

SCSL Digital Collections

**Creating awareness and seeking assistance
on transportation issues facing DSS
clients in the Pee Dee of South Carolina**

Item Type	Text
Publisher	South Carolina State Library
Rights	Copyright status undetermined. For more information contact, South Carolina State Library, 1500 Senate Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.
Download date	2024-10-11 06:21:41
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10827/6302

B8595HC
2. C63
Copy 1

**Creating Awareness and Seeking Assistance
on Transportation Issues Facing DSS Clients
in the Pee Dee of South Carolina**

Submitted by:

**Jim Love
South Carolina Department of Social Services
March 22, 2002**

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

AUG 9 2004

STATE DOCUMENTS

*EXCELLENT JOB
WITH A DIFFICULT TOPIC.*

SC Department of Social Services

Pee Dee Transportation Survey

Executive Summary

Background

Since implementation of the Family Independence (FI) Act in January 1996, transporting DSS clients to and from training and work has been a major barrier to client success. Of the clients who are required to seek training and employment, less than 30% have access to an automobile. Public transportation services are available on a limited basis in only 32 of the State's 46 counties. Due to the lack of jobs in many counties, clients are being required to travel 100 miles or more to work. To further complicate this issue, DSS is authorized to assist clients in paying for transportation services only for a limited period of time.

Since FI was enacted, significant efforts have been made to address the transportation issue including contracts with regional transit authorities, a system of approved "Individual Transportation Providers" and the expenditure of millions of dollars. Despite these efforts, the need for dependable, safe and affordable transportation, that is available to accommodate various work shifts and the pre- and post- employment needs of customers, is still a key issue.

One avenue that has yet to be pursued by DSS is to create better awareness among our state representatives as to the transportation issues we face on behalf of our clients. If a sampling of information were collected from DSS offices in the Pee Dee region of South Carolina, with specifics on current provider satisfaction, expenditures and staff time, (it has been stressed that DSS should not "get into the transportation business") and major barriers, legislators would have a better understanding of the current situation and existing concerns. If creative solutions were also collected and shared with legislators, there would be impetus for action.

This opportunity has prompted this research project which asks: "How can the DSS State Director be provided with data that can be used to convey to Pee Dee legislators the complexity and depth of DSS involvement in transportation and the need for assistance in addressing key transportation issues that remain?"

Data Collection

The Pee Dee Transportation Survey was conducted by the Economic and Business Affairs unit at SCDSS during the period of November 15 and December 7, 2001. The survey was sent to a total of 24 organizations including the 10 Pee Dee County DSS offices (Chesterfield, Clarendon, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Marlboro, and Williamsburg), 3 Workforce Investment Area Directors, 10 Chambers of Commerce and Council of Myrtle Beach Organizations (COMBO). From those sent, 13 surveys were completed and returned for a return rate of 54%.

Survey Ratings

Rating options and corresponding points for reliability were:

1 – Very Reliable 2 – Somewhat Reliable 3 – Not Very Reliable

Rating options for cost effectiveness were:

1 – Very Cost Effective 2 – Somewhat Cost Effective 3 – Not Very Cost Effective

Provider Ratings

With regard to specific transportation providers and their level of reliability and cost effectiveness, responses fell into three major categories: Pee Dee Regional Transit Authority (PDRTA); Individual Transportation Providers (ITPs); and Other Providers.

Pee Dee Regional Transit Authority (PDRTA) received a 1.88 average point rating on reliability or slightly less than "Somewhat Reliable." PDRTA received a 1.77 average point rating on cost effectiveness or slightly less than "Somewhat Cost Effective." (See Survey Results - Page 1)

Individual Transportation Providers (ITPs), that total over 250, received a 2.45 average point rating on reliability or half way between “Somewhat Reliable” and “Very Reliable.” ITPs received a 2.00 average point rating on cost effectiveness or “Somewhat Cost Effective.” (See Survey Results – Page 2)

Other Transportation Providers (totaling 13 including three Regional Transit Authorities) received a 2.66 average point rating on reliability or between “Somewhat Reliable” and “Very Reliable.” Other Transportation Providers received a 2.00 average point rating on cost effectiveness or “Somewhat Cost Effective.”

If the three RTAs were excluded, Other Transportation Providers would receive a 2.75 average point rating on reliability or between “Somewhat Reliable” and “Very Reliable.” They would receive a 2.11 average point rating on cost effectiveness or between “Somewhat Cost Effective” and “Very Cost Effective.” (See Survey Results - Page 3)

Totaling points for all providers resulted in a 2.33 average point rating on reliability or between “Somewhat Reliable” and “Very Reliable.” All providers collectively received a 1.92 average point rating on cost effectiveness or just below “Somewhat Cost Effective.” (See Survey Results - Page 3 or Summary below)

Provider Rating Summary

Provider	Reliability (Average) 1 = Not Very Reliable 2 = Somewhat Reliable 3 = Very Reliable	Cost Effectiveness (Average) 1 = Not Very Cost Effective 2 = Somewhat Cost Effective 3 = Very Cost Effective
PDRTA	1.88	1.77
ITPs	2.45	2.00
Other Providers	2.66	2.00
Other Providers w/out RTAs	2.75	2.11
Totals – All Providers	2.33	1.92

Barriers

Thirteen (13) respondents provided approximately 50 comments on transportation barriers or problems facing their county. These comments were grouped into 5 major categories plus “other.” Also, a few comments spanned more than one category and were included in all relevant categories. An asterisk following the comment notes this.

The categories, by number of comments were: Reliability (9), Availability (9), Cost (9), Rural/Distance Issues (8), Routes (5), and Other (11). (See Survey Results - Pages 4 – 10).

It could be argued that **reliability, availability and cost** are at the foundation of concerns voiced, especially if you view rural/distance and route issues to be a subset of these three main categories.

Creative Ideas/Solutions

Twelve (12) respondents provided 37 recommendations/creative solutions as to how we might address transportation issues that our clients and we face. These recommendations were grouped into 6 major categories plus “Other.” The categories, by number of comments were: Cars for Clients (10), DSS Issues (8), Reliability Ideas (6), Collaboration Ideas (4), Routes (4), Costs (2) and Other (3). (See Survey Results - Pages 11 – 16).

DSS and Client Impact

The 10 county DSS offices reported that staff time spent on addressing transportation issues ranged from 15 to 85 hours per week with an average of 39.6 hours per week. They further reported, by way of providing major routes of each transportation provider, that clients are spending varying amounts of time as they are transported to training, employment and other sites. Some clients are traveling as much as 160 miles (round trip) each day.

The 10 Pee Dee counties have to spend large sums of money to provide transportation assistance each year. For the 12-month period of September 2000 to August 2001, Pee Dee counties expended approximately \$1,200,000.

Conclusions

While this survey was not designed as a scientific instrument, it has clearly captured many of the transportation concerns in the Pee Dee. The survey results that rate current providers on reliability and cost effectiveness are, in themselves, conclusions. Individual Transportation Providers (ITPs) are generally rated as having better service but they are expensive and mostly fill-in service gaps. PDRTA is the most widely used provider and receives the largest amount of funding for transportation from DSS yet it is considered the one of the least reliable and least cost effective.

Reliability, availability and cost appear to be the core barriers and they are closely interrelated. Despite the many barriers, responses dealing with ideas and creative solutions were optimistic.

In a follow-up meeting on January 31, 2002, one of the Pee Dee County Directors stated (paraphrased) "... we should not have to be in the transportation business but we are and our budgets won't support it." This comment was widely supported by the other Pee Dee County Directors in attendance. County Directors went on to say that their transportation staff, (Transportation Coordinators), are spending a great deal of time arranging, negotiating and monitoring daily transportation efforts as well as spending time intervening when the inevitable crisis arises.

Throughout the time this survey was conducted, Pee Dee County Directors have consistently expressed their frustration at the amount of time, effort and money that must be expended in order to achieve limited success in transporting clients to and from training and jobs. This frustration is amplified by the fact that DSS transportation assistance is only a temporary solution. At the point when DSS can no longer provide transportation assistance to a client, that client is unlikely to find a transportation option that is both affordable and sustainable.

Recommendations

As stated in the Background section on page 2, the purpose of this project was to determine how to best provide the DSS State Director with data that can be used to convey to Pee Dee legislators (et al) the complexity and depth of DSS involvement in transportation and the need for assistance in addressing key transportation issues that remain. Survey conclusions can be viewed from three perspectives:

1. DSS transportation role: DSS is indeed in the transportation business by virtue to the time and money spent. Because of the money spent, DSS should be able to demand better service.
2. Provider inadequacies: Current provider options are not sufficient, partly due to route limitations, unreliability and lack of coordination with other providers.
3. Affordability for clients. – Most clients cannot afford the cost of transportation once DSS assistance ends.

These conclusions form the basis of an argument for moving forward to discuss this issue with key stakeholders.

Implementation Plan

While it is feasible for DSS to move forward to meet with Pee Dee legislators et al with the basic survey information, there are other action steps that can be done in parallel or in advance of such meetings. The following chart represents implementation plan that will serve to clarify and strengthen our position by taking steps to: refine the plan (RP), create awareness (CA), build partnerships (BP), seek assistance (SA) and leverage our position (LP).

Action	Purposes	Responsible	Target	Costs
Meet with Ron Chatham, Executive Director of NESAs, to discuss survey results and gain input on next action steps from the NESAs perspective (as recommended by Pee Dee County Directors on 1/31)	RP	Jim Love	3/1/02	Copies
	BP	Clark Leslie		Travel
	SA			
Collect total, itemized expenditures for transportation, by SCDSS including FI, FSE&T, youth, etc. for discussion and leveraging our position with providers	RP	Clark Leslie	3/15/02	Copies
	LP			
Meet with SCDSS State Director to review final survey results, executive summary and reach agreement on next steps to be taken by SCDSS	RP	Jim Love Clark Leslie	4/1/02	Copies
Communicate results of survey and next action steps to key internal stakeholders including Program Policy and Oversight and Regional and County Operations. Recommend survey results and action plans be woven into an overall transportation strategy for the agency.	CA RP	Jim Love	4/15/02	Copies
Assist NESAs in efforts to secure a Rural Infrastructure Grant from SC Dept. of Commerce for regional transportation study of the Pee Dee	BP	Jim Love	5/1/02	Travel
	SA	Clark Leslie		

Action	Purpose	Responsible	Target	Cost
Discuss with other state agencies, WIA Administrators and others to discuss transportation concerns, determine if they are facing similar issues and whether we would want to move this issue forward as a coalition	BP SA LP	Jim Love	TBD	Copies Travel
Meet with SC Department of Commerce regarding a special project in the Pee Dee with possible connection to transportation.	CA BP SA	Jim Love	3/1/02	Copies Travel Parking
Meet with the Tourism Labor Work Group to provide details of survey results, seek input and solicit support for becoming a partner in this effort	BP SA	Jim Love	TBD	Copies
Explore opportunity to partner with Francis Marion University and their new economic development efforts. Determine interest in focusing on transportation issues.	BP SA	Elizabeth Patterson Jim Love	5/1/02	Travel
Refine contract with RTAs (which is due 4/1/02) to include specific demands as to routes needed, reliability performance goals and other specific local needs.	LP	Jim Love	4/1/02	NA
Host a meeting with Pee Dee Transit providers discuss concerns and possible solutions	CA LP	Jim Love	TBD	Copies Travel
Have the DSS State Director discuss survey results with Pee Dee Legislators, NESAs members, a subgroup of NESAs like the Executive Board or the Board Chairman	BP SA	Jim Love	TBD	Copies Travel

Potential Resources

Tourism Labor Work Group	M. Beach Hospitality Association
Other State Agencies with similar problems	Honda of Timmonsville, SC
Workforce Investment Area Administrators	Francis Marion University
Current DSS funds expended	Coastal Carolina University
Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Funds	Florence-Darlington Tech
Horry-Georgetown Tech	Burris and Chapin
Commuter Choice Tax Benefit for employers	PDR TA/CRPTA

Integration into Standard Operating Procedure

Success of the Pee Dee demonstration effort will be replicated in other regions and counties of South Carolina.

Evaluation Methods

- Repeat survey 6 to 12 months after actions taken and positive movement anticipated. Look for changes in reliability, cost effectiveness, staff time spent, obstacles and creative solutions.
- Monthly tracking of transportation cost data in the Pee Dee and in the other 36 counties to do comparisons of funds expended in relation to number of clients transported.

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

County	Provider	Reliability	Cost Effectiveness	Major Routes	Staff Time Hrs Wkly
Chesterfield - FI	PDRTA	3 –Not Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Employment transportation after establishment in job - door-to-door	15
Chesterfield - Medicaid	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	None/Routes vary and are door-to-door	18
Clarendon					70
Darlington	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Hartsville - Myrtle Beach Darlington - Myrtle Beach	42.5
Dillon	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Dillon County Dillon to Florence	85
Florence	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	Florence Vicinity (Rural and city)	20
Georgetown	PDRTA	1 – Very Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Choppe Hwy. To Hemingway Hwy. 17 to Myrtle Beach/Charleston Hwy. 701 to Conway Hwy. 521 to Andrews Hwy. 51 to Hemingway	37.5
Horry					45
Marion	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Marion - Beach - Marion Highway 76 Commuter	15
Marlboro	PDRTA	2 – Somewhat Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Marlboro, Chesterfield, Darlington, and Florence Counties .65 per passenger mile	30
Williamsburg					18
Other					
Pee Dee Regional COG	PDRTA	3 – Not Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective		
Totals		19 into 9 = 2.11 average	20 into 9 = 2.22 average		396 into 10 = 39.6 hrs per week average

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

County	Provider	Reliability	Cost Effectiveness	Major Routes
Chesterfield - FI	Individual Transportation Providers (ITPs) 31	1 – Very Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Door-to-Door Pickup - employment and other
Chesterfield - Medicaid	ITPs - 108	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	None/routes vary and are door-to-door
Clarendon	ITPs - 27	2 - Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Pickup - countywide Destinations - countywide plus any out of county point
Darlington	ITPs - 45	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	Hartsville - Florence Darlington - Florence
Dillon	ITPs	1 – Very Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Dillon County Dillon to Florence, Charleston, Columbia, SC Dillon to Tar Heel, NC
Florence				
Georgetown	ITPs - 22	1 – Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Choppe Hwy. to Hemingway Hwy. 17 to Myrtle Beach/Charleston Hwy. 701 to Conway, Hwy. 521 to Andrews Hwy. 51 to Hemingway
Horry	ITPs	2 – Somewhat Reliable	3 - Not Very Cost Effective	Florence, Charleston, Columbia, Georgetown, Myrtle Beach, Conway, Loris, Little River
Marion	ITPs	3 –Not Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	As needed
Marlboro	ITPs	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Marlboro, Chesterfield, Darlington, and Florence counties and other areas as needed. .32 per vehicle mile
Williamsburg	ITPs - 33 3 - Econ. Servs. 15 - Medicaid 15 - Human Servs.	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	Mostly local
Other				
Pee Dee Regional COG	ITPs	2 – Somewhat Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	
Totals		17 into 11 = 1.54 aver.	22 into 11 = 2.00 average	
County	Provider	Reliability	Cost Effectiveness	Major Routes

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

Chesterfield - FI	Temp. Agency Contract - van driver	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	To East, West & South of Co. (Cheraw, Pageland, and McBee)- deliver to train.
Clarendon	Santee Wateree (RTA)	2 – Somewhat Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Pickup - countywide Destinations - countywide (Sumter, Florence, & Cola.
Clarendon County Chamber	Santee Wateree (RTA)	1 - Very Reliable	2 - Somewhat Cost Effective	
Dillon	Accu Staff - (Temporary employee transporting using state vehicle)	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	Dillon County Dillon to Florence
Florence	Youth Resource Management	1 – Very Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Florence-City and Rural Lake City to Myrtle Beach
Florence	Godwin's Transportation Services	1 – Very Reliable	2 – Somewhat Cost Effective	Lake City - Sumter Johnsonville - Sumter Lake City-Myrtle Beach
Florence	Rudolph Williams Trucking Co.	1 – Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Rural Lake City area to Lake City and Myrtle Beach
Horry	CRPTA	2 - Somewhat Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Conway, Loris, Little River, Myrtle Beach N. Myrtle Beach Georgetown, Murrels Inlet
Horry	Georgetown County Council on Aging	2 – Somewhat Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	Loris, Conway, Myrtle Beach
Williamsburg	Williamsburg Transit	2 – Somewhat Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	4-12 to Myrtle Beach Kingstree to Tupperware-Hemingway Kingstree to Superior-George.
Williamsburg	Rev. Herbert Godwin	1 – Very Reliable	3 – Not Very Cost Effective	As contracted
Williamsburg	Reliable Transportation	Not Rated	1 – Very Cost Effective	Never used; need 6-8 people going same place
Williamsburg	Berkeley RTMA	1 – Very Reliable	1 – Very Cost Effective	Gamble x-roads to Mikasa LUS 52 thru St. Stephens, Moncks Corner, N. Chas., Cainhoy
Gtr. Hartsville Chamber	Trolley (Bus)	?	?	Need schedule so we can answer requests about it

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

Totals		12 into 16 = 1.33 average	13 into 23 = 2.0	
Totals w/out RTAs		8 into 10 = 1.25 average	9 into 17 = 1.88	
Totals – All Providers	2.11 + 1.54 + 1.33 = 4.98	4.98 into 3 = 1.66 average		
	2.22 + 2.00 + 1.88 = 6.10		6.10 into 3 = 2.03 average	

What are the top three barriers or problems your county is facing with regard to transportation?

County	
Chesterfield - FI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fixed routes 2. A reliable public transportation system 3. Only one public system to choose from for transportation
Chesterfield - Medicaid	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shortage of lift vans and drivers for the contracted provider 2. No fixed routes 3. Missed appointments due to providers not picking up clients, or late pickup of clients
Clarendon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RTA: untimely pickups/drop-offs; 4-day lead time hinders or eliminates meeting of emergency requests; hours available (2nd and 3rd shifts); cost 2. Private providers: non-payment for vehicle parking and lack of reimbursement for meals
Darlington	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providers that transport early morning, late night

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Short distance transportation providers 3. Reliable RTA
Dillon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of transportation for 2nd and 3rd shift workers 2. Lack of established transportation routes to out of county work sites that limit job opportunities for many clients. Many clients live in remote areas and can't easily access transportation. 3. Because of the distance and increased cost due to distance, transportation is difficult to "sustain" for these individuals.
Florence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to large number of rural clients, the distance traveled to work is long which accounts for high cost for services 2. Many jobs are just minimum wage, therefore, clients continue to depend on agency assistance 3. In an effort to reduce the cost of transportation, we tried to use the provider that's most cost effective, but then reliability becomes an issue
Georgetown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural county 2. No public transportation in county 3. Lack of drivers license for people we serve
Horry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clients not getting to appointments and work on time 2. Contractual providers do not have enough established route to provide countywide transportation 3. Contractual providers do not provide enough off-peak hour trips on established routes
Marion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of regular established routes that satisfy employer needs and that enable access throughout the county

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

	2. Lack of transportation/bus shelters throughout the county 3. Lack of coordination with RTA's in other counties
Marlboro	1. Reliability of transportation 2. Transportation for 2nd and 3rd shift demands 3. Geographical layout of county
Williamsburg	1. Funding available to pay for non-transit transportation 2. Transit's need of 6-10 people to contract route 3. Remote location where people live in county may not be served by transit

Other	
Pee Dee Regional COG	1. Variety of options 2. Responsiveness to the rural needs 3. Pee Dee RTA, no matter how much funding, cannot serve the need of all the citizens that need transportation 4. Not flexible (hrs/days) 5. Timely service a problem 6. Responsiveness - poor
Clarendon Co. Chamber	1. (RTA) does not offer transportation for people needing. What is offered is cost <u>prohibitive</u> for may people. 2. To and from doctors, grocery stores.

	3. Know it is difficult as we are a large agricultural county.
Gtr. Hartsville	1. Poorly maintained two lane roads
Chamber	2. No connective bus service to regional hub and/or train.

What are the top three barriers or problems your county is facing with regard to transportation? Categories listed by number of comments.

* = Comment also in another category

RELIABILITY ISSUES

1. A reliable public transportation system
2. Missed appointments due to providers not picking up clients, or late pickup of clients
3. Reliable RTA
4. RTA: untimely pickups/drop-offs
5. In an effort to reduce the cost of transportation, we tried to use the provider that's most cost effective, but then reliability becomes an issue *
6. Clients not getting to appointments and work on time
7. Reliability of transportation
8. Timely service a problem
9. Responsiveness - poor

AVAILABILITY ISSUES

1. Transportation for 2nd and 3rd shift demands

2. Hours available (2nd and 3rd shifts)
3. Lack of transportation for 2nd and 3rd shift workers
4. Providers that transport early morning, late night
5. Contractual providers do not provide enough off-peak hour trips on established routes
6. Not flexible (hrs/days)
7. (RTA) does not offer transportation for people needing it. What is offered is cost prohibitive for many people *
8. To and from doctors, grocery stores.
9. No connective bus service to regional hub and/or train

COST ISSUES

1. Private providers: non-payment for vehicle parking and lack of reimbursement for meals
2. Funding available to pay for non-transit transportation
3. Pee Dee RTA, no matter how much funding, cannot serve the need of all the citizens that need transportation
4. Cost
5. Because of the distance and increased cost due to distance, transportation is difficult to “sustain” for these individuals.
6. Due to large number of rural clients, the distance traveled to work is long which accounts for high cost for services
7. In an effort to reduce the cost of transportation, we tried to use the provider that’s most cost effective, but then reliability becomes an issue
8. Many jobs are just minimum wage; therefore, clients continue to depend on agency assistance
9. (RTA) does not offer transportation for people needing it. What is offered is cost prohibitive for many people.

RURAL/DISTANCE ISSUES

1. Because of the distance and increased cost due to distance, transportation is difficult to “sustain” for these individuals.
2. Remote location where people live in county may not be served by transit
3. Lack of established transportation routes to out of county work sites that limit job opportunities for many clients. Many clients live in remote areas and can't easily access transportation.
4. Rural county
5. Due to large number of rural clients, the distance traveled to work is long which accounts for high cost for services *
6. Responsiveness to the rural needs
7. Geographical layout of county
8. Know it is difficult as we are a large agricultural county.

ROUTE ISSUES

1. Fixed routes
2. No fixed routes
3. Lack of established transportation routes to out of county work sites that limit job opportunities for many clients. Many clients live in remote areas and can't easily access transportation *
4. Lack of regular established routes that satisfy employer needs and that enable access throughout the county
5. Contractual providers do not have enough established route to provide countywide transportation

OTHER ISSUES

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

1. Lack of coordination with RTA's in other counties
2. (Lack of) Variety of options
3. Only one public system to choose from for transportation
4. No public transportation in county
5. Short distance transportation providers
6. Transit's need of 6-10 people to contract route
7. Lack of drivers license for people we serve
8. Lack of transportation/bus shelters throughout the county
9. Shortage of lift vans and drivers for the contracted provider
10. 4-day lead time hinders or eliminates meeting of emergency requests
11. Poorly maintained two lane roads

What are three recommendation or creative solutions you have regarding transportation that seem reasonable and “doable”?

County	
Chesterfield – Family Independence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create reliable public transportation system 2. Establish CDC in county that offers IDAs so clients can purchase own vehicle 3. More choices available for public transportation
Chesterfield – Medicaid	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fixed routes 2. Reliable public transportation system 3. More choices for public transportation
Clarendon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reimburse meals and parking for ITPs
Darlington	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. County DSS offices process transportation invoices timely and accurately 2. State office does a better job of screening QTPs 3. County offices follow manual policy and not their own regarding transportation implementation
Dillon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employ drivers and let them transport using state vehicles 2. Encourage car pooling by paying working clients with cars to transport other clients working at the same location 3. As an incentive, assist clients with buying used vehicles (such as by making down payment) after they have retained a job for a specified amount of time

Florence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have clients enter into an agreement/plan as to how they will meet their transportation needs 2. Staff should have regular contact with clients monthly to assess their plan for independence 3. To develop a system wherein clients are gradually weaned off of assistance - Ex: set up a fee scale and have clients start to pay a portion of the cost after the 3rd month of employment
Georgetown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need more access to transportation for folks in wheelchairs 2. Purchase vehicles for FI clients who work 3. County Council should authorize a public transportation provider that is accessible to all county residents
Horry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More collaboration from contractual providers to establish new routes in remote areas 2. Better advertisement of existing routes, times, stops, etc. 3. All RTAs in areas work together to establish adequate and effective transportation
Marion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish regular routes that satisfy employer needs and that enable access throughout the county 2. Establish transportation/bus shelters throughout the county 3. Establish and maintain collaborative efforts and programs between RTAs in targeted counties to ensure efficient and effective services to employers and consumers in targeted regions
Marlboro	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete transit system wherein fixed routes are used 2. Assist customers in owning their own vehicles (state and federal surplus) 3. Collaboration with school systems to allow customers/schools to ride school buses

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

Williamsburg	1. Helping people with Driver's Ed., training, and obtaining Driver's License 2. Have local auto dealers set up program similar to Spartanburg Co.'s 3. Have all "old" agency vehicles go into "carpool" and give back to counties
Other	
Pee Dee Regional COG	1. Individual Development Accounts to allow for purchase of cars for low-income individuals 2. Leasing Agreements for cars for transportation to work 3. Surplus cars (state) rehab. For citizens - (Bottom Line: figure out how to get cars into hands of workers!)
Gtr. Hartsville Chamber	1. Regular service to Florence Amtrak and bus stations.

What are three recommendation or creative solutions you have regarding transportation that seem reasonable and "doable"?

Categories listed by number of comments.

CARS FOR CLIENTS

1. Assist customers in owning their own vehicles (state and federal surplus)
2. Purchase vehicles for FI clients who work
3. Establish CDC in county that offers IDAs so clients can purchase own vehicle
4. Individual Development Accounts to allow for purchase of cars for low-income individuals
5. As an incentive, assist clients in buying used cars (such as by making down payment) after they have keep a job for a specified amount of time

6. Have local auto dealers set up program similar to Spartanburg Co.'s
7. Have all "old" agency vehicles go into "carpool" and give back to counties
8. Surplus cars (state) rehab. for citizens
9. Bottom Line: figure out how to get cars into hands of workers!
10. Leasing Agreements for cars for transportation to work

Comment from 1/31/02 meeting – Clients with their own transportation seem to have better work records. Having a car creates more client responsibility.

DSS ISSUES

1. Have clients enter into an agreement/plan as to how they will meet their transportation needs
2. Staff should have regular contact with clients monthly to assess their plan for independence
3. County DSS offices process transportation invoices timely and accurately
4. State office does a better job of screening QTPs
5. County offices follow manual policy and not their own regarding transportation implementation
6. Employ drivers and let them transport using state vehicles
7. Encourage car-pooling by paying working clients with cars to transport other clients working at the same location
8. Helping people with Driver's Ed., training, and obtaining Driver's License

Comments from 1/31/02 meeting – State DSS should investigate procurement rules, especially with regard to local counties negotiating rates.

State DSS transportation contracts do not always fit local needs.

RELIABILITY ISSUES

1. Create reliable public transportation system
2. Reliable public transportation system
3. More choices for public transportation
4. More choices available for public transportation
5. Complete transit system wherein fixed routes are used
6. County Council should authorize a public transportation provider that is accessible to all county residents

COLLABORATION ISSUES

1. More collaboration from contractual providers to establish new routes in remote areas
2. All RTAs in areas work together to establish adequate and effective transportation
3. Establish and maintain collaborative efforts and programs between RTAs in targeted counties to ensure efficient and effective services to employers and consumers in targeted regions
4. Collaboration with school systems to allow customers/schools to ride school buses

ROUTE ISSUES

NESA – DSS Partnership - Pee Dee Transportation Survey Results – Revised 3/13/02

1. Establish regular routes that satisfy employer needs and that enable access throughout the county
2. Complete transit system wherein fixed routes are used
3. Fixed routes
4. Better advertisement of existing routes, times, stops, etc.

COST ISSUES

1. To develop a system wherein clients are gradually weaned off of assistance - Ex: set up a fee scale and have clients start to pay a portion of the cost after the 3rd month of employment
2. Reimburse meals and parking for ITPs

OTHER ISSUES

1. Need more access to transportation for folks in wheelchairs
2. Establish transportation/bus shelters throughout the county
3. Regular service to Florence Amtrak and bus stations