U.S. Department of Transportation

FY 2026 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN

Secretary of Transportation
Sean P. Duffy

About the U.S. Department of Transportation

The U.S. Department of Transportation oversees and administers programs, policies, and regulations to ensure that our transportation system contributes to the Nation's economic growth while keeping traveling Americans safe. Established in 1967 by Congress, the U.S. Department of Transportation consolidated more than 30 transportation agencies and functions. DOT employees work across the country in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, the Office of Inspector General, and the Operating Administrations.

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 Material Safety Administration (PHMSA)

Introduction and Leadership Team

In accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, as amended by the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT or the Department) presents its Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 Performance Plan (APP), which defines the level of performance to be achieved during FY 2025 and 2026. The Performance Plan spans the Department's Operating Administrations and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, providing information on DOT's plans for continued progress to fulfill its mission.

SEAN DUFFY
Secretary of Transportation
Provides leadership for the Department and serves as the principal advisor to the President in all matters relating to federal transportation programs.

STEVEN G. BRADBURY
Deputy Secretary of Transportation
Oversees the Department's operating administrations and spearheads initiatives to ensure a safe, efficient, and modern transportation system that strengthens economic productivity and global competitiveness.

Read more about DOT's **Chief Financial Officer's Senior Management Team** who work to provide sound budget development, disciplined performance review, rigorous financial management, and responsible credit administration for the Department.

Performance Goals

The 36 performance goals will be carried out by the Department's Operating Administrations and the Office of the Secretary. The following tables include information about the performance goals' intended outcomes, target performance levels, and prior year results.

#	Performance Goal	Lead OA	FY 2024 Actual	FY 2025 Target	FY 2026 Target
1	Reduce the annual rate of total roadway fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to 1.18 or fewer by CY 2026	NHTSA	1.20*	1.20**	1.18**
2	Reduce the annual number of total roadway fatalities to 36,458 or fewer by CY 2026	NHTSA	39,345*	36,458**	36,458**
3	Reduce the annual rate of passenger vehicle occupant fatalities per 100 million passenger vehicle miles traveled (PVMT) to 0.73 or fewer by CY 2026	NHTSA	0.77*	0.74**	0.73**
4	Reduce the annual number of large truck and bus related fatalities to 4,555 or fewer by FY 2029	FMCSA	5,039	4,938	4,839
5	Increase the annual vehicle recall completion rate to 59.6% or more by FY 2026	NHTSA	59.2%	59.4%	59.6%
6	Reduce the number of motor carriers in caution status to 64,460 or fewer by FY 2029	FMCSA	65,775	65,512	65,249
7	Increase the annual new entrant motor carrier pass rate to 93.0% or more by FY 2029	FMCSA	91.2%	91.5%	91.9%
8	Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries per 100 million train/bus revenue miles from transit collision and derailment events to 278.3 or fewer by FY 2026	FTA	283.9	281.1	278.3
9	Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries per 100 million train/bus revenue miles on transit from assaults on all persons to 79.4 or fewer by FY 2026	FTA	81.0	80.2	79.4
10	Reduce the annual number of railroad employee operational on-duty fatalities to zero by FY 2030	FRA	5	4	3
11	Reduce the annual number of activation failures at grade crossings by 25% to 198 or fewer by FY 2030	FRA	264	260	253
12	Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by pipelines to 25 or fewer by FY 2026	PHMSA	26	25	25
13	Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel to 17 or fewer by FY 2026	PHMSA/ FRA/ FAA/ FMCSA	18***	17	17
14	Maintain the commercial air carrier fatality rate per 100 million persons on board at 4.4 or below through FY 2026	FAA	0.0	4.4	4.4
15	Maintain the general aviation fatal accident rate per 100,000 flight hours at 0.91 or below through FY 2026	FAA	0.68	0.92	0.91

#	Performance Goal	Lead OA	FY 2024 Actual	FY 2025 Target	FY 2026 Target
16	Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.38 per million operations for commercial aviation through FY 2026	FAA	0.08	0.38	0.38
17	Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 1.39 per million operations for non-commercial aviation through FY 2026	FAA	0.58	1.39	1.39
18	Reduce the Northeast Corridor state of good repair backlog of $71.40B by 60% to $28.56B or less by FY 2035	FRA	$71.39B	$68.39B	$64.39B
19	Reduce the state of good repair backlog for transit revenue vehicles to 20.2% or below by FY 2030	FTA	22.4%	22.0%	21.7%
20	Maintain the percentage of Interstate pavement in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026	FHWA	97.2%**	95%	95%
21	Maintain the percentage of National Highway System bridges' deck area in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026	FHWA	96%	95%	95%
22	Maintain the percentage of paved runways in fair or better condition at 93% through FY 2026	FAA	97.4%	93%	93%
23	Ensure reliable freight movement by maintaining a Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTR) at 1.43 or lower through FY 2026	FHWA	1.35	1.40	1.43
24	Start intercity passenger rail service on at least three new corridors by FY 2035	FRA	0	1	1
25	Reduce the number of transit rail stations inaccessible to persons with disabilities to 891 or fewer by FY 2030	FTA/DOCR	961	945	918
26	Reduce the number of Amtrak-served stations that are inaccessible to persons with disabilities from 86 to zero by FY 2030	FRA/DOCR	86	71	52
27	Maintain 99% commercial use availability rate for the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway	GLS	99%	99%	99%
28	Increase the annual outlay of Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) project funds to $3.3 million or more by FY 2026	MARAD	$2.7M	$2.9M	$3.3M
29	Increase the number of U.S. Flag vessels in international service from 94 vessels to 96 vessels or more by FY 2026	MARAD	94	95	96
30	Increase the United States Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) graduating class size to 220 or more by FY 2029	MARAD	214	216	218
31	Decrease the annual number of findings to remedy per checked vessel hosting cadets from the USMMA to 2 or fewer by FY 2026	MARAD	4.0	3.0	2.0
32	Increase the annual number of air traffic controllers trained to at least 1,900 or more in FY 2026	FAA	1,576	1,800	1,900
33	Maintain the National Airspace System On-Time Arrival Rate at Core Airports at 88% or above through FY 2026	FAA	90.6%	88%	88%
34	Publish a final rule reducing the regulatory cost of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards regulation by 2026	OST	N/A	N/A	Publish Final Rule
35	Increase the DOT Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Cybersecurity Score to 95/100 or more by FY 2027	OCIO	87	89	91
36	Increase the percentage of DOT's IT budget that uses shared services to 46% or more by FY 2026	OCIO	45%	45%	46%

* Calendar Year 2024 estimate

** Calendar Year Target

*** Fiscal Year 2023 Actual

DOT's performance goals cover our major program activities and investments, and align to the priorities of the Administration and Secretary. The next section provides a description of how DOT will achieve the performance goals, including key definitions of performance goals and indicators, and investments, programs and resources that contribute to accomplishing the goals.

Performance Goals Descriptions

1. **Reduce the annual rate of total roadway fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled VMT to 1.18 or fewer by CY 2026**
   This performance goal counts the number of reported fatalities occurring within 30 days of a crash involving a motor vehicle on a trafficway customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. A roadway fatality is the death of any vehicle occupant (any driver, passenger, or person riding on the exterior of a motor vehicle), any motorcycle (two- or three-wheeled motor vehicle) riders or passengers, and any non-occupants (e.g., a pedestrian or pedalcyclist) involved in a motor vehicle crash. VMT includes all vehicle miles traveled by all types of vehicles. We examine roadway fatalities scaled to the total amount of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on the Nation's roads.

2. **Reduce the annual number of total roadway fatalities to 36,458 or fewer by CY 2026**
   Roadway fatalities include any death occurring within 30 days of a crash of a motor vehicle occupant inside or on the exterior of a motor vehicle traveling on a trafficway customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. DOT reduces these fatalities through interventions to make crashes more survivable, such as increasing the widespread use of seat belts, as well as interventions to reduce the number of crashes, including impaired driving laws and improvements to roadway design and traffic operation practices.

3. **Reduce the annual rate of passenger vehicle occupant fatalities per 100 million passenger vehicle miles traveled (PVMT) to 0.73 or fewer by CY 2026**
   In 2023, passenger vehicle occupants accounted for 59% of all traffic fatalities. This performance goal includes all types of passenger vehicles but excludes motorcycles and commercial vehicles (large trucks and buses). It scales passenger vehicle fatalities to the total number of passenger vehicle miles traveled.

4. **Reduce the annual number of large truck and bus related fatalities to 4,555 or fewer by FY 2029**
   Five million truck and bus drivers share the road with more than 250 million motorists. In FY 2024, the number of fatalities because of a large truck or bus crash was 5,039. FY 2024 fatalities were a 9% reduction from FY 2023 (5,502). FMCSA reduces these fatalities through a focus on investigations and traffic enforcement. FMCSA grant programs supplement States' Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV) safety, enforcement, and outreach efforts, and contribute to efforts to reduce large truck and bus crashes.

5. **Increase the annual vehicle recall completion rate to 59.6% or more by FY 2026**
   Safety recalls are issued if the manufacturer or NHTSA determines that a vehicle or its equipment (such as air bags, tires, or car seats) pose either a safety risk or otherwise do not meet motor vehicle safety standards. A manufacturer must report to NHTSA the number of recalled products that have been remedied by the manufacturer following a recall. NHTSA uses these completion rates to identify recalls that are underperforming. We ensure these risks are mitigated as quickly as possible, reducing the potential harm they may cause, by requiring manufacturers to implement an improvement plan that includes sending renotification letters to owners, and tracking recall completion rates.

6. **Reduce the number of motor carriers in caution status to 64,460 or fewer by FY 2029**
When FMCSA cites a carrier either for regulatory violations or for demonstrating behaviors that may cause or increase the severity of crashes, the carrier is placed in caution status. As of September 30, 2024, out of approximately 2 million registered motor carriers nationwide, 65,775 were in caution status. FMCSA's Compliance, Safety, Accountability (CSA) program uses FMCSA's Safety Measurement System (SMS) to assess motor carriers according to seven Behavior Analysis and Safety Improvement Categories (BASICs): Unsafe Driving, Crash Indicators, Hours of Service Compliance, Vehicle Maintenance, Controlled Substances/Alcohol Compliance, Hazardous Materials Compliance, and Driver Fitness. FMCSA uses the SMS to group carriers that have similar BASICs scores. Carriers that are placed in caution status are prioritized for interventions and investigations. FMCSA also uses a motor carrier's safety data that is transmitted by State and Federal enforcement to the Motor Carrier Management Information System.

7. **Increase the annual new entrant motor carrier pass rate to 93.0% or more by FY 2029**
New entrants accounted for a rising Percent of Fatal Large Truck and Bus Crashes Involving New Entrant Carriers, 2017-2022 with the rate increasing from 4.6% to 7.4%. FMCSA uses this performance goal to measure new entrant safety audit pass rates to ensure compliance with applicable Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs), Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMRs), and related record-keeping requirements. FMCSA's New Entrant Program monitors motor carriers' compliance with safety regulations for their first 18 months to help carriers operate safely on the Nation's roads. Within this program, FMCSA and State partners assess safety performance by collecting data about carriers through safety audits, roadside inspections, investigations, and crash reports. FMCSA uses this performance goal to demonstrate new entrant carriers' safety audit pass rates to ensure compliance with applicable FMCSRs, HMRs, and related record-keeping requirements.

8. **Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries per 100 million train/bus revenue miles from transit collision and derailment events to 278.3 or fewer by FY 2026**
While transit is the safest surface transportation method, FTA works to reduce the risks of fatalities and injuries from transit collisions and derailments by improving safety standards and strengthening transit worker protections. Revenue miles are the distance traveled when a transit train or bus is available to carry public passengers. In FY 2025, FTA will establish minimum safety standards for transit workers on or along rail tracks. In FY 2025 and FY 2026, FTA will deliver technical assistance to help transit agencies comply with federal requirements and to advance their Safety Management Systems processes. FTA will also continue efforts to offer recommendations to improve transit worker safety and strengthen training.

9. **Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries on transit from assaults on all persons per 100 million train/bus revenue miles to 79.4 or fewer by FY 2026**
While transit is the safest surface transportation method, FTA works to protect passengers and transit workers from crime on transit systems by improving safety standards and strengthening transit worker protections. Revenue miles are the distance traveled when a transit train or bus is available to carry public passengers. In FY 2025, FTA is committed to restore safety for the travelling public and will direct transit agencies to address the significant and continuing national-level safety risk related to assaults on transit workers. In FY 2025 and FY 2026, FTA will address challenges to mitigating health and safety risks that affect transit safety through FTA's Safety Risk Management program and safety training for transit employees, benefitting urban and rural transit riders.

10. **Reduce the annual number of railroad employee operational on-duty fatalities to zero by FY 2030**
Over the last ten years, operational fatalities made up about 55% of total railroad worker fatalities, peaking at 16 in 2021. FRA defines an operational fatality as a fatality to a railroad worker that results directly from incidents related to rail operations. When FRA receives fatality reports from a railroad, the fatality is categorized as operational (e.g., death from a moving train), natural causes (e.g., heart attack), or other causes (e.g., slip and fall). FRA will reduce railroad worker operational injuries and fatalities through identification and resolution of safety violations that result from safety inspections, investigations, and audits.

11. **Reduce the annual number of activation failures at grade crossings by 25% to 198 or fewer by FY 2030**
An "activation failure" occurs when an active highway-rail grade crossing warning system fails to indicate the approach of a train at least 20 seconds prior to the train's arrival at the crossing or fails to indicate the presence of a train occupying the crossing. If warning devices fail to activate, there is a substantial increase in risk that an accident will occur at that crossing. FRA reduces activation failures through identification and resolution of safety violations that result from safety inspections, investigations, and audits. FRA's grant programs also support this goal by providing federal assistance dollars to fund the replacement of warning devices at grade crossings.

12. **Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by pipelines to 25 or fewer by FY 2026**
PHMSA's programs focus on preventing incidents before they occur. In FY 2026, PHMSA will continue working with the Common Ground Alliance to reduce excavation damages to underground facilities and analyze additional excavation damage data collected from pipeline operators. PHMSA will collaborate with both State pipeline safety partners and with pipeline operators to identify remedial measures to improve safety.

13. **Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel to 17 or fewer by FY 2026**
In FY 2026, PHMSA will enhance the Freight and Fuel Transportation Optimization Tool (FTOT) to minimize routing risks and promote safety outcomes. PHMSA is also rolling out the Hazardous Materials Commodity Flow project to provide monitoring data to local governments for emergency preparedness.

14. **Maintain the commercial air carrier fatality rate per 100 million persons on board at 4.4 or below through FY 2026**
FAA defines a commercial air carrier fatality as a death that occurs during a commercial airline flight as a result of flight operations, including both scheduled and non-scheduled flights of U.S. passenger and cargo air carriers. FAA uses data from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) to measure fatalities and collaborates with industry stakeholders to reduce risk through safety management systems.

15. **Maintain the general aviation fatal accident rate per 100,000 flight hours at 0.91 or below through FY 2026**
FAA defines a general aviation fatality as a death that occurs during or up to 30 days after a general aviation flight. General aviation covers diverse activities like single-seat homebuilt aircraft, helicopters, balloons, and turbojets. The data for general aviation fatal accidents is sourced from the NTSB's Aviation Accident Database and annual flight hours from the FAA's General Aviation and Part 135 Activity Survey. FAA improves general aviation safety by identifying accident precursors, understanding human factors, and implementing safety risk mitigations.

16. **Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.38 per million operations for commercial aviation through FY 2026**
    Runway incursions involve any aircraft, vehicle, person, or object on the ground in the airport runway environment that creates a collision hazard or loss of required separation with an aircraft taking off, landing, or intending to do so. FAA categorizes these incursions by severity, Category A and B runway incursions have significant potential for a collision or require extreme action to avoid a collision. Monitoring runway incursions allows the FAA and other stakeholders to track the effectiveness of safety programs and interventions aimed at reducing these incidents. Based on the data, FAA implements various mitigation strategies, including physical modifications to the airport layout, improved training for pilots and controllers, and enhanced communication protocols.

17. **Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 1.39 per million operations for non-commercial aviation through FY 2026**
    Non-commercial aviation accounts for the majority of runway incursions, making this a critical safety metric due to the potential for collisions or near misses. While commercial aviation faces higher scrutiny, the risk posed by non-commercial aircraft highlights the need for consistent safety practices across all sectors. Tracking these incursions helps identify trends and contributing factors, such as pilot errors or operational mistakes. Analyzing this data allows the FAA to implement targeted strategies to improve safety. Mitigation efforts include physical changes to airport layouts, better signage, and training for pilots and ground personnel, all aimed at preventing collisions and reducing risks.

18. **Reduce the Northeast Corridor state of good repair backlog of $71.40B by 60% to $28.56B or less by FY 2035**
    As of September 2024, the Northeast Corridor (NEC) needs public and private investment of at least $71.40B to bring infrastructure assets into a state of good repair. The baseline comprises 15 major backlog projects, 15 defined capital renewal projects, and routine programmatic capital renewal maintenance needs. The Department provides grants to NEC partners to address these infrastructure needs through the Federal-State Partnership for Intercity Passenger Rail (FSP) grant program, among others. When construction starts on grant projects, dollars are expended by NEC partners for infrastructure improvement, FRA reimburses those dollars, and the dollar value of the backlog decreases.

19. **Reduce the state of good repair backlog for transit revenue vehicles to 20.2% or below by FY 2030**
    Transit revenue vehicles are the buses, trains, and ferries that carry transit customers. Like all transit capital assets, vehicles are in a state of good repair when they can operate at a full level of performance. Assets that are not in a state of good repair have lower reliability, increased safety risks, higher maintenance costs, and reduced performance. FTA makes formula and discretionary grants to transit operators to replace and rehabilitate transit vehicles, as well as occasionally purchase vehicles for transit fleet expansion. FTA also supports transit agencies by providing technical assistance on best practices in asset management.

20. **Maintain the percentage of Interstate pavement in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026**
    Pavement condition is evaluated based on the International Roughness Index (IRI) and surface characteristics such as faulting, cracking, and rutting. A good condition rating suggests no major investment is needed immediately while a poor condition rating suggests major rehabilitation or reconstruction investment is needed. Pavements that fall between these two ranges are considered "fair." The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) and the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program provide most of the federal funding for pavement upkeep and related infrastructure improvements.

21. **Maintain the percentage National Highway System bridges' deck area in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026**
    Each bridge is evaluated based on four key components: the deck, superstructure, substructure, and culverts. Classifications of the bridge condition is weighted by bridge deck area; in general, larger bridges are costlier to rehabilitate or replace than smaller bridges. Maintaining bridges in good or fair condition ensures the safety and reliability of the transportation network. Federal funding for bridge replacement, rehabilitation, and other improvements is primarily provide through the Bridge Formula Program (BFP), National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) and the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program.

22. **Maintain the percentage of paved runways in fair or better condition at 93% through FY 2026**
    Runway pavement conditions are essential for aircraft safety and efficiency, requiring regular maintenance, rehabilitation, and upgrades. Deterioration occurs due to weather, heavy use, faulty construction, or substandard materials. A comprehensive maintenance program preserves runways. Projects are carefully timed to avoid impacting system-wide capacity, with no more than 7% of runways under reconstruction simultaneously to meet a 93% capacity goal. While FAA funds capital development at most National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) airports, ongoing maintenance is generally the airport's responsibility, with major projects funded through Airport Improvement Program grants, Passenger Facility Charge revenues, airport revenues, and other sources.

23. **Ensure reliable freight movement by maintaining a Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTR) at 1.43 or lower through FY 2026**
    The Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index for interstate highways is a key indicator of day-to-day travel reliability, indicating on average how much additional buffer time a truck driver needs to include in a typical trip to ensure 95% on-time delivery. An index of 1.5 indicates that at the 95% percentile, travel time is 1.5 times longer (50% slower) than the median travel time. FHWA supports State DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) with implementation of transportation system management and operations (TSMO) strategies that can improve highway reliability and congestion. Enhancements to the highway system reduce user costs, such as travel time and vehicle operating expenses per mile. The National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) provides most of the federal funding for pavement upkeep and related infrastructure improvements.

24. **Start intercity passenger rail service on at least three new corridors by FY 2035**
    Expansion of rail service across the Nation will provide new transportation options to the American people. FRA is identifying potential corridors, selecting corridors for implementation funding, and providing oversight for construction grants. In 2025, FRA expects service to restart on the Gulf Coast corridor, which stopped service after Hurricane Katrina. Other corridors are in development and are planned to start service between 2027 and 2035.

25. **Reduce the number of transit rail stations inaccessible to persons with disabilities to 891 or fewer by FY 2030**
    Approximately 25 percent of transit rail stations and facilities are still inaccessible to persons with disabilities. The *1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)* requires that when transit stations or facilities are altered, the altered areas—and often the paths of travel to them—be made accessible as part of the alteration. FTA supports accessibility improvements through the All-Stations Accessibility Program (ASAP). Transit agencies may also make accessibility improvements using other eligible FTA grants, in addition to using local funding.

26. **Reduce the number of Amtrak-served stations that are inaccessible to persons with disabilities from 86 to zero by FY 2030**
    Of the 520 total stations along Amtrak routes, Amtrak has sole responsibility for compliance with the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) at 142 stations, of which 86 were not fully accessible as of FY 2025. FRA's Office of Railroad Development oversees Amtrak's progress toward bringing these stations into compliance through funding and oversight of grant agreements with Amtrak. Amtrak plans to bring the 86 inaccessible stations into compliance by 2030.

27. **Maintain 99% commercial use availability rate for the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway**
    The binational St. Lawrence Seaway consists of 15 locks (13 Canadian; 2 U.S.) that raise and lower vessels more than 600 feet from Montreal, Quebec, to Lake Superior. Each year, more than 35 million metric tons of cargo valued at $14 billion move through the Seaway. This waterborne trade supports 147,350 U.S. jobs and generates $26 billion in economic activity. Much like an interstate highway or commercial rail route, the U.S. locks and waters of the Seaway need to be open and safe to ensure the continuous, reliable, and efficient movement of commercial trade. The Seaway reliability rate is impacted by all delays to commercial shipping, including vessel incidents, adverse weather conditions, or lock unavailability.

28. **Increase the annual outlay of Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) project funds to $3.3 million or more by FY 2026**
    MARAD makes grants through the Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) to improve the capacity and resiliency of the Nation's supply chains. As grantees complete projects funded by PIDP grants, they will be able to seek reimbursement for their costs, increasing program outlays. MARAD provides technical assistance and oversight to grantees in administering this program to ensure that PIDP grants meet the program's goals.

29. **Increase the number of U.S. Flag vessels in international service from 94 vessels to 96 vessels or more by FY 2026**
    Increasing the number of commercial U.S.-flag vessels operating in international trade, promotes the national security and economic growth of the United States. The Maritime Security Program and the Tanker Security Program will both contribute to this performance goal. Additionally, EO 14269 "Restoring America's Maritime Dominance" includes elements which, upon implementation, will further support the internationally-trading U.S.-flagged fleet.

30. **Increase the United States Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) graduating class size to 220 or more by FY 2029**
    The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) contributes to resilient supply chains by increasing the number of available, qualified crew members to support Department of Defense (DoD) requirements for merchant marine shipping. USMMA will develop an academic program that increases the retention rate of first year students and improves licensure pass rates for graduating students.

31. **Decrease the annual number of findings to remedy per checked Vessel Hosting Cadets from the USMMA to 2 or fewer by FY 2026**
    MARAD has established Every Mariner Builds A Respectful Culture (EMBARC) Standards for U.S.- flag vessel commercial operators hosting cadets from the US Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) to ensure that every cadet mariner is treated with dignity and respect during their training. These standards strengthen a culture of sexual assault and sexual harassment (SASH) prevention and support appropriate responses to incidents of sexual violence and harassment. MARAD regularly inspects vessels hosting USMMA cadets on compliance with the EMBARC Standards and is seeking to lower the annual number of findings to achieve universal compliance.

32. **Increase the annual number of air traffic controllers trained to at least 1,900 or more in FY 2026**
A trained controller has graduated from the FAA Academy and is ready for placement at an Air Traffic Control Tower or other FAA facility to begin the process of becoming a Certified Professional Controller. Entry-level applicants must complete the required training courses and spend several months at the FAA Academy in Oklahoma City. After graduating from the academy, individuals are placed in locations across the country and must gain 1-3 years on-the-job experience before becoming a certified professional controller.

33. **Maintain the National Airspace System On-Time Arrival Rate at Core Airports at 88% or above through FY 2026**
Each of the Nation's 30 core airports either has one percent or more of total U.S. passenger enplanements (boardings) or else handles 0.75% or more of the total U.S. non-military itinerant operations. The NAS on-time arrival rate is measured by dividing the number of flights arriving on or before 15 minutes of flight plan arrival time by the total number of completed flights for the core airports. The on-time arrival calculation uses the latest carrier flight plan filed with the FAA and excludes minutes of delay attributed by air carriers to extreme weather, carrier action, security delay, and prorated minutes for late arriving flights at the departure airport as defined by the DOT Airline Service Quality Performance System.

34. **Publish a final rule reducing the regulatory cost of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards regulation by FY 2026**
DOT is committed to reducing the burden of regulations on American consumers and businesses. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards regulation is the most economically significant regulation within DOT's regulatory portfolio. DOT is committed to publishing a final rule in 2026 that will reduce the burden of these regulations and make automobiles more affordable for the average American family.

35. **Increase the DOT Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Cybersecurity Score to 95/100 or more by FY 2027**
The Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) of 2014 requires DOT to ensure the protection and resilience of Information Technology (IT) supporting DOT's mission and business functions. The Departmental Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) follows the National Cybersecurity Strategic Plan, Office of Management and Budget policy, and directives issued by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). The CISO uses DOT's risk management processes to identify and manage risks. Key priorities supporting the target goal include continued implementation of zero trust, automation in cybersecurity processes, and improving DOT's abilities to detect and remove counterfeit or malicious products.

36. **Increase the percentage of DOT's IT budget that uses shared services to 46% or more by FY 2026**
Shared services help organizations reduce unnecessary spending on information technology and often result in better products and services for customers. They are an important tool for DOT to help reduce costs, eliminate serious cybersecurity and privacy vulnerabilities, and enable better use of limited resources. The Chief Information Officer (CIO) partners with the Office of the Senior Procurement Executive and the Chief Financial Officer to increase the use of shared services for managing IT investments. Key shared services priorities for DOT currently include cybersecurity, human resources, and increasing the use of shared services by DOT grant-issuing programs.

DOT Operating Administrations and Leadership

Operating Administration	Lead
Federal Aviation Administration	Bryan Bedford, Administrator
Federal Highway Administration	Gloria M. Shepherd, Acting Administrator
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	Jesse Elison, Chief Counsel
Federal Railroad Administration	Drew Feeley, Acting Administrator
Federal Transit Administration	Marcus J. Molinaro, Administrator
Great Lakes Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	J. M. (Mike) McCoshen, Administrator
Maritime Administration	Elizabeth O'Connor, Chief Counsel
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	Jack Danielson, Acting Administrator
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	Benjamin Kochman, Acting Administrator

Major Management Priorities and Challenges

DOT reviewed the FY 2025 Top Management Challenges Report prepared by DOT Office of the Inspector General, the current High-Risk List published by GAO in 2025 and DOT's own FY 2025 Enterprise Risk Profile to identify its Major Management Priorities and Challenges. DOT identified thirteen major management challenges for FY 2026, including:

1. Aviation Safety
2. Surface Safety
3. Surface Transportation Infrastructure
4. Grantee Technical Capacity
5. Programs Serving Tribes
6. Data Quality Issues
7. IT Acquisitions and Operations
8. Grant and Contract Fund Stewardship
9. Financial Management & Fraud
10. Information Security
11. Aviation Governance and Modernization
12. Transportation Transformation
13. Transportation Sector Cybersecurity

DOT's portfolio of performance goals measure progress toward resolving the challenges.

Appendix: Performance Data Completeness & Reliability Report

A review of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Fiscal Year 2026 Performance Plan by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics

This appendix outlines the processes the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) pursues to support the general accuracy and reliability of performance information, reduce the risk of inaccurate performance data, and provide a sufficient level of confidence to Congress and the public that the information presented is credible as appropriate to its intended use (Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Circular A-11, Section 240.260).

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) includes measures provided for verification and validation by June 2025 for inclusion in the 2026 Annual Performance Plan (APP) in this Performance Data Completeness and Reliability (PDCR) appendix. Any updates made to the APP after June 2025 may not be reflected in this appendix.

Title 49 U.S. Code § 6302(b)(3)(B)(ix) tasks the Director of BTS with reviewing and reporting to the Secretary of Transportation on the sources and reliability of the statistics produced to measure outputs and outcomes as required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as amended by the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRAMA). To complete this task, BTS assesses the completeness, reliability, and quality of the performance indicators that feed into the APP. The review includes all measures that USDOT actively collects. Per 49 U.S. Code § 6302(b)(3)(B)(ix), BTS reviews the reliability and other statistical properties of the measures, not whether the measures are the most appropriate reflection of performance for the particular goal or program. BTS' review supports the Department's Learning Agenda, which is required by Section 101 of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Evidence Act), codified at 5 U.S. Code § 312(a).

This appendix includes a description of performance indicators and associated data provided by the mode (including the Office of the Secretary OST) or modes in charge of those measures. For each metric and/or commonly used data source, the section includes:

Scope: Provides a definition and an overview of the performance indicator.

Source(s): Identifies the data sources used in each measure.

Statistical Issues: Describes the variability of the measure and other issues, based on information provided by the mode in charge of the measure.

Completeness: Describes any limitations of the performance indicator due to data being unavailable or missing and provides methods used by the mode in charge of the measure to impute missing data, as appropriate.

Reliability: Provides an indication of the consistency and quality of the measure; and

Verification and Validation: Explains the processes modes have in place to support the general accuracy and reliability of performance information, reduce the risk of inaccurate performance data, and provide a sufficient level of confidence to Congress and the public that the information presented is credible, as appropriate, for its intended use.

Commonly Used Data Sources

This section summarizes the Department's most frequently used data sources, which span multiple indicators.

For the indicators that contain the commonly used data source(s), the section on that indicator includes the scope of the indicator as well as a definition and overview. The performance indicator write-up points to the commonly used data source and, if needed, identifies any nuances particular to each measure.

The commonly used sources include:

- Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)
- Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS), Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Pavement Condition, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- National Transit Database (NTD), Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Railroad Safety Information System (RSIS), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
- Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS), Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA)

Fatality Analysis Reporting System, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Source: NHTSA maintains the FARS database, a census of fatal motor vehicle traffic crashes, based on Police Crash Reports (PCRs), State vehicle registration files, State driver license files, State highway department data, vital statistics data, death certificates, Coroner/Medical Examiner reports, and emergency medical service reports within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

NHTSA projects roadway fatality counts for Calendar Year (CY) 2024, with related rates based on those projections. The 2023 FARS Annual Report File includes traffic fatalities for CY 2023.

Statistical Issues: FARS counts of motor vehicle traffic crash fatalities will differ from fatality statistics reported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) due to the differences between the inclusion criteria listed below. NHTSA maintains the FARS as a census of fatal motor vehicle crashes with a set of data files documenting all qualifying fatalities that occurred within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico since 1975. To qualify as a FARS case, the crash had to involve a motor vehicle traveling on a trafficway customarily open to the public and must have resulted in the death of a motorist or a non-motorist within 30 days of the crash. In contrast, NCHS includes all fatalities identified as motor vehicle-crash related using International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10) codes based on the date of death (rather than the date of crash) and includes fatalities from all five US territories—Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Completeness: FARS reports the qualified fatalities. FARS includes annual traffic fatalities currently available through CY 2023, published in April 2025.

Reliability: NHTSA maintains an interagency agreement with each State's government to report information in a standard format on all qualifying fatal crashes in each State. The National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA) Office of Data Acquisition, State Data Reporting Systems Division, manages these agreements.

To ensure FARS data reliability, FARS analysts employed by the State apply specific definitions and guidelines before inputting the appropriate values for each data element into the system.

These standards ensure that States report uniform data in FARS, eliminating State variance in crash record collection.

Verification and Validation: To verify and validate FARS data, NHTSA ensures consistency by executing established training programs, numerous quality control measures, and standard data coding guidelines, thereby assuring the national data can facilitate accurate analyses. Training for field personnel includes a new analyst and coder training program that provides self-directed preparatory training, followed by three days of webinar sessions and two non-consecutive weeks of classroom training as well as annual, system-wide training for all analysts and coders.

NHTSA identifies training issues throughout the year and implements changes to the system at the system-wide training. The Crash Data Acquisition Network (CDAN) helpdesk provides ongoing coding assistance, quality checks, and guidance for FARS. NHTSA controls the data upon entry with the FARS data entry system edit checks. NHTSA updates these edit checks annually along with a Coding and Validation Manual that provides definitions, rules, and guidance for each data element.

NHTSA monitors the quality of each FARS case for completeness, unknown values, and violations of edit check rules. Once in the database, NHTSA also monitors the FARS data through statistical quality control charts that identify deviations from expected trends in the data and indicate when an inconsistency in the data occurs.

While these activities help to ensure consistency in data acquisition, additional factors such as changes in the collection of the data in States and corresponding changes in FARS make monitoring data quality more complex. When these changes occur, they can limit the effectiveness of data monitoring using trend analysis. To help address these issues, NHTSA takes steps to develop additional means to support data quality that involve manual reviews of the casework coded by the FARS analysts. NHTSA developed the FARS case re-coding process to conduct annual case sampling and re-coding for data quality monitoring, analyst performance assessment, and training. The design combines the concepts of selected case re-coding with State-specific training. This quality assurance process uses samples from the current file year so that corrective actions to improve the quality of the data can be performed throughout the file year when NHTSA identifies inconsistencies. NHTSA aims to provide more immediate benefits from a case re-coding effort in the form of analyst training and to tangibly improve data quality.

Visit NHTSA's website for more information about FARS.

Highway Performance Monitoring System, Vehicle Miles Traveled and Pavement Condition, Federal Highway Administration

Source: FHWA estimates the annual VMT and pavement conditions data from the HPMS.

The HPMS compiles annual data from the States concerning the extent, use, condition, and performance of all public roads in the United States. The HPMS includes the annual average daily traffic (AADT) by road segment as well as pavement conditions.

For VMT, States provide AADT on all Federal-aid highway sections. States provide these data based on actual field traffic counts taken from every segment of the Federal-aid highway sections at least once every three years on the National Highway System (NHS), interstate, and principal arterials, and at least once every six years on minor arterials and collectors. States adjust traffic counts to reflect day-of-week and seasonal variations, current year conditions, and axle corrections, as necessary. FHWA multiplies the AADTs by the length of each road segment and sums for all road segments and days of the year to yield the annual VMT. For roadways classified as Rural Minor Collector, Rural Local, and Urban Local, States submit summary VMT data to the HPMS.

FHWA calculates monthly VMT by applying a change rate, derived from monthly average daily traffic (MADT) based on data reported by State highway agencies' automated traffic recorders (ATRs), to the most recent annual VMT from the HPMS. State highway agencies collect their monthly traffic data through the so-called Continuous Count Stations (CCS) supported by the ATR technology, such as inductive loops in the roadway. States report data from about 7,000 CCSs to FHWA each month and submit and process it using the Travel Monitoring Analysis System (TMAS). Monthly average daily traffic (MADT) is computed from the CCS traffic counts.

FHWA computes monthly average daily traffic (MADT) from the ATR traffic counts. FHWA compares each MADT with the MADT for the same month the previous year to yield a change rate. FHWA then averages the change rates by functional class of road. If a State does not provide traffic data in time, FHWA estimates change rates based on data from surrounding States. FHWA's Traffic Volume Trends (TVT) reports Monthly VMT by combining the change rates for each month with the most recent annual VMT from the HPMS. FHWA publishes the TVT report within 60 days after the close of the month. The report requires data that covers a minimum of 30 States, and 70 percent of the VMT for publication.

FHWA measures the pavement condition based on a classification system of Good, Fair, and Poor. State DOTs in HPMS report mainline lane miles of the interstate system, full-extent International Roughness Index (IRI), and distress data (i.e., cracking percent, rutting, and faulting). The information in the HPMS contains pavement condition and inventory data items for 0.1-mile sections of the entire NHS as required by the HPMS Field Manual. From the data provided, FHWA monitors the condition of the Nation's pavements, which includes identifying those pavements that are in Good and Fair condition.

Statistical Issues: State highway agencies follow the FHWA HPMS Field Manual specification to develop HPMS samples, which FHWA uses to develop the TVT. All States and the District of Columbia exceed the HPMS sampling specification needs and standards. FHWA has not identified any statistical issues with the data.

Completeness: FHWA collects HPMS and TVT VMT data based on samples of State highways. FHWA publishes the HPMS VMT data through 2023. FHWA publishes the TVT VMT available through October 2024.

For pavement statistics, FHWA requires States to report their data by April 15th each year. However, FHWA accepts updates until June 15th, after which FHWA extracts the data, calculates and publishes the data.

Reliability: FHWA deems the HPMS and TVT VMT data reliable and valid as the data gathering, compilation, and analysis follow established and periodically reviewed and updated procedures and processes.

To ensure the HPMS reliability, FHWA provides guidelines for data collection in the HPMS Field Manual and 23 CFR 490.309. Adherence to these guidelines varies by State; however, to help States improve data quality, FHWA requires States to develop data quality management plans that define the acceptable level of data quality and describe how the data collection process will ensure this level of quality in its deliverables and processes per 23 CFR 490.319c.

Verification and Validation: FHWA validates HPMS traffic data against annual VMT growth rates by functional system. The HPMS software also performs a list of data validation procedures after uploading new data for quality assurance/quality control and verification purposes.

For pavement condition data, FHWA conducts an annual review both at headquarters and in the division offices in each State. FHWA reviews the reported data by comparing it with previously reported data and other reasonability checks. FHWA provides a written annual evaluation to each State to document potential problems and to encourage corrective actions. FHWA requests data resubmittal in cases where FHWA identifies major problems.

For information on TVT and HPMS VMT verification and validation, visit the Highway Performance Monitoring System Field Manual at the Office of Policy & Governmental Affairs webpage.

Also, visit FHWA's website for more information about VMT.

National Transit Database, Federal Transit Administration

Source: Following a congressional data reporting requirement codified in 1974, FTA created the NTD to be the repository of data on the financial, operating, and asset conditions of American transit systems. The NTD stores the financial, operating, and asset conditions of transit systems to inform the annual apportionment of FTA formula funds and to provide public information and statistics on the transit industry. By design, the NTD supports local, State, and regional planning efforts and helps governments and other decision-makers make multi-year comparisons and trend analyses. NTD data include agency funding sources, inventories of vehicles and maintenance facilities, safety event reports, measures of transit service provided and consumed, and data on transit employees, among other data.

Recipients or beneficiaries of FTA grants under the Urbanized Area Formula Program (§5307) or Other than Urbanized Area (Rural) Formula Program (§5311) must submit data to the NTD. Approximately 1,000 transit providers in urbanized areas (UZAs) currently report to the NTD through the Internet-based reporting system.

Statistical Issues: The NTD publishes a complete inventory of fatality, injury, and vehicle revenue mile (VRM) data through its monthly safety and service reports. VRM refers to the trainset or bus vehicle distance traveled from the first passenger stop to the last passenger stop for fixed-route service, and from the first passenger pick-up to the last passenger drop-off for demand response service. FTA differentiates train revenue miles from bus vehicle revenue miles because train revenue miles are counted per full trainset instead of per rail car to account for differences in the number of rail cars per trainset run by transit rail operators. FTA estimates Train Revenue Miles (TRM) for each FTA fiscal year based on the rail industry's monthly VRM reporting, using the industry-wide railcars per train (CPT) ratio for the corresponding reporting year (VRM/CPT = TRM).

For indicators using the NTD Annual Revenue Vehicle Inventory data, transit agencies report an inventory of revenue vehicles to the NTD annually. FTA calculates the annual state of good repair backlog indicator based on the agency-reported age of each asset compared to the agency-reported Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) of each asset.
For indicators using the Annual Transit Stations data, transit agencies report an inventory of passenger rail stations to the NTD annually. FTA calculates the number of legacy transit rail stations inaccessible to persons with disabilities based on agency-reported station counts. In FY 2023, FTA identified a small number of transit agencies that reported incorrect station counts beginning in FY 2019 (NTD report year 2018). FTA worked directly with these transit agencies to resolve issues and continues to refine data and improve processes for data collection and data quality.

Completeness: For all indicators using NTD data, a small number of transit systems do not receive FTA funding and therefore do not report to the NTD. Private non-profit operators that do not provide transportation to the general public also do not report to the NTD.

Large, urban transit systems must report reportable major safety events to the NTD within 30 days of the event. In some cases, a transit operator might fail to report an event to the FTA. Although FTA attempts to ensure that all transit operators meet their reporting obligations, in some cases, the agency may not know if they miss a report. Transit agencies classified as rural or reduced reporters submit annual rather than monthly safety and security data. Otherwise, within the scope defined in the indicators that use Monthly Safety Reports data, FTA considers the fatality and injury count data complete.

Within the scope defined in the indicators that use the NTD Annual Revenue Vehicle Inventory data, FTA considers the transit revenue vehicle data complete.

Within the scope defined in the indicator that uses Annual Transit Stations data, FTA considers the data to be complete.

Transit agencies classified as rural or reduced reporters do not submit monthly data for bus vehicle revenue miles (VRM). Otherwise, within the scope defined in the indicator that uses the VRM and UZA data, FTA considers the data complete.

Reliability: Most reportable rail safety events must be investigated by the State Safety Oversight (SSO) organization designated by each State with rail transit service. FTA reconciles reported safety events against the list of SSO Investigations on an annual basis.

A transit system's chief executive officer (CEO) or their designate self-certifies all annual data report submissions for safety events, VRM, TRM, revenue vehicles, and transit stations. Sometimes, late reporting influences the accuracy of the data.

Verification and Validation: FTA independently verifies and validates safety event reports. FTA validates VRM and TRM data against operations and financial data in the rest of the annual NTD report to ensure consistency. FTA also validates against the prior year's reported VRM and TRM.

FTA validates the revenue vehicle, facilities, and transit station data reported to the NTD for consistency with the rest of the annual report, as well as a comparison with the prior year's report.

Visit FTA's website for more materials and links to NTD data reporting and products.

Railroad Safety Information System, Federal Railroad Administration

Source: RSIS compiles rail-related accident and incident data from railroads subject to FRA oversight as well as from Federal and State railroad safety inspectors. Railroads subject to oversight must have an accident and incident record-keeping system that meets or exceeds Federal standards as required under 49 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 225, Railroad Accidents/Incidents, Reports Classification, and Investigations.

The regulations provide FRA with accurate information about safety issues and risks on the Nation's railroads to carry out its regulatory and enforcement responsibilities effectively under the Federal railroad safety mandates. FRA's data collection and analysis effort aims to improve railroad safety by creating programs that prevent railroad injuries and accidents. This system contains approximately 40 years of data on railroad casualties, train accidents, highway-rail grade crossing collisions, and operating statistics, including train miles.

FRA requires railroads to report an employee-on-duty incident when a death or injury to an employee on duty occurs and the event results from the operation of a railroad. If it is not obvious whether an event arose from the operation of a railroad, the railroad must evaluate the circumstances surrounding the event to decide whether one or more events arising from the operation of a railroad contributed to the resulting condition.

The railroad must report a death of any employee on duty and an injury to any person that results in medical treatment, a significant injury as diagnosed by a physician or other licensed healthcare professional, or a loss of consciousness.

Railroads report employee on duty injuries on FRA form F6180.55a, Railroad Injury and Illness Summary, for each injured employee in field 5f, Type Person/Job Code, as Code A-Worker on Duty- Railroad Employee. If the injuries occurred in a Train Accident or Grade Crossing Incident, the railroad would submit and indicate the total number of employees' on-duty injuries on the FRA form F6180.54, Rail Equipment Accident/Incident Report, or the FRA form F6180.57, Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Accident/Incident Report, respectively.

Statistical Issues: FRA identified no statistical issues.

Completeness: FRA excludes reporting requirements for railroad systems that do not connect with the general rail system. Examples include subway systems (e.g., Washington, D.C. Metro, and New York City Subway), track existing inside an industrial compound, and insular rail (e.g., rail not connected to the general system and not intersecting a public highway-rail grade crossing or navigable waterway). Although FRA generally requires railroads to report accidents and incidents within 30 days after the end of the month in which the event occurred, FRA keeps data files open for amendment for five years to capture late reports, audit findings, and other updates. Data processing requires up to 30 days to prepare the information for merging into the database. As a result, FRA updates measures that might differ from previous reports. A more detailed explanation of this process is available in FRA's Guide for Preparing Accident/Incident Reports.

Reliability: FRA audits railroads' reporting and internal records. If railroads do not report accurately, completely, and timely, FRA can assess civil monetary penalties.

Validation and Verification: FRA's systems and periodic audits help validate railroad-submitted data to ensure timeliness, completeness, accuracy, and reliability. Every two years, FRA conducts a data reporting audit of each of the seven largest carriers, known as Class I railroads, and Amtrak. FRA also audits the smaller railroads approximately every five years. In these audits, FRA checks for properly completed reports and verifies the reported data, including identifying accidents or incidents that meet thresholds but are not reported by the railroad. After verification and validation, FRA provides public access to the data at FRA Safety Data.

Motor Carrier Management Information System, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

Source: FMCSA created MCMIS to collect and store FMCSA-regulated entity census and safety performance information records. FMCSA maintains and operates MCMIS. The MCMIS database stores crash information, excluding private driver data, about motor carriers with USDOT numbers on their trucks, buses, passenger cars, and light trucks with hazardous materials placards.

FMCSA receives data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and stores the information in the MCMIS to monitor and develop motor carrier safety standards for registered commercial vehicles operating in interstate commerce under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSR) or Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMR).

The MCMIS Crash File contains data on commercial trucks and buses in fatal, injury, and towaway crashes (crashes in which at least one vehicle is disabled as a result of the crash and transported away from the crash scene). Crash severity thresholds and vehicle type definitions in MCMIS differ slightly from those in FARS and the General Estimating System (GES)/Crash Report Sampling System (CRSS), and FMCSA notes all tables accordingly.

Statistical Issues: FMCSA designed the MCMIS Crash File to be a census of trucks and buses involved in fatal, injury, and towaway crashes; however, some States do not report all FMCSA-eligible crashes, and some report more than those that are eligible. FMCSA continues to work with the States to improve data quality and reporting of eligible large truck and bus crashes to the MCMIS crash file.

Completeness: FMCSA releases Safety Investigation data and New Entrant Safety Audit data from MCMIS through April 2025. FMCSA uses MCMIS fatal crash data in the calculation for large trucks and buses and reports based on a subset of the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) used by FARS.

FMCSA publishes total annual fatalities from MCMIS through CY 2024 and partial data through April 2025. FMCSA expects States to report crash data to FMCSA within 90 days of the crash. FMCSA considers all data preliminary for 22 months to allow for changes.

Reliability: FMCSA acknowledges some concerns about consistency in vehicle counts across States. FMCSA highlights this as a future research need.

FMCSA also acknowledges the concern about State differences in the rate of inspections and violations. FMCSA attributes this due to differences from State to State in road type, congestion, and the prevalence of ice, degree of visibility, and other conditions. Since the driving environment varies State by State, this can have an impact on crash frequency. In addition, States differ in their administration of the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspection system.

FMCSA acknowledges that further research to study the quality of the MCMIS fatal crash data from the subset of the MMUCC data used by FARS would benefit the quality of the data.

Verification and Validation: FMCSA analyzes self-reported MCMIS registration data and applies filters to identify and remove inaccurate entries to avoid over- or under-estimating values.

Visit FMCSA's website for more information about the MCMIS data.

FY 2026 Annual Performance Plan – Performance Goals

1 Reduce the annual rate of total roadway fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to 1.18 or fewer by CY 2026

Lead: NHTSA

Indicator: Total roadway fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.

Scope: NHTSA calculates roadway fatalities per 100 million VMT for each calendar year.

The FARS includes the number of traffic fatalities as a count of deaths of motorists or non-motorists occurring within 30 days of a crash involving a motor vehicle traveling on a trafficway customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. NHTSA defines a roadway fatality as the death of any vehicle occupant (any driver, passenger, or person riding on the exterior of a motor vehicle), including motorcycle (two- or three-wheeled motor vehicle) riders or passengers, and any non-occupants (any person not an occupant of a motor vehicle in transport, such as a pedestrian or pedal cyclist) in a motor vehicle crash. VMT includes all vehicle miles traveled by all types of vehicles, including:

- Passenger cars
- Motorcycles
- Buses
- Two-axle, four-tire vehicles (including vans, pickup trucks, and sport/utility vehicles)
- Single-unit two-axle, six-tire or more trucks
- Combination trucks

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: NHTSA obtains roadway fatality data from the NHTSA FARS, and VMT is estimated using data from the FHWA's HPMS. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for more information on the FARS and VMT data.

2 Reduce the annual number of total roadway fatalities to 36,458 or fewer by CY 2026

Lead: NHTSA

Indicator: Number of motor vehicle-related fatalities.

Scope: The FARS includes the number of traffic fatalities as a count of deaths of motorists or non-motorists occurring within 30 days of a crash involving a motor vehicle traveling on a trafficway customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. NHTSA defines a roadway fatality as the death of any vehicle occupant (any driver, passenger, or person riding on the exterior of a motor vehicle), including motorcycle (two- or three-wheeled motor vehicle) riders or passengers, and any non-occupants (any person not an occupant of a motor vehicle in transport, such as a pedestrian or pedal cyclist) in a motor vehicle crash.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: NHTSA obtains the roadway fatality data from the FARS database. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on the FARS data source.

3 Reduce the annual rate of passenger vehicle occupant fatalities per 100 million passenger vehicle miles traveled (PVMT) to 0.73 or fewer by CY 2026

Lead: NHTSA

Indicator: Passenger vehicle occupant fatalities per 100 million passenger vehicle miles traveled.

Scope: NHTSA calculates the passenger vehicle occupant fatalities per 100 million PVMT each calendar year.

FARS defines the number of fatalities as a count of passenger vehicle occupant deaths occurring within 30 days of a crash involving a motor vehicle traveling

on a trafficway customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico[1].

A motor vehicle occupant (driver and passenger) is any person inside or on the exterior of a motor vehicle in transport. PVMT includes vehicle miles traveled by all types of passenger vehicles, including:

- Passenger cars
- Vans
- Pickup trucks
- Sport/utility vehicles

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: Roadway fatality data are obtained from the NHTSA FARS, and VMT are estimated using data from FHWA's HPMS. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for more information on the FARS and VMT data.

4 Reduce the annual number of large truck and bus related fatalities to 4,555 or fewer by FY 2029

Lead: FMCSA

Indicator: Annual number of large truck and bus-related fatalities.

Scope: FMCSA defines the number of fatalities as a count of deaths occurring within 30 days of a crash involving large trucks or buses traveling on a traffic way customarily open to the public within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FMCSA obtains roadway fatality data from the MCMIS. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for more information on MCMIS.

5 Increase the annual vehicle recall completion rate to 59.6% or more by FY 2026

Lead: NHTSA

Indicator: Predicted completion (within 5 percentage points) for vehicle recalls classified as high risk.

Scope: In the quarters following a safety recall, a manufacturer must report to NHTSA the number of recalled products that have been remedied by the manufacturer. NHTSA uses these completion rates to identify underperforming recalls, with a specific focus on high-risk recalls.

High-risk recalls typically involve vehicles that pose significant safety risks to the public. NHTSA analyzes these completion rates to ensure the timely resolution of potentially dangerous situations by reducing the number of vehicles on the road with open recalls. By monitoring the completion rate, NHTSA can ensure that these risks are mitigated as quickly as possible, reducing the potential harm they may cause.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: Manufacturer's official Recall Completion Reports sent to NHTSA.

Statistical Issues: NHTSA's Recall Management Division (RMD) is updating NHTSA's prediction model to increase the model fit with recall completion rates and more accurately predict future recall completion rates. Critically, this allows RMD to better identify recalls that fall short of performance expectations, ultimately advancing NHTSA's mission to reduce defective vehicles on the road.

1 Puerto Rico fatality data is reported separately.

Completeness: NHTSA defined recalls entering the Recall Case Manager (RCM) before March 13, 2023, as high-risk if they included at least one of the following: 1) more than 50,000 light vehicles; 2) air bag recalls; 3) any recall with an observed timeliness concern; or 4) a recall from new manufacturers. NHSTA defined recalls that entered the RCM after March 13, 2023 as high-risk if they included at least one of the following: 1) more than 150,000 light vehicles; 2) air bag recalls; 3) recalls involving Over-the-Air updates; 4) school buses, child safety seats, or sub-components of Occupant Safety Systems; 5) new technology 6) recalls involving risk of death, park it/do not drive, regional, re-recalls, and scope expansion; or 7) alternative propulsion-type recalls (e.g., EV, hydrogen).

Reliability: RMD will continue to evaluate and update the criteria for high-risk recalls to ensure that recalls posing the most significant safety risks to the public are captured in the review process.

Verification and Validation: NHTSA will conduct studies to better learn why consumers choose not to repair their recalled vehicles, as well as assess the recall notification letter that vehicle manufacturers mail to their customers. NHTSA also intends to continue issuing grants to State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMVs) that begin notifying their vehicle registrants of open recalls.

6 Reduce the number of motor carriers in caution status to 64,460 or fewer by FY 2029

Lead: FMCSA

Indicator: Number of motor carriers in caution status.

Scope: This measure tracks the number of motor designated carriers that are in caution status under FMCSA's Safety Measurement System (SMS). FMCSA prioritizes carriers placed in caution status for interventions or further monitoring. As of September 27, 2024, out of 2,064,582 registered carriers nationwide, 65,775 were in caution status. FMCSA places carriers in caution status for violations demonstrating behaviors that may cause or increase the severity of crashes. The Safety Measurement System (SMS) assesses motor carriers' on-road performance and compliance by organizing data into seven Behavior Analysis and Safety Improvement Categories (BASICs): Unsafe Driving, Crash Indicator, Hours of Service Compliance, Vehicle Maintenance, Controlled Substances/Alcohol, Hazardous Materials Compliance (HM), and Driver Fitness.

FMCSA and its enforcement partners use SMS data through the Compliance, Safety, Accountability (CSA) program to identify high-risk carriers and hold both carriers and drivers accountable for safety performance. A driver's safety behavior affects not only their individual record but also contributes to the carrier's overall safety profile.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FMCSA's MCMIS data. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on MCMIS, Safety Measurement System (SMS).

7 Increase the annual new entrant motor carrier pass rate to 93.0% or more by FY 2029

Lead: FMCSA

Indicator: Number of new entrant safety audit pass rate.

Scope: Motor carriers must undergo a safety audit within the first 12 months of their operations to complete the New Entrant Program. In FY 2024, 91.2% of new entrant motor carriers successfully passed the Safety Audit. FMCSA aims to increase the annual pass rate to 93.0% by FY 2029. An FMCSA-certified auditor conducts a Safety Audit to review a motor carrier's records designed to verify that a carrier employs basic safety management controls are in place to ensure compliance with applicable Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs), Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMRs), and related record-keeping requirements. A FMCSA-

certified auditor conducts the audit at the carrier's place of business, or electronically, by submitting relevant documents to FMCSA online or via mail or fax. FMCSA will tell carriers which type of audit they have been selected for by phone or mail. During the Safety Audit, carriers will be asked to submit documentation that verifies that they have established effective safety management controls. Auditors may request documents related to drivers and vehicles, as well as general operating procedures and record-keeping requirements.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FMCSA's MCMIS data. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on MCMIS's new entrant safety audit data.

8 Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries per 100 million train/bus revenue miles from transit collision and derailment events to 278.3 or fewer by FY 2026

Lead: FTA

Indicator: Fatalities and injuries from transit collision and derailment events per 100 million train/bus revenue miles.

Scope: This measure includes rail transit systems subject to the FTA's State Safety Oversight (SSO) Program. FTA excludes systems that do not receive FTA funding—and are, therefore, not subject to the SSO Program—and systems regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The measure also excludes Amtrak and all aerial tramway systems.

FTA collects fatality data from most other non-rail transit systems that report to the NTD. Transit agencies classified as rural or reduced reporters do not submit monthly safety and security data. FTA excludes fatalities from those systems that do not report to the NTD and fatalities from rural transit systems and small urbanized systems that receive a small system reporting waiver.

Transit fatality and injury data include event type, person type (passengers, revenue facility occupants, trespassers, employees, other transit workers (e.g., contractors), pedestrians, occupants of third-party vehicles), and other data. FTA defines a transit fatality as a death within 30 days of an incident on a transit right-of-way, in a transit revenue facility, in a transit maintenance facility, or involving a transit revenue vehicle. FTA defines an injury as any damage or harm to persons that requires immediate medical attention away from the scene. This definition of an injury includes train operators who were transported for psychological trauma after their assigned train fatally struck a pedestrian.

Additionally, rail transit operators must report serious injuries that may not require immediate medical attention away from the scene, such as second or third-degree burns, and known hospitalizations of at least two days occurring within a week of a reported event.

FTA excludes deaths or injuries due to unrelated medical conditions or natural causes occurring on public transportation systems. FTA also excludes deaths occurring inside administrative buildings.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: NTD Monthly Safety Reports for fatality and injury data. NTD Monthly Service Reports for train/bus revenue miles data. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on NTD data.

9 Reduce the annual rate of fatalities and injuries per 100 million train/bus revenue miles on transit from assaults on all persons to 79.4 or fewer by FY 2026

Lead: FTA

Indicator: Fatalities and injuries on transit from assaults on all persons per 100 million train/bus revenue miles.

Scope: This measure includes rail transit systems subject to the FTA's SSO Program. FTA excludes systems that do not receive FTA funding—and, therefore, are not subject to the SSO Program—and systems that FRA regulates. The measure also excludes Amtrak and all aerial tramway systems.

FTA collects fatalities and injuries from most other non-rail transit systems that report to the NTD. Transit agencies classified as rural or reduced reporters do not submit monthly safety and security data. This measure excludes fatalities from systems that do not report to the NTD and fatalities from rural transit systems and small urbanized systems that receive a small system reporting waiver.

FTA defines an assault as an attack by one person on another without lawful authority or permission. FTA bases this definition of "assaults" on language from the 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). FTA finalized corresponding changes to NTD reporting in the Federal Register in February 2023.

This measure includes fatalities and injuries resulting from assaults occurring on transit agency-owned property or vehicles, as well as events involving a person boarding/alighting from a vehicle. FTA does not consider bus stops or shelters owned by municipalities or authorities that also operate transit systems as "transit agency-owned" property.

FTA defines a transit fatality as a death within 30 days of an incident. FTA defines an injury as any damage or harm to persons that requires immediate medical attention away from the scene.

Additionally, rail transit operators must report serious injuries that may not require immediate medical attention away from the scene, such as second or third-degree burns, and known hospitalizations of at least two days occurring within a week of a reported event.

FTA excludes deaths or injuries due to unrelated medical conditions, natural causes, or suicide occurring on public transportation systems.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source:
NTD Monthly Safety Reports for fatality and injury data and NTD Monthly Service Reports for train/bus revenue miles data. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on NTD data.

10 Reduce the annual number of railroad employee operational on-duty fatalities to zero by FY 2030

Lead: FRA

Indicator: Number of railroad employees on-duty operational fatalities.

Scope: Railroads report employee on-duty injuries and fatalities on the FRA form F6180.55a, Railroad Injury and Illness Summary. The number of railroad operational employees on-duty fatalities is determined by reviewing all railroad employee on-duty fatalities reported and categorizing them into three types: operational, natural cause, and other. Operational are those in which the employee was engaged in activities related to the operations of the railroad, excluding natural causes such as heart attacks or other medical emergencies unrelated to the performance of the employee's work duties and other causes such as crimes (e.g., murder) or accidents (e.g., driving accident while transiting to a work site) unrelated to operational work.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source:
See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on the RSIS data.

11 Reduce the annual number of activation failures at grade crossings by 25% to 198 or fewer by FY 2030

Performance Lead(s): FRA

Indicator: Number of highway-rail grade crossing activation failures.

Scope: An "activation failure" occurs when an active highway-rail grade crossing warning system fails to indicate the approach of a train at least 20 seconds prior to the train's arrival at the crossing or fails to indicate the presence of a train occupying the crossing.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: Railroads report warning device activation failures at grade crossings by submitting the FRA form F 6180.83 to the FRA electronically in PDF. A member of FRA's Signal, Train Control, and Crossing (STCC) Division reviews the PDF and creates an entry in FRA's internal tracking system for investigation. The internal tracking system also documents the results of FRA's investigation. If the investigation determines that an activation failure did not occur, the report is excluded from the count of activation failures. FRA provides public access to activation failure data online at Activation Failure – Browse Records.

Statistical Issues: FRA identified no statistical issues.

Completeness: FRA requires railroads to report activation failures within 15 days of the date on which the event occurred. STCC staff review the initial report for completeness. FRA inspections validate the completeness of the information submitted by the railroad for each activation failure.

Reliability: FRA audits railroads' reporting and internal records. If railroads do not report accurately, completely, and timely, FRA can assess civil monetary penalties.

Verification and Validation: FRA investigates all activation failures that are reported to FRA. During the investigation, FRA verifies the information reported on F 6180.83. Additionally, FRA periodically inspects railroad data to ensure timeliness, completeness, accuracy, and reliability. In these inspections, FRA checks for properly completed reports and verifies the reported data.

12 Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by pipelines to 25 or fewer by FY 2026

Lead: PHMSA

Indicator: Incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by pipelines.

Scope: Operators must report incidents involving death and or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by pipelines to PHMSA. PHMSA defines major injuries as those requiring overnight hospitalization, resulting from a failure in a hazardous materials transportation system in which there is a release of a hazardous liquid, carbon dioxide, natural gas, or other regulated hazardous material. Incidents on gas pipeline systems, liquefied natural gas facilities, and underground natural gas storage facilities must be reported to the PHMSA under 49 CFR 191.15. Hazardous liquid and carbon dioxide (CO_2) pipeline system accidents must be reported to PHMSA under 49 CFR 195.50. PHMSA subjects both interstate and intrastate pipeline systems to the reporting requirements. PHMSA partners with operators, State partners, and other stakeholders to identify and confirm all information on the incident reports, including deaths or major injuries that occurred due to a release of hazardous liquid, gas, or other hazardous material regulated by PHMSA.

Sources/Central Data Source: This measure uses PHMSA's incident data. For pipeline incidents, pipeline operators report these data on PHMSA Forms F-7100.1, F-7100.2, F-7100.3, and F-7000-1. PHMSA regulations require pipeline operators to report incidents online through the PHMSA Portal.

Statistical Issues: Results in any single year should be interpreted with caution. There is some normal annual variation in the number of reported incidents each year, particularly given the relatively small number of serious incidents, and this variation might not reflect real changes in the underlying risk, given changes in exposure, or external factors such as changes in pipeline mileage, energy consumption, or U.S. population, that could affect the number of serious incidents.

Completeness: Pipeline operators submit most incidents that meet reporting requirements, resulting in relatively high compliance. PHMSA verifies high compliance by reviewing pipeline operator records during regular inspections, where inspectors review leak and repair records – these reviews do not typically find unreported incidents. Operators must submit reports within 30 days of an incident or face penalties for non-compliance. Pipeline operators can supplement incident reports at any time after the original submittal. Often, pipeline incidents categorized as serious incidents can be under investigation for a long time, meaning the final cause (and therefore jurisdiction) may not be finalized for months after the incident. This can cause changes in serious incident counts when operators submit the final supplemental reports.

Reliability: PHMSA collects all incident data on OMB-approved forms online. Detailed OMB-approved instructions for incident reports are available on the PHMSA website. PHMSA runs validation checks in the online instrument prior to submittal to ensure all required data fields have been populated.

Verification and Validation: PHMSA routinely cross-checks incident reports against other sources of data, such as immediate notifications the NRC (National Response Center) and media outlets provide. PHMSA inspectors also regularly discuss incidents with operator personnel during routine inspections.

PHMSA staff are responsible for reviewing each incident report to ensure the data matches information gained during the PHMSA investigation or media reports. Pipeline operators have online access to each report they have submitted. On the PHMSA website, the public can download all the incident raw data or view 20-year trend lines of pipeline incident data, with views of individual report data available.

13 Reduce the number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel to 17 or fewer by FY 2026

Lead: PHMSA, FRA, FAA, FMCSA

Indicator: Number of incidents involving death or major injury resulting from the transportation of hazardous materials by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel.

Scope: PHMSA, under 49 CFR 171.15 and 171.16, requires incidents relating to the transportation of hazardous material during air, water, rail, or highway, including loading, unloading, and storage incidental to transportation, to be reported if they meet certain conditions.

PHMSA defines a major injury as an injury in which an individual requires in-patient hospitalization as a result of a failure of hazardous materials packaging during transportation. PHMSA considers an individual—including employees, emergency responders, and members of the public—injured as a direct result of hazardous materials during transportation by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel, to have sustained a major injury if they are admitted to the hospital overnight or if they miss three or more days of work due to the injury. In-patient hospitalization means hospital admission and at least one overnight stay.

Sources: This measure uses DOT and PHMSA data from incidents involving transportation of hazardous materials by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel. The incident data come from reports submitted on

Form DOT F 5800.1 and maintained in the HMIS (Hazardous Materials Identification System). In addition, PHMSA seeks information and data to identify potentially reportable incidents through the NRC, as well as the monitoring of daily print, television, and social media.

Statistical Issues: Results in any single year should be interpreted with caution. There is some normal annual variation in the number of reported incidents each year, particularly given the relatively small number of incidents involving death or major injury, and this variation might not reflect real changes in the underlying risk. PHMSA does not normalize the performance measure for changes in exposure, or external factors such as changes in U.S. population, shipments per person, or other parameters that could affect the number of incidents with death or major injury.

Completeness: Pipeline operators submit most incidents that meet reporting requirements, resulting in relatively high compliance. Operators must submit reports within 30 days of an incident or face penalties for non-compliance. For transportation by air, motor carrier, rail, or vessel, there may be a 30- to 60-day lag in reporting, verifying, validating, and compiling information in the database for analysis, as many companies do not file incident reports on time. Filers have one year to modify their 5800.1.

Reliability: Data for incidents involving death or major injury are considered the most reliable of PHMSA's incident data. These incidents have additional verification and validation procedures that include follow-up contact with the company or individual who made the report, contact with State and local law enforcement and/or emergency response officials, and data matching with initial reports made to the NRC. PHMSA also partners with operators, State partners, and other stakeholders to identify and confirm deaths. PHMSA continues to work to improve the quality of the incident data.

Verification and Validation: PHMSA routinely cross-checks incident reports against other sources of data, such as immediate notifications provided to the NRC and media outlets. PHMSA inspectors also regularly discuss incidents with operator personnel during routine inspections. PHMSA collects all incident data on OMB-approved forms online. PHMSA provides detailed OMB-approved instructions for incident reports on the PHMSA website. PHMSA runs validation checks in the online instrument before submittal to ensure all required data fields have been populated. PHMSA staff review each incident report to ensure the data matches information gained during the PHMSA investigation or media reports. On the PHMSA website, the public can download all the raw data or view 20-year trend lines of hazardous materials incidents and view individual incident report data.

14 Maintain the commercial air carrier fatality rate per million persons on board at 4.4 or below through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Number of fatalities per 100 million persons on board.

Scope: This indicator includes both scheduled and nonscheduled flights of United States passenger and cargo air carriers (14 CFR Part 121) and scheduled passenger flights of commuter operators (14 CFR Part 135). It excludes on-demand (i.e., air taxi) services and general aviation (GA). FAA includes accidents involving passengers, crew, ground personnel, and the uninvolved public.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: The data on commercial fatalities come from NTSB's Aviation Accident Database. Most of the data from persons on board comes from the air carriers, who submit information for all passengers on board to the Office of Airline Information within BTS. Additionally, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) estimates the crew on board based on the distribution of aircraft departures by make and model, plus an average of 3.5 persons on board per Part 121 cargo flight.

Statistical Issues: The NTSB and BTS data collections constitute a census, having no sampling error. FAA estimates the crew on board with a small range of variation for any given make and model of aircraft. BTS collects departure data and enplanements for Part 121. FAA bases the crew estimate on fleet makeup and crew requirements per number of seats.

FAA assumes that for the current fleet, crew members constitute about seven percent of all Part 121 enplanements. For cargo flights, the FAA estimates an average of 3.5 crew members on board per departure, based on data from subscription services such as Cirium, a proprietary database insurers use to obtain information such as fleet mix, accidents, and claims. Cargo crews typically include two flight crew members, occasionally accompanied by another pilot, a company representative, or two deadheading passengers. While BTS and Cirium databases provide a subset of the Part 135 data, it is not complete. The FAA Aviation Safety organization verifies the data with the operators to identify gaps. Based on previous accident and incident reports, the FAA estimates an average of five enplanements per departure. Crew for Part 135 is derived from past accident and incident data. Any error introduced by estimating the crew size is minimal, overshadowed by the passenger census. Importantly, FAA notes, the low fatality rate could significantly fluctuate from year to year due to a single accident.

Completeness: FAA does comparison checking of the departure data that BTS collects. FAA uses this data for crew estimates.

However, the FAA maintains no independent data sources against which to validate the numbers submitted to BTS. FAA compares its list of carriers to the USDOT list to validate completeness and places the carriers in the appropriate category (i.e., Part 121 or Part 135). FAA considers the number of actual persons on board for any given period preliminary for up to 18 months after the close of the reporting period. Carriers subsequently file amended reports updating the numbers in this period. FAA provides preliminary estimates based on projections of the growth in departures developed by the Office of Aviation Policy, Planning, and Environment (APL). However, the FAA notes that changes to the number of persons on board rarely affect the annual fatality rate.

To overcome reporting delays of 60 to 90 days, the FAA relies on historical data, partial internal data sources, and Official Airline Guide (OAG) scheduling information to project at least part of the fiscal year activity data. FAA uses OAG data until BTS releases the official data. FAA does not consider the final result for the air carrier fatality rate reliable until BTS provides preliminary numbers. Due to reporting procedures in place, the FAA does not believe that the calculation of future fiscal year departure data will be markedly improved. This lack of complete historical data on a monthly basis and independent sources of verification increases the risk of error in the activity data.

Reliability: FAA considers the results preliminary based on projected activity data. Most accidents are joint undertakings involving several agencies. The NTSB has the statutory responsibility to determine probable cause, while the FAA has separate statutory authority to investigate accidents and incidents to ensure that the FAA meets its broader responsibilities. FAA accident investigators and other employees participate in all accident investigations led by NTSB investigators. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, personnel evaluation, and accountability.

Verification and Validation: NTSB and the Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP) confer periodically to validate information on the number of fatalities. FAA and NTSB consider accident data preliminary until the NTSB publishes a press release early in the following year reporting on accidents from the previous year. Thus, FY 2025 results will be finalized after the 2026 press release. In general, however, the FAA does not expect the number of fatalities to change significantly between the end of the fiscal year and the date NTSB finalizes them.

15 Maintain the general aviation fatal accident rate per 100,000 flight hours at 0.91 or below through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Number of fatalities per 100 million flight hours.

Scope: This indicator includes United States registered on-demand (non-scheduled Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 135) and general aviation (GA) flights to include everything not Part 121 or Scheduled Part 135.

General aviation comprises a diverse range of aviation activities, from single-seat homebuilt aircraft, helicopters, and balloons, single and multiple engine land and seaplanes, to highly sophisticated, extended range turbojets.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: The data for general aviation fatal accidents come from the NTSB Aviation Accident Database. Aviation accident investigators, under the auspices of the NTSB, develop the data. FAA derives annual flight hours from the FAA's annual GA and Part 135 Activity Survey. FAA's Forecast and Performance Analysis Division provides current-year estimates.

Statistical Issues: The NTSB finalizes the actual number of general aviation fatal accidents. The NTSB completes a census of accidents, thus no statistical issues relevant to the data.

The general aviation community and the General Aviation Joint Safety Committee (GAJSC), as part of the Safer Skies initiative, recommended the development of a data collection program that will yield more accurate and relevant data on general aviation demographics and utilization. FAA developed improved general aviation survey and data collection methodologies based on these recommendations. As a result of these efforts, the FAA, working with the General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), the NTSB, and other aviation industry associations, made many improvements to the survey. FAA initiated an improved survey in FY 2004. These annual surveys created, for the first time, a statistically valid report of activity on which the general aviation community could agree. First, FAA significantly increased the sample size, created a reporting form to make it much easier for organizations with large fleets to report, and worked with the Aircraft Registry to improve the accuracy of contact information. Each year, FAA makes significant improvements to substantially improve the accuracy of the data.

The GAJSC, the Safety Analysis Team of the GAJSC, and the General Aviation Data Improvement Team worked closely with the general aviation community and industry to develop this performance indicator and target. The working group provided unanimous support and consensus for the indicator and target.

Completeness: FAA considers the NTSB-reported number of general aviation fatal accidents, even when reported as preliminary, as accurate. NTSB and the Office of AVP confer periodically to validate information on the number of fatalities. NTSB usually completes investigations and issues reports on accidents that occur during any fiscal year by the end of the next fiscal year. FAA considers the results final when all NTSB-reported accidents from the previous year when NTSB published a press release early in the following year. For example, FY 2025 results will be final after the FY 2027 press release. In general, however, the FAA does not believe the number of fatalities will change significantly between the end of the fiscal year and the date they are finalized. FAA finalizes the general aviation survey calendar hours by December 31 of the following year. Hence, the FAA does not consider the fatal accident rate for FY 2025 final/ complete until December 31, 2027.

Reliability: FAA considers the results preliminary based on projected activity data. NTSB and FAA jointly investigate most accidents. NTSB has the statutory responsibility to determine probable cause, while the FAA has separate statutory authority

to investigate accidents and incidents to ensure that the FAA meets its broader responsibilities. The FAA's own accident investigators and other FAA employees participate in all accident investigations led by NTSB investigators. The FAA uses performance data extensively for program management, personnel evaluation, and accountability.

Verification and Validation: The NTSB finalizes the actual number of general aviation fatal accidents as the authoritative source. The FAA's Forecast and Performance Analysis Division provides current-year flight hour estimates. FAA derives the annual flight hours used to compute the final result from the FAA's annual general aviation and Part 135 Activity Survey.

16 Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.38 per million operations for commercial aviation through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Weighted Surface Safety Risk Index.

Scope: The Surface Safety indicator measures the overall safety performance of the National Airspace System (NAS) in the runway environment. It includes all manner of operations (commercial and other types), aircraft, and vehicle/pedestrian movement that occur in that environment. It includes runway collision accidents, runway excursion accidents, taxiway collision accidents, runway incursion incidents, runway excursion incidents, and taxiway surface incidents. FAA defines operations as the total takeoffs and landings. FAA measures commercial and non-commercial operations separately. The Air Traffic Organization (ATO) considers operations under FAR Parts 121, 129, and 135 as commercial operations and all other operation types as non-commercial.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: The NTSB database provides the primary source of runway accident data. FAA supplements runway excursion data by AVP's Aviation System Analysis and Sharing (ASIAS) database, which aggregates runway excursion data from multiple sources. FAA collects data from air traffic controllers and pilots as the primary source of runway incursion and surface incident reports.

FAA records the data in the Comprehensive Electronic Data Analysis Reporting (CEDAR) system. CEDAR replaced the FAA Air Traffic Quality Assurance (ATQA) database for the ATO. FAA evaluates preliminary incident reports when received, and the evaluation can take up to 90 days. FAA's new source, Aviation Risk Identification Assessment (ARIA), provides additional data for evaluating events. The ARIA algorithm computes a potential risk score for two aircraft based upon proximity to one another. FAA provides operations data used to calculate the runway incursion rate via Operational Network (OPSNET) and downloaded directly from the FAA Operations and Performance Data database.

Statistical Issues: The FAA uses statistical modeling to categorize various accidents, which generates a sampling error.

Completeness: The FAA verifies and validates the accuracy of runway incursion and surface incident data through the initial validation process, followed by quality assurance and quality control reviews. FAA reconciles the databases monthly and explores and resolves anomalies. In cases where the FAA identifies major problems, the FAA issues a request for resubmission. The FAA conducts annual reviews of reported data and compares them with data reported from previous years. FAA uses the annual runway incursion incident data to provide a statistical basis for research, analysis, and outreach initiatives.

FAA will recalculate the Surface Safety indicator if operators report accidents or incidents late or if FAA retroactively adjusts operations data.

Reliability: FAA uses a classification algorithm with approximately 95 percent accuracy to classify NTSB events as runway collisions, taxiway collisions, or runway excursions. Given this classification

error, the FAA believes irrelevant accidents could be included in the Surface Safety Indicator calculation, or relevant accidents will be excluded.

Errors caused by external factors, like air traffic controllers, pilots, and/or vehicle/pedestrian events, contribute to runway accidents and incidents. The FAA directly influences air traffic controller performance, but indirectly influences pilots and airport personnel.

Verification and Validation: The FAA verifies and validates the accuracy of runway incursion and surface incident data through the initial validation process, followed by quality assurance and quality control reviews. FAA reconciles the databases monthly and explores and resolves anomalies. In cases where the FAA identifies major problems, the FAA issues a request for resubmission.

17 Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 1.39 per million operations for non-commercial aviation through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Weighted Surface Safety Risk Index.

Scope: The Surface Safety Indicator measures the overall safety performance of the NAS in the runway environment. It includes all manner of operations (commercial and other types), aircraft, and vehicle/pedestrian movement that occur in that environment. It includes runway collision accidents, runway excursion accidents, taxiway collision accidents, runway incursion incidents, runway excursion incidents, and taxiway surface incidents. FAA defines operations as total takeoffs and landings. FAA measures Commercial and Non- Commercial operations separately. The Air Traffic Organization (ATO) considers operations under FAR Parts 121, 129, and 135 commercial operations and all other operation types as non-commercial.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: See metric 16: Maintain the weighted surface safety risk index at or below 0.38 per million operations for Commercial Aviation through FY 2026.

18 Reduce the Northeast Corridor state of good repair backlog of $71.40B by 60% to $28.56B or less by FY 2035

Lead: FRA

Indicator: Dollar value of Northeast Corridor state of good repair backlog.

Scope: The reduction in the state of good repair (SOGR) backlog is based on expenditures under FRA grant agreements and other federal funds, to include project sponsor matching dollars for projects that address SOGR along the Northeast Corridor (NEC). Projects that address SOGR are defined as activities associated with two types of projects. FRA defines the first as rehabilitation or replacement of major bridges and tunnels, which is not undertaken on a routine basis. The NEC Commission defines “major backlog projects” of NEC infrastructure as major bridges and tunnels, and includes a list of 16 identified pieces of major NEC infrastructure. The second project type includes repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or modernization of basic infrastructure assets, including rails, ties, ballast, communication systems, signaling systems, electric traction power systems, and undergrade bridges.

Sources: FRA captures expenditure data on FRA grants in DOT’s financial system, Delphi. Additionally, project sponsors submit expenditure reports quarterly for the Federal State Partnership for Intercity Passenger Rail grant program, specific to NEC backlog projects.

Statistical Issues: None.

Completeness: FRA's grant agreements require quarterly financial reporting in accordance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.328. Additionally, DOT's accounting system maintains records of project sponsor invoices and payment information.

Reliability: Experienced project sponsors typically complete NEC projects, such as Amtrak and State Departments of Transportation, with a history of providing FRA financial reports that contain comprehensive and reliable data. FRA determined that Delphi provides a reliable source through audits of DOT's financial systems.

Verification and Validation: FRA validates financial data by comparing financial reports to project completion status included in periodic progress reports submitted by each project sponsor. FRA verifies progress data through site visits and compliance checks. FRA reviews Delphi annually in association with the annual audit of DOT's Financial Statement.

19 Reduce the state of good repair backlog for transit revenue vehicles to 20.2% or below by FY 2030

Lead: FTA

Indicator: State of good repair (SOGR) backlog for transit revenue vehicles (percent of transit revenue vehicles in backlog).

Scope: The percentage is calculated as the number of transit revenue vehicles in the SOGR backlog divided by the total number of transit revenue vehicles.

Transit providers report annually on the asset type, number, date of manufacture, and Default Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) of revenue vehicles for which they have capital responsibility. FTA excludes vehicles not part of a dedicated fleet, meaning transit agencies use the vehicles regularly for activities other than public transportation. FTA also excludes "spare" revenue vehicles only used in service for emergencies or other unplanned events. FTA considers assets due for replacement when their age (calculated from the date of manufacture) reaches the ULB value. FTA considers assets at or beyond their ULB to be in the state of good repair backlog.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: NTD Annual Revenue Vehicle Inventory. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on NTD data.

20 Maintain the percentage of Interstate pavement in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026

Lead: FHWA

Indicator: Percent of interstate pavement in either good or fair condition.

Scope: This measure serves as an indicator of trends for pavements in Good or Fair conditions on the interstate system. FHWA determines performance ratings of good or fair condition for NHS pavements using a combination of several pavement performance metrics that State DOTs collected and reported to the HPMS. For this measure, pavement condition is evaluated based on the reported pavement performance metrics, including International Roughness Index (IRI), faulting, roughness, cracking, and rutting. In HPMS, data items are provided for 0.1-mile sections of the entire NHS as required by the HPMS Field Manual. Maintaining pavements in good or fair condition is essential for the safe and efficient movement of people and freight. A good condition rating suggests no need for immediate major investment, while a poor condition rating suggests the need for major rehabilitation or reconstruction investment. State DOT investments in preservation and maintenance investments are also critical for keeping pavements in good and fair condition.

Effective May 2017, a USDOT-issued Final Rule established a new framework of National performance indicators for pavement and bridge conditions. FHWA requires States to make significant

progress towards achieving targets for their individual performance indicators for pavements and bridges. The regulation requires FHWA to report the performance of highway pavements Nationally as the percentage of the interstate system in Good and Poor condition.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FHWA uses data collected by States and submitted to HPMS. FHWA calculates the percentage from mileage and pavement condition data reported to the HPMS. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for more information on the pavement condition in HPMS data.

21 Maintain the percentage National Highway System bridges' deck area in fair or better condition at or above 95% through FY 2026

Lead: FHWA

Indicator: Percent of deck area on National Highway System (NHS) bridges in fair or better condition.

Scope: This measure serves as an indicator of trends in bridges in Good or Fair condition on the NHS. FHWA believes the surface area (i.e., length multiplied by width) of bridge decks provides a more meaningful measure than simply a count of bridges. Approaching the measure this way recognizes the size difference among bridges and avoids the pitfall associated with treating every bridge the same regardless of size.

Beginning in 1971, and with the expanded authority provided in 1978, the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) required the inspection of all highway bridges located on public roads and the submission of bridge inventory and inspection data to FHWA for inclusion in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). FHWA maintains the NBI, which contains data on more than 623,000 highway bridges (2024 NBI dataset).

The information in the NBI contains 95 data items for each of the bridges as required by the Recording and Coding Guide for the Structure Inventory and Appraisal of the Nation's Bridges. From the data provided, FHWA monitors the condition of the nation's bridges, which includes identifying those bridges in Good or Fair condition.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FHWA uses the NBI data to determine if a bridge is in Good or Fair condition, which FHWA currently assembles from annual data submittals from States, Federal agencies, and tribal governments. FHWA calculates the deck area from length and width data also reported to the NBI.

Statistical Issues: FHWA identifies that further research is needed to identify potential statistical issues.

Completeness: The NBI provides the world's most comprehensive database of bridge information. FHWA requires States, Federal agencies, and Tribal governments to report their data by March 15th of each year. However, FHWA accepts updates until June 15th at which time FHWA archives and publishes the full data set.

Reliability: Because the performance indicator relies on data associated with more than 147,000 NHS bridges (2024 NBI dataset), the impact of any differences in reporting across States is minimized in the overall National analysis.

Verification and Validation: The NBIS requires annual submittal to FHWA of bridge inventory and inspection data collected and submitted by 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in cooperation with local governments, as well as highway bridge owning Federal agencies and Tribal governments. Through the NBIS Program Oversight Process, FHWA division offices annually evaluate the quality of each State's and agency's bridge inspection program using 23 different indicators, two of which pertain to data quality and timely submission.

FHWA evaluates the inspection programs comprehensively using statistical sampling methods, file reviews, field reviews, and data analysis. FHWA provides a written annual evaluation to each State and agency to document problems and require corrective actions.

Upon annual submittal of the NBI data to FHWA headquarters, FHWA performs additional safety and reasonableness checks on the data prior to acceptance, including comparisons with previously reported data. FHWA requires data resubmittal in cases where FHWA identifies significant or safety-related problems. FHWA evaluates the accuracy and reliability of the submitted NBI information through data checks by both headquarters and division office personnel and as part of FHWA's annual NBIS compliance reviews.

22 Maintain the percentage of paved runways in fair or better condition at 93% through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Percent of paved runways in excellent, good, or fair condition.

Scope: The runway pavement condition goal applies for all open and paved runways at federally funded National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) airports.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source:
FAA collects data through visual inspection of runway pavement in accordance with existing FAA guidance including Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5380-7, Airport Pavement Management Program, and AC 150/5320-17A, Airfield Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating Manuals, which provides uniformity to field observations. Airports report the pavement condition in the Airport Master Record database and airports enter inspection results into the FAA's National Airspace System Resource (NASR).

Statistical Issues: Due to variable reporting cycles, the total number of runways displayed in each month's System of Airports Reporting (SOAR) report varies slightly.

Completeness: A small number of runways do not report a condition each month. These runways represent, on average, less than 0.5% of the total runways in the NPIAS.

Reliability: Airport operators report runway conditions locally. Currently, the FAA does not have a method for confirming a date when an airport operator reviews or updates the condition. However, the FAA can identify a general trend if conditions change over a period of time. Airport infrastructure, particularly airfield facilities at commercial service airports, is exposed to constant heavy use and harsh environmental conditions. Airport operators design runways, taxiways, and aprons to withstand the heavy equipment that operates on them, but even so, these facilities require frequent maintenance and rehabilitation in order to remain in good working condition. Airport operators have to keep runways and taxiways clear of snow, ice, and ponding water that can jeopardize aircraft directional control or braking action. Chemicals and plowing, as well as freeze-thaw cycles, all take a toll on runways, taxiways, and other paved areas. Even at smaller, non-commercial airports, pavement degradation due to meteorological conditions quickly leads to more serious damage if periodic maintenance and resurfacing are not completed in a timely manner.

At the same time, airport operators with limited financial resources defer needed capital projects, which both increases costs and may impact operational capacity if runways and taxiways require more in-depth reconstruction. Funding constraints may significantly affect when the airport sponsor funds pavement rehabilitation. This is why it is so crucial that the FAA offer airports financial assistance in the form of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants to ensure infrastructure is properly protected and preserved at the lowest possible cost.

Verification and Validation: FAA prepares a summary of runway conditions monthly and distributes to each FAA region with the recommendation to distribute as necessary, review their respective region's data, and take any necessary action to ensure pavement conditions remain in fair or better condition. Additionally, at the conclusion of each fiscal year, FAA presents a summary of condition changes that identifies specific runways that could be targeted for improvement due to deteriorating conditions.

23 Ensure reliable freight movement by maintaining a Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTR) at 1.43 or lower through FY 2026

Lead: FHWA

Indicator: Index of Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR).

Scope: FHWA uses travel time reliability as a key indicator of transportation system performance. The TTTR index measures the reliability or consistency of truck travel times on the interstate from day to day over the course of a year. The TTTR index is the ratio of the 95th percentile truck travel time to the 50th percentile truck travel time for each roadway segment. FHWA then averages for the entire interstate system to provide the National TTTR Index.

The TTTR Index represents a system-wide average of extra time or cushion that needs to be added to typical or average travel time to ensure on-time arrival 95 percent of the time. The TTTR Index is reported as 1.0 or greater. The higher the value above 1.0, the less reliable the roadway, while TTTR Index values closer to 1.0 indicate a more reliable roadway. This gives a system-wide indication of how much extra time a motor carrier needs to budget for freight travel on the interstate to account for traffic delays. This additional time results in extra shipping and carrying costs for businesses.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: The National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS) utilizes vehicle probe-based travel time data for passenger vehicles and trucks. FHWA and State DOTs use NPMRDS to calculate the TTTR Index. Most of the probe data is collected from a variety of sources, including mobile devices, connected vehicles, portable navigation devices, commercial fleets equipped with Global Positioning System (GPS), and sensors. NPMRDS includes historical average travel times in five-minute increments daily, covering the entire NHS.

Statistical Issues: FHWA key concerns include the sample size of commercial vehicle probes and the frequency of the sampling time and position sampling. The reported results provide nationwide coverage using data from 700,000 freight vehicles operating in North America. FHWA probes collect most of the data from medium to large fleets that operate tractor-trailer combination trucks in every sector of the industry and every region of the United States and Canada.

Completeness: The NPMRDS provides average travel times in five-minute increments daily, covering the entire NHS. FHWA estimates that data completeness for the interstate system covers probe data for at least 90 percent of all time periods of the day.

Reliability: To provide reliable roadway performance estimates, a large enough number of freight vehicles must be equipped with GPS to provide a valid and reliable measure of roadway performance, and to provide the temporal and geographic diversity desired by the system of performance indicators. Through the use of the NPMRDS, FHWA made progress in increasing sample size and the frequency of sampling by increasing the sources of the probe data and the number of vehicles providing position information. FHWA produces the NPMRDS travel times using path processing. In path processing, FHWA calculates a space mean speed for each

individual probe vehicle from the points along its trajectory path. This provides more accurate average vehicle speed data. FHWA designed the probe vehicle performance system to provide travel time and speed or delay information without traditional fixed-location traffic monitoring and data collection systems. Analysis of the GPS location data allows for very accurate roadway measurements.

Verification and Validation: The NPMRDS includes a measurement of the density of data used to generate each average travel time. FHWA conducts quarterly validations that compare deployed Bluetooth sensor travel-time data to the NPMRDS data.

24 Start intercity passenger rail service on at least three new corridors by FY 2035

Lead: FRA

Indicator: New corridors on which intercity passenger rail service is initiated.

Scope: This performance indicator reflects the initiation of new intercity passenger services, operated by any entity (including, but not limited to Amtrak), and may include both short-distance services (under 750 miles) and long-distance services (over 750 miles), consistent with the statuary definition of "corridor" under the Corridor Identification and Development Program. New corridors may include services that operate, in whole or in part, over routes that previously had no intercity passenger rail service, and new services that may overlap existing services, but are significantly different in their service characteristics (e.g., trip time, frequency, target geographic origin-destination markets)—for example, the introduction of a short-distance service that operates over a portion of the route of an existing long-distance service.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FRA relies on project sponsors quarterly reports submitted under FRA grant agreements. FRA requires the quarterly progress reports to include the status of work completed along the corridor. For Amtrak-sponsored projects, Amtrak and FRA participate in weekly meetings to discuss corridor progress, and Amtrak submits deliverables in accordance with its grant agreement with FRA.

Statistical Issues: None.

Completeness: FRA sees no limitations, as information is submitted to FRA directly in conjunction with FRA's role in providing financial and technical assistance toward the development and implementation of corridors. As FRA identifies and selects corridors for the program, the projects will be provided financial assistance through an FRA grant that will be tracked and monitored in FRA's grant tracker. The grant agreements contain requirements for the project sponsor to provide periodic reports that must be complete and accurate.

Reliability: For corridors under FRA-supported development and implementation, FRA anticipates the reliability of information to be high, and any lack of reliability would likely originate from errors or omissions in required regular periodic progress reports.

Verification and Validation: FRA utilizes a risk-based monitoring and risk assessment process, including site visits, routine monitoring, and regular validation of grant-funded work against milestones in the grant agreement. This continues through the life of the grant, during which FRA appropriately measures, assesses, and resolves any issues. An example of this effort can be seen through the monthly/quarterly reports that project sponsors provide to FRA as a condition of the grant agreement.

25 Reduce the number of transit rail stations inaccessible to persons with disabilities to 891 or fewer by FY 2030

Lead: FTA, DOCR

Indicator: Number of transit rail stations inaccessible to persons with disabilities.

Scope: FTA defines inaccessible transit rail stations as those not fully accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities, including wheelchair users, according to the criteria contained in Appendix A to 49 CFR Part 37. Accessibility criteria for transit rail stations include detectable warnings along station platform edges and positioning platforms and vehicle floors to reduce gaps. The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires that when operators alter transit stations or facilities, the altered areas—and often the paths of travel to them—become accessible at that point. As a result, transit agencies routinely make their existing transit facilities ADA accessible when they renovate or improve stations.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: NTD Annual Transit Stations. See the Commonly Used Data Sources section for information on NTD data.

26 Reduce the number of Amtrak-served stations that are inaccessible to persons with disabilities from 86 to zero by FY 2030

Lead: FRA, DOCR

Indicator: Number of Amtrak-served stations that are inaccessible to persons with disabilities.

Scope: Amtrak has the responsibility to provide access to its stations for persons with disabilities by ensuring station elements (e.g., parking or platforms) are compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). FRA provides funding for Amtrak to bring station elements into compliance with ADA, thereby making the stations accessible to persons with disabilities. FRA's grant agreements with Amtrak require Amtrak to regularly report on the status of compliance work at Amtrak-served stations. FRA tracks, verifies, and reports on Amtrak's progress and performance in meeting its project milestones.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: FRA relies on Amtrak's Monthly Project Reports (MPRs) from which to pull the data for reporting. FRA coordinates with Amtrak to create customized weekly and monthly reporting for station accessibility.

Statistical Issues: None.

Completeness: FRA believes that its grants' terms and conditions, as well as its programmatic and project statement of work, require complete reporting. Amtrak has reported information on station accessibility for over eight years, and FRA and Amtrak track the quality and completeness of that information.

Reliability: Amtrak generally provides sound data associated with station construction. FRA follows up with Amtrak on issues or irregularities found in the reported information.

Verification and Validation: FRA verifies and validates Amtrak's data reporting by comparing and cross-referencing reports from multiple sources, such as site visits, compliance checks, contractor project reports, and monthly reviews of Amtrak MPRs.

27 Maintain 99% commercial use availability rate for the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway

Lead: GLS

Indicator: Percentage of time the United States portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway is available to commercial users.

Scope: The reliability of the United States sectors of the St. Lawrence Seaway (including the two United States Seaway locks in Massena, New York) is critical to continuous commercial shipping during the navigation season from late March to late December.

The conditions are measured in hours/minutes during the 24/7 navigation season. The downtime is updated and reported monthly, with the overall reliability and availability of the locks represented as a percentage of time less than 100 percent throughout the season.

System downtime due to any condition (weather, vessel incidents, malfunctioning equipment) causes delays to ships, impacting international trade to and from the Great Lakes region of North America. GLS measures downtime by hours/minutes of delay for:

- Weather (visibility, fog, snow, ice)
- Vessel incidents (human error, electrical, and/or mechanical failure)
- Water level and rate of flow regulation
- Lock equipment malfunction

The Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (GLS) then estimates the percent of time the portion is available to commercial users by estimating the total hours available for the season (late May to late September) minus the estimated downtime divided by the total hours available for the season.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: GLS Office of Lock Operations and Marine Services maintains data on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Statistical Issues: None.

Completeness: The GLS is the Federal agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of the United States portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. GLS's lock operations unit gathers primary data for all vessel transits through the United States Seaway sectors and locks, including any downtime in operations.

GLS collects data onsite at the United States locks, as vessels move through the seaway or as operations are suspended. GLS compiles this information, measuring the system's reliability, and delivers the results to GLS senior staff and stakeholders each month.

Reliability: The GLS compiles annual system reliability data for comparison purposes. As the GLS gathers data directly from observation, GLS assumes no limitations on the data. The GLS historically reports this performance metric for its navigation season (typically late March to late December/early January).

Verification and Validation: The GLS verifies and validates the accuracy of the data through a review of 24-hour vessel traffic control computer records, radio communication between the GLS and vessel operators, and video and audiotapes of vessel incidents.

28 Increase the annual outlay of Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) project funds to $116.5 million or more by FY 2026

Lead: MARAD

Indicator: Increase outlays through the Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP).

Scope: The Maritime Administration (MARAD) tracks funding data regarding port capacity throughput through the DOT's financial system, Delphi, to determine the increase in the number of outlays through the PIDP.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: MARAD uses the DOT's financial system, Delphi, to determine the annual outlays of the PIDP.

Statistical Issues: None identified.

Completeness: The DOT's financial system, Delphi, accounting system captures the entirety of the PIDP program and subsequent outlays.

Reliability: The outlays data captured in DOT's financial system, Delphi, confirm support to strengthen supply chain reliability, create workforce development opportunities, enhance freight efficiency, lower costs, reduce emissions, and improve the safety, reliability, and resilience of the nation's ports.

Verification and Validation: MARAD ensures verification and validation of annual outlays reported for port throughput capacity through review of DOT's financial system, Delphi, and it will be used to help identify any increases in outlays for port capacity throughput. Outlay data from Delphi provide trends in annual funding dispersed through the PIDP for port throughput capacity projects.

29 Increase the number of U.S. Flag vessels in international service from 94 vessels to 96 vessels or more by FY 2026

Lead: MARAD

Indicator: U.S. Flag vessels in international service.

Scope: MARAD tracks the number of large, internationally trading, ocean-going commercial vessels (1,600 gross tons or more) operating under the U.S.-flag to help ensure an adequate U.S.- flag fleet, crewed by United States qualified Merchant Mariners, to meet Department of Defense (DoD) requirements for sealift support during national contingency operations. Most of the ships that MARAD tracks participate in the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement (VISA) program, and the Voluntary Tanker Agreement (VTA) program, including those participating in the Maritime Security Program (MSP), the Tanker Security Program (TSP), and the Cable Security Fleet (CSF) Program.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: MARAD relies on both commercial and private data sources to maintain an accurate list of ships. MARAD bases this ship list on an extract of ship data from S&P Global Market Intelligence, which is a commercial vendor of vessel registry data and is the trusted and widely used source for such data across the maritime shipping industry.

Additionally, MARAD oversees the MSP and CSF Program and receives data on these vessels directly from participants operating in the program. MARAD also uses the Sea Web online database provided by S&P Global to track the actual movements of MSP vessels worldwide to ensure they are meeting program requirements.

Statistical Issues: The list of ships includes the population of ships meeting the vessel criteria outlined above for the measure. Accordingly, MARAD does not use statistical methods to create the list. MARAD does basic trend analysis to identify any anomalies in terms of the number and type of ships. MARAD constructed an annual time series of the number of cargo-carrying commercial ships of 1,600 tons or more operating in international trade back to 2000. MARAD does not have records of ship lists before that time that would allow discernment between vessels in domestic and international trade. Under an interagency agreement with DoD, aging vessels may be replaced in a phased approach, with periodic increases in the number of vessels for government-owned sealift, before obsolete vessels can be retired.

Completeness: MARAD produces the internationally sailing vessel list as the complete list of large, U.S.-flag self-propelled, privately-owned merchant vessels carrying cargo from port to port that are not eligible to serve in the United States domestic trade. Limiting the fleet list to vessels exceeding 1,600 gross tons ensures that MARAD only considers large ocean-going vessels. All ships of this type have an official and unique International Maritime Organization (IMO) number, which allows MARAD to identify and track them with certainty.

Reliability: MARAD maintains a highly reliable count of the number of large ocean-going vessels in the U.S.-flagged fleet. These ships are all cataloged in international databases and subject to tracking via established online services. The commercial data vendor is considered the trusted source in the maritime industry.

Verification and Validation: MARAD ensures validation and verification through data collected directly from vessel operators and other federal resources. MARAD conducts monthly data assurance checks to account for and resolve any discrepancies in the data.

30 Increase the United States Merchant Marine (USMMA) graduating class size to 220 or more by FY 2029

Lead: MARAD

Indicator: Increase the number of certified graduates at the USMMA.

Scope: The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) supports the national security, marine transportation, and economic needs of the United States by preparing students for service as military officers and merchant mariners. To achieve this mission, USMMA will develop academic programs that enhance student learning experiences, increase first-year student retention rates, and improve professional licensure pass rates to increase the annual number of graduates. These efforts will ensure a steady pipeline of qualified graduates to meet critical national maritime and defense workforce needs.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: Annually, the USMMA compiles information on the size of the graduating class.

Statistical Issues: None identified.

Completeness: MARAD monitors the graduating class information compiled by the USMMA.

Reliability: The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) at Kings Point, External Affairs, announces through communications the size of its graduation class for each year's commencement exercise.

Verification and Validation: MARAD ensures validation and verification through data collected directly from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, External Affairs, Kings Point, NY, communications, and announcement of the annual class size of newly graduated U.S. Merchant Marine and Military Officers in the commencement ceremony.

31 Decrease the annual number of findings to remedy per checked Vessel hosting cadets from the USMMA to 2 or fewer by FY 2026

Lead: MARAD

Indicator: Annual number of findings to remedy per checked vessel hosting cadets from the USMMA.

Scope: MARAD conducts both random and targeted checks of not less than five percent annually of U.S.-flag commercial vessel operators who host cadets on their vessels to ensure they are meeting the requirements of Every Mariner Builds A Respectful Culture (EMBARC) Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment (SASH) Prevention Mandatory Standards. The EMBARC Standards set policies, programs, procedures, and practices to help strengthen a culture of SASH prevention and support appropriate responses to incidents of sexual violence, sexual harassment, and other forms of misconduct. Accession into EMBARC must be completed as a prerequisite before U.S.-flag vessel commercial operators will be authorized to employ United States Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) students as cadets aboard their vessels. MARAD works closely with the vessel operators to ensure compliance with the EMBARC Standards. This includes ensuring each vessel operator has SASH prevention and response policies in place and documented within their Safety Management System; Vessel operators shall submit copies of their SASH policies together with the enrollment

checklist and statement of compliance document, which MARAD reviews and approves. Each vessel operator agrees to conduct self-assessments of its compliance with the EMBARC Standards annually thereafter and submit confirmation of such self-assessments. Further, each vessel operator agrees to permit MARAD—including third parties engaged by MARAD—to conduct recurring assessments of its compliance with the EMBARC Standards. For FY 2025, MARAD enrolled and maintains 23 vessel operators in the EMBARC Standards program, with a combined total of approximately 180 United States commercial vessels under their control eligible to host USMMA Cadets.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: MARAD relies on the U.S.-flag vessel operators for all data and information necessary for MARAD to determine compliance of an enrolled vessel operator, adhering to the requirements of the EMBARC Standards. MARAD also relies on the USMMA to provide the data for each cadet, the vessel on which each cadet is training onboard, when they join, and when they depart any vessel. MARAD documents evidence of non-conformity with the EMBARC Standards discovered during MARAD vessel checks as findings in an after-action report to the operator. MARAD requests a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) with estimated timelines specified to address all non-conformities listed, along with all supporting documentation when confirming completion to remedy. The evidence of implementation of the corrective action plans and closure of the findings should be documented by the operator in accordance with their company and vessel Safety Management System (SMS). The implementation of the corrective action shall be verified at their next scheduled internal company audit of the vessel, per ISM Code 12.1, and at their next MARAD EMBARC assessment.

Statistical Issues: MARAD will conduct both random and targeted checks of not less than 5 percent in FY 2024, FY 2025, as well as FY 2026, of the commercial vessels that host cadets from USMMA for compliance with EMBARC Standards, consistent with the 46 USC 51322 mandated requirement for 10 percent biennially. MARAD only allows vessels eligible to host USMMA Cadets for Sea Year training if they are enrolled in the EMBARC program. Five percent will be based on a three-year running average of vessels that participate.

Completeness: MARAD continues to work closely with the vessel operators to ensure they comply with the EMBARC Standards. This includes ensuring each vessel operator maintains SASH policies in place and a statement of compliance; agrees to conduct self-assessments of its compliance with the EMBARC Standards annually thereafter, and to submit confirmation of such self-assessments. MARAD receives, reviews, and accepts all annual self-assessments submitted by companies that have reached their anniversary date of enrollment.

Reliability: Each vessel operator agrees to comply with the EMBARC Standards in order to enroll as a carrier and remain approved for sea-year participation. MARAD requires each vessel operator to have their SASH prevention and response policies in place, and they must be documented within their Safety Management System (SMS). Vessel operators shall submit copies of their SASH policies together with the enrollment checklist and statement of compliance document, which is reviewed and approved by the MARAD EMBARC Enrollment Review Team (EERT) and then forwarded for recommendation and final approval by the Deputy Associate Administrator for Maritime Education and Training. Each vessel operator agrees to conduct a self-assessment of its compliance with the EMBARC Standards annually thereafter and submit confirmation of such self-assessments. Further, each vessel operator agrees to permit MARAD—including third parties engaged by MARAD—to conduct recurring assessments of its compliance with the EMBARC Standards. Conformity with EMBARC Standards will be reviewed regularly during vessel audits and during each annual verification of the enrolled operator company's compliance assessment. Further, because the EMBARC Standards require

the SASH policies and procedures to be included in their SMS, the EMBARC program will be subject to regulatory oversight during periodic verifications by the United States Coast Guard (USCG) recognized organizations (RO) and the vessel through initial, intermediate, and renewal verifications of the operator's entire SMS. In addition, MARAD also conducts independent EMBARC-enrolled vessel operators' office location visit assessments. This is to ensure the vessel operators comply with EMBARC Standards at the company level.

Verification and Validation: MARAD ensures validation and verification through data collected directly from vessel operators through random and targeted validation checks of vessels, authorized by law to do so, and guided by internally vetted standard operating procedures for vessel and operator assessments.

MARAD also collects updated data and information received from the submission of vessel operators' annual self-assessments. MARAD requires the operator to provide such information annually or when requested by MARAD to remain an approved EMBARC participant.

32 Increase the annual number of air traffic controllers trained to at least 1,900 or more in FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: Number of air traffic controllers enrolled in training at the FAA Academy annually.

Scope: The FAA is enhancing its air traffic controller training capabilities to align with the Secretary of Transportation's supercharged hiring initiative. To meet this demand, the agency is increasing initial training throughput at the FAA Academy in Oklahoma City, where candidates receive foundational training prior to on-the-job training at facilities nationwide. The FAA is leveraging expanded hiring efforts, increased use of simulation technology, and targeted curriculum improvements to meet its training objectives efficiently and effectively.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: To improve oversight of its air traffic controller initial training pipeline, the FAA is tracking recruiting and hiring efforts. The FAA is tracking the throughput at the FAA Academy by using enrollment data.

Statistical Issues: Not applicable.

Completeness: FAA considers enrollment data a complete accounting of controllers enrolled in training.

Reliability: ATO closely monitors initial controller training at the FAA Academy and validates the enrollment data.

Verification and Validation: The FAA verifies and validates training throughput at the FAA Academy by tracking hiring and enrollment data.

33 Maintain the National Airspace System On-Time Arrival Rate at Core Airports at 88% or above through FY 2026

Lead: FAA

Indicator: National Airspace System On-Time Arrival Rate at Core Airports.

Scope: FAA considers a flight on time if it arrives no later than 15 minutes after its published, scheduled arrival time. The USDOT Airline Service Quality Performance (ASQP) and Aviation System Performance Metrics (ASPM) reporting systems both use this definition. Air carriers, however, also file up-to-date flight plans for their services with the FAA that may differ from their published flight schedules. This indicator measures on-time performance (OTP) against the carriers' filed flight plan, rather than what may be a dated published schedule.

FAA includes only Core airports in this indicator. FAA defines Core airports as those that have 1% or more of total United States enplanements (the USDOT large hub airports) or 0.75% or more of total United States non-military itinerant operations.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source:
The ASPM database, maintained by the FAA's Office of Performance Analysis, in conjunction with USDOT's ASQP causation database, provides the data for this metric. By agreement with USDOT, certain major United States carriers file ASQP flight data for flights to and from most large and medium hubs. Flight records contained in the Traffic Flow Management System (TFMS) supplement the flight data.

Statistical Issues: FAA does not collect data for all carriers; at present, 21 operating carriers report monthly into the ASQP reporting system.

Completeness: FAA finalizes fiscal year data approximately 90 days after the close of the Fiscal year.

Reliability: FAA verifies the reliability of ASPM daily by the execution of several audit checks, comparison to other published data indicators, and through the use of ASPM by over 1,300 active registered users. ASQP data is filed monthly with USDOT under 14 CFR Part 234, ASQP Reports, which separately requires reporting by major United States air carriers on domestic flights to and from Core airports. External factors such as weather, airline scheduling practices, runway construction/maintenance, and ramp/airport congestion may all impact on-time performance.

Verification and Validation: Each month, FAA senior leadership reviews ASQP data under 14 CFR Part 234, ASQP, which separately requires reporting by major United States air carriers on domestic flights to and from Core airports.

34 Publish a final rule reducing the regulatory cost of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards regulation by FY 2026

Lead: OST

Indicator: Final Rule reducing the regulatory cost of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards.

Scope: Issue a final rule setting vehicle fuel economy standards in compliance with statutory requirements.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source:
49 USC 32902

Statistical Issues: Not Applicable

Completeness: Not Applicable

Reliability: Not Applicable

Verification and Validation: Not Applicable

35 Increase the DOT Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Cybersecurity Score to 95/100 or more by FY 2027

Lead: OCIO

Indicator: Composite cybersecurity score, calculated per OMB guidance and derived from supporting the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) metrics, with a maximum value of 100.

Scope: FISMA of 2014 seeks to ensure effective protection and resilience of DOT's networks and information systems in accordance with the National Cybersecurity Strategic Plan, OMB policy, and guidance and directives issued by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). The Departmental Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) leads and oversees the implementation, operation, and improvements to DOT's cybersecurity program, and collaborates with officials across the agency in the execution of the program, remediation of weaknesses, implementation of new capabilities, and response to cybersecurity and privacy incidents. In addition to leveraging dedicated program resources provided by the DOT Cybersecurity Initiative, the CISO leverages DOT's risk management programs and processes to identify and manage risk, a community

of cybersecurity experts, and a FISMA integrated project team to govern efforts to implement priority capabilities including zero trust architecture, multifactor authentication, quantum-resistant encryption, and security in DOT's expanding cloud environment.

Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act (FITARA) requires each Federal agency's Inspector General (IG) or a contracted independent external auditor to conduct an annual independent evaluation to determine the effectiveness of its FISMA information security program and practices. This assessment includes testing and assessing the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, as well as a subset of information systems.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: There are numerous data sources, including the Cybersecurity Asset Management (CSAM), the DOT official system of record for all DOT systems, CyberScope, Continuous Data Monitoring (CDM) Dashboard, and OMB Max Portal.

Statistical Issues: Department of Homeland Security (DHS), OMB, and OIG obtain DOT FISMA data to contribute to the FISMA score. The data is shared across all groups, but sometimes delays or errors occur in the information retrieved.

Completeness: The annual FISMA audit occurs each year, with the official published score in December of the fiscal year by DHS and OMB.

Reliability: The reliability of the FISMA data is collaboratively monitored by the DOT Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), OMB, and DHS, where each organization checks for errors.

Verification and Validation: OCIO facilitates biweekly FISMA meeting with key stakeholders to review data, identify areas of opportunity, progress status of all FISMA aspects.

36 Increase the percentage of DOT's IT budget that uses shared services to 46% or more by FY 2026

Lead: OCIO

Indicator: Percentage of information technology systems operating on a shared platform.

Scope: USDOT maintains 488 FISMA-reportable systems. Of these systems, an unidentified quantity resides on shared platforms. Applications and Digital Solutions (S86) will seek to identify the systems or applications currently on shared platforms and which systems or applications could be candidates for migration to a shared platform. This action will be performed by executing an Application Rationalization effort in FY 2022. A primary objective is to catalog all applications for identification to consolidate and modernize older technologies. OCIO expects these activities to generate savings in cybersecurity compliance, reduce software and licensing costs, and reduce both acquisition and staff support requirements.

Sources/Commonly Used Data Source: OCIO will work with the following office to gather data on shared services: Applications and Digital Solutions (S86), Cybersecurity and Information Protection (S83), Strategic Portfolio Management (S81), and the USDOT agencies which maintain data on the department software and applications.

Statistical Issues: N/A

Completeness: Applications and Digital Solutions will engage the USDOT Chief Architect, S83 Chief Information Security Office, and all USDOT OAs to ensure an accurate inventory.

Reliability: To complete the USDOT portfolio review, the analyst applies specific definitions and guidelines and inputs the appropriate values for each data element into the database. In this way, OCIO maintains uniform data contained in the Application Rationalization, eliminating differences in collecting and maintaining relevant application records.

Verification and Validation: Reviewing every office portfolio of applications will identify applications used throughout the USDOT organization. This activity will help to ensure consistency in the data acquired and will capture additional factors such as the technologies used, user authentication methods, software version, current security status, and other information. When OCIO discovers inconsistencies, OCIO will quickly identify and make corrections to ensure accurate data collection. To help address these inconsistency issues, OCIO takes steps to develop a robust collection model to support data quality. This involves manual reviews of the work coded by the collection analysts. Once the full as-is list is validated, S86 will work with each OA Partner to look for efficiencies, opportunities for shared services and platforms, modernization solutions, and reduce redundancies while planning the new "To-Be" future state roadmap.

U.S. Department of Transportation

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20590

transportation.gov