

APPENDIX A: Blank Internet Survey Form

Human Services Transportation Plans and Grant Programs

Welcome

Effectiveness of Human Services Transportation Plans and Grant Programs

The research team is supporting the AASHTO Standing Committee on Public Transportation by conducting a NCHRP study on the Effectiveness of Human Services Transportation Plan and Grant Programs. As part of this study, the research team is conducting an online survey; it is our intention that the survey should not take more than 20-25 minutes to complete.

The survey uses multiple choice questions and opportunities for additional comments to help:

- 1) Determine the extent to which the respondents believe coordinated public transit/human services transportation plans have met FTA goals of enhancing transportation access, minimizing duplication of services, and facilitating the most appropriate and cost-effective transportation possible with available resources, and
- 2) Ascertain the cost of developing and maintaining these Coordination Plans (in terms of time and money) to ensure that resources are being used wisely and effectively, resulting in the better, more cost-effective and coordinated programs that the plans are expected to foster.

The questions in the survey are divided into four sections:

1. Perceived Success of the Public Transit/Human Service Coordination Plans
2. Cost of Coordination Plan Development
3. Awarding Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Section 5317 New Freedom Grant Funds
4. Please Tell Us About Yourself

For timely completion of our study, please complete the online survey by **Monday, November 9, 2009**. If you have any questions about the study or the survey, please contact Sara Carini of AECOM at sara.carini@aecom.com

Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

I. Perceived Success of the Public Transit/Human Service Coordination Plans

We understand that the experiences may be different for various regions/localities within your state. Please answer the questions for the state as a whole and describe any significant differences from the “average” experience in the boxes provided for explanation.

If you cannot answer the question for the state as a whole, please answer for the area/portion you are most familiar with and describe the area/portion in the boxes provided for explanation.

For the purposes of this survey, the collective group of persons with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with lower incomes will be referred to as the “target populations.”

1. On a scale of 1-5, have the coordination plans been successful in:

No Success Little Success Average Success Moderate Success Significant Success

a. Meeting the FTA

goal of enhancing

transportation access

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

for the target

populations in your

state?

b. Meeting the FTA

goal of minimizing the

duplication of

transportation services

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

for the target

populations in your

state?

c. Meeting the FTA

goal of facilitating the

most appropriate and

cost-effective

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

transportation possible

with available

resources in your

state?

Please explain.

2. Did your state have any local and/or state planning requirements already in place that were used to satisfy the federal coordination plan requirement?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

3. Have additional state or local goals been met by the coordination plans?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

4. Have you found that successful coordination plans, if any, have led to additional state funds allocated to public transit services in your state?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

5. On a scale of 1-5, what level of commitment/participation has been seen in the coordination plans:

	No	Little	Average	Moderate	Full
	Participation	Participation	Participation	Participation	Participation
a. At the state level?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. At the local level?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Which state and local agencies are taking the lead on the coordination plans? (select all that apply)

- ☐ State transit office
- ☐ Transit agencies
- ☐ Interest/community groups
- ☐ MPOs
- ☐ Other

If other or additional descriptions needed, please describe.

7. Did your state achieve the same level of coordination on transportation for the target populations before the requirements came into being?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

8. Could the same program objectives be achieved in your state without the coordination plans?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

II. Cost of Public Transit/Human Service Coordination Plan Development

We understand that the experiences may be different for various regions/localities within your state. Please answer the questions for the state as a whole and describe any significant differences from the “average” experience in the boxes provided for explanation.

If you cannot answer the question for the state as a whole, please answer for the area/portion you are most familiar with and describe the area/portion in the boxes provided for explanation.

1. How much money is being spent for the initial public transit/human service coordination plans in your state (Statewide total)?

- ☐ Less than \$250,000
- ☐ \$250,001 - \$500,000
- ☐ \$500,001 - \$750,000
- ☐ \$501,000 - \$1,000,000
- ☐ More than \$1,000,000

Additional comments, if necessary.

2. What is the projected annual cost for maintaining the public transit/human service coordination plans in your state (Statewide total)?

- ☐ Less than \$250,000
- ☐ \$250,001 - \$500,000
- ☐ \$500,001 - \$750,000

- \$501,000 - \$1,000,000
- More than \$1,000,000

Additional comments, if necessary.

3. Where is the money to develop these plans coming from in your state and is the revenue source sustainable?
4. Have other needed projects been curtailed or eliminated to fund the coordination plans in your state?
 - Yes
 - No

If yes, please explain.

5. Are there additional implementation costs or issues with the preparation of the coordination plans in your state?
 - Yes
 - No

If yes, please explain.

6. Have additional employees or consultants been hired in your state in order to meet coordination plan requirements?

	Yes	No
At the state level?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At the local level?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If yes, please explain.

7. Have these coordination plans placed additional administrative burden on the state transit office?
 - Yes
 - No

Please explain the type of administrative burden or why there is no additional burden.

III. Awarding Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Section 5317 New Freedom Grants

We understand that the experiences may be different for various regions/localities within your state. Please answer the questions for the state as a whole and describe any significant differences from the “average” experience in the boxes provided for explanation.

If you cannot answer the question for the state as a whole, please answer for the area/portion you are most familiar with and describe the area/portion in the boxes provided for explanation.

1. On a scale of 1-5, what is your level of success in awarding the Section 5316 JARC funds?

- ☐ 1 (No Success)
- ☐ 2 (Little Success)
- ☐ 3 (Average Success)
- ☐ 4 (Moderate Success)
- ☐ 5 (Significant Success)

Please explain some of the challenges in obligating these funds.

2. What types of projects and recipients have received Section 5316 JARC funding?

3. On a scale of 1-5, what is your level of success in awarding the Section 5317 New Freedom funds?

- ☐ 1 (No Success)
- ☐ 2 (Little Success)
- ☐ 3 (Average Success)
- ☐ 4 (Moderate Success)
- ☐ 5 (Significant Success)

Please explain some of the challenges in obligating these funds.

4. What types of projects and recipients have received Section 5317 New Freedom funding?

5. A review of the FTA data for FY 2006-2008 reveals that nationwide, there generally is difficulty in obligating all appropriated funds. Of the FY 2006 appropriations, between 84% and 88% of the JARC and New Freedom funds were obligated by FY 2008 (expiration date of the funding). Similarly, of the FY2007 appropriations, between 38% and 40% of the funding had been obligated by FY 2008 (only one year remaining before expiration in FY 2009); and of the FY 2008 appropriations, only 12% to 14% had been obligated by the end of FY 2008. Is this national experience representative of your state's experience?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

6. Have you had any JARC or New Freedom appropriations expire before they could be obligated?

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No

Please explain any issues with obligating these funds.

7. Has the percentage of JARC funding obligated improved with the coordination plan requirement?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please explain.

8. Is there a general understanding by potential grant recipients of what types of projects are eligible for JARC funding?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If no, please explain.

9. Is there an understanding by potential grant recipients of what types of projects are eligible for New Freedom funding (i.e. what is considered beyond ADA requirements)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If no, please explain.

10. Has your state experienced difficulty in designating entities to administer the Section 5316 JARC and Section 5317 New Freedom grants?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, please explain.

11. Does the requirement for a competitive project selection process impact your state's ability to obligate funds from these programs?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, please explain.

12. Do the program matching requirements for Sections 5316 JARC and 5317 New Freedom (20% for capital and 50% for operating) impact your project selections?

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No

If yes, please explain.

13. What is your state's greatest concern with the matching requirements for the Section 5316 JARC and Section 5317 New Freedom grants? (select the one that most applies)

- ☐ Ability of the state and/or local agency to provide matching funds
- ☐ Need to reprogram matching funds from existing uses ☐ 3 (Average Success)
- ☐ Potential restrictions on the use of matching funds from other federal programs
- ☐ Other

If other, please explain.

14. Does the limited size of the Section 5317 New Freedom program limit the ability of your state (or localities in your state) from undertaking large projects?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If there a similar issue with the Section 5316 JARC program? If yes to either question, please explain.

15. Is there reluctance in your state (or localities in your state) to start new services with these funds?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, please explain.

16. What recommendations or suggestions do you (or your state) have to improve the use and management of the Section 5316 JARC and 5317 New Freedom grant programs that could be considered as part of Reauthorization?

IV. Please Tell Us About Yourself

1. Please tell us about yourself.

- a. Name
- b. Position/Job title
- c. State
- d. Phone number
- e. Email address

2. Would you be willing to participate in a more detailed phone interview?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. Do you think that your state would make an interesting case study for the success or lack of success in obligating the JARC and New Freedom grant funds or in the development of the public transit/human services coordination plans?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please explain.

Thank you for completing your survey by *Monday, November 9, 2009*. We greatly appreciate your time and effort.