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Introduction

• Research Background
• LEP Definition Affecting Funding Allocations
• Mobility Information Needs of LEP Population
• Incorporating LEP in Emergency Evacuation Plan
• Summary
Research Background

• Mobility Information Need Study for New Jersey Transit
• Chicago Transit Authority Limited English Proficiency Study
• Emergency Response Planning
• Immigration and Refugee Related Issues
Sampling Approaches

- NJ Transit Study
- Research Objectives
- Research Design
- Data Sources
- Survey and Analysis Results
- Contrast and Comparison w/Other Fields
- Lessons Learnt
Definition of LEP by DOT

LEP persons are those individuals with a primary or home language other than English who must, due to limited fluency in English, communicate in that primary or home language if they are to have an equal opportunity to participate in or benefit from any aids or services provided by the transportation agency.
Research Objectives

• Understand demographics of LEP travelers
• Assess mobility information needs
• Further NJDOT’s compliance w/Title VI
• Provide NJ Transit w/a Best Practice Manual
• Collect information on cost & schedule of recommended practices
Research Design

1. Literature Review
2. Identify LEP Data Sources
3. Classify LEP Populations in New Jersey
4. Generate Input from LEP Travelers in New Jersey
5. Survey Peer Transportation Agencies
6. Survey Internationally Oriented Activity Centers
7. Survey Selected International Entities
8. Develop a Non-verbal Communication Approach
9. Synthesizing Verbal and Nonverbal Approaches
10. Draft Final Report
11. Quarterly Progress Report, Final Report, and Presentation to RSIP.
LEP Population Classification by Census 2000

TOTAL LEP POPULATION By County, 2000
- 40,000 or More
- 10,000 to 40,000
- Less Than 10,000

LEP POPULATION Language Group by County, 2000
- Spanish
- Other Indo-European
- Asian & Pacific Island
- Other Languages

By County, 2000
- 72,000
## Top Non-English Language Spoken at home in NJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>5 years and over</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish or Spanish Creole</td>
<td>967,741</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>116,365</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>84,345</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>74,663</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese or Portuguese Creole</td>
<td>72,870</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>66,851</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarathi</td>
<td>47,324</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (incl. Patois, Cajun)</td>
<td>47,225</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>47,052</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>41,025</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>38,566</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of LEP Communities

• Evaluation Criterion
• Design Survey Questionnaire
• Identify Survey Candidates
  – Language Groups
  – Geographic Locations
  – ESL Establishment
  – Civil Organizations
• Establish Focus Groups
Survey Sites and Focus Groups

The Hispanic Focus Groups
The Arabic Focus Groups
The Chinese Focus Group
The Polish Focus Group
The Russian Focus Group
The Mixed Language Focus Groups
Demographic Characteristics

Age Distribution

- Under 20: 15%
- 20~30: 30%
- 31~64: 45%
- 65 or above: 10%

Household Size

- 1: 28%
- 2: 24%
- 3: 17%
- 4: 22%
- 5 or more: 9%
Language Background

Native languages

- Spanish: 31%
- Russian: 23%
- Other: 21%
- Polish: 9%
- Korean: 3%
- Arabic: 3%
- Portuguese: 3%
- Chinese: 6%
- Italian: 1%

Reading English

- Very well: 17%
- Well: 50%
- Not well: 40%
- Not at all: 1%

Speaking English

- Very well: 9%
- Well: 47%
- Not well: 40%
- Not at all: 4%
Travel Choices

Mode Share

- Use transit: 55%
- Not use transit: 45%

Mode Shares of Transit Users

- Bus: 57%
- Subway: 21%
- Light Rail: 2%
- Commuter rail: 20%

Trip Purposes

- Eating: 2%
- Shopping: 18%
- Visiting friends: 17%
- Recreation: 12%
- Others: 3%
- Business meeting: 4%
- Working: 17%
- School: 20%
Desired Improvements

- Native language signs, brochure, & announcement: 27%
- Picture signs: 26%
- Multilingual website: 12%
- Multilingual phone lines: 17%
- Translator: 14%
- Others: 4%
Understanding and Usefulness of Mobility Information Provided

- Not satisfied: 18%
- Very satisfied: 11%
- Satisfied: 71%
Acceptance of Solutions

- Picture signs: 26%
- Native language signs, brochure, & announcement: 27%
- Multilingual website: 12%
- Multilingual phone lines: 17%
- Translator: 14%
- Others: 4%

The pie chart shows the percentage of acceptance of different solutions for accessibility.
Mobility Needs Of LEP Travelers in New Jersey

- The Importance of Transit Services
- Mobility Information Needs
- Transit Service Needs
- Desires of LEP Community
Transit Service Needs

- A broader perspective on LEP people’s concerns
  - Comprehension
  - Attitude
  - Inefficient route placement
  - infrequent service, safety, reliability
Best Practice Surveys

- Survey of Transit Agencies in North America
- Survey of International Transportation Agencies
- Survey of International Related Activity Centers
- Synthesizing w/Market Research Questionnaire Design
QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

1. Type of Transit Services,
2. Written agency plan for serving Limited English Proficiency (LEP) travelers,
3. Top three languages other than English spoken by your riders,
4. Various multi-language service techniques,
5. Non-verbal Techniques, such as pictograms,
6. Estimated costs,
7. Greatest success in providing services for LEP users,
8. Relevance of the survey to the services you provide?
IDENTIFYING SURVEY CANDIDATES

• High concentration around certain metropolitan areas.
• Along both coasts and southern borders.
• Highest number of LEP population according to the 2000 census
• Intermodal and multimodal Transportation Services
SURVEY CANDIDATES
OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

- Response rate: 64%.
- Various Types of transit services.
- No written plan devoted to the strategies for serving LEP travelers.
- Top 10 Languages other than English.
- Type of strategies to serve LEP communities.
- Costs of each plan by different agencies.
Type of Transit Services

- Commuter Rail: 10%
- Light Rail: 14%
- Bus: 46%
- Other: 19%
- Heavy Rail: 11%
Top 10 Languages Other Than English

- Spanish: 31
- Chinese: 6
- Vietnamese: 4
- Portuguese: 3
- Russian: 2
- Hmong: 2
- Bosnian: 2
- German: 2
- French: 2
- Korean: 2
Multilanguage Techniques

Type of Transit Information

- Multi-language Pictograms: 10
- Multi-language Website: 5
- Multilingual Information Booths: 16
- Multilingual Phone Lines: 16
- Multilingual Ticket Machines: 5
- Multilingual Timetable or Route Map: 21
- Multi-language Announcement: 11

Number of Transit Systems
ESTIMATED COSTS OF LEP SERVICES

Portion of transit systems surveyed by cost range:

- 0-5000: 27%
- 10,000-30,000: 45%
- 100,000-250,000: 27%
EXAMPLES OF TRANSIT AGENCIES SERVING LEP TRAVELERS

- Washington DC Metro (WMATA)
- Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon
- Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority
- New York City Metropolitan Transit Authority
Washington D.C. METRO (WMATA)

- Serves the Nation’s Capital area.
- 800 railroad cars, 100 miles of track, and 1400 buses.
- A live translation service capable of handling 140 languages; receives approximately 80 calls a month with 96% in Spanish.
- Eight languages are available in Pocket Guide and website.
- Spanish bus schedules and 12 bi-lingual service employees
- Multilingual video.
- Over 30 representatives of social service agencies that work with LEP communities.
Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon

- Serves the Portland-Salem MSA with light rail and bus systems.
- Multilingual timetables and booklet.
- Multilingual website for complaints or suggestions.
- Seven pictographic symbols.
- $7,000 to print 100,000 copies of the “How to Ride” booklet and $7,000 in staff costs.
- The multilingual phone line costs approximately $2,600 per month.
Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority

• Serves the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton metropolitan area.
• Light rail, commuter train, and bus services.
• Multilingual telephone line with community mailings in nine languages besides English.
• Budgets $15,000 per year to communicate with LEP communities; Budgets $150,000 per year to communicate with all people in the area-at-large about new projects.
New York City Transit

• Provides heavy rail and bus services to the densely populated, multi-lingual New York metropolitan area.

• Three languages other than English are displayed at any given ticket machine.

• Two-sided brochures in English and the appropriate foreign languages and distributes the material at different stations.

• Approximately $250,000 per year including map production and translation services.
SURVEY INDICATIONS

• Multilingual phone lines and the bi- or multi-lingual personnel are widely practiced.
• Ticket-machine instructions in languages other than English and multi-language websites are less used strategies.
• Two thirds of the respondents have systems for receiving and processing complaints from LEP travelers.
• Only a few agencies have mechanisms for evaluating the success of their tactics.
• The lack of evaluation procedures increases the difficulty of analyzing the success or cost effectiveness of many strategies.
BEST PRACTICES

• Multilingual Verbal Materials—Publications and Signs
• Multilingual Announcements
• Multilingual Phone Lines
• Pictograms and Other Visual Aids
• Multilingual Websites
• Multilingual Personnel – Human Contact
• Cooperating with Other Organizations
• Publicizing What Is Available
Incorporating LEP in the Emergency Evacuation Plan

- Estimate Evacuation Demand
- Assess Transportation Systems
- Maintain Communication
Unique Aspects of LEP Need for Emergency Planning

- Timely information accessible to LEP people in EMGERENCES
- Primary information sources may not serve the needs of LEP communities
- To maximize effective emergency communication, learn about their needs
Spotlighting Critical Issues

- Definition of LEP
- Accurate Reflection of LEP Needs
- Service Coverage
- Particular Needs of LEP Population in Emergency Evacuation Situations
- Dissemination of Best Practices