

# MAP-21 FACT SHEET

**PREPARED BY:** Curt Davis, Chief  
Office of project Delivery & Accountability  
Division of Local Assistance  
Phone: (916) 653-4221; e-mail: curt.davis@dot.ca.gov

**DATE:** December 15, 2012

**SUBJECT:** MAP-21: Project Delivery Performance Measure

---

## **PROBLEM STATEMENT:**

Map 21 requires the establishment of national performance measures for reduced project delivery delays. Developing a set of performance measures that meet the requirement for “all states” is a daunting challenge due its wide variance among states.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Department use the codified performance measures established as agreed to in the departments’ stewardship agreement with FHWA. The Division of Local Assistance (DLA) under project delivery use the measure of ensuring 100% of the departments financial resources are available when and where needed this objective would be measured by the percent of federal subvention funds obligated for local projects on/and off the state highway system. The second objective would be to ensure 100% compliance with response times and scheduled milestones for Local Assistance, oversight, and permits, as negotiated with our local partners and other submitting entities.

The performance targets that will measure the impacts of both, measures would be identified by 1) Local Assistance delivery percentage of the available FFY 2013/14 formula OA through June 30, 2014 and by 2) the # of Requests for Federal Authorizations (RFAs) submitted to FHWA by Caltrans HQ Local Assistance within 30 days of receiving a correct and complete RFA package.

## **BACKGROUND:**

On July 6, 2012, the President signed MAP-21 into law. There is currently a process in place, as outlined in the departments’ stewardship agreement with FHWA. DLA regularly coordinates with FHWA and Local agencies to ensure compliance with project milestones and timelines. There may or may not be changes or impacts as a result of federal rulemaking process.

## **ALTERNATIVES:**

Alternative 1: Use the existing process as identified in the departments’ stewardship agreement.

Pros:

- Minimizes the departments’ effort and avoids duplication by utilizing existing processes to meet MAP21 requirements.
- Meet the deadline to set performance targets.

---

---

**SUBJECT: MAP-21: Division of Local Assistance Project Delivery Performance Measure**

---

---

Cons:

- When a national measure is provided, it might be different from the one State currently uses.

Alternative 2: Wait until a national guidance is issued by FHWA before revising performance measures.

According to recent FHWA guidelines, fact sheets, and webinars, the expected deadlines are about April 2014 for publishing the rulemaking for performance measures, and April 2015 for setting performance targets. At this time, it is unknown whether the rulemaking will be published earlier than expected, in which case the deadline for setting performance targets would be 1 year after the earlier date.

Pros:

- National measures will be known and can be used to set goals, and performance targets.

Cons:

- Lose time needed to analyze data and to develop accurate and realistic performance measures and targets by the deadline.
- May not be able to meet the deadline to set the State's delivery performance targets, given only 1 year to do so.
- May not be able to fully obligate the State's HSIP funds in the year that performance targets are required to be set.

**PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:**

- Utilize current performance measures as identified in departments stewardship agreement with FHWA (immediately)
- Dates may change if Secretary publishes the rulemaking on performance measures earlier than expected.