

Federal Highway Administration

Region 3

NEPA Reviewer

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies
Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies

May 2007

THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION

This document contains proprietary research, copyrighted materials, and literary property of The Gallup Organization. It is for the guidance of your company's executives only and is not to be copied, quoted, published, or divulged to others outside of your organization. We ask that this document be safeguarded, allowing no physical or electronic duplication, allowing no one outside your organization to view this document, and allowing no one to duplicate or change the contents in an effort to formulate an inferior product. No changes may be made to this document without the express written permission of The Gallup Organization.

The following pages provide a summary of responses to the Gallup/FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies. Respondents were asked to rate a recent project with a Transportation agency, so the data reflect the views of Resource agencies toward those projects with Transportation agencies. The survey statements were generally rated on a scale which required a response from among six response categories:

5	Strongly Agree	Extremely Satisfied	Excellent
4			
3			
2			
1	Strongly Disagree	Extremely Dissatisfied	Poor
Does Not Apply or Don't Know			

The statement or dimension averages are based on a 5-point scale, with "1" being the lowest possible average and "5" being the highest average. "Does Not Apply" or "Don't Know" responses are not scored.

The FHWA Resource Agency Scorecard provides feedback on how the region is doing with regards to NEPA processes as compared to the "best practice" or highest scoring region for each survey item. Note the following term definitions:

- Index** The average top two box response percentages for statements measuring each category of survey items (Relationship, Communication, Timeliness, Performance, General, and Problems)

- Top Two Box** The percentage of "5" and "4" responses.

- Best Practice Region** The region with the highest percentage of top two box responses.

- Region 1** Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont

- Region 2** New Jersey, New York

- Region 3** Delaware, Washington D.C., Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia

- Region 4** Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee

- Region 5** Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin

- Region 6** Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

- Region 7** Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska

- Region 8** Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming


- Region 9** Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada

- Region 10** Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington

The lists of transportation and resource reviewers for both 2003 and 2006 were generated by Gallup based on information that existed at the time the surveys were undertaken. It is understood that although they may not represent the entire population of transportation and resource reviewers, they both represent the best list of reviewers that could be constructed. In the absence of any other lists to represent these populations, these lists were treated as the target population for this study. Results based on the data presented in this report, therefore, relate to these lists only and may not be generalizable to any other population of transportation and resource reviewers. For further details on list construction and methodology used for this study, please refer to Technical Notes in the Final Report.


Index Comparison

- Total n: 49
- Region: Region 3




Region Comparison - % Top Two Box


Relationship




Communication




Timeliness



Performance



General





Relationship

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies

Region 3



	Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
6A My agency knew what was expected of it in this process.	47	2	0	11	34	53		4.36	4.69
	26	0	0	0	31	69	7	4.69	
6B Provided my agency with the materials, information, or documentation that we needed.	48	2	2	27	33	35		3.98	4.16
	37	3	8	5	35	49	5	4.19	
6C Appreciated our contribution to the process.	47	4	4	17	47	28		3.89	4.19
	24	13	0	4	42	42	7	4.00	
6D Encouraged us to play an active role in the process.	48	0	4	17	23	56		4.31	4.22
	27	0	7	7	37	48	8	4.26	
6E My agency's opinions seemed to count in the process.	47	0	6	21	36	36		4.02	4.16
	41	5	0	12	46	37	4	4.10	
6G Helped to move this project forward.	47	2	2	9	47	40		4.21	4.31
	47	2	2	9	47	40	3	4.21	
6H Made efforts to improve the process during this project.	45	4	4	24	29	38		3.91	3.97
	27	4	4	15	33	44	8	4.11	

Top Line: Region 3



Bottom Line: Best Practice

Communication

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies

Region 3



	Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
7A Involved us early on in the process.	47	0	2	11	30	57		4.43	4.26
	47	0	2	11	30	57	3	4.43	
7B Responded in a timely way to our requests.	48	0	2	31	35	31		3.96	3.94
	26	4	12	4	58	23	8	3.85	
7C Invited our participation in key meetings.	44	2	2	16	25	55		4.27	4.07
	35	0	3	17	29	51	1	4.29	
7D Kept us informed of their progress.	46	4	2	15	54	24		3.91	3.83
	46	4	2	15	54	24	3	3.91	
7E Was open and honest with us.	46	2	9	17	35	37		3.96	4.13
	27	4	7	4	33	52	8	4.22	
7F Was open to our suggestions or alternatives.	46	2	13	22	35	28		3.74	4.03
	39	3	0	23	51	23	4	3.92	
7G Gave reasonable suggestions or alternatives.	45	9	7	16	40	29		3.73	4.03
	40	3	0	18	53	28	4	4.03	
7H Gave clear explanations if they did not agree with our recommendations.	40	5	13	23	40	20		3.58	3.65
	14	0	7	14	36	43	2	4.14	
7I Was willing to compromise.	44	9	9	16	41	25		3.64	3.88
	36	3	0	25	56	17	4	3.83	
7J Had adequate participation at key meetings.	44	0	0	9	32	59		4.50	4.41
	44	0	0	9	32	59	3	4.50	
7K Overall, there was a sufficient level of communication between the two agencies on this project.	47	2	6	19	40	32		3.94	4.26
	27	7	11	4	48	30	8	3.81	

Top Line: Region 3



Bottom Line: Best Practice

Timeliness

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies

Region 3



	Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
8A Adhered to schedules that were set throughout the process.	42	2	2	17	38	40	3	4.12	4.17
	42	2	2	17	38	40	3	4.12	
8B Gave your agency enough time to accomplish tasks.	47	4	9	15	45	28	5	3.83	4.29
	36	0	3	17	47	33	5	4.11	
8C The entire process took a reasonable amount of time.	46	4	9	26	33	28	2	3.72	4.07
	15	7	7	13	27	47	2	4.00	
8D The process was the shortest it could have been without compromising NEPA.	43	7	5	21	35	33	2	3.81	NA
	12	0	17	8	25	50	2	4.08	

Top Line: Region 3



Bottom Line: Best Practice

Performance

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies

Region 3



	Sample Size	Poor					Excellent	Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5			2006	2003
9A The quality of information provided to your agency	48	0	4	8	56	31		4.15	4.06	
	16	0	0	13	50	38	2	4.25		
9B The completeness of information they provided	48	0	6	27	46	21		3.81	3.81	
	16	0	0	19	44	38	2	4.19		
9F The level of resources they devoted to this project	44	0	2	7	45	45		4.34	4.07	
	44	0	2	7	45	45	3	4.34		
9G The range of reasonable alternatives they suggested for this project	46	4	9	15	46	26		3.80	4.19	
	46	4	9	15	46	26	3	3.80		
9H Their willingness to consider a range of mitigation measures	41	2	10	10	37	41		4.05	3.71	
	25	8	0	8	44	40	7	4.08		
9I How good of a job they did at protecting the environment	44	9	0	27	36	27		3.73	3.79	
	24	13	8	8	29	42	7	3.79		



Top Line: Region 3

Bottom Line: Best Practice

General

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies
Region 3



Question	Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
11A Understands your agency's mission.	49	0	2	12	47	39	4.22	4.00	
	49	0	2	12	47	39	3	4.22	
11B Cares about your agency's mission.	49	10	6	29	33	22	3.51	3.66	
	33	9	6	15	52	18	5	3.64	
11C Is committed to doing quality work.	49	2	2	14	33	49	4.24	4.22	
	38	0	3	8	53	37	4	4.24	
11D Has competent staff.	49	0	6	12	41	41	4.16	4.31	
	15	0	7	0	53	40	2	4.27	
11E There is a sufficient level of trust between your two agencies.	48	8	2	35	29	25	3.60	3.56	
	39	0	8	13	54	26	4	3.97	
11F Is committed to making the environmental review process a timely one while ensuring environmentally sound projects.	48	6	8	19	38	29	3.75	3.91	
	38	0	0	29	42	29	4	4.00	
11G Is willing to compromise.	46	9	7	24	43	17	3.54	3.69	
	26	8	12	15	46	19	8	3.58	
11H There is a sufficient level of communication between your two agencies.	47	0	6	23	34	36	4.00	4.13	
	39	0	10	10	51	28	4	3.97	
11I Is committed to protecting the environment.	49	8	2	29	35	27	3.69	3.78	
	16	0	6	25	38	31	2	3.94	

Top Line: Region 3

Bottom Line: Best Practice

Problems

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Resource Agencies Rating Processes With Transportation Agencies
Region 3

	Sample Size	Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied					Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5	2006	2003
1 Overall, how satisfied were you with the agency's performance on this project?	49	4	8	20	47	20	3.71	4.00

	Sample Size	2006	Sample Size	2003
		% Yes		% Yes
2 Did you experience any problems during the project?	47	55	32	22

At what stage of the process did the problem or problems occur? (Items 3A through 3H show actual numbers, not percentages.)

	2006	2003
	Yes	Yes
3A Early project planning or scoping	11	1
3B Defining purpose and need	8	1
3C Information or data collection	13	2
3D Development and analysis of alternatives	11	5
3E Analysis of impacts	11	2
3F Selection of preferred alternative	15	3
3G Commitment to mitigation measures	7	2
3H Finalizing documents or response to comments	16	4

	Sample Size	% Stayed		
		% Gotten Worse	The Same	% Improved
12 Over the past three years, has your agency's overall relationship with the transportation agency improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse?	48	8	42	50

	Sample Size	Poor Excellent					Mean Scores	
		% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5	2006	2003
13 In general, how would you rate the overall relationship between your agency and the transportation agency?	49	2	4	24	41	29	3.90	3.97

Top Line: Region 3