

Federal Highway Administration

Region 2

NEPA Reviewer

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource 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 Transportation Agencies. Respondents were asked to rate a recent project with a Resource agency, so the data reflect the views of Transportation agencies toward those projects with Resource 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 Transportation 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.


Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies

Region 2


Index Comparison

- Total n: 38
- Region: Region 2




Region Comparison - % Top Two Box


Relationship




Communication




Timeliness



Performance



General




Relationship

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies

Region 2



		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.	37	3	14	8	43	32		3.89	4.29
		51	0	4	6	43	47	5	4.33	
6B	The resource agency provided my agency with the materials, information, or documentation that we needed.	35	0	9	29	43	20		3.74	3.52
		51	4	6	12	39	39	5	4.04	
6D	The resource agency wanted to play an active role in the process.	35	0	6	23	20	51		4.17	3.46
		66	0	3	15	35	47	4	4.26	
6E	My agency's opinions seemed to count in the permitting process.	36	3	3	39	25	31		3.78	3.63
		48	2	8	8	33	48	5	4.17	
6F	The resource agency felt mission of project was important.	32	0	3	31	34	31		3.94	3.86
		48	6	4	10	42	38	5	4.00	
6G	The resource agency helped to move this project forward.	38	11	11	24	34	21		3.45	3.26
		50	8	6	10	38	38	5	3.92	
6H	The resource agency made efforts to improve the process during this project.	31	3	23	29	26	19		3.35	2.58
		54	7	17	19	35	22	6	3.48	

Top Line: Region 2


Bottom Line: Best Practice

Communication

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies

Region 2



		Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
			% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
7B	Responded in a timely way to our requests.	38	11	13	24	32	21		3.39	3.14
		51	8	4	14	39	35	5	3.90	
7C	Invited our participation in key meetings.	20	10	10	30	20	30		3.50	2.89
		27	4	7	19	22	48	8	4.04	
7D	Kept us informed of their progress.	36	17	8	28	39	8		3.14	2.74
		47	2	6	38	19	34	8	3.77	
7E	Was open and honest with us.	36	3	3	17	42	36		4.06	3.57
		49	0	2	8	39	51	5	4.39	
7F	Was open to our suggestions or alternatives.	34	0	18	21	35	26		3.71	3.65
		46	4	7	11	33	46	5	4.09	
7G	Gave reasonable suggestions or alternatives.	32	9	9	41	16	25		3.38	3.09
		46	2	13	15	43	26	5	3.78	
7H	Gave clear explanations if they did not agree with our recommendations.	30	7	10	30	40	13		3.43	3.82
		39	0	8	13	56	23	5	3.95	
7I	Was willing to compromise.	31	3	23	39	29	6		3.13	3.20
		38	5	5	13	50	26	5	3.87	
7J	Had adequate participation at key meetings.	33	6	3	21	36	33		3.88	2.89
		43	2	7	12	30	49	5	4.16	
7K	Overall, there was a sufficient level of communication between the two agencies on this project.	38	3	8	24	42	24		3.76	3.70
		51	2	4	12	37	45	5	4.20	

Top Line: Region 2



Bottom Line: Best Practice

Timeliness

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies

Region 2



		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.	33	12	9	30	27	21		3.36	3.33
		46	2	11	11	37	39	5	4.00	
8B	Gave your agency enough time to accomplish tasks.	32	0	3	28	41	28		3.94	3.82
		62	0	5	15	42	39	4	4.15	
8C	The entire process took a reasonable amount of time.	37	8	24	16	32	19		3.30	3.39
		48	6	4	15	38	38	5	3.96	
8D	The process was the shortest it could have been without compromising NEPA.	35	17	17	23	20	23		3.14	NA
		49	8	8	22	29	33	5	3.69	

Top Line: Region 2



Bottom Line: Best Practice

Performance

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies

Region 2



		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	33	0	3	36	42	18		3.76	3.32
		49	0	2	20	53	24	5	4.00	
9B	The completeness of information they provided	33	0	0	30	52	18		3.88	3.61
		48	0	2	19	48	31	5	4.08	
9F	The level of resources they devoted to this project	33	9	15	24	39	12		3.30	3.09
		45	2	9	22	36	31	5	3.84	
9G	The range of reasonable alternatives they suggested for this project	26	0	12	42	31	15		3.50	3.07
		32	3	3	31	44	19	5	3.72	
9H	Their willingness to consider a range of mitigation measures	33	0	9	36	36	18		3.64	3.37
		40	3	3	15	45	35	5	4.08	



Top Line: Region 2

Bottom Line: Best Practice

General

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies
Region 2



		Sample Size	Strongly Disagree . . . Strongly Agree					Best Practice Region	Mean Scores	
			% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	% 5		2006	2003
11A	Understands your agency's mission.	38	3	13	24	32	29		3.71	3.48
		49	2	6	12	37	43	5	4.12	
11B	Cares about your agency's mission.	36	3	25	25	28	19		3.36	3.25
		48	4	10	17	46	23	5	3.73	
11C	Is committed to doing quality work.	37	0	5	11	35	49		4.27	4.05
		48	0	0	4	42	54	5	4.50	
11D	Has competent staff.	37	5	0	14	46	35		4.05	3.92
		50	0	4	8	48	40	5	4.24	
11E	There is a sufficient level of trust between your two agencies.	37	3	14	32	35	16		3.49	3.43
		50	2	4	26	40	28	5	3.88	
11F	Is committed to making the environmental review process run efficiently.	36	6	19	31	28	17		3.31	3.04
		49	8	4	18	39	31	5	3.80	
11G	Is willing to compromise.	34	0	18	32	44	6		3.38	3.21
		45	4	4	31	38	22	5	3.69	
11H	There is a sufficient level of communication between your two agencies.	37	5	11	32	46	5		3.35	3.25
		63	0	6	25	46	22	4	3.84	
11J	Is committed to transportation improvements.	33	3	27	30	21	18		3.24	3.08
		60	3	17	30	38	12	6	3.38	

Top Line: Region 2

Bottom Line: Best Practice

Problems

Federal Highway Administration

FHWA Survey of Transportation Agencies Rating Processes With Resource Agencies
Region 2

	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?	38	3	11	21	45	21	3.71	3.46

	Sample Size	2006 % Yes	Sample Size	2003 % Yes
2 Did you experience any problems during the project?	38	37	24	50

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

	2006 Yes	2003 Yes
3A Early project planning or scoping	2	3
3B Defining purpose and need	3	4
3C Information or data collection	5	2
3D Development and analysis of alternatives	4	4
3E Analysis of impacts	7	7
3F Selection of preferred alternative	5	6
3G Commitment to mitigation measures	5	4
3H Finalizing documents or response to comments	7	7

	Sample Size	% Stayed		
		% Gotten Worse	The Same	% Improved
12 Over the past three years, has your agency's overall relationship with the resource agency improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse?	37	8	62	30

	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 resource agency?	38	0	11	37	42	11	3.53	3.29

Top Line: Region 2