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**1. Problem Title**

Lessons Learned from Consistency Determination

**2. Background**

Per the MAP 21 and FAST Acts each state developed a Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) meeting all the requirements of 23 U.S.C 119 and 23 CFR part. The risk-based TAMPs are 10-year frameworks for lifecycle management of included assets and are required to include a financial plan itemized by five prescribed work types: (1) construction, (2) maintenance, (3) preservation, (4) rehabilitation, and (5) reconstruction.

Each year, by June 30, states must request a “consistency review” by their FHWA Division Office. This consistency review request must include documentation demonstrating implementation of the TAMP by showing actual expenditures and progress towards meeting established infrastructure condition targets for the bridges and pavement on the National Highway System. FHWA then reviews and certifies if a state is “consistent” with their TAMP. As of the time of this proposal, states have completed and submitted 2 consistency reviews.

As there is no “template” or specific guidance on what form the consistency review take, each state has charted their own path in consultation with their FHWA Division Office.

**3. Literature Search Summary**

As states have only just completed their second consistency review, there is not much in the transportation literature about how states draft consistency reviews or how FHWA evaluates them.

**4. Research Objective**

The objectives of this synthesis study are to:

* Review states consistency reviews and identify commonalities in demonstrating implementation
* Identify problems for states that were unable to demonstrate consistency

The final product could include a written report, a template for states to use when drafting their consistency reviews, and best practices to follow to ensure they can easily demonstrate consistency.

**5. Urgency and Potential Benefits**

State DOT’s will use the information generated from this study to improve how they demonstrate implementation of asset management practices. FHWA will benefit from having more consistent information provided by each state.

**6. Implementation Considerations and Supporters**

The AASHTO Committee on Performance-Based Management has identified this topic as an area of interest, ranking it 9th on the overall list of research needs.

**7. Recommended Research Funding and Research Period**

Recommended funding: $300,000. This includes $250,000 for a full-time investigator (or two half-time investigators) for a year.

Recommended research period: 12 months.

**8. Problem Statement Author(s)**

The following individuals contributed to development of this problem statement:

* Todd Shields, Indiana Department of Transportation, [tshields@indot.in.gov](mailto:tshields@indot.in.gov)
* William Johnson, Colorado Department of Transportation, [will.johnson@state.co.us](mailto:will.johnson@state.co.us)
* Meredith Hill, Maryland Department of Transportation, [mhill8@mdot.maryland.gov](mailto:mhill8@mdot.maryland.gov)

1. **Others Supporting the Problem Statement**

List organizations, including AASHTO Committees or Councils, which support this problem statement, and provide contact information.

* AASHTO Committee on Performance-based Management, Tim Henkel, Chair

1. **Potential Panel Members**

* Please contact Matt Hardy, AASHTO Program Director for Planning and Performance Management, for a list of recommended panel members representing the AASHTO Committee on Performance-based Management and the Subcommittee on Risk Management.

**11. Person Submitting the Problem Statement**

Provide contact information for the individual submitting this problem statement.

* Todd Shields
* 317-515-1227
* tshields@indot.in.gov
* Affiliation:  
  Indiana DOT on behalf of the AASHTO Committee on Performance-based Management, Tim Henkel, Chair.