

State Management Review Survey Results

**MTAP Steering Committee Meeting
July 12, 2022**

David Schilling
Division Chief, Performance Analysis and Quality Assurance
Office of Program Oversight
Office of Transit Safety and Oversight
Federal Transit Administration



Agenda

- Survey Overview
- Survey Results
- Next Steps



MTAP State DOT Survey Overview

- FTA partnered with MTAP in 2019 to develop a State Management Review (SMR) evaluation (survey)
- The goal of the survey is to better understand and improve oversight review experiences among State DOTs
- Survey includes 46 background, pre-site visit, site visit, and post-site visit questions
- As of April 2022, 34 State DOTs completed surveys
- Responses associated with 2018-2021 SMRs
- Survey located on the AASHTO/MTAP website at:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/FTAreviewsurvey>



MTAP State DOT Survey

Background

Is there significant staff turnover at the non-executive level of my agency of the past three years?

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	13	35%
Agree	11	30%
Neither Agree or Disagree	6	16%
Disagree	6	16%
Strongly Disagree	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

SMR Workshop

The SMR Workshop was helpful for my agency to prepare for the review?

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21	57%
Agree	4	11%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	10	27%
Total	37	100%



MTAP State DOT Survey

Pre-Site Visit

Did FTA regional staff provide assistance before the site visit?

	# of Responses	Percentage
Yes	18	49%
No	19	51%
Total	37	100%

Did you request FTA assistance before visit?

	# of Responses	Percentage
Yes	2	5%
No	17	46%
N/A	18	49%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Pre-Site Visit

The comprehensive review guide was helpful for my agency to prepare for the review.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	30%
Agree	23	62%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	8%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Total	37	100

MTAP State DOT Survey

Site Visit

Deficiencies and corrective actions were clearly communicated and explained by contractor.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	30%
Agree	17	46%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	8%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	3	8%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Site Visit

The technical assistance provided by the contractor team during the site visit was beneficial to my agency.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15	41%
Agree	13	35%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	16%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Site Visit

Overall, we feel that FTA made a fair assessment of our agency.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15	41%
Agree	16	43%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	11%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Site Visit

FTA regional staff provided an adequate level of assistance and guidance to help close findings.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	8	22%
Agree	7	19%
Neither Agree or Disagree	16	43%
Disagree	4	11%
Strongly Disagree	1	3%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Post-Site Visit

The time frame allotted to complete each corrective action was adequate.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	30%
Agree	16	43%
Neither Agree or Disagree	3	8%
Disagree	1	3%
Strongly Disagree	1	3%
N/A	5	14%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

The contractor team was knowledgeable about the subject matter of the review.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21	57%
Agree	13	35%
Neither Agree or Disagree	1	3%
Disagree	1	3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

The contractor team was professional and responsive throughout the course of review.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	7	19%
Agree	22	59%
Neither Agree or Disagree	4	11%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

The contractor team was knowledgeable regarding my agency's procedures and general operations.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	7	19%
Agree	22	59%
Neither Agree or Disagree	4	11%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

The contractor team was knowledgeable regarding regulatory and statutory requirements affecting my agency.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	15	41%
Agree	19	51%
Neither Agree or Disagree	0	0%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

The contractor team clearly communicated all activities and expectations to my agency throughout the review process.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18	49%
Agree	11	30%
Neither Agree or Disagree	5	14%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	1	3%
Total	37	100%

MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

There was an appropriate level of FTA regional staff involvement throughout the review.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11	30%
Agree	13	35%
Neither Agree or Disagree	5	14%
Disagree	6	16%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
N/A	2	5%
Total	37	100%



MTAP State DOT Survey

Overall Feedback

After participating in this review, my agency better understands FTA requirements and how to comply with them.

	# of Responses	Percentage
Strongly Agree	10	27%
Agree	19	51%
Neither Agree or Disagree	7	19%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Total	36	97%

MTAP State DOT Survey – General Summary

- FTA's SMR resources are useful
- Turnover is common at State DOTs
- Contractor preparation, communication and feedback is generally good with few hiccups
- State DOTs benefit from participating in a SMR
- FTA Regional Staff participation could be better
- State DOTs want more technical assistance support during SMR from contractors and FTA staff



MTAP State DOT Survey – Comments/Recommendations

Pre-Site Visit

- Need more time for RIR response, not providing leads to not sending complete and final information
- Contractors were not prepared or did enough research of State DOTs beforehand
- Virtual workshops did not allow for personal interaction of questions, during breaks, etc.
- States received late agenda packages which led to schedule conflicts with staff

MTAP State DOT Survey – Comments/Recommendations

Pre-Site Visit (cont.)

- FTA needs to have a more hands-on approach with State DOTs to include more technical assistance beforehand and longer site visits
- SMR only contractor manual more beneficial to States



MTAP State DOT Survey – Comments/Recommendations

Site Visit

- Not enough technical assistance provided from FTA and/or contractor
- Lack of communication/clarify of why state received a finding
- Contractors need to provide more clarity of who should attend meetings during site visit
- For the virtual reviews, FTA staff did not participate in all the calls since they were spread out
- Disagreement between FTA and the Contractor



MTAP State DOT Survey – Comments/Recommendations

Overall

- FTA should differentiate between major vs minor findings (not all findings are the same)
- Disagreement between FTA and the Contractor
- Need for contractors to share best practices from other State DOTs



Next Steps

- Continue to gather feedback from the survey and make updates to SMR program based on responses and comments
- Continue to share information with State DOTs; focus on changes implemented based on results



Questions

David Schilling

Division Chief, Performance Analysis and Quality Assurance

Office of Program Oversight

David.Schilling@dot.gov

202-366-4442





[TRANSIT.DOT.GOV](https://www.transit.dot.gov)