

**OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS:
Social Service Provider Survey**

FINAL REPORT

SPR 395

by

Northwest Research Group, Inc.
Bellevue, WA 98004

for

Oregon Department of Transportation
Research Group
200 Hawthorne SE, Suite B-240
Salem, OR 97301-5192

and

Federal Highway Administration
Washington, D.C. 20590

June 1999

1. Report No. FHWA-OR-RD-99-27	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Oregon's Mobility Needs: Social Service Provider Survey Final Report		5. Report Date June 1999	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Northwest Research Group		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Northwest Research Group, Inc. 400 108th Ave NE Suite 200 Bellevue, WA 98004		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. SPR 395	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Oregon Department of Transportation Research Group 200 Hawthorne Avenue SE Suite B-240 Salem, OR 97301-5192 Federal Highway Administration and Washington, D.C. 20590		13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract <p>In 1998, the Oregon Department of Transportation undertook the Social Services Provider Survey as part of an investigation of the transportation needs of mobility impaired individuals in Oregon. This survey was designed to gain information about the transportation needs of the low income, elderly and disabled from the perspective of organizations who work closely with mobility impaired populations. It followed statewide surveys of transportation needs from the perspectives of the mobility impaired individuals and public transportation providers. Local offices providing state- or federally-supported social services were mailed a written survey. Over 400 agencies responded representing education, senior & disabled services, health, vocational rehabilitation, community colleges, mental health and others.</p> <p>The study found that nearly all agencies serve the mobility impaired, with approximately 40% of their clients having one or more mobility impairments. The findings showed that 75% of the agencies provide some type of transportation for their participants. Only 4% of the agencies charge for transportation. Funding comes from a wide variety of sources, some requiring specific limits on types of trips or groups of participants. Policy limits increase the travel limitations of these programs.</p> <p>Agencies rated public transportation's ability to provide trips. Nine of ten felt that their clients had additional transportation needs not currently met by public transportation. Over half estimated that an average of two or more additional trips per week was needed, with 18% noting the need for more than six additional trips. Social/recreational, work, personal business and shopping trips were the most difficult to obtain. More services, more hours and days of operation, and better connections with other services were key recommended improvements.</p> <p>Findings were consistent across the three surveys. Transportation needs for social service clients are similar to the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. Statewide, there is a need for more transportation services. Service improvements are needed, though specific improvements vary geographically.</p>			
17. Key Words Disability, public transit, human services, social services, transportation, needs assessment,		18. Distribution Statement Copies available from NTIS	
19. Security Classification (of this report) unclassified	20. Security Classification (of this page) unclassified	21. No. of Pages	22. Price


SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol	Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
<u>LENGTH</u>					<u>LENGTH</u>				
In	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm	mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
Ft	feet	0.305	meters	m	m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
Yd	yards	0.914	meters	m	m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
Mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km	km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
<u>AREA</u>					<u>AREA</u>				
in ²	square inches	645.2	millimeters squared	mm ²	mm ²	millimeters squared	0.0016	square inches	in ²
ft ²	square feet	0.093	meters squared	m ²	m ²	meters squared	10.764	square feet	ft ²
yd ²	square yards	0.836	meters squared	m ²	ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
Ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha	km ²	kilometers squared	0.386	square miles	mi ²
mi ²	square miles	2.59	kilometers squared	km ²	<u>VOLUME</u>				
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL	mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
Gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L	L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
ft ³	cubic feet	0.028	meters cubed	m ³	m ³	meters cubed	35.315	cubic feet	ft ³
yd ³	cubic yards	0.765	meters cubed	m ³	m ³	meters cubed	1.308	cubic yards	yd ³
<u>MASS</u>					<u>MASS</u>				
Oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g	g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
Lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg	kg	kilograms	2.205	pounds	lb
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams	Mg	Mg	megagrams	1.102	short tons (2000 lb)	T
<u>TEMPERATURE (exact)</u>					<u>TEMPERATURE (exact)</u>				
°F	Fahrenheit temperature	5(F-32)/9	Celsius temperature	°C	°C	Celsius temperature	1.8 + 32	Fahrenheit	°F

NOTE: Volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m³.



* SI is the symbol for the International System of Measurement

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the members of the ODOT Research Group for their advice and assistance in this research project. In particular, we are grateful to Joni E. Reid, project manager, and Alan R. Kirk for his assistance in the preparation and editing of this report. We also thank Jean Palmateer of ODOT's Public Transit Division for her work on this project .

Gratitude is also extended to the members of the Technical Advisory Committee for their advice and assistance throughout the project. Technical Advisory Committee members include:

Charlotte Duncan and Laurie Schwartz from the Oregon Developmental Disabilities Council
Nancy Thomas and Steve Kautz of Tri-Met Accessible Transportation Program
Terry Parker of Lane Council of Governments
Larry Daimler of the Office of Medical Assistance Programs, Dept. of Human Resources
Dale Shepardson of the Senior & Disabled Services Division, Dept. of Human Resources
Eugene Organ of the Oregon Disabilities Commission
Donna Wickman of Oregon Housing and Associated Services
Roger Harding of the Federal Highway Administration
Joni Reid of the ODOT Research Group
Mark Ford, who served as interim manager of the Public Transit Division during this project.

DISCLAIMER

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Oregon Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The State of Oregon and the United States Government assume no liability of its contents or use thereof.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are solely responsible for the facts and accuracy of the material presented. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Oregon Department of Transportation or the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The State of Oregon and the U.S. Government do not endorse products of manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear herein only because they are considered essential to the object of this document.

This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

**OREGON’S MOBILITY NEEDS:
SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	vii
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS	vii
CONCLUSIONS.....	xi
1.0 BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES	1
1.1 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
1.2 RESEARCH PROCEDURES	2
1.2.1 Questionnaire	2
1.2.2 Sampling Procedures.....	3
1.2.3 Geographic Distribution of Respondents	3
1.3 TRANSPORTATION DEFINITIONS.....	5
1.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORT FORMAT.....	5
2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	7
2.1 SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY PROFILE	7
2.1.1 Type of Agency	7
2.1.2 Services Provided.....	7
2.1.3 Population Served	8
2.1.4 Number of Individuals Accessing Services	9
2.2 EXTENT MOBILITY IMPAIRED POPULATION IS SERVED.....	9
2.2.1 Type of Mobility Impairments.....	9
2.2.2 Incidence of Mobility Impairment10	
2.3 TRANSPORTATION USED TO ACCESS SERVICES.....	11
2.3.1 Use of Public Transportation to Access Services	12
2.4 AGENCY PROVIDED TRANSPORTATION	13
2.4.1 Type of Transportation Provided.....	13
2.4.2 Cost to Participant.....	14
2.4.3 Funding Sources.....	15
2.4.4 Limitations	17
2.5 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION’S ABILITY TO MEET NEEDS	20
2.5.1 Transportation to Agency Services.....	20
2.5.2 Transportation for Non-agency Related Trips	22
2.6 UNMET TRANSPORTATION NEEDS.....	23
2.6.1 Number of Additional Trips Needed	23
2.6.2 Type of Trips Needed.....	24
2.7 IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS	25
2.8 SUPPORT FOR INCREASED FUNDING	27
3.0 CONCLUSIONS	29
4.0 REFERENCES.....	31

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
- APPENDIX B: ZIP CODES
- APPENDIX C: SAMPLE BANNER OUTPUT

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Geographic Distribution of Respondents	4
Table 1.2: Community Size	4
Table 2.1: Type of Services Provided.....	8
Table 2.2: Agencies Serving Participants with Mobility Impairments	10
Table 2.3: Type of Transportation Used to Access Service.....	11
Table 2.4: Transportation Provided Directly By Agency.....	13
Table 2.5: Source of Funding For Transportation	16
Table 2.6: Limitations on Types of Participants Receiving Transportation.....	18
Table 2.7: Limitations on Types of Trips Agencies Provide.....	19
Table 2.8: Restrictions on Transportation	20
Table 2.9: Why Trips Are Limited.....	21
Table 2.10: Service Improvement Ratings by Geographic Area.....	26

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Type of Agency.....	7
Figure 2.2: Agency Services by Age Group Served.....	8
Figure 2.3: Extent Mobility Impaired Population is Served.....	9
Figure 2.4: Percent of Clients With Mobility Impairments by Geographic Area and Community Size	11
Figure 2.5: Percent of Agencies' Clientele Who Use Public Transportation To Access Services	12
Figure 2.6: Percentage of Agencies Who Supply Transportation to Participants	13
Figure 2.7: Type of Trips Provided by Geographic Area.....	14
Figure 2.8: Agencies' Policy Towards Charging Participants For Transportation	15
Figure 2.9: Sources of Funding for Transportation.....	16
Figure 2.10: Transportation Limitations -- Specific Groups of Participants.....	17
Figure 2.11: Transportation Limitations -- Type of Trip	19
Figure 2.12: Ability of Public Transportation to Provide Trips to Agency Services	20
Figure 2.13: Ability of Public Transportation to Provide Trips Other than to Agency's Services.....	22
Figure 2.14: Additional Trips Needed.....	23
Figure 2.15: Types of Trips for Which Participants Have Difficulty Obtaining Transportation.....	24
Figure 2.16: Agency Perception of Community Support for Transportation Improvements	27

OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDER SURVEY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) undertook the Social Service Provider Survey as part of an investigation of the transportation needs of mobility impaired individuals in Oregon. This survey was designed to gain information about the transportation needs of the low income, elderly and disabled from the perspective of organizations who work closely with these mobility impaired populations. It followed a study of mobility needs from two other perspectives, as reported in “*OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: General Population Survey and Transportation Provider Survey,*” also conducted by ODOT.

The objectives of the Social Service Provider Study were to:

- 1) Determine the extent to which social service agencies serve the mobility impaired population.
- 2) Determine the type of mobility impairments present in populations served by social service agencies.
- 3) Identify the extent to which social service agencies address the problem of mobility impairment by providing transportation services to their clientele.
- 4) Assess, in the opinion of social service agencies, the effectiveness of current transportation systems in serving the needs of the mobility impaired population.

To accomplish these objectives, social service agencies were interviewed via written questionnaire about the transportation needs of the populations they serve. Over 400 agencies from across the state completed the questionnaire, and their responses are summarized in this report.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS

Nearly all responding social service agencies (94%) serve people who have mobility limitations.

- About three out of four (76%) are public agencies. Public agencies are somewhat more likely than private agencies to serve people with mobility limitations.
- Over one third of the agencies (35%) list transportation as one of the primary social services they provide.

On average, agencies estimate that 41 percent of the individuals they serve have one or more of these mobility impairments. Table ES.1 shows the percentage of agencies which have participants with various types of mobility impairments.

**Table ES.1: Agencies Serving Participants with Mobility Impairments
(Base = Agencies Who Serve Individuals With Mobility Impairments)**

Mobility Impairment	% of Agencies Providing Services			
	Total*	Large / Medium*	Small Town*	Rural Area*
Physical	88%	92%	85%	88%
Cognitive	75	83	67	80
Cannot Afford Motor Vehicle	66	65	67	72
Lack of Motor Vehicle (Reasons Other Than Income)	60	59	62	64
Remote Location	59	49	66	72
Vision	59	64	53	64
Age-related	53	48	52	80
Mental / Emotional / Psychiatric	4	3	4	8

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple responses allowed

Bold faced type indicates significantly higher (at the 95% confidence level) mean scores.

- While agencies in different areas of the state are equally likely to serve clients with mobility impairments, agencies in urban areas estimate they have a higher proportion of clients with mobility impairments than do those in rural areas.
- The incidence of mobility impairment indicated by the General Population Survey is 11% statewide. The estimate by social service agencies that 41% of their clients have mobility impairments supports the idea that disadvantages such as poverty, unemployment, physical disabilities or health problems is often accompanied by a lack of mobility.

Overall, more than three out of four agencies (77%) report that they have clients who use public transportation (fixed route or Dial-A-Ride) to access their offices or services. More than three out of five agencies (62%) report that they have clientele who use fixed route bus service; 52 percent of the agencies report that Dial-A-Ride transportation is used by some clients to access services.

Social service agencies statewide estimate that 26 percent of the individuals they serve use public transportation (either fixed route or Dial-A-Ride services) to access the agencies' offices or services. However, when agencies located in areas without public transportation services are removed, this figure increases to 31 percent.

- This rate is much higher than the rate of public transportation use by the general public – 22% of those in areas with transportation services use public transportation (*Fleishman-Hillard 1998*).
- This figure is fairly consistent with the usage of public transportation by mobility impaired individuals, as shown in the General Population Survey: 35 percent of all mobility impaired individuals who have public transportation use it regularly (at least once a week), and another 33 percent use it irregularly (less than once a week). (*Northwest Research Group 1998*). The findings of the Social Service Provider Survey

are not directly comparable, however, because they show what proportion of all clients use public transportation, not what portion of mobility impaired clients use public transportation.

Three out of four agencies (75%) supply some type of transportation to their clientele.

- Agencies provide the most trips by supplying participants with tickets or scrip for use on public transportation. Only 4 percent of agencies charge participants for their transportation services.
- Agencies that provide transportation assistance usually identify public funding sources for providing transportation -- 75 percent mention State funds, and 64 percent mention Federal funds. Agencies report that they provide transportation assistance through such programs as Medicaid, Vocational Rehabilitation, Temporary Aid to Needy Families, Job Opportunities & Basic Skills (JOBS), Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Special Transportation Fund, and through state and local general funds.

The majority of agencies (69%) limit the transportation that they provide to both specific groups of participants and specific types of trips. Only 5 percent of agencies that supply transportation place no restrictions on who can use the services or how the services can be used. Over half of the restrictions are limits placed by the funding source, about 4 of 10 agencies also have their own policies limiting eligible travelers or trips.

Overall, social service agencies are mixed in their opinions about public transportation's ability to provide trips for their clients when and where they need them

- Forty-four percent of agencies believe that their clients get most or all of the transportation services they need, to travel to agency services.
- Thirty-five percent believe that their clients get most or all of the services they need, to travel to places other than the agency.
- As might be expected, in urban areas the public transportation system's ability to meet clients' needs is rated higher than in rural areas.

Agencies believe the primary reasons why travel to their offices or services via public transportation may be limited include: participants live too far away from services, there is no existing service, public transportation does not run during the hours when rides are needed, and accessing service is too difficult (see Figure ES.1). Moreover, one out of three agencies report that travel to their services is limited because their participants do not know how to use the services. Educating agency staff and clients on how to use public transportation may help meet some of their needs.




Figure ES.1: Why Agencies Believe Public Transportation for Clients is Limited
(Base = All Responding Agencies)

Nine out of ten agencies (92%) believe that there is at least some unmet demand for transportation among their clientele, reporting that each participant would require, on average, one or more additional trips per week in order to meet their needs.

- Over half (53%) report that their participants would require, on average, two or more additional trips per week in order to meet their needs.
- Nearly one in five (18%) report that their participants need more than five additional trips per week.
- Agencies report that transportation for social or recreational events, work, personal business and shopping are the types of trips most difficult for their clients to obtain.
- Over one half (57%) of the agencies think that their community would support an increase in taxes to fund improvements in public transportation for seniors and people with disabilities.
- These findings are consistent with the General Population Survey.

Agencies were asked how important they feel twenty public transportation improvements are for seniors and people with disabilities in their community. The improvements that ranked highest include:

- transportation that is easier to use for seniors or people with disabilities;
- longer hours of operation;
- greater number of door-to-door rides;
- better connections with neighboring transit services; and
- more days of operation.

The ranking of specific improvements varies geographically in the state. These findings are consistent with those of the Transportation Provider Survey.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this survey are consistent with those of the General Population Survey and the Transportation Provider Survey on the needs of mobility impaired individuals. Social service agencies recognize that mobility impairment affects a significant share of the people they serve, and they devote resources to address this need. The following conclusions are drawn from this survey:

- Public transportation is an important mode of transportation for many clients of social service providers. Public transportation is utilized by social service agency participants at rates higher than the general population, but consistent with usage by senior citizens and persons with disabilities.
- Social service agencies statewide see a need for increased transportation services for mobility impaired populations, particularly to meet travel needs to work. The median number of additional trips per client is estimated to be 2.44 trips per week.
- In the view of social service agencies, service improvements for existing transportation systems are needed, although the specific type of improvement varies by geographic area.

This study provides an important source of information when examining the transportation needs of the mobility impaired population. Results presented here are from the perspective of those who work closely with the mobility impaired population. However, they should not be examined alone, but rather with this study's companion report – *OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: General Population Survey and Transportation Provider Survey*. Together, these two reports provide a full range of perspectives on the transportation needs of the mobility impaired, including the voice of the transportation provider, the social service provider, and the mobility impaired individuals themselves.

The findings of this survey and of the two earlier surveys in the Mobility Needs Study will be useful for planners, policy makers and transportation providers across the state. The findings will be used by the participants in Oregon's State Agency Transportation Coordination Project, and will be shared with social service agencies and transportation providers. Future work will include additional analysis of the data collected in the surveys to determine the extent of the need and alternative responses for consideration.

Recommendations for future work include performing additional analysis to determine the extent of the need and alternative responses for consideration. The Department of Transportation and Department of Human Resources should consider similar survey efforts in the future, using this study as a baseline for measuring improvements in service coverage and quality.

1.0 BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES

1.1 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) undertook the Social Service Provider Survey as part of an investigation of the transportation needs of low-income, elderly and disabled individuals in Oregon. This study was designed to gain information about the transportation needs of the mobility impaired, from the perspective of organizations who work closely with these populations providing services such as: job placement, education or training, life skills development and other social services.

This research effort represents the third phase of an investigation into the needs of the mobility impaired population. The first two phases consisted of a General Population Survey of over 500 mobility impaired individuals and a survey of over 100 transportation providers:

- 1) General Population Survey** – To assess the needs of mobility impaired individuals, telephone interviews were conducted with a random sample of over 8,500 Oregon households, asking several questions to screen for persons with mobility impairments. Those with mobility impairments could be defined as persons with difficulty transporting themselves without the use of special equipment or outside assistance. Other questions were used to determine if the mobility impairments were related to physical, cognitive or psychiatric impairment or because of age (60 years or older). The screening survey for incidence of mobility impairment found 11% of households had one or more members with transportation difficulties, with 8% due to a disability or age. In-depth interviews were conducted with those with mobility impairments due to disability or age.
- 2) Transportation Provider Survey** – This survey gauged the ability of existing publicly-supported transportation services to meet the needs of the mobility impaired population.

The results of these two surveys were published in "OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: General Population Survey and Transportation Provider Survey," available from the ODOT Research Group. (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).

This third phase of the study was developed in consultation with the staff and participants in the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project, spearheaded by the Governor's office and the Public Transit Division. Participants in the coordination project, from state and local agencies who fund, provide or use transportation services, are working to maximize independence and productivity by providing people in Oregon with universal access to coordinated transportation services (*Oregon Department of Transportation 1999*). They are investigating different coordination opportunities and will develop recommendations for policy and program changes

to increase transportation options. The three surveys of the Mobility Needs Study will provide background and information for this work.

The Social Service Provider Survey was developed to answer questions about how the mobility impaired populations overlap with the client groups served by social service agencies. The objectives of the Social Service Provider Study were to:

- 1) Determine the extent to which social service agencies serve the mobility impaired population.
- 2) Determine the type of mobility impairments present in populations served by social service agencies.
- 3) Identify the extent to which social service agencies address the problem of mobility impairment by providing transportation services to their clientele.
- 4) Assess, in the opinion of social service agencies, the effectiveness of current transportation systems in serving the needs of the mobility impaired population.

1.2 RESEARCH PROCEDURES

1.2.1 Questionnaire

The social service provider questionnaire contained 54 questions (a copy is included in Appendix A). The questionnaire was developed with the input of the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project staff and included the following topics:

- Description of the agency and the population that the agency serves.
- Type of transportation used by clients to access services.
- Type of transportation provided by the agency to the individuals it serves.
- Perceptions of latent demand.
- Importance of service improvements and support for sources of funding to make these improvements and address the unmet demand.

The questionnaire used a variety of question formats, including closed single- and multiple-response questions for all categorical data. All attitudinal and evaluation questions used scaled response formats. Scales were typically five points in length. An open-ended question was provided, allowing respondents to record additional comments.

1.2.2 Sampling Procedures

The Oregon Department of Transportation developed a database of 794 social service providers throughout the state, using lists of agencies from the following:

- Oregon Youth Authority
- Department of Education
- Community Colleges/JTPA
- Health Division
- Senior & Disabled Services
- Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Services
- Services to Children and Families
- Commission for the Blind
- Disabilities Commission
- Dept. of Human Resources Volunteer Program
- Dept. of Human Resources Community Partnership office
- Vocational Rehabilitation

This list was developed with the participants in the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project. Representatives were asked to provide names and addresses of local contacts for agency services, including local offices, subcontractors and others who provide services.

The questionnaire was mailed to all agencies in the database. A cover letter explained the nature and importance of the questionnaire. If the questionnaire was not returned via mail within two weeks, a follow up telephone call was made to reiterate the importance of the study and urge the respondent to participate.

After preliminary analysis of the provider surveys, follow-up telephone calls were made to respondents as necessary to clarify ambiguities in the data and obtain further insight into the information provided by the written survey.

A total of 427 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 54 percent. Due to inconsistencies in responses, 24 surveys were not included in final analysis. The final database consisted of 403 completed questionnaires. Thus the final response rate for the Social Service Provider Survey was 51 percent.

1.2.3 Geographic Distribution of Respondents

All survey respondents were postcoded into one of four geographic areas based on the county in which the agency was located. The geographic areas were defined as follows:

- Portland Metro Area – Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties.
- Northwestern Oregon – Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook, Yamhill, Polk, Marion, Lincoln, Benton, Linn, and Lane Counties.

- Southwestern Oregon – Douglas, Coos, Curry, Josephine, and Jackson Counties.
- Eastern Oregon – Hood River, Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Jefferson, Crook, Deschutes, Klamath, Lake, Morrow, Wheeler, Umatilla, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Baker, Union, and Wallowa Counties.

The resulting number of agencies in each geographic area is summarized in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Geographic Distribution of Respondents (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Geographic Area	Number of Agencies
Portland Metro Area	108
Northwestern Oregon	135
Southwestern Oregon	47
Eastern Oregon	93
Statewide or regional*	20
Total	403

*Provided zip code did not coincide with area served.

All survey respondents were also postcoded into one of four groups based on the estimated 1997 population of the city or town in which the agency was located (*Center for Population Research and Census 1998*). That is, responding agencies were divided into strata based on population counts of the city or town in which the agency resides. Zip codes defined these areas. (A list of the zip codes in each population category is included in Appendix B.) The population categories were defined as follows:

- Large City – Portland.
- Medium City – cities with a population greater than 50,000, excluding Portland.
- Small City / Town – cities or towns with a population between 2,500 and 50,000.
- Rural – towns with a population under 2,500, and all other areas not already described.

The resulting number of agencies in each population density segment is summarized in Table 1.2. Assignment of population type was based on the census population of the community, regardless of proximity to a large urban area. For example, suburbs of the Portland Metro area were placed into the Small City / Town category if the population of the suburb was between 2,500 and 50,000.

Table 1.2: Community Size (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Population Density	Number of Agencies
Large City	70
Medium City	113
Small City / Town	171
Rural	29
Statewide or regional*	20
Total	403

*Provided zip code did not coincide with area served.

1.3 TRANSPORTATION DEFINITIONS

The following definitions of transportation systems and terms were used in the questionnaire distributed to the social service agencies:

- Fixed route bus service – buses that run on a schedule (e.g. a city bus).
- Dial-A-Ride service – small buses or vans that operate on request.
- Van services – services for specific participants (e.g. veterans, church members, seniors, etc.).
- Private taxi or van company – a service operated by a for-profit organization and open to the general public).
- Medical transportation – an ambulance or stretcher car.

1.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORT FORMAT

One set of banner cross-tabulations was completed for the Social Service Provider Study, providing insight into how important subgroups (e.g. public vs. private agencies) responded to each question. The subgroups used for data analysis included:

- Agency type: Public or Private
- Age served: Any age or Age restricted
- Agency Supplies Transportation: No or Indirectly or Directly
- Number of Clients visiting the office each week: <20 or 20-75 or 76-150 or 151+
- Geographic Area: Portland Metro or Northwest or Southwest or East
- Population of Area: Large/Medium or Small or Rural

A sample page from the banner tables is included in Appendix C. Complete documentation of the data analysis has been published separately from this report (*Northwest Research Group 1998b*).

The sample size shown for each question in this report is the total number of cases with valid responses for that question. “Don’t knows” and “refusals” are counted as missing values unless “don’t know” is a valid or meaningful response.

For the most part, the data were reviewed and analyzed based on the total sample of social service agencies. When significant differences (assuming a 95 percent confidence level) were observed among agencies on key characteristics (e.g. agencies in different areas of the state), they have been noted in this report. Statistical tests performed included z tests on column proportions, independent t tests on means, and chi-square as appropriate.

The report is organized by major topic area. Tables and charts provide supporting data. Some percentages in this report may add up to more or less than 100 percent because of rounding, the permissibility of multiple responses for specific questions, or based on the presentation of abbreviated data.

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

2.1 SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY PROFILE

State and local governments invest considerable resources in transportation services for their participants. Preliminary estimates from the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project are that over \$200 million is spent in Oregon each year to help meet public, pupil and client travel needs. The Coordination Project has identified 35 programs administered by 13 separate state and federal agencies that have transportation components and serve transportation disadvantaged populations. About \$130 million annually is spent by the Department of Education on pupil transportation. Agencies of the Department of Human Resources spend over \$32 million through more than 20 different programs (*Oregon Department of Transportation 1999*). While transportation is not a primary function of these agencies, the need to support mobility for their clients makes transportation a key program area. The Social Service Provider Survey collected information on the social service investment in transportation at the local level.

2.1.1 Type of Agency

Three out of four agencies responding to the survey (76%) are public agencies. One out of five organizations (20%) are private non-profit agencies. Figure 2.1 summarizes the type of agencies.




Figure 2.1: Type of Agency (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.1.2 Services Provided

All agencies were asked to provide a list of the primary social services their agency provides. These responses are summarized in Table 2.1.

The most common service is employment opportunities or job placements -- over one half (52%) of agencies provide this service. About one out of three agencies (35%) list transportation as

one of the primary social services they provide. Transportation assistance ranks fifth in the listing of services. Most agencies provide broad-based services, listing more than one social service in their responses. Only 14 percent of agencies list just one type of service.

Table 2.1: Type of Services Provided (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Type of Service	% Providing Service*
Employment Opportunities / Job Placements	52%
Education / Training	49
Life Skills Development & Assistance	41
Community Support Networks	40
Transportation	35
Family Support & In-home Assistance	31
Health Care	29
Diagnosis & Early Evaluation	22
Nutrition	20
Residential Care	19
Family Safety and Protection	19
Alcohol, Tobacco, Or Drug Evaluation & Treatment	17
Child Care	14
Housing	13
Cash / Food Stamps Assistance	10
Case Management	5
Other Services	17

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple responses allowed

2.1.3 Population Served

Responding agencies were asked for which age group(s) their services were designed. Half (50%) of the responding agencies provide services to any age group. The remaining agencies design their services for a particular age group. The most common age group served is 18 to 54 years of age – more than four out of five (85%) of all agencies serve these individuals. Figure 2.2 summarizes these responses.




Figure 2.2: Agency Services by Age Group Served (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.1.4 Number of Individuals Accessing Services

All agencies were asked how many individuals travel to their office or service per week. Overall, the estimated number of clients per week ranges from less than one to 3,400, with the exception that one agency reports serving 50,000 clients per week. This tremendous range reflects the great diversity in the size of agencies responding to the survey. Excluding the outlying case, an average of 204 individuals accesses the agencies' offices or services per week. Nearly one half (47 percent) of agencies, however, report that 75 or fewer individuals access their services per week. Thus, 85 individuals per week – the median number reported – may be a better measure of central tendency.

2.2 EXTENT MOBILITY IMPAIRED POPULATION IS SERVED

Each agency was asked if it serves individuals with mobility limitations.

Nearly all agencies (94%) serve people with mobility limitations – see Figure 2.3. Public agencies are somewhat more likely (96%) to serve people with mobility limitations than private non-profit agencies (88%).




Figure 2.3: Extent Mobility Impaired Population is Served (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.2.1 Type of Mobility Impairments

Agencies serving individuals with mobility impairments were asked the nature of the impairment served. These responses are summarized in Table 2.2.

Agencies serve clientele with a wide range of mobility impairments, including physical (88%), cognitive (75%), vision (59%), age-related (53%), and mental or psychiatric (4%). Agencies also report serving clientele with mobility impairments related to income status or the environment. Two out of three agencies (66%) serve individuals who cannot afford a vehicle; 60 percent serve individuals who don't have a motor vehicle; and 59 percent serve individuals who have mobility impairments due to residing in a remote location.

**Table 2.2: Agencies Serving Participants with Mobility Impairments
(Base = Agencies Who Serve Individuals With Mobility Impairments)**

Mobility Impairment	% of Agencies Providing Services			
	Total*	Large / Medium*	Small Town*	Rural Area*
Physical	88%	92%	85%	88%
Cognitive	75	83	67	80
Cannot Afford Motor Vehicle	66	65	67	72
Lack of Motor Vehicle (Reasons Other Than Income)	60	59	62	64
Remote Location	59	49	66	72
Vision	59	64	53	64
Age-related	53	48	52	80
Mental / Emotional / Psychiatric	4	3	4	8

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple responses allowed

Bold faced type indicates significantly higher (at the 95% confidence level) mean scores.

There are differences in the types of mobility impairment reported by agencies in communities of various sizes. (Where differences between responses from one area to another are statistically significant, those responses are shown in **bold** type.)

- Agencies in large or medium sized communities are more likely than agencies in small towns to serve individuals with physical or cognitive impairments.
- Not surprisingly, agencies located in rural areas, and to a lesser extent in small towns, are more likely to serve individuals with mobility impairments due to residing in a remote location.
- Agencies located in rural areas are more likely to serve individuals with age-related mobility impairments.

2.2.2 Incidence of Mobility Impairment

On average, agencies estimate that about two out of five individuals they serve (41%) have one or more mobility impairments. Eighteen percent (18%) estimate that 76 to 100 percent of their clientele have mobility impairments. In contrast, the General Population Survey findings show that the statewide incidence of mobility impairment is 11% (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*). The larger percentages reported by social service providers supports the notion that disadvantages due to unemployment, poverty, disabilities and health problems are often accompanied by impaired mobility.

When compared to social service agencies located in Eastern Oregon counties, those located in the Portland Metro counties estimate a significantly higher proportion of the population they serve has mobility impairments (an average of 46 percent in Metro counties compared to 35 percent in Eastern Oregon) – see Figure 2.4. Similarly, when compared to agencies in rural areas, those in large cities estimate that a significantly higher proportion of the population they serve have mobility impairments (49 percent compared to 27 percent).

This finding contrasts with the findings of the General Population Survey, which found that the incidence of mobility impaired individuals was consistent across the state. The greater availability and accessibility of social services in urban areas may contribute to the higher estimates of mobility impaired clients in urban areas, compared to rural areas.




Figure 2.4: Percent of Clients with Mobility Impairments by Geographic Area and Community Size (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.3 TRANSPORTATION USED TO ACCESS SERVICES

All responding agencies were asked what modes of transportation people use to access their offices or services. As shown in Table 2.3, the most common mode of transportation is a car. In addition, about three out of five agencies (62%) report that some clientele use fixed route bus service to access the agency; 52 percent report that Dial-A-Ride transportation is used by some to access services. It should be noted that an affirmative response to each transportation method indicates only that the agency serves one or more participants that use that transportation mode. The number or percentage of clients who use a given mode is not addressed here.

Table 2.3: Type of Transportation Used to Access Service
(Base = All Responding Agencies)

Type of Transportation	% of Agencies Reporting This Type*
Family Member Drives	82%
Friend or Neighbor Drives	76
Participant Drives Self	75
Fixed Route Bus Service	62
Dial-A-Ride Services	52
Private Vehicle Driven by Agency Employee	49
Private Taxi or Van Company	37
Van Services For Specific Participants	28
Medical Transportation	20
Walk	10
Bicycle	7

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple responses allowed

2.3.1 Use of Public Transportation to Access Services

On average, agencies estimate that about one out of four (26%) of the individuals they serve use public transportation to access the agencies' offices or services (see Figure 2.5). However, 44 percent of the agencies report that there is no existing public transportation, and another 8 percent report that there is no service to the agencies' locations. When these agencies are removed from this analysis, the proportion of individuals using public transportation to access service is nearly one in three (31%).

- These figures can be compared to the general population study which found that 23 percent of the mobility impaired population, with access to fixed route service, use it regularly (once or more per week) and an additional 32 percent used fixed route service irregularly (less than once per week) (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*). The findings of the Social Service Provider Survey are not directly comparable, however, because they show what proportion of all clients use public transportation, not what portion of mobility impaired clients use public transportation.
- They can also be compared to national research statistics, which showed that 22 percent of the U.S. population with access to public transportation used it in the past year, with only 15 percent using transit in the month prior to the survey (*Fleishman-Hillard 1998*).

Metro area agencies report that about two out of five (42%) of their clientele use public transportation to access their services. This is significantly higher than all other areas of the state.




Figure 2.5: Percent of Agencies' Clientele Who Use Public Transportation To Access Services (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.4 AGENCY PROVIDED TRANSPORTATION

All agencies were asked if they provide any type of transportation to their participants.

Three out of four agencies (75%) supply some type of transportation to their participants – see Figure 2.6. Agencies located in Southwestern Oregon are somewhat more likely to supply transportation (85%), while those in Eastern Oregon are less likely (70%).




Figure 2.6: Percentage of Agencies Who Supply Transportation to Participants
(Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.4.1 Type of Transportation Provided

Social service agencies were asked to indicate the types of support they provide for their participants to receive transportation. Overall, they provide the most trips – an average of 87 per week – by supplying participants with tickets or scrip for use on public transportation (see Table 2.4). They provide an average of 55 trips per week by supplying participants with cash specifically for transportation. Agencies provide an average of 51 trips per week by providing rides directly to their clientele.

Table 2.4: Transportation Provided Directly By Agency
(Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

Type of Transportation	Mean Number Trips Per Week
Provide Tickets or Scrip	87
Provide Cash Specifically for Transportation	55
Provide Rides Directly	51
Other Methods of Transportation	18
Manage Volunteer or Rideshare Program	15
Total Number of Trips	226

The average number of trips provided by geographic area and trip type is summarized in Figure 2.7. On average, agencies located in Northwestern Oregon provide the highest number of trips to their participants.

- Agencies located in Eastern Oregon supply proportionately fewer trips by providing tickets, scrip or cash than do agencies in other parts of Oregon.
- Agencies located in Southwestern and Eastern Oregon supply proportionately more trips via a volunteer or rideshare program than do agencies in other areas of Oregon.
- Agencies in Eastern Oregon supply transportation by providing rides directly more often than agencies in other areas of Oregon.




Figure 2.7: Type of Trips Provided by Geographic Area (Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

2.4.2 Cost to Participant

Agencies who provide transportation were asked if they charge participants to use the service.

Only 4 percent of agencies charge participants for their transportation services. Thirty-five percent (35%) are prohibited from charging, and 61 percent do not charge for services – most likely due to an agency policy. These responses are summarized in Figure 2.8.




Figure 2.8: Agencies' Policy Towards Charging Participants For Transportation
(Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

2.4.3 Funding Sources

Agencies who provide transportation to their participants were asked the source of the funding for providing transportation. These responses are summarized in Figure 2.9 and Table 2.5. It is important to note that the classification of funding into federal, state and local sources is based on the perceptions of the respondents. Because of complicated funding streams and subcontracting arrangements, the more detailed descriptions of funding sources in the table may provide more useful information than the summary data.

- The most frequently mentioned source of funding is State funds -- 75 percent of agencies that provide transportation say they receive some funding from this source.
- The least frequently mentioned source of funding is donations, United Way, fundraising or volunteers -- only 17 percent receive funding from these sources.
- Public agencies are significantly more likely to receive funding from Federal sources. Nearly three out of four public agencies (74%) receive funds from the Federal Government, while only 36 percent of private agencies receive monies from this source.
- Agencies report that they provide transportation assistance through such programs as Medicaid, Vocational Rehabilitation, Temporary Aid to Needy Families, JOBS, JTPA, Special Transportation Fund, and through general funds.




Figure 2.9: Sources of Funding for Transportation (Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

Table 2.5: Sources of Funding For Transportation (Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

Source and Type of Funding	Percent of Agencies Responding
City, County, or Special District Funds	23%
General Fund	46
Special Transportation Fund (STF)	18
School District	15
Other	21
Federal Funds	64%
Medicaid	42
Vocational Rehabilitation Department	18
Temporary Aid to Needy Families	14
Job Training Partnership Act	10
Older Americans Act	5
Food Stamp Fund	4
RSA	3
Other	19
State Funds	75%
General	25
Medicaid	17
JOBS	13
Vocational Rehabilitation Department	11
Special Transportation Fund	7
ODDS	5
OYA	4
Mental Health / Developmental Disabilities	4
Other (includes ODOT funding of 3%)	27
Donations, United Way, Fundraising, Volunteer*	17%

*No breakdown of this category is available

2.4.4 Limitations

Agencies that supply transportation were asked if they limit their transportation services to specific groups of participants or for specific types of trips. This information on funding source and policy restrictions may suggest areas where the State Agency Transportation Coordination Project may look for opportunities to expand transportation options by providing for more flexible uses of funds.

About four out of five agencies who supply transportation (81%) limit the service to specific groups of participants or residents (see Figure 2.10).

- Agencies in Southwestern Oregon are more likely to limit trips to specific groups of participants -- 93 percent do so. Agencies in Northwestern Oregon are less likely to limit trips to specific groups -- 75 percent do so.
- Half (51%) of the agencies limit the trips because of a funding source restriction. A little over one-third (37%) limit trips because of agency policy. Seven percent (7%) limit trips because of both a funding source restriction and agency policy. The remainder (5%) could not answer why they limit trips to specific groups, as it varies with the specific situation.




Figure 2.10: Transportation Limitations -- Specific Groups of Participants
(Base = Agencies Who Supply Transportation)

Providing transportation to persons with disabilities is the most common limitation imposed by the agencies on specific groups of participants: 56 percent limit their transportation services to this group.

Table 2.6 lists other limitations on the type of participant that can participate in agency-provided transportation.

Table 2.6: Limitations on Types of Participants Receiving Transportation

Type of Participant	% of Agencies Responding*
People With Disabilities	56%
Low Income / Means Tested	25
Program Participants	24
Seniors	16
Children	11
Students	7
Veterans	3
Other Groups	2

**Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple Responses Allowed.*

Consistent with the percentage of agencies limiting trips to specific groups of participants, more than four out of five agencies (81%) limit their transportation services to specific types of trips (see Figure 2.11).

- Public agencies are more likely to limit the type of trip that can be taken. Eighty-five percent (85%) of public agencies place these limits on their transportation services. In contrast, 63 percent of private non-profit agencies have limits on the type of trip that can be taken.
- Nearly half (45%) of the agencies limit the trips because of a funding source restriction. Two out of five (41%) limit trips because of agency policy. Nine percent (9%) limit trips because of both a funding source restriction and agency policy. The remainder (5 %) could not answer why they limit trips to specific groups as it varies with the specific situation.




Figure 2.11: Transportation Limitations -- Type of Trip
(Base = Agencies Who Supply Transportation)

Providing transportation for medical visits is the most common type of trip restriction placed by agencies -- 62 percent limit their transportation in this way. Other limitations placed on the type of trip are listed in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7: Limitations on Types of Trips Agencies Provide

Type of Trip	% of Agencies Responding*
Medical Visits	62%
Job Training	50
School	34
Treatment Related	22
Emergency	19
Job Search / Employment	13
Counseling / Mental Health Treatment	12
Nutrition	7
Recreation	4
Other	14

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple Responses Allowed.

The majority (69%) of agencies limits the transportation that they provide to **both** specific groups of participants and specific types of trips. Only 5 percent of agencies that supply

transportation place no restrictions on who can use the services or how the services can be used. Table 2.8 summarizes the restrictions agencies place on the transportation they provide.

Table 2.8: Restrictions on Transportation (Base = Agencies Who Provide Transportation)

	% With Restriction
Yes -- Type Of Participants / Yes -- Type Of Trip	69%
Yes -- Type Of Participants / No -- Type Of Trip	13
No -- Type Of Participants / Yes -- Type Of Trip	13
No Restrictions	5

2.5 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION'S ABILITY TO MEET NEEDS

2.5.1 Transportation to Agency Services

Agencies were asked how they would rate public transportation's ability to provide trips to agency services.

As shown in Figure 2.12, on a statewide basis social service agencies are mixed in their ratings. Slightly less than half (44%) of the agencies believe that public transportation in their area is able to provide participants with most or all of the trips they need to reach agency services.




Figure 2.12: Ability of Public Transportation to Provide Trips to Agency Services (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Agencies located in the Portland Metro counties rate public transportation’s ability to provide trips significantly higher than do agencies in other areas. Two out of three agencies (66%) in the Metro area feel that participants get trips they would like all or most of the time. In contrast, only about one in four agencies in Southwestern and Eastern Oregon (24% and 26%, respectively) report that their participants get most or all of the trips they need to reach agency services.

All agencies were asked why they thought their participants have limited access to public transportation for trips to the agencies’ office or services. Responses are summarized in Table 2.9.

Table 2.9: Why Trips Are Limited (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Reasons Why Trips Are Limited	Percent of Agencies Responding*				
	Total	Metro	NW	SW	East
Live Too Far Away	51%	48%	54%	61%	43%
No Existing Service	47	32	44	48	64
Service Does Not Run During Hours Needed	44	31	56	59	36
Accessing Service Too Difficult	40	48	43	43	26
Do Not Know How to Access Service	32	37	38	27	19
Lack of Money for Fares	30	35	27	43	24
No Service to Agency Location	22	15	26	20	20
Do Not Qualify for Service	13	16	9	16	13
Turned Away in Past / Given Up Asking	12	15	9	18	11
Other Factors	4	5	4	5	2

*Column sums to more than 100%. Multiple responses allowed.

Bold faced type indicates significantly higher (at the 95% confidence level) mean scores.

Reasons for limitations on participants’ travel by public transportation include: participants live too far away from services (51%), there is no existing service (47%), public transportation does not run during the hours when rides are needed (44%), and accessing service is too difficult (40%). Over one third (32%) report that their clients do not know how to access transportation services. Providing training on using public transportation may help meet the travel needs of many agency clients.

- Agencies located in the Portland Metro counties or Northwestern Oregon areas are more likely than agencies in other areas to report that trips are limited because accessing public transportation services is too difficult for their clientele or that their clientele do not know how to access the system. In addition, agencies in Northwestern Oregon are more likely than agencies in Portland Metro and rural areas of Oregon to report that trips are limited because service does not run during the hours when rides are needed.
- Agencies located in Southwestern Oregon are more likely than agencies in other areas to report that trips are limited because their clientele lives too far away from service, the service does not run during the hours needed, or because their clientele does not have the money to pay the fare.

- Agencies located in Eastern Oregon are more likely than agencies in other areas to report that trips are limited because there is no existing service.

2.5.2 Transportation for Non-agency Related Trips

Agencies were also asked to rate public transportation’s ability to provide service to their clientele for trips other than those to the agencies’ services.

Results are similar to agencies' opinions of how well public transportation provides trips to their offices or services (Section 2.5.1). A little over one in three agencies (35%) believe that their clientele get most or always get trips when or where they want them (see Figure 2.13).

Over one half (54%) of Metro agencies report their participants get trips always or most of the time. In contrast, only 21 percent of Eastern and Southwestern agencies say that their participants get trips always or most of the time.




Figure 2.13: Ability of Public Transportation to Provide Trips Other than to Agency’s Services (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.6 UNMET TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

2.6.1 Number of Additional Trips Needed

Agencies were asked how many trips they believe each of their participants would like to receive, but are currently not receiving. The median number of needed additional trips per client, per week is estimated by the agencies to be 2.44. Their responses are summarized in Figure 2.14.

Nine out of ten agencies statewide (92%) believe that there is at least some unmet demand for transportation among their clientele. They report that to meet their needs, each participant would require one or more additional trips per week. About half (53%) report that two or more additional trips per week would be needed for each of their participants, with 18 percent estimating that more than five additional trips are needed. Not surprisingly, social service providers in the Portland Metro counties estimate fewer additional trips are needed than providers in more rural areas of the state.

Consistent with these findings, it is worth noting that in the General Population Survey, 55 percent of the mobility impaired population would like to make two or more trips per week on fixed route service, and 44 percent would like to make two or more trips per week on Dial-A-Ride service if it were available (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).




Figure 2.14: Additional Trips Needed (Base = All Responding Agencies)

2.6.2 Type of Trips Needed

Agencies were asked for what type of trips (other than trips to the agencies' services) their participants have difficulty obtaining transportation.

Social or recreational events and work are the most often mentioned type of trips (Figure 2.15). Agencies located outside of the Metro counties (i.e. those in Northwestern, Southwestern and Eastern Oregon) are more likely to report that their participants have difficulty finding transportation to and from work. In addition, agencies in Eastern Oregon are more likely than other areas to report that their participants have difficulty finding transportation for shopping, medical visits, education, and meal programs.




Figure 2.15: Types of Trips for Which Participants Have Difficulty Obtaining Transportation
(Base = All Responding Agencies)

Consistent with these findings, in the General Population Survey individuals with mobility impairments **also** report social and recreation trips most often (60%) as a type of trip that they would like to make or make more often but cannot because they do not have transportation (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).

Conversely, individuals with mobility impairments were much less likely (5%) to report work as a type of trip that they would like to make or make more often but cannot because they do not have transportation. (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*). This difference between the two surveys in the need for work trips is most likely due to the high incidence of retired people with mobility impairments in the General Population Survey, versus younger, employable clientele in the Social Services Provider Survey.

2.7 IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

Agencies were asked how important they felt twenty public transportation improvements were for seniors and people with disabilities in their community. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale where "one" means "not needed" and "five" means "urgent."

All twenty service improvements rated above a "two" ("would be nice") but below a "four" ("very important").

Improvements that agencies feel are most important include:

	Mean Score (5-point Scale)
Easier to Use for Seniors / People with Disabilities	3.66
Longer Hours of Operation	3.62
Greater Number Door-to-Door Rides	3.60
Better Connections with Neighboring Transit Services	3.42
More Days of Operation	3.36
More Fixed Route Service	3.35
Employees More Knowledgeable About People with Special Needs	3.28
Easier Scheduling of Trips by Phone	3.27
More Reliable On-Time Pick Ups	3.20
More Reliable On-Time Drop Offs	3.18
More Reliable Service	3.17
More Availability of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles	3.15
Printed Schedules Are Easier to Understand	3.14

Improvements that agencies feel are relatively less important include:

	Mean Score (5-point Scale)
Easier to Identify Vehicles	2.19
Vehicles in Better Condition	2.40
More TTY / TDD Availability	2.84
Lower Fares	2.85
Vehicles More Suited to Users' Needs	2.86
More Availability of Schedules for the Sight-Impaired	3.05
Better Arrangements for Securing Wheelchairs	3.06

The General Population Survey shows that mobility impaired individuals rate "employees' knowledge of people with special needs" and "easy to understand printed schedules" higher than social service agencies (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).

The Transportation Provider Survey shows that transportation providers rank the importance of the improvements in a similar order to social service agencies – both groups rank “service easier to use for seniors / disabled,” “greater number of door to door rides,” and “longer hours of operation” the three most needed service improvements. However, in almost all cases, social service agencies feel that the improvements are more urgently needed (i.e. rate the items higher on the four-point scale) (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).

The ratings from agencies in each geographic area are listed in Table 2.10. Social service agencies in the Metro counties are more likely than those in other areas to rate the following improvements as being urgently needed: “employees more knowledgeable about people with special needs,” “more reliable pick-ups,” and “more reliable drop-offs.”

Agencies in Northwestern Oregon rate the following improvements higher in importance than do agencies in other areas: “longer hours of operation,” “better connections with neighboring transit services,” “more days of operation,” “more fixed route service” and “easier to identify vehicles.”

Agencies in Southwestern and Eastern Oregon rate the following improvements higher in importance than agencies located in the Metro area: “longer hours of operation,” “more days of operation,” and “more fixed route service.”

Table 2.10: Service Improvement Ratings by Geographic Area (Base = All Responding Agencies)

Service Improvement	Mean Score (1 = Not Needed, 5 = Urgent)				
	Total	Metro*	NW*	SW*	East*
Easier to Use for Seniors / People with Disabilities	3.66	3.66	3.69	3.62	3.61
Longer Hours of Operation	3.62	3.12	3.84	3.93	3.67
Greater Number Door-to-Door Rides	3.60	3.53	3.63	3.73	3.61
Better Connections with Neighboring Transit Services	3.42	3.44	3.60	3.22	3.19
More Days of Operation	3.36	2.73	3.63	3.78	3.50
More Fixed Route Service	3.35	3.11	3.46	3.50	3.36
Employees More Knowledgeable About People with Special Needs	3.28	3.49	3.33	2.92	3.11
Easier Scheduling of Trips by Phone	3.27	3.38	3.23	3.30	3.19
More Reliable On-Time Pick Ups	3.20	3.70	3.12	2.68	2.92
More Reliable On-Time Drop Offs	3.18	3.67	3.10	2.58	2.93
More Reliable Service	3.17	3.35	3.04	3.13	3.17
More Availability of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles	3.15	3.13	3.20	2.97	3.19
Printed Schedules Are Easier To Understand	3.14	3.15	3.22	3.14	3.03
Better Arrangements for Securing Wheelchairs	3.06	3.07	3.11	2.92	2.95
More Availability of Schedules for the Sight-Impaired	3.05	2.98	3.22	3.17	2.90
Vehicles More Suited to Users’ Needs	2.86	2.72	3.01	2.76	2.87
Lower Fares	2.85	2.83	2.84	2.81	2.90
More TTY / TDD Availability	2.84	2.80	2.77	2.82	3.00
Vehicles in Better Condition	2.40	2.22	2.46	2.39	2.45
Easier To Identify Vehicles	2.19	2.04	2.34	1.86	2.28

Bold faced type indicates significantly higher (at the 95% confidence level) mean scores.

2.8 SUPPORT FOR INCREASED FUNDING

Agencies were asked, in their opinion, the extent to which people in their community would support an increase in taxes or an increase in state funding to fund improvements in public transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. The results are summarized in Figure 2.16.




Figure 2.16: Agency Perception of Community Support for Transportation Improvements
(Base = All Responding Agencies)

Over one half (57%) of the responding agencies think that their community would support an increase in taxes. The majority, however, believes that people would only somewhat support it (54%), as opposed to strongly support it (3%). In the Transportation Provider Survey respondents have perceptions similar to those of social service agencies: 6 percent believe communities would strongly support a tax increase, and 50 percent believe communities would somewhat support a tax increase (*Northwest Research Group 1998a*).

In the General Population Survey support for a tax increase is more strongly supported by mobility impaired persons, with 32 percent indicating they would strongly support it and another 32 percent indicating they would somewhat support it (*Northwest Research Group, 1998a*).

Agencies believe that support would be greater for increased state funding for transportation. Eighteen percent (18%) believe that people would strongly support an increase in state funding, while an additional 58 percent believe that people would somewhat support it.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

The Social Service Provider Survey assessed the views of over 400 social service agencies throughout Oregon. The findings of this survey complement those of the earlier General Population Survey and the Transportation Provider Survey to identify the transportation needs of people with mobility impairments - i.e. individuals who, due to a physical, mental or cognitive disability, or because of their age and income, have difficulty obtaining transportation. The following conclusions may be drawn from the findings of this study:

- A significant number of social service agencies' participants rely on public transportation to access social services. Public transportation is an important mode of transportation for people who use the services these agencies provide. More than three out of four agencies (77%) report that they have clients who use public transportation (fixed route or Dial-A-Ride) to access their offices or services. Overall, agencies estimate that 26 percent of their participants rely on public transportation to get to and from their offices or services. They estimate that two out of five (41%) of their clients have some type of mobility impairment.
- Social service agencies statewide see a need for increased transportation services for mobility impaired populations, particularly to meet travel needs to work. The Social Service Provider Study supports the General Population Study's conclusion that current transportation services are insufficient to completely meet the needs of those who need them most – the mobility impaired population. Forty-five percent of agencies believe that their clientele gets service to their agency when and where it is needed all or most of the time. Moreover, 53 percent of agencies believe that two or more additional trips per week, per participant, would be needed to meet the latent demand for transportation that exists among the consumers of their services. The median number of needed additional trips per client, per week is estimated to be 2.44.
- In the view of social service agencies, service improvements for existing transportation systems are needed. The specific type of improvement varies by geographic area. In the Portland Metro counties, where significant service exists, agencies believe improvements should be targeted towards improving service for the senior and disabled population – i.e. making service easier to use for the senior and disabled population, improving the employees knowledge base about people with special needs, and increasing the reliability of pick-ups / arrivals and drop off / departures. In other areas of the state, agencies believe it is more urgent to increase service so that it meets the basic needs of a population, many of whom rely on it as their only means of transportation. Increasing the number of door-to-door rides, increasing the hours of operation, increasing the number of days of operation, better connections with neighboring transportation systems and increasing fixed route service are some of the improvements for transportation systems outside of the Metro area that social service agencies believe are needed.

Overall, social service agencies and transportation providers agree on what improvements are most needed. Both agencies and providers agree that the three most needed improvements are: greater number of door to door rides, services that are easier for seniors and disabled to use, and longer hours of operation. However, mobility impaired individuals report the following improvements as the most critical: that employees are more knowledgeable about people with special needs, printed schedules that are easier to understand and easier access to service.

This study provides an important source of information when examining the transportation needs of the mobility impaired population. Results presented here are from the perspective of those who work closely with the mobility impaired population. However, they should not be examined alone, but rather with this study's companion report – *OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: General Population Survey and Transportation Provider Survey*. Together, these two reports provide a full range of perspectives on the transportation needs of the mobility impaired, including the voice of the transportation provider, the social service provider, and the mobility impaired individuals themselves.

The findings of the three surveys in the Mobility Needs Study will be useful for planners, policy makers and transportation providers across the state. They will be used by the participants in Oregon's State Agency Transportation Coordination Project and will be shared with social service agencies and transportation providers. The survey data will be made available to research and policy makers at other agencies working on transportation issues.

Recommendations for future work include performing additional analysis of the data collected in the surveys to determine the extent of the need and alternative responses for consideration. The Department of Transportation and Department of Human Resources should consider similar survey efforts in the future, using this study as a baseline for measuring improvements in service coverage and quality.

4.0 REFERENCES

Center for Population Research & Census. 1998. *Population of Incorporated Cities in Oregon by Alphabetical Order: July 1, 1997*. Portland State University, School of Urban and Public Affairs. Portland OR. Updated 2/20/98. http://www.upa.pdx.edu/CPRC/city97_1.html. INTERNET.

Fleishman-Hillard Research. 1998. *Market Research on National Current Public Attitudes Toward Public Transportation: Final Research Report to the American Public Transit Association*. St. Louis MO. 100 pp. + appendices.

Northwest Research Group. 1998a. *OREGON'S MOBILITY NEEDS: General Population Survey and Transportation Provider Survey. Final Report*. Report No. FHWA-OR-RD-99-19. Oregon Department of Transportation, Salem OR. 93 pp. + appendices.

Northwest Research Group. 1998b. *ODOT Social Services Providers Survey: Banner Cross-tabulations by Total, Agency Type, Age Group Served, Agency Supply Transportation, Number of Clients Travel to Office per Week, Geographic Area, and Population Type*. Bellevue WA. 259 pp.

Oregon Department of Transportation. 1999. *State of Oregon State Agency Transportation Coordination Project: 3-24-99 Working Group Meeting Products*. Public Transit Division.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey of transportation issues for Oregon social service providers is being conducted by the Oregon Department of Transportation, Public Transit Section. The goal of this survey is to determine the transportation challenges you and your participants and/or residents face in obtaining needed services.

For the survey to be meaningful, it is important that you answer all of the questions. If you don't know the exact answer, please make an educated guess. If you need clarification on any questions, please call Chelsea Shand at 1-800-545-5909.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Postage has already been taken care of.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDER RESEARCH

Is the information below correct? If not, please make any needed corrections.

Contact name _____
Agency name _____
Agency address _____
Agency county _____
Agency phone # _____

1) Is your agency: ₁ Public ₂ Private non-profit ₃ Private for-profit

2) What are the primary social services your agency provides? (check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Alcohol, Tobacco or Drug Education & Treatment | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ Community Support Networks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Diagnosis & Early Evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ Family Support & In-home Assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ Education/Training | <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ Family Safety & Protection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ Employment Opportunities/Job Placements | <input type="checkbox"/> ₈ Nutrition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₉ Health Care | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₀ Life Skills Development & Assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₁ Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₂ Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₃ Child Care | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₄ Residential Care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁₅ Other (please specify) | |
-

3) What age group are your services designed for? (check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Under 18 | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ 18 to 54 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ 55 to 59 | <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ 60 to 64 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ 65 to 74 | <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ 75 and older |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ Any Age | |

4) Does your agency serve people with mobility limitations? (Mobility limitations are physical, mental, or other conditions that limit their ability or cause difficulty in getting to places they need or want to go)

- ₁ Yes ₂ No (Please skip to question 5)

4a) Please identify the types of mobility limitations (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ Age-related | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ Cognitive |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ Physical | <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ Vision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ Cannot afford motor vehicle | <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ Remote location |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ Lack of motor vehicle (for reasons other than income) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ₈ Other (please specify) | |
-

4b) What percentage of your participants and/or residents do you estimate have mobility limitations? (e.g. 5%, 40%, etc.) _____%

5) During the average week, how many participants and/or residents travel to your offices and/or services (such as congregate meal sites, medical clinics, supervised employment, etc.)?

6) Of your participants and/or residents, what percentage do you estimate use public transportation (buses, vans, dial-a-ride or light rail) to get to or from your office and/or services? (e.g. 5%, 40%, etc.) _____%

7) **Which of the following transportation methods do your participants and/or residents use to access your services?** (check all that apply)

- ₁ Fixed route bus service (buses that run on a schedule, city bus, etc.)
 - ₂ Dial-a-ride service (small buses or vans, etc. that operate on request.)
 - ₃ Van services for specific participants (for veterans, church members, senior centers, etc.)
 - ₄ Private taxi or van company (operated by a for-profit organization and open to the general public)
 - ₅ Medical transportation (ambulance, stretcher car, etc.)
 - ₆ Private vehicle driven by agency employee or volunteer
 - ₇ Family
 - ₈ Friends or neighbor
 - ₉ Drive themselves
 - ₁₀ Other (please specify)
-

8) **Does your agency supply any type of transportation to its participants? Please respond yes if your agency provides trips in an agency vehicle and/or distributes money specifically for the purpose of transportation.**

- ₁ Yes, agency supplies transportation
- ₂ No, agency does not supply transportation to participants (Please skip to question 14)

9) **Below is a list of methods for supplying transportation. Please estimate the total number of trips (one way) your agency supplies each week to its participants and/or residents using these methods.**

- Provide rides directly..... _____
- Provide tickets or scrip..... _____
- Manage volunteer or rideshare program _____
- Provide cash to participants specifically for transportation..... _____
- Other (please specify)..... _____

10) **Does your agency charge participants for the transportation services?**

- ₁ Yes, participant pays a fee
- ₂ No, participant does not pay a fee
- ₃ No, prohibited from charging for services

11) **Other than charging participants, how are the transportation services your agency provides funded?** (check all that apply)

- ₁ City, county or special district funds (describe)

 - ₂ Donations, United Way, fundraising, volunteer
 - ₃ Federal funds (what category)

 - ₄ State funds (what category)

-

12) **Is your funding for transportation services limited to specific groups of participants and/or residents?**

₁ Yes



₂ No (*Please skip to question 13*)

12a) **How are the funds limited?** (*please check all that apply*)

- ₁ People with disabilities only ₂ Seniors only ₃ Students
₄ Veterans only ₅ Low income/Means tested ₆ Children
₆ Other (*please specify*)
-

12b) **Is this limit a funding source restriction or an agency policy?**

- ₁ Funding source restriction ₂ Agency policy

13) **Are the kinds of trips your participants and/or residents can take limited in any way?**

₁ Yes



₂ No (*Please skip to question 14*)

13a) **How are the trips limited?** (*please check all that apply*)

- ₁ Emergency only ₂ Nutrition only
₃ Job training only ₄ Veterans services only
₅ Medical visits only ₆ School only
₇ Other (*please specify*)
-
-
-

13b) **Is this limit a funding source restriction or an agency policy?**

- ₁ Funding source restriction ₂ Agency policy

14) **Of the people you serve who depend on public transportation (*buses, vans, dial-a-ride or light rail*) to access your services, how would you rate public transportation's ability to provide trips to your services where and when your clients would like them?**

- ₁ Always get trips where and when they want
₂ Get most trips but not all
₃ Get only limited trips, perhaps for specific purposes only
₄ Almost never get trips
₅ Get no service

15) **For those participants who have trouble obtaining public transportation to your services, why do you think their access to trips are limited?** *(please check all that apply)*

- ₁ No existing service
 - ₂ No service to our location
 - ₃ Service doesn't run during hours when rides needed
 - ₄ Accessing service is too difficult *(waiting, reservation requirements, equipment not suited)*
 - ₅ Don't qualify for the services available
 - ₆ Lack of money for fares
 - ₇ Don't know how to access the system
 - ₈ Live too far away
 - ₉ They have been turned away in the past and have given up asking
 - ₁₀ Other factors *(please explain)*
-
-

16) **Thinking now about trips your participants and/or residents make other than trips to your service (e.g. shopping, recreation, social, etc.) how would you rate the availability of public transportation to provide trips where and when your clients would like them?**

- ₁ Always get trips where and when they want
- ₂ Get most trips but not all
- ₃ Get only limited trips, perhaps for specific purposes only
- ₄ Almost never get trips
- ₅ Get no service

17) **For what types of trips other than trips to your services do your participants and/or residents have difficulty obtaining transportation?**

- ₁ Education
 - ₂ Medical
 - ₃ Nutrition/Meal programs
 - ₄ Personal business *(banking, etc.)*
 - ₅ Shopping
 - ₆ Social / Recreational
 - ₇ Work
 - ₈ Other *(please explain)*
-

18) **On average, about how many more trips per week do you think each of your participants and/or residents would like to receive but currently don't receive?**

- ₁ 0 – they already get all the trips they need
- ₂ 1 or 2 additional trips per week
- ₃ 2 to 5 additional trips per week
- ₄ More than 5 additional trips per week

19) Please rate the importance of the following service improvements for public transportation for seniors and people with disabilities in your community:

	Urgent	Very Important	Important	Would be Nice	Not Needed
Greater number of door-to-door rides available	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More fixed-route service	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Service easier to use for seniors and people with disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Longer hours of operation	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More days of operation	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More reliable service	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Vehicles in better condition	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Vehicles more suited to users' needs	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Lower fares	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Employees more knowledgeable about people with special needs	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Easier scheduling of trips by phone	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More TTY/TTD availability	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Printed schedules that are easier to understand	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More availability of schedules for the sight-impaired	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More reliable on-time pick-ups/arrivals	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More reliable on-time drop-offs/departures	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Easier-to-identify vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
More availability of wheelchair-accessible vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Better/easier arrangements for securing wheelchairs on the vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅
Better/more convenient connections with neighboring transit services	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅

20) In your opinion, how much would people in your community support an increase in taxes or fees for improvements to public transportation for seniors and people with disabilities?

- ₁ Strongly not support
- ₂ Somewhat not support
- ₃ Somewhat support
- ₄ Strongly support

21) In your opinion, how much would people in your community support increased state funding for improvements to public transportation for seniors and people with disabilities?

- ₁ Strongly not support
- ₂ Somewhat not support
- ₃ Somewhat support
- ₄ Strongly support

Thank you for your help. Please record any additional comments in the space below.

APPENDIX B

ZIP CODES

ZIP CODES OF STRATIFIED POPULATION CATEGORIES

Area 1 Large	Area 2 Medium	Area 3 Small			Area 4 Rural					
97222	97330	97814	97470	97838	97833	97532	97063	97376	97473	97107
97267	97331	97370	97479	97019	97834	97623	97109	97390	97481	97131
97201	97333	97013	97496	97030	97870	97624	97117	97329	97484	97136
97202	97501	97022	97720	97080	97877	97632	97125	97345	97486	97810
97203	97504	97027	97031	97431	97884	97633	97144	97872	97831	97813
97204	97401	97034	97502	97368	97907	97636	97347	97710	97848	97826
97205	97402	97035	97520	97041	97456	97452	97371	97721	97837	97835
97206	97403	97038	97524	97503	97023	97492	97108	97758	97840	97868
97209	97405	97045	97535	97523	97016	97341	97112	97904	97324	97875
97210	97408	97055	97540	97627	97018	97380	97122	97536	97011	97886
97211	97321	97068	97741	97053	97048	97394	97149	97541	97028	97824
97212	97301	97070	97526	97739	97449	97498	97842	97711	97049	97827
97213	97302	97103	97527	97760	97466	97327	97377	97730	97067	97841
97214	97303	97138	97601	97443	97444	97348	97903	97761	97121	97867
97215	97305	97146	97603	97004	97465	97358	97906	97497	97130	97876
97216	97306	97051	97630	97009	97756	97360	97908	97531	97020	97883
97217	97304	97056	97424	97015	97759	97374	97909	97534	97639	97828
97218	97477	97064	97426	97017	97417	97389	97911	97538	97145	97846
97219	97478	97411	97325	97042	97435	97446	97917	97543	97857	
97220	97404	97420	97362		97436	97901	97920	97544	97885	
97221	97440	97423	97381		97442	97910	97010	97621	97001	
97227	97310	97458	97383		97462	97918	97637	97625	97021	
97230	97005	97459	97818		97469	97002	97638	97731	97037	
97231	97006	97754	97024		97499	97026	97640	97733	97040	
97232	97007	97415	97060		97812	97032	97735	97737	97434	
97233	97008	97701	97338		97823	97137	97412	97620	97437	
97236	97123	97702	97351		97820	97342	97413	97635	97438	
97266	97124	97707	97361		97825	97346	97419	97054	97451	
97223		97457	97141		97845	97350	97427	97414	97453	
97224		97467	97801		97856	97352	97430	97468	97454	
97225		97448	97862		97864	97375	97750	97751	97455	
97229		97463	97882		97865	97385	97830	97752	97461	
		97487	97850		97869	97392	97874	97753	97480	
		97365	97058		97873	97836	97101	97406	97488	
		97367	97062		97738	97839	97111	97450	97489	
		97391	97113		97014	97843	97114	97476	97490	
		97355	97116		97522	97844	97127	97712	97493	
		97386	97140		97525	97344	97148	97410	97326	
		97913	97115		97530	97029	97396	97416	97343	
		97914	97128		97537	97039	97057	97429	97357	
		97071	97132		97539	97050	97106	97441	97364	
		97439	97378		97734	97065	97119	97447	97366	

APPENDIX C
SAMPLE BANNER OUTPUT

ODOT Social Service Provider Survey

Q1 Is Your Agency Public, Private Non-Profit, Or Private For-Profit?

BASE = ALL RESPONDENTS

TOTAL	AGENCY TYPE		AGE SERVED		SUPPLY TRANSPORT		CLIENTS TO OFFICE/WEEK				GEOGRAPHIC AREA				POPULATION TYPE					
	Pub-lic	Pri-ate	Any Age	Rest-rictd	No Dir-ectly	Indir-ectly	<20	20-75	76-150	151+	Metro	NW	SW	East	Large	Small	Rural			
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)	(T)
403	289	76	200	202	102	141	160	67	106	79	105	108	135	47	93	70	113	171	29	29
380	289	76	188	191	97	135	148	61	98	78	100	101	128	45	87	65	107	162	27	27
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
289	289	-	140	148	67	126	96	40	72	64	86	74	99	38	63	51	80	125	18	18
76%	100%	-	74%	77%	69%	93%	65%	66%	73%	82%	86%	73%	77%	84%	72%	78%	75%	77%	67%	67%
76	-	76	42	34	25	9	42	12	23	13	14	22	23	6	22	13	23	29	8	8
20%	100%	100%	22%	18%	26%	7%	28%	20%	23%	17%	14%	22%	18%	13%	25%	20%	21%	18%	30%	30%
14	-	-	5	9	5	-	9	8	3	1	-	4	6	1	2	1	4	7	1	1
4%	-	-	3%	5%	5%	-	6%	13%	3%	1%	-	4%	5%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
*%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-
23	-	-	12	11	5	6	12	6	8	1	5	7	7	2	6	5	6	9	2	2

Comparison Groups: BC/DE/FGH/IJKL/MNOP/QRST
 Independent T-Test for Means, Independent Z-Test for Percentages
 Upper case letters indicate significance at the 95% level.