



U.S. Department of Transportation

# FY 2024 Evaluation Plan

## Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Introduction</b> .....  | <b>1</b>  |
| Organizational Structure .....   | 2         |
| Strategic Goals and Objectives .....   | 3         |
| <b>FY 2024 Proposed Significant Evaluations</b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| Airport Terminal Program .....   | 5         |
| Efficacy of the Program Management Maturity Model<br>within the FAA Security and Hazardous Materials Safety Organization ..... | 6         |
| Enterprise Assessment of the Focused Approach to Safety .....  | 7         |
| FHWA's Oversight of State and Local Entities Under the Americans with Disabilities Act .....                                   | 8         |
| State Performance Management Program .....   | 9         |
| Effectiveness of the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program .....   | 10        |
| Entry Level Driver Training Provider Registry .....  | 11        |
| Automated Track Inspection Program .....   | 12        |
| Grade Crossing Grant Benefits .....  | 13        |
| Northeast Corridor BIL Program .....   | 14        |
| Operation Lifesaver .....  | 15        |
| Very Long Trains Study .....   | 16        |
| Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program .....   | 17        |
| Effectiveness of State Maritime Academies' Recruitment and Enrollment Strategies .....   | 19        |
| National Impaired Driving Paid Media Campaign .....  | 21        |
| Equity in the Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program .....   | 22        |
| Natural Gas Distribution Infrastructure Safety and Modernization Grant Program .....   | 24        |
| <b>Acronyms and Abbreviations</b> .....  | <b>26</b> |

## Introduction

*The mission of the U.S. Department of Transportation is to deliver the world's leading transportation system, serving the American people and economy through the safe, efficient, sustainable, and equitable movement of people and goods.*

In accordance with the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 ([Public Law No. 115-435](#)), the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is pleased to present the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 Evaluation Plan. This Plan describes DOT's significant evaluation activities anticipated to occur in FY 2024. It outlines the Department's criteria for designating evaluations as "significant" and provides an overview of the significant evaluations. It also includes the key questions for each of the 17 significant evaluation studies and the associated information needs, proposed methods, anticipated challenges, and planned dissemination.

Per [Office of Management and Budget \(OMB\) Memorandum M-20-12](#), an evaluation is defined as "an assessment using systematic data collection and analysis of one or more programs, policies, and organizations intended to assess their effectiveness and efficiency." Rigorous program evaluation can establish a causal relationship between an activity or program and the outcomes experienced by those affected by it; program evaluation is the only method for answering questions of effectiveness. Different types of evaluation are intended to answer different types of questions and include formative, process/implementation, outcome, and impact evaluations. As discussed in [OMB Memorandum M-21-27](#), evidence-building questions lead to potential evidence-building types, including specific types of evaluations, that in turn suggest appropriate methodological approaches. The Annual Evaluation Plan requires agencies to think proactively and methodically about how they will use evaluations to improve program strategy and operations.

As discussed in [OMB Memorandum M-19-23](#), in developing a definition of significance, the Department considered factors such as:

- The importance of a program to the Department's mission;
- The size of the program in terms of funding or population(s) served; and
- The extent to which the study would provide new and meaningful information about the program, population(s) served, or the issue(s) the program was designed to address.

In considering these factors, DOT designated an evaluation as significant based on the program's relationship to the recently passed Bipartisan Infrastructure Law or BIL ([Public Law No. 117-58](#)), the size of the program including funding levels, and its alignment with the Department's priorities, including equity. All significant evaluations met the definition of a program evaluation as stated in the Evidence Act and have proposed funding in the FY 2024 budget request.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs (OST-B) created this Plan in collaboration with the Department's Chief Data Officer (Office of the Chief Information Officer) and Statistical Official (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology or OST-R). OST-B also sought input from the larger DOT Performance Community, which is a Department-wide community of practice representing performance and evaluation staff from all Operating Administrations as well as the Office of the Secretary. OST-B chairs a monthly meeting of about 100 Federal and contract staff who support performance and evaluation across the agency. The attendees' positions and backgrounds include budget and finance, information technology, policy, research and development, and international affairs. Topical areas represented include safety, equity, and climate change. The meeting provides an opportunity to discuss Evidence Act requirements, including this Plan, as well as to share experiences and request assistance with the planning and execution of evaluations. This group supports the Department in meeting requirements under Title I of the Evidence Act, contributes to the maturation of the Department's capabilities in these areas, and fosters a culture of continuous learning and improvement through stakeholder engagement and education. OST-B coordinated with the Chief Data Officer, Statistical Official, others in OST-R, program evaluation owners across DOT, and other partners committed to advancing the use of evidence in decision-making to develop this FY 2024 Evaluation Plan.

In addition to publishing the [DOT Learning Agenda](#) in 2022, DOT published an [Evaluation Framework](#) to define and describe principles to guide the planning and execution of program evaluations at DOT. While conducting the evaluations described in this document and those described in the DOT Learning Agenda, DOT also intends to undertake other evaluation and evidence-building initiatives going forward that support the [FY 2022 – 2026 Strategic Plan](#).

The passage of BIL also presents new opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities. For example, the Department has committed to incorporating appropriate evidence and evaluation work into the delivery of grant programs with budgets exceeding \$1 billion. DOT intends to evaluate such programs in the coming fiscal years as the Department develops its maturity in evaluation, including developing a formal policy and standards. DOT will update its Annual Evaluation Plan as it progresses in the implementation of BIL programs and ensure that the Plan continues to align with the Department's Strategic Plan and Learning Agenda.

In October 2022, OST-B hosted an Evaluation Symposium attended by more than 150 people from the Department's Operating Administrations and other Office of the Secretary of Transportation offices. The primary goals of the Evaluation Symposium were to kick start a concerted effort to advance program evaluation at DOT, to provide an overview of the fundamentals of program evaluation, and to strengthen the capacity of DOT staff working on evaluations. The event also provided a forum for staff to share information and insights on their Operating Administrations' evaluations with the rest of the Department. Attendees heard from

a panel of evaluation experts from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Small Business Administration. Evaluation experts from OMB also delivered a presentation and "question and answer" session. As the Department's capacity for evidence-building matures, OST-B plans to provide additional guidance, support, and resources for Operating Administrations around how to conduct evaluations and use the findings to inform programmatic and policy decisions.

## Organizational Structure

Congress established DOT in 1967, consolidating 31 transportation-related agencies and functions. Approximately 54,000 DOT employees continue to bring innovations and integrity to the work of improving the safety and performance of our multi-modal transportation system. Leadership of the Department is provided by the Secretary of Transportation, who is the principal advisor to the President in all matters relating to Federal transportation programs. The Office of Secretary oversees nine Operating Administrations, each with its own management and organizational structure.



Federal Aviation  
Administration (FAA)



Federal Highway  
Administration (FHWA)



Federal Motor Carrier Safety  
Administration (FMCSA)



Federal Railroad  
Administration (FRA)



Federal Transit  
Administration (FTA)



Great Lakes St. Lawrence  
Seaway Development  
Corporation (GLS)



Maritime Administration  
(MARAD)



National Highway Traffic  
Safety Administration  
(NHTSA)



Pipeline and Hazardous  
Materials Safety  
Administration (PHMSA)

## Strategic Goals and Objectives

The FY 2022 – 2026 Strategic Plan identifies six strategic goals, which are outcome-oriented, long-term goals for the major functions and operations of DOT. Each strategic goal has associated strategic objectives, which express more specifically the impact DOT is trying to achieve, many of which support the transformational initiatives made possible by the BIL.

| Strategic Goals   | Strategic Objectives   |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Safety</b></p> <p>Make our transportation system safer for all people. Advance a future without transportation-related serious injuries and fatalities.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Safe Public</li> <li>✓ Safe Workers</li> <li>✓ Safe Design</li> <li>✓ Safe Systems</li> <li>✓ Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Economic Strength and Global Competitiveness</b></p> <p>Grow an inclusive and sustainable economy. Invest in our transportation system to provide American workers and businesses reliable and efficient access to resources, markets, and good-paying jobs.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Job Creation and Fiscal Health</li> <li>✓ High-Performing Core Assets</li> <li>✓ Global Economic Leadership</li> <li>✓ Resilient Supply Chains</li> <li>✓ System Reliability and Connectivity</li> </ul>                                      |
| <p><b>Equity</b></p> <p>Reduce inequities across our transportation systems and the communities they affect. Support and engage people and communities to promote safe, affordable, accessible, and multimodal access to opportunities and services while reducing transportation-related disparities, adverse community impacts, and health effects.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Expanding Access</li> <li>✓ Wealth Creation</li> <li>✓ Power of Community</li> <li>✓ Proactive Intervention, Planning, and Capacity Building</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Climate and Sustainability</b></p> <p>Tackle the climate crisis by ensuring that transportation plays a central role in the solution. Substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions and transportation-related pollution and build more resilient and sustainable transportation systems to benefit and protect communities.</p>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Path to Economy-Wide Net-Zero Emissions by 2050</li> <li>✓ Infrastructure Resilience</li> <li>✓ Climate Justice and Environmental Justice</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Transformation</b></p> <p>Design for the future. Invest in purpose-driven research and innovation to meet the challenges of the present and modernize a transportation system of the future that serves everyone today and in the decades to come.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Matching Research and Policy to Advance Breakthroughs</li> <li>✓ Experimentation</li> <li>✓ Collaboration and Competitiveness</li> <li>✓ Flexibility and Adaptability</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Organizational Excellence</b></p> <p>Strengthen our world-class organization. Advance the Department's mission by establishing policies, processes, and an inclusive and innovative culture to effectively serve communities and responsibly steward the public's resources.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Customer Service</li> <li>✓ Workforce Development</li> <li>✓ Data-Driven Programs and Policies</li> <li>✓ Oversight, Performance, and Technical Assistance</li> <li>✓ Sustainability Initiatives</li> <li>✓ Enterprise Cyber Risks</li> </ul> |

## FY 2024 Proposed Significant Evaluations

This Plan describes 17 significant evaluations the Department expects to fund in FY 2024, which is 14 more evaluations than contained in the [FY 2023 Evaluation Plan](#). Many of the evaluations (six of 17) involve BIL programs, and three of the program evaluations involve grant programs whose budgets exceed \$1 billion. The planned evaluations come from eight of the Operating Administrations and span many modes of transportation. The evaluations also vary by type: formative and process evaluations are often applied to the newer programs, and

outcome and impact evaluations tend to be used for the more mature programs. Several evaluations advance the Department's equity work, including the formative evaluations for the Transit-Oriented Development and Reconnecting Communities pilots. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has requested additional funds in their FY 2024 budget request to support the evaluations described in this Plan. DOT expects to conduct the other planned evaluations with existing resources. The remainder of this Plan describes the 17 significant evaluation studies and the associated information needs, proposed methods, anticipated challenges, and planned dissemination.

| Evaluation  | Lead  | BIL-Related | Large Grant Program | Evaluation Type   |
|---|-------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Airport Terminal Program  | FAA   | ✓           | ✓                   | Process           |
| Efficacy of the Program Management Maturity Model within the FAA Security and Hazardous Materials Safety Organization | FAA   |             |                     | Process           |
| Enterprise Assessment of the Focused Approach to Safety   | FHWA  |             |                     | Process           |
| FHWA's Oversight of State and Local Entities Under the Americans with Disabilities Act                                | FHWA  |             |                     | Process           |
| State Performance Management Program  | FHWA  |             | ✓                   | Process           |
| Effectiveness of the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program  | FMCSA |             |                     | Process           |
| Entry Level Driver Training Provider Registry   | FMCSA |             |                     | Outcome           |
| Automated Track Inspection Program  | FRA   |             |                     | Process           |
| Grade Crossing Grant Benefits   | FRA   | ✓           |                     | Outcome           |
| Northeast Corridor Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Program  | FRA   | ✓           | ✓                   | Outcome           |
| Operation Lifesaver   | FRA   |             |                     | Process           |
| Very Long Trains Study  | FRA   | ✓           |                     | Outcome           |
| Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program  | FTA   | ✓           |                     | Formative         |
| Effectiveness of State Maritime Academies' Recruitment and Enrollment Strategies                                      | MARAD |             |                     | Process / Outcome |
| National Impaired Driving Paid Media Campaign   | NHTSA |             |                     | Outcome           |
| Equity in the Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program  | OST-P |             |                     | Formative         |
| Natural Gas Distribution Infrastructure Safety and Modernization Grant Program  | PHMSA | ✓           |                     | Process / Outcome |

## Airport Terminal Program

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Lead                   | Federal Aviation Administration   |
| Program                | The <a href="#">Airport Terminal Program</a> (ATP) is a competitive (discretionary) grant program awarding BIL funds to eligible projects, including airport terminals and associated roadways, multimodal terminal projects, airport rail access projects, and airport sponsor-owned towers, regardless of staffing. At many airports, terminals, including roadways and airport-owned airport traffic control towers, have limited access to <a href="#">Airport Improvement Program</a> or other Federal grant programs. The purpose of the ATP grants is to assist these airports in addressing their aging infrastructure. |
| Time Frame             | FY 2023 – 2024  |
| Evaluation Questions   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent were all eligible airport sponsors, including sponsors in disadvantaged communities, made aware of this opportunity?</li> <li>▪ What outreach methods were used, and who did they reach during the notice period?</li> <li>▪ To what extent did selected projects indicate improvements in accessibility for persons with disabilities?</li> <li>▪ To what extent did selected projects indicate improvements in energy efficiency?</li> </ul>  |
| Information Needed     | <p>The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) expects primarily to use existing data to conduct this evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BIL requirements;</li> <li>▪ List of eligible airport sponsors;</li> <li>▪ Descriptions of outreach;</li> <li>▪ FY 2022 and 2023 project selection data;</li> <li>▪ Reports from grant recipients on outcomes achieved with respect to accessibility; and</li> <li>▪ Reports from grant recipients on outcomes achieved with respect to energy efficiency.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | This process/implementation evaluation will rely primarily on document review and analysis, supplemented by a limited number of interviews and site visits.   |
| Anticipated Challenges | The FAA is currently developing and testing ATP processes. The FAA coordinates continuously with the BIL Team within the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and may adjust processes as necessary, which may complicate efforts to measure effectiveness.  |
| Dissemination          | The FAA will share results internally to inform subsequent BIL ATP cycles. The FAA may share relevant findings through Frequently Asked Questions or technical assistance documents to improve applications for future awards.  |

### Efficacy of the Program Management Maturity Model within the FAA Security and Hazardous Materials Safety Organization

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Lead</b>                   | Federal Aviation Administration   |
| <b>Program</b>                | The FAA's Office of Security and Hazardous Materials Safety (ASH) created the Strategic Management Program to manage strategy development, execution, and measurement as an office-wide endeavor, shaping program performance planning as the means for measured progress towards program optimization and organizational excellence. This Program intends to serve obligations for sound business planning, resource stewardship, and enterprise risk management, but it also underpins ASH's efforts to sustain an assured and secured National Airspace System. The ASH Strategic Management Program relies on the Program Management Maturity Model (PM3) to provide aggregate indicators for systematically tracking improvements and evaluating progress. The PM3 is part of ASH's Business Plan under the Operational Excellence, Mission Efficiency, and Support objective. The objective of this evaluation is to gauge the efficacy of the PM3 in helping ASH meet its mission. |
| <b>Time Frame</b>             | FY 2024 – 2025  |
| <b>Evaluation Questions</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent is the PM3 a viable and reliable indicator for promoting and evidencing continual improvement in the delivery of services?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have changes in ASH organizational structures supported the intended improvements to business processes, internal coordination, or other practices?</li> <li>▪ What design changes to the PM3 could facilitate improvement in strategic outcomes?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Information Needed</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information about internal changes in processes, practices, structure, and performance reporting from ASH employees;</li> <li>▪ Quartile self-assessments;</li> <li>▪ Internal program data;</li> <li>▪ Official records and narrative reports;</li> <li>▪ Business planning data; and</li> <li>▪ Information on leading practices in performance planning and measurement from FAA experts.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Methods</b>                | <p>This process evaluation uses a mixed-methods Intervention Case Study Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Synthesis of internal interviews (with purposeful sampling) and focus groups with employees representing the six ASH program offices;</li> <li>▪ Analysis of data from quartile self-assessments matched against documentary evidence from the PM3 reporting tool and database;</li> <li>▪ Multilevel guided review of records, applying thematic analysis to a representative sampling of business planning data to analyze trends and identify opportunities for improvement in the workflow process; and</li> <li>▪ Analysis of data collected and coded from a round table discussion to connect FAA experts in performance planning and measurement with ASH leaders for identifying leading practices.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | A potential challenge stems from the operational focus that sustains much of the ASH mission portfolio. As such, the limited availability of individuals and the necessary collaboration in preparing, presenting, and developing leadership actions consistent with the findings and recommendations may delay progress.   |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | The FAA will issue the final report, including quarterly updates, internally with findings and recommendations to guide ASH executive decision-making. ASH will develop and implement corrective actions based on the recommendations. Such corrective actions could include but are not limited to changes in policies, practices, implementation of staff training, or supplemental staff expertise.  |



## Enterprise Assessment of the Focused Approach to Safety

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Lead                   | Federal Highway Administration  |
| Program                | The Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) <a href="#">Office of Safety's Focused Approach to Safety</a> provides additional resources to eligible high priority States to address the nation's most critical safety challenges through additional program benefits. This evaluation will use the FHWA Program Area Evaluation tool, which uses systematic data collection and analysis to assess program efficiency.  |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>The FHWA Enterprise Performance Management (EPM) Team will facilitate a multi-discipline team to evaluate implementation of the Focused Approach to Safety program area using data from the Program Area Profile and a standardized assessment methodology to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Program Objectives and Purpose:</i> To what degree is the purpose of the Focused Approach to Safety understood, aligned, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Measures:</i> To what degree do the program measures used by the Focused Approach to Safety reflect mission-related outputs/outcomes that are utilized by management, reported internally and externally, and archived?</li> <li>▪ <i>Activities:</i> To what degree are Focused Approach to Safety program activities understood, appropriate, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Risks:</i> To what degree does the Focused Approach to Safety program's risk management demonstrate results in achieving its mission and outcomes?</li> </ul> |
| Information Needed     | <p>The FHWA Program Manager will provide data for the evaluation of the Focused Approach to Safety program in a Program Area Profile, which is a FHWA template populated with data verified by subject matter experts. The Profile will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program objectives and/or purpose in statutes, regulations, and policies;</li> <li>▪ Measures of success in use and associated current data;</li> <li>▪ Lists of activities; and</li> <li>▪ Risks and response strategies in use.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | The Program Area Evaluation is an FHWA tool for process and implementation evaluation. Using key questions and a maturity model, it assesses how the program or service is delivered relative to its intended theory of change and includes information on content, quantity, quality, and structure of the information provided in the Program Area Profile. The FHWA EPM Team will conduct this evaluation using a standardized assessment methodology in accordance with the current EPM guidelines.   |
| Anticipated Challenges | The current Program Area Evaluation (Profile Assessment with Maturity Model) guidance is also currently under evaluation and testing, making it subject to revision.  |
| Dissemination          | Recommendations and suggested changes to internal processes and procedures will be communicated to the FHWA Leadership Team and then disseminated to Agency staff. FHWA will publish the results on an internal EPM shared site.  |

## FHWA's Oversight of State and Local Entities Under the Americans with Disabilities Act

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Highway Administration   |
| Program                | The <a href="#">Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Program</a> includes FHWA's regulatory responsibilities under <a href="#">Title II of the ADA</a> and <a href="#">Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973</a> . It includes FHWA's oversight of State and local entities and recipients of Federal funds for roadways and pedestrian facilities to ensure that they do not discriminate based on disability in any highway transportation program, activity, service, or benefit they provide to the public. This evaluation will use the FHWA Program Area Evaluation tool, which uses systematic data collection and analysis to assess program efficiency.  |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024  |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>The FHWA EPM Team will facilitate a multi-discipline team to evaluate implementation of the ADA oversight program area using data from the Program Area Profile and a standardized assessment methodology to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Overarching Questions:</i> What is FHWA doing in its ADA oversight that works, and what could FHWA do differently to make the program more successful?</li> <li>▪ <i>Program Objectives and Purpose:</i> To what degree is the purpose of FHWA's ADA oversight understood, aligned, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Measures:</i> To what degree do the program measures used in FHWA's ADA oversight reflect mission-related outputs/outcomes that are utilized by management, reported internally and externally, and archived?</li> <li>▪ <i>Activities:</i> To what degree are FHWA's ADA oversight activities understood, appropriate, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Risks:</i> To what degree does the ADA oversight program's risk management demonstrate results in achieving mission and outcomes?</li> </ul> |
| Information Needed     | <p>The FHWA Program Manager will provide data for the evaluation of the ADA oversight program in a Program Area Profile, which is a FHWA template populated with data verified by subject matter experts. The Profile will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program objectives and/or purpose in statutes, regulations, and policies;</li> <li>▪ Measures of success in use and associated current data;</li> <li>▪ Lists of activities; and</li> <li>▪ Risks and response strategies in use.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | The Program Area Evaluation is an FHWA tool for process and implementation evaluation. Using key questions and a maturity model, it assesses how the program or service is delivered relative to its intended theory of change and includes information on content, quantity, quality, and structure of the information provided in the Program Area Profile. The FHWA EPM Team will conduct this evaluation using a standardized assessment methodology in accordance with the current EPM guidelines.  |
| Anticipated Challenges | The current Program Area Evaluation (Profile Assessment with Maturity Model) guidance is also currently under evaluation and testing, making it subject to revision.   |
| Dissemination          | Recommendations and suggested changes to internal processes and procedures will be communicated to the FHWA Leadership Team and then disseminated to Agency staff. FHWA will publish the results on an internal EPM shared site.   |

## State Performance Management Program

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Lead                   | Federal Highway Administration  |
| Program                | The <a href="#">National Highway Performance Program</a> (NHPP) is a multi-billion-dollar formula grant program that provides support for the condition and performance of the <a href="#">National Highway System</a> and for the construction of new facilities on the National Highway System. The program also ensures that investments of federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a State's asset management plan for the National Highway System. While the NHPP contains multiple program areas, FHWA's evaluation will focus on implementation of <a href="#">23 U.S. Code § 119 (e) State Performance Management</a> . This evaluation will use the FHWA Program Area Evaluation tool, which uses systematic data collection and analysis to assess program efficiency.  |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>The FHWA EPM Team will facilitate a multi-discipline team to evaluate implementation of the State Performance Management program area using data from the Program Area Profile and a standardized assessment methodology to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Overarching Questions:</i> What is FHWA's State Performance Management program doing that works, and what could FHWA do differently to make the NHPP State Performance Management program more successful?</li> <li>▪ <i>Program Objectives and Purpose:</i> To what degree is the purpose of FHWA's State Performance Management program understood, aligned, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Measures:</i> To what degree do the program measures used by the State Performance Management program reflect mission-related outputs/outcomes that are utilized by management, reported internally and externally, and archived?</li> <li>▪ <i>Activities:</i> To what degree are State Performance Management activities understood, appropriate, and monitored?</li> <li>▪ <i>Risks:</i> To what degree does the State Performance Management program's risk management demonstrate results in achieving mission and outcomes?</li> </ul> |
| Information Needed     | <p>The FHWA Program Manager will provide data for the evaluation of the State Performance Management program in a Program Area Profile, which is a FHWA template populated with data verified by subject matter experts. The Profile will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program objectives and/or purpose in statutes, regulations, and policies;</li> <li>▪ Measures of success in use and associated current data;</li> <li>▪ Lists of activities; and</li> <li>▪ Risks and response strategies in use.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | The Program Area Evaluation is an FHWA tool for process and implementation evaluation. Using key questions and a maturity model, it assesses how the program or service is delivered relative to its intended theory of change and includes information on content, quantity, quality, and structure of the information provided in the Program Area Profile. The FHWA EPM Team will conduct this evaluation using a standardized assessment methodology in accordance with the current EPM guidelines.   |
| Anticipated Challenges | The current Program Area Evaluation (Profile Assessment with Maturity Model) guidance is also currently under evaluation and testing, making it subject to revision.  |
| Dissemination          | Recommendations and suggested changes to internal processes and procedures will be communicated to the FHWA Leadership Team and then disseminated to Agency staff. FHWA will publish the results on an internal EPM shared site.  |

### Effectiveness of the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  |
| Program                | The <a href="#">Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program</a> (MCSAP) is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to reduce crashes, fatalities, and injuries involving commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety and enforcement programs. The MCSAP is the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA) largest grant program that supports State and local law enforcement agencies, including more than 12,000 officers performing enforcement and safety activities Nationwide.   |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024 – 2025   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>As a result of activities funded by MCSAP grants...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How effectively do State partners execute their approved safety activity strategies, called Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Plans (CVSPs)?</li> <li>▪ To what degree do decision-makers use key performance measures in the denial of registration to unsafe carriers and the removal of unsafe vehicles and drivers from the highways?</li> <li>▪ What process improvements, if any, do State partners employ that could be shared Nationwide?</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Questions may change as FMCSA identifies specific objectives to focus the evaluation.</i></p>   |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statutory, regulatory, and policy information;</li> <li>▪ State funding and planned CVSP activities;</li> <li>▪ Actual CVSP enforcement activities data by year, including inspections, investigations, removing dangerous drivers, and placing dangerous companies out of service;</li> <li>▪ State partner performance measures and descriptions;</li> <li>▪ CVSP implementation and process information by grant recipient; and</li> <li>▪ Information on processes from subject matter experts.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Perform review of statute, regulation, and policies; public perspectives of the program; training resources; and CVSP and grant requirements;</li> <li>▪ Assess State Performance data relating to their compliance with their CVSP;</li> <li>▪ Retrieve and assess performance and enforcement data from a variety of DOT, State, and association data systems;</li> <li>▪ Assess effectiveness of each State's CVSP by interviewing subject matter experts to collect information on processes;</li> <li>▪ Assess to what degree FMCSA State partner performance measures and metrics are used in decision making; and</li> <li>▪ If the evaluation provides sufficient evidence, use results to develop criteria and propose adoption of best practices that may be applied Nationwide.</li> </ul> |
| Anticipated Challenges | Evaluation could take longer than 12 months due to number of States and territories, data required, and timing associated with Paperwork Reduction Act requirements for reaching out to State and local agencies.  |
| Dissemination          | FMCSA will disseminate the evaluation results in an internal report to program managers to inform and guide corrective actions for program improvements.   |

## Entry Level Driver Training Provider Registry

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration  |
| Program                | The key element of the FMCSA <a href="#">Entry Level Driver Training</a> (ELDT) program is the Training Provider Registry (TPR), which is the authorized list of training providers. Entry-level commercial drivers must obtain training from providers listed on the TPR before testing for certain commercial driver's licenses and commercial driver's license endorsements. Use of the TPR ensures that entry-level drivers of CMVs complete minimum training requirements established by the new ELDT regulations ( <a href="#">49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 380 Subparts F and G</a> ).   |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024 – 2025   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>This program evaluation will evaluate the effectiveness of the TPR implementation and process outputs to date. Questions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what degree have ELDT regulatory objectives been met?</li> <li>▪ How has ELDT implementation influenced State Driver's License Agency (SDLA) skills test pass rates?</li> <li>▪ How accurate and timely is the data transmission between training providers, FMCSA, and SDLAs Nationwide?</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Questions may change as FMCSA identifies specific objectives to focus the evaluation.</i></p>   |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statute, regulations, and policies;</li> <li>▪ Industry and State perspectives on process implementation and outputs;</li> <li>▪ Sample of TPR provider data;</li> <li>▪ ELDT curricula and SDLA skills tests results; and</li> <li>▪ Information on data transmission between training providers, FMCSA, and SDLAs.</li> </ul>   |
| Methods                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Perform a review of statute, regulation, policies, and public perspectives of the program, as well as training resources;</li> <li>▪ Interview subject matter experts to collect data and information across headquarters, regions, divisions, States, and SDLAs regarding the various aspects of the ELDT;</li> <li>▪ Assess compliance with the ELDT provider registry by sampling providers to verify qualifications of TPR providers;</li> <li>▪ Compare SDLA skills tests pass rates before and after the rule change; and</li> <li>▪ Calculate data transmission between training providers, FMCSA, and SDLAs.</li> </ul> |
| Anticipated Challenges | Timing associated with Paperwork Reduction Act requirements on reaching out to State agencies, drivers, and training professionals. Evaluation also could take longer than expected due to number of States and territories and the data involved.   |
| Dissemination          | FMCSA will disseminate the evaluation results in an internal report to program managers to inform and guide corrective actions for program improvements.   |

### Automated Track Inspection Program

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Railroad Administration  |
| Program                | The mission of FRA's <a href="#">Automated Track Inspection Program</a> (ATIP) is to reduce track-caused derailments through the advancement and utilization of automated track inspection technologies across the U.S. rail network. This program provides detailed information for timely mitigation of non-compliant conditions. The program also plays a key role in the development of new technologies focused on improving track inspection capabilities of FRA and the entire U.S. railroad industry. FRA's ATIP program utilizes contractor-operated, vehicle-based automated technology to inspect track geometry and rail integrity. It collects and distributes critical track safety data to help railroads identify and address track defects and rail flaws to prevent track-caused derailments or accidents. ATIP delivers accurate, objective information for FRA safety oversight and enforcement activities, allowing FRA to audit railroad track safety compliance and determine the state of good repair of the Nation's railroads. |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024 – 2025<br><i>This time frame provides for collection of certain data needed post-implementation of FY 2023 programmatic changes.</i>   |
| Evaluation Questions   | In FY 2022, FRA solicited offers for operations of ATIP's inspection vehicles. The new contract(s) that will be issued in FY 2023 incorporate changes recommended from an Office of Inspector General audit. This process evaluation will assess the contractors' implementation of the program under the new contract approach and utilization metric. Evaluation questions will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent does the new contract structure use the vehicle-based assets?</li> <li>▪ To what extent do the revised utilization metrics provide information used to inform decisions?</li> </ul>   |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ATIP program goals and processes;</li> <li>▪ Pre- and post-implementation data from the contract(s);</li> <li>▪ Interviews; and</li> <li>▪ Additional program data.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | This study will utilize multiple evaluation methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of the new contract(s) will be an implementation evaluation to compare a new approach against what it replaced. It will assess the changes to quantifiable performance metrics pre- and post-implementation of the contractual changes.</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of ATIP's management and use of assets will be a process evaluation that reviews the current program goals and approach to identify how the program activities align with the goal of improving safety.</li> </ul>  |
| Anticipated Challenges | Anticipated challenges include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implementation of new contracts may require significant transition activities between incumbent and newly assigned contractors, which could inhibit direct comparisons;</li> <li>▪ ATIP operates in a complex environment with numerous contributing factors that may not be adequately isolated or accounted for during the evaluation; and</li> <li>▪ Certain data relevant to program efficacy are maintained by non-governmental entities and may only be available in limited or aggregated formats.</li> </ul>  |
| Dissemination          | FRA intends to distribute the findings of the evaluation internally, although portions may be disseminated to relevant stakeholders. The findings will inform program and policy decisions that may allow for an increase in the efficiency and efficacy of the program.   |

### Grade Crossing Grant Benefits

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Lead</b>                   | Federal Railroad Administration  |
| <b>Program</b>                | FRA grant programs have funded improvements to more than 1,000 highway-rail grade crossings since FY 2015. FRA's grade crossing experts will analyze these improvements to determine their effectiveness. The work will focus on before-and-after analysis to identify whether there was an increase in safety at grade crossings that received grant funds. This review will inform programmatic changes that could maximize the safety benefits and cost-effectiveness of federal grant funding. |
| <b>Time Frame</b>             | FY 2024 – 2025   |
| <b>Evaluation Questions</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What were the characteristics of the improvements to grade crossings, including costs, and what were the characteristics of the locations?</li> <li>▪ To what extent do the different types of grade crossing improvements affect incidents and other safety measures?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Information Needed</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Funding provided for grade crossing improvements;</li> <li>▪ Location of and specific improvements made to grade crossings; and</li> <li>▪ Safety data pre- and post-improvement.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Methods</b>                | <p>This outcome evaluation will take a mixed-methods approach, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Description of where and what grade crossing improvements were funded;</li> <li>▪ Data analysis of change in safety at crossings; and</li> <li>▪ Potential cost-benefit analysis.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manually compiling the population of grade crossing improvements; and</li> <li>▪ Obtaining specific data on grade crossing improvements from previous grantees, including the cost of the improvements and specific types of improvements.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | FRA intends to disseminate the results internally. However, FRA will provide relevant results to the public for consideration of future grade crossing projects.   |

### Northeast Corridor Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Program

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Lead                   | Federal Railroad Administration   |
| Program                | The BIL provided \$24 billion in advance appropriations for railway projects along the Northeast Corridor (NEC). These funds are intended to make substantial progress in reducing the state of good repair backlog on the NEC and delivering the trip time and service improvements envisioned in the NEC Commission's <a href="#">CONNECT NEC 2035</a> plan. The initial CONNECT NEC 2035 plan, released in July 2021, identified a total funding need of \$102 billion between FY 2022 and FY 2036, consisting of both state of good repair and service expansion projects. The CONNECT NEC 2035 plan served as a primary input to DOT's NEC Project Inventory issued in November 2022. The NEC Project Inventory will inform selections for the BIL-funded <a href="#">Federal State Partnership for Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program</a> , the primary discretionary grant mechanism to fund investments along the corridor. The NEC Project Inventory is statutorily required to be updated at least every two years. |
| Time Frame             | FY 2024 – 2026  |
| Evaluation Questions   | <p>This evaluation will assess to what extent the NEC Project Inventory effectively enables NEC project sponsors to meet 2035 targets established for reducing the state of good repair backlog and reducing delay minutes on the NEC. A subset of this objective will be to assess whether the inventory approach required by BIL streamlines the implementation of NEC projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent did the use of the NEC Project Inventory lead to selection of projects focused on reducing the state of good repair backlog and trip delays (rather than other focus areas) compared to selections prior to use of the inventory?</li> <li>▪ To what degree does the NEC Project Inventory enable FRA and sponsors to streamline project advancement (i.e., allow for projects to move more quickly from planning to project development and then to construction) compared to projects selected prior to use of the inventory?</li> </ul>   |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NEC Project Inventory;</li> <li>▪ Project information from applications, including scope, budget, and schedule information to determine whether the project primarily addresses state of good repair needs, trip times, or other possible focus areas; and</li> <li>▪ Project timelines and milestones achieved.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | <p>This process/implementation evaluation will take a mixed-methods approach, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document review;</li> <li>▪ Data coding and analysis of project information from applications;</li> <li>▪ Data coding and analysis of time associated with project timelines and milestones; and</li> <li>▪ Interviews with key individuals involved in project award and execution.</li> </ul>  |
| Anticipated Challenges | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Time needed to gather interview feedback and review documentation; and</li> <li>▪ NEC Commission and FRA ability to support the evaluation in terms of time and data.</li> </ul>  |
| Dissemination          | Dissemination of evaluation results will be internal to FRA and the NEC Commission.   |



## Operation Lifesaver

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Railroad Administration  |
| Program                | <a href="#">Operation Lifesaver</a> (OLI) is a non-profit rail safety education and awareness organization dedicated to reducing collisions, fatalities, and injuries at highway-rail crossings and preventing trespassing on or near railroad tracks. FRA funds OLI each year through a grant agreement with the purpose of enabling safe, reliable, and efficient movement of people and goods. FRA has partnered with the DOT's Volpe National Transportation Systems Center to conduct this evaluation. FRA will present findings to FRA's safety and research and development teams, as well as OLI leadership and staff. FRA and Volpe will document ways to learn from the information collected and improve the program. |
| Time Frame             | FY 2022 – 2024   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent is OLI executing the requirements in FRA's grant agreement?</li> <li>▪ What materials and services does OLI provide and to whom?</li> <li>▪ How does OLI make the products available to stakeholders and how do they distribute them?</li> <li>▪ How and to what extent do stakeholders access OLI's materials and services?</li> </ul>  |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grantee information including OLI activities, materials, services; and</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder data such as who, what, where, and how often they coordinate with OLI and access OLI products.</li> </ul>   |
| Methods                | <p>This process evaluation will take a mixed-methods approach with an assessment of whether additional tools can support OLI in its rail safety mission, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of grant documents;</li> <li>▪ Interviews with participating stakeholders and questionnaires; and</li> <li>▪ Data analysis of stakeholder data.</li> </ul>   |
| Anticipated Challenges | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Insufficient data; and</li> <li>▪ Willingness of OLI, States, and other stakeholders to participate.</li> </ul>  |
| Dissemination          | Evaluation results will be disseminated internally within FRA and externally to OLI, States, and other DOT Operating Administrations, as appropriate.  |

### Very Long Trains Study

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Lead                   | Federal Railroad Administration  |
| Program                | <a href="#">Section 22422 of BIL</a> directs the Department to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study on the operation of freight trains that are longer than 7,500 feet. This study will evaluate operational, safety, efficiency, and other performance issues of trains that are longer than 7,500 feet compared to shorter trains. FRA will use the results to determine if any additional studies, rulemaking, or other regulations may be needed to regulate very long trains. More details regarding the study can be found <a href="#">here</a> .   |
| Time Frame             | FY 2022 – 2024   |
| Evaluation Questions   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How are the operation of Very Long Trains relative to shorter trains, including, but not limited to loss of communication between the end-of-train device and locomotive cab, loss of radio communications between crew members, derailments, and other train accidents, associated with differences in safety outcomes?</li> <li>▪ What are the effects of longer trains relative to shorter trains on greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental concerns; scheduling efficiency of passenger and freight train operations; and the frequency and amount of time that highway-rail grade crossings are occupied by trains?</li> </ul> |
| Information Needed     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data on train characteristics from the railroads, including train make-up/location of empty cars; type of technology in the cab; underlying signal and control system; crew training; and</li> <li>▪ Data on schedules, blocked crossings, and train emissions.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods                | Methods will include statistical data analysis, testing, and modeling  |
| Anticipated Challenges | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Railroads' willingness to provide data; and</li> <li>▪ Railroads and/or FRA not having the data needed to complete the evaluation.</li> </ul>  |
| Dissemination          | This study will be distributed internally to FRA and externally to Congress, and it will be publicly available.  |

## Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Lead                 | Federal Transit Administration  |
| Program              | <p>Since 2012, Congress and DOT have taken steps to facilitate transit-oriented development projects to increase transit ridership and revenues by encouraging population growth along transit corridors. These projects generally comprise mixed-use residential and commercial real estate development projects near transit services. In July 2012, the <a href="#">Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act</a> (MAP-21) established a pilot program under which the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides grants to help communities develop strategies to facilitate transit-oriented development planning. Through a competitive grant process, the <a href="#">Pilot Program for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Program</a> (TOD Pilot Program) assists in financing comprehensive planning for capital or capacity improvement projects that include transit-oriented development. The program finances development of a plan for a transit-oriented development project. Implementation of the planned project occurs later, and it must be separately funded.</p> <p>Since 2015, when FTA first awarded grants through the TOD Pilot Program, FTA has awarded 110 planning grants totaling \$90 million to transit agencies and other entities through six rounds of funding. Funding for the TOD Pilot Program has continued under BIL, with the appropriation of approximately \$68 million over five years. MAP-21 established six objectives for each awarded grant project in the TOD Pilot Program:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhance economic development, ridership, and other goals established during the project development and engineering processes;</li> <li>2. Facilitate multimodal connectivity and accessibility;</li> <li>3. Increase access to transit hubs for pedestrian and bicycle traffic;</li> <li>4. Enable mixed-use development;</li> <li>5. Identify infrastructure needs associated with the eligible project; and</li> <li>6. Include private sector participation.</li> </ol> |
| Time Frame           | FY 2022 – 2024  |
| Evaluation Questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What range of activities and strategies did grantees pursue in completing their planning studies?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have the completed planning studies under the TOD Pilot program been successful in meeting the initial MAP-21 objectives for the program?</li> <li>▪ What challenges and helpful factors did grantees encounter in trying to address the MAP-21 requirements when developing their plans?</li> <li>▪ What lessons learned can be identified from grantees' experiences with the pilot program that could potentially improve future TOD planning and implementation assistance projects?</li> </ul>  |
| Information Needed   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TOD pilot planning studies;</li> <li>▪ Grantee website information; and</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder and community experiences with the TOD Pilot.</li> </ul>  |
| Methods              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Review of Planning Studies and Grantee Website Materials:</i> The TOD Pilot Program requires awarded grant recipients to submit a final deliverable documenting the results of their metropolitan area planning work, usually in the form of a planning study. The evaluation team will conduct a content analysis of all completed planning studies to analyze the range of strategies pursued by grantees; proposed performance criteria identified by grantees for planning work; and the extent to which any additional TOD planning work or initial steps toward implementation occurred after completion of FTA-funded work.</li> </ul>   |

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Methods</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Interviews, Focus Groups, Listening Sessions:</i> FTA will conduct outreach to grantees, key stakeholders, and community members representing a range of FTA regions, agencies, and community types to collect information on the types of grantee strategies pursued, the extent of post-planning study progress toward TOD implementation, challenges, and opportunities, the effectiveness of FTA technical support to grantees, and opportunities to improve future TOD grant programs.</li></ul> |
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | Planning projects can take up to four years to complete, and the subsequent project construction typically takes multiple years to complete, up to a decade. Therefore, despite awarding the first grants in 2015, it will be difficult to assess long-term outcomes of the program at this time.  |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | The final evaluation plan will be submitted to the <a href="#">Government Accountability Office</a> to satisfy a recommendation that FTA develop a plan to evaluate the TOD pilot program. FTA also will submit a report on the findings of the evaluation to the program managers, who will develop strategies for program improvement based on the results. In addition, FTA will provide a high-level summary of the findings to the public on the <a href="#">TOD Pilot Program website</a> .  |

### Effectiveness of State Maritime Academies' Recruitment and Enrollment Strategies

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Lead                 | Maritime Administration   |
| Program              | <p>The <a href="#">Student Incentive Program</a> (SIP) provides Federal funding to students for tuition and education costs in return for a service obligation, which requires each SIP recipient to sail for three years, maintain their license for five years after graduation, and be available to serve on strategic sealift missions. To become a SIP recipient, a student must first apply and be accepted into one of the six State Maritime Academies (SMAs), five of which are integrated within their State-university system and one that is an autonomous State school. To become an SMA cadet, a student needs to choose the Strategic Sealift Midshipman Program (SSMP) track within the SMA program at the State-university system. If qualified, they may then apply for the SIP. Enrollments across the SMAs have dropped by nearly 18% over the past five years, with SSMP licensed track enrollment in the SMAs declining by 23%. Enrollments across the board were likely affected by COVID-19, including SIP participation, which has dropped by 25% over recent years. Unlimited license graduations have to an extent paralleled these declines. The decline in student enrollments across the SMAs over the last five years and the subsequent decline in SSMP licensing track participation, and declining SIP participation suggests that a different approach is required to reach those interested in pursuing a maritime academy education and a willingness to serve on strategic sealift national security missions.</p> <p>The primary focus of this proposed study is to evaluate the factors associated with current SMA enrollment to identify and share best practices, while providing insight into the reasons for declining enrollment and its possible corresponding effect on SIP enrollment. The study may also gather available information and evidence about strategies used by similar programs that have not experienced declining enrollment in recent years. Results from this evaluation will help improve effectiveness of recruitment and enrollment strategies across SMAs by identifying effective strategies that could be more widely adopted.</p> |
| Time Frame           | FY 2024 – to be determined  |
| Evaluation Questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does recruitment of those accepted into the SMA, those enrolling in the SSMP track, and those accepted into the SIP vary by the six SMAs?</li> <li>▪ How does recruitment vary across demographic subgroups and geographic areas?</li> <li>▪ What activities and strategies do SMAs use to recruit students into the school and the SSMP track? To what extent are specific strategies associated with higher rates of overall enrollment and enrollment in the SSMP track; how, if at all are strategies associated with enrollment rates for demographic subgroups?</li> <li>▪ What recruitment materials related to SIP do the SMAs provide for those enrolling at the SMA and those enrolling in the SSMP track? How are the recruitment materials distributed (i.e., at in-person meetings, through email, via social media platforms) and to whom? How many people receive the materials?</li> <li>▪ Using administrative records related to applicants, reports from the SMAs, and interviews with leadership at the SMAs, what factors affect whether an applicant attends a SMA?</li> <li>▪ Using administrative data related to students, reports from the SMAs, and interviews with leadership at the SMAs, what factors affect whether a student enters the SSMP track?</li> </ul>   |
| Information Needed   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SMA recruitment, SSMP track enrollment, and SIP acceptance data with associated demographic and geographic data for applicants and students;</li> <li>▪ SMA recruitment activities and strategies;</li> <li>▪ Lists of recruitment materials with type of distribution and reach; and</li> <li>▪ Perspective on what is working from knowledgeable individuals.</li> </ul>   |
| Methods              | Quantitative analysis by demographic and geographic groups as well as by SMA while accounting for differences in recruitment and enrollment. Will be supplemented by interviews with individuals at the SMAs and at the Maritime Administration (MARAD).  |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | Anticipated challenges include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Limitations in availability of demographic and geographic data for applicants and students; and</li><li>▪ Challenges measuring the level of recruitment activities.</li></ul> |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | Results will be shared with the SMAs to help improve effectiveness of recruitment and enrollment strategies.  |

## National Impaired Driving Paid Media Campaign

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Lead</b>                   | National Highway Traffic Safety Administration   |
| <b>Program</b>                | The <i>Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over</i> and <i>If You Feel Different, You Drive Different. Drive High. Get a DUI.</i> initiatives are paid media campaigns designed to influence the attitudes and behaviors related to alcohol- and drug-impaired driving among young male drivers (ages 18 to 34). Examples and additional information regarding these campaigns can be found <a href="#">here</a> and <a href="#">here</a> .  |
| <b>Time Frame</b>             | FY 2023 – 2025   |
| <b>Evaluation Questions</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How, if at all, do the messages in the impaired driving paid media campaigns influence the attitudes and behaviors of those who are most at risk of impaired driving crashes; in particular, 21- to 34-year-old males for alcohol-impaired driving and 18- to 34-year-old males for drug-impaired driving?</li> <li>▪ How (if at all) are the attitudes and behaviors of those outside the target demographic, including women and those 35 and older, influenced by the media campaigns?</li> <li>▪ How do responses to the messages vary across different demographic characteristics, including age, gender, and race or ethnicity?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Information Needed</b>     | The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) will collect information related to self-reported knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors from survey participants. This information collection will be a new effort.   |
| <b>Methods</b>                | NHTSA plans to use a survey panel of pre-screened individuals to collect information before and after both paid media campaigns. Different individuals will be invited to participate in each wave. NHTSA plans to analyze differences in the knowledge, attitudes, and stated behaviors among survey participants in each of the waves.   |
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | NHTSA is concerned that there may not be enough males aged 18 to 34 in the survey panel participant pools to assess the attitudes and behaviors eight times in two years. As part of the market research and contract award protocols, NHTSA will work to determine whether this mode of data collection would be appropriate and will provide useful data.  |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | NHTSA will summarize the findings in a research report and posted on the <a href="#">National Transportation Library</a> . The National Transportation Library will also host the data. NHTSA will use the research findings to inform future public campaigns and will share the findings widely with stakeholder organizations.  |

### Equity in the Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Lead</b>                 | Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy   |
| <b>Program</b>              | The primary goal of the <a href="#">Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) Program</a> is to reconnect communities that were previously cut off from economic opportunities by transportation infrastructure. Through planning activities and capital construction projects that are championed by those communities, the program aims to address infrastructure barriers, restore community connectivity, and improve peoples' lives. The RCP Program seeks to redress the legacy of harm caused by transportation infrastructure, including barriers to opportunity, displacement, damage to the environment and public health, limited access, and other hardships. In pursuit of this goal, the program will support and engage economically disadvantaged communities in planning and implementing solutions to knit communities back together. Those solutions can include high-quality public transportation, infrastructure removal, pedestrian walkways and overpasses, capping and lids, linear parks and trails, roadway redesigns and complete streets conversions, and main street revitalization that increase affordable, accessible, and multimodal access to daily destinations such as jobs, healthcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship, recreation, and park space.  |
| <b>Time Frame</b>           | FY 2023 – 2025  |
| <b>Evaluation Questions</b> | <p><i>Primary Question:</i> How can we understand the efficacy of RCP program design as a catalyst for community-engagement in planning transportation facility remediations?</p> <p>Specific questions will center around the primary objectives of the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What are the present-day baseline conditions of the communities selected as Reconnecting Communities grant recipients and of a subset of grant applicants? How has transportation infrastructure such as highways and rail-lines impacted these communities? Conditions for measurement may include socioeconomic demographics; transportation burdens and mode choice; access to jobs and services; pollution; safety and health outcomes.</li> <li>▪ What are the anticipated economic, social, and climate impacts of capital construction projects funded by the RCP program on the baseline conditions? What are the measurable impacts of capital construction projects on baseline conditions? Impacts may include expanded access to jobs and services, reduced pollution, safety, new mode choices, jobs created, property values, and new public or private investment catalyzed.</li> <li>▪ What community engagement and stewardship practices used by Reconnecting Communities grant recipients are effective at increasing the participation of hard-to-access and marginalized groups in transportation planning? Does strong, sustained community engagement carried out by Reconnecting Communities substantively alter the outcomes of the transportation planning process?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Information Needed</b>   | <p>The evaluation will require data for assessment and analyses of each phase of the RCP program. Baseline data and other evidence may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data from grant applicants and grantees;</li> <li>▪ Existing DOT data, census data, and other local and State transportation data; and</li> <li>▪ Social and economic indicators from local, regional, State, non-government organizations, and other Federal agencies (e.g., U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and others to be determined).</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Methods</b>              | RCP will take an integrative approach to understand the impacts and outcomes of the RCP program that will consider the use of qualitative methods in addition to quantitative analysis. Design of the evaluation will consider human-centered design and other relevant social science methodologies.   |



|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Anticipated Challenges</b> | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Difficulty in assessing outcomes of capital construction projects given the time frame of the evaluation;</li><li>▪ Updates to data collection methods and tools, such as the possible integration of qualitative evidence;</li><li>▪ Limited access to interagency data; and</li><li>▪ Avoiding undue data collection burdens on disadvantaged communities.</li></ul>   |
| <b>Dissemination</b>          | <p>The findings from this evaluation will be disseminated in a report internally to the program managers to inform and guide the development of strategies and/or corrective actions for program improvements, efficiencies, and new policies. Furthermore, the RCP program is required to submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives. Relevant evaluation findings will be submitted in the report to Congress.</p> |

### Natural Gas Distribution Infrastructure Safety and Modernization Grant Program

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Lead                 | Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration  |
| Program              | <p>The BIL provides funding for the <a href="#">Natural Gas Distribution Infrastructure Safety and Modernization (NGDISM) Grant Program</a>. NGDISM funds are available for municipality- or community-owned utilities (not including for-profit entities) to repair, rehabilitate, or replace their natural gas distribution pipeline system or portions thereof, or to acquire equipment to reduce incidents and fatalities and avoid economic losses. Through the NGDISM Grant Program, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) seeks to reduce the risk profile of existing pipeline systems (which often contain pipes prone to leakage of methane), create related well-paying jobs, promote economic growth, and benefit disadvantaged rural and urban communities with safe provision of natural gas.</p>  |
| Time Frame           | FY 2023 – 2024  |
| Evaluation Questions | <p><i>Process Implementation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What share of applicants came from municipality- or community-owned utilities representing disadvantaged communities?</li> <li>▪ What types and how much outreach did PHMSA provide to potential grantees?</li> <li>▪ What types and degree of public engagement did grantees provide after award?</li> <li>▪ To what extent were the program application processes clear and understood by applicants?</li> </ul> <p><i>Program Outputs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How did the performance (in terms of pipeline replaced, repaired, or rehabilitated) of different operator types vary by type of grantees while considering different operator environments?</li> <li>▪ What share of economic benefits accrued to disadvantaged communities through this program?</li> </ul>  |
| Information Needed   | <p><i>Process Implementation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lists of who was eligible to apply as well as those who applied;</li> <li>▪ Description of outreach activities (and any associated metrics) provided by PHMSA;</li> <li>▪ Descriptions of public engagement (and any associated metrics) provided by the grantees;</li> <li>▪ Questions received from applicants, as well as aspects of the application that were the focus of the questions.</li> <li>▪ Applications requiring additional information or clarification from PHMSA to successfully review the applications; and</li> <li>▪ Within the application review process, the amount of time (if any) a phase exceeded the anticipated completion date.</li> </ul> <p><i>Program Outputs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Miles of pipeline replaced, repaired, and rehabilitated by operator type and environment;</li> <li>▪ Amount of funding allocated to replace, repair, and rehabilitate pipelines that serve disadvantaged communities; and</li> <li>▪ Number of jobs created or retained as a result of this program.</li> </ul> |
| Methods              | PHMSA will answer evaluation questions with the information gathered from applications, quarterly federal financial and progress reports, reimbursement documentation, feedback from applicants and grant recipients, and internal grant files.   |

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>Methods</b></p>                | <p>In terms of process implementation, the methods will explore the experience of municipality- or community-owned utilities representing disadvantaged communities compared to other utilities including in terms of who applied versus who was eligible, the degree of outreach and public engagement, and the application process. The evaluation also will consider the most common issues among applicants to aid future projects.</p> <p>In terms of program outputs, the evaluation will examine the amount of pipeline replaced in both those representing disadvantaged communities as other utilities while controlling for operator type and environment. The evaluation also will examine the estimated job created and retained in both those representing disadvantaged communities as well as other utilities.</p> |
| <p><b>Anticipated Challenges</b></p> | <p>Anticipated challenges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grantees are often small entities without government grant experience and will need to be trained on key performance indicators and progress reporting, including single audits;</li> <li>▪ Key concepts may be difficult to measure or capture;</li> <li>▪ Different operators face very different environments that may make it easier or more difficult to replace high-risk pipeline; and</li> <li>▪ Potential staffing challenges due to high volume of program demands.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Dissemination</b></p>          | <p>There are no statutory requirements for reporting related to this evaluation. However, PHMSA will provide reports to Congress on an as-needed basis.</p>   |

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| ADA    | Americans with Disabilities Act                                  |
| ASH    | FAA Office of Security and Hazardous Materials Safety            |
| ATIP   | Automated Track Inspection Program                               |
| ATP    | Airport Terminal Program   |
| BIL    | Bipartisan Infrastructure Law                                    |
| CMV    | Commercial motor vehicle   |
| CVSP   | Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Plan                             |
| DOT    | Department of Transportation                                     |
| ELDT   | Entry Level Driver Training                                      |
| EPM    | FHWA Enterprise Performance Management Team                      |
| FAA    | Federal Aviation Administration                                  |
| FHWA   | Federal Highway Administration                                   |
| FMCSA  | Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration                      |
| FRA    | Federal Railroad Administration                                  |
| FTA    | Federal Transit Administration                                   |
| FY     | Fiscal year  |
| MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Act    |
| MARAD  | Maritime Academy   |
| MCSAP  | Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program                          |
| NEC    | Northeast Corridor   |
| NGDISM | Natural Gas Distribution Infrastructure Safety and Modernization |
| NHPP   | National Highway Performance Program                             |
| NHTSA  | National Highway Traffic Safety Administration                   |
| OLI    | Operation Lifesaver  |
| OMB    | Office of Management and Budget                                  |
| OST-B  | Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs        |
| OST-P  | Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy      |
| OST-R  | Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology    |
| PHMSA  | Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration           |
| PM3    | Program Management Maturity Model                                |
| RCP    | Reconnecting Communities Pilot                                   |
| SDLA   | State Driver's License Agency                                    |
| SIP    | Student Incentive Program  |
| SMA    | State Maritime Academy   |
| SSMP   | Strategic Sealift Midshipman Program                             |
| TOD    | Transit-Oriented Development                                     |
| TPR    | Training Provider Registry                                       |



U.S. Department of Transportation