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*Although many gains have been made in transportation coordination, the need remains to reach out to people with disabilities to incorporate their wisdom and experiences into the planning process at all levels – national, state, and local*

*(Project ACTION, 2009).*
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Background

Easter Seals Project ACTION (ESPA) has a long history of generating knowledge and providing technical assistance support on mobility management. From ESPA’s perspective, mobility management is centered on the individual and the identification of the best transportation options to meet an individual’s travel needs, and it is built on a foundation of participation from a diverse range of human services organizations. ESPA refers to this approach to mobility management as person-directed. Elements of person-directed mobility management include:

* Identifying needed services and transportation needed to access those services;
* Assessing community transportation resources;
* Assessing the individual’s ability to use those resources;
* Filling transportation service or information gaps so that individuals can find out about community transportation resources; and
* Providing agencies and individuals with information and training materials on local transportation and how to use those local transportation services.

Photo: A woman using a wheelchair and reading the train times from a sign.

Mobility management necessitates the engagement of a variety of human services organizations. One example of ESPA’s work includes its Mobility Management Independent Living Coaches (MMILC) program. Since 2010, the MMILC program, a joint demonstration program of ESPA, the Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living (APRIL) and the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL), has worked to bridge the gap between the independent living and transportation communities (ESPA, 2012). ESPA’s efforts to improve mobility and transportation options for those accessing community services, workforce development centers, education, and health services is grounded in a National Strategic Plan for Human Services Person-Directed Mobility Management (ESPA, 2009). The plan was developed in 2008 in coordination with the Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA, 2006) and with the direct input of over 50 stakeholders representing disability services and rural, medical, aging, Hispanic, state Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), workforce, independent living, transit, tribal, education, and children & family agencies and organizations. Over the course of a two-day conference in September 2008, the stakeholders identified four ways that mobility management can be implemented at the local, regional or state levels: a) policy adoption or development of institutional standards; b) agency-to-agency coordination; c) development of the coordination manager or navigator role; and d) direct customer service to individuals and their families.
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The themes and recommendations from the conference were presented to over 30 national association and federal agency representatives during a one-day summit in November 2008. The national representatives discussed general goals, objectives and tasks that ESPA could include in a strategic plan to address the four levels of mobility management discussed during the September conference. Based on the national agency recommendations, ESPA staff developed the National Strategic Plan that includes the goals of building capacity across the U.S. for mobility managers, assessing existing options and setting priorities, putting local plans in place to ensure access to mobility services, and expanding community awareness of transportation needs and options. All of these goals lead to a fifth and final goal: ensuring long-term sustainable and efficient transportation options.

The MMILC program is one of the first formal programs to grow out of ESPA’s strategic plan. The MMILC program supports the plan’s goals of building capacity for mobility managers, helping local agencies conduct assessments and expanding community awareness of transportation issues and options. In particular, the MMILC program focuses on relationship building at the local level by bringing together mobility managers and CILs so that each can understand the others’ needs, services and institutional practices. Typically, a person was affiliated with the human services agency whose responsibilities included mobility management and transportation topics for their stakeholders. It was most efficient when councils or coordinated systems within a community had a professional designated with the title mobility manager. As a result, each group has the opportunity to take a more visible, vocal role in their community and state. With the support of a nationally recognized researcher, ESPA evaluated the MMILC program and is able to offer recommendations to other organizations seeking to establish similar relationships with CILs and human services and transportation professionals (Noonan, 2012).

Requirements in federal transportation authorizing legislation (MAP-21) focus on the cooperation and coordination of transportation services among the various constituencies associated with accessible transportation, including human services organizations. Mobility management is the infrastructure in which these coordination efforts take place, and a mobility manager is the professional most often responsible for coordination activities. The goal of mobility management and coordination is to reduce service silos and streamline programs to increase transportation options for peoples with disabilities, older adults and people with limited income. Coordination is about shared responsibility, shared managements, shared power, and shared funding (ESPA, 2009). Coordinated transportation plans provide the foundation for mobility management and represent the transportation needs of a wide range of riders. The interests of diverse riders are core to the mission of human services organizations that provide services to people with disabilities, older adults and people with low income. For this reason, it is critical to engage human services organizations and professionals and their perspectives, insight and experience in mobility management.

Human services participation in mobility management can support the ability of people with disabilities, older adults and people with low income to live spontaneous lives connected as they choose to community-based activities, including healthcare, recreation/leisure, civic engagement, social and entertainment activities, education, and employment (ESPA, 2012). This rationale provides the foundation for this work, the ESPA Mobility Management Rapid Response Study, in which we sought to understand the participation of human services organizations in mobility management. This work reflects an extension of the MMILC program described above. Specifically, we were interested in learning the extent to which representatives from human services organizations knew about and participated in mobility management. This learning is informative to the field about gaps related to the participation of human services organizations in mobility management. Through online electronic surveys and follow-up interviews, we also expected to learn about the knowledge levels of various human services professionals as they relate to their engagement in mobility management. The following reflects findings from the ESPA Mobility Management Rapid Response Study.
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Methods

Two survey instruments were developed to solicit input from human services professionals and United We Ride (UWR) Ambassadors regarding their knowledge about and engagement in mobility management. The human services professional survey was designed for a wide range of professionals representing different human service agencies and organizations on both the state and national level. The human services professional survey consisted of seven items (see Appendix 4) that focused on the scope of the organization, who its stakeholders were, the kinds of work conducted related to mobility management, the level of engagement of their stakeholders in mobility management, and the types of resources needed by their stakeholders. The survey also sought information about the organization’s interest in becoming more involved in national activities around mobility management.

The second survey (see Section 2) was designed specifically for the UWR Ambassadors who provide states and territories with hands-on technical assistance in the development and implementation of coordinated human service transportation. The UWR Ambassadors also work to build awareness among decision-makers, service providers, and consumers on key issues related to human service transportation and coordination. The UWR Ambassadors survey was similar in length and focus as the human service professional survey but specifically sought the respondents’ input from their perspective as an Ambassador in their region. In addition to completing the online survey, the nine Ambassadors also participated in a telephone interview, providing them with the opportunity to elaborate on their survey responses. The interview responses have also been integrated into this report where appropriate.

Box to the left lists the following bullets:

* Vocational Rehabilitation
* Welfare Agencies
* Developmental Disabilities Councils
* Human Services Providers Council Members
* Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities
* Offices of Adolescent Health
* PACER Center
* Independent Living Centers
* The ARC
* Association for Persons in Supported Employment
* National Association of State Directors of Special Education
* Transition Research & Training Center
* Administration on Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities
* Disabled & Elderly Health Programs Group
* Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
* Child, Adolescent & Family Branch
* Center for Mental Health Services
* Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
* Cross Matrix Lead on Disability & Military Families
* Assertive Adolescent & Family Treatment Program
* Workforce System Policy
* Office of Disability & Employment Policy
* Veteran’s Administration
* Social Security Administration
* Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

The online human services professional survey, along with a cover letter that included a definition of mobility management (Appendix 3) was sent to the email addresses of 477 human services professionals representing a wide array of human services organizations. We identified this sample (see adjacent textbox) based on several factors including: their identification as a human services organization whose stakeholders include people with disabilities, older adults or people with low income; the belief that access to transportation was important to these organizations and their stakeholders; and the knowledge that these organizations provide information, resources or services to targeted stakeholders. The sample included federal and national organizations with formal infrastructures to reach stakeholders at the state level, such as the Association for Persons in Supported Employment, and national organizations with less formal relationships at the state or local level but, nevertheless, provide resources and services to state and local levels, such as the PACER Center, a national center supported in part by an array of federally funded projects that provide services to parents and families on topics related to the education of students with disabilities.
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The UWR Ambassador online survey was sent to the email addresses of the 10 regional UWR Ambassadors of which nine responded. Additional follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with each of the nine UWR Ambassadors and served to confirm and enhance data that they provided on the online survey. As a result, the data collected from the UWR Ambassadors is exceptionally reliable information.

**Study Limitations:** The online surveys to human services organizations and the UWR Ambassador surveys and follow-up interviews with UWR Ambassadors yielded some important qualitative findings that can be useful in mobility management work. It would be difficult, however, to generalize these findings to the larger sample of human services organizations due to the small sample size (N=27) in this study. Possible reasons for the low response rate include 1) the uncertainty of potential respondents views of their participation in transportation or mobility management; 2) the survey was emailed to the wrong person; 3) the time of year which included a succession of holidays; 4) survey fatigue due to being inundated with different surveys; and 5) the short turn-around time in which to conduct the survey which inhibited any extensive follow-up activities that are usually required to obtain a higher response rate. Nevertheless, we are able to report on the data collected from the small sample and UWR Ambassador interviews and offer discussion regarding implications for future work.

Photo: A woman riding a bus.
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Section 1: Results of the Rapid Response Survey to Human Services Organizations

**Scope of Organization**

A total of 27 respondents completed the general survey. Not all respondents, however, answered all questions. Respondents were from 22 states (for a list of all respondent organizations see Appendix 2). The majority of respondents 72% (N=18) indicated that they worked for a state organization with only 8% (N=2) indicating that they worked with a regional or local organization. Only one respondent indicated that he worked for a national organization. Figure 1 highlights the scope of the respondents’ organization.

Figure 1: Scope of Organization

Image of a pie chart that depicts:

* National – 4%
* Regional – 8%
* State – 72%
* Local – 8%
* Other – 8%

**Stakeholders or Target Audiences of Organization**

The electronic survey asked respondents to indicate the stakeholder group or target audience of their work. A total of 27 respondents participated and were instructed to check all target audience categories that applied. The majority of respondents 85.2% indicated that individuals with disabilities were their target audience. Forty-four percent of respondents also indicated that state and local human services professionals and agencies were their target audience. Fewer respondents indicated that senior citizens were their target audiences (37%), while K-12 educators, higher educational professionals, and public or private transit providers were indicated as being the target audience, each 22% or less. Youth or students with disabilities or individuals with low incomes were also identified as target audiences but at a lower rate. Figure 2 identifies key stakeholders.

Figure 2: Stakeholders or Target Audiences

Image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Individuals with disabilities – 85.2%
* Youth, Students with Disabilities – 63%
* Local human services professionals/providers – 44.4%
* State human services professionals/providers – 44.4%
* Individuals with low incomes – 40.7%
* Seniors – 37.0%
* Veterans – 33.3%
* Educators (K-12) – 22.2%
* Transit providers public/private – 22.2%
* Educators (higher education) – 14.8%
* Other – 14.8%
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**Work Related to Mobility Management**

When asked to select the kinds of activities in their work that related to mobility management, the most frequent response was “collaborate with other organizations and agencies” with 63% of respondents selecting that activity. Almost half (48.2%) of respondents indicated that they served on committees and advisory groups and encouraged stakeholders to participate in mobility management. Thirty-three percent indicated that they informed policy and legislation and problem-solved local solutions to better engage diverse audiences and improve mobility management. Twenty-six percent of respondents indicated that they offered stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan and provided technical assistance and training, with slightly fewer respondents indicating that they develop information materials and products. Respondents selected “develop policy and accompanying guidance” least often with only 18.5% of respondents listing this activity as part of their work. Fourteen respondents indicated that they did not do any work around mobility management. These data substantiate the wide variance of activity across states and organizations around mobility management. This was also confirmed through interviews with the UWR Ambassadors, who themselves conduct work across several states in a Federal Transit Administration region.

Figure 3: Type of Work Related to Mobility Management

Image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Collaborate with other organizations and agencies – 63%
* Serve on committees and advisory groups – 48.2%
* Encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility – 48.2%
* Problem solve local solutions to better engage diverse stakeholders – 33.3%
* Inform policy and legislation – 33.3%
* Offer stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan – 25.9%
* Provide technical assistance and training – 25.9%
* Develop informational materials and products – 22.2%
* Develop policy and accompanying guidance – 18.5%
* We do not do any work around mobility management – 14.8%
* Other – 14.8%

**Stakeholder Level of Engagement in Mobility Management**

Slightly more than half (55.6%) of the 27 respondents indicated that their stakeholders were engaged in mobility management. When asked about the types of activities in which their stakeholders were engaged, only 15 of the 27 respondents provided responses, which are presented in Figure 4. Similar to the responding organizations themselves, the activities that stakeholders of these organizations were reported to be the most engaged in were “serv[ing] on local committees and advisory groups” and “collaborat[ing] with other local organizations and agencies”.
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Figure 4: Type of Engagement

Figure 5: Barriers to Mobility Management

If yes, how are they engaged? (Respondents could check all that apply) N=15

Image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Collaborate with other organizations and agencies – 86.7%
* Serve on committees and advisory groups – 86.7%
* Problem solve local solutions to better engage diverse stakeholders – 66.7%
* Encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility – 60.0%
* Inform policy and legislation – 60.0%
* Offer stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan – 53.3%
* Develop local policy and accompanying local guidance – 53.3%
* Provide technical assistance and training – 46.7%
* Develop informational materials and products – 33.3%
* Stakeholders not do any work around mobility management – 0.0%
* Other – 0.0%

One respondent indicated in their comments that “Due to the wide range of stakeholders involved with our agency, it is not possible for me to know how to answer the question regarding stakeholder involvement with mobility management...I just don’t know who might be focused on this, to what extent, etc.”

**Barriers to Mobility Management**

The most frequently chosen barrier to engaging in mobility management work was “lack of information about how to be involved in mobility management” (66.7%) followed closely by “lack of opportunity and unaware of mobility management”. Other barriers to this work included the lack of resources, such as time or money to engage in mobility management, and the disbelief that the respondent’s perspective or opinions can influence mobility management.

Figure 5: Barriers to Mobility Management

If no, what do you think are the barriers that inhibit their engagement? (Respondents could check all that apply) N=12

* Lack of information about how to be involved in mobility management – 66.7%
* Lack of opportunity – unaware of mobility management – 58.3%
* Lack of resources, such as time or money to engage in mobility management – 25.0%
* Do not know what the barriers are – 16.7%
* Do not believe that their perspective or opinions can influence mobility management – 16.7%
* Do not believe it is a need or relevant to their life conditions – 0.0%
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One UWR Ambassador highlighted that sometimes the barrier is “having human service agencies understand the value of transportation and coordination”. Another UWR Ambassador agreed with this and indicated: “We still have the same issue—human services sides of things—if we take money from their program [they think] it takes away [the] dollars they have for direct services”.

No respondents indicated that a barrier was that stakeholders do not believe it is a need or relevant to their life conditions, but two respondents indicated that they did not know what barriers existed to engaging in mobility management. One respondent commented that “better access to transportation in rural areas is needed.” Another indicated that tax policy in Idaho is not helpful. It is the only state in the country that does not use state funds to support public transportation. Local option sales taxes would be helpful, but the state does not allow for local option sales tax votes and the legislation to change that has not made it out of committee.

**Resources that Could Increase Engagement in Mobility Management**

Almost 60% of respondents indicated that they were interested in becoming more involved in national activities around mobility management. Respondents indicated strongly (63%) that research and evidence regarding strategies that work would increase the engagement in mobility management. Other helpful resources cited included forums to collaborate with other organizations and agencies, products and materials, presentations, conferences and meetings, peer-to-peer mentoring programs, webinars. Fewer than 40% of respondents indicated that the following resources would be helpful: intensive technical assistance with an expert, coalition building forums, and online communities of practice.

Figure 6: Helpful Resources

An image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Research and evidence regarding strategies that work – 63.0%
* Forums to collaborate with other organizations and agencies – 55.6%
* Presentations and conferences and meetings – 48.2%
* Products and materials – 48.2%
* Peer to Peer mentoring program related to mobility management – 48.2%
* Webinars – 40.7%
* Coalition-building forums – 37.0%
* Online community of practice – 33.3%
* Intense technical assistance with an expert – 25.9%
* Other, please specify – 3.7%
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Image: Woman with a service dog and a man coming up an escalator

Although results from the survey and interviews with UWR Ambassadors will be more fully described in Section 2, comments from the UWR appear to confirm the results of the survey to the human services organization respondants. For instance, a UWR Ambassador shared that most of human service transportation is handled by human services agencies—not by transit. She suggested that the human services transportation office was a successful model and provided built-in relationships. A survey respondent who had these insights about mobility management in the state of Iowa shared additional observations:

*State of Iowa DOT has facilitated a state-wide transportation council which helps focus on this issue. It has been an excellent source of information bringing together a diverse group of interested parties. There are challenges with state-wide implementation, consistent communication delivery to all impacted players, limited resources to spread over a large geographic area, and unique rural geographic needs. I am impressed by the current mobility managers working through contracts with DOT and feel efforts are being made with visibility, promotion, partnering, access to general information and response to identified needs. There still are information and knowledge gaps existing in the field both professionally and with the general public on resources available. I am not that familiar with Easter Seals’ role with the mobility managers and with the general public.*

Another respondent indicated that:

*Although mobility management is not a core aspect of the work we do, our target population would benefit from efforts to convene agencies, organizations and stakeholders in addressing issues of mobility.*
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Section 2: Results of the United We Ride Ambassador Survey and Telephone Interviews

Section 2 will provide the results of the UWR Ambassador Survey that was conducted online in Survey Gizmo and follow-up telephone interviews that were conducted by Judy Shanley, the ESPA Mobility Management Rapid Response Study project director in Fall 2012. A total of nine out of ten respondents, with one respondent from each of the nine regions, participated in the online UWR Ambassador Survey and telephone interviews (see Appendix 6 Ambassador Interview Questions). Given the high response rate (90%), we believe the data and related information are very reliable and provide a comprehensive view of human services professionals’ engagement in mobility management.

**Target Audience**

One-hundred percent of the UWR Ambassadors respondents indicated that they target or work with state or local human services organizations or agencies, public and private transit providers, and veterans. Close to 89% also indicated that they worked with individuals with disabilities and senior citizens. Another 77.8% indicated that they worked with individuals with low incomes. A little over 55% indicated that they worked with youth with disabilities. At a much lower frequency, 33.3% of respondents indicated that they worked with K-12 and higher education educators. Individual respondents also indicated that they worked with state, regional and local coordinating councils focused on human services transportation and mobility management; Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Service Coordinators; Tribal Nations; the American Cancer Society; a nutrition agency; Vehicles for Change; and other charitable organizations. Figure 1 highlights the key target audiences.

Figure 1: Target Audience

Image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Veterans – 100.0%
* Transit providers public/private – 100.0%
* Local human services professionals/providers – 100.0%
* State human services professionals/providers – 100.0%
* Seniors – 88.9%
* Individuals with disabilities – 88.9%
* Individuals with low incomes – 77.8%
* Youth, Students with Disabilities – 55.6%
* Other – 44.4%
* Educators (higher education) – 33.3%
* Educators (K-12) – 33.3%

**Human Services Professionals Work Related to Mobility Management**

Almost 89% of UWR Ambassador respondents indicated that the human services organizations with which they work collaborate with other organizations or agencies, serve on advisory groups, encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility management, offer stakeholders opportunities to plan, and provide technical assistance and training. Another 77.8% indicated that these human services organizations work to find local solutions to better engage diverse audiences and improve mobility management. Close to 67% of respondents indicated that these human service organizations developed informational materials and products. Almost 56% of respondents indicated that these human services organizations worked on developing policy and accompanying guidance and to inform policy and legislation related to mobility management. Some of the “Other” category responses included the development of alternative transportation programs, e.g. taxi vouchers in Maine; the utilization of retired vehicles in providing service; more emphasis on coordination that has addressed mobility management as an effective strategy; and that more education and outreach is needed to continue this dialogue. Figure 2 details the type of work with which human services professionals are involved related to mobility management.
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Boxed item: *The involvement of human services organizations in mobility management differs widely in my region.* – Human service provider

Figure 2: Human Service Professionals Work

An image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Collaborate with other organizations and agencies – 88.9%
* Serve on committees and advisory groups – 88.9%
* Encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility – 88.9%
* Offer stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan – 88.9%
* Provide technical assistance and training – 88.9%
* Problem solve local solutions to better engage diverse stakeholders – 77.8%
* Develop informational materials and products – 66.7%
* Other, please specify – 55.6%
* Develop policy and accompanying guidance – 55.6%
* Inform policy and legislation – 55.6%

**UWR Ambassadors Identified Barriers that Inhibit Engagement of Human Services Providers in Mobility Management**

Close to 89% of UWR Ambassador respondents indicated that they felt two major barriers that inhibit engagement of human services professionals in mobility management were a lack of resources and information on how to be involved. Another 66.7% indicated that they felt another significant barrier was a lack of opportunity or an unawareness on the part of human services professionals of what mobility management is about. A little over 55% of the UWR Ambassadors indicated that they thought that human services professionals did not feel that their perspective or opinion could influence mobility management. Another 33.3% of the UWR Ambassadors indicated that they felt that human services professionals do not know what the barriers were and/or they do not believe it is a need. See Figure 3 for a breakout of the barriers to participation in mobility management by human services professionals perceived by UWR Ambassadors.

Boxed item: *When money is siloed, [it] turn[s]organizations inward; Programs get siloed because the money is siloed.* – Human service provider

Boxed item: *The difference in participation is that there is community – or way to get folks together – I would like to see more of it – I am concerned about it*. – Human service provider

A UWR Ambassador expressed, “when human services providers also provide direct transportation services, they are more apt to be involved in mobility management systems.”
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Figure 3: Barriers that Inhibit Engagement of Human Service Providers Identified by UWR Ambassadors

 An image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Lack of resources, such as time or money – 88.9%
* Lack of information about how to be involved – 88.9%
* Lack of opportunity – unaware of mobility management – 66.7%
* Do not believe that their perspective can influence – 55.6%
* Do not know what the barriers are – 33.3%
* Do not believe it is a need or relevant to their life conditions – 33.3%

**Resources for Human Services Professional Engagement in Mobility Management**

Boxed item: *One UWR Ambassador indicated, “Coordinated transportation plans help bring in mobility managers.”*

One-hundred percent of the UWR Ambassador respondents indicated that they believed that peer-to-peer mentoring related to mobility management would foster greater engagement of human services professionals. Close to 89% of respondents also felt that coalition-building forums promote the greater engagement of professionals. Another 77.8% indicated that intense technical assistance, forums to collaborate with other organizations, webinars, and research and evidence regarding strategies that work were all strategies that could increase human services professionals’ engagement in mobility management. UWR Ambassador responses to the ‘Other’ category included: peer-to-peer mentoring program, attendance and presentations at conferences, products and materials, creation of an online community of practice related to engagement in mobility management; research and evidence on effective strategies; webinars; forums that foster collaboration with other organizations and agencies; and intense technical assistance with an expert. See Figure 4 for greater detail in overall responses.

Figure 4: Resources for Human Service Provider Engagement

An image of a bar graph that depicts:

* Peer to Peer mentoring program related to mobility management – 100.0%
* Coalition-building forums – 88.9%
* Intense technical assistance with an expert – 77.8%
* Forums to collaborate with other organizations and agencies – 77.8%
* Webinars – 77.8%
* Research and evidence regarding strategies that work – 77.8%
* Presentations and conferences and meetings – 66.7%
* Other, please specify – 55.6%
* Products and materials – 55.6%
* Online community of practice – 55.6%
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**Interest in National Involvement Regarding Mobility Management**

An overwhelming number of the UWR Ambassador respondents (88.9%) indicated that they believed that the human services organizations with which they worked would be interested in becoming more involved in national activities around mobility management. A UWR Ambassador representing western states indicated, “becoming involved in mobility management can open up doors for human service organizations.”

Boxed item: *A UWR Ambassador suggested that having the participation of mobility managers who themselves represent human services and non-profit organizations was a way to garner more interest in mobility management systems by other human services organizations.*

**Technical Assistance Needs of Human Services Organizations**

The UWR Ambassadors indicated that they believed that human services organizations were concerned with long-term sustainability and availability of federal and state funding. The UWR Ambassadors identified the following as areas of potential technical assistance for human services organizations:

* Provide information on how public transportation is funded and operated. Many mobility managers from human services organizations are just getting up to speed on the technical side of public transportation.
* Assist communities with coordinating their mobility management services and designating one person at the coordinating council level, who is the mobility manager and serves as the liaison to human services organizations. It would be inefficient to have mobility managers at each human services organization. The one mobility manager affiliated with the community coordinating council, however, can support human services organizations with mobility management and transportation topics.
* Support the allocation of staff resources. One UWR Ambassador indicated that if the human services agency has a mobility manager, then that person would be involved in national activities. If the agency attends coordination council meetings but doesn’t have a staff person dedicated to mobility management, then they don’t want to be much more involved. The UWR Ambassador providing this idea added, “in my region, most areas with Coordinating Councils have a mobility manager that leads the council. The council is made up of human service agencies that may be very active in developing plans and assisting with some implementation, but they expect that the mobility manager will do the bulk of the work.”
* Develop leadership at the state level around mobility management. UWR Ambassadors noted that the participation of human services organizations may depend on support for mobility management at the state level. The Provision of resources to assist states to develop leadership around mobility management would benefit the local level.
* Create opportunities to talk with diverse groups about transportation. As a respondent noted, “we get a lot of transportation people talking to transportation people—so, we should look for opportunities to get human service people involved—with transportation people—we need to have heterogeneous groups—in training—in classes.”
* Develop information that emphasizes the importance of having mobility managers be as independent as possible, regardless of what organization they are housed in, so they can take the big view.
* Continue to build the infrastructure that has been created with the UWR Ambassador and other programs at ESPA, CTAA and APTA for mobility management to expand, including providing technical assistance. A UWR Ambassador offered, “with an ongoing and expanded TA program and education at every event possible, I believe it could be a national model. Once this work has been enhanced, the mobility management programs would continue independently with less assistance from the national level but we are nowhere near this goal.”
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* Help human services organizations identify financial resources in whatever form to provide assistance to their clients. The respondent providing this idea elaborated, “if the technical assistance does not provide a clear path to financial stability or additional resources or obvious benefit to clients and staff without their adding money to the pot they feel they cannot participate.”
* Offer one-on-one support—this is the best. The UWR Ambassador providing this thought explained, “conferences and Webinars are limited. Most State and Local agencies have faced cut backs and the individuals are doing the work of two or three people.”
* Make it work for those on the ground. Often this requires a forum for which folks can justify the slice of time required, whether that is a webinar or an in-person seminar or bringing the technical assistance to the mobility manager. Observing people in their own element can often lead to tailored solutions. The UWR Ambassador added, “That said, the best way to provide TA seems to be extracting folks from their element into a common gathering, the formal and informal networking that occurs in this situation benefits the MM.”
* Provide guidance around technology. The respondent noted, “There is a great need, in this technological era, for assistance leading to the sharing of data through open architecture. Some professional that could provide a platform where software could talk to each other. A barrier appears to be where one type of software has difficulty communicating with other software.”
* Focus on consistent educational tools for use at conferences, forums and small group presentations.
* Enhance understanding across human services organizations on the benefits of their participation in mobility management.
* Provide orientation to human services professionals about the various transportation supports that exist in addition to mobility management systems such as information on One-Call-One Click Centers, volunteer programs, 211 programs, or other transportation supports that may be available in their community.
* Identify mobility managers and their systems and practices that are successful at engaging human services organizations and provide them with opportunities to share their expertise, success, and learning through national platforms such as webinars and conferences.
* One UWR Ambassador related that Title IV guidance is needed from the FTA. They suggested that it is also helpful “to look at resources to identify underserved populations and identify agencies who are working with these entities – these are your partners – smaller agencies don’t do this so much – this does give you a snapshot of who you serving”.
* Another UWR Ambassador cited the need for tools to help planning organizations tap into local coordinating councils to use their input. They suggested that local coordinating councils should be involved in planning.

**Implications and Recommendations**

The overall purpose of the two surveys and telephone interviews of the UWR Ambassadors was to begin to understand the participation of human services organizations in mobility management. This study was intended to be a rapid-response outreach to targeted human services organizations that were believed to have an interest in mobility management and transportation topics. As was explained, although the response rate for the online human services professionals survey was low, the data offered and qualitative information obtained through the online survey and telephone interviews with the nine out of 10 UWR Ambassadors is invaluable.
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First, the nine UWR Ambassadors represent 90% of the country and the Ambassadors themselves are focused on mobility management for their work so we believe the data they provided results in a very reliable picture of the current status of the participation of human services professionals in mobility management and related needs in the field. This data can also be useful for mobility managers and other transportation professionals as they build coordinated transportation systems to include a wider range of human services professionals.

Further, data from this rapid-response study can be used to establish a benchmark that the field can use to measure the participation of mobility management by human services professionals over time. Additionally, the strategies provided by respondents, especially related to the types of activities with which they and their stakeholders are involved, can be useful as coordinated transportation systems identify ongoing ways to engage human services organizations. UWR Ambassadors offered recommendations to human services organizations, mobility managers and policy-makers on enhancing the awareness of the value that engagement in mobility management can bring at multiple levels. This is a message that can be integrated in work across the industry. Finally, the information provided can be used to identify needs in order to establish a more coordinated and person-centered system of transportation for targeted populations. Based on the results of both surveys and telephone interviews with the UWR Ambassadors, six key recommendations emerged for the mobility management field to consider. These recommendations include:

1. Develop more **information and technical assistance for human services organizations** to better understand how they can be involved in mobility management and why this is important to their organizations and stakeholders;
2. Identify appropriate **channels of communication** for the diverse range of human services organizations;
3. Develop a variety of **universally designed multimedia materials** including a technical assistance/informational packet that human services organizations can **use to engage their stakeholders** (e.g., web-based and hard copy) for the wide range of human service organizations and consumers and family members;
4. Implement strategies that promote **greater agency-to-agency coordination** **and communication** such as online learning communities, listservs/blogs, Facebook, and LinkedIn;
5. Establish a mechanism for **measuring continuous ongoing improvement** regarding human services organizations’ involvement in mobility management; and
6. Establish a **baseline for human services organizations’ involvement** in mobility management and measure the growth of human services organizations’ involved in mobility management and other coordinated transportation efforts over time.

Photo: A man using a power scooter boarding on a paratransit van lift
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Appendix 1: Human Service Respondent Organizations to Rapid Response Survey on Mobility Management

* Arizona Rehabilitation Services Administration
* Children’s Home + Aid (Illinois)
* Delaware Department of Health and Social Services, Division for the Visually Impaired
* Enable (New York)
* Human Services Council (Washington)
* Idaho Department of Health & Welfare
* Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services
* Iredell-Statesville Schools (North Carolina)
* LifeWorks (Texas)
* Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota
* Maine Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Aging and Disability Services
* Morris Heights Health Center (New York)
* Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Developmental Disabilities
* New Mexico Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
* Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI)
* Oklahoma Department of Rehabilitation Services
* Oregon Commission for the Blind
* PACER Center (Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights)
* Service to the Blind and Visually Impaired (South Dakota)
* South Carolina Department of Social Services
* State of Montana Department of Health and Human Services Disability Employment Transitions Division
* Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services
* Virginia Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services
* Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
* Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Division of Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services, Department of Developmental Services
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Appendix 2: State Respondent to Rapid Response Survey on Mobility Management

1. North Carolina

2. New Mexico

3. Texas

4. Iowa

5. Minnesota

6. Virginia

7. Nebraska

8. Washington

9. Arizona

10. South Carolina

11. New York

12. Ohio

13. Idaho

14. Oklahoma

15. Montana

16. Connecticut

17. Wisconsin

18. Delaware

19. South Dakota

20. Oregon

21. Tennessee

22. Maine
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Appendix 3: Human Services Professional Survey Cover Sheet

Dear Human Services Professional:

As you are likely aware, Easter Seals has a long history of promoting accessible transportation for individuals with disabilities through its national technical assistance center, Project ACTION. Easter Seals Project ACTION is working to understand the participation of human services organizations in mobility management.

This short questionnaire is an extension of ESPA’s work on mobility management through its Mobility Management Independent Living Coaches (MMILC) Program. The program began in 2010 as a partnership between ESPA and the Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living (APRIL) and the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL). The purpose of the project was to build a network of professionals with disability expertise affiliated with centers for independent living (CILs) to serve as liaisons with mobility managers to enhance services for individuals with disabilities in mobility management.

We hope you will answer some questions about the knowledge of and participation of your organization, and its stakeholders, in mobility management. We hope to use this information as a steppingstone to build relationships with your organization and its stakeholders, around mobility management. Please refer to the following definition as you respond:

**Mobility Management** is an approach to transportation service development and management that focuses on individualized customer markets and involves establishing a variety of services tailored to meet the needs of those markets. A mobility manager is someone who understands the needs of individuals who need transportation, such as persons with disabilities and seniors, and helps connect these riders with transportation resources in their community.

This work is being conducted by Easter Seals Project ACTION, through a continuation of its mobility management grant and is supported by the US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). We look forward to the information we learn through this feedback as a way to extend the participation of a diverse range of human services mobility management. For more information about our current work visit our website at: http://www.projectaction.org/initiatives/MobilityManagement.aspx

For questions regarding this survey, please contact Dr. Judy Shanley at jshanley@easterseals.com
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Appendix 4: Human Service Professional Rapid Response Survey on Mobility Management

**Name of Organization, Program, or Agency:**

**Contact Full Name:**

**Contact Email:**

**Contact Phone Number:**

**What is the scope of your organization, program, or agency? (Select one)**

* National
* Regional
* State
* Local
* Other, please explain: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Who are your stakeholders or target audiences? (Check all that apply)**

* State human services professionals/providers and agencies
* Local human services professionals/providers and agencies
* Transit providers public/private
* Educators (K-12)
* Educators (Higher education)
* Individuals with disabilities
* Seniors
* Individuals with low incomes
* Youth, Students with Disabilities
* Veterans
* Other, please explain: *(there is space to write here)*

**Which of the following topics best reflects the work that you do related to mobility management? (Check all that apply**)

* Provide technical assistance and training
* Inform policy and legislation
* Develop policy and accompanying guidance
* Offer stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan
* Encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility management
* Develop informational materials and products
* Serve on committees and advisory groups
* Collaborate with other organizations and agencies
* Problem solve local solutions to better engage diverse audiences and improve mobility management
* Other, please specify *(there is space to write here)*
* We do not do any work around mobility management
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**Are your stakeholders engaged in mobility management?**

* Yes
* No

**Which of the following resources could help your organization or its stakeholders better engage in mobility management? (Check all that apply)**

* Peer to peer mentoring program related to mobility management
* Online community of practice
* Coalition-building forums
* Products and materials
* Presentations and conferences and meetings
* Research and evidence regarding strategies that work
* Webinars
* Forums to collaborate with other organizations and agencies
* Intense technical assistance with an expert
* Other, please specify: *(there is space to write here)*

**Is your organization interested in becoming more involved in national activities around mobility management?**

* Yes
* No

**Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your participation in mobility management?**
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Appendix 5: United We Ride Ambassador Survey

Logo: Easter Seals Project ACTION

Dear United We Ride Regional Ambassador:

As you are likely aware, Easter Seals has a long history of promoting accessible transportation for individuals with disabilities through its national technical assistance center, Project ACTION. Easter Seals Project ACTION is working to understand the participation of human services organizations in mobility management.

This short questionnaire is an extension of ESPA’s work on mobility management through its Mobility Management Independent Living Coaches (MMILC) Program. The program began in 2010 as a partnership between ESPA and the Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living (APRIL) and the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL). The purpose of the project was to build a network of professionals with disability expertise affiliated with centers for independent living (CILs) to serve as liaisons with mobility managers to enhance services for individuals with disabilities in mobility management.

We hope you will answer some questions about your knowledge and experiences regarding the participation of human services organizations and their stakeholders, in mobility management. We hope to use this information as a steppingstone to build relationships with these organizations, around mobility management as we move forward with work around mobility management. Please refer to the following definition as you respond:

**Mobility management** is an approach to transportation service development and management that focuses on individualized customer markets and involves establishing a variety of services tailored to meet the needs of those markets. A mobility manager is someone who understands the needs of individuals who need transportation, such as persons with disabilities and seniors, and helps connect these riders with transportation resources in their community.

This work is being conducted by Easter Seals Project ACTION, through a continuation of its mobility management grant and is supported by the US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). We look forward to the information we learn through this feedback as a way to extend the participation of a diverse range of human services mobility management.

For more information about our current work visit our website at http://www.projectaction.org/Initiatives/MobilityManagement.aspx. For questions regarding this survey, please contact Dr. Judy Shanley at jshanley@easterseals.com.

Please respond by December 10. Thank you in advance for sharing your perspectives. If you would like a copy of the report that reflects the findings of this study, please send a note to Judy at jshanley@easterseals.com.
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**Survey Questions**

1) Name of Organization, Program, or Agency: *(there is space to write here)*

* Contact full name
* Contact Email
* Contact Phone number
* Please indicate the region you work with:
	+ Region 1: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont
	+ Region 2: New York New Jersey, and Virgin Islands
	+ Region 3: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia
	+ Region 4: Alabama, Florida Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and Tennessee
	+ Region 5: Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin
	+ Region 6: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas
	+ Region 7: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska
	+ Region 8: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming
	+ Region 9: Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam, American Samoa and Northern Marianas
	+ Region 10: Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington

2) As an ambassador, did you have experience in working with human services colleagues whose target audiences included: (Check all that apply)

* State human services professionals/providers and agencies
* Local human services professionals/providers and agencies
* Transit providers public/private
* Educators (K-12)
* Educators (higher education)
* Individuals with disabilities
* Seniors
* Individuals with low incomes
* Youth, Students with Disabilities
* Veterans
* Other, please explain: *(there is space to write here)*

3) In your experience with human services professionals which of the following topics best reflects the work they do related to mobility management? (Check all that apply)

* Provide technical assistance and training
* Inform policy and legislation
* Develop policy and accompanying guidance
* Offer stakeholders opportunities to convene and plan
* Encourage stakeholders to participate in mobility management
* Develop informational materials and products
* Serve on committees and advisory groups
* Collaborate with other organizations and agencies
* Problem-solve local solutions to better engage diverse audiences and improve mobility management
* Other, please specify: *(there is space to write here)*
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4) If human services organizations are not involved in mobility management, what do you think are the barriers that inhibit their engagement? (Check all that apply)

* Lack of information about how to be involved in mobility management
* Lack of resources, such as time or money to engage in mobility management
* Lack of opportunity – unaware of mobility management
* Do not believe it is a need or relevant to their life conditions
* Do not believe that their perspective or opinions can influence mobility management
* Do not know what the barriers are.

5) Which of the following resources could help the human services professionals you work with better engage in mobility management?

* Peer to peer mentoring program related to mobility management
* Online community of practice
* Coalition-building forums
* Products and materials
* Presentations and conferences and meetings
* Research and evidence regarding strategies that work
* Webinars
* Forums to collaborate with other organizations and agencies
* Intense technical assistance with an expert
* Other, please specify: *(there is space to write here)*

6) What do you think motivates human services organizations to be engaged in mobility management?

7) Do you believe the human services organizations you work with are interested in becoming more involved in national activities around mobility management?

* Yes
* No

8) Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the technical assistance needs of the human services organizations you work with regarding mobility management?

We may follow-up with you with a brief telephone interview to clarify and extend on your responses. Thank you so much for taking the time to support this important work.

For questions regarding this survey, please contact, Judy Shanley, jshanley@projectaction.org or 1-800-659-6428.

The mission of Easter Seals Project ACTION (ESPA) is to promote universal access to transportation for people with disabilities (www.projectaction.org).
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Appendix 6: United We Ride Ambassador Telephone Interview Questions

Date:

*Judy provided an overview of the study, its purposes, and how this information, along with their participation in the electronic survey, will be used.*

**Ambassador Name**

Region:

Did you get the electronic survey?

Based on your experience, describe the ways in which human services organizations are involved in mobility management

What strategies have you observed that engage human services organizations in mobility management?

Why don’t you think they participate?

What recommendations could you offer that may be helpful in engaging human services organizations in mobility management?

Recommendations in general?

Back cover:
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Phone: 202-347-3066
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www.projectaction.org
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