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Executive Summary

The New Freedom (NF) program provides funding for projects designed to reduce transportation barriers and to expand transportation mobility options available to persons with disabilities beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

FTA contracted with Commonwealth Environmental Services, Inc. (CES) and its subcontractor, TranSystems, to manage data collection and analysis for the FY 2010 JARC / New Freedom (NF) Program Performance Evaluation. Grant recipients submitted reports on JARC- and NF-funded services using a set of online forms. This report presents findings for the New Freedom program only. Findings for the JARC program are presented in a separate report.

## Highlights for FY 2010

A total of 156 grant recipients submitted complete reports for 657 New Freedom-funded services in FY 2010. Key findings include:

* New Freedom-supported services provided 3.3 million one-way trips, a 35% increase over FY 2009.
* Most one-way trips were recorded on demand response services (30%), followed by -door-to-door or door-through-door assistance (14%),. Fixed route, same-day ADA paratransit, and flexible services each carried 10% of one-way trips.
* Out of the active New Freedom-funded services, more than half were trip-based (57%). Information-based services also made up a large portion of service, with a 27% share. The remaining programs were capital investment projects (16%).
* Demand response services accounted for the most services (25%) and the most trips (30%).
* Mobility managers generated more than 186,000 one-way trips and initiated over 1 million customer contacts.
* More than 10,000 people received one-on-one transit training, about 5,600 took part in group travel resource training, and 100 individuals receiving driver training.
* Transit agencies added 55 new vehicles, which were responsible for more than 130,000 one-way trips.
* Grant recipients added 30 accessible taxis, which generated about 16,600 one-way trips.
* ITS-related improvements included new radios, installation of global positioning systems (GPS), routing software, and mobile data terminals.

## Program Performance Measures

FTA has established several key performance measures for the New Freedom program:

* Increases or enhancements related to geographic coverage, service quality, and/or service times that impact the availability of transportation services for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year
* Additions or changes to environmental infrastructure (e.g., transportation facilities, sidewalks, etc.), technology, and vehicles that impact availability of transportation services as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year
* Actual or estimated number of rides (as measured by one-way trips) provided for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year

For New Freedom **demand response**, recipients were asked to report the following:

* Within the existing ADA paratransit service area, **number of service hours added** for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service
* Outside the existing ADA paratransit service area, **number of service hours added** for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service

For New Freedom **fixed route, flexible, and shuttle/feeder services**, recipients were asked to report the following:

* **New miles** added to route (based on one-way route length in miles) for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service
* **Additional hours** added for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service.

The majority of New Freedom-funded programs can report one or all of these measures.  However, NF grants also support programs like one-stop centers and wheelchair lifts that provide indirect benefits. To ensure that these programs are represented in the overall analysis, FTA established a protocol for reporting on JARC and, later, New Freedom services. With the assistance of the JARC / NF Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from transit agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and state DOTs, the consultant team developed a reporting matrix for capturing relevant information about the range of JARC and NF services. The matrix asks grant recipients to categorize their programs based on two criteria: project type and primary project goal.

The reporting matrix includes four basic project types:

* **Trip-based services**, which provide transportation directly to individuals
* **Information-based services**, which provide information about transportation services to individuals but do not provide direct transportation services
* **Capital investment projects**, which include facilities and infrastructure to support transportation services

In keeping with Federal reporting requirements, the five primary program goals are:

* Expanded geographic coverage
* Extended service hours or days
* Improved system capacity
* Improved access/connections
* Improved customer knowledge

After selecting the combination of service type and primary goal that best describes their program, grant recipients were asked to report service output measures. The output measures typically include the number of one-way trips for trip-based programs, the number of customer contacts for information-based services, and the number of units provided for capital investment projects. In some cases, grantees were asked to report descriptive information.

## Service Profiles

Finally, FTA continued to collect program profiles, or summaries, for each New Freedom service. While ridership statistics allow FTA to provide a national summary of the NF program, the profiles allow the grantees to convey the benefits of the program at the local level. These qualitative descriptions complement the data collection and provide an additional avenue for understanding the impacts and benefits of both grant programs.

The profiles provide a rich source of detailed information about the New Freedom program and are provided in their entirety under separate cover. For convenience, they are organized in 10 separate documents based on the FTA regions. In addition, relevant excerpts have been incorporated throughout this summary report. As the program profiles made abundantly clear, the New Freedom program connects with riders and customers on a human scale.***Table of Contents***
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# Introduction

The New Freedom (NF) program provides funding for projects designed to reduce transportation barriers and to expand transportation mobility options available to persons with disabilities beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

The New Freedom program was established in 2005 as a formula-based program under Section 5317 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The new formula was intended to provide an equitable funding distribution to states and communities as well as a stable and reliable funding source. States and public bodies are eligible designated recipients, and they may distribute grants to subrecipients through a competitive selection process. Eligible subrecipients are private non-profit organizations, state or local governments, and operators of public transportation services including private operators of public transportation services.

New Freedom funds are allocated among large urban, small urban, and non-urbanized/rural areas as follows:

* 60% of funds go to designated recipients in large urban areas with populations 200,000 and more
* 20% of funds go to states for small urban areas under 200,000
* 20% of funds go to states for non-urbanized/rural areas

States may transfer funds between urbanized and non-urbanized area programs.

The New Freedom formula is based on the population of people with disabilities in states and large urbanized areas. SAFETEA-LU authorized approximately of $340 million for NF grants from FY 2006 through FY 2009. Starting in FY 2010, Congress continued to authorize funding for the New Freedom program through a series of continuing resolutions. Table 1-1 shows New Freedom funding for FY 2006 through FY 2010.

Table ‑  
FTA New Freedom Funding, 2006 - 2010

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Apportionments | $77.2M | $81.0M | $87.5M | $92.5M | $99.0M |

## New Freedom Program Performance Evaluation

The FTA contracted with Commonwealth Environmental Services, Inc. (CES, Inc.), and its subcontractor, TranSystems, to manage data collection and analysis for the FY 2010 JARC / New Freedom (NF) Program Performance Evaluation. Individuals from both firms have been key evaluators of the JARC program since 2002 and developed the JARC / NF Program Performance Evaluation system currently being used to evaluate both programs.[[1]](#footnote-1) This volume presents findings for the New Freedom program only. Findings for the JARC program are presented in a separate report.

Under the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA), FTA is required to “establish performance goals to define the level of performance” and to also “establish performance indicators to be used in measuring relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes” for each of its programs. In addition, FTA is capturing overall program measures to be used with the GPRA and the Performance Assessment Rating Tool process for the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

Originally, FTA established three key performance indicators for the New Freedom program:

* Increases or enhancements related to geographic coverage, service quality, and/or service times that impact the availability of transportation services for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year
* Additions or changes to environmental infrastructure (e.g., transportation facilities, sidewalks, etc.), technology, and vehicles that impact availability of transportation services as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year
* Actual or estimated number of rides (as measured by one-way trips) provided for individuals with disabilities as a result of the New Freedom projects implemented in the current reporting year

For the FY 2010 analysis, FTA introduced several additional measures for New Freedom services to capture qualitative data about improvements to demand response, fixed route, flexible, and shuttle services.

For New Freedom **demand response**, recipients were asked to report the following:

* Within the existing ADA paratransit service area, **number of service hours added** for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service
* Outside the existing ADA paratransit service area, **number of service hours added** for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service

Recipients were asked to report separate totals for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service. For all services, respondents were asked to report average hours per day added, not annual hours. This information was collected for service matrix (described below) goals A (expanded geographic coverage), B (extended hours/days of service), and D (improved access/connections).

For New Freedom **fixed route, flexible, and shuttle/feeder services**, recipients were asked to report the following:

* **New miles** added to route (based on one-way route length in miles) for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service
* **Percentage increase in miles** (total route length divided by new miles) for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service

Recipients were asked to report separate totals for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday/holiday service. If a reported service included more than one route, recipients were asked to sum the route miles and report the total. This information was collected for service matrix (described below) goals A (expanded geographic coverage), B (extended hours/days of service), C (improved system capacity), and D (improved access/connections).

*Proud “Vermonters” are a difficult population to serve! Our biggest struggle with this service is convincing isolated, independent residents that it is “okay” to receive help and take care of their medical needs. Some of the participants had gone without seeing a doctor or receiving needed services for much too long. Participants have been grateful beyond our wildest expectations.*

Woodstock Area Council on Aging  
Vermont Agency of Transportation

In both cases, the goal was to capture additional quantitative information about service improvements that New Freedom funding made possible.

The majority of New Freedom-funded programs can report one or all of these measures.  However, NF grants also support programs like one-stop centers and wheelchair lifts that provide indirect benefits. To ensure that these programs are represented in the overall analysis, FTA established a protocol for reporting on JARC and, later, New Freedom services. With the assistance of the JARC / NF Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from transit agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and state DOTs, the consultant team developed a reporting matrix for capturing relevant information about the range of JARC and NF services. The matrix asks grant recipients to categorize their programs based on two criteria: project type and primary project goal.

The reporting matrix includes four basic project types:

* **Trip-based services**, which provide transportation directly to individuals
* **Information-based services**, which provide information about transportation services to individuals but do not provide direct transportation services
* **Capital investment projects**, which include facilities and infrastructure to support transportation services

In keeping with Federal reporting requirements, the five primary program goals are:

* **Expanded geographic coverage**, which includes increasing the coverage area for a service (typically for trip-based or capital investment projects)
* **Extended hours or days of service**, which includes adding hours and/or days to existing services (typically for trip-based or capital investment projects)
* **Improved system capacity**, which includes adding resources that result in additional quantities of service (typically for trip-based or capital investment projects)
* **Improved access or improved connections**, which include projects that improve an individual’s ability to travel (typically trip-based services but also some information-based services such as mobility mangers or capital investment projects such as vehicle loan programs)
* **Improved customer knowledge**, which provides additional resources for information-based services especially customer information and training programs

Based on the combination of service type and primary goal, the cells in the matrix identify the type of service output data to be provided by the reporting grantee. The output measures typically include the number of one-way trips for trip-based programs, the number of customer contacts for information-based services, and the number of units provided for capital investment projects.

In addition to providing the basic reporting elements required for the New Freedom evaluation, grant recipients were asked to complete brief profiles describing each service. The profiles include a description of the service, lessons learned, how the local service is evaluated, and major accomplishments of the program. Recipients were also asked to identify the service area (generally city/county and state). The profile information helps to illustrate the breadth and depth of the projects funded by the NF program and provides particularly useful information about the nature of the information-based and capital investment projects that do not lend themselves to traditional FTA data reporting. Profiles for NF services are presented in an appendix to this report under separate cover. For convenience, they are organized into 10 stand-alone volumes based on the FTA region of the designated recipient.

## Summary of FY 2010 Analysis

A total of 156 grant recipients submitted complete reports for 664 New Freedom-funded services in FY 2010. Key findings include:

* New Freedom-supported services provided 3.3 million one-way trips, a 35% increase over FY 2009.
* Out of the active NF-funded services, trip-based projects made up more than half of the funded services (56%). Information-based services made up 27% of projects, capital investment projects accounted for 15%, and planning studies were 1% of the total.
* Demand response was the single most common service, accounting for 25% of all services and 30% of one-way trips.

### Year-to-year comparisons

The current data collection effort, conducted in 2011, covered New Freedom services in operation during Federal FY 2010 (October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010). When relevant, this analysis will make comparisons with information reported in previous years. When making year-to-year comparisons, it is important to recognize that annual fluctuations in service provision may not necessarily reflect trends in program performance as several factors may influence these annual changes.

This is especially relevant for interpreting ridership trends. While the number of one-way trips generated by NF services is a partial, though important, measure of overall program performance, the New Freedom program is designed to support a broad range of services. These include services that provide transportation directly (such as fixed route, demand response, or user-side subsidies) as well as programs that provide information, planning, and investments in capital improvements.

Therefore, year-to-year changes in the number of one-way trips should be studied carefully in judging program performance. As the mix of services changes each year, the number of one-way trips will change accordingly. In the aggregate, it may not be possible to determine whether this kind of change reflects a trend in program performance or simply a new mix of services offered. For example, if the number of capital investment programs increases, the number of one-way trips may well decrease, because improvements such as software systems may not translate directly into trips.

This is why the matrix approach, introduced for FY 2006 (for JARC) and refined for this data cycle, is especially important. The service matrix captures performance information for all New Freedom services and reflects the range of choices made at the local level.

While acknowledging these considerations, the data collected still presents an overall picture of the New Freedom program. Therefore, this analysis:

* Compares the mix of programs from year-to-year, including service type
* Compares the mix of grantees and subrecipients from year to year, including type of operating setting
* Incorporates information from the profiles into the analysis to show the diversity of the New Freedom program, along with lessons learned and elements of success

Table 1-2 illustrates the change in the number of grant recipients reporting in FY 2007 through FY 2010. As the table shows, the number of New Freedom-supported services continues to increase, although the rate of growth has slowed.

Table ‑  
New Freedom Services Reported by Fiscal Year

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Recipients | | Services | |
| Fiscal Year | **Number** | **Change** | **Number** | **Change** |
| FY 2007 | 21 | - | 60 | - |
| FY 2008 | 43 | 105% | 203 | 238% |
| FY 2009 | 128 | 198% | 487 | 140% |
| FY 2010 | 156 | 22% | 664 | 36% |

### Data cleaning and validation

The original database had 159 grant recipients reporting on 690 New Freedom-supported programs. As a first step in the analysis, the technical team reviewed the records to identify errors, invalid entries, duplicate services, missing data, or other error in data entry.

Common errors and omissions included the following:

* **For all services** - Reporting on service that was not in operation during FY 2010
* **For trip-based services** – Defining demand response services as flexible routes
* **For fixed-route, flexible, and shuttles** – Reporting annual revenue miles instead of route length
* **For service area** – Indicating “county” or “city” instead of entering the name for the county or city served

When the errors had a clear solution (e.g., an obvious typographical error in the state name), the team made the corrections without further research. In other cases, the team contacted recipients and/or subrecipients by telephone or email to clarify questions and to obtain updated information. The final corrected dataset included 156 grant recipients reporting on 664 New Freedom-supported services. This analysis is based on the final validated dataset.

### Data presentation

Most of the tables and charts included in this report present data in percentage terms rather than raw numbers. Because the number of services and one-way trips varies by service type, percentages are a better way to compare programs. In most cases, the percentages are presented in two ways – summed by table row (usually service type) and summed by table column (e.g., size of urbanized area). In Chapter 5, which presents data collected in the context of the New Freedom service matrix, information is presented in the order used on the data collection forms. Otherwise, throughout the report, charts and tables are sorted by percentage, rather than program type.

## Document Overview

The remainder of this document provides information about the process and results of the New Freedom service evaluation for FY 2009. Chapter 2 summarizes the data collection process; results of the NF evaluation are presented in Chapters 3-6:

* Chapter 3 presents an overview of New Freedom services, including the distribution of service types
* Chapter 4 summarizes ridership on New Freedom services
* Chapter 5 describes the primary goals and outputs of New Freedom-supported programs, as reported by grant recipients
* Chapter 6 highlights key findings of the report

Appendix A summarizes the service matrix approach and Appendix B includes the New Freedom service profiles, which are presented under separate cover as a set of 10 separate documents based on FTA regions.

# Data Collection

Consistent with previous years, New Freedom grantees were asked to use an online form for reporting on FY 2010 New Freedom services. To streamline the data collection process, FTA collected reports for the JARC and NF grant programs at the same time using a single portal. This chapter describes the combined data collection activities for the JARC and NF programs.

The team’s focus during the data collection phase is to maximize the percentage of recipients reporting. For FY 2010, 99% of recipients either reported or indicated that they had no reporting obligation. This matched the reporting rate for the previous cycle and was accomplished by:

*A reluctant elderly gentleman had agreed to take a ride with a trainer for what he thought was for the benefit of the trainer. After his initial ride on the bus, he expressed that he was pleasantly surprised at how comfortable and relaxing the ride was. Within a few days of his training, he left a recorded message for his trainer. In an excited voice he said, “I just wanted you to know I have ridden the bus four times and even bought a bus pass. I love it!”*

Eastern Oregon Center for Independent Living  
Oregon Department of Transportation

* Verifying recipient contacts and reporting requirements in advance of data collection
* Following up repeatedly with non-responding recipients

The team provided support to recipients via email, an updated support website, and by two webinars.

This chapter provides additional details on the data collection process.

## Reporting Universe

As in prior years, FTA required recipients to report for the FY 2010 reporting cycle if they provided JARC- or New Freedom-funded services at any time between October 1, 2009, and September 30, 2010. The reporting requirement was based on actual service dates rather than the year the funds were awarded, obligated, or spent.

Starting with the FY 2009 reporting cycle, FTA directed the team to exclude congressionally designated earmark projects, which were funded prior to SAFETEA-LU. By excluding these projects, FTA could focus the JARC and New Freedom reporting efforts on a consistent universe of designated recipients reporting on programs funded through the formula programs established through SAFETEA-LU.

Through its TEAM system, FTA tracks the status of JARC and New Freedom grants. However, TEAM does not track when agencies actually provide funded services.

As in past years, FTA provided the team with a list of 241 agencies with open JARC or New Freedom grants in FY 2010, which was used as a superset of the agencies required to report. The team then contacted each recipient in the superset to determine whether the recipient had a reporting obligation for FY 2010. The goal was to have every recipient in the superset either report on JARC and/or New Freedom services or to indicate that no services were provided during the reporting fiscal year.

Reporting performance is measured as the ratio of the number of recipients who have either reported or indicated they had no reporting obligation to the number of recipients in the superset. For FY 2010, this percentage was 99%.

## Recipient Outreach, Tracking, and Follow Up

It is sometimes difficult to reach a responsive contact at an agency. Agencies may be slow to respond because they know they had provided no JARC or New Freedom services during the fiscal year or because they have other priorities. In a few cases, this has led to agencies discovering that they do have a reporting requirement, close to the end of the reporting period, when it is difficult to gather the needed data and provide it to the reporting system.

### Milestones

The official reporting period began on March 15, 2011, and ended on May 15, 2011. The reporting calendar included the following milestones:

* **Screening survey** – From the middle of February through the middle of March, the team focused on inviting and reminding recipients in the superset to complete the screening survey.
* **Data collection** – The reporting site opened to recipients for testing early in March 2011. The site was opened to all recipients and their subrecipients on March 15. General reporting closed on May 15. However, recipients who requested additional time to report were provided with access through June 4.
* **Follow-up and verification** – After May 15, the team worked intensively via email and telephone with recipients who had not yet reported to ensure that they would report. The last submission was received on June 3, and the reporting system was locked to public access on June 4.

### Screening Survey

To improve contact with recipients and support responsiveness, the team instituted a separate effort to determine reporting obligations in advance of the FY 2010 data collection period. The screening survey proved successful for the FY 2009 data collection period and the team maintained the screening survey for the FY 2010 data collection.

Beginning in mid-February 2011, the team, with FTA assistance, contacted all agencies on the superset list, requesting their response to an online screening survey that would allow the agency to (a) determine whether it was required to report for FY 2010, (b) revise its point-of-contact information, and (c) indicate whether the agency would prefer to provide two reporting contacts – one for JARC and one for New Freedom.

Ultimately, 87% of the 241 agencies on the superset list provided responses to the screening survey, either directly, via the web interface, or via phone or email follow-up from a team member. Most of these responses were received, as intended, before the beginning of the reporting period.  The team focused on reaching out to the remaining 13% via phone and email follow-up and obtained correct reporting contact information for each of these organizations.

### Email Communication

The team sent out 1,765 email reminders to specific recipients during the reporting process, to encourage reporting and to ask individual recipients if they needed additional assistance or time to complete their reporting requirements. See Figure 2-1.

This year, the team used an email delivery tracking system, which allowed identification and follow-up on messages that were not delivered because they were obstructed by firewalls or spam filters. The system also permitted email recipients to “unsubscribe” from JARC and New Freedom reporting reminders with one click. This provided another avenue for identifying and correcting contact information for each recipient.

Figure ‑  
Email Outreach, February – May 2011

### Tracking

The team used real-time access to the reporting database, in combination with a flexible reporting capability, to identify non-reporters as well as recipients who had provided data but had not completed their submissions for follow-up. This information was used to generate customized reminders and offers of assistance.

### Data responses

As a result of the screening survey, diligent follow-up, and assistance from FTA headquarters, the team was able to maintain the 99% response rate achieved for the FY 2009 reporting cycle. (See Table 2-1.)

Table ‑  
Reporting Response Rate

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FY 2010 | | FY 2009 | | FY 2008 | |
| Status | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** |
| Report submitted | 200 | 83% | 189 | 67% | 158 | 54% |
| Not required to report | 39 | 16% | 90 | 32% | 59 | 20% |
| Unknown | 2 | 1% | 3 | 1% | 75 | 26% |
| Total | 241 | 100% | 282 | 100% | 293 | 100% |

## Technical Assistance

The team provided support to the recipients during the reporting process via a website, webinars, and email and telephone contact.

### Support site

As in previous years, the support effort relied on the FTA JARC & New Freedom Reporting Support Center website (<http://ftajarcnf.cesnn.com/>).

For this reporting cycle, the team substantially reorganized the site, including the graphics and interface. The focus of the redesign was to provide the user with multi-tiered “how to” information coupled with form instructions and to provide users with guidance according to user type. The support site is only available on-line during the reporting period.

### Webinars

In this reporting cycle, the team continued the practice of enhancing and expanding the effort to support recipients via webinars. Two webinars were held on March 18 and April 7 and included participation from FTA staff and the evaluation team. They reached a total of 220 locations, each comprising one or more individuals, presented 38 slides, and handled questions submitted via chat interface and telephone. Participants also used the chat interface (similar to a direct-messaging application) to share information with one another.

### Email and telephone contact

Lauren Miller, the team’s lead for technical assistance, responded to 397 email threads from February 1 through June 5. She also assisted recipients and subrecipients via telephone during the reporting process. Evaluation team members Susan Bregman and Caroline Ferris also provided support to recipients and subrecipients during the reporting period. In addition, as part of the quality assurance process described in Chapter 1, Ms. Bregman and Ms. Ferris reviewed all the records and contacted about two dozen recipients after the reporting period closed to modify apparent inconsistencies within records or to resolve ambiguities about specific data elements in their service reports. For example, if a record categorized a service as “fixed route” but the profile clearly described a demand-response service, the record was updated to say “demand response.” More than 250 records were modified in some way during the quality assurance process.

## Overview of Online Technology and Changes

The data collection system was originally developed for the JARC program in FY 2003 and has been substantially refined in subsequent years. It was modified to include the New Freedom program starting with FY 2007.

### Web infrastructure

The JARC/New Freedom data collection and analysis effort is managed through two public-facing websites and four private websites supporting development and testing.

Recipients and subrecipients enter, review, and submit JARC and New Freedom service information through the data collection website – <http://ftajarcnf-report.cesnn.com>. This site serves as the front-end for the official reporting database, “jnf\_fy10a”. Users also have access to the support website – <http://ftajarcnf.cesnn.com> – as described above.

Behind the scenes, the team maintains four additional websites:

1. The development version of the reporting system
2. The preview version of the reporting system
3. The development blog, used to narrate changes and issues in the team’s websites and databases
4. A formal software version control system, which provides granular tracking and control of code changes and serves as the conduit for code moving from development to preview to production

The development and preview websites are backed by databases separate from the formal reporting database

### Technical changes

For the FY 2010 reporting cycle, the team modified the reporting interface to support agencies with multiple subrecipients and to enhance data quality.

#### Support for large agencies

The team improved the reporting experience for recipients at large agencies in two ways:

1. All recipients who had submitted JARC or New Freedom reports during the FY 2008 or FY 2009 reporting cycles had online access to those earlier reports.
2. Large recipients were able to import the relevant portions of the FY 2009 reporting into their FY 2010 forms upon request.

As part of the effort to simplify reporting by recipients with multiple subrecipients, the reporting system provided optional access to subrecipients as well. A total of 655 distinct users logged used the reporting system, suggesting that, on average, each of the 241 recipients comprised a reporting team of close to 3 logins: the recipient itself, plus two subrecipient users. Some reporting teams were quite large: the top four recipients, by reporting team size, accounted for 20% of distinct users, approximately 33 individuals per reporting team.

#### Other changes

Three changes were made to enhance data quality:

1. The service matrix was expanded to include planning studies;
2. Spellchecking was added to the Service Profiles and other descriptive text fields; and
3. Recipients were required to report the specific counties (or equivalent) served in whole or part by each of their services.

Finally, to enhance usability and to streamline the appearance of the service form, certain detailed questions were presented only if they applied to the particular circumstance of the service. For instance, if a recipient indicated, for certain New Freedom services, that expanded geographic coverage was provided on Sundays or holidays, they were then asked to indicate by how many square miles Sunday/holiday service was expanded.

# Overview of New Freedom Services

This chapter reports on the characteristics of New Freedom grantees and their services for FY 2009. Subsequent chapters cover New Freedom performance measures, including one-way trips and outputs for non-trip-based services.

The information is based on data collected from the 156 New Freedom grant recipients that submitted complete and validated reports for FY 2010; these grantees reported on 664 services.

## Service Type

Grantees reported a total of 657 active New Freedom-funded services for FY 2010. Grant recipients were asked to classify services in one of four ways:

* **Trip-based services**, which provide transportation directly to individuals. These include fixed routes, flexible routes, shuttles, demand response, and user-side subsidy programs (e.g., vouchers, ridesharing, and guaranteed ride home).
* **Information-based services**, which provide information about transportation services to individuals but do not provide direct transportation services. These include mobility managers/brokerages, trip or itinerary planning, Internet-based travel information, informational materials, and one-on-one training.
* **Capital investment programs**, including facilities and infrastructure to support transportation services. These include vehicle based programs (such as those making automobiles available to individuals or organizations), facility or amenity improvements, and technology to support transportation services.

Although FTA funds mobility managers as an eligible capital expense, they are categorized here as information-based services for reporting purposes.

Out of the active New Freedom-funded services, more than half were trip-based, at approximately 56%. Information-based services also made up a large portion of service, with a 27% share. The remaining programs were capital investment projects (15%) . (See Figure 3-1).

As Table 3-1 shows, by far the most commonly reported programs were demand response and mobility managers. Together, these transit services accounted for almost 40% of New Freedom -funded programs. Other assistive services, such as door-to-door or door-through-door service and one-on-one transit training were also funded at a high rate.

Table ‑  
New Freedom Services by Type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | # | % |
| Trip-Based Services | **375** | **57%** |
| Demand response | 164 | 25% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 53 | 8% |
| Flexible routing | 40 | 6% |
| User-side subsidy | 35 | 5% |
| Volunteer driver program | 31 | 5% |
| Fixed route | 23 | 3% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 13 | 2% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 10 | 2% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 6 | 1% |
| Information-Based Services | **180** | **27%** |
| Mobility manager | 90 | 15% |
| One-on-one transit training | 54 | 8% |
| One-stop center | 14 | 2% |
| Transportation resource training | 9 | 1% |
| Materials and marketing | 8 | 1% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | 2 | 0% |
| Internet-based information | 2 | 0% |
| Driver training | 1 | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **102** | **16%** |
| ITS investments | 30 | 5% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | 24 | 4% |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 19 | 3% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 17 | 3% |
| Accessible taxis | 5 | 1% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | 3 | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | 2 | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | 1 | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | 1 | 0% |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | **657** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
New Freedom Services by Type, FY 2007 – FY 2010

The New Freedom program supports a broad array of services tailored to the needs of individual communities. The distribution of program types has stayed fairly stable over the past four years. Trip-based services comprise the majority of NF-funded services, followed by information-based and capital programs.

In FY 2010, demand response and mobility manager made up the largest share of total services provided, accounting for nearly 40% of the total services. (See Figure 3-2.) Six other categories of NF-supported services achieved at least a 5% share:

* Door-to-door or door-through-door (N=53)
* One-on-one transit training (N=52)
* Flexible routing (N=40)
* User-side subsidy or vouchers (N=35)
* Volunteer driver program (N=31)
* ITS-related hardware/software investments (N=30)

Together, these eight types of New Freedom services accounted for 75% of the total services. Notably, five of these eight services are trip-based.

## Agency Type

As described earlier, several types of agencies are eligible to receive New Freedom funds. NF **recipients** receive funding from FTA through the Section 5317 formula program. Generally, recipients are state departments of transportation, transit operators, or metropolitan planning organizations. Recipients distribute NF funds to **subrecipients**, typically through a competitive selection process. Eligible subrecipient organizations include state or local governments, public transit operators, or nonprofits. For example, a state department of transportation may distribute NF funds to a rural transit operator for a demand response service or a transit operator may award NF funds to a community-based nonprofit to operate a one-stop center.

Recipients receive funds directly from FTA and subrecipients receive funds indirectly via recipients.

For FY 2010, 156 recipients, or grantees, reported on New Freedom-supported services. As Table 3-2 shows, half of reporting recipients were transit agencies. Another 26% were state DOTs and 16% were MPOs; “other” types of agencies made up 7% of those reporting.

Table ‑  
Recipients by Agency Type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agency Type | # | % |
| Transit agency | 79 | 51% |
| State DOT | 40 | 26% |
| MPO | 25 | 16% |
| Other | 12 | 7% |
| Total | **156** | **100%** |

For FY 2010, 502 separate subrecipients reported New Freedom services. As Table 3-3 indicates, 42% of subrecipients were nonprofits, underscoring the importance of this funding source for these agencies. Public transit operators made up the next largest group (27%), while all other agency types made up 8% or less of subrecipients.

Some subrecipients provided multiple services and a few received funds from multiple recipients. Separate from the FTA definitions, for the purposes of data reporting and analysis, a recipient was also classified as a subrecipient if that recipient agency used New Freedom funds to operate a project itself.

Table 3‑3  
Subrecipients by Agency Type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agency Type | # | % |
| Nonprofit | 213 | 42% |
| Public transit operator | 137 | 27% |
| Other | 39 | 8% |
| City DOT | 39 | 8% |
| Other county | 26 | 5% |
| County DOT | 21 | 4% |
| Other city | 11 | 2% |
| Private transit operator | 8 | 2% |
| State agency | 8 | 2% |
| Total | **502** | **100%** |

## Size of Urbanized Area

In FY 2010, half (50%) of New Freedom-supported services were operated in large urbanized areas (population over 200,000), 33% in non-urbanized or rural areas (population less than 50,000), and 17% in small-urban localities (population 50,000-199,000). Note that grantees reported on the size of the service area for each individual program, not for the grantee agency itself. For example, a state DOT that submitted a report for multiple services was asked to characterize the operating setting for each service separately. When a service covered multiple jurisdictions, grantees were asked to select the setting that best characterized the service.

As shown in Figure 3-3, New Freedom-funded services continue to shift toward large urbanized areas, up from 28% in FY 2007 to 50% in FY 2010. Through FY 2009, the shift in service share came from small urbanized areas, rather than from rural areas. But between FY 2009 and FY 2010, the service share in rural areas dropped from 40% to 33% and the small urban share changed only slightly.

The services more likely to be located in non-urban areas were vehicles for transit agencies (58%), flexible routing (48%) and demand response (45%). One-on-one transit training (69%), user-side subsidies (66%) and ITS-related investments (60%) were more likely to be found in large urbanized settings. Mobility managers seemed to be adaptable to all settings and could be found in large urbanized (37%), small urbanized (23%), and non-urbanized areas (40%).

In large urbanized areas, the most commonly reported New Freedom services included demand response (18%), one-on-one travel training (11%), and mobility manager. In small urban areas and rural localities, demand response and mobility managers were the most frequently reported services; taken together, these two program types comprised nearly half the services in each setting.

Figure ‑  
New Freedom Services by Size of Urbanized Area, FY 2007 – FY 2010

(Percentage by Column)

Table 3‑4  
New Freedom Services by Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Row)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | # | Large Urban | Small Urban | Non Urban | Total |
| Trip-Based Services | **375** | **46%** | **15%** | **39%** | **100%** |
| Demand response | 164 | 37% | 18% | 45% | 100% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 53 | 49% | 8% | 43% | 100% |
| Flexible routing | 40 | 43% | 10% | 48% | 100% |
| User-side subsidy | 35 | 66% | 11% | 23% | 100% |
| Volunteer driver program | 31 | 68% | 10% | 23% | 100% |
| Fixed route | 23 | 30% | 35% | 35% | 100% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 13 | 69% | 8% | 23% | 100% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 10 | 70% | 10% | 20% | 100% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 6 | 67% | 0% | 33% | 100% |
| Information-Based Services | **180** | **53%** | **20%** | **27%** | **100%** |
| Mobility manager | 90 | 37% | 23% | 40% | 100% |
| One-on-one transit training | 54 | 69% | 19% | 13% | 100% |
| One-stop center | 14 | 71% | 21% | 7% | 100% |
| Transportation resource training | 9 | 78% | 11% | 11% | 100% |
| Materials and marketing | 8 | 50% | 13% | 38% | 100% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | 2 | 50% | 0% | 50% | 100% |
| Internet-based information | 2 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Driver training | 1 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **102** | **55%** | **21%** | **25%** | **100%** |
| ITS investments | 30 | 60% | 13% | 27% | 100% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | 24 | 54% | 38% | 8% | 100% |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 19 | 26% | 16% | 58% | 100% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 17 | 76% | 0% | 24% | 100% |
| Accessible taxis | 5 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | 3 | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | 2 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 100% |
| Vehicle for individual | 1 | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Vanpool vehicles | 1 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **657** | **50%** | **17%** | **33%** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
New Freedom Services by Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Row)

Table 3‑5  
New Freedom Services by Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Column)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | # | Large Urban | Small Urban | Non Urban | Total |
| Trip-Based Services | **375** | **53%** | **49%** | **66%** | **57%** |
| Demand response | 164 | 18% | 27% | 33% | 25% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 53 | 8% | 4% | 10% | 8% |
| Flexible routing | 40 | 5% | 4% | 9% | 6% |
| User-side subsidy | 35 | 7% | 4% | 4% | 5% |
| Volunteer driver program | 31 | 6% | 3% | 3% | 5% |
| Fixed route | 23 | 2% | 7% | 4% | 3% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 13 | 3% | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 10 | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 6 | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Information-Based Services | **180** | **29%** | **32%** | **22%** | **27%** |
| Mobility manager | 90 | 10% | 19% | 16% | 14% |
| One-on-one transit training | 54 | 11% | 9% | 3% | 8% |
| One-stop center | 14 | 3% | 3% | 0% | 2% |
| Transportation resource training | 9 | 2% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| Materials and marketing | 8 | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | 2 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Internet-based information | 2 | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Driver training | 1 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **102** | **17%** | **19%** | **11%** | **16%** |
| ITS investments | 30 | 5% | 4% | 4% | 5% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | 24 | 4% | 8% | 1% | 4% |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 19 | 2% | 3% | 5% | 3% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 17 | 4% | 0% | 2% | 3% |
| Accessible taxis | 5 | 2% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | 3 | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | 2 | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | 1 | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | 1 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **657** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
New Freedom Services by Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Column)

# One-Way Trips

As in previous years, New Freedom grant recipients were asked to report annual one-way trips. Most grantees with trip-based services were able to provide this information (88%). In addition, some grantees with information-based services or capital-investment programs reported on one-way trips as well, including mobility managers and agencies that acquired vehicles for passenger service. Trips reported were generally those that were taken as a result of the information or assistance provided by the mobility manager, or those provided on an additional vehicle purchased with New Freedom funds, etc.

For FY 2010, it is estimated that New Freedom-supported services provided 3.3 million one-way trips, a 35% increase over FY 2009

Most one-way trips were recorded on demand response services (30%), followed by user- door-to-door or door-through-door assistance (15%). Flexible routing, same-day ADA paratransit, and fixed route services each accounted for another 10% of trips. Table 4-1 and Figure 4-1 show this distribution.

Although the proportion of demand response services was stable between FY 2009 and FY 2010, comprising 24% of all services in FY 2009 and 25% a year later, the number of trips associated with these services more than doubled, from 424,462 to 998,147. Several factors may have influenced this apparent growth in demand response trips.

First, the analytical approach used to evaluate ridership statistics may have overstated the results for trip-based services, including demand response, and understated trips for services like mobility manager and vehicle purchases. When grant recipients used New Freedom funds to purchase one or more vehicles that they placed into service, they were asked to report two separate services or programs: a capital investment to purchase the vehicle and a trip-based service (e.g., demand response) to provide passenger service. In these cases, trips were attributed to the service (e.g., fixed route or demand response) and not to the capital investment to avoid double counting. For the same reason, mobility managers that provided service directly were also asked to report on that service separately and to attribute those trips to the service rather than to the mobility manager program. Assigning all the trips from mobility manager and vehicle investments to trip-based services likely overstated the one-way trips associated with trip-based service, especially demand response, at the expense of capital investments and information-based services.

Second, as discussed in Chapter 1, fluctuations in service provision may not necessarily reflect trends in program performance. Although demand response services comprised the same proportion of all services in both fiscal years, a different mix of grantees may have reported services in each year, making year-to-year comparisons potentially misleading.

Table ‑  
One-Way Trips by New Freedom Service Type

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Services | One-Way Trips | |
| Service Type | **#** | **#** | **%** |
| Trip-Based Services | **375** | **2,917,443** | **89%** |
| Demand response | 164 | 998,147 | 30% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 53 | 504,809 | 15% |
| Flexible routing | 40 | 337,424 | 10% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 13 | 323,726 | 10% |
| Fixed route | 23 | 312,821 | 10% |
| Volunteer driver program | 31 | 199,367 | 6% |
| User-side subsidy | 35 | 166,643 | 5% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 6 | 45,039 | 1% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 10 | 29,467 | 1% |
| Information-Based Services | **180** | **186,084** | **5%** |
| Mobility manager | 90 | 186,084 | 6% |
| One-on-one transit training | 54 | NA | 0% |
| One-stop center | 14 | NA | 0% |
| Transportation resource training | 9 | NA | 0% |
| Materials and marketing | 8 | NA | 0% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | 2 | NA | 0% |
| Internet-based information | 2 | NA | 0% |
| Driver training | 1 | NA | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **102** | **173,074** | **5%** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 19 | 131,499 | 4% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 17 | 24,975 | 1% |
| Accessible taxis | 5 | 16,600 | 0% |
| ITS investments | 30 | NA | 0% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | 24 | NA | 0% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | 3 | NA | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | 2 | NA | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | 1 | NA | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | 1 | NA | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | **657** | **3,276,601** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
One-Way Trips by New Freedom Service Type   
(Thousands of Trips)

## Size of Urbanized Area

Clear differences were apparent among geographic settings. More than half of one-way trips (61%) were reported in large urbanized areas, compared to 28% in rural settings, and only 12% in small urbanized areas.

*Our passengers express huge appreciation about our drivers - every time they are asked:*

* *The program is a life saver.*
* *If it wasn't for this program, I couldn't get to the lunch program.*
* *Everyone is like family.*
* *Without transportation, I feel like a prisoner in my own home.*
* *We get so much done and have so much fun at the same time.*

City of Lafayette

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (CA)

For one-way trips on demand response services, half (49%) were reported in large urbanized areas, 42% in rural communities, and only 9% in small urban areas. Same-day ADA paratransit service mostly served people in large urban areas (90% of trips), as did flexible routes (70%) and door-to-door and door-through-door services. See Table 4-2 and Figure 4-2.

In large urban areas, demand response services generated the most one-way trips (25%), followed by door-to-door and door-through-door services (17%) and same-day ADA paratransit (15%). In small urban areas, fixed route and demand response collectively carried half the trips on New Freedom services. In rural areas, demand response accounted for nearly half the one-way trips for FY 2010 (46%). No other service captured more than 10% of the trips in these non-urban communities. (See Table 4-3 and Figure 4-3).

Table ‑  
One-Way Trips by Service Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Row)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | # | Large Urban | Small Urban | Non-Urban | Total |
| Trip-Based Services | **2,917,443** | **62%** | **10%** | **27%** | **100%** |
| Demand response | 998,147 | 49% | 9% | 42% | 100% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 504,809 | 69% | 13% | 18% | 100% |
| Flexible routing | 337,424 | 70% | 3% | 27% | 100% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 323,726 | 92% | 3% | 5% | 100% |
| Fixed route | 312,821 | 57% | 35% | 8% | 100% |
| Volunteer driver program | 199,367 | 70% | 4% | 26% | 100% |
| User-side subsidy | 166,643 | 59% | 6% | 35% | 100% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 45,039 | 9% | 0% | 91% | 100% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 29,467 | 78% | 5% | 17% | 100% |
| Information-Based Services | **186,084** | **71%** | **1%** | **28%** | **100%** |
| Mobility manager | 186,084 | 71% | 1% | 28% | 100% |
| One-on-one transit training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| One-stop center | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Transportation resource training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Materials and marketing | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Internet-based information | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Driver training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **173,074** | **23%** | **47%** | **30%** | **100%** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 131,499 | 2% | 62% | 37% | 100% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 24,975 | 84% | 0% | 16% | 100% |
| Accessible taxis | 16,600 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| ITS investments | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **3,276,601** | **61%** | **12%** | **28%** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
One-Way Trips by New Freedom Service Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Row)

Table ‑  
One-Way Trips by Service Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Column)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | # | Large Urban | Small Urban | Non-Urban | Total |
| Trip-Based Services | **2,917,443** | **91%** | **79%** | **88%** | **89%** |
| Demand response | 998,147 | 25% | 23% | 46% | 30% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 504,809 | 17% | 17% | 10% | 15% |
| Flexible routing | 337,424 | 12% | 3% | 10% | 10% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 323,726 | 15% | 3% | 2% | 10% |
| Fixed route | 312,821 | 9% | 28% | 3% | 10% |
| Volunteer driver program | 199,367 | 7% | 2% | 6% | 6% |
| User-side subsidy | 166,643 | 5% | 3% | 6% | 5% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 45,039 | 0% | 0% | 5% | 1% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 29,467 | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Information-Based Services | **186,084** | **7%** | **0%** | **6%** | **6%** |
| Mobility manager | 186,084 | 7% | 0% | 6% | 6% |
| One-on-one transit training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| One-stop center | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Transportation resource training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Materials and marketing | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Internet-based information | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Driver training | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **173,074** | **2%** | **21%** | **6%** | **5%** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 131,499 | 0% | 21% | 5% | 4% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 24,975 | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Accessible taxis | 16,600 | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| ITS investments | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | NA | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **3,276,601** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
One-Way Trips by New Freedom Service Type and Size of Urbanized Area   
(Percentage by Column)

## Compare Trips and Services

The analysis compared the number of trips by service type with the number of programs. As shown in Table 4-4 and Figure 4-4, the trends that emerge are not surprising, given the goals of the program. Specifically:

* Overall, trip-based services made up 56% of the services but generated 89% of the one-way trips reported for New Freedom services.
* Demand response services accounted for the most services (25%) and the most trips (30%).
* User-side subsidies accounted for only 5% of the New Freedom services but 16% of the one-way trips.
* Mobility managers made up 14% of the services – second only to demand response – but generated only 5% of the trips.

For purposes of this analysis, when a grant recipient used NF funds to purchase a vehicle and place that vehicle in service, the resulting trips were assigned to the service rather than to the capital investment. Similarly, when a mobility manager program also provided service directly, the trips were attributed to the trip-based service and not to the mobility manager. These analytical conventions were intended to reduce the potential for double-counting but they also further had the effect of reassigning the trips reported for information-based programs and capital projects to trip-based services, most likely demand response.

Table ‑  
Comparison of New Freedom Services and One-Way Trips   
(Percentage by Column)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | Services | Trips |
| Trip-Based Services | **57%** | **89%** |
| Demand response | 25% | 30% |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door | 8% | 15% |
| Flexible routing | 6% | 10% |
| User-side subsidy | 5% | 5% |
| Volunteer driver program | 5% | 6% |
| Fixed route | 3% | 10% |
| Same-day ADA paratransit service | 2% | 10% |
| Shuttle/Feeder | 2% | 1% |
| Aide/escort assistance | 1% | 1% |
| Information-Based Services | **27%** | **6%** |
| Mobility manager | 14% | 6% |
| One-on-one transit training | 8% | 0% |
| One-stop center | 2% | 0% |
| Transportation resource training | 1% | 0% |
| Materials and marketing | 1% | 0% |
| Trip/itinerary planning | 0% | 0% |
| Internet-based information | 0% | 0% |
| Driver training | 0% | 0% |
| Capital Investment Projects | **16%** | **5%** |
| ITS investments | 5% | 0% |
| Other infrastructure improvements | 4% | 0% |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 3% | 4% |
| Vehicle for other agency | 3% | 1% |
| Accessible taxis | 1% | 1% |
| Large-capacity wheelchair lifts | 0% | 0% |
| Wheelchair securement areas | 0% | 0% |
| Vehicle for individual | 0% | 0% |
| Vanpool vehicles | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | **100%** | **100%** |

Figure ‑  
Comparison of New Freedom Services and One-Way Trips   
(Percentage by Column)

# Primary Goals

As described in Chapter 1, the New Freedom service matrix was developed to categorize and summarize New Freedom-funded services based on service type and primary goal. The matrix allows FTA to extend its analysis beyond one-way trips by also capturing program performance outputs from non-traditional services.

## Program Goals

Recipients were asked to indicate the primary goal for each New Freedom-supported service. Although many programs have multiple goals, for the purposes of this analysis, recipients were asked to select only one goal. The five goals are:

* Expanded geographic coverage
* Extended service hours or days
* Improved system capacity
* Improved access/connections
* Improved customer knowledge

When developing the matrix, FTA made certain assumptions about the relationship between service types and project goals, and not every combination was considered reasonable. For example, grantees reporting on mobility manager programs were only allowed to select *improved access / connections* as a goal; the other choices were not available. Cells that were not available for data entry are grayed out on the matrix tables in this chapter. The following three tables show New Freedom-supported services in relation to the five goals. Table 5-1 shows number of services, Table 5-2 shows the percentage of service by type, and Table 5-3 shows the percentage by goal.

*Fourteen individuals successfully graduated from the travel training program. It's an especially good feeling to see the excitement of an individual when they are able to transition from paratransit to fixed route transit services and new doors of independence are opened.*

Bi-State Development Agency (MO)

Figure 5-1 illustrates the shifting program goals among the four years of New Freedom analysis. Between FY 2007 and FY 2010, the proportion of programs selecting *improved access/connections* has grown from 38% to 53%. At the same time, the percentage using New Freedom-funded programs to provide *expanded geographic coverage* has decreased from 25% to 15%. This pattern could indicate that grantees have maximized their ability to expand geographically and now seek to extend services through better access and connections to other services.

In fact, for FY 2010, i*mproved access/connections* was by far the most commonly selected goal (53%). Other goals were *expanded geographic coverage* (15%), *improved customer knowledge* (15%), *extended service hours or days* (9%), and *improved system capacity* (8%). Major findings include:

* Demand response programs were distributed fairly evenly across three goals: *expanded geographic coverage* (38%), *improved access/connections* (34%), and *extended service hours or days* (28%).
* Programs providing *improved access/connections* included mobility manager (26%), demand response (16%), and door-to-door/door-through-door (15%).
* Demand response comprised the majority (63%) of services with a primary goal of *expanded geographic coverage*. Other services selecting this goal were flexible routing (15%) and fixed route (10%).
* More than half (55%) of the services providing *improved customer knowledge* were one-one transit training. Other services with this goal included one-stop centers (14%), travel resource training (9%), and marketing materials (8%).
* Fully 75% of the services providing *extended service hours or days* were demand response.
* Capital investments generally provided *improved system capacity*, including vehicles for other agencies (26%), vehicles for transit agencies (22%), and ITS hardware and software investments (19%).

Figure ‑   
New Freedom Services by Goal, FY 2007 – FY 2010   
(Percentage by Column)

## Program Outputs

The New Freedom service matrix was designed to enable FTA to capture information about the range of benefits that NF-funded services provide – benefits that extend beyond the traditional measure of one-way trips. Grant recipients were asked to report on the outputs of their NF-funded services. These measures were developed by FTA, in consultation with the Project Advisory Committee, and included the following:

* **One-way trips** – All trip-based services were asked to report one-way trips, as well as programs like mobility manager and vehicle purchase programs that generated trips
* **New miles added** – All trip-based services were asked to report the number and percentage of new, one-way miles added to weekday, Saturday, or Sunday/holiday route
* **Additional service hours** – Demand response services were asked to report number of new hours added to weekday, Saturday, or Sunday/holiday service both within the existing ADA paratransit service area and beyond the existing ADA paratransit service area
* **Customer contacts** – Mobility managers, along with other information-based programs that worked with individuals on a one-on-one basis, reported customer contacts
* **Customers served** – This measure applied to web-based programs and was designed to reflect site visitors or similar analytic measures of Internet activity
* **People trained** – Programs that provide training, either to individuals or to groups, were asked to estimate the number of individuals who received training
* **Materials distributed** – Programs that developed marketing brochures or similar products were asked to provide a brief description of their materials
* **Vehicles added** – This measure applied to programs that acquired vehicles for agencies or individuals

For programs that were less easy to categorize, like ITS-related hardware or software improvements, recipients provided a brief description of the program or investment.

As previously indicated, some reporting measures were initially implemented for the FY 2009 reporting cycle, including number of service hours added for demand response service, and new miles added for fixed route, shuttle/feeder, and flexible service.

Table 5-4 shows the distribution of program outputs by service type and primary goals. Highlights are presented in the following sections.

### Trip-based services

New Freedom-supported trip-based services generated 2.9 million one-way trips in FY 2010.

* More than half of trips (59%) were reported for services providing *improved access / connections*.
* Demand response services carried the largest number of one-way trips (998,147). Nearly half of the trips (47%) and 38% of the services were associated with the goal *expanded geographic coverage*.
* Fixed and flexible routes were also likely to provide *expanded geographic coverage*. Grantees selected this goal for 43% of fixed route and 38% of flexible routes.
* Programs with a reported goal of *improving access / connections* added 277 additional miles of service, 208 additional hours of service within current ADA coverage areas, and 239 additional hours of service outside the ADA-mandated service area.
* Programs providing *expanded geographic coverage* added 2,248 new miles of service and 138 hours of service outside the ADA-mandated service area. These services generated 716,404 one-way trips.

### Information-based services

This category included a broad mix of programs, from mobility managers to Internet-based information. Some of the major findings:

* Mobility managers generated more than 186,000 one-way trips and initiated over 1 million customer contacts
* One-stop centers served more than 272,000 customers.
* More than 10,000 people received one-on-one transit training, about 5,600 took part in group travel resource training, and 100 individuals receiving driver training.

Grant recipients reporting on mobility manager programs had two options for reporting one-way trips. Some categorized the trip information as part of the mobility manager project, and others reported the services directly, for example, as a demand-response service. Accordingly, the trip numbers associated with mobility managers likely understate the impacts of those investments; the number of customer contacts may be a more accurate depiction of the trip served.

### Capital investment programs

This category included programs providing transit vehicles for agencies (transit and other), vehicles for vanpool programs, accessible taxis, ITS investments, and wheelchair lift and securement improvements. Highlights included:

* Transit agencies added 55 new vehicles, which were responsible for more than 130,000 one-way trips.
* Other agencies purchased 28 vehicles, accounting for almost 25,000 trips.
* Grant recipients added 30 accessible taxis, which generated about 16,600 one-way trips.
* Grant recipients installed 10 wheelchair securement devices and evaluated 537 wheelchairs to determine the best location for securing them.
* ITS-related improvements included new radios, installation of global positioning systems (GPS), routing software, and mobile data terminals.

Grant recipients that used New Freedom funding to purchase agency vehicles had two options for reporting one-way trips. Some categorized the trip information as part of the capital project; others reported the service component separately, for example as a demand-response or fixed route service. For this reason, the trip numbers associated with capital vehicle purchases understate the impacts of those investments.

Table ‑  
New Freedom Service Matrix – Distribution of Services by Primary Goal   
(Number of services)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| I. Trip-Based | **90** | **57** | **11** | **217** | **0** |
| Fixed route | 10 | 5 | 4 | 4 |  |
| Flexible routing | 15 | 6 | 7 | 12 |  |
| Shuttle/Feeders | 3 | 0 |  | 7 |  |
| Demand response | 62 | 46 |  | 56 |  |
| Same-day ADA paratransit |  |  |  | 13 |  |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door |  |  |  | 53 |  |
| Volunteer driver |  |  |  | 31 |  |
| User-side subsidy |  |  |  | 35 |  |
| Aide/escort assistance |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| II. Information-Based | **0** | **0** | **0** | **90** | **90** |
| Mobility manager |  |  |  | 90 |  |
| One-stop center |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| Itinerary planning |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| One-on-one transit training |  |  |  |  | 54 |
| Transportation resource training |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| Internet-based info |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Materials and marketing |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Driver training |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| III. Capital Investment | **7** | **4** | **42** | **43** | **6** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 4 | 3 | 12 |  |  |
| Vehicle for other agency | 2 | 1 | 14 |  |  |
| Accessible taxis | 1 | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| Vehicle for individual |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Vanpool vehicles |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |
| ITS investments |  |  | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| Large-capacity lifts |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Wheelchair-securement areas |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Other infrastructure | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **98** | **61** | **54** | **352** | **99** |

Table ‑  
New Freedom Service Matrix – Distribution of Services by Primary Goal   
(Percentage by row)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| I. Trip-Based | **24%** | **15%** | **3%** | **58%** | **0%** |
| Fixed route | 43% | 22% | 17% | 17% |  |
| Flexible routing | 38% | 15% | 18% | 30% |  |
| Shuttle/Feeders | 30% | 0% |  | 70% |  |
| Demand response | 38% | 28% |  | 34% |  |
| Same-day ADA paratransit |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| Volunteer driver |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| User-side subsidy |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| Aide/escort assistance |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| II. Information-Based | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **50%** | **50%** |
| Mobility manager |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| One-stop center |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| Itinerary planning |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| One-on-one transit training |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| Transportation resource training |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| Internet-based info |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| Materials and marketing |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| Driver training |  |  |  |  | 100% |
| III. Capital Investment | **7%** | **4%** | **41%** | **42%** | **6%** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 21% | 16% | 63% |  |  |
| Vehicle for other agency | 12% | 6% | 82% |  |  |
| Accessible taxis | 20% | 0% | 80% |  |  |
| Vanpool vehicles |  |  | 100% | 0% |  |
| Vehicle for individual |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| ITS investments |  |  | 33% | 50% | 17% |
| Large-capacity lifts |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| Wheelchair-securement areas |  |  |  | 100% |  |
| Other infrastructure | 0% | 0% | 4% | 92% | 4% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **15%** | **9%** | **8%** | **53%** | **15%** |

Table ‑  
New Freedom Service Matrix – Distribution of Services by Primary Goal   
(Percentage by column)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| I. Trip-Based | **92%** | **93%** | **20%** | **62%** | **0%** |
| Fixed route | 10% | 8% | 7% | 1% |  |
| Flexible routing | 15% | 10% | 13% | 3% |  |
| Shuttle/Feeders | 3% | 0% |  | 2% |  |
| Demand response | 63% | 75% |  | 16% |  |
| Same-day ADA paratransit |  |  |  | 4% |  |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door |  |  |  | 15% |  |
| Volunteer driver |  |  |  | 9% |  |
| User-side subsidy |  |  |  | 10% |  |
| Aide/escort assistance |  |  |  | 2% |  |
| II. Information-Based | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **26%** | **91%** |
| Mobility manager |  |  |  | 26% |  |
| One-stop center |  |  |  |  | 14% |
| Itinerary planning |  |  |  |  | 2% |
| One-on-one transit training |  |  |  |  | 55% |
| Transportation resource training |  |  |  |  | 9% |
| Internet-based info |  |  |  |  | 2% |
| Materials and marketing |  |  |  |  | 8% |
| Driver training |  |  |  |  | 1% |
| III. Capital Investment | **7%** | **7%** | **78%** | **12%** | **6%** |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 4% | 5% | 22% |  |  |
| Vehicle for other agency | 2% | 2% | 26% |  |  |
| Accessible taxis | 1% | 0% | 7% |  |  |
| Vanpool vehicles |  |  | 2% | 0% |  |
| Vehicle for individual |  |  |  | 0% |  |
| ITS investments |  |  | 19% | 4% | 5% |
| Large-capacity lifts |  |  |  | 1% |  |
| Wheelchair-securement areas |  |  |  | 1% |  |
| Other infrastructure | 0% | 0% | 2% | 6% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** |

Table ‑  
New Freedom Service Matrix – Service Outputs by Primary Goal

|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| I. Trip-Based |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixed route | 93,717 one-way trips  Miles added  1,577 weekday  34 Saturday  8 Sunday | 121,935 one-way trips  Hours added  16 weekday  9 Sunday  Miles added  10 weekday | 4,368 one-way trips  Miles added  50 weekday | 32,801 one-way trips  Miles added  52 weekday |  |
| Flexible routing | 148,750 one-way trips  Miles added  564 weekday  65 Saturday | 13,268 one-way trips  Hours added  31 weekday  12 Saturday  8 Sunday | 87,787 one-way trips  Miles added  237 weekday  234 Saturday  166 Sunday  Hours added  13 weekday  4 Saturday  3 Sunday | 87,649 one-way trips  Miles added  222 weekday |  |
| Shuttle/Feeders | 5,506 one-way trips | 0 |  | 23,961 one-way trips  Miles added  3 weekday |  |
| Demand response | 468,431 one-way trips  Hours added beyond service area  51 weekday  59 Saturday  28 Sunday | 206,990 one-way trips  Hours within service area  183 weekday  146 Saturday  107 Sunday  Hours added beyond service area  181 weekday  121 Saturday  120 Sunday |  | 345,766 one-way trips  Hours added within service area  138 weekday  53 Saturday  17 Sunday  Hours added beyond service area  134 weekday  68 Saturday  37 Sunday |  |
| Same-day ADA paratransit |  |  |  | 323,726 one-way trips |  |
| Door-to-door or door-through-door |  |  |  | 504,809 one-way trips |  |
| Volunteer driver |  |  |  | 199,367  one-way trips |  |
| User-side subsidy |  |  |  | 166,643  trips |  |
| Aide/escort assistance |  |  |  | 45,039 one-way trips |  |
| II. Information-Based |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mobility manager |  |  |  | 186,084 one-way trips  1,017,640 customer contacts |  |
| One-stop center |  |  |  |  | 272,829 customer contacts |
| Itinerary planning |  |  |  |  | 582 customer contacts |
| One-on-one transit training |  |  |  |  | 10,697 trained |
| Transportation resource training |  |  |  |  | 5,618 trained |
| Internet-based info |  |  |  |  | Database updates |
| Materials and marketing |  |  |  |  | Various, including maps, brochures, newsletters, video, presentations |
| Driver training |  |  |  |  | 200 drivers trained |
| III. Capital Investment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle for transit agency | 9 vehicles | 5 vehicles  1,491 one-way trips | 41 vehicles  130,008 one-way trips |  |  |
| Vehicle for other agency | 6 vehicles  1,000 one-way trips | 1 vehicle  55 one-way trips | 21 vehicles  23,920 one-way trips |  |  |
| Accessible taxis | 4 vehicles added |  | 16,600 one-way trips  26 vehicles added |  |  |
| Vanpool vehicles |  |  | 3 vehicles added | None reported |  |
| Vehicle for individual |  |  |  | 21 clients |  |
| ITS investments |  |  | Various, including MDT, GPS, software updates | Various, including radios, call center, GPS, AVL, dispatch software | Various, including APC, routing software, LED, talking maps |
| Large-capacity lifts |  |  |  | 17 lifts added |  |
| Wheelchair-securement areas |  |  |  | 547 securements evaluated or added |  |
| Other capital projects | None reported | None reported | Transit benches | Various, including stop improvements, shelters, tactile strips, intersection improvements, Magnetic swipe cards and reader | Bus stop signs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Conclusions

This report includes the results of the data analysis for the FTA New Freedom program for the FY 2010 reporting period, which corresponds to the federal fiscal year beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on September 30, 2010. The program goals correspond to federal performance measurements required by regulations.

## New Freedom Highlights

A total of 156 grant recipients submitted complete reports for 664 New Freedom-funded services for FY 2010. Key findings include:

* New Freedom-supported services provided 3.3 million one-way trips, a 35% increase over FY 2009.
* Out of the active New Freedom-funded services, more than half were trip-based (56%). Information-based services also made up a large portion of service, with a 27% share. The remaining programs were capital investment projects (15%) and planning studies (1%).
* Most one-way trips were recorded on demand response services (30%), followed by door-to-door or door-through-door assistance (14%). Fixed route, same-day ADA paratransit, and flexible services each carried 10% of one-way trips.

*New Freedom funding has made it possible for individuals with disabilities, who would otherwise have been unemployed or underemployed, to earn more than $16,500 during this reporting period.*

Mt. Rogers Community Services Board  
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation

* Demand response services accounted for the most services (25%) and the most trips (30%).
* Mobility managers generated more than 186,000 one-way trips and initiated over 1 million customer contacts. Because trips associated with mobility manager programs were assigned to related trip-based services for analytical purposes, the number of trips for mobility managers is likely higher.
* More than 10,000 people received one-on-one transit training, about 5,600 took part in group travel resource training, and 100 individuals receiving driver training.
* Transit agencies added 55 new vehicles, which were responsible for more than 130,000 one-way trips.
* Grant recipients added 30 accessible taxis, which generated about 16,600 one-way trips.
* ITS-related improvements included new radios, installation of global positioning systems (GPS), routing software, and mobile data terminals.
* New Freedom-funded services continue to shift toward large urbanized areas, up from 28% in FY 2007 to 50% in FY 2010.
* Between FY 2007 and FY 2010, the proportion of programs selecting *improved access/connections* as a primary goal grew from 38% to 53%, while those providing *expanded geographic coverage* decreased by 10 percentage points. This pattern could indicate that grantees have maximized their ability to expand geographically, and now seek to extend services through better access and connections to other services.

## Program Profiles

Finally, FTA continued to collect program profiles, or summaries, for each New Freedom service. While ridership statistics allow FTA to provide a national summary of the New Freedom program, the profiles allow the grantees to represent the human side of these transportation programs. These qualitative descriptions complement the data collection and provide an additional avenue for understanding the impacts and benefits of both grant programs.

The profiles provide a rich source of detailed information about the New Freedom program and are provided in their entirety under separate cover. For convenience, they are organized in 10 separate documents based on the FTA regions. In addition, relevant excerpts have been incorporated throughout this summary report. As the program profiles made abundantly clear, the New Freedom programs connect with riders and customers on a human scale.

Appendix A  
New Freedom Service Matrix

The following information describes in more detail how the New Freedom service matrix was developed and how NF grant recipients use it for annual Program Performance Evaluation (PPE) reporting purposes.

A JARC service matrix was initially developed through a collaborative effort between the JARC Evaluation Team and the Community Transportation Association of America’s Joblinks Advisory Committee. The matrix was later refined working with the JARC and New Freedom Advisory Committee, formed to assist the evaluation team with refinement of the JARC and later NF reporting process.

The intent of the matrix reporting approach was two-fold:

* Make reporting easier for grant recipients
* Capture performance information about non-traditional programs

First, the service matrix was designed to make it easier for grantees to report on services provided. Once they selected the primary goal and service type, grantees were directed to a data entry form that included only those questions relevant to the service type / goal combination. For example, grantees reporting demand response services were asked to report the number of one-way trips provided, while those providing travel training were asked to indicate the number of individuals trained.

Second, the matrix structure represents the diversity of programs funded through the JARC and, later, New Freedom programs. The numbers associated with non-trip-based services like mobility managers and vehicle-loan programs are small in relation to one-way trips and jobs accessed, but they represent very real mobility benefits at a local level. The matrix approach allows FTA to capture this information and ensure that the benefits of these non-traditional programs are not overshadowed by the measures of one-way trips and jobs accessed.

Beginning with the FY 2007/FY 2008 reporting period, with the assistance of the JARC/New Freedom Advisory Committee, the JARC matrix reporting approach was expanded to include a companion matrix for the New Freedom program. The New Freedom matrix is organized with the same four categories of projects and the same set of five project goals as the JARC reporting matrix. However, the list of projects was modified to reflect allowable projects for NF funding as outlined in FTA Circular 9045.1 and subsequent guidance.

For PPE reporting purposes, the matrix is used to identify the primary goal for each New Freedom-funded service operated during the reporting year and to report output and outcome information related to the services provided as required to complete the federal Program Performance Evaluation.

To facilitate completion of the PPE forms, grant recipients were provided specific information via an on-line support site, email and phone support, and webinar training on how to use the reporting tools. Definitions were provided to help guide grantees in their choice of service and goal combinations. For example, trip-based services that are categorized as “flexible routing” include route deviation, point deviation, and other community circulators that may go off route to pick up individuals on a request basis. A “user-side subsidy” refers to individuals whose trip costs are subsidized by New Freedom funds including taxi vouchers, mileage reimbursements, underwriting the cost of vanpool seats, and so on. In contrast, trips provided through a “demand response” service would involve payment to an agency to subsidize the cost of running the vehicle, and not provide a direct subsidy to the individual user.

“Mobility managers” are an emerging service approach with a variety of responsibilities. For example, in some cases, a mobility manager is a clearinghouse of information about transportation services provided locally. Other mobility managers may schedule trips, but have nothing to do with the responsibility of providing (or paying for a trip). In these two cases, it would be most appropriate to report the number of customer contacts as a performance measure. However, some mobility managers also oversee the actual provision of service either by contracting with a provider or directly operating service themselves. In the latter case, it would be appropriate for the mobility manager service to report both the number of customer contacts enabled by the New Freedom program, as well as the number of one-way trips provided. It also should be noted that, although FTA allows for “mobility managers” to be funded as a capital program, they are considered information-based services for NF reporting purposes, given the nature of the service.

“One-on-one training” includes teaching an individual on how to use fixed route bus service or providing instruction on how to care for and maintain a vehicle. “Trip/itinerary planning” is another specific form of assistance that provides individual assistance.

Finally, capital investment projects range from providing vehicles to individuals through low-interest loan programs, providing a vehicle for an agency to transport its customers, or vanpool vehicles if the cost of the vehicle lease is underwritten. In these cases, grantees would be asked to report the number of units (vehicles) provided and if available the number of one-way trips taken by New Freedom-supported participants. Other capital investments include amenities, such as adding bus shelters to waiting areas or bicycle racks on buses to allow access to a transit system.

New Freedom Service Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| I. Trip-Based |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Fixed route | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun |  |
| 1. Flexible routing | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun |  |
| 1. Shuttle/Feeders | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun |  | # one-way trips  # miles added weekday / Sat / Sun |  |
| 1. Demand response | # one-way trips  # hours added within service area weekday / Sat / Sun  #hours added beyond service area weekday / Sat / Sun | # one-way trips  added within service area weekday / Sat / Sun  #hours added beyond service area weekday / Sat / Sun |  | # one-way trips  added within service area weekday / Sat / Sun  #hours added beyond service area weekday / Sat / Sun |  |
| 1. Same-day ADA paratransit |  |  |  | # one-way trips |  |
| 1. Door-to-door or door-through-door |  |  |  | # one-way trips |  |
| 1. Volunteer driver |  |  |  | # one-way trips |  |
| 1. User-side subsidy |  |  |  | # one-way trips |  |
| 1. Vanpool service |  |  | # one-way trips | # one-way trips |  |
| 1. Aide/escort assistance |  |  |  | # one-way trips |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Goal | | | | |
| Service Type | (A) Expanded geographic coverage | (B) Extended hours/days of service | (C) Improved system capacity | (D) Improved access/  connections | (E) Improved customer knowledge |
| II. Information-Based |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Mobility manager |  |  |  | # one-way trips  #customer contacts |  |
| 1. One-stop center |  |  |  |  | # customer contacts |
| 1. Itinerary planning |  |  |  |  | #customer contacts |
| 1. One-on-one transit training |  |  |  |  | # trained |
| 1. Transportation resource training |  |  |  |  | # trained |
| 1. Internet-based info |  |  |  |  | # customer contacts |
| 1. Materials and marketing |  |  |  |  | descriptive |
| 1. Driver training (individuals) |  |  |  |  | # trained |
| III. Capital Investment |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Vehicle for individual |  |  |  | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |
| 1. Vehicle for transit agency | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |  |
| 1. Vehicle for other agency | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |  |
| 1. Accessible taxis | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |  |
| 1. Vanpool vehicles |  |  | # one-way trips  # vehicles | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |
| 1. Car-sharing | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  | # one-way trips  # vehicles |  |  |
| 1. ITS investments |  |  | descriptive | descriptive | descriptive |
| 1. Elevators |  |  |  | # added  descriptive |  |
| 1. Large-capacity lifts |  |  |  | # added  descriptive |  |
| 1. Wheelchair-securement areas |  |  |  | # added  descriptive |  |
| 1. Other capital projects | descriptive | descriptive | descriptive | descriptive | descriptive |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix B  
New Freedom Service Profiles

Under separate cover

1. Reports from CES and TranSystems on JARC /NF services in operation during FY 2009, FY 2007 / FY 2008, and FY 2006 (JARC only) can be found on the JARC program page of the FTA website at http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/grants\_financing\_9292.html. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)