

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Bob Schwab

Regional Transportation Coordinator

El Paso County

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Objective – to identify, understand and fill the mobility needs of persons dependent on, likely to become dependent on or who's lives will materially improve with better public transportation resources and access to them.

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

The assessment should include the mobility needs of persons currently using, could be using, will be using, and should be using public transportation or other alternative transportation services.

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Elements of Mobility Needs Assessments

- Literature – Reports/Studies/Articles
- Surveys
- Interviews
- Public hearings
- Surveys by others

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Elements of Mobility Needs Assessments

- Demographic Analysis
- Trend Analysis
- 411 Call Logs

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Literature

- U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics
- Transit Cooperative Research Program
- United We Ride / CTAA
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging - *A profile of Older Americans*
- AARP - *Home and Community Preferences of the 45+ Population*

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Literature

- 14america.org - *Aging in Place, Stuck Without Options; Fixing the Mobility Crisis Threatening the Baby Boom Generation*
- Brookings Institution, The Metropolitan Policy Program - *Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America*
- Texas Transportation Institute – *Sizing and Serving Urban Gaps in Texas*

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Surveys

- Two page survey sent to 30+ public and private health & human service, workforce and other organizations
- Survey asked about the organizations' services; who, how, where and when they served; how clients accessed them and if the organization provides transportation itself

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Surveys

- Included 16 questions about client transportation needs
- Written survey was used primarily as a prompt for a follow-up face to face interview
- Organizations reluctant to complete survey were offered the option of interview
- Include first responders, special education staff, shelters, hospitals and others

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Interviews

- Interviews were intended to clarify survey responses and delve more deeply into issues
- Individualized interview forms were prepared to record responses
- Interviews lasted .5 to 1.5 hours
- Interviews provided opportunity to address immediate mobility needs

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Public Hearings

- They may be necessary but add little value
- Better to partner with advocacy or other organization, encourage them to invite their constituency, promote as a public meeting and encourage public to attend

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Surveys by Others

Surveys by others that are not mobility centric may be more objective and not as leading

- Community Action Agencies
- United Way
- Centers for Independent Living
- Transit Agencies (customer suggestions/ complaints/anticipated service changes)

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Demographic Analysis

- Look at incidence and number of transit dependent populations in comparison to their distribution in your region and the state
- Relied heavily on U.S. Census, Data Profile 1-4 & American Community Survey; and Office of State Demographer

Table IV: Far West Texas / El Paso Transit Dependency Indicators

Census Designated Place	Population 2000 ¹	Population Estimate January 2010 ²	Percentage Change 2000-2010	Population Projection 2020 ³	Persons Aged 65+ ¹	Persons 5-19 ¹	Population Ages 5-19 and 65+ ¹	Population with a Disability By Age (percent of group)			Families Below Poverty Level ¹	Percentage Households with No Vehicle Available ¹
								5-20	21-64	65+		
El Paso County	679,622	758,303	11.6%	981,772	66,073 9.7%	180,970 26.6%	247,043 36.3%	13,867 7.3%	77,460 22.1%	31,209 48.0%	34,264 20.5%	21,798 10.4%
El Paso	563,662	625,085	10.9%	n/a	60,121 10.7%	145,024 25.7%	205,145 36.4%	11,059 7.3%	63,871 21.5%	28,237 47.8%	26,968 19.0%	19,972 11.0%
Anthony	3,850	4,444	15.4%	n/a	255 6.6%	736 19.1%	991 25.7%	29 3.9%	240 19.1%	120 53.8%	131 22.7%	76 11.1%
Canutillo	5,129	5,290	3.1%	n/a	417 8.1%	1,515 29.5%	1,932 37.7%	267 19.4%	1,073 40.9%	208 44.0%	398 31.9%	145 10.2%
Clint	980	1,015	3.6%	n/a	129 13.2%	251 25.6%	380 38.8%	17 6.3%	92 16.7%	38 31.9%	42 16.6%	13 4.2%
Fabens	8,043	8,540	6.2%	n/a	631 7.8%	2,622 32.6%	3,253 40.4%	131 4.7%	784 20.8%	258 44.5%	769 41.2%	304 14.6%
Horizon	5,233	14,597	179.0%	n/a	423 .08%	1,457 27.8%	1880 35.9%	49 2.9%	402 13.8%	161 34.3%	106 7.1%	28 1.7%
San Elizario	11,046	13,657	23.6%	n/a	514 4.7%	3,932 35.6%	4446 40.2%	309 7.6%	1535 29.7%	325 67.4%	937 40.2%	189 7.3%
Socorro	27,152	32,742	20.6%	n/a	1,726 6.4%	8,331 30.7%	10,057 37.0%	584 6.4%	3623 25.3%	921 52.6%	1982 30.9%	523 7.6%
Tornillo	1,609	1,658	3.7%	n/a	83 5.2%	518 32.2%	601 37.3%	130 22.9%	435 58.0%	48 58.5%	136 36.6%	35 8.7%
Vinton	1,892	2,152	13.7%	n/a	57 3.0%	656 34.7%	713 37.7%	57 8.2%	200 22.3%	27 40.3%	104 25.2%	37 7.8%
Texas	20,851,820	25,010,235	19.9%	32,736,716	2,072,532 9.9%	4,921,608 23.6%	6,994,136 33.5%	410,156 7.9%	2,315,414 19.9%	879,978 44.0%	632,696 12%	548,125 7.4%

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

²Texas State Data Center, Texas Population Estimates, November 2010

³Texas State Data Center, Texas Population Projections, February 2009

Amounts in **red** represent values greater than State rate

Table IV: Far West Texas / El Paso Transit Dependency Indicators, Continued

Census Designated Place	Population 2000 ¹	Population Estimate January 2010 ²	Percentage Change 2000-2010	Population Projection 2020 ³	Persons Aged 65+ ¹	Persons 5-19 ¹	Population Ages 5-19 and 65+ ¹	Population with a Disability By Age (percent of group)			Families Below Poverty Level ¹	Percentage Households with No Vehicle Available ¹
								5-20	21-64	65+		
Brewster	8,866	9,416	6.3%	9,979	1,297 14.6%	1,904 21.5%	3,201 36.1%	234 10.8%	1,116 22.7%	579 46.4%	282 12.6%	236 6.4%
Alpine	5,786	6,336	10.0%	n/a	860 14.9%	1,241 21.4%	2,101 36.3%	131 9.6%	642 20.2%	437 52.5%	221 15.5%	188 7.6%
Terlingua Study	267	298	11.6%	n/a	28 10.5%	70 26.2%	98 36.7%	22 20.4%	21 9.6%	9 52.9%	9 10.2%	5 3.4%
Culberson	2,975	2,495	-16.0%	3,374	334 11.2%	823 27.7%	1,157 38.9%	21 2.5%	356 22.6%	124 39.4%	174 21.5%	71 6.7%
Van Horn	2,435	2,115	-13.0%	n/a	272 11.2%	699 28.7%	971 39.9%	12 1.7%	263 21.2%	109 42.2%	160 24.3%	68 8.3%
Hudspeth	3,344	3,371	0.8%	4,252	331 9.9%	966 28.9%	1,287 38.8%	47 4.7%	393 23.2%	184 56.4%	278 32.6%	79 7.2%
Ft. Hancock	1,713	1,811	5.7%	n/a	135 7.9%	533 31.1%	668 39.0%	21 3.6%	187 21.7%	103 65.2%	194 44.6%	44 8.5%
Sierra Blanca	533	575	7.9%	n/a	49 9.2%	128 24.0%	177 33.2%	3 1.8%	31 10.4%	16 34.8%	29 19.6%	17 8.7%
Dell City	413	421	1.9%	n/a	55 13.3%	116 28.1%	171 41.4%	23 14%	105 42.5%	44 62.9%	38 26.4%	15 7.9%
Jeff Davis	2,207	2,643	19.8%	2,422	359 16.3	510 23.1%	869 39.3%	33 7.4%	311 25.0%	160 44.2%	89 14.1%	36 4.0%
Ft. Davis	1,050	1,446	37.7%	n/a	164 15.6%	236 22.5%	400 38.1%	15 6.4%	164 28.4%	80 44.2%	62 20.7%	19 4.5%
Valentine	187	220	17.6%	n/a	39 20.9%	51 27.3%	90 48.1%	0	16 17.0%	16 43.2%	6 12.8%	11 15.9%
Presidio	7,304	8,128	11.3%	10,338	1,017 13.9%	2,042 27.9%	3,059 41.9%	148 7.0%	1,136 32.6%	613 59.1%	605 32.5%	331 13.1%
Marfa	2,121	2,125	0.2%	n/a	392 18.5%	481 22.7%	873 41.2%	32 6.6%	320 30.3%	202 49.9%	91 15.7%	117 13.4%
Presidio	4,167	5,160	23.8%	n/a	464 11.1%	1314 31.5%	1778 42.7%	105 7.7%	679 34.3%	328 71.0%	417 40.4%	186 14.4%
Redford	132	126	-4.5	n/a	32 24.2%	29 22.0%	61 46.2%	- -	9 17.6%	14 51.9%	23 65.7%	6 13.6%
	20,851,820	25,010,235	19.9%	32,736,716	2,072,532 9.9%	4,921,608 23.6%	6,994,136 33.5%	410,156 7.9%	2,315,414 19.9%	879,978 44.0%	632,696 12%	548,125 7.4%

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

²Texas State Data Center, Texas Population Estimates, November 2010

³Texas State Data Center, Texas Population Projections, February 2009

Amounts in red represent values greater than State rate

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Trend Analysis

- Land Use / Development patterns
- Growth in ESRD / Dialysis
- Rural Retirement
- Cost of Living Changes

411 Call Logs

- Extent to which transportation was an inquiry or component of a more primary inquiry

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Gap Analysis

- Compares needs assessment to inventory of transportation resources
- Geographic Component
 - Urban fixed-route & DRT gaps
 - Rural fixed-route & DRT gaps
 - Duplication in transportation system
 - Transit provider operational challenges

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Gap Analysis

- Implications for Regional Mobility and Coordination
- Strategies
 - Greater reliance on fixed-route
 - Better coordination between paratransit and MTP
 - Targeted programs to address special needs

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Gap Analysis

- Strategies
 - Accessibility related gaps
 - Improved public awareness
 - Same day service
 - Non-traditional services
 - Service Duplication
 - On-going mechanism to identify and fill gaps

CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & GAP ANALYSIS

Bob Schwab

rschwab@epcounty.com

915-834-8242

www.gobusgo.org