State DOT contacts will be given the option to identify the best person within their agencies to complete each of the subsections of the survey, which will be based on the anticipated State DOT's TPM roles
- The survey software will then automatically email the referenced people invitations to complete surveys with the identified survey subsections
- The same follow-up protocols will be followed for the subsection survey respondents as for the main surveys

MPO Assessment:

- FHWA Office of TPM and Division Office staff will alert the MPO contacts of an upcoming web-based assessment. If the State DOT contacts do not provide a contact for an MPO, the MPO Executive Director will be the point-of-contact
- The project team will develop invitation emails with links to the MPO survey. The FHWA OPM Director will send the email invitation with a link to the surveys to the MPO contacts
- If no response is received after seven days, an automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to the MPO contacts
- After seven more days, a second automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to non-respondents
- As part of the main surveys, the MPO contacts will be given the option to identify the best person within their agencies to complete each of the subsections of the survey, which will be based on their agencies' anticipated TPM roles
- The survey software will then automatically email the referenced people invitations to complete surveys with the identified survey subsections
- The same follow-up protocols will be followed for the subsection survey respondents as for the main surveys

State DOT and MPO Assessment Results Analyses & Report:

- Responses will be monitored throughout the data collection process to identify any issues as promptly as possible and to track data collection progress
- Upon completion of the web survey data collection, we will code open-ended question responses and identify any responses that require telephone follow-up clarification
- The first output of the readiness assessment effort will be topline tabulations and cross-tabulations of the web survey questions
- A report of the assessment results will then be prepared for review and approval by FHWA. The report shall include detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the survey results
- The raw assessment data will also be submitted to FHWA in a simple excel workbook.

Follow-up State DOT and MPO Assessments:

- FHWA Office of TPM and Division Office staff will alert the State DOT and MPO respondents from the initial assessments of the upcoming web-based follow-up assessments.
- The project team will develop invitation emails with links to the State DOT and MPO follow-up assessments. The FHWA OPM Director will send the email invitation with a link to the follow-up assessments to the State DOT and MPO
- If no response is received after seven days, an automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to the MPO contacts
- After seven more days, a second automated reminder email invitation with a link to the survey will be sent to non-respondents
- If still no response is received, the project team will place a telephone call reminder asking the contact to either complete the web-based survey or to set up an appointment to complete it by phone

- As for the initial assessments, the State DOT and MPO contacts will be given the option to identify the best person within their agencies to complete each of the subsections of the survey, which will be based on their agencies' anticipated TPM roles
- The survey software will then automatically email the referenced people invitations to complete surveys with the identified survey subsections
- The same follow-up protocols will be followed for the subsection survey respondents as for the main surveys

Follow-up State DOT and MPO Assessment Analysis & Report:

- Responses will be monitored throughout the data collection process to identify any issues as promptly as possible and to track data collection progress
- Upon completion of the web survey data collection, we will code open-ended question responses and identify any responses that require telephone follow-up clarification
- The first output of the readiness assessment effort will be topline tabulations and cross-tabulations of the follow-up assessment web survey questions
- In addition, a comparative analysis of the initial assessment and follow-up assessment results will be developed
- A report of the follow-up assessment results will then be prepared for review and approval by FHWA. The report shall include detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the survey results.
- The raw follow-up assessment data will also be submitted to FHWA in a simple excel workbook.

Selection of data collection mode

The National TPM Implementation Assessment efforts lend themselves to a web-based survey approach with in-person follow-up because:

- the survey audiences are well-connected to the Internet and reachable via email,
- the objective of the assessments is to collect largely quantitative data which leads to the use of primarily web-survey friendly closed-ended question types
- data consistency checks can be performed as the data are collected, rather than in a separate post-survey cleaning task
- although the assessment will not have a large sample size, the multiple point-of-contact survey data collection protocol will require extra care that can be better managed through an online approach

Selection of survey data collection software

The proposed survey software platform is Survey Gizmo.

<http://www.surveygizmo.com/>

Specific advantages of this platform compared to other online survey data collection options³:

³ A full list of Survey Gizmo features is available at <https://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-software-features/#complete-features>.

- Wider range of question types than most online survey options, including group questions, matrix questions, and experimental design choice exercises
- Custom scripting capabilities
- Flexible page and question logic and skipping
- Style themes by device type
- Email campaign tools
- Response tracking, reporting, and multiple data export formats (CSV, Excel, SPSS, etc.)
- Greater range of respondent access controls than other online products
 - Allowance of save-and-continue
 - Duplicate protection
 - Anonymous responses
 - Quota setting
 - Restrictions on going backward
 - Section navigation
- Greater range of administrator roles and collaboration features than other products

The Section Navigator is particularly critical for the Partner Organization assessment because it will enable the primary points-of-contact to separate the assessment into sections to make it easy for different respondents to complete different parts without interrupting or overwriting one another. Simply stated, the Section Navigator enables one Partner Organization to be completed by multiple people. For example:

Navigation

Section	Status	Actions	Invite Colleague to Complete
HealthCare	Not Started	Answer	<input type="text" value="Email Address"/> <input type="button" value="Send"/>
Finance	Not Started	Answer	<input type="text" value="Email Address"/> <input type="button" value="Send"/>
Contact Information *	Not Started	Answer	<input type="text" value="Email Address"/> <input type="button" value="Send"/>

Source: Survey Gizmo documentation, 2014.

An example of a recent survey conducted in Survey Gizmo:

<http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1775738/AASHTO-CTPP-Survey-a>

National TPM Implementation Assessment and Follow-up Assessment Content

The initial and follow-up assessments will include questions about TPM in general, performance-based planning and programming (PBPP), and Asset Management. In addition, a set of questions related to data, measures, targets, programming, and reporting will be asked for six performance areas (safety, bridge, pavement, freight, congestion/mobility/system performance, and on-road mobile source emissions). As warranted by each performance area, additional questions will be included. Questions about capacity building needs will be included in the general TPM section, PBPP section and system performance area sections.

Assessment questions will be based on:

- Draft survey questions developed by FHWA staff
- Comments from FHWA staff on PBPP
- Comments from FHWA staff on Asset Management
- Comments from FHWA staff on Safety
- Comments from FHWA staff on Bridge
- Comments from FHWA staff on Congestion/Mobility/System Performance
- TPM Capacity Maturity Model (Task 2) developed under FHWA's TPM Technical Assistance Program
- TPM Implementation Guidebook (Task 3) developed under FHWA's TPM Technical Assistance Program
- FHWA Division Survey (Task 4) developed under FHWA's TPM Technical Assistance Program

The Assessment and follow-up Assessment will include:

- Scale questions regarding State DOT and MPO levels of preparedness, relative importance, and challenges with following TPM components:

Component	Definition
Strategic direction	The establishment of an agency's direction through well-defined goals and objectives and a set of aligned performance measures.
Target Setting	The use of baseline data, information on possible strategies, funding constraints, and forecasting tools to collaboratively set targets.
Performance-based planning	The use of agency goals, objectives, and performance trends to drive the development of strategies and priorities in mid and long range plans.
Performance-based programming	The use of strategies and priorities to guide the allocation of resources to projects selected to achieve goals, objectives, and targets.
Reporting & communication	The products, techniques, and processes used to communicate performance information to different audiences for maximum impact
Monitoring & adjustment	Processes to track and evaluate actions taken and outcomes achieved that establish a feedback loop to adjust planning, programming, and target setting decisions.
External collaboration	Established processes to engage and collaborate with agency partners and stakeholders on planning/visioning, target setting, programming, data sharing, and reporting.
Data Usability & Analysis	The existence of useful and valuable data sets and analysis capabilities, provided in usable, convenient forms to support TPM.
Data Management	The means by which an organization efficiently plans, collects, creates, organizes, uses, controls, stores, disseminates and disposes of data to ensure that the value of the data is understood and fully exploited.

Component	Definition
Organization & Culture	Institutionalization of a performance management culture within the organization, as evidenced by leadership support, employee buy-in, and embedded organizational structures and processes that support performance management.

- Scale question regarding agency’s general assessment of TPM as a business practice
- Scale questions regarding State DOT and MPO levels of preparedness, relative importance, and challenges with the implementation of PBPP
- Scale questions regarding staffing, levels of preparedness, relative importance, and challenges with implementing TPM practices for specific performance areas.
- Open-ended questions regarding the need for training, guidance resources, and technical assistance. “What specific training, guidance resources, and technical assistance activities would benefit your agency the most?”
- Prioritization of general technical assistance activities. “Speaking generally, which of the following technical assistance activities should FHWA be prioritizing the most in order to best support your agency?”

Given the estimated length of the assessment, the number of open-ended questions will be kept to as low a number as possible.

The web survey instruments for the assessments are envisioned to consist of:

- A main survey directed at the principal contacts at the State DOTs, and MPOs regarding TPM in general
- A survey section dedicated to PBPP
- A survey section dedicated to Asset Management
- Sub-sections based on six performance areas:
 - Safety,
 - Bridge,
 - Pavement,
 - Freight,
 - Congestion/Mobility/System Performance and
 - On-road mobile source emissions.

Survey Question Construction

The development of the survey instrument will be an interactive process, beginning with FHWA review and editing of the data elements listed above. As data elements are settled, specific question wording will be developed. Each question and associated response categories will be evaluated along the following dimensions:

- Lack of focus
- Bias
- Fatigue
- Miscommunication

Bias limitation and detection

It will be important to limit the amount of time needed for respondents to completely respond to the National TPM Implementation Assessment. Fatigue and loss of interest affect survey completion rates, data quality, and open-ended response completeness and thoughtfulness. We will seek to limit the main survey completion time to 20 minutes and subsection survey completion times to no more than 15 minutes each.

Where possible, response category orders will be randomized to limit bias.

Survey page timers (not visible to respondents) will be used to identify potential understanding problems (unusually long page dwell times) and potential loss-of-interest problems (unusually short page dwell times)

Testing the Draft Survey

Survey instrument diagnostics: Survey software includes built-in capabilities to evaluate the web-based survey instrument:

- Fatigue / survey timing scores
- Language and graphics accessibility scores

Generation of survey test data: Once the survey is drafted, we will generate hypothetical synthetic output datasets. This will enable us to correct response category problems and to ensure that the output data will support the tabulations and analyses we expect to perform on the actual data set.

Office pretest: Prior to engaging the Partner Organizations, we will generate an email invitation link to a test survey and distribute it to Spy Pond Partners and FHWA staff that are knowledgeable of the survey topics but that were not involved in the survey development. We will seek their input on the survey questions and identify potential improvements to the survey.

Field pretest: Because the National TPM Implementation Assessment will be distributed to all State DOTs and most MPOs, a full dry-run survey field pretest cannot be used.

Instead, we will schedule about five of the FHWA Partner agencies (State DOT and/or MPOs) assessments to be delivered earlier than the rest of the assessments. We will review results of the early assessments as they are completed to evaluate comprehension and cooperation levels. We will contact early respondents by phone to ask if they had any specific issues that could be fixed. We will make necessary changes for the full assessment release, and if necessary re-contact early respondents to collect any data elements that were not in the early survey.

Analysis of Results

Data review

As the data are collected, we will review responses for validity

- Survey response patterns (such as straightlining, etc.)
- Page completion times
- Completion of closed-ended and open-ended survey responses

- Internal consistency checks
- Data outlier review

Tabulations

- Topline results
- Cross-tabulations
- Cluster analysis to group partner organizations by similarities, if feasible

Analyses

- MaxDiff priority measurement
- Gap analysis (training needs versus capabilities)
- Open response coding
- (Follow-up assessment only) Longitudinal (before-after) comparisons of initial assessments and follow-up assessments

The MaxDiff priority measurement approach is a discrete choice data collection and analysis method where respondents will be asked to select the most important and least important priorities among several experimentally designed lists. The respondent selections will be used to model the relative prioritization of roles and responsibilities, as well as potential capacity building strategies. More direct rating scale questions have the appeal to respondents of being easily understood, but the ratings are commonly affected by response effects, such as respondents scoring many potential responses as the highest priority. In addition, responses to scales can vary from person to person. Consequently, relying only on scale questions can be problematic. Choice exercises, such as MaxDiff, help to alleviate many of the problems of scale questions.

Survey Data Files and Tabulation

- Access to the assessment results will be given to FHWA staff to support additional data analysis and summary efforts. Through this access FHWA staff will be able to provide individual respondents upon request.
- The raw assessment data will also be submitted to FHWA in a simple excel workbook.

FHWA's National TPM Implementation Assessment Report

- An analysis report will summarize the results of the assessment including key findings that can be used to inform the TPM Implementation effort
- Given that the report audience is internal and external stakeholders, only aggregated information will be included in the assessment report. Reports for individual respondents will not be developed. However, access to the assessment data will enable FHWA staff to produce respondent level reports upon request.

MPO PROJECT UPDATE

DISCUSSION ITEM:

The MPO staff will give an update on the ongoing MPO projects that include the following:

- TIGER Design Build project
- Round-a-bout Study
- Cape Coral Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan