DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 262 CE 001 815

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Lawrence, Frederick T.; And Others |
| TITLE | Transportation as a Factor in the Delivery of Rural Manpower Services in Public Service Employment. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Vermont State Employment Service, Montpelier. Dept. of Employment Security. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development. |
| REPORT NO | DLMA-82-48-70-30-13-FR |
| PUB DATE | Sep 73 |
| NOTE | 37p.; For related documents, see CE 001 805-818 |
| AVAILABLE FROM | National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 ($3.00) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Employment Problems; *Employment Programs; *Job Tenure; *Low Income Groups; Pilot Projects; Rural Areas; *Transportation; Unemployment |
| IDENTIFIERS | Manpower Research; Private Transportation; *Public Transportation; Vermont |

ABSTRACT

The Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project placed low income unemployed individuals in wage subsidized job slots in public and nonprofit agencies, anticipating that the work experience and related job skills gained would enable them to acquire nonsubsidized employment. A quantitative analysis is presented of 196 Special Work clients confronted with the problems of private transportation. Although sincere efforts were made to combat each individual transportation problem (Training Related Expense monies for repairs, car pools, etc.), it was found that the severe lack of public transportation and poor condition of private vehicles were in many cases the prime factors for clients terminating training. Several suggested solutions are presented. (Also included is a list of tables.) (Author)

# TRANSPORTATION AS A FACTOR

# IN THE DELIVERY OF

# RURAL MANPOWER SERVICES

# IN PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT:

# *THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE*


**Vermont Department of Employment Security**

Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner

## The Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor



September 1973

# TRANSPORTATION AS A FACTOR
# IN THE DELIVERY OF RURAL MANPOWER SERVICES
# IN PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT:
# THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract No. 82-48-70-30. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Contract No. 82-48-70-30 funded the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor. This Project was conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner. The principal author of this monograph is Frederick T. Lawrence of the Vermont Department of Employment Security.

September, 1973

| BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET | 1. Report No. DLMA 82-48-70-30- 13 | 2. | 3. Recipient's Accession No. |
|---|---|---|---|

4. Title and Subtitle
TRANSPORTATION AS A FACTOR IN THE DELIVERY OF RURAL MANPOWER SERVICES IN PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

5. Report Date: Sep. 73

6.

7. Author(s) Frederick T. Lawrence, Vermont Department of Employment Security

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Vermont Department of Employment Security
Box 488, Green Mountain Drive
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.
DL82-48-70-30

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address
U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210

13. Type of Report & Period Covered
Final: 11/1/70 - 6/30/73

14.

15. Supplementary Notes Prepared as part of the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security.

16. Abstracts The Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project placed low income unemployed individuals in wage subsidized job slots in public and nonprofit agencies, anticipating that the work experience and related job skills gained would enable them to acquire nonsubsidized employment. A quantitative analysis is presented of 196 Special Work clients confronted with the problems of private transportation. Although sincere efforts were made to combat each individual transportation problem (Training Related Expense monies for repairs, car pools, etc.), it was found that the severe lack of public transportation and poor condition of private vehicles were in many cases the prime factors for clients terminating training.

Several suggested solutions are presented.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors
Mobility

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5A, 5E

| 18. Availability Statement | 19. Security Class (This Report) | 21. No. of Pages |
|---|---|---|
| Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151. iv / v | UNCLASSIFIED | 45 |
| | 20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED | 22. Price 3.00 |

## PREFACE

In mid-1970, as a consequence of welfare reform legislation then pending in the United States Congress, the Vermont Department of Employment Security was chosen to test and document experimentation in the manpower training aspects of the proposed legislation. The overall objective of the resulting Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting the Special Work Project (Public Service Employment) for the unemployed and Upgrading training for the working poor, as a means of helping to develop guidelines and other knowledge required to facilitate and make more effective national implementation and rapid expansion of manpower projects aimed at enhancing the employability of heads (and other members) of low-income families.

The project thus had two major components within the overall project:

- "Special Work Project" whereby unemployed persons, by performing work (at public and private nonprofit agencies in the public interest) can develop job skills which enable them to obtain nonsubsidized (private or public) employment,

- "Upgrading training" whereby low-income employed persons ("working poor") can develop new job skills for which they receive increased salary.

More specifically the project:

- developed various designs for operating the two manpower programs,

- tested operating practices to identify smooth running procedures,

- tested the feasibility and relative effectiveness of alternative operating procedures,

-identified problems and issues central to the establishment and running of these programs,

-prepared technical materials and other aids for use in the programs,

-monitored and evaluated outcomes of activities,

-determined requirements for administration, facilities, staff and financing of the programs,

-established guides for determining how these programs might fit into the overall mixture of manpower programs and services at the local level,

-developed the necessary guidelines and manuals for effectively replicating the programs elsewhere,

-researched and documented the effect of the program on E&D manpower clients and,

-produced monographs on salient aspects of project experience, relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

The project was initiated on July 1, 1970, and terminated on October 31, 1973. Operation of the project was divided into the following segments:

July 1, 1970, through October 31, 1970: Planning, initiation, and startup,

November 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971: Operations limited to Chittenden and Lamoille counties,

July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1973, through October 31, 1973: Evaluation, writing, printing and publishing.

| FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY | | | SPECIAL WORK | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| As of July 2, 1973 | Number | Number | Number | Percentage of Total Enrollees |
| Total Special Work Enrollments | | 656 | | 100% |
| Completed Training | | 430 | | 65.6% |
| -Completed, Placed in Employment | 307 | | | 46.8% |
| -Completed, Placed in Work Training | 26 | | | 4.0% |
| Total Placements | | | 333 | 50.8% |
| -Completed, Placed in Education or Skill Training | 6 | | | 0.9% |
| -Completed, Awaiting Placement | 91 | | | 13.9% |
| Terminated Training | | 226 | | 34.4% |
| -Good Cause | 99 | | | 15.1% |
| -Without Good Cause | 127 | | | 19.3% |

| FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY | | UPGRADING | |
|---|---|---|---|
| As of July 2, 1973 | Number | Number | Percentage of Total Enrollees |
| Total Upgrading Enrollments | | 144 | 100% |
| -Completed Training | | 118 | 81.9% |
| Upgraded | 114 | | 79.2% |
| Not Upgraded | 4 | | 2.8% |
| -Terminated Training | | 26 | 18.0% |
| Good Cause | 17 | | 11.8% |
| Without Good Cause | 9 | | 6.2% |

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Preface | vii |
| List of Tables | xiii |
| Section I: Summary and Recommendations | 1 |
| A. Summary | 1 |
| B. Recommendations | 2 |
| 1. Public Transportation | 2 |
| 2. Private Transportation | 3 |
| 3. General | 4 |
| Section II: Introduction | 5 |
| A. Background | 5 |
| B. Purpose of Monograph | 5 |
| C. Approach | 5 |
| Section III: Transportation Situation in Vermont | 7 |
| A. General Factors Affecting the Transportation System | 7 |
| B. Transportation Facilities Available | 7 |
| C. Basic Industrial Configuration | 8 |
| D. Conclusion | 9 |
| Section IV: The Effect of Distance Traveled to Slot on SWP Clients | 11 |
| A. Description of Lamoille County | 11 |
| B. Location of Clients and Slots | 11 |
| C. The Effect of Distance on Completion or Termination of SWP | 12 |
| D. Conclusion | 15 |
| Section V: A Case History and Some Car Pool Experiences | 17 |
| A. A Typical Case History | 17 |
| B. Car Pool Experiences | 18 |
| Section VI: Transportation Problems and Their Effect on Clients in the E&D Project | 23 |
| A. Information and Data | 23 |
| B. Transportation Problems and Solutions | 24 |
| C. Effects of Transportation Problems on Participation, Termination and Completion | 26 |
| D. Conclusions | 28 |

Page

Section VII: The Application of Training Related Expense Funds to Transportation Problems . . . . . 29

A. Definition and Implementation of Training Related Expenses . . . . . 29
B. Training Related Expenses . . . . . 29
C. Information and Data. . . . . 30
D. Conclusions . . . . . 31

# LIST OF TABLES


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Means of Transportation to Work in Vermont -- 1970 Census | 8 |
| 2. | Distance in Miles Between Participant and Slots (Round Trip) | 12 |
| 3. | Participant Population by Round Trip Miles and Completion-Termination Status | 13 |
| 4. | Comparison of Completers and Terminators Who Lived More or Less Than a 30 Mile Round Trip from their SWP Slot | 13 |
| 5. | SWP Enrollees with Transportation Problems | 23 |
| 6. | TRE Distribution By Completers and Terminators | 30 |
| 7. | TRE Distribution By Clients Reporting Transportation Problems | 31 |

SECTION I

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Summary

To determine the effects transportation (or lack of it) had on participants in the Special Work Project (SWP) of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project, several facets of the problem are examined. The study focuses on the experiences of the SWP applicants and participants in Morrisville, Vermont, over the three years of project operation. Specifically addressed are:

1. The general situation: it is noted that public facilities are almost nonexistent in Vermont and that, therefore, more than 90% of the workers must find their own way to work. Also noted are contributing factors such as terrain, geography, road conditions, etc. A discussion of the basic industrial configuration of the state shows a lack of large employers (only 40 employers had 250 or more workers and 85% had less than 20). Additionally, the population and employers are found to be scattered with a lack of significant concentration of jobs.

2. The effect of distance on completion or termination is examined by an analysis of 190 participants in SWP from the

Morrisville office. These are grouped in relation to the distance clients had to travel daily to reach their slots. A marked difference was noted in the percent of completion rate between those who traveled more and those who traveled less (60% versus 45%). It is concluded that the further a client had to travel the more aggravated the problem became.

3. A case history outlining transportation problems encountered by client and staff is presented in order to illustrate the day to day problems of a specific participant. Also, a description of car pool problems by a local E&D office manager is included.

4. Attention is addressed to problems encountered by SWP clients and the solution to these problems by staff. Also, the overall effect of transportation problems on completion versus termination is assessed. It is noted that only 33% of completers had problems, while over 53% of terminators reported transportation difficulties. Specific problems are examined (no license, no car, marginal car, etc.) and solutions both formal and "ad hoc" are discussed. Specific cases are used to illustrate the effect of transportation problems on participation, termination and completion. The conclusion is drawn that transportation problems had a significant effect on a client's abilities to benefit from the program.

5. Training Related Expenses (TRE's) are examined as to their use in solving transportation problems. Data are presented compiled from the Morrisville experience and grouped according to termination or completion status. A comparison, for both terminators and completers, is made between those with problems who received aid and those who did not. It is noted that 42.3% of completers with problems received transportation related TRE's, while only 14% of terminators in the same category received them. An inference is made that this was the case because terminators' problems were beyond solution by TRE due to their seriousness as employment barriers.

## B. Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed through consultation with E&D staff and an analysis of client experiences. They consider the situation encountered and they relate to the rural nature of the population served.

### 1. Public Transportation

To remedy the lack of public transportation is a difficult task. Several suggestions, however, bear investigation regarding feasibility, particularly as to cost versus return.

a. The most obvious is a network of project vehicles to transport clients to their slots. These could be trainee driven and maintained providing additional SWP slots for clients. Outside

commuting hours the vehicles could be utilized to provide other services such as transporting children to child care, clients to medical services and clients to enrichment training and job interviews.

b. Investigation of utilization of the school bus network is recommended. Insurance and other problems would have to be overcome, but it is felt that this could be a valuable resource.

c. Project funds could be used to subsidize private transportation companies such as taxi cabs. These companies could be contracted on a bid basis to provide a means for clients to get to work. An advantage to this recommendation is the considerable amount of flexibility it would afford staff in setting up work slots.

2. Private Transportation

Since most clients in a rural situation are forced to provide their own means of transportation and the vehicles used were almost always "marginal", the following recommendations are addressed to this problem:

a. Direct purchase of private cars was frequently mentioned by staff as a solution to this problem. This course is very delicate and creates more problems than it solves. Obviously determination of who qualifies for such a purchase is subjective and open to abuse. Also the machinery necessary to establish such a procedure is cumbersome and, after adequate safe guards were built in, could be self-defeating. Often problems such as maintenance responsibility, insurance considerations and the problem of car ownership in case of termination militate against the adoption of this recommendation.

b. An alternative to direct purchase could be the leasing of cars on a monthly or longer basis from a private vendor and assigning them to selected clients. Car pools could also be formed and these vehicles assigned to the pool. The use of the assigned vehicles would be limited to job transportation on a mileage basis. Pools would pay for gas, and maintenance would be provided by the lessor. A great advantage of this idea is that new reliable vehicles would be available without the necessity of purchase. Since lease agreements would be between the project and the lessor, accurate budgeting would be possible and control could be exercised.

c. Many staff members recommended that a low interest loan fund be established to allow clients to purchase vehicles. Regular deductions from pay checks could be set up to provide for repayment. Implicit in this suggestion would be counseling in purchase of a suitable vehicle and mechanical evaluation of the vehicle selected. If an employee terminated and repossession was necessary, suitable cars could be offered to other participants.

It is believed that this plan could serve as an incentive to clients to complete training in order to qualify for better transportation.

d. It is strongly recommended that low cost car repair facilities be made available to clients. These could be either client staffed and operated or subsidized private garages. By reducing the cost of repairs, clients could afford to maintain their vehicles properly and, therefore, increase their reliability.

3. General Recommendation

It is recommended that in all projects utilizing a term of training involving work experience or on-the-job training, thought should be given to solutions to anticipated transportation problems before the program is implemented.

SECTION II

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Background

The Special Work component of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was designed to test temporary subsidized employment with nonprofit employers of low-income unemployed persons with dependent children to determine if such employment would lead to permanent jobs. The Special Work Project (SWP) was implemented with the first placement of clients in late 1970 and was phased out June 30, 1973. In addition to a slot with an employer, eligible clients were to be furnished with a full range of supportive services. Delivery of these services was provided by an employability team, consisting of a Counselor, Manpower Specialist and a Coach. This team was charged with responding to problems directly as they arose and affected the employability of the client in SWP. The members were to utilize the full range of services available, public and private, to meet and overcome difficulties, supporting the client in his effort to join and remain in the "World of Work". As part of these duties, the employability team members dealt specifically with "transportation" as a problem on a day to day basis. That is, they helped the client with the problem of getting to and from work consistently and promptly.

### B. Purpose of Monograph

The purpose of this monograph is to examine how transportation (or lack of it) effected the implementation of the E&D Special Work Project in Public Service Employment (PSE) in Vermont. We will also examine impact of transportation problems on client participation in, termination from, and completion of, the SWP program.

### C. Approach

1. The E&D Special Work Project was originally started in late 1970 in Burlington and Morrisville, Vermont. It was expanded to the rest of the state during its second year. For our purposes we have chosen to focus on the Morrisville experience in order to typify the problems of transportation in the state. It is felt that because of the large number of participants from Morrisville (196 out of 656 statewide) and its rural character, the findings presented are representative. It should be noted that staff interviews throughout the state corroborate the similarity of

experience. Even in Burlington, the state's largest city (pop. 38,635),[1] the minimal public transportation and geographical dispersion of employers and clients resulted in common and similar transportation problems.

2. We will undertake to examine broadly the state of transportation and the basic industrial configuration of Vermont, relating to the problems of the poor in general and E&D clients in particular.

3. Using the Morrisville experience, we will determine where the clients lived in relation to their work slots and the distances involved in getting to and from work.

4. Using case histories and statistics gleaned from an analysis of the Morrisville files, we will illustrate and identify the common problems of transportation in Vermont and the solutions to these devised by staff and clients.

5. Again focusing on Morrisville, we will detail the use of Training Related Expenses as an aid in the elimination or amelioration of various transportation problems encountered.

6. Finally, we will present and evaluate a series of recommendations for improvement of project transportation resources.

1 1970 Census

SECTION III

## TRANSPORTATION SITUATION IN VERMONT

### A. General Factors Affecting the Transportation System

In order to understand the transportation system in Vermont, it is necessary to examine briefly the character of the state. Vermont is largely rural in nature with the population scattered around small settlements. In fact, 59.9% of the population is classified as rural nonfarm (See TABLE 1). There are only eight areas in the state with populations of 10,000 persons or more, and of these only Burlington has a metropolitan area containing more than 50,000 persons.[1] Since employers and services tend to be scattered and very little urbanization is present, some form of transportation is required for most Vermonters to obtain work and services. Another factor not to be overlooked is the severe winter weather in Vermont which increases the strain on transportation systems. Also, the mountainous terrain and the large number of undeveloped roads are factors directly affecting the type of transportation system.

### B. Transportation Facilities Available

The major transportation facility in Vermont is the private car. Public transportation facilities are extremely limited. Three urban areas (Burlington and environs, Brattleboro and Barre-Montpelier) have bus lines. There is an inter-city bus service which operates for travelers on a noncommuting schedule. Passenger rail service is limited to Vermont stops on the Amtrak service from New York to Montreal; there are no commuter trains. The only other alternative to private vehicles or walking is local taxicabs whose rates make daily commuting by this means extremely expensive. The situation is dramatically reflected in TABLE 1. It will be noted that 77% of the state's working population indicated that the private car was their means of getting to work, either as driver (62%) or passenger (15%). In the Rural Nonfarm category 82% of workers listed the car as their means of getting to their jobs. Since the next largest percentage of workers list walking (13%) as their method of transportation, it can be seen that 90% of the work force provide their own transportation.

Further, rather than expanding, the existing public transportation system appears to be on the wane. Consider the situation in Burlington. Recently the private company which had provided service to the city and nearby suburban towns (Essex Junction, Winooski and South Burlington) announced it was shutting down.

[1] 1970 Census

The municipalities formed a public transportation authority and with federal help took over the company. Already some of the communities involved have expressed doubts as to their willingness to contribute to the authority citing the small number of people using the service. The long range future of this service is insecure.

In Lamoille County (Morrisville), which we are focusing on in this monograph, there is no public transportation of any sort except local taxicabs.

TABLE 1

Means of Transportation to Work in Vermont -- 1970 Census

| | Total State | | Urban | | Rural Nonfarm | | Rural | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | |
| All Workers | 165239 | 100 | 55364 | 100 | 96793 | 100 | 13082 | 1 |
| Private Auto, Driver | 102151 | 62 | 32492 | 59 | 64081 | 66 | 5578 | |
| Private Auto, Passenger | 25042 | 15 | 8897 | 16 | 15063 | 16 | 1082 | |
| Bus or Streetcar | 1902 | 1 | 1404 | 3 | 434 | - | 64 | |
| Subway or Elevated Train | 54 | - | - | - | 46 | - | 8 | |
| Railroad | 20 | - | - | - | 20 | - | - | |
| Taxicab | 1113 | 1 | 860 | 2 | 244 | - | 9 | |
| Walked only | 21187 | 13 | 8984 | 16 | 10122 | 10 | 2081 | |
| Other Means | 3922 | 2 | 984 | 2 | 2607 | 3 | 331 | |
| Worked at Home | 9848 | 6 | 1743 | 3 | 4176 | 4 | 3929 | |

C. Basic Industrial Configuration

A brief look at the industrial configuration of the state will be helpful in illuminating the situation.

Vermont employers are largely involved in services as opposed to manufacturing. In fact, three out of four nonagricultural salaried

jobs are in services.[1] Firm size is typically small, 85% of the firms have less than 20 employees. Only five percent have 50 employees or more. There are just 40 large employers who employ more than 250 workers. The larger firms are located in the six most heavily industrialized counties, i.e., Bennington, Chittenden, Rutland, Washington, Windsor and Windham. It should not be inferred that industry is centralized; however, even in the most industrialized counties, employers tend to be scattered locating on the fringes of the populated areas rather than in the core. The general small size of employers and their scattered location work directly against the establishment of mass transit systems and probably are important reasons for their lack.

D. Conclusion

From the above it can be seen that to work in Vermont the overwhelming majority must rely on the private car or live close enough to walk to work. As will be seen in the ensuing sections, this fact had a significant effect on the E&D Project.

[1] E. F. Shelley and Company, Inc. Vermont Economic and Social Characteristics and Their Implications for Upgrading the Working Poor. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1972.

SECTION IV

## THE EFFECT OF DISTANCE TRAVELED TO SLOT ON SWP CLIENTS

To examine the effect of distance traveled on SWP participants and to determine its relation to completion or termination, we have chosen to examine the experience of clients enrolled through the Morrisville office. It is felt that the experiences here are representative of the state's rural population.

### A. Description of Lamoille County

Lamoille County is the area that was served by the Morrisville E&D unit. The county is located in the heart of the Green Mountains. The road network is comprised of two lane paved and unpaved dirt roads. It has two employment and industrial centers, Morrisville and Stowe. Its population according to the 1970 census is 13,309 persons, divided into 3,201 families. Of these, 1,785 had related children under 18 (a condition of eligibility for SWP clients). There were 361 families considered to be below the poverty level and 192 families receiving public assistance.[1] The unemployment rate (another SWP eligibility condition) was 7.4% in 1971.[2] Of the 361 families listed as below the poverty level, 251 had related children under the age of 18 and thus were potential clients.[3]

The Lamoille County Business community is almost entirely composed of small businesses. Only seven have more than 50 employees. Winter skiing and summer vacations comprise a large portion of the service industry which, along with retail and wholesale trade, make up more than 85% of the employers.

### B. Location of Clients and Slots

1. The clients were drawn from throughout the county and their residences were either in the small villages or in the rural countryside. We could find no significant concentration with the possible exceptions of the Morrisville-Hyde Park and Stowe areas. This we feel was due to the fact that this was the most densely populated portion of the county and that the E&D Project office was located there.

2. Since SWP slots had, by definition, to be with nonprofit

---

[1] 1970 Census

[2] E. F. Shelley and Company, Inc.

[3] Ibid.

employers, the E&D staff was faced with a problem: within the county there were few suitable employers. Accordingly, a subcontract was written with the Vermont State Hospital, a large mental institution, located in the next county at Waterbury, 20 miles from Morrisville. Other slots were developed at a small state college and a small school for emotionally disturbed children. The remaining employers were scattered throughout the county and were municipalities, social agencies and schools.

3. In order to show distribution of SWP slots in relation to the clients who filled them, we examined the files of 190 of the 196 participants in SWP during the three years of the E&D Project. (The six files not included were those of clients transferred to other districts during their SWP employment; it is assumed that their experiences were similar to the group as a whole.)

TABLE 2 shows the breakdown by miles that all clients had to travel in order to reach and return from their SWP slots. The table further indicates those employed at the Vermont State Hospital, which had the largest number of clients, and those in all other slots.

TABLE 2

Distance in Miles Between Participants and Slots (Round Trip)

| Miles | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VSH Slots | 18 | 7 | 3 | 45 | 16 | 27 | 116 |
| All Other Slots | 28 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 74 |
| Total | 46 | 20 | 11 | 52 | 23 | 38 | 190 |
| % of Total | 24.2 | 10.5 | 5.8 | 27.4 | 12.1 | 20.0 | 100.0 |

4. It should be noted that included in the 46 clients shown as having a ten mile or less round trip to work were several who were so placed because they had indicated to Counselors that they had no transportation at all. Of the 38 clients shown as residing over a 51 mile round trip from their SWP slots, several commuted more than 70 miles and one dedicated soul drove 94 miles to and from work.

C. The Effect of Distance on Completion or Termination of SWP

1. In order to determine if distance from the slot had an effect on completion or termination, we divided the clients into two groups: those who completed training and those who terminated

for any reason. These groups were then subdivided into those who had a 30 mile round trip or less and those who had more. TABLE 3 and TABLE 4 show the results.

TABLE 3

Participant Population By
Round Trip Miles and Completion-Termination Status

| | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Participants | 46 | 20 | 11 | 52 | 23 | 38 | 190 |
| Percent | 24.2% | 10.5% | 5.8% | 27.4% | 12.1% | 20.0% | 100% |
| Completers | 25 | 14 | 7 | 21 | 9 | 20 | 96 |
| Percent | 26% | 14.6% | 7.3% | 21.9% | 9.4% | 20.8% | 100% |
| Terminators | 21 | 6 | 4 | 31 | 14 | 18 | 94 |
| Percent | 22.3% | 6.4% | 4.3% | 33% | 14.9% | 19.1% | 100% |

TABLE 4

Comparison of Completers and Terminators
Who Lived More or Less Than A 30 Mile Round
Trip From Their SWP Slot

LESS THAN A 30 MILE ROUND TRIP

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Participants | 77 |
| Percent of all Participants | 40.5% |
| Number of Completers | 46 |
| Percent | 59.7% |
| Number of Terminators | 31 |
| Percent | 40.3% |

OVER 30 MILE ROUND TRIP

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Participants | 113 |
| Percent of all Participants | 59.5% |
| Number of Completers | 50 |
| Percent | 44.2% |
| Number of Terminators | 63 |
| Percent | 55.8% |

TOTAL PROJECT

| | |
|---|---|
| Total all Participants | 190 |
| Completers | 96 |
| Percent | 50.5% |
| Terminators | 94 |
| Percent | 49.5% |

2. Examination of the tables shows several interesting points. Of the 77 clients who lived within a 30 mile round trip from work, 46 or 59.7% completed their training, while 31 or 40.3% terminated. Of the 113 clients who lived outside the 30 mile limit, only 50 or 44.2% completed their training, while 63 or 55.8% terminated.

Since of the whole group, 96 or 50.5% completed and 94 or 49.5% terminated, we believe the 15.5% swing in completion rate between the two groups when compared as to distance (59.7% to 44.2%) is significant. It shows that as distance increased from the slot the problems of transportation had a marked effect on completion.

3. It should be interjected here that few of the clients surveyed lived within walking distance of each other. This exacerbated the distance problems. In addition, in many cases both husband and wife were enrolled in SWP slots necessitating the transportation of children to child care facilities before leaving for work. Also, even though a great many clients had slots at the Vermont State Hospital the distance between clients made pooling of transportation difficult to organize. It is to the credit of the E&D staff that this problem was met as well as it was.

4. It might be instructive to outline briefly a typical case, illustrating how distance contributed to the problems clients faced in participating in SWP.

Mr. A entered SWP training from Morrisville. His slot at the Vermont State Hospital was a 40 mile round trip from his home. His car was old and in poor shape. Nonetheless, he was responsible for transporting three other workers who had no transportation of their own. Since his wife was seriously ill, he had to care for his six children, transporting those below school age to a day care facility. His daily schedule follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 6:30-leave home for day care center | 5 miles |
| 6:40-pick up first passenger | 2 miles |
| 6:45-pick up second passenger | 1 mile |
| 6:50-pick up third passenger | 1 mile |
| 7:30-arrive at work | 20 miles |
| 4:00-leave work | 20 miles |
| 4:40-drop off passengers | 4 miles |
| 5:00-pick up children and return home | 5 miles |
| total | 58 miles |

Needless to say, Mr. A's old car did not stand up well to 290 miles per week and broke down frequently. Finally it gave up the ghost completely. The E&D staff tried valiantly to place Mr. A and his riders in other pools and did succeed in placing two of his people. Both Mr. A and the remaining passenger could not be placed and were forced to drop out of the program. While lack of

dependable transportation was not Mr. A's only problem (his wife was very ill), it was aggravated by the distance he had to travel and contributed directly to his termination.

D. Conclusion

In summary, it can be said that the distance between client and slot has a measurable impact on the ability of a participant to complete SWP training. That is, the further a client lives from his slot the higher the probability of termination.

SECTION V

## A CASE HISTORY AND SOME CAR POOL EXPERIENCES

### A. A Typical Case History

The following case history is presented in some detail to illustrate the impact of transportation difficulties on rural clients. It is by no means an isolated case.

The subject, Mr. B, was 44 years old when he was referred to the E&D Project. He was an unemployed married man, father of nine children, seven of whom lived at home. He had a seventh grade education and had worked most of his adult life as a tree trimmer. At the time of his referral, he was receiving $491.00 per month welfare aid. He had earned $800 the previous year.

He was considered by the ES (Employment Service) Counselor who interviewed him as a well motivated individual who was handicapped by his lack of education. He expressed an interest in steady employment and a dislike for welfare dependency. He also stated that his wife was interested in getting training and would like to work to help out. The Counselor noted that "marginal transportation" was a serious barrier to steady employment. The client seemed ideally suited for the E&D program, and both he and his wife were placed in slots at the Vermont State Hospital -- Mr. B as a Stock Clerk and his wife as a Food Service Worker. The wages they earned allowed their welfare aid to drop from $491 per month to $125. The B's did well and subsequently were offered permanent employment.

The problems caused by "marginal transportation" surfaced almost at once. Mr. B owned a 1964 automobile with over 100,000 miles on it. This car was required to transport the B's and another client daily on the 80 mile round trip from their residences. Repairs were required almost at once in the amount of $151.60. Part of this was covered by the Training Related Expense fund. Shortly after this, the transmission broke. These repairs were paid for by the client after the Coach had obtained agreement from the repair shop to accept $25.00 per month until the $100 bill was paid.

Since the three clients worked different hours, the day was a long one. The B's had to care for their seven children and then drive the 40 miles to work in order to get Mr. B there in time for his shift at 7:30 a. m. His wife did not start work until 10:00 a. m. After Mr. B completed work, he and the other

client had to wait until she finished work at 6:30 before they could leave for home. This was indeed a long day. Despite these problems, things went well for some time. Finally, however, the strain of 400 miles a week was too much for the car and it ceased to function at all. The B's were forced to stay home. The other client in the pool was able to get a ride because another client agreed to go 20 miles out of his way to transport him. The E&D staff went to work to try to remedy the situation. The car needed a new motor and a windshield. A used motor was located after much effort but approval for its purchase and installation in the amount of $263.80 could not be obtained. The staff had no choice but to terminate the B's from the program. As a result, the B's welfare aid was raised back to $491 per month.

As we have said, the problems encountered here were by no means unique but, rather, are routine. As for the B's, after some months a solution to their problem was worked out. An apartment in another town was located within walking distance of a job Mr. B qualified for. He is currently working full time and is highly thought of. It is clear that transportation was the biggest problem in Mr. B's case and until it was resolved, all efforts to help him help himself were in vain.

B. Car Pool Experiences

Since car pools were a frequent and obvious response to transportation problems, we feel it will be helpful to examine their function. To illustrate their problems and organization, we include the following direct quote from the Manager of the E&D unit to the Central Office describing the pools in operation at that moment. At the time of the memo, the B's car had just broken down completely.

> I will try as best I can to outline our immediate problems:
>
> B Car Pool from Hardwick (80 Miles Round Trip)
>
> Edmund B -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
> Mildred B -- works 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.
> John T -- works 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
>
> Notice that these people are at the hospital from 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. because of Mrs. B's hours -- this is a long day!! Mr. B's car is not running and is beyond repair with over 130,000 miles on it. At the present time, the B's are not working, and the hospital staff is cooperating with us to hold their jobs open until we resolve the problem. John T, who resides in Wolcott, is temporarily riding with Robert A who is driving an extra 20 miles per day to transport Mr. T. [Wolcott is in the opposite direction of the Morrisville to Waterbury route.]

The B's have seven children to take care of before they leave Hardwick for work. I will say that the B's and John T are very dedicated and steady workers at the hospital.

Greg, the Welfare Caseworker, visited the B's this morning and he further confirmed that the car is beyond repair. Further, he states that there is nothing the District Social Welfare can do to resolve this problem.

Alan G Car Pool from Morrisville

Alan G -- works 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Fred F -- works 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Alan G has six children and he has to transport them to a child care center before work. His wife is very sick in the hospital and it will be at least three months before she can resume the care of her children in the home. We have worked out child care problems with Welfare and Lamoille County 4-C /Community Coordinated Child Care/ for the temporary child care. Both Mr. G and Mr. F are permanent employees.

G's car is in very poor shape. The car would not start this morning. We tried to help him start the car with jumper cables, but the old car would not start in minus eight degree weather with heavy winds. He recently had new plugs and points installed. We called the local Ford garage to determine what repairs the car requires, and we were informed that the car is not worth repairing.

A Social Welfare caseworker has made arrangements with an automotive instructor at the Lamoille Union High School, vocational school, to have the car repaired, if at all possible.

Douglas M Car Pool from Hyde Park

Douglas M -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Emma M -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The M's have two children to transport to child care centers. Doug has always been cooperative in transporting trainees. He is reluctant to travel extra miles to trainees, as he is trying to conserve mileage on his old car. He is presently sick in the hospital.

S Car Pool from Morrisville

Victoria S -- works 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
John H -- works 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

John H's car is wearing out, and we have arranged for him to ride with Mrs. S.

M Car Pool from Morrisville

Fred M -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Linda C -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Leonard Y -- works 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

This pool is okay so far. We are trying to arrange today to have Mr. M take on Steve G and Clarence F. However, there is a problem in transporting Steve G's six children and having Mr. M leave at least a half hour earlier.

J Car Pool from Eden

Robert J -- works 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Mary J -- works 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Wendell K -- works 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

The J's will go on the evening shift, 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. in the very near future. They have five children to transport to the daycare center.

D Car Pool from North Hyde Park

Leaman D -- works 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Alice D -- works 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Both are permanent employees. They have three children to transport to the daycare center.

N Car Pool from Morrisville
N Car Pool from Morrisville

Katherine N -- works 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Ilene D -- works 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

These two trainees just started.

Winston P from Johnson works from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. He has just gone on permanent. His wife is sick and is being admitted to the hospital very soon. He has five children to transport to the daycare center.

I have explored the thought of having some of these people who are permanent obtain a loan from the Vermont Employees Credit Union and it appears that a co-signer is required. I believe this requirement does exist because the employee attrition rate at the hospital is fairly high compared to other departments.

We are continually working on the transportation problem, but it is quite evident that some of the permanent employees and trainees have no choice but to terminate if we don't come up with some solutions.

Transportation is a serious problem in a rural area where no public transportation exists.

The above illustrates graphically the problems E&D staff faced on a routine basis in operation of SWP.

SECTION VI

## TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND THEIR EFFECT ON CLIENTS IN THE E&D PROJECT

This section will deal with transportation problems encountered by clients going to and from their SWP slots. Also, we will note solutions to problems worked out by staff and clients, either through formal utilization of program resources or "ad hoc" methods. We will again focus on the Morrisville experience as typical of the program as a whole. As previously noted, even in the urban places, the problems encountered were similar.

### A. Information and Data

To develop the information shown below we examined the files of 340 persons who were considered for the project, 190 of whom were eligible and became participants in the E&D Project in Morrisville. Also examined were the Training Related Expense (TRE) files. We noted and tabulated all comments and notations by staff relating to transportation problems. Additional information and comments were gathered through interviews with many staff members. TABLE 5 summarizes the results of this study.

TABLE 5

SWP Enrollees with Transportation Problems

| | No. | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Total Enrollees in SWP Slots | 190 | |
| Total Completers | 96 | 50.5 |
| *Total Terminators | 94 | 49.5 |
| Total Enrollees with Identifed Transportation Problems | 82 | 43.2 |
| Completers with Transportation Problems | 32 | 33.3 |
| Terminators with Transportation Problems | 50 | 53.2 |

*14 terminators (15%) listed transportation as the main problem.

To produce the above figures we divided the participants into two groups. Completers were those who completed their first SWP slot. In some cases they were permanently placed, in some cases not. Our intention has been to focus on problems during training. In

any case, it is felt that if a transportation problem did not appear as a barrier during the training period, it probably would not prevent the client from taking a subsequent permanent job. Terminators were counted also during their first SWP slot. They were counted as terminated if they did not complete training for any reason. It should be noted that some of these were readmitted to slots later after the E&D staff had removed the reason for the termination and did successfully complete training.

TABLE 5 shows some interesting facts. While only 1/3 (33.3%) of the completers had transportation problems, more than 1/2 (53.2%) of the terminators had an identified problem. We feel that the 20% difference is significant in that it suggests transportation problems had a marked effect on whether a client completed training or not. Additionally, of those who did not complete training, 14% or 15% listed transportation (or lack of it) as their main reason for termination.

B. Transportation Problems and Solutions

In general, the lack of a dependable method of getting to and from work was the main problem. The lack of public transportation forced clients to depend on private vehicles as their primary transportation resource. Since clients by definition were low income people, the cars they did have were for the most part marginal in dependability. The distances between client and work site placed an additional burden on these autos, and as might be expected, they continually and regularly broke down (See Section VII). Also, many clients did not own a car or had no driver's license either because they did not know how to drive or because they had lost their licenses (driving while intoxicated, traffic offenses, nonpayment of poll tax, etc.). While no numerical value could be given to problems encountered, the following were mentioned most often:

1. No license -- In this category, the client either never had a license or had lost it for some reason. In many cases, the client simply had never learned to drive. In the cases where a car was available or a client was able to buy one, the staff either purchased driving lessons (TRE) or in some instances, taught the client to drive personally. In many cases, the client had no license under the recently repealed law that required payment of the poll tax as a condition of licensing. A TRE to pay the tax handled this problem. Some clients had no license because of previous accidents when driving uninsured. Another state law required special insurance before reissue of a license. TRE funds again were used to obtain this coverage. Finally, many clients had suffered license revocation for driving while intoxicated or traffic violations. In many cases, this was impossible to rectify but staff efforts were made and some reinstatements reported.

2. No car -- Lack of a car was another frequent circumstance facing clients and staff. This situation was met in several ways and sometimes a combination of methods was used. In practically every case, there were special circumstances. In some cases, staff

was successful in helping clients budget an installment purchase of a suitable car which involved budgeting, selection and credit arrangements consistent with the client's resources. In no case were program funds used for car purchase, although staff comments indicate many times they would have liked to.

As has been frequently stated, public transportation is extremely limited in Vermont (in Lamoille County there is none) and where available not always suitable to client needs (infrequent schedule, limited routes, etc.). On several occasions, for short periods however, TRE's were used to help clients with bus or taxi fare where there was no other alternative. Some dedicated clients walked long distances (seven miles in one case) to get to work or hitchhiked, but this invariably led to lateness and absenteeism.

In some rare cases, staff or clients tried to arrange for clients to ride local school buses when their slots were in schools These arrangements, however, led to problems with school boards because of insurance reasons and were only rarely successful.

The most obvious solution to the no car problem was car pools, and these were formed wherever possible. The difficulties of establishing and maintaining these car pools were legion; an ongoin task never entirely solved. In the first place, as we have frequen said, the cars that transported the pools were in rough shape.

Secondly, the clients' homes were widely scattered as were the slots. Shift times varied (see Section V-B) and children had to be placed for care and retrieved before and after work. Even for the Morrisville E&D staff where the great majority of clients enrolled were placed in slots at the Vermont State Hospital (110 out of 190), the problem was complex. The clients typically lived in rural areas as far as 40 miles from the hospital, and several different shifts were worked, complicating pool arrangement. Some clients had no insurance and were reluctant to carry passengers for this reason; TRE's were helpful here. The logistics and organizatic to keep pools going was thus very complicated and time consuming, but it was really the only viable alternative to a vexing problem. Generally, the clients cooperated very well in pooling efforts, ofte starting early, leaving late, and driving out of their way to help others. The staff was also successful, in some cases, in setting up pools with non-SWP regular employees of participating employers. This was particularly true at the Vermont State Hospital where cooperation was excellent. Obviously, pooled transportation is the most feasible method in circumstances such as these.

Finally, when all else failed, staff transported clients in their own vehicles on a limited emergency basis. It was avoided as a regular occurrence for obvious reasons but at times was unavoidable.

3. The most common problem faced by clients was marginal vehicles. These cars, as might be expected, were generally old and in poor condition, in some cases actually unsafe to drive.

They were required to cover long distances on secondary and unimproved roads in all kinds of weather. Naturally, many failed. The most common solution to the problem was the use of Training Related Expense (TRE) funds to assist the client with repair costs (See Section VII). In emergencies, staff would aid clients with towing and direct assistance (starting, gas and the like), but felt at times they were fighting a losing battle. As one put it: "Our clients cars are old, they have no money to fix them and can't get to work to make any money. A viscious circle."

C. Effects of Transportation Problems on Participation, Termination and Completion

1. Participation

This problem is difficult to document, yet it clearly existed. After the staff had created an "employability plan" for a client and a suitable job slot was located, transportation became paramount. If a client had a car, it had to be reliable enough to make the daily round trip. If no car was available, a car pool had to be arranged. If the client did not live near another participant with similar hours, it was necessary to try to locate a slot within walking distance of where he happened to live or where a ride was available. Such slots were very rare. Relocation was often attempted to get a client nearer a job or a ride. If none of these solutions fitted the circumstances, the client could not participate. An examination of the files shows that this occurred frequently. Another problem encountered was transportation of a client's children to a child care facility while the client worked. On some occasions participation was prevented by this, even though a suitable ride for work was obtained.

As we have said, it is difficult to give actual figures on clients who were eligible for SWP and could not participate for transportation reasons but the 340 Morrisville files examined revealed that it was a nagging and consistent problem. The brief case history below illustrates a typical example.

a. Mr. L was the unemployed father of four who lived with his wife and children in a shack (staff description) in an isolated rural area. He was on welfare ($340 per month) and eligible for the E&D program. Both he and his wife desired training and SWP slots were available for them. They were exactly the type of client the program was set up to serve, and the staff felt that they could benefit from training. Mr. L had a license but no car and no money to buy one. They were dependent upon neighbors for rides to the store, etc. and in fact, for trips to the E&D office. Since no client currently in a slot with the employer lived closer than ten miles away (in the opposite direction from the slot), they could not be enrolled. They are still on welfare.

2. Termination

Transportation was a definite factor in termination from the E&D SWP experiment. As is shown in TABLE 5, of the 94 clients who did not complete their SWP slots, transportation was an identified problem in 50 (53.2%) of the cases. These problems ran the full gamut from no license or car to marginal vehicles. In the case of Mr. B (See Section V), two well motivated clients had to terminate because of transportation problems. In fact, in 14 cases (15%), transportation problems were the direct cause of termination.

The following case history further indicates the variety of problems faced and the lengths to which staff members went in order to obtain solutions.

a. Mr. H was a 25 year old Vietnam veteran, married with two children, who had been unemployed for six months prior to enrollment. He resided 22 miles from the work slot selected for him. At the time of enrollment (November 1972), he owned a 1967 model car with 68,000 miles on it. Since it was arranged that he would transport three others to work at the same facility, four clients depended upon this car for transportation. Initially the client required snow tires to enable him to handle winter road conditions. These were provided through a TRE funding of $17.22. Shortly thereafter the car developed major problems. Again, a TRE request was submitted and approved for repairs in the amount of $137.35. After this, the car functioned with only minor repairs ($2.70 for a radiator hose in January) until early February 1973. At this point, the clutch failed and several other repairs were required before the car could pass state inspection. The estimate came to $213.09. Since a total of $157.27 had already been spent on this car and its overall condition was still so poor, this expense was not approved. The E&D staff then arranged to have the car towed to the client's SWP employer where it was hoped that the repairs could be made by a vocational training class for the cost of the parts alone. The towing fee was $25.00, paid by TRE funds. When repairs proved impossible, the car was junked. During this period, the client was hitchhiking to work and was frequently late or absent. (Fortunately, the staff was able to place his riders in other pools.) At last the client was terminated by his employers for absenteeism and lateness. Thus, despite expenditure of $182.27 in TRE funding and considerable expenditure of time by the E&D staff, lack of transportation caused the termination of an otherwise satisfactory client. Again unemployed, the client was obliged to reapply for welfare.

3. Completion

The figures in TABLE 5 show that a solution to transportation problems increases a client's chances of completion. Those completing (32 of 96 or 33.3%) had 20 percentage points less problems than those terminating (50 of 94 or 53.2%). When this barrier was absent or eliminated, chances for success increased markedly.

The following case history outlines a success by staff and client in resolving formidable difficulties resulting in a successful completion.

a. Mr. K at the time of his enrollment was a 34 year old married father of five children, three of whom were under the age of six. He was also an admitted alcoholic who professed a desire to stop drinking. He had been unemployed for three months and received $247 welfare assistance. It was felt that training would be beneficial to him but, because of his condition, should be done in a closely supervised environment. Additionally, he was taking a drug (Antabuse) to help control his drinking problem. He was accordingly placed as a case aide in the Alcohol Rehabilitat Unit at the Vermont State Hospital. Since the client had lost his driver's license for driving while intoxicated, there was an initial transportation problem. His home was a 56 mile round trip from the hospital. During his training, he participated in several car pools and despite many problems, managed to get to work and complete training. After training he was offered a temporary position as a case aide. During this entire period, he did not take a drink and was so highly thought of by his supervisors that he was recommended for and received two advanced training courses. After his training, TRE funds were used to repair his old car. His wife began transporting him to work, going back and forth twice daily, a trip of 112 miles. Since temporary jobs with the State of Vermont have a limit of 38 weeks, Mr. K continued to work daily as an unpaid volunteer after his period was completed. Finally a permanent job opened up which Mr. K was offered, contingen upon his regaining a driver's license necessary for the job. Staff and supervisory personnel prepared a special appeal to the Governor asking reinstatement based on his record since enrolling in SWP. After a great deal of effort, a pardon was obtained and Mr. K's license was reinstated. He was immediately hired and is currently a full-time employee at the hospital's Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division. He has not had a drink in more than two years.

This history graphically illustrates the effect resolution of transportation problems can have. If Mr. K could not have been placed in the highly supportive atmosphere of this slot, it is doubtful that he could have controlled his drinking alone. Additionally, if TRE funds had not been available to enable him to get work and if staff had not made heroic efforts to regain his license, he could not have been permanently placed. Although it is particularly satisfying, Mr. K's case is not unusual among those who completed training.

D. Conclusions

The problems faced by the rural poor are formidable; their resolution had a marked effect on the ability of SWP clients to complete training.

To quote from a local E&D office Manager, "Transportation is a serious problem in the rural area. The trials, tribulations and frustrations encountered are beyond belief."

SECTION VII

## THE APPLICATION OF TRAINING RELATED EXPENSE FUNDS TO TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

### A. Definition and Implementation of Training Related Expenses

As one of the most important resources available to the E&D staff for use in resolving transportation problems, it is necessary to understand how this system functioned in the project.

1. A TRE request could be originated by the local office to meet a program related expense beyond the client's financial capability. TRE funds were to be used to remove a specific employment barrier. Items less than $20.00 could be approved and expended at the local office level. All others were processed in the Central Office. Items from $20.00 to $99.99 were approved or disapproved by the Director of Employment Service. Items over $100 had to be presented to the State Purchasing Department.

   a. Standard items (tires, batteries, etc.) were purchased from state approved vendors at state prices and shipped directly to local E&D offices for delivery to the client.

   b. Nonstandard items (repairs, etc.) were considered for approval only on the basis of two estimates. Approval had to be made before the work was done.

2. Approval time varied as to the amount and purpose of the TRE. Both staff and Central Office cooperated in keeping delays to a minimum. A system of verbal approvals was developed with the justifying paper work being done later. Control was maintained, however, to avoid abuses and monitor costs.

### B. Training Related Expenses

Types of Training Related Expenses varied considerably. For our purposes we have broken the group down into two groups: those who had transportation related TRE's and all others. Nontransportation related TRE's included payments for clothing, uniforms, test fees, etc. We have included as transportation related TRE's items such as car repair, equipment (tires and batteries), emergency services (starting, towing, etc.) and several special items (payment of poll tax, registration fees, driving lessons and insurance). Exactly one-half of the Morrisville clients required TRE's. Of

these, 25 (26.3%) were transportation related. Interestingly, of the $3,531.48 spent on TRE's for Morrisville clients, $1,895.64 (53.7%) was spent on transportation problems. Obviously the individual TRE for transportation was considerably larger than the others.

C. Information and Data

In order to determine use and distribution of TRE's in the E&D project, the records of the Morrisville clients were again used. These listed the type of TRE, the amount and the date approved. These records were compared as to completion and termination and the results are shown on TABLE 6.

TABLE 6

TRE Distribution By Completers and Terminators

| | Completers | Terminators | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Clients | 96 (50.5%) | 94 (49.5%) | 190 (100%) |
| Received TRE's | 52 (54.2%) | 43 (45.7%) | 95 ( 50%) |
| Transportation TRE's | 18 (34.6%)* | 7 (16.3%)* | 25 (26.3%)* |

*Percentages are of all clients receiving TRE's.

1. The above figures show a difference (8.5%) between completers who receive TRE funds of all types and terminators. This could be accounted for by noting that, on the whole, completers spent more time in the program or that they could be expected to have more frequent need of this resource. The 18.3% differential between the two groups receiving transportation related TRE funds is more marked. It may indicate that some of the problems faced by terminators were beyond the scope of TRE's. This would seem to be borne out by TABLE 7.

TABLE 7

TRE Distribution by Clients Reporting Transportation Problems

| | Completers | | Terminators | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Clients | 96 | (50.5%) | 94 | (49.5%) | 190 | (100%) |
| Clients with Transportation Problems | 32 | (33.3%) | 50 | (53.2%) | 82 | (43.2%) |
| Clients with Transportation Problems, Receiving TRE's | 18 | (56.3%)* | 7 | (14.0%)* | 25 | (30.5%)* |

*Percentages are of all clients with transportation problems.

2. The 42.3% difference between those who completed after reporting transportation problems and receiving TRE's and those in the same category who terminated seems significant. Reasons accounting for this could be that the length of time in the program put more strain and mileage on vehicles requiring more repairs or that the staff made value judgements as to who should receive a TRE. It is believed, however, that it is probable that the large disparity occurred because the terminators transportation problems could not be handled by TRE funding. That is, rather than being a simple matter of car repair or equipment, they were more complex (no car, no license, car beyond repair, etc.). This interpretation would jibe with facts as developed in other parts of this monograph. To put it another way, completers had less problems. Those they had were more solvable by resources available to staff and they accordingly received more TRE funding. Even though other factors may have been present, it is believed that this is the major cause of the disparity between the two groups (See TABLE 5 Section VI).

D. Conclusions

Staff members felt that the TRE was a very valuable resource. Some felt that the limit for local approval should be raised to $100 to short cut the time lag between submission and approval. A system of verbal approval substantiated later by paper work was instituted, and this worked well on reducing waiting time. Use of TRE funds for transportation problems was instrumental in many cases in allowing completion by clients with transportation problems. It is felt that the completion ratio would have been markedly lower without this valuable resource.