



Resolution 2020-3-10A

Adoption of Targets for Safety Performance Measures Established by The Texas Department of Transportation

WHEREAS, pursuant to federal law, the Governor of the State of Texas designated the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Austin region in 1973; and

WHEREAS, CAMPO's Transportation Policy Board is the regional forum for cooperative decision-making regarding transportation issues in Bastrop, Burnet, Caldwell, Hays, Travis and Williamson Counties in Central Texas; and

WHEREAS, CAMPO must adopt safety performance measure targets annually within 180 days of the state performance measure target adoption in compliance with federal rule making; and

WHEREAS, CAMPO may choose to adopt the safety performance measure targets set forth by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT); and

WHEREAS, TxDOT has set a safety performance target of a reduction of 2% by 2022 for trends with a positive slope in the following areas:

- Number of Fatalities
- Rate of Fatalities
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CAMPO Transportation Policy Board hereby votes to adopt and support the Texas Department of Transportation's performance measures safety targets as reflected in this resolution; and

Hereby orders the recording of this resolution in the minutes of the Transportation Policy Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board delegates the signing of necessary documents to the Board Chair.

The above resolution being read, a motion to adopt and support the Texas Department of Transportation performance measures safety targets as reflected was made on March 9, 2020 by Judge James Oakley duly seconded by Council Member Rudy Metayer.

Ayes: Commissioner Cynthia Long, Council Member Ann Kitchen, Mayor Steve Adler, Council Member Alison Alter, Commissioner Clara Beckett, Commissioner Gerald Daugherty, Judge Sarah Eckhardt, Mr. Tucker Ferguson, P.E., Council Member Jimmy Flannigan, Council Member Marci Cannon (Proxy for Mayor Troy Hill), Mayor Jane Hughson, Commissioner Mark Jones, Council Member Rudy Metayer, Mayor Craig Morgan, Judge James Oakley, Mayor Dale Ross, Commissioner Edward Theriot, Commissioner Jeffrey Travillion (Proxy for Commissioner Brigid Shea), and Mayor Corbin Van Arsdale

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent and Not Voting: Mr. Terry Mitchell

SIGNED this 9th day of March 2020



Chair, CAMPO Board

Attest:



Executive Director, CAMPO



Resolution 2020-3-10B

Adoption of Transit Asset Management Performance Targets

WHEREAS, pursuant to federal law, the Governor of the State of Texas designated the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Austin region in 1973; and

WHEREAS, CAMPO's Transportation Policy Board is the regional forum for cooperative decision-making regarding transportation issues in Bastrop, Burnet, Caldwell, Hays, Travis and Williamson Counties in Central Texas; and

WHEREAS, the use of a performance-based transportation planning process is required by the federal government in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP); and

WHEREAS, part of the performance-based planning process requires the adoption of performance targets in key areas by the effective date set by FHWA and FTA's Final Rulemaking; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Metropolitan Transit Authority (Capital Metro), a direct recipient of federal funds from the Federal Transit Agency (FTA), must also comply with the FAST Act by adopting Transit Asset Management (TAM) performance measures and targets; and

WHEREAS, Capital Metro adopts their TAM targets annually prior to January of each year, which are then submitted to the National Transit Database (NTD), and these targets are coordinated with the MPO and incorporated into the TIP and MTP in compliance with the FAST Act; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CAMPO Transportation Policy Board hereby votes to adopt and support the Capital Metropolitan Transit Authority's Transit Asset Management performance targets as reflected in this resolution; and

Hereby orders the recording of this resolution in the minutes of the Transportation Policy Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board delegates the signing of necessary documents to the Board Chair.

The above resolution being read, a motion to adopt and support the Capital Metropolitan Transit Authority's Transit Asset Management performance targets as reflected was made on March 9th, 2020 by Judge James Oakley duly seconded by Council Member Rudy Metayer.


Ayes: Commissioner Cynthia Long, Council Member Ann Kitchen, Mayor Steve Adler, Council Member Alison Alter, Commissioner Clara Beckett, Commissioner Gerald Daugherty, Judge Sarah Eckhardt, Mr. Tucker Ferguson, P.E., Council Member Jimmy Flannigan, Council Member Marci Cannon (Proxy for Mayor Troy Hill), Mayor Jane Hughson, Commissioner Mark Jones, Council Member Rudy Metayer, Mayor Craig Morgan, Judge James Oakley, Mayor Dale Ross, Commissioner Edward Theriot, Commissioner Jeffrey Travillion (Proxy for Commissioner Brigid Shea), and Mayor Corbin Van Arsdale

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent and Not Voting: Mr. Terry Mitchell

SIGNED this 9th day of March 2020.


Chair, CAMPO Board

Attest:


Executive Director, CAMPO

FY2020 STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP) PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Performance Measures and Target Setting - TxDOT used a linear trend analysis to establish target(s), and analyzed the linear trend analysis of different data sets including three to five years of raw data as well as the moving averages for those data sets. While utilizing the linear trend analysis projections, the slope is determined to be a positive factor or negative factor.

The SHSP uses a data-driven, multi-year collaborative process to establish safety targets. The consensus of the SHSP stakeholder and executive teams is to utilize a methodology of establishing targets that would result in a 2% reduction from the original trend line projection in 2022. The proposed reduction of 2% by 2022, which only applies to positive slope projection trends, would be achieved by reducing each intermediate year by the following reduction percentages:

Year	Reduction
2017	0.0%
2018	0.4%
2019	0.8%
2020	1.2%
2021	1.6%
2022	2.0%

When the slope analysis projects a negative slope, the target set will mirror the projection determined by the slope.

Performance Targets:

Target: Total number of traffic fatalities

2020 Target: To decrease the expected rise of fatalities to not more than a five-year average of 3,840 fatalities in 2020. The 2020 Target expressed as a 5-year average would be as follows:

Year	Target or Actual Data	Source
2016	3,797	FARS
2017	3,722	ARF
2018	3,631	CRIS
2019	3,980	Target
2020	4,068	Target
2020 Target expressed as 5-year average		3,840

As noted in the table above, the calendar year target for 2020 would be 4,068 fatalities.

FY2020 STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)
PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Target: Total number of serious injuries

2020 Target: To decrease the expected rise of serious injuries to not more than a five-year average of 17,533 serious injuries in 2020. The 2020 Target expressed as a 5-year average would be as follows:

Year	Target or Actual Data	Source
2016	17,573	CRIS
2017	17,535	CRIS
2018	14,892	CRIS
2019	18,367	Target
2020	18,602	Target
2020 Target expressed as 5-year average		17,394

As noted in the table above, the calendar year target for 2020 would be 18,602 serious injuries.

Target: Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled

2020 Target: To decrease the expected rise of fatalities per 100 MVMT to not more than a five-year average of 1.406 fatalities per 100 MVMT in 2020. The 2020 Target expressed as a 5-year average would be as follows:

Year	Target or Actual Data	Source
2016	1.40	FARS
2017	1.37	ARF
2018	1.31	CRIS
2019	1.47	Target
2020	1.48	Target
2020 Target expressed as 5-year average		1.406

As noted in the table above, the calendar year target for 2020 would be 1.48 fatalities per 100 MVMT.

FY2020 STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)
PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Target: Serious Injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled

2020 Target: To decrease the serious injuries per 100 MVMT to not more than a five-year average of 6.286 serious injuries per 100 MVMT in 2020. The 2020 Target expressed as a 5-year average would be as follows:

Year	Target or Actual Data	Source
2016	6.48	CRIS
2017	6.42	CRIS
2018	5.37	CRIS
2019	6.60	Target
2020	6.56	Target
2020 Target expressed as 5-year average		6.286

As noted in the table above, the calendar year target for 2020 would be 6.56 serious injuries per 100 MVMT.

Target: Total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

2020 Target: To decrease the expected rise of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries to not more than a five year average of 2,285.0 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries in 2020. The 2020 Target expressed as a 5-year average would be as follows:

Year	Target or Actual Data	Source
2016	2,304	FARS-CRIS
2017	2,146	ARF-CRIS
2018	2,104	CRIS
2019	2,394	Target
2020	2,477	Target
2020 Target expressed as 5-year average		2,285.0

As noted in the table above, the calendar year target for 2020 would be 2,477 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Metropolitan Planning Organization Safety Performance Measures Fact Sheet

Safety Performance Measures

The Safety Performance Management Measures regulation supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and requires State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to set HSIP targets for 5 safety performance measures. This document highlights the requirements specific to MPOs and provides a comparison of MPO and State DOT responsibilities.

How do MPOs establish HSIP targets?

Coordination is the key for all stakeholders in setting HSIP targets. Stakeholders should work together to share data, review strategies and understand outcomes. MPOs must work with the State DOT. MPOs should also coordinate with the State Highway Safety Office, transit operators, local governments, the FHWA Division Office, National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) Regional Office, law enforcement and emergency medical services agencies, and others. By working together, considering and integrating the plans and programs of various safety stakeholders, MPOs will be better able to understand impacts to safety performance to establish appropriate HSIP targets. Coordination should start with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). More information on the SHSP is available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/shsp/>.

HSIP Safety Targets Established by MPOs	
1	Number of fatalities
2	Rate of fatalities
3	Number of serious injuries
4	Rate of serious injuries
5	Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries

MPOs establish HSIP targets by either:

1. agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or
2. committing to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area.

To provide MPOs with flexibility, MPOs may support all the State HSIP targets, establish their own specific numeric HSIP targets for all of the performance measures, or any combination. MPOs may support the State HSIP target for one or more individual performance measures and establish specific numeric targets for the other performance measures.

If an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target, the MPO would ...	If an MPO establishes its own HSIP target, the MPO would...
<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Work with the State and safety stakeholders to address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area■ Coordinate with the State and include the safety performance measures and HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan area in the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan)■ Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP■ Include a description in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Establish HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan planning area in coordination with the State■ Estimate vehicles miles traveled (VMT) for all public roads within the metropolitan planning area for rate targets■ Include safety (HSIP) performance measures and HSIP targets in the MTP■ Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP■ Include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets



Volumes for HSIP Rate Targets: MPOs that establish fatality rate or serious injury rate HSIP targets must report the VMT estimate used for such targets, and the methodology used to develop the estimate, to the State DOT. For more information on volumes for HSIP rate targets, see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/tools/technical_guidance/index.cfm.

Roads addressed by MPO HSIP Targets: HSIP targets cover all public roadways within the metropolitan planning area boundary regardless of ownership or functional classification, just as State HSIP targets cover all public roads in the State.

How do MPOs with multi-State boundaries establish HSIP targets?

MPOs with multi-State boundaries must coordinate with all States involved. If an MPO with multi-State boundaries chooses to support a State HSIP target, it must do so for each State. For example, an MPO that extends into two States would agree to plan and program projects to contribute to two separate sets of HSIP targets (one for each State). If a multi-State MPO decides to establish its own HSIP target, the MPO would establish the target for the entire metropolitan planning area.

When do MPOs need to establish these targets?

States establish HSIP targets and report them for the upcoming calendar year in their HSIP annual report that is due August 31 each year. MPOs must establish HSIP targets within 180 days of the State establishing and reporting its HSIP targets. Since FHWA deems the HSIP reports submitted on August 31, MPOs must establish HSIP targets no later than February 27 of each year.

Top 5 Things to Know about MPO HSIP Safety Performance Targets	
✓	All MPOs must set a target for each of the 5 HSIP Safety Performance Measures
✓	MPOs may adopt and support the State's HSIP targets, develop their own HSIP targets, or use a combination of both
✓	MPOs must establish their HSIP targets by February 27 of the calendar year for which they apply
✓	MPO HSIP targets are reported to the State DOT
✓	MPO HSIP targets are not annually assessed for significant progress toward meeting targets; State HSIP targets are assessed annually

Where do MPOs report targets?

While States report their HSIP targets to FHWA in their annual HSIP report, MPOs do not report their HSIP targets directly to FHWA. Rather, the State(s) and MPO mutually agree on the manner in which the MPO reports the targets to its respective DOT(s). MPOs must include baseline safety performance, HSIP targets and progress toward achieving HSIP targets in the system performance report in the MTP.

Whether an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target or establishes its own HSIP target the MPO would include in the MTP a systems performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the safety performance targets described in the MTP including progress achieved by the MPO in achieving safety performance targets

Assessment of Significant Progress

While FHWA will determine whether a State DOT has met or made significant progress toward meeting HSIP targets, it will not directly assess MPO progress toward meeting HSIP targets. However, FHWA will review MPO performance as part of ongoing transportation planning process reviews including the Transportation Management Area certification review and the Federal Planning Finding associated with the approval of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.



Capital Metro Transit Asset Management Targets

Asset Class	Quantity	FY20 Target
Articulated Buses	29	0.00%
Over the Road Buses	44	14.00%
Buses	380	0.00%
Cutaway Vans	88	0.00%
Minivans	20	0.00%
Railcars- RS - DMUs	10	0.00%
Automobiles (<i>Cars & SUVs</i>)	58	35.00%
Trucks & other Rubber Tire Vehicles	38	50.00%
Steel Wheel Vehicles	4	0.00%
Passenger /Parking Facilities	16	0.00%
Administrative/Maintenance Facilities	4	0.00%
Hybrid Rail	64.38	1.00%



FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

Planning for TAM | Roles & Responsibilities for MPOs and State DOTs

Background

FTA and FHWA published the final rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning on May 27, 2016. FTA published the final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) on July 26, 2016. The rules establish new requirements for metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to coordinate with transit providers, set performance targets, and integrate those performance targets and performance plans into their planning documents by certain dates. Below are the specific requirements for MPOs.

Metropolitan Planning Agreements

MPOs should initiate discussions with transit agencies, state DOTs and planning partners to update their Metropolitan Planning Agreements, per 23 CFR § 450.314. This presents an opportunity for the MPO and its planning partners to clarify roles and responsibilities for developing and sharing performance data, setting performance targets, reporting of targets, and tracking progress towards meeting targets, through a formal agreement.

Establish Performance Targets for Metropolitan Planning Areas

The MPO is required to set performance targets for each performance measure, per 23 CFR § 450.306. Those performance targets must be established 180 days after the transit agency established their performance targets. Transit agencies are required to set their performance targets by January 1, 2017. If there are multiple asset classes offered in the metropolitan planning area, the MPO should set targets for each asset class.

Performance Measures in Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP) and Metropolitan Transportation Plans

MPOs are required to reference the performance targets and performance based plans into their TIPs and Metropolitan Transportation Plans by October 2018, per 23 CFR § 450.324 and 23 CFR § 450.326. The planning products must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system, for transit asset management, safety, and the FHWA performance measures. This should also include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets.

Background

FTA and FHWA published the final rule on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning, on May 27, 2016. FTA published the final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) on July 26, 2016. There are new transit requirements for State Departments of Transportation (State DOTs). Below are the specific requirements for state DOTs.

State DOTs and Planning Agreements

State DOTs should hold discussions with transit providers, MPOs and planning partners to update their planning agreements, per 23 CFR § 450.314. This presents an opportunity for all parties to clarify roles and responsibilities for developing and sharing performance data, setting performance targets, reporting of targets, and tracking progress towards meeting targets, through a formal agreement. Examples include how parties will develop a TAM plan and share targets such as State of Good Repair measures.

Group Plan Sponsors

Sponsors of a Group TAM plan are responsible for setting unified targets for plan participants, per 49 CFR § 625.25. Once performance targets are set, sponsors are expected, to the maximum extent possible, to share the target with the MPO or MPOs that house their participant transit agencies in their MPA, per 49 CFR § 625.45. MPOs are responsible for implementing performance based planning in their planning documents.

Statewide Planning Agencies Incorporating TAM Requirements into Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP) and Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plans

State DOTs are required to reference the performance targets and performance based plans into their planning documents by October 2018, per 23 CFR § 450.216 and 23 CFR § 450.218. The planning products must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system for transit asset management, safety, and the FHWA performance measures. This should also include, to the maximum extent possible, a description of the anticipated effect of the STIP toward achieving the performance targets identified in the long-range statewide transportation plan, linking investment priorities to those performance targets. Group TAM plan sponsors will need to incorporate group performance targets in the asset management discussions for their respective planning documents.



FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

Timeline for Transit Asset Management

By January 1, 2017:

- Provider establishes their initial targets

By 180 days after providers set and share their initial targets:

- MPO establishes regional targets

Within four (4) months of the end of the provider's fiscal year 2018 (and each year thereafter)

- Provider submits to NTD their Asset Inventory Module (AIM); and performance targets for the next fiscal year

No later than October 1, 2018

- Provider completes their initial TAM Plan that covers four (4) years
- TAM Plan can be amended at any time
- A TAM Plan update is required at least every four (4) years

October 1, 2018:

- The MPO reflects the performance measures and targets in all MTPs and TIPs updated after this date
- The State DOT reflects the performance measures and targets in all long-range statewide transportation plan and STIPs updated after this date

Within four (4) months of the end of the provider's fiscal year 2019 (and each year thereafter)

- Provider submits to NTD their Asset Inventory Module (AIM); performance targets for the next fiscal year; and
- Narrative report on changes in transit system conditions and the progress toward achieving previous performance targets

Note: Provider refers to the Tier I transit providers, the Tier II providers who choose to not be part of a Group Plan, and the Group Plan Sponsors for two or more T II providers.



FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION



Federal Transit
Administration

TAM Performance Measures

Background

In 2012, MAP-21 mandated FTA to develop a rule establishing a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public capital assets effectively through their entire life cycle. The TAM Final Rule 49 USC 625 became effective Oct. 1, 2016 and established four performance measures. The performance management requirements outlined in 49 USC 625 Subpart D are a minimum standard for transit operators. Providers with more data and sophisticated analysis expertise are allowed to add performance measures and utilize those advanced techniques in addition to the required national performance measures.

Performance Measures

Rolling Stock: The percentage of revenue vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark (ULB).

Equipment: The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles (by type) that exceed the ULB.

Facilities: The percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale.

Infrastructure: The percentage of track segments (by mode) that have performance restrictions. Track segments are measured to the nearest 0.01 of a mile.



TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT

Data To Be Reported - Optional Report Year 2017, Mandatory Report Year 2018

Rolling Stock: The National Transit Database (NTD) lists 23 types of rolling stock, including bus and rail modes. Targets are set for each mode an agency, or Group Plan Sponsor, has in its inventory.

FTA default ULB or Agency customized ULB: Default ULBs represent maximum useful life based on the TERM model. Agencies can choose to customize based on analysis of their data OR they can use the FTA provided default ULBs.

Equipment: Only 3 classes of non-revenue service vehicles are

collected and used for target setting: 1) automobiles, 2) other rubber tire vehicles, and 3) other steel wheel vehicles.

Facilities: Four types of facilities are reported to NTD. Only 2 groups are used for target setting 1) Administrative and Maintenance and 2) Passenger and Parking.

Infrastructure: The NTD lists 9 types of rail modes; the NTD collects data by mode for track and other infrastructure assets.

BRT and Ferry are NTD fixed guideway modes but are not included in TAM targets.

TAM Performance Metrics: The NTD collects current year performance data. The NTD will collect additional Asset Inventory Module (AIM) data but targets forecast performance measures in the next fiscal year.

TAM Narrative Report: The TAM Rule requires agencies to submit this report to the NTD annually. The report describes conditions in the prior year that led to target attainment status.

www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/ULBcheatsheet

TERM Scale: Facility condition assessments reported to the NTD have one overall TERM rating per facility. Agencies are not required to use TERM model for conducting condition assessment but must report the facility condition assessment as a TERM rating score.

What You Need to Know About Establishing Targets

Include:

- Only those assets for which you have direct capital responsibility.
- Only asset types specifically referenced in performance measure.

Group Plans:

- Only one unified target per performance measure type.
- Sponsors may choose to develop more than one Group Plan.

MPOs:

- MPOs must establish targets specific to the MPO planning area for the same performance measures for all public transit providers in the MPO planning area within 180 days of when the transit provider establishes its targets.
- Opportunity to collaborate with transit providers.

Example Target Calculations

Rolling Stock and Equipment: Each target is based on the agency's fleet and age. Agencies set only one target per mode/class/asset type. If an agency has multiple fleets in one asset type (see example BU and CU) of different service age, it must combine those fleets to calculate the performance metric percentage of asset type that exceeds ULB and to set the following fiscal year's target. The performance metric calculation does not include emergency contingency vehicles.

TERM Rating	Condition	Description
Excellent	4.8–5.0	No visible defects, near-new condition.
Good	4.0–4.7	Some slightly defective or deteriorated components.
Adequate	3.0–3.9	Moderately defective or deteriorated components.
Marginal	2.0–2.9	Defective or deteriorated components in need of replacement.
Poor	1.0–1.9	Seriously damaged components in need of immediate repair.

Asset Category	Vehicle Class/Type	Fleet Size	Vehicle age	default ULB	FY 16 Performance Metric (% Exceeding ULB)	FY17 Target
Rolling Stock	Over the road bus (BU)	10	5	14 years	0%	60%
		15	13	14 years		
	Cutaway bus (CU)	19	8	10 years	21%	21%
		5	12	10 years		
	Mini Van (MV)	5	5	8 years	0%	0%
	Van (VN)	1	10	8 years	67%	67%
		2	5	8 years		
Equipment	Auto (AO)	5	4	8 years	0%	0%

This example assumes no new vehicle purchases in the calculation of targets for FY17, therefore the FY17 target for over the road bus (BU) increases due to the second fleet vehicles aging another year and exceeding the default ULB. If an agency is more conservative, then it might set higher value targets. If an agency is more ambitious or expects funding to purchase new vehicles, then it might set lower value targets.

There is no penalty for missing a target and there is no reward for attaining a target. Targets are reported to the NTD annually on the A-90 form. The fleet information entered in the inventory forms will automatically populate the A-90 form with the range of types, classes, and modes associated with the modes reported.