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Title VI Policy Statement

The Gompers Habilitation Center Title VI policy assures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964, the Restoration Act of 1987, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI states that “no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, or disability be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination” under any government-sponsored program or activity. There is no distinction between the sources of funding.

Gompers also assures that every effort will be made to prevent discrimination through the impacts of its programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations. Furthermore, Gompers will take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services for persons with limited English proficiency.

If Gompers distributes Federal-aid funds to another entity/person, Gompers will ensure all subrecipients fully comply with Gompers’ Title VI Nondiscrimination Program requirements. With the approval of the Board of Directors, the Executive Director of Gompers has delegated the authority to the Human Resources Director, as Title VI Program Coordinator, to oversee and implement FTA Title VI requirements.

Mark A. Jacoby, Executive Director
Title VI Notice to the Public
This notice is posted on Gompers web site, www.gomperscenter.org, in Gompers lobby, and in Gompers transit vehicles.

Notifying the Public of Rights Under Title VI
Gompers Habilitation Center

Gompers Habilitation Center operates its programs and services without regard to race, color, national origin or disability in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Any person who believes she or he has been aggrieved by any unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI may file a complaint with the Gompers Habilitation Center Title VI Coordinator.

For more information on the Gompers' Title VI program, and the procedures to file a complaint, contact Gompers Human Resources Director at 602-336-0061; or email humanresources@gomperscenter.org; or visit our administrative office at 6601 N 27th Avenue, Phoenix AZ 85017. For more information, visit www.gomperscenter.org.

A complainant may file a complaint directly with the City of Phoenix Public Transit Department or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) by filing a complaint directly with the corresponding offices of Civil Rights: City of Phoenix Public Transit Department: ATTN: Title VI Coordinator, 302 N. 1st Ave., Suite 900, Phoenix AZ 85003, ATTN: Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington DC 20590.

If information is needed in another language, please contact James Plutowski at 602-336-0061 and an interpreter will be provided.
Title VI Notice to the Public-Spanish

This notice is posted on Gompers web site, www.gomperscenter.org, in Gompers lobby, and in Gompers transit vehicles.

Aviso al Público Sobre los Derechos Bajo el Título VI
Gompers Habilitation Center

Gompers Habilitation Center (y sus subcontratistas, si cualquiera) asegura cumplir con el Título VI de la Ley de los Derechos Civiles de 1964, Sección 504 de la Ley de Rehabilitación de 1973 y La Ley de ciudadanos Americanos con Discapacidades de 1990 (ADA). El nivel y la calidad de servicios de transporte serán provehidos sin consideración a su raza, color, o país de origen.

Para obtener más información sobre la Gompers' programa de derechos civiles, y los procedimientos para presentar una queja, contacte Gompers Human Resources Director, Title VI Coordinator, (602) 336-0061; o visite nuestra oficina administrativa en 6601 North 27th Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85017. Para obtener más información, visite www.gomperscenter.org.

El puede presentar una queja directamente con City of Phoenix Public Transit Department o Federal Transit Administration (FTA) mediante la presentación de una queja directamente con las oficinas correspondientes de Civil Rights: City of Phoenix Public Transit Department: ATTN Title VI Coordinator 302 N. 1st Ave., Suite 900, Phoenix AZ 85003 or FTA: ATTN Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor –TCR 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington DC 20590
Title VI Complaint Procedures

Any person who believes that he or she has been excluded from participation in, been denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to unlawful discrimination under any Gompers Habilitation Center service, program or activity, and believes the discrimination is based upon race, color or national origin may file a formal complaint with Gompers Habilitation Center Human Resources Director. This anti-discrimination protection also extends to the activities and programs of Gompers Habilitation Center's third party contractors. Any such complaint must be filed within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory act (or latest occurrence).

Passengers using federally funded public transportation are entitled to equal access, seating and treatment. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended) and related statutes, Gompers Habilitation Center must ensure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any federally funded program, activity or service it administers.

Complaints for alleged non-compliance with Title VI and related statutes may be lodged with Gompers Habilitation Center Human Resources Director. Any such complaint must be filed within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory act (or latest occurrence).

To submit a complaint online, fill out the online complaint form.

To submit a claim by mail or in person, please fill out the printable complaint form and mail/take to:

Gompers Habilitation Center
Attn: Human Resources Director
6601 N 27 Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85017
Email: humanresources@gomperscenter.org
Phone: (602) 336-0061

Individuals may also file complaints directly with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) within the 180-day timeframe.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
Attention: Title VI Coordinator
East Building, 5th Floor –TCR
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20590
Complaints received by Gompers Human Resources Director will be assigned to the appropriate staff member(s) for investigation in accordance with federal standards (28 CFR Part 35 and FTA Circular 4702.1B). After the complaint is processed, the Human Resources Director will respond to the complainant and, if warranted by the investigation, take appropriate action. The City of Phoenix, as the designated recipient of federal funds for this region, is responsible for monitoring this process.

Any person who believes she or he have been discriminated against on the basis of race, color, or national origin by Gompers Habilitation Center may file a Title VI complaint by completing and submitting the agency’s Title VI Complaint Form or by calling Gompers Habilitation Center’s Human Resources Director. All complaints are logged into Gompers Habilitation Center’s complaint log and will be investigated according to federal standards.

Gompers Habilitation Center’s Title VI Complaint Form (English and Spanish) is located on our website.

To request information about Gompers Habilitation Center’s Title VI Policy or request information in an alternative format, please send an e-mail to humanresources@gomperscenter.org or phone (602) 336-0061.

Gompers Habilitation Center has 30 days to investigate each complaint. If more information is needed to resolve the case, Gompers Habilitation Center may contact the complainant. Following the investigation of the complaint, a possibility of two letters will be sent to the complainant: a closure letter or a letter of finding. A closure letter states that there was not a Title VI violation; therefore, the case will be closed.

A letter of finding states that there was a Title VI violation and explains what corrective action will be taken to remedy the situation. A complainant can appeal the decision within 60 days of receiving the letter. All appeals must be submitted to Gompers Habilitation Center Customer Service.

Procedures for Tracking and Investigating Title VI Complaints

**TRACKING**

Complaint comes in to Gompers Human Resources Director and is logged into the Gompers Title VI Complaint Log (the Log). The Human Resources Director is responsible for ensuring that information is complete, that all appropriate parties are notified within 24 hours for the closure of the complaint. Gompers Executive Director and Human Resources Director will audit complaints to ensure appropriate notifications and closure.

**INVESTIGATING**

STEP ONE: Summary of the complaint, completed by Gompers Human Resources Director.

STEP TWO: Statement of issues.
List every issue derived from the complaint summary. Include questions raised by each issue:
1. Who?
2. What?
3. When?
4. Where?
5. How?

Add new issues that surface during investigation. The final list of issues becomes outline for investigation.

STEP THREE: Respondent’s reply to each issue.
- Obtain information from each respondent, listen to each tape, review each document.
- All staff will document information collected in the customer contact (respondent area).
- After all respondent information is documented, complete the documentation (remaining steps).
- Determine the action taken.
- Follow up with the customer.
- Note: “Respondent” is not confined to the transit vehicle operator. “Respondent” is defined as any source of information that can contribute to the investigation, such as:
  - Operator (Interview/History)
  - Radio/Dispatch/OCC reports
  - GPS tracking software and programs
  - Maintenance (Staff/Records)
  - Witnesses
  - Complainant (Interview/History)
  - Spotter reports
  - Video (camera) and/or audio recordings
  - Incident reports (supervisor, transit police, fare/security inspectors)
  - Other Gompers employees
  - Route history

STEP FOUR: Findings of fact.
Investigate every “issue” (stated in the “statement of issues noted in step two). Separate facts from opinions.

STEP FIVE: Citations of pertinent regulations and rules.
Develop list of all regulations, rules, policies, and procedures that apply to the investigation
- Title VI requirements
- Company rules and procedures
- Gompers Habilitation Center policies and service standards
STEP SIX: Conclusions of law.
- Compare each fact from “findings of fact” to the list of regulations, rules, etc.
- Make decision on whether violation(s) occurred.
- List of violations becomes “conclusions of law”.

STEP SEVEN: Description of remedy for each violation.
- Specific corrective actions for each violation found.
- Include plans for follow-up checks.
- Do not conclude report with “no action taken”.
- If no violations found, conclude the report in a positive manner.
- Review policies and procedures.
- Review Title VI provisions.

Response to Customer:
Detailed summary of conversation with customer. Send copy of letter to customer.

Action Taken:
- Must include specific corrective action for each violation found.
- Include a follow-up action plan.
- If no violations found, note policies, procedures, etc. reviewed with operator.
- Never state “no action taken”.
# Title VI Complaint Form

## Section I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (Home):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (Work):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Mail Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Format Requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section II:

Are you filing this complaint on your own behalf?  
Yes*  No

*If you answered "yes" to this question, go to Section III.

If not, please supply the name and relationship of the person for whom you are complaining.

Please explain why you have filed for a third party:

Please confirm that you have obtained the permission of the aggrieved party if you are filing on behalf of a third party.  
Yes  No

## Section III:

I believe the discrimination I experienced was based on (check all that apply):

- Race  
- Color  
- National Origin  
- Disability

Date of Alleged Discrimination (Month, Day, Year):

Explain as clearly as possible what happened and why you believe you were discriminated against. Describe all persons who were involved. Include the name and contact information of the person(s) who discriminated against you (if known) as well as names and contact information of any witnesses. If more space is needed, please use the back of this form.

## Section VI:

Have you previously filed a Title VI complaint with this agency?  
Yes  No
If yes, please provide any reference information regarding your previous complaint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section V:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you filed this complaint with any other Federal, State, or local agency, or with any Federal or State court?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, check all that apply: □ Federal Agency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Federal Court: □ State Agency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ State Court: □ Local Agency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide information about a contact person at the agency/court where the complaint was filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section VI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of agency complaint is against:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of person complaint is against:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number (if available):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may attach any written materials or other information that you think is relevant to your complaint. Your signature and date are required below

__________________________  __________________________
Signature                        Date

Please submit this form in person at the address below, or mail this form to:
Gompers Human Resources Director
Title VI Coordinator
Gompers Habilitation Center
6601 North 27th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85017

A copy of this form can be found at www.gomperscenter.org
**Title VI Complaint Form - Spanish**

*Forma para poner una queja*

### Sección I:
- **Nombre:**
- **Domicilio:**
- **Teléfono(Casa):**
- **Teléfono(Trabajo):**
- **Correo electrónico:**

### Sección II:
- Esta presentando esta queja en su propio nombre?  
  **Sí**  **No**

*Si contestó “Sí” en esta pregunta, continúe con la Sección III.*

Si contestó no, por favor escribe el nombre y la relación de la persona por quien esta sometiendo esta queja.

Por Favor, explique porque usted ha presentado en persona tercera:

For Favor confirme que ha obtenido el permiso del agravado si esta entregando esta queja en persona tercera.

### Sección III:
- ¿Cuál de las siguientes razones describe por lo que usted siente que se le discriminó?:
  - Raza/Color(Especifique)
  - Nacionalidad(Especifique)
  - Sexo(Especifique)
  - Edad(Especifique)
  - Incapacidad(Especifique)

- ¿En qué fecha(s) sucedió la discriminación (mes, día, año)?:

Describa la presunta discriminación. Explique qué sucedió y quién cree usted que fueron responsable (si necesita más espacio, agregue otra hoja).

### Sección VI:
- Anteriormente ha sometido alguna otra queja de Título VI con esta agencia?  
  **Sí**  **No**
Si contestó sí, escriba una lista con los nombres de las personas que puedan tener conocimiento de la presunta discriminación y como contactarlas.

Sección V:

Ha Presentado esta queja con otra agencia federal, estatal o local en este estado o otro?

☐ Sí        ☐ No

Si marcó sí, marque las que apliquen apply:

☐ Agencia Federal:

☐ Corte Federal:  ☐ Agencia Estatal:

☐ Corte Estatal:  ☐ Agencia local:

Por Favor proporcione información de la persona a la que presentó su queja en la agencia/corte.

Nombre:  

Título:  

Agencia:  

Dirección:  

Teléfono:  

Sección VI:

Nombre de la agencia con quien es su queja: 

Nombre de la persona que la queja es contra: 

Título:  

La ubicación:  

Número de teléfono (si es disponible):  

Por favor firme abajo. Si gusta puede agregar cualquier material estricto o alguna otra información que usted crea que es sobre su queja.

Firma  __________________________      Fecha  __________________________

Someta la forma y cualquier información adicional a:

Gompers Human Resources Director  

Title VI Coordinator  

Gompers Habilitation Center  

6601 North 27th Avenue  

Phoenix, AZ 85017
Title VI Investigations, Complaints, and Lawsuits

This form will be submitted annually. If no investigations, lawsuits, or complaints were filed, a blank form will be submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description/Name</th>
<th>Date (Month, Day, Year)</th>
<th>Summary (include basis of complaint: race, color, national origin or disability)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action(s) Taken (Final findings?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawsuits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gompers Habilitation Center has not had any Title VI complaints, investigations, or lawsuits in 2015.
Gompers Habilitation Center Public Participation Plan
Gompers Habilitation Center provides limited transit services solely to persons who are enrolled in its programs. Individuals are referred to Gompers program through the Arizona Department of Economic Security/Division of Development Disabilities.

For individuals who have Limited English Proficiency (both current members and prospective members), Gompers provides the following alternatives to assist them:

- Gompers has a very diverse staff from multiple nationalities who are utilized for purposes of translation when necessary.
- Gompers can, when necessary, provide its literature in an alternative language basis.
- Gompers website utilizes Google translator and can currently be translated into 6 languages - Afrikaans, Arabic, Greek, Portuguese, Spanish and Swahili.

Gompers provides marketing and outreach to the community in the following manner:

- Gompers participates in outreach via community partners, disability provider fairs, and school transition fairs.
- Gompers provides a newsletter to our mailing list on a quarterly basis.
- Gompers belongs to a variety of local chambers and member organizations and associations.
- Gompers is engaged in a variety of social media platforms including Facebook and Twitter.
- Gompers has a limited marketing and advertising budget.

Gompers participates in the Maricopa Association of Government outreach meetings but does not engage directly in transit planning or decision-making.
Limited English Proficiency Plan

Gompers Habilitation Center Limited English Proficiency
Gompers Habilitation Center has developed the following Limited English Proficiency Plan (LEP) to help identify reasonable steps to provide language assistance for LEP persons seeking meaningful access to Gompers' services as required by Executive Order 13166. A Limited English Proficiency person is one who does not speak English as their primary language and who has a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English.

This plan details procedures on how to identify a person who may need language assistance, the ways in which assistance may be provided, training to staff, notification to LEP persons that assistance is available, and information for future plan updates. In developing the plan while determining Gompers' extent of obligation to provide LEP services, Gompers undertook a U.S. Department of Transportation four-factor LEP analysis which considers the following:

1) The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible in the Gompers service area who may be served or likely to encounter by Gompers' program, activities, or services;

2) The frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with Gompers' services;

3) The nature and importance of the program, activities or services provided by Gompers to the LEP population; and

4) The resources available to Gompers and overall costs to provide LEP assistance. A brief description of these considerations is provided in the following section.

A statement in Spanish will be included in all public outreach notices. Every effort will be made to provide vital information to LEP individuals in the language requested.

Safe Harbor Provision

Gompers complies with the Safe Harbor Provision, as evidenced by the number of documents available in the Spanish language. With respect to Title VI information, the following shall be made available in Spanish:

(1) Title VI Notice
(2) Complaint Procedures
(3) Complaint Form

In addition, we will conduct our marketing (including using translated materials) in a manner that reaches each LEP group. Vital Documents include the following:

(1) Notices of free language assistance for persons with LEP
(2) Notice of Non-Discrimination and Reasonable Accommodation
(3) Outreach Materials
(4) Bus Schedules
(5) Route Changes
(6) Public Hearings
Non-elected Committees Membership Table

Gompers does NOT select the membership of any transit-related committees, planning boards, or advisory councils.
Monitoring for Subrecipient Title VI Compliance

Gompers does NOT have subrecipients and does not monitor subrecipients for Title VI compliance.
Title VI Equity Analysis

A subrecipient planning to acquire land to construct certain types of facilities must not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin, against persons who may, as a result of the construction, be displaced from their homes or businesses. "Facilities" in this context does not include transit stations or bus shelters, but instead refers to storage facilities, maintenance facilities, and operation centers.

Gompers has no current or anticipated plans to develop new transit facilities covered by these requirements. No facilities covered by these requirements have been developed.

Board Approval for the Title VI Program

Board approval of the Gompers Title VI program is attached hereto.
Appendix A:
Board Resolution
Board Resolution of the Title VI Program

Gompers Habilitation Center Board of Directors meeting November 19, 2015

Board Resolution – Title VI Limited English Proficiency Plan: Cary Pfeffer moved and David Goldstein seconded the adoption of the City of Phoenix / Valley Metro Limited English Proficiency Plan as Gompers plan. The resolution passed unanimously.

Board Resolution – Title VI Policy: David Goldstein moved and Cary Pfeffer seconded the adoption of the Gompers Title VI Policy. The resolution passes unanimously.
Appendix B: 
City of Phoenix/Valley Metro 
Limited English Proficiency Plan
1.0 INTRODUCTION

In 1993, the Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) board adopted the name Valley Metro as the identity for the regional transit system in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Under the Valley Metro brand, local governments joined to fund the Valley-wide transit system that serves more than 73 million riders annually. Valley Metro provides fixed route bus service, light rail service and complementary paratransit service across the region. Valley Metro distributes transit funds from the countywide transit sales tax to its member agencies including the cities of Tempe, Mesa, Glendale, Phoenix, Buckeye, Tolleson, Wickenburg, Surprise, Peoria, Chandler, Gilbert, El Mirage, Avondale, Goodyear, Scottsdale, and Maricopa County. For the most part, Valley Metro and its member agencies utilize service providers for operations of bus, light rail and paratransit services. The cities of Glendale, Scottsdale, Peoria, and Phoenix contract some of their service directly to service providers.

The regional transit system has 44 local bus routes, 15 key local bus routes, 1 limited stop peak and 2 limited stop all-day routes, 20 Express/RAPID routes, 19 community circulator routes, one rural connector route, and one light rail system for a total of 103 regional routes. Eight regional entities provide Dial-a-Ride service for seniors and persons with disabilities, as well as ADA paratransit service for those who are unable to use fixed route bus service.

Valley Metro and the region supports the goal of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) limited English proficient (LEP) guidance to provide meaningful access to its services by LEP persons. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) notes that transit agencies that provide language assistance to LEP persons in a competent and effective manner will help ensure that their services are safe, reliable, convenient, and accessible to those persons. These efforts may attract riders who would otherwise be excluded from using the service because of language barriers and, ideally, will encourage riders to continue using the system after they are proficient in English and/or have more transportation options.

1.1 Regulatory Guidance

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, provides that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal financial assistance.

Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency,” issued on August 11, 2000, directs each federal agency to publish guidance for its respective recipients in order to assist with its obligations to LEP persons under Title VI. The Executive Order states that recipients must take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons. Providing English-only services may constitute national origin discrimination in violation of Title VI and its implementing regulations.
The FTA Circular 4702.1B, "Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients", issued in October 2012 reiterates this requirement. Chapter III states that — FTA recipients must take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are Limited English Proficient (page III-6)." 

In the Phoenix Metropolitan Area, there are over seventy different languages identified in households where English is not the predominate language. Using the "Four Factor Analysis" prescribed by the FTA, this plan was developed to ensure that all transit providers effectively communicate with all users of the public transportation agency’s services provided.

1.2 Four Factor Analysis

The FTA Circular 4702.1B identifies four factors that recipients of federal funds should follow when determining what reasonable steps should be taken to ensure meaningful access for LEP persons.

The four factor analysis involved the following:

1. Identify the number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered with transit service.
2. Determine the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with transit service.
3. Determine the nature and importance of transit service provided to LEP individuals.
4. Assess the resources available to the recipient for LEP outreach, as well as costs associated with that outreach.

This document describes Valley Metro’s four-factor analysis and summarizes its LEP efforts, including staff training, followed by a description of how the plan will be monitored and updated.

2.0 LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT POPULATION (FACTOR 1)

The Factor 1 analysis assessed the number and proportion of persons with limited English speaking proficiency likely to be encountered within the service area, which is defined as a one-half mile radial buffer around all fixed route services. The LEP population is those individuals who reported to the Census Bureau that they speak English “less than very well.”
2.1 Evaluation Methods and Data Sources

In accordance with the FTA’s policy guidance, the initial step for providing meaningful access to services for LEP persons and maintaining an effective LEP program is to identify LEP populations in the service area and their language characteristics through an analysis of available data. Determining the presence of LEP populations in the Valley Metro service area was completed through an analysis of several data sources, including:

- U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Sample

The U.S Decennial Census 2010 data was not used, as the 2010 Census did not include language specific information on the census forms. The Census 2000 data provides some general information about language groups that is included below; though recognized to be 15 years old. Notably the demographic landscape has transformed since 2000, though this dataset provides a historical comparison and additional insight given the long form of Census 2000 provided more detailed sampling for population characteristics like language proficiency as compared to Census 2010 and the ACS, which is more of a random sample.

2.2 LEP Population Identification

FTA describes LEP persons as having a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. For this LEP analysis, those who reported to the Census Bureau that they speak English “less than very well” were used to tabulate the LEP population for the transit service area.

Census 2000

U.S. Decennial Census 2000 provides information about English language proficiency within the Valley Metro service area. The census provides information on languages; recognizably this data is 15 years old and may not reflect the current state of the region. These data are available at the census block group and census tract level. There are 618 census tracts with one-half mile of fixed transit service. Figure 1 depicts the census tracts within the County. Census tracts encapsulated within the one-quarter mile buffer are also included in the estimates.
The Census 2000 data include the number of persons ages 5 and above who self-identified their ability to speak English as "very well", "well", "not well", and "not at all". Table 1 shows English proficiency for the County and for Valley Metro's service area using the Census 2000 data. The table shows that 12.1 percent of the population age 5 and over within the service area reported speaking English less than very well and is considered the overall LEP population. The census tracts within one-half mile of fixed route service have slightly higher population of LEP than Maricopa County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or Area</th>
<th>Total Population Age 5 and Over</th>
<th>Speaks English Only</th>
<th>Speaks English</th>
<th>Percentage Less than Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>Less than Very Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>2,832,694</td>
<td>2,148,696</td>
<td>355,963</td>
<td>328,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Tracts within ½-mile fixed routes</td>
<td>2,651,705</td>
<td>1,986,112</td>
<td>344,003</td>
<td>321,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 displays the data on English language proficiency for the census tracts within one-quarter mile around the fixed route service population ages 5 years and above by the linguistic categories identified by the U.S. Census Bureau, which include Spanish,
Indo-European, Asian or Pacific Islander, and All Other Languages. Predominately the population self-identified as speaking English less than “Very Well” is of Spanish language group, encompassing 10.4 percent of the total population ages 5 years and over. Indo-European, Asian or Pacific Islander, and All Other Languages groups comprised 1.7 percent of the population. Of all those speaking English less than very well, the Spanish group comprises 86.0 percent of the total population over age five with limited English proficiency.

Table 2: 2000 Census Data by Language Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Category</th>
<th>Total Population Age 5 and Over</th>
<th>Speaks English</th>
<th>Percentage Less than Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,651,705</td>
<td>344,003</td>
<td>133,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1,986,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>528,613</td>
<td>252,587</td>
<td>103,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>66,605</td>
<td>47,582</td>
<td>12,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>44,109</td>
<td>24,273</td>
<td>12,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Languages</td>
<td>26,286</td>
<td>19,561</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Census 2000 data also provide information on linguistically isolated households. "A linguistically isolated household is one in which no member 14 years old and over (1) speaks only English and (2) speaks a non-English language and speaks English 'very well.' In other words, all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English" (Census 2000). In total, the Census 2000 Summary File 3 data identified 1,048,128 households. The entire membership of a linguistically isolated household would be considered LEP. Table 3 details those data for linguistically and non-linguistically isolated households by language category.

Table 3: 2000 Census Data by Linguistically Isolated Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Category</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Isolated Households</th>
<th>Non-Isolated Households</th>
<th>Percentage Isolated Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Tracts 1/2 mile fixed routes</td>
<td>1,053,667</td>
<td>62,471</td>
<td>201,748</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>788,723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>190,507</td>
<td>51,213</td>
<td>139,294</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>40,883</td>
<td>5,161</td>
<td>35,498</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20,853</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>16,109</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Languages</td>
<td>12,701</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>11,296</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the fixed route transit area 5.9 percent of households are considered linguistically isolated. Again, these are predominately Spanish households making up 4.9 percent of the total. Remaining languages comprise 1.1 percent of households that are classified as linguistically isolated.
Figure 2 shows a map depicting the concentrations of linguistically isolated households in census tracts within one-quarter mile of fixed route service. Most areas throughout the region are mixed, though there are a few pockets of Census blocks that have concentrations of linguistically isolated households, thus identified as persons with limited English proficiency.

**American Community Survey**

The American Community Survey (ACS) is a continuous nationwide survey conducted monthly by the U.S. Census Bureau to produce annually updated estimates for the same small area (census tracts and block groups) formerly surveyed via the decennial census long-form survey. It is intended to measure changing socioeconomic characteristics and conditions of the population on a recurring basis. It is important to note that the ACS does not provide official counts of the population between each decennial census, but instead provides weighted population estimates.

Figure 3 shows the census tracts within the ½ mile buffer of transit routes. Census tracts encapsulated within this area are included in the estimates though they may not be within a ½ mile of a fixed route.

Within this area, the most recent census data from the ACS 2013 data estimate the population age 5 years and older within the service area to be 3,051,428 with 340,076, or 11.1 percent, of the population is LEP; see Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or Area</th>
<th>Total Population Age 5 and Over</th>
<th>Speaks English Only</th>
<th>Speaks English</th>
<th>Percentage Less than Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County</td>
<td>3,610,510</td>
<td>2,660,946</td>
<td>589,679</td>
<td>359,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Tracts 1/2-mile fixed routes</td>
<td>3,051,428</td>
<td>2,171,136</td>
<td>540,216</td>
<td>340,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ACS data show 19 languages or language groups with 1,000 or more LEP persons. However, only one LEP population exceeds 5 percent of the total population of persons eligible to be served or likely encountered. Table 5 shows the populations that meet either of these thresholds using ACS 2013 population by language and ability, sorted by percentage of LEP population.
Table 5: ACS 2013 Data by Language within One-Quarter Mile of Fixed Route Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Speak English</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Language LEP of Total LEP Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Languages</td>
<td>340,076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>275,370</td>
<td>416,599</td>
<td>691,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9,005</td>
<td>8,305</td>
<td>17,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9,391</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>15,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>4,908</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>12,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>8,918</td>
<td>13,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>10,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>7,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>6,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>7,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other indo European</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>5,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indic</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>3,989</td>
<td>5,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>9,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>4,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Island</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>4,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>4,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>3,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>8,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>10,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within one-half mile of fixed route service, the majority (81%) of the LEP population is the Spanish speaking population; this is the only language group to exceed 5 percent of the LEP population. The Spanish LEP population consists of 275,370 persons within the service area. Chinese and Vietnamese followed with 2.65 percent and 2.76 percent respectively, both were approximately 9,000 persons. There are 4,908 Arabic speaking LEP persons or 1.44 percent of the LEP population. The fifth largest LEP population is Tagalog consisting of 4,114 people, or 1.21% of the LEP population within the service area.

Figure 4 shows a map depicting the concentrations of population speaking English Less than Very Well throughout the service area. Most areas throughout the region are mixed, though there are a few pockets of Census blocks that have concentrations of persons with limited English proficiency.
3.0 FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT POPULATION (FACTOR 2)

The first step of the four-factor LEP needs assessment revealed that the largest language group was overwhelmingly Spanish; followed by Chinese, Vietnamese, Arabic, and Tagalog. Factor 2 is intended to assess the frequency with which LEP persons interact with Valley Metro programs, activities, or services. The USDOT "Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients 'Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Person" (USDOT 2005) advises that:

_Recipients should assess, as accurately as possible, the frequency with which they have or should have contact with LEP individuals from different language groups seeking assistance, as the more frequent the contact, the more likely enhanced language services will be needed_ (emphasis added). _The steps that are reasonable for a recipient that serves an LEP person on a one-time basis will be very different than those expected from a recipient that serves LEP persons daily._
The frequency of use was evaluated by assessing current resources, available data, and a short survey of transit employees.

3.1 Evaluation Methods and Data Sources

In an effort to determine the frequency that LEP persons interact with the agency, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to analyze access to services. Anecdotal information regarding interactions with LEP persons, garnered through conversations with Valley Metro employees is also included in this section. More structured analysis is included using several sources of information:

- Transit Employee Survey
- Customer Service Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Call Log
- Transit Education Program
- Valley Metro Website Translation Data

Together these sources provide a picture of the interaction of LEP persons with programs, activities, or services provided by the agency.

3.2 Frequency of Contact Analyses

With about a quarter of the region speaking more than only English, Valley Metro recognizes the value of providing convenient and efficient information to transit riders. Understanding how often LEP persons are utilizing services will assist in serving customers better in the future with quality services, programs, and activities.

Transit Employee Survey

An employee survey was performed in an effort to determine how often those employees in contact with transit riders regularly encounter LEP persons. During late March and early April 2015, a voluntary survey of customer service and transit employees was conducted regarding the interaction with LEP persons and languages spoken. A copy of the survey instrument can be found as Appendix B. The Valley Metro Customer Service Representatives provide passenger assistance most commonly through email, but also via the phone. In addition, there are several Customer Service Representatives that are dedicated for fare sales, transit information, or are stationed at transit passenger facilities¹ to provide assistance to passengers. Employees surveyed were of one of the following locations:

- Customer Service Representatives (via Customer Assistance System, letter, phone, or email)
- Central Station Transit Center
- Ed Pastor Transit Center

¹ Facilities operated by the City of Phoenix or the City of Tempe
- Metrocenter Transit Center
- Sunnyslope Transit Center
- Tempe Transportation Center

In total 26 respondents provided information about their experiences. Approximately 70% of those surveyed were Customer Service Representatives employed at the Mobility and Customer Service Center.

When asked if representatives have had any requests for materials in another language, 31% responded yes they had encountered a request; see Figure 5. Of these, most interpretation or translation requests were for Spanish.

By cross-referencing the locations of respondents with responses that language assistance had been requested, only three locations had received requests: Central Station Transit Center (50% of requests), the Mobility and Customer Service Center (38% of requests), and Ed Pastor Transit Center (13% of requests).

Languages requested were predominately Spanish (55%) followed by French (18%). See Figure 6 for a full breakdown of the languages requested, including Japanese, Swahili, and Sa’ban.

Due to a low number of requests that had been received for materials in other languages the questions regarding frequency of requests shown in Table 6 were quite evenly spread.
Table 6: Frequency of Requests Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you receive requests?</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every six months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$9^2$</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing that 60% of language requests were for the Spanish language, the two write-in responses for “Other” provide some telling qualitative information. Those responses were:

- “French—every six months, Swahili only once ever”
- “Once in 19 years” for Japanese

These responses were categorized appropriately and cross-referenced with the language requested. See Figure 7 for a comparison. Spanish was much more frequently requested than any other language. Additionally, languages other than Spanish were requested at a less frequent rate.

Figure 7: Language Requested by Frequency

This survey helped support that there are many languages encountered by transit professionals, yet Spanish is the most common and most frequent of those encountered.

**Customer Service Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Call Log**

The Customer Service Center updated the automated phone system mid-2014\(^3\) to establish the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) feature. With this expansion, the new

\(^2\) One respondent provided two responses — the second being a write in under the “Other” response.
system is able to provide a log to which line callers have requested to be transferred. Available are six topic categories, each in English and Spanish for twelve options total. The topics available include:

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Customer Relations (CR)
- Light Rail
- Lost and Found
- Transit Information (TI)

This system allows Spanish-speaking callers to be automatically transferred to a bilingual representative reducing the time it takes to be served in the preferred language. Beyond being more convenient and helpful, this system also is more efficient by reducing the likelihood callers may be redirected to a bilingual representative. Currently, 12 bilingual customer service representatives are employed by Valley Metro. The new phone system prioritizes selection of Spanish calls received. Acknowledging that this is a truncated data set, Table 7 below shows the distribution of calls by option selected, followed by the sum of calls by language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Calls</th>
<th>% of Total Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA-English</td>
<td>13,840</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA-Spanish</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-English</td>
<td>75,874</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-Spanish</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail-English</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail-Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Found-English</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Found-Spanish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-English</td>
<td>936,408</td>
<td>85.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-Spanish</td>
<td>67,630</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1,031,379</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>68,167</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Calls</td>
<td>1,099,546</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 shows a pie chart of the calls by language. Approximately 94% of calls were for English and 6% of calls were for Spanish. At the time of this report, 37 customer service representatives were currently on staff; of these, twelve are bilingual (32%).

When evaluating the customer service call logs, the bulk of calls received are through the

---

3 Data available July 2014 through April 2015
English phone lines with a small portion (6%) selecting a Spanish option.

Transit Education Program

Valley Metro has a Transit Education program that presents information to various groups to teach about public transit, benefits of transit, and how to use the system. Staff visit schools, present to new residents and refugee groups, and provide mobility training for senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Additionally, transit information and assistance is provided at community or special events including environmental fairs, transportation or vehicle days, career days, and more. This team also conducts general presentations by request to any group who wants to learn more about the transit system. For more-comprehensive training, monthly sessions are held at the Disability Empowerment Center and Glendale Adult Center.

Discussions with the program staff revealed some helpful anecdotal information. Typically, persons encountered spoke English fluently or well. The second most common language encountered was Spanish. Fifty percent of this team speaks Spanish and regularly provide information in Spanish.

Occasionally, presentations are made to various refugee groups. Due to the varied backgrounds of the participants, the hosting organizations generally provide necessary interpreters. Anecdotally, predominately Arabic and less often Burmese are the languages typically encountered during these presentations. However, it was noted that languages from around the world have been encountered through these group presentations.

Website Translation

Apart from accessing information via transit employees whether by phone, email, in person or another method, many customers utilize the www.valleymetro.org website for information. The website is equipped with the Google Translate feature, which allows translation into 90 languages. Users have translated the Valley Metro website into 70 different languages using this feature. Approximately 99% of sessions were utilizing the default English setting. The remaining 1% was comprised of 69 other languages. Table 8 provides an itemization of the languages translated and the percentage of sessions. Note that only languages comprising at least 0.01% of total sessions are included below; a full table of entries is available in Appendix C.
Table 8: Website Sessions by Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Sessions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,614,462</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21,392,285</td>
<td>98.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>222,177</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Sessions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>123,377</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>26,684</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>10,316</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>7,457</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, Spanish was overwhelmingly the most utilized language with the website translation service comprising 0.57% of sessions, followed by Chinese (0.12%), Japanese (0.06%), German (0.05%), and French (0.05%). See Figure 9 below for a chart of the number of translated sessions by language.

![Number of Translated Website Sessions by Language](image)

---


5 There were 13,829 entries excluded from the analysis that did not have a valid ISO language code associated with the website visit; thus, entries were deemed invalid.
The website was translated to an additional 55 languages that each comprises less than 0.01% of the sessions; collectively these viewings attribute to 0.03% of all sessions. These languages include:

- Acoli
- Afrikaans
- Albanian
- Armenian
- Aymara
- Azerbaijani
- Bengali
- Bosnian
- Breton
- Bulgarian
- Catalan
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Esperanto
- Estonian
- Filipino
- Finnish
- Galician
- Georgian
- Greek
- Gujarati
- Hebrew
- Hindi
- Hungarian
- Icelandic
- Indonesian
- Irish
- Javanese
- Kannada
- Kanuri
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Macedonian
- Malay
- Malayalam
- Marathi
- Navajo
- Norwegian
- Persian
- Pushto
- Romanian
- Serbian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Tagalog
- Telugu
- Thai
- Tonga
- Turkmen
- Ukrainian
- Vietnamese
- Walloon
- Welsh

Persons around the region utilize the website to gather information in languages from around the world using the Google Translate feature. The majority of translated sessions are for the Spanish language (0.57%).

Furthermore, many documents uploaded to Valley Metro’s website are translated into Spanish since they are disseminated as paper materials to the public. Individuals may utilize these documents without translating the website into Spanish, but rather use the Google Translate feature. Some of these documents include project updates, route maps and schedules, instructions and applications for a Reduced Fair ID, service change information, policies, brochures, and forms.

**Conclusion**

The Factor 2 analysis revealed that there is regular contact between the LEP population and Valley Metro personnel. The Transit Employee Survey conducted revealed that 31% of all respondents had encountered an LEP person; of those who had encountered a request for assistance in another language, 55% of requests were for Spanish. The Customer Service Call Log, though limited, showed that a mere 6% of customers utilized one of the six Spanish options. Information from the Transit Education team qualitatively identified Spanish as the main language group, while there were also occasional encounters with Arabic-speaking populations. Finally, translation data from the Valley Metro website indicated 1.03% of sessions were translated; approximately half of which were translated to Spanish. The website was translated to 70 different languages. Overall, there is broad diversity within the Phoenix region that accesses regional transit services, however; these are predominately English and Spanish speaking individuals.
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4.0 NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE PROGRAM, ACTIVITY OR SERVICE PROVIDED (FACTOR 3)

The third step in the four-factor LEP needs assessment is an evaluation of the importance of Valley Metro services to persons with limited English proficiency. The first component of the Factor 3 analysis is to identify critical services. Next, input received from community organizations was used to identify ways to improve these services for LEP populations. The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) "Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients' Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons" (USDOT 2005) advises that:

The more important the activity, information, service, or program, or the greater the possible consequences of the contact to the LEP individuals, the more likely language services are needed. The obligations to communicate rights to an LEP person who needs public transportation differ, for example, from those to provide recreational programming. A recipient needs to determine whether denial or delay of access to services or information could have serious or even life-threatening implications for the LEP individual . . . providing public transportation access to LEP persons is crucial. An LEP person's inability to utilize effectively public transportation may adversely affect his or her ability to obtain health care, education, or access to employment.

With assistance from Valley Metro's Community Relations and Marketing departments, a list of services provided was prepared and prioritized. The input from community organizations and LEP persons were incorporated to ensure views of the importance of services provided are adequately prioritized.

4.1 Services Provided

In cooperation with Valley Metro's Communications and Operations departments, services currently provided to LEP persons were queried. Typically, materials in both English and Spanish are available on both bus and light rail services. Below is a list of available materials and services in Spanish that includes next bus and light rail specific services:

- Press Releases
- Public materials, including, but not limited to:
  - Route Scout (announcements on buses and light rail)
  - Ride Guide and Destinations Guide
  - Service changes materials
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- Transit book
- Website
- Project updates
- Title VI forms
- Large special events materials (e.g. Super Bowl public materials)
  - Direct mailers or door hangers for targeted outreach
  - Ticket vending machines (Spanish and Braille)
  - Bilingual customer service staff
  - Email List Serv Messages
- Bus specific services:
  - Car cards (on-board advertisements)
  - Bus signs (i.e. priority seating, caution signs, entry/exit, etc.)
  - Variable message sign that displays announcements on buses
- Light Rail specific services:
  - LRT vehicle signage including priority seating, manners, and other train information
  - VMS Announcements on vehicles and at stations
  - System maps and auxiliary information
  - Operator call boxes on trains
  - Emergency call box at stations
  - Safe place notices

Critical Services

Public transit is a key means of mobility for persons with limited English proficiency. Of those services identified above, a subset of critical services was prioritized to ensure that those services imperative to utilize Valley Metro public transportation options are available to all users.

Basic trip information is available both printed and electronically in Spanish, including service hours, tickets, trip planning, airport and transit connections, parking, bicycles, and services for persons with disabilities. Also available in Spanish is information regarding how to utilize transit, manners, priority seating, caution signs, and exit locations on vehicles. Ticket vending is available in both Spanish and Braille. Emergency notification measures are also translated, including audio VMS\(^6\) Announcements on vehicles (bus and rail), operator call boxes, emergency call boxes, and Safe Place notices.

\(^6\) Variable message signs
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Bilingual customer service representatives are available during regular call center hours. Representatives use the same procedures for comments and note that the inquiry was in Spanish so that a bilingual representative is assigned in any follow-up response if needed. Outside of customer service hours, the website is available for translation to most languages at any time. For public meetings and hearings, a Spanish translator is usually available; additional translators are available upon request or appropriate context. Typically, additional translation services requested are provided for American Sign Language through an on-call contract.

**Community Outreach**

Valley Metro conducted interviews with six community organizations that encounter various LEP populations. The organizations interviewed range from cultural adult centers to refugee services organizations.

Key findings from outreach effort:

- Public transportation is the main form of transportation to access jobs, medical appointments, social services, grocery shopping and school.
- Many of the organizations provide an orientation to transportation services and also provide free transit passes for employment searches.
- Two primary challenges with the public transportation system were voiced, which related to route location and schedule.
  - The schedule does not accommodate early morning or late night shifts.
  - The transit system does not travel to all locations, especially those on the outer reaches of the Phoenix metropolitan region.

**Community Organizations Interviews**

To garner insight on the use and role of Valley Metro services to the LEP populations within the Phoenix Metropolitan region, six community organizations were interviewed:

- Catholic Charities
- Friendly House
- Refugee Focus
- Arizona Immigration Refugee Services (AIRS)
- Chinese Senior Center
- Hope VI

Organizations were identified to ensure that a wide variety of cultural and language groups were reached over large service areas. These organizations indicated that they serve populations speaking a broad range of languages, including Spanish, Arabic, Somali, Chinese, Burmese and French.
Participating agencies were asked a series of questions from the FTA handbook “Implementing the Department of Transportation’s Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” (FTA 2007b). Organizations interviewed expressed needs of LEP populations regarding language assistance including:

- **System Map Information**: LEP populations have expressed a difficulty in understanding and familiarizing themselves with system maps.
- **On-Board Messaging**: LEP populations have expressed hardship in reading and understanding on-board signage/message boards as well as driver instructions.
- **Transit Service Information**: LEP populations have expressed the desire for information, such as how to ride and fare payment information, be communicated in an understandable format. Symbols could be used to communicate messages to a wider audience. Also, offering orientation to these populations, through their respective agencies, would familiarize them with the transit system.

### 5.0 CURRENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND THE COSTS TO PROVIDE LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE SERVICES (FACTOR 4)

The final step of the four-factor LEP analysis is an evaluation of the current and projected financial and personnel resources available to meet the current and future needs for language assistance. The first component of the Factor 4 analysis was to identify current language assistance measures and associated costs. The next step was to determine what additional services may be needed to provide meaningful access. The USDOT “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” (USDOT 2005) advises that:

* A recipient’s level of resources and the costs imposed may have an impact on the nature of the steps it should take in providing meaningful access for LEP persons. Smaller recipients with more limited budgets are not expected to provide the same level of language services as larger recipients with larger budgets. In addition, ‘reasonable steps’ may cease to be reasonable where the costs imposed substantially exceed the benefits.

Valley Metro has a strong commitment to reducing the barriers encountered by LEP persons in accessing its services and benefits, to the extent resources are available. Valley Metro currently does not break down all cost expenditures related to providing language assistance. Valley Metro will evaluate how to consolidate its language assistance measures to deliver the most cost-effective services.
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5.1 Current Measures and Costs

Costs incurred by Valley Metro for the language assistance measures currently being provided include:

- Translation of materials
- Printing, advertising, or other marketing costs
- Interpretation services
- Staff costs associated with Title VI efforts in adhering to language assistance measures

Typically, an amount is embedded into the project costs by activity (logged under printing or other direct expenses) for translation and production of any materials. Agency wide there is a standing on-call contract for any interpretation needs. Any production costs are included in printing and public meetings budgets. Furthermore, there are bilingual employees that provide intermittent language assistance needs as part of their other duties. Specifically, the Public Relations team has two employees (33% of the department staff) that are bilingual. These employees may be assigned to prepare press releases or media events with Spanish-speaking publications in addition to their typical duties. These soft costs are not tracked, though most of the formal interpretation services are contracted.

Interpreters are contracted for public meetings or hearings to ensure that any language assistance needs are met so that public relations staff can focus on facilitating the event. All hearings are staffed with interpreters while public meetings are staffed depending on the anticipated number of persons reached and upon request. Valley Metro's current contract for interpreters at public meetings allow for approximately $200 per meeting. Annually $5,000-$6,000 is spent for interpreters to staff meetings and public hearings for various projects and efforts. In addition, $800-$1,200 is spent annually for sign language interpreters at requested meetings and public hearings. Costs for translating and producing materials like meeting notices, display boards, news releases, and project update sheets are also budgeted annually; approximately $14,000 - $15,000. In total, approximately $20,000 - $25,000 is contracted out directly in support of language assistance services for interpreters, translation, and materials dependent on the projects and programs implemented each year.

Additional soft costs include other staff time utilized on an ad hoc or regular basis to provide translation or interpretive services. Over thirty percent of Public Relations and Customer Service Representatives are bilingual, servicing Spanish-speaking customers as well as English-speaking customers. Being bilingual is a preferred qualification when hiring customer service staff though not required. There are also bilingual employees.
that may assist on an informal, ad hoc basis to communicate with LEPs in other departments.

5.2 Cost-effective Practices

Valley Metro will continue to evaluate ways to improve the cost-effectiveness and the quality of its language services. Additional strategies for saving costs or improving quality may include developing internal and external language services, with the opportunity to coordinate across multiple agencies in the region. Current measures practiced to ensure services are cost effective include:

- bilingual staff trained to act as interpreters and translators
- shared customer service center and other information for combined translation and interpretation resources
- some standardized common documents with transit and other public agencies
- translated vital documents currently posted on <valleymetro.org>

Strategies for consolidating the regional language assistance measures to achieve efficiencies may include:

- creating a one-stop LEP information center for Valley Metro employees
- surveying Valley Metro staff to determine any additional existing multilingual resources
- conducting outreach to various community organizations to secure volunteers for translation and interpretation services that are currently contracted or completed in-house
- consolidating contract services for oral and written translation to secure the most cost-effective rates

Valley Metro continues to use qualified translators and interpreters to uphold the quality of language assistance measures. Valley Metro strives to provide basic informational training for volunteer staff on its language assistance measures.

5.3 Additional Services and Budget Analysis

Valley Metro is committed to reducing the barriers encountered by LEP persons in accessing its services to the extent funding is available. While Valley Metro currently does break down contracted cost expenditures related to providing language assistance, expenditures of efforts for translation and interpretation completed in-house are less well documented. As part of the Language Assistance Plan, Valley Metro will better monitor efforts in the future. Valley Metro will further evaluate how to consolidate its language assistance measures to deliver the most cost-effective services.

The information received from community organizations provided some insight on additional services that may ease access for LEP persons to regional transit services.
The summary above portrays more insight of the interviews conducted. Services requested were centered on service expansions that included increased frequencies and later services at night. However, these would be greater improvements for consideration and prioritization of the system rather than specific services for LEP persons. Therefore, they were excluded here and assigned to the general public process for service requests.

Other requests included using more symbols to depict messaging and system routes. Audio messaging is also shown using VMS\textsuperscript{7} that could potentially show messaging in another language as well. The light rail system VMS currently shows messages in English and Spanish. Bus messaging is typically location data and in close proximity depending on stop locations. The feasibility and helpfulness of VMS translation should be evaluated.

As applicable, through the annual budget process, additional services requested or identified may be considered for implementation. In 2015, Valley Metro has shifted to a zero based budget that is approved by two appointed boards: Valley Metro Rail Board and the Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority Board of Directors. Year by year the budget is developed as appropriate to the unique needs and demands of the agency at that point in time.

\textbf{5.4 Projected Costs}

Requests for added services include expanded symbols to understand how to use transit services, on-board messaging, and system map information. With a commitment to providing reasonable language assistance measures, Valley Metro will assess current symbolism used on vehicles, at station locations, and elsewhere to determine the sort of improvements that could be made so that the system is more easily understood visually. With expanded symbolism, it is expected that the need for enhancing the on-board messaging and system map information may be reduced. Furthermore, these could be incorporated into the regular updates of this information and signage. Biannually in coordination with the service changes, updated system maps are produced.

Other improvements would be considered after analyzing the staff costs, third party contract costs, and costs related to volunteer or community organization coordination. These would be evaluated in comparison with anticipated benefits to the LEP population. Other considerations may include operational issues and implementation time.

\textsuperscript{7} LINK stations, light rail stations and vehicles are equipped with VMS announcements; most fixed route vehicles are also equipped with VMS capabilities
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6.0 LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE MEASURES

Valley Metro is committed to full compliance with Title VI and Executive Order 13166 to provide meaningful access and reduce barriers to services and benefits for persons with limited English proficiency.

6.1 Current Language Assistance Measures

As discussed earlier in this Language Assistance Plan, Valley Metro currently provides both oral and written language assistance. Oral language assistance includes bilingual customer service representatives, speaking Spanish. Additionally, Spanish interpreters are available at public meetings; sign language and other language interpreters are available as requested. On vehicles and at stations, VMS announcements are also in Spanish.

Written Spanish language assistance includes signage, press releases, list serv messages, service change materials, Title VI complaint forms, policies, and procedures. Additional translation of some vital documents is provided, such as schedules, maps, ride and destination guides, route scouts, and more. Meeting notices and public input surveys at public meetings are translated. The website is equipped with the Google Translate feature, which allows translation into 90 languages (www.translate.google.com). Fare vending machines provide Spanish and Braille translations as well.

Notices to the public of language assistance measures are typically provided side-by-side an English version of the document. For example, Ride Guide documents are provided in both English and Spanish and are available together wherever disseminated. Where available, documents are commonly printed on both sides with an English version and a Spanish version on each side of the paper. When calling into the customer service line, the interactive voice response system will ask if Spanish is the preferred language automatically prior to being connected with a representative.

6.2 Staff Training

Specific policies and procedures for interacting with LEP persons are not formally adopted on a standalone basis. These policies and procedures are in essence those for all customers and have been embedded into multiple documents (including the Title VI Plan, trainings, instructions, etc.).

Using the customer service center as an example, Spanish calls are assigned directly to a Spanish-speaking representative through the phone system. In the customer assistance system a note is made that the customer speaks Spanish so that if the query is not able to be responded to immediately, any response is assigned to another
bilingual representative. This training is implanted into general customer assistance staff training to ensure cost effective practices and efficient use of training resources. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is distributed to new employees and where applicable, employees are expected to know how to file discrimination claims based on race, color, or national origin. Additionally, there are related trainings available including quarterly Civil Rights Workshops, training sessions for conducting complaint investigations according to federal guidelines and streamlining the complaint investigative process.

Training for employees who regularly encounter the public may also include:
- Type of language services available,
- How staff and/or LEP customers can obtain these services,
- How to respond to LEP callers,
- How to respond to correspondence from LEP customers,
- How to respond to LEP customers in person, and
- How to document LEP needs.

Valley Metro continues to consider opportunities to provide quality services for LEP persons throughout the service area.

6.3 Future Language Assistance Services

With the development of subsequent Language Assistance Plans, it is expected that through the monitoring, evaluation, and update process that additional services continue to be identified and considered for feasibility of implementation. Valley Metro strives to serve LEP populations adequately with an equal opportunity to use transportation options available. Section 7 provides more information about the monitoring and update process of this plan.

7.0 MONITORING AND UPDATING THE LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PLAN

Triennially Valley Metro will review, monitor, and update this LAP. Feedback from agency staff and community members will be accepted throughout the year at the email address: TitleVICoordinator@ValleyMetro.org. Additional community feedback may be elicited during the update process. Internal monitoring will be conducted using the template provided from the FTA handbook “Implementing the Department of Transportation’s Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” (FTA 2007b). Using this checklist periodically, stations, vehicles, customer service, community outreach, and public relations are monitored.
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Using this information, changes may be made to the language assistance plan recognizing any cost implications and resources available. Depending on this evaluation, language assistance measures may be expanded, modified or eliminated based on their effectiveness.

As the transit service area is modified through service changes, the demographics served will be reviewed to ensure that those high concentrations of LEP persons are reflected accurately in an effort to provide language assistance measures to areas with expanded transit services.

Throughout the monitoring period, Valley Metro will continue to follow the recommendations and use the resources provided by Executive Order 13166, FTA Circular 4702.1B, the USDOT “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Person” (USDOT 2005), and the FTA handbook “Implementing the Department of Transportation’s Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” (FTA 2007b). Valley Metro will be better able to apply the DOT LEP guidance’s four-factor framework and will continue to determine an appropriate mix of language assistance in the preparation of language assistance implementation plans.
APPENDIX A – FULL LIST OF LANGUAGES

ACS 2013 population by language and ability: cells shaded purple in this table meet either the 1,000 persons threshold or the 5% threshold of the total population of persons eligible to be served or likely encountered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Category Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Total LEP Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Languages Speaks English Less Than Very Well (LEP Population within Service Area)</td>
<td>331,981</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>672,220</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>403,157</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>269,063</td>
<td>81.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>8,757</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>7,023</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Creole</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Creole Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Creole Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>10,437</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>9,347</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West Germanic</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West Germanic Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West Germanic Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Polish Speak English Less Than Very Well | 645 | 0.19%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Slavic</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Slavic Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Slavic Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indic</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indic Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indic Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo European</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo European Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo European Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>13,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>8,840</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>10,615</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>12,386</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Island</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Island Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Island Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>8,257</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native North American</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native North American Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native North American Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>12,259</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>4,859</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages Speak English Very Well</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages Speak English Less Than Very Well</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B – TRANSIT EMPLOYEE INSTRUMENT

Language Assistance Program Survey 2015

*-denotes required question
*Name: ___________________________________________
*Email Address: ___________________________________

1. Location
   - Customer Service Representatives (electronic, phone, email)
   - Central Station Transit Center
   - Ed Pastor Transit Center
   - Metrocenter Transit Center
   - Sunnyslope Transit Center
   - Tempe Transportation Center

2. Have you had any requests for information or materials in other languages?
   - Yes
   - No
   *If yes, please complete the remainder of the survey.
   *If no, thank you for your participation.

3. What language(s) have been requested?

4. How often do you receive requests?
   - More than once a week
   - Once a week
   - More than once a month
   - Once a month
   - Once every three months
   - Once every six months
   - Once a year
   - Other:
## APPENDIX C – WEBSITE SESSIONS BY LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Sessions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,628,079⁶</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21,392,285</td>
<td>98.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>222,177</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Sessions</th>
<th>Percent of Non-English Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>123,377</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>26,684</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>10,316</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ There were 13,829 entries included that did not have a valid ISO language code associated with the website visit; thus the sum of languages will fall short.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanuri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijani</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushto</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoll</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
A. There are housing locations between 7th Avenue and 19th Avenue on Buckeye and at 16th Street and Van Buren.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
A. Between 745-800 people.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
A. It fluctuates.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
A. Mexico, China, Somalia, Iraq, other Arab countries, Ukraine, other African countries.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
A. Varies.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
A. Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Arabic, Somali

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
A. The majority is female ranging from children to elderly.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
A. High school diploma or less. Most read at a 5th or 6th grade level.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
A. The majority use public transportation.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
A. Yes. Most residents know how to use the system. Bus passes are provided for employment searches.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?

A. The most frequently traveled destinations include doctor’s appointments and the grocery store.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?

A. Yes, it can be difficult to use the transportation system, especially Dial-A-Ride, for doctor’s appointments.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?

A. Yes. School-age children use public transportation to get to school, seniors use it during the daytime, and for those that work it depends on their shift.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?

A. Emails, community events, flyers.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?

A. Case workers, family members, English-speaking children.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/27/15
Re: LAP Interview – Arizona Immigration Refugee Services (AIRS)

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
A. The agency provides services across metropolitan Phoenix.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
A. 180 people per year.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
A. It has slightly increased.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
A. Iraq, Burmese, Afghanistan, Somalia, Cuba, Congo.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
A. It varies. The populations from Iraq and Afghanistan would have an urban background. Populations from other countries will a rural background.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
A. Arabic, Burmese, Spanish, French, Chin, Farsi, Somali.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
A. The agency serves males and females ranging from 4 months to 85 years old.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
A. It varies. The average education level is early high school.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
A. The population has expressed that there needs to be increased night time service as well as increased frequency of bus service. They have also expressed a safety concern with riding the bus. The population is also uncomfortable with using maps and cannot understand the signage on the bus or the bus drivers.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
A. Yes. Some have training before they arrive while others learn about transportation services from their case worker.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?

A. Between home and the AIRS office or to their work location.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?

A. Yes. There is no service to north Scottsdale resorts or to the dairies on the west side.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?

A. The likely users are young and male. Women tend to ride with family or in groups.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?

A. One on one contact, telephone.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?

A. Family members, other community members who have shared the same experiences.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/27/15
Re: LAP Interview – Friendly House

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
A. The agency provides services across Maricopa County, but mainly serves central and south Phoenix.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
A. 15,000 people per year.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
A. It has decreased slightly.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
A. Predominately Spanish-speaking countries as well as Middle East and African countries.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
A. Urban.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
A. Spanish, Arabic, Burmese.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
A. The agency serves males and females age three to seniors.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
A. No information available.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
A. The population has expressed a need to get to social services.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
A. No information available.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?
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A. No information available.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?

A. No information available.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?

A. Yes. Some utilize carpooling, local buses, or walking for travel.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?

A. One on one communication, surveys.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?

A. Case managers, teachers, and staff.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/27/15
Re: LAP Interview – Chinese Senior Center

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
   A. Mainly about three miles around the senior center, but the center does have people come from around metro-Phoenix.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
   A. About 1000 members.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
   A. Increased.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
   A. Southern Asia, China, and Taiwan.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
   A. Urban.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
   A. Chinese/different dialects of Chinese.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
   A. The age is over 60 and the center sees an equal mix of males and females.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
   A. The majority of the population is educated.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
   A. The population does not drive so they need public transportation services to get around.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
   A. Yes.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?
A. The most frequently traveled destinations are to the senior center and to home.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?

A. Yes, it is difficult to get to doctor's appointments.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?

A. There is no difference.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?

A. The best way to obtain input is to use surveys or make announcements.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?

A. Staff at the senior center.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/29/15
Re: LAP Interview – Catholic Charities

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
A. The agency serves central and northern Arizona. Refugee services are focused in Maricopa County.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
A. The agency provides services to 5,000 - 10,000 people per year. The refugee program serves about 1,000 people per year.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
A. It has stayed the same.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
A. It continually changes, but primarily the agency serves Arabic, Somali, and Spanish-speaking populations.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
A. It is mixed. The population from Iraq has an urban background and the Somali population has a rural background.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
A. Spanish, Arabic, Somali, Swahili, and Burmese.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
A. There is a 55% male and 45% female ratio. The agency serves all ages.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
A. It is mixed. The Iraqi and Cuban populations have a high school or college degree. The Somali population is less educated.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
A. Public transportation is the main source of transportation for the refugee populations. One challenge is accommodating for light night shifts. It was suggested that if materials were to be translated into another language that it be Arabic.
Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
A. Yes. The agency provides a bus and light rail orientation. It is the most popular program at the agency.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?
A. Most are traveling from the West Valley to the East Valley.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?
A. No information available.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?
A. No.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?
A. Community forums with professional interpreters.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?
A. Professionally trained interpreters.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/27/15
Re: LAP Interview – Arizona Immigration Refugee Services (AIRS)

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
A. The agency provides services across metropolitan Phoenix.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
A. 180 people per year.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
A. It has slightly increased.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
A. Iraq, Burmese, Afghanistan, Somalia, Cuba, Congo.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
A. It varies. The populations from Iraq and Afghanistan would have an urban background. Populations from other countries will a rural background.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
A. Arabic, Burmese, Spanish, French, Chin, Farsi, Somali.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
A. The agency serves males and females ranging from 4 months to 85 years old.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
A. It varies. The average education level is early high school.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
A. The population has expressed that there needs to be increased night time service as well as increased frequency of bus service. They have also expressed a safety concern with riding the bus. The population is also uncomfortable with using maps and cannot understand the signage on the bus or the bus drivers.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
A. Yes. Some have training before they arrive while others learn about transportation services from their case worker.

Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?

A. Between home and the AIRS office or to their work location.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?

A. Yes. There is no service to north Scottsdale resorts or to the dairies on the west side.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?

A. The likely users are young and male. Women tend to ride with family or in groups.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?

A. One on one contact, telephone.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?

A. Family members, other community members who have shared the same experiences.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 5/27/15
Re: LAP Interview – Refugee Focus

Summary:

Q. What geographic area does your agency serve?
   A. The agency provides service across metropolitan Phoenix.

Q. How many people does your agency provide services to?
   A. 800 people per year.

Q. Has the size of the population you serve increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years?
   A. It has stayed the same.

Q. What are the countries of origin from which your population has immigrated?
   A. Afghanistan, Bhutan, Burma (Burmese, Chin, Karen), Congo, Cuba, Columbia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, and Sudan.

Q. Does your population come from an urban or rural background?
   A. Both.

Q. What are the languages spoken by the population you serve?
   A. Amharic, Arabic, Assyrian, Burmese, Chaldean, Chin (Haka, Matu, Khumi, Muzo, and Falam), Dari, Dinka, Dzongkha (Bhutanese), Farsi, French, Hindi, Karen, Kibembe, Kinya-rwanda, Kirundi, Kiswahili, Kunama, Lingala, Nepali, Oromo, Pashto, Spanish, Somali, Thai, and Tigrinya.

Q. What is the age and gender of your population?
   A. The agency serves males and females from zero to 96 years old.

Q. What is the education and literacy level of the population you serve?
   A. It varies. Some refugees have some schooling while others are college educated.

Q. What needs or expectations for public transportation services has this population expressed?
   A. Public transportation services are needed. Free bus passes are also given out by the agency.

Q. Has the population inquired about how to access public transportation or expressed a need for public transportation service?
   A. Yes.
Q. What are the most frequently traveled destinations?
A. Work, medical appointments, social services, home, grocery store, school.

Q. Are there locations that the population has expressed difficulty accessing via the public transportation system?
A. Yes. There is no access to resorts in north Scottsdale or south to the casinos. Sometimes the closest bus stop is 20 minutes away. In addition, shifts do not match with the bus schedule. Also, there is difficulty accessing Mohave and 51st Avenue. Shifts at this employment location begin at 6 a.m. The current bus system limits accessibility to employers and can also create long commutes with workers trying to get there on time.

Q. Do the transit needs and travel patterns of the population vary depending on the age or gender of the population members?
A. Yes. Some may attend school; others may work or stay at home.

Q. What is the best way to obtain input from the population?
A. From case workers.

Q. Who would the population trust most in delivering language appropriate messages?
A. Case managers, community leaders.