



INSTITUTE FOR
CHILD &
FAMILY
POLICY
AT BGSU

*Lucas County Board of Mental
Retardation and Developmental
Disabilities Current and Projected
Resource Utilization Project
Phase 3 Report*



Prepared by:

Dr. Erin Curran, Assistant Professor, Leadership & Policy Studies

Dr. Mary Murray, Assistant Professor, Intervention Services

Dr. Laura Landry-Meyer, Co-Director, Institute for Child & Family Policy

Dr. Randy Leite, Co-Director, Institute for Child & Family Policy

Leslie Straka, Program Coordinator, Institute for Child & Family Policy

An Examination of Lucas County Board of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities' Current and Prospective Resource Utilization

Recommendations Based on Phase 1 Data Activities

The following recommendations were developed by project partners Dr. Erin Curran, assistant professor, Leadership and Policy Studies and Dr. Mary Murray, assistant professor, School of Intervention Services based on their work on Phase 1 of this project. These recommendations address data management functions explored during that phase of the project.

1. Consider the variables/characteristics that you would like to collect information on – regardless of reporting requirements – and set up a system for data collection/storage/reporting on those variables.
2. Consider coding response options for variables in data collection system numerically (e.g., male = 1, female = 2). This would simplify data input and allow for efficient analysis of data. A master copy of numerical codes of response options must be developed.
3. Consider reorganization of data management system so that duplicate entries (e.g., one individual having multiple lines within the system due to changes in service) are avoided.
4. Consider developing one data management system that tracks individuals across programs (e.g., early intervention) and services (e.g., transportation). This would minimize duplication of effort and allow more comprehensive data analysis and reporting.
5. Consider coding the purpose for missing data within the data management system (e.g., individual was not asked the information, individual was not able to provide information requested, etc.). This would identify the reason(s) for missing data.
6. Consider developing a list of definitions for each variable on which data is being collected and possible response options. This would facilitate consistency and accuracy in data collection and reporting.
7. Consider the utility of current response options for variables. For example, 99.9% of current consumers have a Primary Diagnosis (as identified on the IIF) of “Unspecified Mental Retardation.” Make changes so that data collected is meaningful and useful.
8. Consider grouping response options with dozens of response options (such as those for Primary Condition, IIF form) into meaningful categories. This would allow for meaningful statistical analysis and reporting.

An Examination of Lucas County Board of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities' Current and Prospective Resource Utilization

Recommendations Based on Phase 2 Data Activities

The following observations and recommendations were developed by project partners Dr. Randy Leite, associate professor, Human Development and Family Studies and co-director of the Institute for Child and Family Policy and Leslie Straka, program coordinator of the Institute for Child and Family Policy based on their work on Phase 2 of this project. These recommendations focus on resource and transportation allocations based on ten-year population projections developed during that phase of the project.

Phase 2 of this project focused on exploring current and projected patterns of consumer and general population distributions to inform resource allocation planning. Phase 2 activities consisted of geographic mapping of current consumer and general populations, mathematical determination of projected populations, and development of maps of projected population distributions. An analysis of these populations indicates that, after accounting for consumers who reside in Board-owned housing, the consumer population geographic distribution largely models that of the general population. This similarity supports the development and use of mathematically-derived projections based on population patterns.

It should be noted that projected patterns of change over the next decade include “high-end” and “low-end” projections. These stand as reasonable boundaries for a range of expected change in Lucas County and specific geographic regions within the county. The differing projections reflect decisions regarding the application of local economic and residential development assumptions. Generally speaking, utilizing those assumptions results in greater projected growth and/or smaller declines. While it may be difficult to judge the veracity of assumptions about the impact of future economic development on population growth, the incorporation of local assumptions does provide a valuable contextual element that is lacking from the purely mathematically-derived projections.

Based on the projections that were developed in Phase 2 of this project, the following observations and recommendations are offered:

1. All population data suggest that the Board should anticipate a slight decrease in consumer population over the next decade or, at best, stable consumer population levels (*Figures 2.1 and 2.2*). Not only is Lucas County projected to experience a slight population decrease over the next decade, a significant number of current consumers are projected to age out of the system during this time. There is no indication in any of the data or from any sources of population projections that the consumer population will exhibit substantial growth over the next decade (*Figures 2.4 and 2.5*). To a certain degree, possible decline is mitigated somewhat by a projected slight growth in adolescents and young adults who will be transitioning into the LCBMRDD system in ten years as described below.

2. Examination of general population data on current youth in Lucas County suggests that there will be an increase of up to 10% in the number of teenagers and young adults transitioning into Board services a decade from now compared to current levels (*Figures 2.34 and 2.35*). Thus, while the Board may experience a slight decline in consumers over the next decade, this trend is not expected to be long-term. Larger numbers of younger consumers transitioning into Board programs will eventually result in slight gains in adult consumer populations beyond the next decade. In light of this projection, it is recommended that the Board take care in making resource reductions that might be long-term.
3. In addition to projections concerning overall county population patterns, the population projections and geographic maps developed as a part of Phase 2 of this project suggest a number of interesting and potentially impactful patterns of population shift within Lucas County. These shifts are projected and described in relation to the four areas of geographic interest identified by the board.
 - a. City of Toledo: The City of Toledo is projected to experience further significant population decline over the next decade, an extension of recent population trends in the city. Approximately half of those who leave the city will also leave Lucas County whereas the other approximately half will move to areas of Lucas County outside Toledo. Population decline will be the greatest in the northern and central, south-central areas of the city. The far southwest areas of Toledo are expected to experience little population change or even slight growth over the next decade (*Figure 2.12*). These patterns suggest that Board transportation within the City of Toledo (*Figure 2.17*) will skew even more to the southwest and, to a lesser degree, far eastern regions of the city.
 - b. Southwestern Area of Interest: The southwestern area of interest, encompassing Maumee, Waterville, Monclova Township, and nearby areas, is projected to exhibit substantial population growth over the next decade (*Figure 2.6*). This assertion is based on population projections that include attention to local economic and population development assumptions and is largely due to projected growth in Monclova Township, generally associated with growing retail development in that area. Less substantial growth is projected for Maumee and Waterville. As a result of these projections, it is estimated that the southwestern area of Lucas County immediately adjacent to the City of Toledo will represent, by far, the densest population of projected consumers in 2017. Beyond the general population growth projected for this region, substantial growth in youth and young adults is also projected, suggesting considerable numbers of future consumers transitioning into Board programs will come from this area of Lucas County. Based on these numbers and projections, it is strongly suggested that the Board should make this area a focus of its resource distributions over the next decade, both in terms of transportation and service resources.
 - c. Northwestern Area of Interest: The northwestern area of interest is centered around Sylvania. In this area, the City of Sylvania and Sylvania Township are projected to experience slight growth over the next decade (*Figure 2.8*).

Additionally, this area of the county is projected to include larger numbers of teenagers and young adults than most other areas of Lucas County. The data suggest that this area of the county will include greater concentrations of future consumers than most other areas with the exception of the southwestern area of interest and the southwestern and eastern regions of the City of Toledo. The projections for both the northwest and southwest areas immediately adjacent to Toledo suggest that the greatest amount of transportation demand will be clustered in these areas. Resources should be structured to maximize the ability to transport and serve consumers in these two areas of the County along with the nearby southwestern areas of the City of Toledo.

- d. Eastern Area of Interest: The eastern area of interest includes the City of Oregon and Jerusalem Township. Only very slight population change is projected for this region with expected growth clustered in the far western area of Oregon bordering Toledo (*Figure 2.10*). Data and projections suggest that the consumer population in this area of Lucas County will remain stable or even decline slightly. Thus, there is no reason to believe from this analysis that there will be a need to substantially increase Board resources or attention to this area of the County.
 - e. Summary: The data and projections included in this analysis suggest Board resources should be clustered in the areas to the southwest and west of Toledo. Catchment areas should be maximized to serve the greater concentrations of consumers in these areas. There is no indication that other areas of the county will warrant significant shifting of resources. Within the City of Toledo, greatest concentrations of consumers will be found in the southwestern areas. These areas should be factored into plans to address consumer populations in those areas adjacent to southwestern and western Toledo.
4. While the greatest number of consumers are presently transported to the Telegraph facility, an examination of projected population changes in the areas of greatest density of consumers served at Telegraph suggest that there may be less demand in the future from these areas (*Figure 2.18*). Projections further suggest greater growth in areas from which consumers are more likely to be transported to the Hill and Holland ASCs (*Figures 2.19 and 2.20*). Over the next decade, it may be efficient for the Board to plan to provide greater service out of these facilities. While they are geographically further from the eastern area of the county, there is no indication that there will be substantial growth in that area while the southwestern and western areas of the county are projected to experience substantial growth.
 5. As of now, information available to support Board resource decisions still reflects a large “doughnut hole” for potential future consumers who are presently served through local school districts. While there is support for the method used to develop projections in this report, the lack of data on present school-aged children will necessarily limit the accuracy of projections. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that Board staff undertake active efforts to develop communication channels through which information on the number of potential future clients may be accessed from local school districts. To this end, Dr. Mary Murray, associate director of the Institute for Child and Family Policy and one of

the present project partners has begun to work on this project. Initial contacts have been made with local educational administrators (superintendents and special services coordinators) who may be available to assist in soliciting and collecting information from area schools. Dr. Murray is available to work with Board staff on an ongoing basis regarding gaining access to school data on potential future consumers. Should the Board wish to pursue this avenue, revised projections will be developed once data is available. Board staff may wish to begin to coordinate with Dr. Murray on this follow-up project to the present analysis.

6. As a follow-up to the present project, LCBMRDD staff may wish to consider conducting comparisons to population patterns and present and anticipated resource allocations in demographically-similar counties in Ohio. Three counties, in particular, are somewhat similar to Lucas County on a number of demographic variables and, as such, would offer appropriate comparisons: Montgomery County, Stark County, and Summit County. Such comparisons might be useful in developing a broader focus of potential interest to a statewide audience.