

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW Summary FY07

Background

In April 2003 the General Accounting Office (now the General Accountability Office) issued a report to Congress titled “Better Guidance Could Improve Oversight of State Highway Safety Programs” (GAO-03-474). In response, NHTSA’s Regional Operations and Program Delivery (ROPD) office developed an oversight process that was given to Regional Administrators in April 2004. One component of the process was the Special Management Reviews (SMRs). These reviews are designed to be conducted in States that demonstrate consistent performance that is worse than the national average performance, and progress that is less than half of that recorded by the Nation as a whole. An SMR is one part of the ROPD State Highway Safety Programs oversight quality assurance process.

In 2005, Congress enacted Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) that requires the Secretary shall (1) conduct a program improvement review of a highway safety program that does not make substantial progress over a three-year period in meeting its priority program goals and (2) provide technical assistance and safety program requirements to be incorporated in the State highway safety program for any goal not achieved. Additionally, the Secretary shall make publically available on the Web site (or successor electronic facility) the Administration’s Summary Report of findings from management reviews and improvement plans

Currently, SMRs are conducted in NHTSA’s two high-priority areas, occupant protection and impaired driving. Each review looks at management and operational practices and examines six critical areas of State performance: including leadership, project issues, spending, legislation, State priorities and evaluation as it relates to the specified program area. A Performance Enhancement Plan (PEP), developed collaboratively with the State, lists strategies to be used to implement recommendations that result from the SMR.

Summary

During FY2007, the third year in which SMRs were conducted, 16 States were triggered for an SMR, 10 for occupant protection and 6 for impaired driving. (One State was recommended for both an occupant protection and impaired driving SMR). Of the States identified, 5 States were exempted from having occupant protection SMRs and 2 States were exempted from having impaired driving SMRs. (One State was exempted from both SMRs). Exemptions were based on the fact that an SMR or a combined SMR/Assessment or assessment had been conducted within the previous three years. Of the remaining special management reviews, 4 were for impaired driving and 5 were for occupant protection. Appendix A has a listing of FY 2007 Special Management Review States.

As in previous years, the number and type of specific strengths, deficiencies, and recommendations varied considerably from State to State. There were a total of 114 strengths, 102 deficiencies, and 146 recommendations. As in FY 2006, the highest number of strengths were in leadership and the highest number of deficiencies and recommendations were in the

project area. It is important to note that there were factors that caused each of the listed States to be triggered for a SMR, and there were a number of strengths in place, particularly in the area of leadership. Summaries for each category are depicted in tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1. Summary of Strengths

	Occupant Protection (5 States)	Impaired Driving (4 States)	Total
Leadership	20	15	35
Project	14	17	31
Legislation	9	5	14
Priorities	7	10	17
Spending	6	5	11
Evaluation	5	1	6
TOTAL	61	53	114

Table 2. Summary of Deficiencies

	Occupant Protection (5 States)	Impaired Driving (4 States)	Total
Leadership	10	10	20
Project	19	24	43
Legislation	11	6	17
Priorities	3	4	7
Spending	3	5	8
Evaluation	4	3	7
TOTAL	50	52	102

Table 3. Summary of Recommendations

	Occupant Protection (5 States)	Impaired Driving (4 States)	Total
Leadership	13	14	27
Project	26	30	56
Legislation	14	5	19
Priorities	4	7	11
Spending	10	11	21
Evaluation	6	6	12
TOTAL	73	73	146

Highlights of Occupant Protection Deficiencies and Recommendations

As in FY2006, the majority of deficiencies and resulting recommendations were in the leadership, project, and legislative areas, with highest percentage (36% of deficiencies and 38% of recommendations) being in the project area. In the leadership area it was noted there was lack of support for legislation, lack of a statewide coalition or taskforce to provide direction, and lack of cohesion and Statewide planning. In 2 States there were references to limited minority outreach, specifically to Hispanic and America Indian populations, and in 1 State a need for better problem identification of high-risk populations. It was noted in the project area that there was a need to increase and better use law enforcement liaisons (LELs) and make improvements to earned and paid media plans. Two occupant protection assessments were recommended.

Highlights of Impaired Driving Deficiencies and Recommendations

Similar to the occupant protection SMRs, the highest percentage of impaired driving deficiencies were in leadership, project, and legislative areas. However, in contrast there were more recommendations in the spending area than the legislative area. Better statewide coordination, either through a statewide task force or advisory board, full-time impaired driving coordinator, and/or strategic plan were recurrent themes. Use of resources such as LELs and traffic safety resource prosecutors along with development of DWI courts were recommended. Increased strategic use of financial resources through improvements to problem identification and the planning processes were also suggested. Recommendations were made for two impaired driving and one Standard Field Sobriety Testing assessments.

Evaluations

States have the opportunity to express their thoughts about the SMR process by completing an evaluation form after the review. For FY 2007, 2 States out of 9 returned the SMR evaluation forms.

Examples of topics covered under each area are listed below.

Leadership Issues

Dedicated position for program area leadership
Statewide task force
High visibility enforcement campaign
Governor's support
Governor's representative support
Key law enforcement support
Outreach to diverse populations
Utilization of partners

Project Issues

Utilization of earned media
Use of paid media and development of media plans
Project funding
Problem identification
Utilization of LEL's and LEL networks
Types of funded projects

Spending Issues

Funding of seat belt incentive programs
Sources of seat belt funding
Percentage of federal funding dedicated to increasing seat belt use
Percentage of funds used for paid media

Legislative Issues

Impediments to legislative improvements
Efforts underway to promote legislative improvements
Utilization of partners for legislative improvements

State's Priorities

Are State's goals in alignment with problem identification
Ranking system for projects
Are approved surveys used
Is data consistent with MMUCC guidelines

Evaluation Issues

What program evaluation is being conducted
Does the State utilize NHTSA resources for evaluation
Does the state have a staff person who can conduct program evaluation
Has there been an evaluation of incentive programs

FY 2007
States Identified for Special Management Reviews
Listed by Region.

Region	State	Program Area	Status	Reason for Exemption
1	Rhode Island	OP	conducted	
2	None			
3	None			
4	Florida	ID	conducted	
	South Carolina	OP	exempt	SMR 2005
	Kentucky	OP	exempt	Assessment 2005
	Alabama	ID	exempt	SMR 2006
5	Wisconsin	ID	conducted	
6	Louisiana	OP	conducted	
7	Missouri	ID	conducted	
	Missouri	OP	conducted	
	Nebraska	OP	conducted	
8	Montana	OP	exempt	SMR/Assessment 2006
	South Dakota	OP	conducted	
	Colorado	OP	exempt	Assessment 2006
	Wyoming	OP	exempt	SMR/Assessment 2006
	Wyoming	ID	exempt	SMR 2005
9	Hawaii	ID	conducted	
10	None			