

ARRA Program Post Evaluation – Survey Considerations

Targeted audiences:

1. Headquarters ODOT staff (OPL, Geo-Environmental Section, Statewide STIP Coordinators, OPO-Agreements, Traffic-Roadway Section, Pavement Section)
2. Regional ODOT staff (Local Agency Liaisons, Environmental Coordinators, Area Managers, Agreement Writers, STIP Coordinators)
3. Other agency staff (FHWA, OLPC, AOC, LOC, Metro, MPO's)
4. City and County staff (Managers, Public Works Directors, Engineers)
5. Consultants

Survey orientation – purpose:

All local agency ARRA-funded projects have been successfully processed and taken to bid. The success of the 2009 ARRA Program may be attributed to the focused and collaborative efforts of FHWA, ODOT headquarters and regional staff, local agencies, and consultants.

This survey is intended to review specific processes developed by ODOT to respond to the challenges and time constraints imposed by the 2009 ARRA Program. Survey results will be used to develop and/or refine these processes in anticipation of a second round of ARRA funding.

We appreciate your willingness to complete this survey, and thank you for your time.

Questions:

1. In general, how would you rate the ODOT Local Government Section's response to ARRA during the past year? (excellent, good, fair, poor – explain what worked and what did not)
2. How much did the ARRA Program create project development delays related to the processing of other Federal-aid projects within your jurisdiction? (1-5 rating, with 5 representing significant disruption)
3. Would you say that the ODOT Local Program (including regional ODOT staff) was adequately staffed to effectively respond to the requirements imposed by ARRA?

4. In your opinion, was the ARRA statewide transportation funding distribution methodology well-defined, reasonable, and clearly communicated?
5. How effective was the ARRA Program in creating and/or retaining jobs throughout Oregon? (very effective, somewhat effective, somewhat ineffective, very ineffective)
6. Did the ARRA Program allow you to fund your transportation priorities?
7. Should the funding distribution methodology be changed in the event that ARRA2 is passed by Congress? (please explain how)
8. Do you feel you received adequate support from the Local Government Section in responding to the time constraints imposed by ARRA?
9. How would you rate the IGA process? (excellent, good, fair, poor – explain what worked and what did not)
10. Should the IGA process be changed in the event that ARRA2 is passed by Congress? (please explain how)
11. How would you rate the consultant selection process? (excellent, good, fair, poor – explain what worked and what did not)
12. Should the consultant selection process be changed in the event that ARRA2 is passed by Congress? (please explain how)
13. Did ODOT's batching of similar projects under a single environmental clearance package (i.e., IR paving with attached guidelines; light replacements and signal upgrades) contribute to a streamlined project development process?
14. Did the Local Government Section's in-house review of all PS&E packets result in time and cost savings during project development?
15. If you are a consultant, how would you rate the support you received from ODOT in responding to ARRA requirements?
16. How would you rate the effectiveness of the project application process?
17. How would rate the effectiveness of the "contingency project" process developed in response to low bids?

18. If Congress passes ARRA2, which of the following aspects of project delivery should be managed differently? (same – different)

Initial notification (local agency outreach process)

Project selection - award

Prospectus preparation

IGA preparation

Project amendments (scope, agreement, funding)

Environmental clearance process (including Part 3 preparation)

Consultant selection – management

Consultant Statement of Work (SOW) preparation

PS&E development – review

DRAFT