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Executive Summary

South Florida Commuter Services is a regional commuter assistance program that serves Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties in South Florida. Funded by the Florida Department of Transportation, the program is dedicated to improving South Florida's traffic congestion through many services that promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel. During 2004 South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS) has continued to improve its programs and services as measured by the required and optional performance measures of the Florida Department of Transportation's Commuter Assistance Program evaluation criteria.

Methodology

For the evaluation, 600 commuters living in the SFCS service area, Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties, and 600 members of the SFCS database were surveyed by phone. CUTR also conducted email-distributed surveys of both businesses contacted by SFCS in 2004 and employers with a designated SFCS employer transportation coordinator (ETC). A total of 65 surveys were completed by employers with a working relationship and 42 by employers that did not establish a relationship.

Results

Percentage of Commuters Switching Modes Increases

In 2004, SFCS continued to demonstrate improvements in the majority of FDOT required and optional performance measures. According to SFCS, the number of commuters requesting assistance nearly doubled during 2004. Due to increased use of matchlists and the substantial increase in the number of vanpools, the percentage of commuters switching modes increased from 24.5 percent in 2002 to 26.4 percent in 2004. SFCS reported that in 2004, 32 vanpools were formed bringing the total to 94 at the beginning of December 2004. According to the 2004 results, 44 percent of all database members surveyed use an alternative mode to commute once per week or more, compared to 19 percent of the general public.

Between 2002 and 2004, the number of total vehicle trips eliminated that were influenced by SFCS increased from over 1.9 million to 2.2 million, in part due to an increased database size. However, the number of total vehicle miles reduced did increase at a greater rate because of both the increased size of the database and increased trip distances for carpoolers, vanpoolers, and especially transit users increasing from approximately 38 million to over 57 million. Overall, SFCS has been responsible for the elimination of approximately 7.7 million trips and over 170 million vehicle miles of travel since 1997.

Cost per VMT Reduced Declines to 4 Cents per Mile

Over time, SFCS has become more cost-effective with some additional improvements in 2004. The cost per vehicle mile reduced was just four cents, which matched the previous low mark reported in the 2001 evaluation. For every dollar spent, SFCS
eliminates 24.7 vehicle miles of travel. The estimated cost to reduce a vehicle trip was $1.09 in 2004. With the number of database members that report contact with SFCS as being an influential factor in their commute decisions, the estimated cost to provide a SFCS-influenced trip was just $0.57 in 2004, compared to $1.23 for the previous year.

**Commuting Patterns Showing Longer Trips**

SFCS database members continue to report significantly longer commuter distances and times compared to the general public. In 2004, 8 percent of database members reported commute distance less than 5 miles, compared to 18 percent of the general public. Furthermore, almost 60 percent of database members have commutes of over 15 miles, compared to just over 40 percent of the general public. In 2004, approximately 70 percent of database members had commutes of over 30 minutes or more. On the other hand, 45 percent of the general public survey respondents claimed to have commutes of over 30 minutes.

**Unaided Awareness Levels Increased Among Database Members**

For database members, increases were seen in both unaided and aided awareness. Unaided awareness of SFCS increased to 25 percent from 19 percent from the previous evaluation, and unaided awareness of the Ride Number increased to 14 percent from 11 percent. Aided awareness increased to 60 percent for SFCS and 75 percent for the Ride Number. Aided awareness of either SFCS or the Ride Number remained the same at 94 percent. For the first time, awareness of the website was added to the survey in 2004 with 13 percent and 45 percent awareness respectively.

Aided awareness among African-Americans and Hispanics increased substantially from 24 percent to 40 percent and 22 percent to 30 percent respectively when income is not taken into account.

**Customer Satisfaction Remains High**

In the database survey, members are asked to rate SFCS services in seven areas: accuracy of information, usefulness of information, promptness of service, courtesy, ability to handle problems, quality of the matchlists, and overall satisfaction. Ratings were virtually unchanged between the last two evaluations except for an increase in the quality of the matchlists from 6.3 to 7.8 on a scale of one to ten, due to the impact of SFCS' online ridematching system that increased the use of the matchlist.

In 2004, 61 percent of database members that stated they would definitely or probably recommend SFCS actually did it, compared to 52 percent in 2002. Word-of-mouth promotion is a powerful tool for growth, and it is recommended that SFCS develop a program to acknowledge and reward referrals.

An evaluation of the impact of SFCS' online ridematching system was also performed in the 2004 evaluation. In general, online users rated the system high with all scores averaging over 4 out of a possible 5. Perhaps the most significant accomplishment is improvement in the use of the matchlists provided and the number of ridesharing arrangements established. Overall, use of matchlists increased from 15 percent in 2002 to 29 percent. In regard to the percent of ridesharing arrangements established after
using the matchlist, the rate of success increased from 5 percent in 2002 to 14 percent in 2004. This increase is attributed to the introduction of the online ridematching system with 33 percent of online users using the list, and 19 percent of matchlist users successfully forming a pool. For those that did not use the online ridematching list, 23 percent used the matchlist and 12 percent formed pools.

**Six Percent of Commuters Report Employer Offers Commuter Benefits**

As reported in the 2002 evaluation, approximately 6 percent of the general public surveyed stated their employer offers some kind of commute benefit, excluding free parking. The most popular commute benefits are gasoline or mileage reimbursement followed by transit and vanpool subsidies.

In 2004, 31 percent of database members (188 of the 600 surveyed) reported that they could receive some type of commuter benefit from their employer. This figure is up from 2002, when 27 percent of members worked for employers that provided some kind of benefit. Of those database members that are eligible to receive a commute benefit, approximately 64 percent take advantage of it. The most common benefits offered and used are transit and vanpool subsidies and pre-tax transit and vanpool benefits.

**Over Half of South Florida Commuters Use HOV Lanes**

According the 2004 general public survey results, approximately 52 percent of the respondents use the HOV lanes of I-95 when they have the opportunity compared to just 40 percent in the 2002 evaluation. Of the commuters that have an opportunity to use them, approximately 81 percent use them when permitted up from 72 percent for the 2002 evaluation.

Of the 600 general public commuters surveyed, approximately 5 percent reported using park-n-ride lots once a week or more. Another 4 percent reported using the lots 1 to 3 times per month, and 5 percent reported using the lots 1 to 10 times per year.

**Over Half of Public Would Change Travel Behavior**

This year's evaluation added questions to gain a better understanding of some demographic data and other characteristics of interest to SFCS. General public survey respondents that drove alone to work were asked what if anything would motivate them to switch to an alternative mode of transportation. Almost half of drive alone commuters stated that nothing would make them change. The most frequent motivation to switch focused on faster and more convenient public transportation.

For almost half of those surveyed (47%), the television is their key media source. Following the television, 20 percent stated the radio, 18 percent newspapers, and 12 percent the internet. In terms of ethnicity, Hispanics had a higher than average use of the Internet, particularly among higher income Hispanics. According to the general public survey results, approximately 73 percent of those surveyed have access to the Internet at work, and 85 percent have access at home. As a result, the Internet and electronic marketing represents another opportunity to disseminate information about SFCS and its services.
Employers Want More Tools to Assist Internal Programs

There were a wide variety of business types and sizes that established a relationship with SFCS. The typical businesses were single-site, large employers in the service, financial and public administration sectors in areas of high traffic congestion. Approximately half of these employers offer some kind of alternative work schedule program, and 90 percent offer one or more commute benefits to their employees. Following the establishment of an ETC and using SFCS for ride-matching, the next most popular benefits include transit and vanpool subsidies and pre-tax programs.

Businesses that were contacted by SFCS but chose not to establish a working relationship also are diverse. However, more of them tend to be either smaller businesses in terms of employee size, or multi-site employers, and have lower perceptions of traffic congestion as a problematic. Of this group of 42 employers, only 15 offer alternative work schedules and 7 provide one or more commute benefits. These employers primarily provide transit and vanpool subsidies.

There were a variety of reasons why these employers did not establish a working relationship with SFCS after initial contact or a Transportation Day. For those without benefits already established, the main reasons were lack of transit in the area, insufficient interest among employees, resistance from upper management, too few employees using transit, and additional benefits could not be added due to staff and/or financial limitations.

Recommendations

Develop Social Marketing Campaign to Reach Low-Income Populations

Based on the findings of this evaluation, CUTR recommends that SFCS continue their efforts to market its programs and services to low-income and ethnic populations. Evaluation results have continually showed that awareness and use of its services are lower for low-income and minority populations. SFCS should consider developing some pilot social marketing campaigns to target these hard to reach low-income populations. Although there have not been significant changes in awareness levels in recent years, there still has been an increase in the demand of SFCS services. This may indicate that SFCS can successfully move beyond “awareness” marketing and focus on increasing interest, desire, and action.

Develop Vanpool Retention Program

With the growth of South Florida Vanpool, it is always important to maintain that success through vanpool rider retention programs. It will be important for SFCS work with VPSI, the primary provider of South Florida Vanpool, to monitor its vanpools closely, listen to vanpool riders, and make adjustments to the service to retain present riders and attract new riders.

Develop Word-of-Mouth Referral and Reward Program

With over 40 percent of database members reporting that they have actually recommended SFCS to friends, family members or colleagues, word-of-mouth
promotion is a powerful tool to increase the demand for SFCS’ programs and services. SFCS should foster referrals and develop a rewards program to stimulate an increase in referrals. Through SFCS’ website and/or the online ridematching system, database members should be given an opportunity to send an electronic referral that will lead a friend or colleague to the SFCS website. A program can then be developed to provide database members with rewards for either any referral given or only for referrals that result in a mode switch.

Maximize Use of Online Ridematching System

Perhaps the most dramatic finding of the 2004 evaluation is the success of the online ridematching system in encouraging the use of matchlists and the formation of ridesharing arrangements. SFCS should take steps to maximize the use of the system. Given that many online users return to the site to update information and check on new matches, it also provides an opportunity for SFCS to receive more feedback from its database members. SFCS should consider what kinds of information can be gleaned from database members who visit the website that can be used to improve service. An increased effort to contact online users after they have entered the system and receive feedback could also improve use of the information provided.

Develop Self-Help Tools and Mentoring Program for ETCs

In terms of employer outreach, greater efforts should be made to help employers gather data on their employees and their commuting behaviors. Not only will this provide SFCS with information to help understand each employer’s situation, it will also help potential ETCs and their supervisors know more about the needs of their employees. SFCS should also consider developing an ETC Mentoring Program that can help new ETCs learn how to develop and implement programs with the knowledge of others that have already been through the process. This type of program could be designed in partnership with human resource professional organizations which are potentially key players in the future of SFCS.

Build Business Profiling System to Identify Best Employers to Target

The results of the employer survey also indicate that SFCS should consider the development of a business profiling system. The purpose of a profiling system would be to increase outreach effectiveness by identifying the best employers and commuters to target. For example, SFCS has had the most success with large single-site employers in the service sector and employees with long distance/duration trips.

Develop Strategy to Reach Employees without Involving Employer

SFCS should also develop a “Plan B strategy” to be implemented when an employer has decided not to work with SFCS directly or develop a commute benefit program. This Plan B strategy should focus on reaching the individual employees without involving the employer per se. This individual employee contact strategy can be built around providing a link to the online system via email sent to the employer contact, who can then internally distribute it to all employees; that way, employees can access the ridematching system and take advantage of all SFCS’ services even if their employer is not interested in establishing a working relationship with SFCS.
South Florida Commuter Services 2004 Evaluation Results

**Contact Information**

South Florida Commuter Services  
3201 West Commercial Blvd.  
Suite 211  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309-3440  
Phone: 1-800-234-RIDE  
Fax: 1-954-731-7319  
Website: www.1800234RIDE.com  
Director: James Udvardy  
FDOT Manager: Corine Williams

**Mission Statement**

SFCS is a regional commuter assistance program operating in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties and is funded by the Florida Dept. of Transportation and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding.

Its mission is to improve the quality of life in South Florida by increasing the use of alternative modes of transportation.

**Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall customer satisfaction (1-10)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters requesting assistance</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>22,012</td>
<td>22,254</td>
<td>40,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters switching modes</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle trips eliminated</td>
<td>445,800</td>
<td>1,022,100</td>
<td>1,352,000</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>2,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles eliminated</td>
<td>10,831,000</td>
<td>19,667,000</td>
<td>30,851,000</td>
<td>37,640,000</td>
<td>57,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter costs saved</td>
<td>$2,937,000</td>
<td>$5,704,000</td>
<td>$8,947,000</td>
<td>$12,230,000</td>
<td>$16,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Trips Eliminated: 1999-2004**

SFCS eliminated between 2,132,000 and 2,332,000 vehicle trips in 2004. (Mean equaled 2,232,000 +/- 4.5%) Based on a budget of $2,425,000, this translates into almost 1 trip reduced for every dollar spent, or a mean cost of just $1.09 for every trip reduced.

**Vehicle Miles Eliminated: 1999-2004**

SFCS eliminated between 55.1 million and 60.2 million vehicle miles in 2004. (Mean equaled 57.7 million +/- 4.5%) With SFCS' budget of $2,425,000, this equates into 24 miles reduced for every dollar spent, or a mean cost of $0.04 for every mile reduced.
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SFCS' Rideshare Database

By 2004, SFCS Rideshare database grew to over 23,000 registered commuters. Approximately 69% of the database members use an alternative mode of commuting one day per week or more compared to just 19% of the general public.

Database members are most likely to hear about SFCS through their employers, underlining the importance of employer outreach.

Cost to Provide a Trip in an Alternative Mode

The cost to provide a trip that was influenced by contact with SFCS members was $0.57 in 2004 compared to $1.23 for the 2002 evaluation.

On average, each new commuter that joined the database in 2004 reduced between 72 and 106 trips and 1,790 and 2,790 vehicle miles of travel.

ERH Program

The Emergency Ride Home (ERH) Program has grown substantially in the last few years. In 2004, SFCS' ERH Program provided almost 750 rides for registered participants who were unable to use their alternative commute mode due to an emergency; compared to fewer than 300 rides provided in 1999.

In 2004, there were over 13,000 people registered in the ERH program.

Vanpools operated by South Florida Vanpool (VPSI)

In December of 2004, South Florida Vanpool operated 94 vanpools that carried an average of 774 commuters daily.

This represents a dramatic increase in the vanpool program that in 1999 operated just 4 vans carrying 41 commuters. In 2004, 32 new vanpools were formed.

Optional Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline saved</td>
<td>433,000</td>
<td>787,000</td>
<td>1,561,000</td>
<td>1,747,000</td>
<td>2,306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 (lbs) reduced</td>
<td>69,102</td>
<td>125,480</td>
<td>199,546</td>
<td>279,022</td>
<td>368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons (lbs) reduced</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>1,511,000</td>
<td>2,213,000</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide (lbs) reduced</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer Satisfaction (Scale of 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Other Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of Information</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Number of Vans in Service</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>SFCS began Rideshare Parking Co-op Partnerships with Rick Case Honda, Wendy's Restaurants and area sports teams, such as the Miami Dolphins and Heat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Information</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Number of Van Pool Riders</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness of Service</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Number of Employer Contacts</td>
<td>872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>ERH Registered Users</td>
<td>13,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Handle Problems</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>ERH Rides Provided</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Match Lists</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Number Registered in Database</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent Developments

In 2004 SFCS translated portions of their website into Spanish and Creole to reach out to the region's minority populations. They also developed a pilot “school pool” program in Palm Beach County to increase safe access to schools. SFCS worked with local transit agencies to promote express bus routes and took part in the promotion of Bike-to-Work Week in Broward, Palm Beach and Miami-Dade Counties.
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1: Objectives and Methodology

The objectives of the project are:

1. To measure the effectiveness of current commuter assistance program activities of South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS) in Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade counties on reducing Single Occupant Vehicles (SOV=s), as established by FDOT’s Commuter Assistance Program (CAP) procedure #725-030-008.

2. To evaluate commuter assistance program services provided in terms of user satisfaction and make recommendations for improvements.

3. To measure awareness of the commuter assistance program and its activities among the general public.

4. To determine recall and impact of SFCS advertising/marketing messages among the general public.

5. To determine the impact of SFCS on businesses contacted during evaluation year and with employers with established ETCs.

CUTR’s approach included the following elements:

1. Review relevant survey data from previous evaluations, travel behavior data, and past and current target marketing approaches.

2. Survey 600 commuters in the SFCS service area to determine awareness of SFCS activities and impact of those activities on commuters’ behavior.

3. Survey 600 ridematch list members to determine the impact of SFCS services and user satisfaction with and attitudes and opinions of ridesharing services. Approximately, 500 surveys were conducted by telephone and 100 surveys were sent by email.

4. Conduct email/mail surveys with employers either working with or who have been contacted by SFCS to 1) determine the impact of employer outreach programs and gather data on commute programs offered by employers with a working relationship with SFCS, and 2) examine reasons why some employers did not establish a working relationship with SFCS.

A. General Public Survey

For the General Public survey, 200 individuals who are over 18 years of age and work outside the home 35 or more hours per week were randomly surveyed in each county; Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach, for a total of 600. The survey was based on surveys from previous evaluation performed by CUTR. For this year’s survey, additional questions were added
on awareness of website, key media sources, motivations to switch modes, and job description. Given the size of the population, a sample size of 600 provides a standard error of +/- 3.4%.

B. Database Survey

For the Database Survey, 500 members of SFCS rideshare database were surveyed by telephone, and 100 member were surveyed via email. The survey was, again, based on surveys from previous evaluations performed by CUTR. For this year's evaluation questions were added on use and satisfaction with SFCS' online ridematching software (RidePro®), awareness of website, key media sources, level of education, and job description. Given the size of the database, a sample size of 600 provides a standard error of +/- 3.5%

As with any database survey, there is always a chance of a selection bias affecting results; meaning that those that have had good experiences using SFCS' programs and services and/or are alternative mode users may be more likely to agree to participate in the survey.

C. Employer Surveys

Over the years, CUTR has used a variety of methods to examine the awareness and relationships fostered between employers and SFCS. CUTR has mailed out surveys to random businesses, surveyed business that have worked with SFCS, and interviewed ETCs to collect a variety of quantitative and qualitative data.

For this year's evaluation, CUTR emailed or mailed out surveys to employers that were contacted by SFCS during 2004 and to employers with established ETCs. Not all the employers contacted during 2004 established a working relationship, so these surveys aimed to look at reasons why the employers did not take advantage of SFCS programs and services. The focus of the ETC surveys was to gather information about the commute benefit programs established and examine ways to improve SFCS' employer outreach.

SFCS provided CUTR with a list of 143 employers that were contacted by SFCS and a list of 123 ETCs. Of the 143 employers in the contact list, 50 also had employees listed on the ETC list. Due to this crossover, a single survey was developed that had two sections. The first section was for employers that had established a working relationship with SFCS, such having an ETC and/or developed commute benefit programs. The second section was for employers that had been contacted by SFCS but chose not to establish a working relationship. A total of 65 surveys were completed by employers with a working relationship with SFCS and 42 by employers that did not. Approximately 216 [(143-50) + 123] surveys were distributed and 107 were returned, so the response rate was approximately 50 percent.
2: FDOT Performance Measures

To track the performance of Commuter Assistance Programs (CAPs) in Florida relative to FDOT's Commuter Assistance Program procedure #725-030-008, a variety of required and optional performance measure data are collected and analyzed. Performance measure data should also be used to set appropriate goals for future evaluation periods.

Tables showing all performance measures and performance measure trends from 1998 to 2004 are located in Appendix A. Definitions of the required and district optional performance measures can be found in Appendix B.

Required FDOT performance measures include:

1. Number of commuters requesting assistance
2. Number of commuters switching modes
3. Number of vans in service
4. Number of vehicle trips eliminated
5. Vehicle miles eliminated
6. Employer contacts
7. Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced
8. Commuter costs saved
9. Major accomplishments

District optional performance measures include:

1. Gasoline saved
2. Emissions reduced as measured in:
   a. HC
   b. CO, and
   c. NOx
3. Special Events
4. Media/community relations

Performance measure data essentially comes from two sources, the commuter assistance program itself (in this case SFCS) and the survey of its database members. Tables 2.1-2.3 below indicate the performance measures for 2004.

Table 2.1: 2002 Required Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters requesting assistance</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of commuters switching modes</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>Derived from the survey of the ridematching database (DB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vans in service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>SFCS (as of 12/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicle trips eliminated</td>
<td>2,232,000</td>
<td>Derived from DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles eliminated</td>
<td>57,660,000</td>
<td>Derived from DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer contacts</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>Derived from DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter costs saved</td>
<td>$16,721,000</td>
<td>Derived from DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major accomplishments</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Accomplishments as Submitted by SFCS

• Implementation of RidePro which allowed participants to register online
• Updated website to include both a Commuter and Employer section, revamped Park-n-Ride section, and developed sections in both Creole and Spanish
• Developed new kit folder, brochure, posters, rack cards, and ERH cards in multiple languages
• Developed an E-Newsletter that was distributed in the Spring and Summer
• Third Outreach Coordinator hired in Miami-Dade with focus on Coral Gables and South Miami
• Partnered with the Citizen Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) in Miami-Dade County and assisted the municipalities with the TDM portion of their required Transportation Plan for the County
• Began School Pools program in Palm Beach County
• Began Carpool Registration at TREX complex in Boca Raton
• Held Second Annual Transportation Leadership Awards
• Distributed 2003-2004 Annual Report
• Outsourced a Transportation Survey to determine demographics of commuters in the Tri-county area
• Partnered with Broward County transit to promote their “Work to Ride” program
• Created Commuter Benefit kit that is allowing SFCS to incorporate the TDM message in new-hire paperwork and orientations at large employers in the tri-county

Special Events

• Held TDM Forum in West Palm Beach to promote TDM policy
• Gave SFCS presentation to full CITT board
• Assisted in the development and kick-off of the City of Coral Gables trolley
• Sponsored the season opener for the Miami Dolphins which provided SFCS exposure in their Game Day magazine, SFCS logo was placed on the Season Schedule and short message was broadcasted on stadium Jumbotron
• Participated in Bike to Work week in Palm Beach and Miami-Dade Counties
• Co-op with Broward County Transit to promote their Route 18 Express
• Developed creative which was used on bus benches and flyer
• Co-op with Miami-Dade Transit to promote the I-95 Express and create billboards and advertisements

Media Relations

• Co-op with Rick Case Honda and Wendy’s restaurants to promote TDM and was provided Honda Civic Hybrid as a giveaway from Rick Case
• Co-op with South Florida Vanpools to promote vanpooling by developing advertisements, collateral pieces, and billboards
• The new online ridematching system received media coverage, including articles in Miami Herald, Sun-Sentinel, Miami Today and Palm Beach Post, and received coverage on ABC and NBC providing stories on ridesharing
• Received coverage in Palm Beach Post and CBS in Palm Beach focusing on the School Pools program in Palm Beach
• Developed Ethnic Campaign promoting TDM in Spanish and Creole and received coverage on Caribbean newspapers and Telemundo television
### Table 2.2: 2004 District Optional Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Optional Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline saved</td>
<td>2,306,000</td>
<td>Derived from the survey of the ridematching database (DB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>368,000</td>
<td>Derived from the DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/community relations</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.3: 2004 Other Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of employer meetings</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of customer inquiries</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of persons registered in database</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpools formed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool riders</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool meetings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vans in service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of calls received</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of applications processed</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of ERH rides provided</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of registered users of ERH</td>
<td>13,212</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of complaints</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of resolved complaints</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of testimonials received</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Average Trips and Miles Reduced and Trips Provided

General Public

Using a battery of questions to determine commuting patterns, CUTR developed estimates of total trips reduced by mode and total vehicle miles reduced by mode for the past year using the following assumptions:

1. Commuters work 49 weeks per year.
2. For all commuters who have not used an alternative mode for the entirety of the prior year, it is conservatively assumed that they have been using the alternative mode for 4 months (for carpoolers and vanpoolers, the question was asked directly).
3. The number of trips reduced is 1, except for carpoolers and vanpoolers, where the number of trips reduced is (number of passengers less 1) divided by the number of passengers.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 2.4.

It should be noted that all of these values in Table 2.4 are on a per commuter basis. The total employed labor force not working at home, drawn from the 2000 Florida Statistical Abstracts and adjusted downward for those working at home, is as follows:

Miami/Fort Lauderdale 2,163,679 (Broward, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach)

So to calculate trips reduced for any area, one would take the trips reduced per commuter from the appropriate table and multiply it by the number of commuters listed above. Population figures from 2000 are used to control for changes in performance rather than changes in population for the purpose of trend analysis.

The statistics included in the table are defined below:

Mean Trips reduced: Refers to the calculation of how many less trips are made per year as a result of use of alternative modes. For instance, using a 2-person carpool would reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ a trip per day each way, and riding a bus would reduce 1 trip per day each way. Reductions are calculated per average commuter to facilitate making estimates for regions and sub-regions.

Mean Miles reduced: Refers to the calculation of how many fewer miles are driven per year as a result of use of alternative modes; calculated by multiplying trip distance by trips reduced as above.

Mean trips provided: Refers to how trips are made using alternative modes per year. For instance, using a carpool or riding a bus would be provided 1 trip per day each way.

95% confidence interval: A calculation of the range in which the true result for the area falls due to sampling error. Thus, for carpooling in South Florida, the true trips reduced per commuter is somewhere between 28.9 and 33.9 trips per year.
### Table 2.4: Total Annual Trip and VMT Statistics per Commuter – South Florida (2,163,679 Commuters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool (CP)</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>747.3</td>
<td>554.0</td>
<td>+85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool (VP)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
<td>665.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>+5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>+3.1</td>
<td>429.8</td>
<td>382.9</td>
<td>+60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>+9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP &amp; VP</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>834.1</td>
<td>988.1</td>
<td>+85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>+10.2</td>
<td>1428.9</td>
<td>988.1</td>
<td>+165.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>+4.0</td>
<td>14,915</td>
<td>6842</td>
<td>+343.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Database Survey Results

Estimates of total trips reduced by mode and total vehicle miles reduced by mode for the past year were obtained by making the following assumptions:

1. Commuters work 49 weeks per year.
2. For all commuters who have not used an alternative mode for the last year, it is conservatively assumed that they have been using that mode for 4 months (for carpoolers and vanpoolers, the question was asked directly).
3. The number of trips reduced is 1, except for carpoolers and vanpoolers, where the number of trips reduced is:
   
   \[
   \frac{\text{number of passengers} - 1}{\text{number of passengers}}
   \]

There were 600 valid responses in the survey of South Florida Commuter Services database members. This information is analyzed in two ways. The first is without respect to the mode that the commuters were using before they joined the database. This calculates the total difference between current commuting modes and what vehicle trips and miles would have been if everyone used a Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) commute mode. This is the method that FDOT requires in its procedures for evaluating CAP performance.

Table 2.5 shows the statistics per commuter without reference to prior mode. For the figures in this table, there is a 95% probability that the true total number of trips reduced of the South Florida Commuter Services database population lies between 194.9 (210.3 - 15.4) trips annually and 225.7 (210.3 + 15.4) trips annually per commuter without respect to prior mode.
In 2004, South Florida Commuter Services and FDOT can be 95% confident that the South Florida Commuter Services database population’s true average reduction in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) ranges from 4,751 miles to 6,075 miles (5,413 +/- 662). Furthermore, there is a 95% probability that the true mean number of trips in an alternative to the SOV ranges from 194.9 trips to 225.7 (210.3 +/- 15.4) trips per year per database member.

It is important to note that this is without respect to prior mode. The figures in Table 2.6 do take into account prior mode, and therefore take into account SFCS database members who joined in 2004 and whether or not they switched modes.

Table 2.5: Total Annual Trips and VMT Reduced per Commuter, South Florida Commuter Services Database: Without Respect to Prior Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced</th>
<th>95% C. I.</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced</th>
<th>95% C. I.</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided</th>
<th>95% C. I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>+4.1</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>+149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>+4.2</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>+154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>+7.9</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>2916</td>
<td>+278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>+81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduced</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>210.3</td>
<td>+15.4</td>
<td>3828</td>
<td>5413</td>
<td>+662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduced -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>+11.4</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>+496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>482 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
<td>9144 total miles</td>
<td>12533 total miles</td>
<td>+223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2004, there was no statistical significant change in the total trips reduced despite the small increase from 201.8 to 210.3 trips per database member per year. There was a slight but not statistically significant decrease in the percentage of those reduced trips influenced by SFCS per database member per year provided by SFCS without respect to prior mode. In 2002, approximately 55 percent of the total trips reduced were influenced by contact with SFCS. However, in 2004, only 45 percent of the total trips reduced were influenced by contact with SFCS. This indicates that while members of the database that have been active customers for longer period remain alternative mode users, they are not reporting that their past contact with SFCS is the main influence. It is possible that the other benefits of alternative mode commuting, such as saving money, are beginning to be recognized.

In terms of trips provided for all database members regardless of prior mode, SFCS rebounded from decreases shown in the 2002 evaluation. See Figure 1 for details.
Table 2.6 takes into account the mode that commuters were using before they contacted SFCS, and thus shows only the difference between that mode and how database members commuted after contacting SFCS. In this table, only those commuters who joined in the last year are included. As previously mentioned, performance measures are taken from this sample group.

According to the survey results, there is a 95% probability that the true total number of trips reduced of the south Florida Commuter Services database population lies between 71.6 and 106.2 trips annually per commuter with respect to prior mode; that the South Florida Commuter Services database population’s true average reduction in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per year ranges from 1,788 and 2,792 miles; and that the true mean number of trips in an alternative influenced by SFCS to the SOV ranges from 82.2 to 103.6 trips per year per commuter.

In comparing 2002 to 2004, there was a decrease in the amount of trips reduced per database member due to the increased size of the SFCS database and statistically significant decreases in trips reduced by transit (See Table 2.6).

However, increases in trip distance for members who joined the database in 2004 more than offset the vehicle trip reduction per database member. For example, although the mean trips reduced for carpooling decreased from 14.1 to 13.1 in 2004, the mean miles reduced increased from 268 to 338 per database member using that mode. In regard to vanpooling, the mean trips reduced only increased from 18.5 to 21.9, but mean miles reduced increased from 352 to 566 per database member vanpooling. Overall, the average trip distance increased from approximately 19 miles to over 25 miles.
Table 2.6: Total Annual Trips and VMT Reduced Per Commuter, South Florida Commuter Services Database: With Respect to Prior Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 2002</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 2004</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 2002</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 2004</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 2002</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 2004</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>±3.9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>±98</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>±4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>±5.9</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>±205</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>±11.0</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>±352</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>±9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>±4.0</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>±12</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>±3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduced</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>±17.3</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>±502</td>
<td>142.3 provided</td>
<td>100.6 provided</td>
<td>±6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reduced-Commuter Services had influence</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>±11.3</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>±584</td>
<td>104.4 provided</td>
<td>81.9 provided</td>
<td>±10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>482 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>±3.7</td>
<td>9315 total miles</td>
<td>12533 total miles</td>
<td>±223</td>
<td>482 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>±3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, many more database members are reporting SFCS to be influential in their decision to use an alternative mode. Due to the increased size of the SFCS database, from 17,655 to 23,618 between the 2002 and 2004 evaluations, the total number of trips provided per new database members did decrease in 2004. In regard to influence, 68 percent of new database members provided trips credited SFCS' influence in 2004 compared with 73 percent in 2002.

Figure 2: Annual Trips Provided with respect to prior mode
Performance Measure Trend Analysis

CUTR has been evaluating SFCS performance since 1998, meaning that years 1997 through 2004 performance measures trends can be examined. However, to maintain a five-year trend analysis, only the years 1999 through 2004 are presented in the current report. Performance measures from 1999 to 2004 are shown in Tables A.4 to A.6 in Appendix A. Figures A.1 to A.7 also depict selected performance measures in bar charts in Appendix A.

As the tables and figures of Appendix A show, SFCS has demonstrated steady improvement in most performance measures since its inception as Gold Coast Commuter Services in 1997. According to SFCS, the number of commuter requesting information and services showed a dramatic increase, nearly doubling between the last two evaluations. This is due in part to increased use of the website and the online ridematching system. Overtime, SFCS has increased its success rate of getting single-occupant vehicle (SOV) commuters to switch to an alternative mode. Between 2002 and 2004, the percent of database members switching modes increased from 24.5 percent to 26.4% (Figure A.1) and has more than doubled since 1999.

In 2004, there was an increase in the total number of vehicle trips reduced despite lower trips reduced per database member because of the increased size of the database. There was also a sizable increase in the total reduction of vehicle miles traveled from 43 million to 57 million as average vehicle trip distances increased. Among all database members there was a decrease in carpool trips per database member but increases in vanpool, transit, and biking and walking trips. Despite the reduction in carpool trips caused by fewer full-time carpoolers, vehicle miles reduced from carpool trips remained virtually the same as in 2002 because of much longer trip distances. With the growth of the vanpool program, the vehicle miles reduced by vanpooling nearly doubled. The most influential factor, however, is the small increase in transit trips but the 65 percent increase in transit trip distance. SFCS has doubled the amount of vehicle trips reduced in determined by the 2000 evaluation (Figure A.2). Over time, the amount of VMT reduced almost doubled between the 2001 and 2004 evaluations from 30.8 million to 57.6 million VMT reduced (Figure A.3). Overall, SFCS has been responsible for the elimination of approximately 7.7 million trips and over 170 million vehicle miles of travel since 1997.

Despite a drop in the amount of parking spaces saved between the last two evaluations, the number of parking spaces saved is still almost five times higher than reported in the 1999 evaluation. (Figure A.4). In 2004, SFCS activities were estimated to have saved over $16 million for commuters. This represents almost a 50 percent increase from the 2001 evaluation (Figure A.5). Much of the increased savings can be related to the number of gallons of gasoline saved through SFCS activities. In 2004, commuters impacted by SFCS activities saved approximately 2.3 million gallons of gasoline, over five times the amount saved in 1999 (Figure A.6).

The extent to which SFCS activities have impacted commuting behavior also translates into substantial emission reductions over time. Figure A.7 indicates that in 2004, over 368,000 pounds of CO, 2.9 million pounds of HC, and 203,000 pounds of NOx were not released into the environment due to the impact of SFCS. Emission reductions for each chemical have more than doubled since 2000.
Cost-Benefit Ratio

Cost to Reduce Trips and Vehicle Miles

The purpose of this section is to illustrate SFSC increasing cost effectiveness. The total budget for SFSC was approximately $2,425,000 in 2004; the same budget reported for the 2002 evaluation. Between 1998 and 2004, SFSC's budget has fluctuated from a low of approximately $1.2 million in 2001 to a high of $2.9 million in 1998.

During 2004, SFCS programs reduced an estimated 57.6 million vehicle miles of travel at a cost of approximately 25 miles reduced for every dollar spent or a cost of $0.04 per mile reduced. In terms of vehicle trips, SFCS programs eliminated over 2.2 million in 2004. This translates into almost a vehicle trip reduced for every dollar spent.

Over time the cost-effectiveness of SFCS programs and activities has improved substantially. In 2004, SFCS matched its 2001 evaluation year mark, with the cost to reduce a vehicle mile of travel at just $0.04. Due to the slight reduction in trips per database member, the cost to eliminate a vehicle trip was $1.09. In 1999, the cost to eliminate a vehicle mile was $0.18 and it cost over $4 to reduce a vehicle trip (1999 dollars).

Table 2.7: Cost to Reduce Vehicle Miles and Vehicle Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>VMT Reduced</th>
<th>Cost per VMT Reduced*</th>
<th>Cost per VMT Reduced per $1</th>
<th>VMT Reduced per $1</th>
<th>Vehicle Trips Reduced</th>
<th>Cost per Vehicle Trip Reduced*</th>
<th>Vehicle Trip Reduced per $1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$2,955,000</td>
<td>7,509,003</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>323,288</td>
<td>$9.14</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,999,000</td>
<td>10,831,125</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>445,859</td>
<td>$4.48</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$1,647,000</td>
<td>19,667,798</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1,022,132</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
<td>30,851,338</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1,352,063</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>37,640,460</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>57,659,637</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>2,232,274</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not adjusted for inflation

Cost to Provide Trips

Based on data collected on SFCS' database members, the estimated cost to provide a trip can also be determined and measured over time. Based on the findings reported in Table 2.5, it is estimated that it cost approximately $0.57 in 2004 to provide a trip for database members who stated that their mode choice was specifically influenced by SFCS (See Table 2.8). This figure is based on the average annual trip provided per database member, an estimation of the total trip provided by SFCS, and the total annual budget.

Due to fluctuations in the number of trips provided, the number of database members and SFCS' annual budget, the estimated cost to provide trips has varied since 1998. Over time, the cost to provide a SFCS-influenced trip has declined steadily with the exception of 2002 when the cost increased.
Table 2.8: Estimated Cost to Provide Trip- All Database Members, SFCS-Influenced Trips only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Annual Trips per Database Member</th>
<th>Members in SFCS Database</th>
<th>Estimated Trips Influenced by SFCS</th>
<th>SFCS Annual Budget</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to Provide SFCS-Influenced Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>559,581</td>
<td>$2,955,000</td>
<td>$5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>673,839</td>
<td>$1,999,000</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11,269</td>
<td>1,600,198</td>
<td>$1,647,000</td>
<td>$1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>10,977</td>
<td>1,679,481</td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
<td>$0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17,655</td>
<td>1,977,360</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td>3,873,352</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to all trips, not just those for which database members specifically stated that SFCS influenced their decision, the cost to provide a trip was just $0.42 in 2004. In 2004, SFCS attained the smallest margin between cost to provide all trips ($0.42) and cost to provide SFCS influenced trips ($0.52) which further represented SFCS increased influence on commute decisions of database members.

Table 2.9: Estimated Cost to Provide Trip- All Database Members, All Provided Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Annual Trips per Database (DB) Member</th>
<th>Members in SFCS Database</th>
<th>Estimated Trips Provided to SFCS DB Members</th>
<th>SFCS Annual Budget</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to Provide Trip to DB Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>1,155,264</td>
<td>$2,955,000</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>1,314,402</td>
<td>$1,999,000</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>11,269</td>
<td>2,558,063</td>
<td>$1,647,000</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10,977</td>
<td>2,590,572</td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>17,655</td>
<td>3,566,310</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td>5,810,028</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to provide a level of comparison, according to the 2001 National Transit Database, the cost to provide an unlinked passenger trip on public buses in SFCS' service area ranged from $4.70 for Palm Tran, $2.50 for Miami-Dade Transit, and $1.90 for Broward County Transit. This comparison should not be used to support any claim that one alternative mode is more cost-effective than another, but more simply to provide a relative understanding of the cost of providing a trip.
3. Commuting Behavior

Commute Distances and Times

According to the general public surveys from 1999 to 2004, the percent of commuters with commute distances under 10 miles has dropped slightly from 41 percent in 1999 to 38 percent in 2004. At the same time, the percent of general public survey respondents with commutes over 20 miles has increased from 28 percent in 1998 to 32 percent in 2004. However, in comparing the 2002 and 2004 general public survey results, there were no statistically significant changes in commute distances. See Figure C1 in Appendix C for details.

In comparing the 2002 and 2004 database surveys, commuted distance on average showed only small changes, but as discussed in the previous chapter, commute distance increased per database member. Over time, database members with commutes under 10 miles has declined from 29 percent in 1999 to 23 percent in 2004. Database members with commutes over 20 miles has increased between 1999 and 2004 from 36 percent to 42 percent. See figure D1 in Appendix D for details.

While both the general public and SFCS database members are experiencing longer distance commutes over time, it is important to note that database members have consistently reported longer commute distances than the general public respondents (see Figure 3). In 2004, just 8 percent of database members reported commute distance under 5 miles, compared to 18 percent of the general public. Furthermore, almost 60 percent of database members have commutes of over 15 miles, compared to just over 40 percent of the general public.

![Commute Distances for Database Members (DB) compared to General Public (GP)](image)

Figure 3: Commute distances of database members and general public
With the increased commute distances come increased commute times. In 2004, approximately 70 percent of database members had commutes of over 30 minutes or more. On the other hand, just 45 percent of the general public survey respondents claimed to have commutes of over 30 minutes (see Figure 4).

![Commute Times for Database Members (DB) compared to General Public (GP)](image)

**Figure 4: Commute times of database members and general public**

In comparing the 2002 and 2004 database survey results, it is important to note that there has been an increase in the percent of database members reporting commutes of over 40 minutes. In 2002, approximately 45 percent of database members had a commute of over 40 minutes. In 2004, 51 percent reported a commute of over 40 minutes.

Commute distance and times are also related to mode choice. According to both the 2002 and 2004 surveys, database members who currently use the bus or train, over 80 percent have commutes of 10 miles or more. Similarly, 76 percent of database members that currently carpool have commutes of over 10 miles in 2004. Vanpooling database members have the longest commutes, with 83 percent reporting commutes of 20 miles or more. As in the past, commuters with longer commute distances and times are an attractive market segment for SFCS programs, especially vanpooling.
Alternative Mode Use

According the 2004 general public survey, approximately 19 (+/- 3.5) percent of South Florida commuters use an alternative mode at least once per week. This represents a decrease, but not a statistically significant decrease, from 2002, when the general public percentage reached a peak of 25 percent (+/- 3.4). (See Figures C3 and C4 in Appendix C).

The primary reason for the decline between 2002 and 2004 is believed to be because only two respondents, out of 600, reported using transit. While small numbers are typically reported for vanpooling, bicycling, and walking in the general public survey, this is the first time that a very low number of people using transit were surveyed. Telecommuting continues to be a major factor in the reduction of vehicle trips and miles for the general public. Approximately 11 percent of general public survey respondents reported telecommuting at least one day per week. Another trend worth highlighting is the continual decline in carpooling from a high of 13 percent in 1998 to just over 6 percent in 2002.

For database members, the percent using an alternative mode use once per week is significantly higher than for the general public survey respondents. According to the 2004 results, 44 percent of all database members use an alternative mode to commute once per week or more, compared to just 19 percent of the general public. Figure 5 below shows a comparison between database members and the general public and clearly demonstrates that database members are much more likely to use all the different alternative modes except telecommuting. The percent of database using alternatives decreased compared to 2002 figures, but not significantly. According to the 2002 evaluation, 48 percent of database members were using alternatives once per week or more.

![Percent of Database Members (DB) compared to General Public (GP) using an alternative mode once per week or more (2004)](chart.png)

Figure 5: Percent of database members compared to general public using an alternative mode once per week or more (2004)
In comparing the 2004 database survey results with 2002, there were increases in the percent of database members carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, and telecommuting. Carpooling at least one per week rebounded from 17 percent in 2002 up to 21 percent in 2004. Vanpooling continues to show yearly improvements up to 9 percent in 2004. Between the 2002 and 2004 evaluations, the number of SFCS vanpools on the road increased by nearly 50 percent, and the number of vanpool riders increased from 469 to nearly 800. In 2002, just 7 percent of database members reported using the bus, which appeared to be out of line with the historical record. In 2004, the percent of database members using the bus one day per week or more increased to 21 percent; a figure more in line with historical trends.

Survey results determined that 65 percent of new database members surveyed drove alone to work everyday prior to contact with SFCS. In addition, 12 percent stated that they primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives before contact. The remaining 23 percent of new members surveyed were already using alternatives to commute to work before contact. After contact with SFCS, 67 percent of the full-time SOV commuters continued to drive alone to work. However, 36 percent of the full-time SOV commuters switched to using an alternative, and at the time of the survey were still using that alternative. Of those that primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives, 29 percent had stopped using alternatives altogether. Out of those that were already using an alternative mode before contact, 12 percent switched to driving alone. Taking this into account, 26.4% of new database members switched from driving alone to work to regularly using some kind of alternative mode of commuting.

These changes in alternative mode use are also reflected in shifts in the percent of trips made by database member using alternative commuting modes (See Figure 6).
There were 200 new database members surveyed for the 2004 evaluation. According to the survey results, 129 of the 200 new members surveyed drove alone to work everyday prior to contact with SFCS. In addition, 24 stated that they primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives before contact. For example, once a week, they would either carpool or ride the train. The 47 remaining new members surveyed were already using alternatives to commute to work before contact. After contact with SFCS, typically through work, 87 of the 129 full-time SOV commuters continued to drive alone to work. However, 47 switched to using an alternative and, at the time of the survey, were still using that alternative. Of the 24 that primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives, 17 continued that pattern, but 7 had stopped using alternatives altogether. Out of the 47 that were already using an alternative mode before contact, 41 were still using alternatives at the time they were surveyed. The other 6 had become drive alone commuters. These figures were used to determine that 26.4% of new database members switched from driving alone to work to regularly using some kind of alternative mode of commuting.

In general, SFCS has consistently shown improvement in getting single occupant vehicle commuters to switch to an alternative mode. Perhaps the most significant changes for the 2004 evaluation are the increase of vanpools on the road and the introduction of SFCS' online ridematching software in facilitating the switch to an alternative mode of transportation.
4. Awareness of SFCS and Impacts

Awareness of South Florida Commuters

Awareness of advertising related to carpooling and/or vanpooling among general public survey respondents decreased slightly between 2002 and 2004 from 47 percent to 44 percent. However, awareness of advertising has increased overtime from just 33 percent in 1999 (See Figure 7 below).

Of those that recall carpooling and/or vanpooling advertisements, the messages that most stick in their minds are 1) that there is a Ride Number that can be called and 2) ridesharing can save you money. Details of message recall can be found in Figure C9 in Appendix C. It is also interesting to note that a greater percent of recall is found among higher income respondents. Over half of those that recalled the advertising earn over $50,000 per year (See Figure C8 in Appendix C).

After several consecutive years of increasing awareness of both SFCS and the Ride Number, there were decreases in 2004. Just 12 percent of general public survey respondents had aided awareness of SFCS, down from 19 percent in 2002. Aided awareness of the Ride Number also decreased from 41 percent in 2002 to 36 percent in 2004. However, the 2004 aided awareness of either SFCS or the Ride Number remained virtually the same as in 2002. New to the 2004 survey were questions concerning awareness of the website www.1800234RIDE.com. In 2004, approximately 8 percent of the general public was aware of this website, and 40 percent were aware of either the website or the ride number.

![Percent of South Florida Commuters aware of SFCS, Ride Number, and/or website]

Figure 7: Percent of South Florida commuters aware of SFCS, Ride Number and/or the website
In terms of the impact of the advertising on the general public, approximately 15% of those that were aware of the advertising considered ridesharing. This is a significant increase from 2002 and previous years. In 2002, only 6 percent of respondents aware of advertising considered switching, and the highest percentage was 7 percent in 2000. However, there was not a corresponding increase in those that tried ridesharing after hearing the messages; only up to 3 percent in 2004 from 2 percent in 2004. There was an increase in the percent of respondents that considered contacting SFCS; up to 3 percent in 2004 from just 1 percent in 2002.

Awareness tends to increase as income increases (see Figure 8). While just 19 percent of respondents living in households that earn under $20,000 per year are aware of SFCS' Ride Number, approximately 42 percent of those in households earning over $70,000 are aware of the Ride Number.

![Awareness of Ride Number by Income Level of General Public](image)

**Figure 8**: Awareness of Ride Number by Income Level of General Public

In terms of awareness and ethnicity, substantial increases were made between the 2002 and 2004 evaluations in terms of increasing awareness of the Ride Number by African Americans and Hispanics. See Figure 9 below. This increase may be related to the campaign promoting TDM in Spanish and Creole that received coverage on Caribbean newspapers and Telemundo television. However, there remains a disparity when income is taken into account. Just 15 percent of African Americans who earn under $30,000 per year were aware of the Ride Number compared with 57 percent of those who earn over $50,000 per year. For Hispanics, the difference is 15 percent to 34 percent for the same income levels, under $30,000 and over $50,000 respectively. See Figure 10 for details.
As recommended in previous evaluations, SFCS should develop innovative ways of reaching low income populations, especially in regard to African-Americans and Hispanic populations. This should include developing targeted marketing messages and products that address both costs and benefits of alternative mode use, identifying the appropriate mediums to reach these populations, and locating where to market the message. It is recommended that SFCS adopt the principles and practices of social marketing to develop a successful and targeted marketing campaign. Unlike
commercial marketing, the goal of social marketing campaigns is to produce a voluntary change in behavior in a distinct target segment, such as switching from a single occupant vehicle to a vanpool. A social marketing campaign is based on qualitative formative research on the target segment to identify the right marketing mix of product, price, place and promotion that addresses factors that motivate and deter behavioral change.

**Awareness of Database Members**

For database members, the survey measures both aided and unaided awareness. Unaided awareness of SFCS has increased steadily since 2001 even though the emphasis has been placed on the Ride Number and website. In 2004, unaided awareness of the ride number has continued to increase; up to 14 percent from just 4 percent in 2001 (See Figure 11 below). Unaided awareness of the website seems to have started at the fairly high level of 13 percent in 2004 especially when compared to the Ride Number which stands at 14 percent. In terms of recalling either SFCS or the Ride Number, unaided awareness increased to 37 percent in 2004.

![Figure 11: Unaided awareness of SFCS, its website, and Ride Number.](image)

Compared to unaided awareness, the figures for aided awareness are significantly higher as expected and also reflect SFCS' emphasis of their Ride Number (See Figure D7 in Appendix or the Figure 12 below). However, there are no significant changes in aided awareness when comparing 2002 and 2004 results. In 2004, aided awareness of the website was 45%. It will be interesting to see how unaided and aided awareness of the website increases in following evaluations.
Figure 12: Aided awareness of SFCS, its website, and Ride Number.

There are a variety of ways in which database members hear about either SFCS or the Ride Number (See Figures D8 and D9 in Appendix D for details). When asked where database members heard of SFCS, almost half reported either at work or from their employer. In terms of the Ride Number, the worksite remains the highest at 33 percent. However, 23 percent of database members that have heard of the Ride Number remember it from either highway signs or billboards and 14 from either the radio or television.

It is important to note that although there have not been significant changes in awareness levels in recent years, there still has been an increase in the demand for SFCS services, as the number of customers requesting assistance has continually increased. This may indicate that SFCS can successfully move beyond awareness marketing and focus on marketing of programs and services.
5. Evaluation of SFCS Services

Each year, database members are asked to evaluate SFCS performance. Specifically, database members evaluate SFCS in terms of:

- Accuracy of information provided
- Usefulness of Information
- Promptness of Service
- Courtesy
- Ability to Handle Problems
- Quality of Matchlists
- Overall Satisfaction

As Figure 13 indicates, in every category SFCS continues to rank high with little change over the years. As has been stated in all previous evaluations, a score of 7.0 to 7.2 on a scale of 1 to 10 for this type of survey indicates a reasonably good score. The only noticeable change seen in the 2004 results is an increase in the quality of list score from a 6.3 to a 7.8.

The high marks that SFCS receives translate into a substantial percentage of database members who would and have recommended the organization to friends and colleagues (See Figure D15 in Appendix D). SFCS saw a slight drop to 70 percent of customers who would definitely or probably recommend SFCS, from 78 percent in 2002.

For the second time, database members were also asked if they have indeed recommended SFCS to friends, family or colleagues. In 2002, 52 percent had actually recommended SFCS. In 2004, of those database members that reported that they would definitely or probably recommend SFSC, 61 percent have actually done it. In other words, over 40 percent of database members have actually
recommended SFCS to a friend, family member or colleague. Word of mouth promotion is a powerful tool for growth. SFCS should foster referrals to build on it.

**Evaluation of Online Ridematching System**

The 2004 evaluation of SFCS is the first to examine the use and impact of their new online ridematching system, RidePro. In 2004, a total of 67 of the 600 database members surveyed used SFCS' online ridematching software. Almost of half of those members learned of RidePro from their employer or at one of SFCS' Transportation Days. It is important to note that 13 percent learned of the online ridematching system from the Internet. See Figure 14 below.

![Figure 14: Where Database Members Heard about the Online Ridematching System](image)

For a new product, the online ridematching system received high marks from SFCS database members who used it. SFCS staff identified five key areas to assess its value and improve performance: the ease of locating link on SFCS website, ease of navigation, ease of entering data, ease of understanding information received, and an overall satisfaction rating.

On a scale of one to five (five being very easy), the average score for the ease of locating the link was a 4.5 with 84 percent giving a 4 (easy) or 5 (very easy) rating. The ease of navigation rating averaged 4.4 with 85 percent giving an easy or very easy rating. In terms of how easy it was for database members to enter their information, users gave RidePro an average rating of 4.3 with 84 percent reporting it was easy or very easy. Once users entered their information and received back a matchlist and instructions, users rated the ease of understanding how to use that information an average score of 4.1. However, only 70 percent rated it easy or very easy to know what
to do with the information given. For overall satisfaction, the online ridematching system received an average score of 4 out of 5.

Figure 15: Ratings of the Online Ridematching System by Users

Over half of online ridematching system users have re-visited the website after initially signing up. Approximately 65% of return visitors were checking for new matches and 20% went to the site to update their information. In regard to how online ridematching could be improved, 20 percent indicated that changes could be made to improve the communication of rideshare information provided to the user. Approximately 14% stated that no changes were necessary.
Effect of SFCS on Database Members

Database members who signed up during 2004 received a variety of information from SFCS. Approximately 75 percent received information on carpooling and/or vanpooling, and 63 percent received information on the Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program (See Figure D10 in Appendix D). Many other requested transit information, suggestions on how to form a carpool or vanpool, and information about park-n-ride lots.

In 2004, approximately 33 percent of database members reported that SFCS had either a moderate or great influence on their choice of modes. This is up from 24 percent in 2002 (See Figure D11 in Appendix D). Specifically in regard to the ERH, the program continues to become more influential on database members' mode choice. Those database members that reported the ERH being moderately or greatly influential has steadily increased from 1998 to the present (See Figure D12 in Appendix D).

In 2004, SFCS continued to show increased success in their ridematching efforts as indicated in Figure 16 below. The results from the 2004 database survey illustrates that SFCS is sending out less “no match” letters as their database is improving in quality and quantity. The most dramatic improvements occur at the level of actually using the matchlist to contact potential ridesharers. Between 2001 and 2004 evaluations, the percent of individuals who used the matchlist, that is made an attempt to contact individuals on their matchlist, has increased from 9 percent to 29 percent. In sum, the percent of matchlist recipients that go on to form a pool has increased from 3% in 2001 to 14% in 2004. Despite this success, both 2002 and 2004 evaluations do show a high percentage of members that either did not receive or do not recall receiving a matchlist. Future evaluations should look into reasons behind this survey result.

![Figure 16: Reception and Use of Match List by Database Members](image-url)
Much of the success observed in the ridematching process can be attributed to the introduction of RidePro, SFCS' online ridematching system. By providing the ridematch electronically and automating the contact process via email, RidePro successfully bypasses one of the major obstacles of ridematching: actually picking up the phone and calling a stranger to arrange a carpool or join a vanpool. The hypothesis that people are much more likely to contact a stranger by email rather than the phone appears to be validated by the survey results.

In the 2004 database survey, 67 respondents used RidePro and 29 (43%) received an online matchlist. It is important to note that 50 percent of RidePro users did not receive or did not recall receiving an online matchlist. Further investigation is needed to identify the reasons for this high figure.

Of the 29 database survey respondents that received a matchlist through RidePro, 22 used the list to contact potential rideshare partners, and 13 (19% of 67) ended up successfully joining a ridesharing arrangement. This means that approximately 76 percent used the list and 59 percent of online ridematching users formed ridesharing arrangements after contacting individual on their matchlist. See Figure 17 for details.

![Figure 17](image)

The success of the online ridematching system is more evident when compared to database members that did not use the online system. In regard to non-online system users, only 37 of 69 who received a matchlist ended up using it, and out of that 37, just 16 formed ridesharing arrangements. Therefore, only 53 percent (compared to 76 percent of online system users) used the list and only 43 percent (compared to 59 percent of online system users) were successful in forming carpools or entering vanpools after attempting to contact. See Figure 18 for details.
Figure 18: Reception and Use of Match List by Database Members not using Online Ridematching System
6. Prevalence of Commuter Benefits

General Public Survey Results

In total, 6 percent of general public survey respondents (36 of 600) reported that their employers offer some type of commuter benefit. Six percent also reported having commuter benefits offered by their employer. The most commonly offered benefits include gas or mileage reimbursement subsidized or pre-tax parking benefit, subsidized bus/rail passes, and pre-tax bus/rail benefit. Of the other benefits reported by survey respondents, the most frequent answers were access to secure bicycle parking and taxi fare reimbursements. In 2004, there was no change in the number of general public survey respondents actually receiving benefits.

Table 6.1: Benefits or Programs Offered to and Received by General Public Respondents (N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit or Program</th>
<th>Percent of respondents whose employer offers benefit or service</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents that currently receive or use benefit or service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized transit or vanpool passes</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tax transit or vanpool passes</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking cash-out program</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas/mileage reimbursement and other</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent of South Florida commuters with access to commuter benefits through their employers should be tracked in future evaluations to serve as indicator of SFCS long-term impact on development of employer-based commuter benefit programs.

Database Member Results

In 2004, 31 percent of database members (188 of the 600 surveyed) reported that they could receive some type of commuter benefit from their employer. This figure is up from 2002, when just 27 percent of members worked for employers that provided some kind of benefit. Of those database members that are eligible to receive a commute benefit, approximately 64 percent take advantage of it. Therefore, approximately 20 percent of all database members surveyed currently receive a commute benefit.
In addition, 18 percent report having an ETC, or person assigned to as a point of contact for SFCS, at their worksite. In 2002, 15 percent reported having an ETC.

Clearly, many more members of the database have access to employer-provided commuter benefits. This corresponded to the findings that the worksite is the most frequent place in which database members learn of SFCS and its programs.
7. Use of HOV Lanes and Park-n-Ride Lots

HOV Lanes

According to the 2004 general public survey results, approximately 52 percent of the respondents reported using the HOV lanes of I-95 at one time or another for either work or non-work trips. In 2002, just 40 percent used them. Of the 48 percent of respondents that do not use the HOV lanes, approximately three-quarters of them do not have an opportunity to use them. Therefore, of the subset of commuters that have an opportunity to use them, approximately 81 percent use them when permitted; up from 72 percent for the 2002 evaluation.

In terms of the perceived effectiveness of HOV lanes, there were no significant changes between the 2002 and 2004 evaluations. In 2004, 10 percent believe HOV lane users can travel twice as fast as non-users and another 48 percent believe that while HOV lane users cannot go twice as fast, they do travel significantly faster. Approximately 30 percent believe that use of HOV lanes do not make any difference to commute times. Only 1 percent thinks that HOV lane users travel slower than non-users. More important is that 65 percent of users of HOV lanes believe that they are either twice as fast or significantly faster, compared to just 53 percent of non-users.

Park-n-Ride Lots

Of the 600 general public, approximately 5 percent reported using the Park-n-Ride lots once a week or more. Another 4 percent reported using the lots 1 to 3 times per month, and 5 percent reported using the lots 1 to 10 times per year. An estimated 86 percent stated they use them less than once per year or not at all.

Five percent of people who reported driving alone as their typical means of getting to work also use park and ride lots at least once per month. Approximately 4 percent of commuters that typically drive alone to work use park-n-ride lots 1 to 3 times a week. And, 4 percent of commuters that typically drive alone to work use park-n-ride lots 1 to 3 times a week.

In general, approximately 56 percent of the general public is using an alternative mode, the HOV lanes, or the park-n-ride lots.

Table 7.1: General Public Using Alternative Modes, HOV lanes, and/or Park-n-Ride Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Alternative Mode Once per Week or More</th>
<th>Use HOV lanes</th>
<th>Use PNR Lots once per week or more</th>
<th>Use any of Alt. Mode, HOV lane or PnR lots.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. General Public and Database Demographics

The 2004 evaluation added some questions to both the general public and database surveys to gain a better understanding of some demographic data and other characteristics of interest to SFCS. In particular, questions were added to both surveys on key media sources and internet access at home and at work, and the general public only was asked what if anything would motivate them to switch from driving alone to using an alternative mode.

Motivations to Switch

General public survey respondents who drove alone to work were asked what if anything would motivate them to switch to an alternative mode of transportation. Almost half of drive alone commuters stated that nothing would make them change. The 53 percent who did offer a reason that would motivate a switch provided a wide variety of responses. The most frequent motivation to switch focused on faster and more convenient public transportation. Other reasons included higher gas prices, eligibility for commute benefits, change in residence location or job type, someone to carpool with, loss of car, childcare transportation, higher parking costs, and increased traffic congestion.

Table 8.1: Motivations to Switch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
<th>Percent of General Public Respondents that Drive Alone to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would make me change</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better public transportation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher gas prices</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer benefits</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in residence location</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone to carpool with</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in job requirements</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of car</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare transportation available</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher parking costs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Media Sources

In order to help SFCS develop a new marketing campaign, a new question on the 2004 general public survey asked respondents to report their key media source. For almost half of those surveyed (47%), the television is their key media source. Following the television, 20 percent stated the radio, 18 percent newspapers, and 12 percent the Internet.
In terms of ethnicity, whites generally fit the same pattern as the general public (due to being the majority ethnic group), but African Americans reported higher than average reporting of the television as their key media source at 57 percent. Hispanics, on the other hand, had a higher than average use of the Internet, particularly among higher income Hispanics.

In terms of income, the Internet is the preferred media source for respondents earning between $20,000 and $40,000 per year. Radio had its highest rankings in the $60,000 to $70,000 income bracket, and television is the most popular media source among lower income respondents. And in regard to age, the Internet is most popular among the 25-34 age group. Radio peaks in the 35-44 age group, and television is more likely to be the key source of media for those who are 45 to 55 years of age.

Table 8.2: Key Media Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Source</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to the Internet

The 2004 evaluation asked for the first time about respondents’ access to the Internet at home and at work. According to the general public survey results, approximately 73 percent of those surveyed have access to the internet at work, and 85 percent have access at home. For database members, approximately 84 percent have access to the internet at work, and 86 percent have access at home. Approximately 8 percent of database members do not have any access to the Internet compared to 12 percent of the general public.

Table 8.3: Internet Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Access</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access at home</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Access at home</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home Refused</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access at Work</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Access at Work</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Work Refused</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables provide a look at database and general public demographic characteristics and provide comparisons between drive alone commuters and users of alternative modes. In terms of marital status, there were no statistically significant differences between database members and the general public, although a higher percentage of database members were single compared to the general public. There were also no statistically significant differences between alternative mode users and drive alone commuters for both the database and the general public.

Table 8.4: Martial Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Martial Status</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the differences in how the questions are asked on the surveys, it appears as though database members are less likely to have children in the household compared to the general public. There were no statistically significant differences between alternative mode users and drive alone commuters for both the database and the general public.

Table 8.5: Children in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Household</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 16</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children under 16</td>
<td>Question not on Database Survey</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6-16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children 6-16</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to the number of working vehicles, database members, especially those that use an alternative mode are more likely to have no working vehicles in the household and have a lower number of vehicles when they are present. SFCS could use this information to support a social marketing campaign designed to target residents of census tracts with high numbers of households with no working vehicles.
Only database members were asked about the level of education completed. In general there are no statistically significant differences in regard to education between alternative mode users and drive alone commuters in the database.

Table 8.7: Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete H.S</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Tech School</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended College</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grad</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of race or ethnicity, the database has a higher proportion of minority groups than the general public. It also appears that Hispanic members of the database are the most prolific alternative mode users. It is also interesting that African-Americans in the database were more likely to drive alone, while African-Americans in the general public were more likely to use an alternative.
Table 8.8: Race or Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of age, it is difficult to make any conclusions due to the lack of statistically significant differences and consistent patterns differentiating the general public from database members and drive alone commuters and alternative mode users.

Table 8.9: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Alt. Mode Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More database members tended to report incomes in the $20,000 to $50,000 range, although comparisons are difficult since approximately 30 percent of general public respondents refused to answer the question. In regard to the database, alternative mode users tended to report lower incomes than drive alone commuters although the differences were not statistically significant. Alternative mode users in the general public also tended to report lower incomes than drive alone commuters.
Table 8.10: Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Users</td>
<td>Drive Alone Commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $10K</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10K to $19,999</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20K to $29,999</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K to $39,999</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40K to $49,999</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K to $59,999</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60K to $69,999</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K plus</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first time, respondents for both surveys were asked about the employment sector in which they work. What is clear is that database members are more likely to work in the employer sectors that typically characterized as office employment rather than non-office employment (see shaded rows in Table 8.11 below). They are less likely to come from employment sectors that require employees to be mobile or may not have standard hours.

Table 8.11: Employment Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Database</th>
<th>General Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Users</td>
<td>Drive Alone Commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufact.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole/Retail</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info/Comm.</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin/Insur.</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manag.</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Srvs.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm.</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Employer Surveys

Over the years, CUTR has used a variety of methods to examine the awareness and relationships fostered between employers and SFCS. CUTR has mailed out surveys to random businesses, surveyed business that have worked with SFCS, and interviewed employer transportation coordinators (ETCs) to collect a variety of quantitative and qualitative data.

For this year's evaluation, CUTR emailed or mailed out surveys to employers that were contacted by SFCS during 2004 and to employers with established ETCs. Not all the employers contacted during 2004 established a working relationship, so these surveys aimed to look at reasons why the employers did not take advantage of SFCS programs and services. The focus of the ETC surveys was to gather information about the commute benefit programs established and examine ways to improve SFCS' employer outreach.

SFCS provided CUTR with a list of 143 employers that were contacted by SFCS and a list of 123 ETCs. Of the 143 employers in the contact list, 50 also had employees listed on the ETC list. Due to this crossover, a single survey was developed that had two sections. The first section was for employers that had established a working relationship with SFCS, such having an ETC and/or developed commute benefit programs. The second section was for employers that had been contacted by SFCS but chose not to establish a working relationship. A total of 65 surveys were filled out by employers with a working relationship and 42 by employers that did not. Therefore, out of the total 217 employers represented on the two lists, almost half (107) responded to the request to participate. See Appendix H to see the employer survey.

Table 9.1 Employer Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for All Respondents</th>
<th>Questions for Working Relationship</th>
<th>Questions for Non-Working Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of business</td>
<td>Reasons why working relationship established</td>
<td>Reasons why working relationship not established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single versus multi-site</td>
<td>Programs developed with SFCS</td>
<td>Consideration of SFCS in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>Rating of usefulness of information</td>
<td>Rating of usefulness of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parking spaces</td>
<td>Rating of effectiveness of outreach staff</td>
<td>Rating of effectiveness of outreach staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating and status of traffic congestion</td>
<td>Formal designation of ETC</td>
<td>Methods to improve employer outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode split</td>
<td>Desired frequency and method of contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Work Schedule</td>
<td>Affiliation with transportation management association/initiative (TMA/TMI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eligibility and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute benefits</td>
<td>Primary contact with SFCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contact with SFCS</td>
<td>Use of surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of relationship established</td>
<td>Recommendations of SFCS</td>
<td>Methods to improve employer outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The survey was sent out as an emailed write-protected document. A number of the questions were open-ended to allow respondents to elaborate, the rest utilized check boxes.

Working Relationship Survey Results

A total of 65 employers who described themselves as having a working relationship with SFCS responded to the survey. There was a wide variety of industry sectors represented. Approximately one-third of survey respondents reported their employer to be in the service sector. The financial/insurance/real estate, retail/wholesale, and public administration sectors were also well represented. See Figure 19 for details.

![Employer Categories- Working Relationship](image)

Employers that have established a working relationship with SFCS tend to have a high number of employees and are typically single-site businesses. Out of the 65 respondents, just 14 reported having less than 50 employees. For the rest, 19 employers had 100-499 employees, 18 had 50-99 employees, and 14 had 500 or more employees. See Figure 18 for details. Employers that had the highest number of employers generally were found in the public administration, financial/insurance/real estate, and transportation and utility sectors. Retail/wholesale sectors tended to have fewer employees. Of the 65 respondents, 42 were single-site businesses and 27 were had multiple employment sites.

Parking spaces available do not appear to be a problem faced by employers with a working relationship with SFCS. Only 3 employers reported have less available parking spaces than employees, and 5 reported having extra parking spaces. Although the remainder checked the same range for employees and parking spaces,
it is not known if they truly have a parking space available for every employee due to
the way the question was asked and use of ranges for both variables.

Employers were also asked to rank traffic congestion on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1
meaning there is no problem with it, and 10 meaning that traffic congestion is a major
problem. The average score was an 8 with lowest score given being a 4. Twenty-four of
the 65 employers surveyed ranked traffic congestion as a 10. Approximately 40 percent
perceived traffic congestion as about the same as the previous year. However, almost
half viewed congestion as slightly worse or much worse than the previous year. Less
than 10 percent stated that traffic congestion as slightly better. No employers reported
traffic congestion as much better.

The vast majority, 45 of the 65 respondents did not know or did not report their mode
split. Those that did report a mode split provided figures for only one or two of the
modes. For example, the employer representative that filled out the survey reported
only their transit or vanpool shares. Typically these were employers that have some
kind of commuter benefit and thus keep track of those specific modes. The incomplete
nature of this variable makes further analysis difficult but clearly points to the need for
SFCS to work with these employers to more aggressively track employee commute
patterns.

In regard to eligibility and participation in alternative work schedules, approximately half
of employers currently offer flextime, compressed work weeks, and/or telecommuting.
Of the 32 employers that offer alternative work schedules, flextime is the least offered
(5), while 25 offer compressed work weeks, and 15 offer telecommuting. While most
employees are eligible for compressed work week schedules, telecommuting appears to
be offered to a limited set of employees, presumably related to job type. All of the
employers that offer compressed work weeks have a portion of eligible workers actually
participating. Participation ranged from 15 to 70 percent. Participation rates were
generally lower for employees that are eligible for telecommuting.

Figure 20: Number of Employees- Working Relationship
All of those employers with a working relationship with SFCS listed at least one commute benefit offered to their employees. A total of 58 of the 65 surveyed reported having ridematching, presumably through SFCS. There were also 57 respondents that indicated having an ETC, which means in some cases individuals from the ETC list provided by SFCS did not view themselves as ETCs or perhaps were unfamiliar with the term or unaware of their designation. In response to a later question, 55 indicated that they were formally designated as an ETC. Over half the employers reported having transit information available on site. Just under half stated that their employees are provided with a transit and/or vanpool subsidy, while only 18 of the 65 respondents work for employers that offer a pre-tax benefit to their employees that use transit or ride in vanpools. The pre-tax parking benefit was slightly more popular with 20 employers providing that benefit. See Figure 21 for more details.

Of the 65 employers with a working relationship with SFCS, 60 of them stated that SFCS has provided assistance in the development of their commuter benefit program after contact and presentation were made. The most popular reasons for choosing to establish a working relationship with SFSC were 1) high levels of transit use among employees, 2) tardiness caused by traffic congestion, and 3) employees requested assistance with getting to work.

Respondents credit SFCS with providing answers to employee commute programs and teaching the appropriate staff persons on how to design and implement subsidy and pre-tax programs. They are also credited with helping to detail the benefits of providing commute alternatives needed to sell the idea to upper management. However, the most frequent response to how SFCS helped employers was simply, "they answered our questions."
In general, SFCS received high rating for the usefulness of materials and information provided. On a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 being not useful at all to 10 being extremely useful, the average score was a 7. However, among those employers that set up a subsidy or pre-tax benefit program, the average score was higher at just over an 8. The average score given for the effectiveness of SFCS employer outreach staff was also a 7. Some of the comments about outreach effectiveness were that SFCS outreach staff were professional and knowledgeable but at times overly optimistic.

When asked how often and by what means employer representatives would like to be contacted, whether they are ETCs or not, the general consensus is quarterly and by email. In total 45 of the 65 reported that quarterly contact was appropriate. The most frequent contact desired indicated was monthly, and the least was once or twice a year. Contact by phone was the least desirable, while by email was clearly the most desirable form of contact with 52 for the 65 choosing electronic contact.

Only a small number of employer representatives were affiliated with a transportation management association or transportation management initiative. Of the 65 respondents, only 9 had representatives coordinating with a TMI or TMA. In regard to their primary contact person from SFCS, 20 of the 65 respondent could state the contact person’s name. Although, it is important to mention that 28 respondents reported dealing with more than one SFCS staff person.

The vast majority of employers with a working relationship with SFCS were unable to provide mode split data for the survey. Only 12 were willing or able to list partial or whole mode split data. Of the 12, most were only able to provide mode share for transit and vanpools, and even less for carpooling. One of the main recommendations made by the survey respondents was for more help in executing employee commute surveys. More than one suggested that SFCS develop an online survey that can be completed by employees that are sent a link to the site with an employer code number to help compile the data.

Other recommendations were also made for improving SFCS employer outreach and ETC programs. One ETC suggested the development of an ETC mentoring program that can help new ETCs develop and maintain a commute benefit program. It was suggested that experienced ETCs could volunteer to be a mentor for a new ETC. As was discovered in the 2002 evaluation, there was another call for SFCS to learn how to use unions as an opportunity rather than an obstacle in developing benefit programs. In terms of marketing materials, one ETC suggested the distribution of more posters that can be hung in employee work rooms and cafeterias. Their idea is to have the themes of the posters change to highlight different programs throughout the year. Also, changing the themes and look of the posters will help maintain awareness and interest.

Another recommendation that was also identified last year was for SFCS to use professional associations, such as human resource associations, to spread the word of SFCS programs and their benefits. It was also stated that professional organizations could be used in the development of an ETC mentoring program. Finally, a newly recommended tool to help employers develop a commute benefit program is a list of third party administrators. It was suggested that some employers might be more willing to embark on a benefit program if an experienced third party administrator could be brought in to implement and maintain the program.
Non-Working Relationship Survey Results

There were a total of 42 responses from employers that had contact with SFCS but decided not to establish a working relationship with them. A smaller range of employer types are represented in the non-working relationship responses. Due to the self-selection bias of the survey, it is not possible to identify specific correlations between business type and the likelihood of working with SFCS. However, it appears that with only one public administration-type employer represented in the non-working relationship group that SFCS tends to have a fair amount of success with government organizations. See Figure 22 for details.

One major difference between the working and non-working relationship employers is that of the 42 non-working relationship employers, 20 are multi-site business. This suggests that developing commute benefit programs may be easier for single-site employers compared to multi-site employers that must deal with different conditions at each site and have issues with establishing an equitable benefit system. First TCRP project and single v. multi-site problems

In regard to business size, a greater portion of non-working relationship employers that responded to the survey were of smaller sizes. While over half of the working relationship employers had over 100 employees and only 21 percent had less than 50 employees, over 50 percent of non-working relationship employers had under 50 employees. This may be due to the fact that smaller companies may not be able to provide a large benefit package or realize a significant tax benefit from providing commute benefits. It is important to that that most of the larger employers were also multi-site businesses. See Figure 23 for details.
As with the employers with working relationships, the non-working relationship employers also do not have any significant parking problems. In this case, all of the employers reported the same categories for employee size and parking spaces available. However, perceptions of traffic congestion are different between the two groups. For those employers that did not work with SFCS, the average score for traffic congestion was 6 compared to an 8 for the opposing group. While 24 of the 65 employers with a working relationship gave traffic congestion a score of 10, just 5 out of 42 did for this group. However, approximately the same amount, about half, did agree with the former group that traffic congestion was getting worse. This kind of information can be used in the development of business profiling system to identify the best employers to target during outreach efforts.

Of the 42 respondents, only three employers were able to provide partial or whole mode split data. Those same three employers were part of the small set that did offer commute benefits to their employees.

In regard to eligibility and participation in alternative work schedules, approximately a third of employers currently offer flextime, compressed work weeks, and/or telecommuting. Similar to the former group, of the 15 employers that offer alternative work schedules, flextime is the least offered (2). In total, 10 offer compressed work weeks, but only 4 offer telecommuting. In another similar trend, most employees are eligible for compressed work week schedules, but telecommuting appears to be offered to a limited set of employees. However, unlike the former group, the non-working relationship group had higher rates of compressed work week participation. Participation rates for telecommuting were virtually the same for both groups.

Of the 42 non-working relationship employers, only 7 provided packages of commute benefits other than alternative work schedules. Six employers provided free or subsidized transit passes and 5 provided similar benefits for vanpoolers. Only one of the
Employers chose the pre-tax option for transit and/or vanpoolers, but 4 provided the pre-tax benefit for parking costs. Just two of the employers (the same two) provided both preferential parking and secure bicycle parking. See Figure 24 for details.

![Figure 24: Employer Categories- Non-Working Relationship](image)

Of the 42 employers in this group, all were contacted by SFCS and approximately three-quarters invited SFCS to hold a Transportation Day. However, following that contact, they choose not to establish a working relationship. There were a variety of reasons for their decision to work with SFCS. Those with commute benefit programs simply stated that they already had a benefits package and were not interested in making any changes. For those without benefits already established, the main reasons were lack of transit in the area, insufficient interest among employees, resistance from upper management, too few employees using transit, and staff and/or financial limitations. However, of the 42 respondents, 36 said they would consider contacting SFCS if their conditions changed.

Even though this group of employers decided not to work with SFCS, they still gave high ratings for the usefulness of materials and information provided. On a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 being not useful at all to 10 being extremely useful, the average score was a 6; just one point lower than the former group. The average score for the effectiveness of the outreach efforts was lower at 5.

Some of the comments about outreach effectiveness were that SFCS outreach staff were professional and knowledgeable but at times overly optimistic. Unfortunately, not many of the respondents offered suggestions on improving outreach efforts. However, 5 respondents mentioned that they were unable to receive the necessary feedback from their employees to embark on developing a benefit program. This appears to fit with the former group’s recommendation to design online employee surveys. There were two
respondents that suggested SFCS develop an email template that SFCS could provide employers who may not want to develop a benefit program but do want to facilitate their employees contact with SFCS through their online services. One other suggestion was to provide employers with transit passes and a couple vans to allow employees to experiment with alternative modes.
10. Conclusions and Recommendations

Research Findings

Performance Measures Highlight SFCS' Effectiveness

In 2004, SFCS continued to demonstrate improvements in the majority of FDOT required and optional performance measures. According to SFCS, the number of commuters requesting assistance nearly doubled during 2004. Due to increased use of matchlists, and the substantial increase in the number of vanpools, the percentage of commuters switching modes increased from 24.5 percent in 2002 to 26.4 percent in 2004. SFCS reported that, in 2004, 32 vanpools were formed bringing the total to 94 at the beginning of December 2004. Between 2002 and 2004, the number of vanpool riders increased from 469 to 774.

Between 2002 and 2004, the number of total vehicle trips eliminated that were influenced by SFCS increased from over 1.9 million to 2.2 million, in part due to an increased database size. However, the number of total vehicle miles reduced did increase at a greater rate because of both the increased size of the database and increased trip distances for carpoolers, vanpoolers, and especially transit users moving from approximately 38 million to over 57 million. Overall, SFCS has been responsible for the elimination of approximately 7.7 million trips and over 170 million vehicle miles of travel since 1997. Furthermore in 2004, SFCS' programs and services saved approximately 4,555 parking spaces and saved commuters an estimated $16.7 million. The reduction in vehicle miles also translated into an estimated 2.3 million gallons of gasoline saved and improved emission reductions. In regard to the emergency ride home program (ERH), the number of registered users almost doubled since the last evaluation, and the number of ERH rides provided increased from 698 to 749.

Table 10.1: 2004 Required Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters requesting assistance</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of commuters switching modes</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vans in service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>SFCS (as of 12/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicle trips eliminated</td>
<td>2,232,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles eliminated</td>
<td>57,660,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer contacts</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter costs saved</td>
<td>$16,721,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Optional Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline saved</td>
<td>2,306,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>368,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>Derived from database survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost per VMT Reduced Declines to 4 cents per mile

Over time, SFCS has become more cost-effective with some additional improvements in 2004. The cost per vehicle mile reduced was just four cents, matching the previous low mark reported in the 2001 evaluation. For every dollar spent, SFCS eliminates 24.7 vehicle miles of travel. The estimated cost to reduce a vehicle trip was $1.09 in 2004. With the number of database members that report contact with SFCS as being an influential factor in their commute decisions, the estimated cost to provide a SFCS-influenced trip was just $0.57 in 2004 compared to $1.23 for the previous year. For all provided trips, not just those made by database members that were influenced by SFCS, the cost to provide a trip reached its lowest level ever at just $0.42 per trip.

Commuting Patterns Showing Longer Trips

SFCS database members continue to report significantly longer commuter distances and times compared to the general public. In 2004, 8 percent of database members reported commute distance less than 5 miles, compared to 18 percent of the general public. Furthermore, almost 60 percent of database members have commutes of over 15 miles, compared to just over 40 percent of the general public. In 2004, approximately 70 percent of database members had commutes of over 30 minutes or more. On the other hand, 45 percent of the general public survey respondents claimed to have commutes of over 30 minutes.

According to the 2004 results, 44 percent of all database members surveyed use an alternative mode to commute once per week or more, compared to 19 percent of the general public. In terms of more frequent alternative mode use, 18 percent of database members surveyed were still carpooling. Of those still carpooling, 50 percent were carpooling 5 days per week and 62 percent were carpooling at least 4 days per week. Another nine percent of respondents to the database survey were still vanpooling. Approximately 93 percent of those still vanpooling were commuting either 4 or 5 days per week by vanpool. Approximately 26 percent of database members surveyed were still using the bus or the train. Under half of bus or train riders reported using transit 5 days per week.

Survey results determined that 65 percent of new database members surveyed drove alone to work everyday prior to contact with SFCS. In addition, 12 percent stated that they primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives before contact. The remaining 23 percent of new members surveyed were already using alternatives to commute to work before contact. After contact with SFCS, 67 percent of the full-time SOV commuters continued to drive alone to work. However, 36 percent of the full-time SOV commuters switched to using an alternative, and at the time of the survey were still using that alternative. Of those that primarily drove alone but occasionally used alternatives, 29 percent had stopped using alternatives altogether. Out of those that were already using an alternative mode before contact, 12 percent switched to driving alone. Taking this into account, 26.4% of new database members switched from driving alone to work to regularly using some kind of alternative mode of commuting.
Unaided Awareness Levels Increased Among Database Members

For database members, increases were seen in both unaided and aided awareness. Unaided awareness of SFCS increased to 25 percent from 19 percent from the previous evaluation, and unaided awareness of the Ride Number increased to 14 percent from 11 percent. Aided awareness increased to 60 percent for SFCS and 75 percent for the Ride Number. Aided awareness of either SFCS or the Ride Number remained the same at 94 percent. For the first time awareness of the website was added to the survey in 2004 with 13 percent and 45 percent awareness respectively.

In 2004, there were slight decreases in aided awareness of SFCS and the Ride Number among the general public. According to the results, approximately 44 percent of the general public was aware of either SFCS or the Ride Number when prompted. The trend of awareness being highest among higher income respondents and lowest among low-income minority populations continued in 2004. Aided awareness among African-Americans and Hispanics increased substantially from 24 percent to 40 percent and 22 percent to 30 percent respectively when income is not taken into account.

Customer Satisfaction Remains High

In the database survey, members are asked to rate SFCS services in seven areas: accuracy of information, usefulness of information, promptness of service, courtesy, ability to handle problems, quality of the matchlists, and overall satisfaction. Ratings were virtually unchanged between the last two evaluations except for an increase in the quality of the matchlists from 6.3 to 7.8 on a scale of one to ten. This is mostly likely due to the impact of SFCS' online ridematching system that increased both the use of the matchlist and the number of ridesharing arrangements made.

SFCS' high customer satisfaction translates into word-of-mouth promotion of services. In 2004, 61 percent of database members that stated they would definitely or probably recommend SFCS actually did it, compared to 52 percent in 2002. Word-of-mouth promotion is a powerful tool for growth, and it is recommended that SFCS develop a program to acknowledge and reward referrals.

An evaluation of the impact of SFCS' online ridematching system was also performed in the 2004 evaluation. In general, online users rated the system high with all scores averaging over 4 out of a possible 5. Furthermore, over half of online users have revisited the site to check for new matches and update their information.

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment seen in the 2004 evaluation is improvement in the use of the matchlists provided and the number of ridesharing arrangements established as Figure 25 indicates. Overall, use of matchlists increased from 15 percent in 2002 to 29 percent. In regard to the percent of ridesharing arrangements established after using the matchlist, the rate of success increased from 5 percent in 2002 to 14 percent in 2004. This increase is attributed to the introduction of the online ridematching system with 33 percent of online users using the list, and 19 percent of matchlist users successfully forming a pool. For those that did not use the online ridematching list, 23 percent used the matchlist and 12 percent formed pools.
Six Percent of Commuters Report Employer Offers Commuter Benefits

As reported in the 2002 evaluation, approximately 6 percent of the general public surveyed stated their employer offers some kind of commute benefit, excluding free parking. The most popular commute benefits are gasoline or mileage reimbursement followed by transit and vanpool subsidies.

For the database survey, there was an increase in the percent of members who work for employers that offer benefits. In 2004, 31 percent of database members (188 of the 600 surveyed) reported that they could receive some type of commuter benefit from their employer. This figure is up from 2002, when 27 percent of members worked for employers that provided some kind of benefit. Of those database members that are eligible to receive a commute benefit, approximately 64 percent take advantage of it. Therefore, approximately 20 percent of all database members surveyed currently receive a commute benefit. The most common benefits offered and used are transit and vanpool subsidies and pre-tax transit and vanpool benefits. Fifteen percent of database member were offered subsidized transit fares compared to five percent being offered a pre-tax transit benefit, and 10 percent of members were offered a vanpool fare subsidy compared to four percent being offered a pre-tax vanpool benefit. Approximately 18 percent of database members work with employers that have established an ETC on site.
Over Half of Customers Use HOV Lane and 5 Percent Use Park-n-Ride Lots

According the 2004 general public survey results, approximately 52 percent of the respondents use the HOV lanes of I-95 compared to just 40 percent in the 2002 evaluation. Of the commuters that have an opportunity to use them, approximately 81 percent use them when permitted up from 72 percent for the 2002 evaluation.

Of the 600 general public commuters surveyed, approximately 5 percent reported using park-n-ride lots once a week or more. Another 4 percent reported using the lots 1 to 3 times per month and 5 percent reported using the lots 1 to 10 times per year. An estimated 86 percent stated they use them less than once per year or not at all.

Over Half of Public Would Change Travel Behavior

This year’s evaluation added questions to gain a better understanding of some demographic data and other characteristics of interest to SFCS. General public survey respondents that drove alone to work were asked what if anything would motivate them to switch to an alternative mode of transportation. Almost half of drive alone commuters stated that nothing would make them change. The 53 percent that did offer a reason that would motivate a switch provided a wide variety of responses. The most frequent motivation to switch focused on faster and more convenient public transportation.

For almost half of those surveyed (47%), the television is their key media source. Following the television, 20 percent stated the radio, 18 percent newspapers, and 12 percent the internet. In terms of ethnicity, Hispanics, had a higher than average use of the Internet, particularly among higher income Hispanics. According to the general public survey results, approximately 73 percent of those surveyed have access to the Internet at work, and 85 percent have access at home. For database members, approximately 84 percent have access to the Internet at work, and 86 percent have access at home. As a result, the Internet and electronic marketing represents another opportunity to disseminate information about SFCS and its services.

Table 10.2: Benefits offered to and received by Database Survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit or Program</th>
<th>Percent of respondents whose employer offers benefit or service</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents that currently receive or use benefit or service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Commute Benefit</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized transit or vanpool</td>
<td>15% transit 10% vanpool</td>
<td>8% transit 4% vanpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tax transit or vanpool</td>
<td>5% transit 4% vanpool</td>
<td>4% transit 2% vanpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential parking</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tax parking</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking cash out</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employers Want More Tools to Assist Internal Programs

For the 2004 evaluation, a total of 107 surveys were collected from employers that either were contacted by SFCS or had established an ETC and a working relationship with SFCS. A total of 65 surveys were completed by employers with a working relationship and/or ETC and 42 were completed by employers that chose not to develop a relationship with SFCS after contact.

There were a wide variety of business types and sizes that established a relationship with SFCS. The typical businesses were single-site, large employers in the service, financial and public administration sectors in areas of high traffic congestion. Approximately half of these employers offer some kind of alternative work schedule program, and 90 percent offer one or more commute benefits to their employees. Following the establishment of an ETC and using SFCS for ride-matching, the next most popular benefits include transit and vanpool subsidies, and pre-tax programs. This group’s primary recommendations for improving SFCS’ employer outreach programs include web-based employee commute surveys, an ETC mentoring program, greater use of professional organizations, lists of third-party administrators that have experience with commute benefits, and using unions as opportunities rather than obstacles.

Businesses that were contacted by SFCS but chose not to establish a working relationship also are diverse. However, more of them tend to be either smaller businesses in terms of employee size, or multi-site employers, and have lower perceptions of traffic congestion as a problematic. Of this group of 42 employers, only 15 offer alternative work schedules and 7 provide one or more commute benefits. These employers primarily provide transit and vanpool subsidies.

There were a variety of reasons why these employers did not establish a working relationship with SFCS after initial contact or a Transportation Day. For those without benefits already established, the main reasons were lack of transit in the area, insufficient interest among employees, resistance from upper management, too few employees using transit, and staff and/or financial limitations. Suggestions from this group of employers to improve SFCS outreach included designing a SFCS-administered online survey for employees and creating an email template to facilitate employee contact with SFCS through their online services without employer involvement.

Recommendations

Develop Social Marketing Campaign to Reach Low-Income Populations

Based on the findings of this evaluation, CUTR recommends that SFCS continue their efforts to market its programs and services to low-income and ethnic populations. Evaluation results have continually showed that awareness and use of its services are lower for low-income and minority population. However, 2004 evaluation results do show increases in awareness among African-Americans and Hispanics with higher incomes. SFCS should consider developing some pilot social marketing campaigns to target these hard to reach low-income populations.

Although there have not been significant changes in awareness levels in recent years, there still has been an increase in the demand of SFCS services, as the number of
customers requesting assistance has continually increased. This may indicate that SFCS can successfully move beyond "awareness" marketing and focus on increasing interest, desire, and action.

Develop Vanpool Retention Program

With the growth of South Florida Vanpool, it is always important to maintain that success through vanpool rider retention programs. It will be important for SFCS work with VPSI, the primary provider of South Florida Vanpool, to monitor its vanpools closely, listen to vanpool riders, and make adjustments to the service to retain present riders and attract new riders.

Develop Word-of-Mouth Referral and Reward Program

With over 40 percent of database members reporting that they have actually recommended SFCS to friends, family members or colleagues, word-of-mouth promotion is a powerful tool to increase the demand for SFCS' programs and services. SFCS should foster referrals and develop a rewards program to stimulate an increase in referrals. Through SFCS' website and/or the online ridematching system, database members should be given an opportunity to send an electronic referral that will lead a friend or colleague to the SFCS website. A program can then be developed to provide database members with rewards for either any referral given or only for referrals that result in a mode switch. Some possible rewards include additional emergency rides home, transit passes, or gas vouchers for car and vanpoolers. The Florida TDM Clearinghouse can assist SFCS with investigating such programs.

Maximize Use of Online Ridematching System

Perhaps the most dramatic finding of the 2004 evaluation is the success of the online ridematching system in encouraging the use of matchlists and the formation of ridesharing arrangements. SFCS should take steps to maximize the use of the system. Given that many online users return to the site to update information and check on new matches, it also provides an opportunity for SFCS to receive more feedback from its database members. SFCS should consider what kinds of information can be gleaned from database members who visit the website that can be used to improve service. SFCS should also investigate why approximately half of online ridematching users reported that they do not recall or did not receive a ridematch list. Perhaps, the online ridematching system can be modified to emphasize and clearly define the information an online users receives back after entering their information. An increased effort to contact online users after they have entered the system and receive feedback could also improve use of the information provided.

Develop Self-Help Tools and Mentoring Program for ETCs

In terms of employer outreach, greater efforts should be made to help employers gather data on their employees and their commuting behaviors. Not only will this provide SFCS with information to help understand each employer's situation, it will also help potential ETCs and their supervisors know more about the needs of their employees. SFCS should also consider developing an ETC Mentoring Program that can help new ETCs learn how to develop and implement programs with the knowledge of others that have
already been through the process. This type of program could be designed in partnership with human resource professional organizations which are potentially key players in the future of SFCS.

**Build Business Profiling System to Identify Best Employers to Target**

The results of the employer survey also indicate that SFCS should consider the development of business profiling system. The purpose of profiling system would be to increase outreach effectiveness by identifying the best employers and commuters to target. For example, SFCS has had the most success with large single-site employers in the service sector and employees with long distance/duration trips.

**Develop Strategy to Reach Employees without Involving Employer**

SFCS should also develop a "Plan B strategy" to be implemented when an employer has decided not to work with SFCS directly or develop a commute benefit program. This Plan B strategy should focus on reaching the individual employees without involving the employer per se. This individual employee contact strategy can be built around providing a link to the online system via email sent to the employer contact who can then internally distribute it to all employees. That way, employees can access the ridematching system and take advantage of all SFCS' services even if their employer is not interested in establishing a working relationship with SFCS.

**Future Evaluations**

In the future, it is recommended that evaluations begin to focus on identifying best practices to continually improve internal operations of SFCS. For example, evaluations could assess how SFCS determines what employers to target and examine their outreach methods. SFCS' marketing campaigns could also be evaluated to determine the reach of those efforts and impact on awareness, use of services, and mode choice.

CUTR will begin to use the vast amount of data on database members collected over the years to examine the long-term impact of SFCS on individuals and groups of database members. Preliminary investigation has shown that many database members have been surveyed more than once over the last several years. This would enable evaluators to examine the influence of SFCS over time and track changes in mode and use of SFCS services.

Future evaluations should identify and consider additional performance measures. FDOT will be revisiting the CAP Procedures in 2005-06. The SFCS experience should be shared with FDOT Central Office and other districts.
### Appendix A: Performance Measures

#### Table A.1: 2002 Required Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters requesting assistance</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters switching modes</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vans in service</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicle trips eliminated</td>
<td>2,232,000</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles eliminated</td>
<td>57,660,000</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer contacts</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter costs saved</td>
<td>$16,721,000</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A.2: 2002 District Optional Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Optional Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline saved</td>
<td>2,306,000</td>
<td>DB survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>368,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table A.3: 2004 Other Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Performance Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of employer meetings</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of customer inquiries</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of persons registered in database</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpools formed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool riders</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool meetings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vans in service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of calls received</td>
<td>40,367</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of applications processed</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of ERH rides provided</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of registered users of ERH</td>
<td>13,212</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of complaints</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of resolved complaints</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of testimonials received</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>SFCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.4: 2004 Required Performance Measures Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Performance Measures</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters requesting assistance</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>22,012</td>
<td>22,254</td>
<td>40,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of commuters switching modes</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vans in service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicle trips eliminated</td>
<td>445,859</td>
<td>1,022,132</td>
<td>1,352,063</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>2,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles eliminated</td>
<td>10,831,125</td>
<td>19,667,798</td>
<td>30,851,338</td>
<td>37,640,460</td>
<td>57,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer contacts</td>
<td>39,055</td>
<td>40,371</td>
<td>37,938</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>4,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter costs saved</td>
<td>$2,937,028</td>
<td>$5,703,661</td>
<td>$8,946,888</td>
<td>$12,230,783</td>
<td>$16,721,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.5: 2004 District Optional Performance Measures Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Optional Performance Measures</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline saved</td>
<td>433,245</td>
<td>786,712</td>
<td>1,561,303</td>
<td>1,747,255</td>
<td>2,306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 (lbs)</td>
<td>69,102</td>
<td>125,480</td>
<td>199,546</td>
<td>279,022</td>
<td>366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbons (lbs)</td>
<td>548,055</td>
<td>995,191</td>
<td>1,510,852</td>
<td>2,212,933</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen oxide (lbs)</td>
<td>38,125</td>
<td>69,231</td>
<td>100,045</td>
<td>153,943</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/community relations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Performance Measures</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of employer meetings</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>291*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of customer inquiries</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td>17,696*</td>
<td>14,968*</td>
<td>22,254</td>
<td>40,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of persons registered in database</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>11,269</td>
<td>10,977*</td>
<td>17,655</td>
<td>23,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpools formed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool riders</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vanpool meetings</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of vans in service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of calls received</td>
<td>8,485</td>
<td>12,388*</td>
<td>16,291</td>
<td>22,254</td>
<td>40,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of applications processed</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>18,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of registered users of ERH</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>8,072</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>13,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of complaints</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of resolved complaints</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of testimonials received</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduced (millions)

Parking Spaces/Needs Reduced

Figure A.3 Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduced (millions)

Figure A.4 Parking Spaces/Needs Reduced
Commuter Costs Saved (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>$2,027</td>
<td>$5,703</td>
<td>$8,946</td>
<td>$12,230</td>
<td>$36,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.5 Commuter Costs Saved (thousands)

Gallons of Gasoline Saved (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallons</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>5,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.6 Gallons of Gasoline Saved (thousands)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CO (thousand lbs)</th>
<th>HC (ten thousands lbs)</th>
<th>NOx (thousand lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>199.5</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>221.2</td>
<td>153.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>292.1</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.7 Emissions Reduced
Appendix B: Definitions of Performance Measures

Definitions of Required Performance Measures

RP1 Number of commuters requesting assistance

This is the number of people that request assistance of some sort including:
❖ Carpool matchlist
❖ Vanpool matchlist or formation assistance
❖ Transit route and/or schedule information
❖ Telecommuting information
❖ Bicycle route and/or locker/rack information

The CAP offices would track the number of requests received and may want to track requests by type. The information would be reported as part of quarterly and annual progress reports.

RP2 Number of commuters switching modes

This is the number of people that actually use the information you provide to change from their SOV mode to carpooling, vanpooling, transit use, telecommuting, walking and/or bicycling.

This information can be gathered by doing sample survey of commuters assisted on a monthly basis by either phone or mail. Every month contact a random sample of the commuters assisted the previous month to see how many actually used the information provided. Extrapolate survey results to estimate total. It is recommended that actual data (rather than data modeled based on the number of commuters in the database and applying a fixed percentage) be used where available.

RP3 Number of vans in service (where applicable)

This measure represents the actual number of commuter vans on the road and/or the number of vanpoolers. These numbers would be collected and reported by the CAP office.

RP4 Number of vehicle trips eliminated

This performance measure is calculated by using follow-up survey data or actual data. For the database survey, this is done without respect to prior mode but includes only those for whom the CAP influenced the mode choice decision.

RP5 Vehicle miles eliminated

This performance measure is calculated by using follow-up survey data. For the database survey, this is done without respect to prior mode but includes only those for whom The CAP influenced the mode choice decision.

RP6 Employer contacts

Report number of employer contacts by the following categories:
❖ Number contacted by letter/fax
❖ Number contacted by phone
❖ Number contacted in person
❖ Number of follow-up calls or visits

When reporting include the number of employees at each site. These figures will be tracked and collected by the CAP staff.
RP7  Parking spots saved/parking needs reduced

This is a performance measure that is calculated by determining the number of people using alternative modes at each employment site. It can also be calculated by taking the number of vehicle trips reduced from a database survey and dividing by 2 trips per day/245 working days per year.

RP8  Commuter costs saved

This performance measure is calculated by multiplying vehicle miles eliminated by the average cost per mile (AAA uses $.448 per mile, the federal government and State of Florida use $.29 per mile).

RP9  Major accomplishments

This performance measure is a listing of all major CAP programs and/or initiatives and the accomplishments of these projects/initiatives. These may include:

❖ New Transit Services Initiated/Improved
❖ Educational Program Initiated
❖ Transportation Planning Initiatives
❖ Emergency Ride Home Projects Initiated
❖ Other Implementation Activities

This information would be tracked and collected by CAP staff.
Definitions of District Optional Performance Measures

OP1  Gasoline saved

This performance measure is calculated by multiplying vehicle miles eliminated by the average miles per gallon figure from EPA. For April, 1997, average fuel consumption is 0.04 gallons/mile (i.e., 25 MPG).

OP2  Emissions reduction

This performance measure is calculated by multiplying vehicle miles eliminated by the emission factors for the CAP service area. Emission factors are available from Department of Environmental Regulation and are available for Hydrocarbons (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen oxide (NO). In April 1997 the average passenger car emissions were estimated at:
- 2.9 grams/mile of HC
- 23 grams/mile of CO
- 1.6 grams/mile of NO

Grams are converted to pounds by multiplying the results of this calculation by .0022.

OP3  Special events

This performance measure reports the number and type of special events conducted by the CAP staff to promote and/or encourage commute alternative use. Special events may include but are not limited to:
- Commuter Service Days
- Commuter Fairs
- Special Promotions

This information would be collected and tracked by CAP staff.

OP4  Media/community relations

This performance measure tracks CAP staff efforts in informing the media and general public about CAP activities and programs. Categories may include but are not limited to:
- Number of PSAs aired
- Number of newspaper articles
- Number of news stories
- Number of magazine articles

This information would be collected and tracked by CAP staff.
Appendix C: General Public Survey Results

Commute Distances for South Florida Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-4 M</th>
<th>5-9 M</th>
<th>10-14 M</th>
<th>15-19 M</th>
<th>20-29 M</th>
<th>30+ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C1: Commute Distances for Florida Commuters

Commute Times for South Florida Commuters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-9 mins</th>
<th>10-14 mins</th>
<th>15-19 mins</th>
<th>20-29 mins</th>
<th>30-39 mins</th>
<th>40-59 mins</th>
<th>60+ mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 SFCS</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 SFCS</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 SFCS</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C2: Commute Times for Florida Commuters
Percent of South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more

Figure C3: Percent of South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes once per week or more (1998-2000)

Percent of South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more

Figure C4: Percent of South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes once per week or more (2001-2004)
Figure C5: Percent of trips made by South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes (1998-2000)

Figure C6: Percent of trips made by South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes (2001-2004)
Figure C7: Percent of South Florida commuters aware of carpool/vanpool related advertising.

Figure C8: Percent of South Florida commuters aware of carpool/vanpool related advertising by income level.
Message recalled from carpool/vanpool advertising by South Florida commuters

Figure C9: Message recalled from carpool/vanpool advertising by South Florida commuters

Percent of South Florida commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number

Figure C10: Percent of South Florida commuters that are aware of SFCS and/or the Ride Number
Figure C11: Impact of advertising on South Florida commuters
Appendix D: Database Survey Results

Commute Distances for Commuter Services Database Members

![Chart showing commute distances for database members from 1999 to 2004.]

Figure D1: Commute Distances for Database Members

Commute Times for Database Members

![Chart showing commute times for database members from 2002 to 2004.]

Figure D2: Commute times for Database Members
Percent of Commuter Services Database Members Using Alternative Commute Modes Once or More Per Week

Figure D3: Percent of commuter services database members using alternative commute modes once or more per week.

Percent of Trips Made by Commuter Services Database Members Using Alternative Commute Modes

Figure D4: Percent of trips made by commuter services database members using alternative commute modes.
Figure D5: Percent of commuter services database members who are using or have used alternative commute modes.

Figure D6: Unaided awareness of commuter services and Ride Number.
Figure D7: Aided awareness of commuter services and Ride Number.

Figure D8: Where database members heard about commuter services
Figure D9: Where database members heard about the Ride Number.

Figure D10: Assistance provided by commuter services when contacted by database members.
Figure D11: Effect of information on mode choice for database members.

Figure D12: Effect of ERH on mode choice for database members.
Reception and Use of Match Information by Database Members

Figure D13: Reception and use of match information by database members.

Ratings of Commuter Services by Database Members

Figure D14: Ratings of commuter services by database members.
How Database Members Would Recommend Commuter Services to Others

![Bar chart showing the percentage of database members who would recommend SFCS to others. The chart includes data for different years: 1999 SFCS, 2000 SFCS, 2001 SFCS, 2002 SFCS, and 2003 SFCS. The chart indicates the percentage of members who would definitely recommend, probably recommend, maybe, probably not, definitely not, and don't know/related.]

Figure D15: How database members would recommend SFCS to others.
Appendix E: Database Survey Instrument

Good morning/afternoon/evening My name is __________ and I am calling on behalf of the University of South Florida’s Center for Urban Transportation Research. This evening/today we are conducting a survey for the Florida Department of Transportation on commuting and traffic issues in the (insert region name) area. We are not attempting to sell you anything, we are only interested in your opinions.

(Ask to speak to person named on sample sheet - repeat intro if necessary)

1. How many days per week do you commute to work? IF 0 TERMINATE
2. And about how far is your commute, one-way, in miles?
2a. How many minutes does your commute usually take?
2b. What time do you usually leave home to go to work? _____ am/pm
2c. And what time do you usually leave work to go home? _____ am/pm
3. Are you aware of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which organizations have you heard of? (probe: any others?) (ALL THAT APPLY) (DO NOT READ LIST)

   a) South Florida Commuter Services or Commuter Services
   b) 1-800-234-Ride
   c) www.1800234RIDE.com
   d) MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit Authority)
   e) BCT (Broward County Transit)
   f) Palmtran (Palm Beach Transit)
   g) The Electric Wave or Miami Beach shuttle
   h) TMAX
   i) Expresso Shuttle
   j) Tri-rail
   k) Tri-rail Shuttle
   l) Civic Center TMO
   m) Miami Beach TMA
   n) South Florida Education Center TMA
   o) Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
   p) Downtown Miami TMA
   q) Free T-Shirt people
   r) "Hang up your Keys" People
   s) Airport West TMI
   t) VPSI
   u) Miami-Dade County Vanpool Program
   v) Transportation Management Organizations (unspecified)
   w) Gold Coast Commuter Services
   x) South Florida Vanpool program
   y) Other specify
5. Have you ever heard of South Florida Commuter Services?
   - Yes 01
   - No 02
   - Don't Know/Refused 98

6. Have you ever heard of the commuter information numbers "1-800-234-RIDE or not?
   - Yes 01
   - No 02
   - Don't Know/Refused 98

6a Have you ever heard of the website www.1800234RIDE.com or not?
   - Yes 01
   - No 02
   - Don't Know/Refused 98

7. How did you hear about South Florida Commuter Services (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Newspaper
   - Radio
   - Television
   - At work
   - In the mail
   - On billboards
   - On road signs
   - Received a phone call
   - At bus stop/on a bench
   - On the side of buses/vans
   - Friends/co-workers/relatives
   - Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day
   - Employer
   - Telephone book/Yellow Pages
   - Internet
   - Other (SPECIFY: ______________________)
   - Dk/Ref
8. How did you hear about the commuter information number, 1-800-234-RIDE or the website www.1800234RIDE?
   a. Newspaper
   b. Radio
   c. Television
   d. At work
   e. In the mail
   f. On billboards
   g. On road signs
   h. Received a phone call
   i. At bus stop/on a bench
   j. On the side of buses/vans
   k. Friends/co-workers/relatives
   l. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day
   m. Employer
   n. Internet
   o. Other (SPECIFY: ___________________)  
   p. DK/Ref

9. Have you ever contacted South Florida Commuter Services, 1-800-234-RIDE or www.1800234RIDE.com, or any other local group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?
   Yes 01  SKIP TO Q.11
   No 02  SKIP TO Q.11
   Don't Know/Refused 98  SKIP TO Q.11

10. Whom did you contact? (ALL THAT APPLY - DO NOT READ)
    South Florida Commuter Services or Commuter Services
    1-800-234-Ride
    www.1800234RIDE
    MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit Authority)
    BCT (Broward County Transit)
    Palmtran (Palm Beach Transit)
    The Electric Wave or Miami Beach shuttle
    TMAX
    Expresso Shuttle
    Tri-rail
    Civic Center TMO
    Miami Beach TMA
    South Florida Education Center TMA
    Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
    Downtown Miami TMA
    "Hang up your Keys" People
    Airport West TMI
    VPSI
    Miami-Dade County Vanpool Program
    Transportation Management Organizations (unspecified)
    Gold Coast Commuter Services
    South Florida Vanpool program
    Other specify_____________
11. Have you ever signed up or had your name registered with South Florida Commuter Services or some other carpool/vanpool service, or not?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/Refused

12. Is your name still registered with that service, or is it no longer registered?

- Yes, still registered
- No, not registered
- Don't Know/refused

13. Why did you decide to remove your name from that service? Any other reasons?

- Didn't get any use out of it
- Already got started in a carpool/vanpool
- Didn't like carpooling/vanpooling
- Didn't provide any names for carpooling/vanpooling
- Only needed for emergencies
- Moved
- Changed jobs
- Other reasons

IF Q.9 IS YES OR Q.11 IS YES, THEN CONTINUE.
IF Q.9 IS NOT YES AND Q.11 IS NOT YES, THEN TERMINATE.

13a. Have you used the online ridematching service, RIDEPRO, available on www.1800234RIDE to register with South Florida Commuter Services?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/Refused
13b. How did you find out about RIDEPRO?

a. Newspaper
b. Radio
c. Television
d. At work
e. In the mail
f. On billboards
g. On road signs
h. Received a phone call
i. At bus stop/on a bench
j. On the side of buses/vans
k. Friends/co-workers/relatives
l. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day
m. Employer
n. Telephone book/Yellow Pages
o. Internet
p. Other (SPECIFY: ________________ )
q. Dk/Ref

For the next few questions, On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being very difficult and 5 being very easy, please provide a rating for the following questions.

13c. How easy was it to find the RIDEPRO link on the website www.1800234RIDE.com? ______

13d. How easy was it to navigate through RIDEPRO? ______

13e. How easy was it to enter your information on RIDEPRO? ______

13f. How easy was it to understand the rideshare information received from RIDEPRO? ______

13g. Have you visited RIDEPRO since your initial registration?

Yes 01—CONTINUE
No 02
Don't Know/Refused 98

13h. Why did you re-visit RIDEPRO?

Update information 01
Check for new matches 02
Other (specify): ____________

13i. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being poor and 5 being excellent, what is your overall rating for RIDEPRO?
13j. What, if anything, should be done to improve RIDEPRO?

No improvements necessary 01
Make RIDEPRO easier to find on website 02
Make it easier to navigate website 03
Simply questions 04
Improve communication of rideshare information provided 05
Don't Know 98
Other (specify): ____________________

For the next few questions, I'm going to ask you about how you commuted before you received information from the agency.

**IF SAMPLE=2 SKIP TO Q. 24x**
**Q.9 IS YES OR Q.11 IS YES, THEN CONTINUE.**
**IF Q.9 IS NOT YES AND Q.11 IS NOT YES, THEN TERMINATE.**

14. Before you received the information from the agency, were you driving to work alone every day you worked, or not?

Yes 01 - CONTINUE
No 02 - SKIP TO Q.15
Don't Know/Refused 98

14a. When you drove to work, did you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car?

Yes 1 - CONTINUE WITH Q.15
No 2 - GO TO Q.22

15. How many days per week were you carpooling to work?

_________________ - IF 0, SKIP TO Q.17

16. About how many people were usually in your carpool, including the driver?

17. How many days per week were you vanpooling to work, that is, riding in a van with 7 to 14 other people?

_________________ - IF 0, SKIP TO Q.19

18. About how many people were usually in your vanpool, including the driver?

19. How many days per week were you riding the bus to work?

20. How many days per week were you getting to work in some other way?

_________________ - IF 0, SKIP TO Q.22

21. And how were you getting to work? (Specify: ____________________)

85
22. Specifically, what types of assistance or information did the agency or website provide you with? (PROBE - DO NOT READ) (ALL THAT APPLY)

- List of potential carpoolers
- Bus schedules & routes
- List of potential vanpoolers
- Information about leasing vans for vanpools
- Letter stating that no carpool/vanpool matches were found
- Information about Park & Ride lots
- Information about shuttle services
- Information about Guaranteed (or Emergency) Ride Home program
- Tips on what to do next to start carpooling/vanpooling
- Information about the commuter club
- Other (SPECIFY: ______________________) 99
- Don’t know/Refused 98

ASK Q.23a-b ONLY FOR THOSE NOT ALREADY MENTIONED IN Q.22

23. Did they provide you with ________________________, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Information about the Guaranteed (in South Florida Emergency) Ride Home program</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A list of potential carpool or vanpool PARTNERS;</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF Q.23b=2, ASK Q.23d

23d. Did they send a letter stating that no carpool or vanpool matches were found?

- Yes 01
- No 02

IF Q.23b=1 or Q.22=1 Q.22=3, ASK Q.23e

23e. Thinking about the list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers you were provided with, did you try to contact anybody on the list?

- Yes 01
- No 02

IF Q.23e=1, ASK Q.23f

23f. And did you successfully join a carpool or vanpool with someone from this list?

- Yes 01 SKIP TO Q.25
- No 02
24x. For the next few questions, I'm going to ask you about how you commuted since you received information from or contacted the agency.

Since you received the information, did you drive to work alone every day you work, or not?

Yes 01 - CONTINUE
No 02 - SKIP TO Q.24
Don't Know/Refused 98

24y. When you drove to work, did you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car?

Yes 01 - SKIP TO Q.24a INSTRUCTION
No 02 - GO TO Q.32

24. Did you ever carpool to or from work after you received the information, or not?

Yes 01 - SKIP TO Q.32
No 02 - SKIIP TO Q.32
Don't Know/Refused 98

ASK Q.24a ONLY IF (EITHER Q.23c3 IS NOT YES OR Q.23f IS NO) AND (Q.24 IS YES OR Q24Y IS YES)

24a. And how did you start this carpool?

25. Are you still carpooling?

Yes 01 - SKIP TO Q.29
No 02 - SKIP TO Q.29
Don't Know/Refused 98

26. About how many days per week are you carpooling both to and from work?

ASK Q.26A ONLY IF Q.26 < Q1

26a. And how many days do you carpool only one-way, either to or from work?

27. About how many people are usually in your carpool, including the driver?

28. About how long have you been carpooling?

____ Days _____ Weeks _______ Months _______ Years

SKIP TO Q.32

29. About how long were you in your carpool?

____ Days _____ Weeks _______ Months _______ Years
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30. How many days per week were you carpooling?  

31. About how many people were usually in your carpool, including the driver? 

32. Did you ever vanpool to or from work, that is, ride in a van with 7 to 14 other people, after you received the information, or not?  
   Yes 01  
   No 02  
   Don't Know/Refused 98  
   SKIP TO Q.40

33. Are you still vanpooling?  
   Yes 01  
   No 02  
   Don't Know/Refused 98  
   SKIP TO Q.37

34. About how many days per week are you vanpooling both to and from work?  
   ASK Q.34A ONLY IF Q.34 < Q.1

34a. And how many days per week are you vanpooling only one-way, either to or from work? 

35. About how many people are usually in your vanpool, including the driver? 

36. About how long have you been vanpooling?  
   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____Months _____Years  
   SKIP TO Q.40

37. About how long were you in your vanpool?  
   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____Months _____Years

38. How many days per week were you vanpooling? 

39. About how many people were usually in your vanpool, including the driver? 

40. Did you ever ride the bus or train to or from work after you received the information, or not?  
   Yes 01  
   No 02  
   Don't Know/Refused 98  
   SKIP TO Q.46

40a. Would that be the bus or the train?  
   Bus 01  
   Train 02

41. Are you still riding the (bus/train)?  
   Yes 01  
   No 02  
   Don't Know/Refused 98  
   SKIP TO Q.44
42. About how many days per week are you riding the (bus/train) both to and from work?

**ASK Q.42A ONLY IF Q.42 < Q.1**

42a. And how many days per week are you riding the (bus/train) only one-way, either to or from work?

43. About how long have you been riding the (bus/train)?

   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____ Months _____ Years

**SKIP TO Q.46**

44. About how long were you riding the (bus/train) to work?

   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____ Months _____ Years

45. About how many days per week were you riding the (bus/train) to work?

46. Is there any other way you used to get to work since you received the information?

   Yes 01
   No 02 - GO TO Q.53
   Don't Know/Refused 98

47. How were you getting to work? (SPECIFY: _____________ )

48. And are you still getting to work by (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47)?

   Yes 01
   No 02 - GO TO Q.51
   Don't Know/Refused 98

49. About how many days per week are you (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47) both to and from work?

**ASK Q.49A ONLY IF Q.49 < Q.1**

49a. And how many days per week are you (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47) only one-way, either to or from work?

   _______ (ENTER 0 IF QUESTION IS SKIPPED)

50. About how long have you been (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47)?

   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____ Months _____ Years

**SKIP TO Q.53**

51. About how long were you getting to work by (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47)?

   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____ Months _____ Years

52. About how many days per week were you getting to work by (INSERT ANSWER TO Q.47)?
ASK Q.53 IF Q.24, Q.32, Q.40 OR Q.46=1.; OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q.55

**SKIP Q53A IF SAMPLE=2**

53a. So, before you received information from the agency, you:

(If q14=1) drove alone to work, without anyone else in the car, every day

(if q14 ne 1):

(If q15>0) carpooled (q15) days per week,
(if q17>0) vanpooled (q17) days per week
(if q19>0) rode the bus or train (q19) days per week
(if q20>0) (q21) (q20) days per week

and after you received information from the agency, you:

(If q24=2, q32=2, q40=2, q46=2 drove alone to work, without anyone else in the car, every day

(if q24=1 and q26>0) carpooled and from work (q26) days per week;
(if q24=1 and q26a>0) carpooled one-way (q26a) days per week
(if q24=1 and q30>0) carpooled (q30) days per week for (q29)
(if q32=1 and q34>0) vanpooled to and from work (q34) days per week,
(if q34a>0) vanpooled one-way (q34a) days per week
(if q24=1 and q38>0) vanpooled (q38) days per week for (q37)
(if q40=1 and q42>0) rode the bus (train) to and from work (q42) days per week,
(if q42a>0) rode the bus (train) one-way (q42a) days per week
(if q40=1 and q45>0) rode the bus (train) (q45) days per week for (q44)
(if q46=1 and q49>0) (q47) to and from work (q49) days per week,
(if q49a>0) (q47) one-way (q49a) days per week
(if q46=1 and q52>0) (q47) (q52) days per week for (q51)

Is that correct?
Yes 1 Continue
No 2 Insert corrections and continue

53. To what extent did information or assistance from South Florida Commuter Services influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...

Have a great deal of influence 04
A moderate influence 03
A small influence, or 02
No influence at all 01

(DO NOT READ) Don't Know/Refused 98

54. To what extent did the Emergency Ride Home Program influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...

Have a great deal of influence 04
A moderate influence 03
A small influence, or 02
No influence at all 01

(DO NOT READ) Don't understand/know about the emergency ride home program 97

(DO NOT READ) Don't Know/Refused 98
IF SAMPLE=2 SKIP TO Q. 56

55. And after this group provided you with the information, did anyone from that group follow up with you by letter or phone call to see if you had any further questions or problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. For the next few questions, please respond by using a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is the lowest or worst rating and 10 is the highest or best rating. Using this scale, how would you rate the agency on....

(ROTATE LIST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Worst)</th>
<th>Best</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The accuracy of the information they provided</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The usefulness of the information they provided</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The promptness with which they provided the information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Their courtesy and professional attitude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Their handling of any questions or problems you had</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The quality and usefulness of the list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers that they sent you</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK F ONLY IF Q.22-01 OR Q.22-03 MENTIONED OR Q.23B=1

57. And still using this scale, overall how satisfied are you with this agency's performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. And if a friend or relative were to ask you about this carpool/vanpool agency and whether they should use their services, would you....

| Definitely recommend using this agency | 05 | GO TO Q.58a |
| Probably recommend using this agency | 04 | GO TO Q.58a |
| Maybe/maybe not recommend them | 03 | GO TO Q.59 |
| Probably not recommend them | 02 | GO TO Q.59 |
| or definitely not recommend them | 01 | GO TO Q.59 |

(DO NOT READ) Don't know/refused 98 GO TO Q.59
58a. Have you actually recommended South Florida Commuter Services to a friend or relative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. Does your employer currently offer any type of commuting benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>01 CONTINUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02 SKIP TO Q.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>08 SKIP TO Q.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>09 SKIP TO Q.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. What kind of benefits do they offer? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

- Subsidized transit or rail passes 01
- Subsidized vanpool fares 02
- Pre-tax transit or rail passes 03
- Pre-tax vanpool fares 04
- Parking Cash-out Program 05
- Qualified parking benefits 06
- Preferential parking for carpools/vanpools 07
- Other specify 99

61. What benefit do you currently receive? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

- Subsidized transit or rail passes 01
- Subsidized vanpool fares 02
- Pre-tax transit or rail passes 03
- Pre-tax vanpool fares 04
- Parking Cash-out Program 05
- Qualified parking benefits 06
- Preferential parking for carpools/vanpools 07
- Not receiving any benefit 08
- Other specify 99

62. Is there an ETC, Employee Transportation Coordinator, at your worksite?

(Interviewer note: An ETC is an employee that help other employees with transportation issues and serves as the employers contact person for transit agencies and/or commuter assistance programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now I just have a few questions remaining that are for statistical and classification purposes only. Your answer will remain completely anonymous and confidential.

**d1.** What is your marital status?

- Single 1
- Married 2
- Divorced/Separated 3
- Widowed 4
- Refused 9

**d2.** Do you have any children under the age of 6 in your household?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Refused 9

**D4.** How many working vehicles do you have in your household?

(Record exact #)

**d3.** Do you have any children aged 6-16 in your household?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Refused 9

**d4.** What is the highest level of education you have completed? (DO NOT READ)

- Did not complete high school 1
- High school graduate 2
- Trade/technical school 3
- Attended college/associate degree 4
- College graduate 5
- Post Graduate degree 6
- Refused 9

**D4a.** Do you have access to the internet at work?

- Yes 01
- No 02
- Refused 98

**D4b.** Do you have access to the internet at home?

- Yes 01
- No 02
- Refused 98
D4c. What is your key media source in general?

a. Newspaper 01  
b. Radio 02  
c. Television 03  
d. Internet 04  
e. other 05

d5. What is your race or ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify ____</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d6. Please stop me when I read the category that contains your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DO NOT READ)

d7. Please stop me when I read the range that contains your household's total income, including yourself and anyone else in your household that worked, for the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 or more</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DO NOT READ)
D8. Please stop me when I read the economic sector in which you are employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail Trade</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Communication</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Science/Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Entertainment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration/Police/Fire</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END: Thank you very much. That concludes our survey.
Appendix F: General Public Survey Instrument

(ASK TO SPEAK TO AN ADULT IF RESPONDENT IS CLEARLY NOT AN ADULT)

Good morning/afternoon/evening My name is ____________ and I am calling on behalf of the Center for Urban Transportation Research at the University of South Florida and the Florida Department of Transportation. This evening/today we are conducting a survey on commuting and traffic issues in the Miami-Dade/Broward/Palm Beach area. We are not attempting to sell you anything; we are only interested in your opinions.

1a. How many persons, 18 years or older in your household, work outside the home, 35 or more hours per week?

__________________ # persons who work full time

IF 0 THANK RESPONDENT AND TERMINATE
IF MORE THAN 1 PERSON WORKS FULL-TIME OUTSIDE THE HOUSEHOLD, ASK Q.1B. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q.1C

1b. Of the persons working full time, I need to speak with the person who had the most recent birthday. Would that person be you?

Yes - 01 CONTINUE
No - 02 ASK FOR THAT PERSON AND REPEAT INTRO

RECORD GENDER:
1c. Male 01 (QUOTA 50%)
Female 02 (QUOTA 50%)

2. Do you currently hold more than one job?

Yes 01 (Please answer the questions in this survey with respect to your primary job.)
No 02

3. How many days do you usually travel to work in a week?

_______ # days

IF "0" THIS IS NOT A PERSON WORKING OUTSIDE OF THE HOME THEN SKIP TO Q.17

4a. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you drive alone to get to work?
IF RESPONDENT USES MORE THAN ONE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION IN A SINGLE TRIP, FOR EXAMPLE WALKING OR DRIVING TO THE BUS, ASK WHAT MODE IS USED FOR MOST OF THE TRIP. IF NOT DRIVING THEN THE FOLLOWING SHOULD BE 0.

_______ # days

4b. When you drive to work, do you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car, or not? ("CARPOOLING" IS DRIVING WITH SOMEONE ELSE TO THE WORKSITE. TAKING A CHILD TO SCHOOL/DAYCARE DOES NOT COUNT AS CARPOOLING FOR THIS QUESTION.)

Yes - 01 (CONTINUE WITH Q.4c)
No - 02 (SKIP TO Q.4e IF APPLICABLE)
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4c. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you carpool to get to work? 
("CARPOOLING" IS DRIVING WITH SOMEONE ELSE TO THE WORKSITE. TAKING A CHILD TO SCHOOL/DAYCARE DOES NOT COUNT AS CARPOOLING FOR THIS QUESTION.)

__________ # days

4d. (IF Q.4a AND Q.4c ARE >0, VERIFY)
"So you drive to work alone (Q.4a response) days per week and carpool (Q.4c response) days per week?"

4a. Response should be ______

4c. Response should be ______

if total = Q.3, SKIP TO Q.5a.

otherwise, continue

4e. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you ________ to get to work? (IF RESPONDENT USES MORE THAN ONE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION IN A SINGLE TRIP, FOR EXAMPLE WALKING OR DRIVING TO THE BUS, ENTER ONLY THE MODE USED FOR MOST OF THE TRIP.)

1. Vanpool, that is ride to work in a van with 7-14 other people ______
2. Ride the bus ______
3. Ride the train to work ______
4. Ride a bicycle ______
5. Walk or jog ______
7. Do something else - specify ____________________________ ______

WHEN THE DAYS FOR ALL MODES-Q.4a, Q.4c & Q.4e ARE ADDED THE TOTAL SHOULD EQUAL THE ANSWER IN Q.3 AND DEFINITELY NOT EXCEED 7 DAYS. WHEN RESPONSES EQUAL THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS WORKED, GO ON TO Q.5a

5a. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you drive alone to get home from work? (IF RESPONDENT USES MORE THAN ONE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION IN A SINGLE TRIP, FOR EXAMPLE WALKING OR DRIVING TO THE BUS, ASK WHAT MODE IS USED FOR MOST OF THE TRIP. IF NOT DRIVING THEN THE FOLLOWING SHOULD BE 0.)

__________ # days

5b. When you drive home from work, do you ever carpool, that is, go home with someone else in the car, or not? ("CARPOOLING" IS DRIVING WITH SOMEONE ELSE TO THE WORKSITE. PICKING A CHILD UP FROM SCHOOL/DAYCARE DOES NOT COUNT AS CARPOOLING FOR THIS QUESTION.)

Yes - 01 (CONTINUE WITH Q.5c)
No - 02 (SKIP TO Q.5e IF APPLICABLE)

5c. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you carpool to get home from work? ("CARPOOLING" IS DRIVING WITH SOMEONE ELSE TO THE WORKSITE OR HOME. PICKING A CHILD UP FROM SCHOOL/DAYCARE DOES NOT COUNT AS CARPOOLING FOR THIS QUESTION.)

__________ # days
5d. (IF Q.5a AND Q.5c ARE >0, VERIFY)
"So you drive home alone (Q.5a response) days per week and carpool (Q.5c response) days per
week?"

5a. response should be_________  
5c. response should be_________  
IF TOTAL = Q.3, SKIP TO Q.6.
OTHERWISE, CONTINUE

5e. Please tell me the number of days in a typical week that you ____________ to get home from work? (IF
RESPONDENT USES MORE THAN ONE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION IN A SINGLE TRIP, FOR
EXAMPLE WALKING OR DRIVING TO THE BUS, ENTER ONLY THE MODE USED FOR MOST OF
THE TRIP.)

1. Vanpool, that is go home from work in a van with 7-14 other people
2. Ride the bus
3. Ride the train
4. Ride a bicycle
5. Walk or jog
6. Do something else - specify ______________

WHEN THE DAYS FOR ALL MODES-Q.5a, Q.5c & Q.5e ARE ADDED THE TOTAL SHOULD EQUAL THE
ANSWER IN Q.3 AND DEFINITELY NOT EXCEED 7 DAYS. WHEN RESPONSES EQUAL
THE TOTAL
NUMBER OF DAYS WORKED, GO ON TO Q.6

ASK Q.6-Q.8 ONLY IF Q.4c>0 OR Q.5c>0

6. How long have you been in your current carpool?
   ___ Days   ___ Weeks   ___ Months   ___ Years

7. Including yourself, how many people are usually in the car when you carpool?
   _______ (PROBE IF "DON'T KNOW")

8. With whom do you regularly carpool? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

   Household members 01
   Non-household relatives 02
   Co-workers 03
   Neighbors 04
   People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist 05
   Other Specify _______________ 99

ASK Q.9-Q.11 ONLY IF Q.4e1>0 OR Q.5e1>0

9. How long have you been in your current vanpool?
   ___ Days   ___ Weeks   ___ Months   ___ Years

10. Including yourself, how many people are usually in the van when you vanpool?
    _______ (PROBE IF "DON'T KNOW")

98
11. With whom do you regularly vanpool? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

Household members 01
Non-household relatives 02
Co-workers 03
Neighbors 04
People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist 05
Other (Specify ______________________) 99

ASK Q.12 ONLY IF Q.4e2>0 OR Q.5e2>0

12. In the past 12 months have you usually been taking the bus to or from work at least twice per week, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don't know 97
Refused 98

ASK Q.13 ONLY IF Q.4e3>0 OR Q.5e3>0

13. In the past 12 months have you usually been taking the train to or from work at least twice per week, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don't know 97
Refused 98

ASK Q.14 ONLY IF Q.4e4>0 OR Q.5e4>0

14. In the past 12 months have you usually been riding your bike to or from work at least twice per week, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don't know 97
Refused 98

ASK Q.15 ONLY IF Q.4e5>0 OR Q.5e5>0

15. In the past 12 months have you usually been walking or jogging to or from work at least twice per week, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don't know 97
Refused 98

ASK Q.16 ONLY IF Q.4c, Q.4e1, Q.4e2, Q.4e3, Q.4e4 and Q.4e5 =0
16. Since the last time either you moved or your job changed locations, have you tried carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, riding the train, or walking to or from work at least once, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don’t know 97
Refused 98

17a. Instead of traveling to your usual worksite, do you ever telecommute, that is, work all day from your home on a regularly scheduled workday, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don’t know 97 Skip to q. 18a
Refused 98 Skip to q. 18a

IF Q.3 = 0 and Q.17a = 1 THEN CONTINUE
IF Q.3 = 0 and Q.17a = 2 THEN TERMINATE
IF Q.3 > 0 AND Q.17a = 2 THEN SKIP TO Q.18a

17b. How many days per week do you usually telecommute?

_____ days

17c. And have you been telecommuting regularly for the past year, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don’t know 97
Refused 98

17d. And about how far would your commute to your office be, one-way in miles, if you were working at your company’s worksite rather than telecommuting?

17e. And about how much time would your commute take? _____

17f. What time do you usually start work? ______ am/pm

17g. And what time do you finish working? ______ am/pm - SKIP TO Q.20

18a. And about how far is your commute, one-way, in miles?

18b. And about how much time does it take you to commute to work?

18c. And how much time would it take to make the same trip on a Saturday or Sunday?

18d. What time do you usually leave home to go to work? ______ am/pm

18e. And what time do you usually leave work to go home? ______ am/pm
20. Have you heard, seen or read any advertising or other messages related to carpooling or vanpooling in the past 6 months, or not?

Yes 01 CONTINUE
No 02 SKIP TO Q.26
Don't know 97 SKIP TO Q.26
Refused 98 SKIP TO Q.26

21. Where did you see or hear this advertising? (DO NOT READ LIST) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE)

a. Newspaper 01
b. Radio 02
c. Television 03
d. At work 04
e. In the mail 05
f. On billboards 06
g. On road signs 07
h. Received a phone call 08
i. At bus stop/on a bench 09
j. On the side of buses/vans 10
k. Friends/co-workers/relatives 11
r. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day 12
s. Employer 13
t. Internet 14
u. Don't Know 97
v. Refused 98
q. Other (SPECIFY: _______________) 99

21a. What is your key media source in general?

a. Newspaper 01
b. Radio 02
c. Television 03
d. Internet 04
e. Other 05

22. What message do you recall from this advertising? (DO NOT READ LIST)

None 01
That one should rideshare 02
That you can call a number for car/vanpool information/the RIDE phone number 03
Ridesharing saves time 04
Ridesharing is less stressful 05
Ridesharing is more enjoyable 06
Ridesharing saves money 07
Driving alone is a hassle 08
Park and Ride related 09
Ridesharing is good for the environment 10
Other specify…………………………………………………………………………… 99
23. Did you try carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it, or not?

Yes 01 SKIP TO Q.26
No 02 CONTINUE
Don't know 97 CONTINUE
Refused 98 CONTINUE

24. Did you consider trying carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it, or not?

Yes 01 SKIP TO Q.26
No 02 CONTINUE
Don't know 97 CONTINUE
Refused 98 CONTINUE

25. Did you consider contacting any organizations to get more information about carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing the advertising, or not?

Yes 01
No 02
Don't know 97
Refused 98

25a. What if anything would motivate you to switch from driving alone to using an alternative way of getting to work?

Higher gas prices 01
Higher parking costs 02
Higher tolls 03
Increased traffic congestion 04
Employer-provided bus passes or vanpool fares 05
Other (specify): ________________________________
Nothing would make me switch 97
Don’t Know 99

26. Have you heard of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool, or not?

Yes 01 CONTINUE
No 02 SKIP TO Q.28
Don’t know 97 SKIP TO Q.28
Refused 98 SKIP TO Q.28
27. Which organizations have you heard of? (DO NOT READ LIST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Commuter Services or Commuter Services</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-800-234-Ride</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.1800234RIDE.com">www.1800234RIDE.com</a></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit Authority)</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCT (Broward County Transit)</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmtran (Palm Beach Transit)</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Electric Wave or Miami Beach shuttle</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMAX</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresso Shuttle</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-rail</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-rail Shuttle</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center TMO</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach TMA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Education Center TMA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Miami TMA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free T-Shirt people</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hang up your Keys&quot; People</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport West TMI</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPSI</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade County Vanpool Program</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Organizations (unspecified)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Vanpool program</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF CODE 01 MENTIONED IN Q.27 THEN SKIP Q.28

28. Have you ever heard of South Florida Commuter Services or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF CODE 02 MENTIONED IN Q.27 THEN SKIP Q.29

29. Have you ever heard of any commuter information numbers such as 1-800-234-RIDE, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF CODE 03 MENTIONED IN Q.27 THEN SKIP Q.29a

29a. Have you ever heard of the website www.1800234RIDE.com or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Have you ever contacted South Florida Commuter Services, the 1-800-234-RIDE number, www.1800234RIDE.com or some other group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Who did you contact?

- South Florida Commuter Services
- 1-800-234-RIDE
- www.1800234RIDE.com
- Other specify __________________ __________

32. When you are commuting or making other car trips in the Miami/Fort Lauderdale area, do you ever use the carpool lanes or HOV lanes on I-95, or not?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>(SKIP TO Q.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/refused</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(SKIP TO Q.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Do you have the opportunity to use the carpool lanes and just choose not to use them, or do you not have the opportunity to use them?

(Interviewer note: carpool lanes require 2 or more people in the car at certain times of day)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the opportunity</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have opportunity</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. And thinking about carpool lanes or HOV lanes on the freeways, in general do you believe that people who use carpool lanes during rush hour get to where they’re going

- Twice as fast or more than people traveling in non-carpool lanes 01
- Significantly faster but not twice as fast 02
- At about the same time 03
- Or less quickly 04
- Don’t Know/refused 97

35. How often do you use park and ride lots?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>once a week or more</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times per month</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 times per year;</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once per year</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104
36. Does your employer currently offer any type of commuting benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What kind of benefits do they offer? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

- Subsidized transit or rail passes 01
- Subsidized vanpool fares 02
- Pre-tax transit or rail passes 03
- Pre-tax vanpool fares 04
- Parking Cash-out Program 05
- Qualified parking benefits 06
- Preferential parking for carpools/vanpools 07
- Other specify ________________________________ 99

38. What benefit do you currently receive? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

- Subsidized transit or rail passes 01
- Subsidized vanpool fares 02
- Pre-tax transit or rail passes 03
- Pre-tax vanpool fares 04
- Parking Cash-out Program 05
- Qualified parking benefits 06
- Preferential parking for carpools/vanpools 07
- Not receiving any benefit 08
- Other specify ________________________________ 99

39. Is there an ETC, Employee Transportation Coordinator, at your worksite?  
(Interviewer note: An ETC is an employee that help other employees with transportation issues and serves as the employers contact person for transit agencies and/or commuter assistance programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D1. Now I just have a few questions remaining that are for statistical and classification purposes only. Your answers will remain completely anonymous and confidential.

What is your marital status? Are you...

- Single 01
- Married 02
- Divorced/Separated 03
- Widowed 04
- Refused 98

(DO NOT READ)

D2. Do you have any children under the age of 16 in your household?

- Yes 01
- No 02
- Refused 98

D4. How many working vehicles do you have in your household? ______
(Record exact #)

D4a. Do you have access to the internet at work?

- Yes 01
- No 02
- Refused 98

D4b. Do you have access to the internet at home?

- Yes 01
- No 02
- Refused 98

D5. What is your race or ethnicity? Are you...

- White 01
- African-American 02
- Hispanic 03
- Asian 04
- American Indian 05
- Other, Specify: ______ 99

(DO NOT READ) Refused 98
D6. Please stop me when I read the category that contains your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 years old</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D7. Please stop me when I read the range that contains your household’s total income, including yourself and anyone else in your household that worked, for the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 or more</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D8. Please stop me when I read the economic sector in which you are employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail Trade</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Communication</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Science/Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Entertainment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration/Police/Fire</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey.

Verify:

Name: ____________________________________________

Phone Number: ________________________________
Appendix G: Employer Survey Instrument

DIRECTIONS: The survey is a write-protected Word document that makes you of check boxes and text fields. Simply check the appropriate box and type your responses into the text fields. The text fields are set as unlimited so feel free to write as much as you want. Use the tab key to move from field to field. Thank you for your participation.

1. Which of the following categories best describes your company? (CHECK ONE)
   - Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
   - Construction
   - Transportation, Public Utilities
   - Finance/Insurance/Real Estate
   - Services (business, personal)
   - Mining
   - Manufacturing
   - Wholesale
   - Retail Trade
   - Public Admin

2. Which of the following best describes your company's organizational structure?
   - Single site employer
   - Multi-site employer

3. How many employees do you have at this location? (CHECK ONE)
   - Less than 5
   - 20-49
   - 50 or more
   - 5-9
   - 50-99
   - 10-19
   - 100-499

4. How many parking places are available for your employees within 1/4 mile of your worksite? (CHECK ONE)
   - Less than 5
   - 20-49
   - 50 or more
   - 5-9
   - 50-99
   - 10-19
   - 100-499

5. Using a scale of 1 to 10, in your opinion, how much of a problem is traffic congestion for your employees in getting to and from work? (CHECK ONE)

6. And compared to this time last year, is traffic congestion in your worksite? (CHECK ONE)
   - Much worse
   - Slightly worse
   - About the same
   - Slightly better
   - Much better
7. **What percentage of your employees:**

- Drive alone to work %
- Carpool %
- Vanpool %
- Walk %
- Bicycle %
- Bus %
- Train %

☐ Mode shares not known

8. **What percentage of your organization’s employees are:**

Currently **eligible** for: Currently **participating** in:

- Flextime % %
- Compressed Work Weeks (4 days/40 hours, 9/80) % %
- Telecommuting % %

☐ No programs offered ☐ No employees participating

9. **Which of the following commute benefits does your company offer? (Check all that apply)**

- a. Transit pass subsidy or discounted passes ☐
- b. Vanpool subsidy or discounted passes ☐
- c. Pre-tax transit/vanpool program ☐
- d. Ridematching program ☐
- e. Preferential parking of carpools/vanpools ☐
- f. Secure bicycle parking ☐
- g. Pre-tax qualified parking benefit ☐
- h. Transit routes and schedule information ☐
- i. Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC) ☐
- j. Other:
10. Please make a check mark by each of the following statements that correctly describes your organization's interaction with South Florida Commuter Services: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Your company has contacted or been contacted by South Florida Commuter Services ☐

b. South Florida Commuter Services has made a presentation to your organization ☐

c. South Florida Commuter Services has provided assistance in the development of a commuter benefit program at your company ☐

d. Other kinds of contact:

11. Following your initial contact, has your company developed a working relationship with SFCS? For example, after hosting a Transportation Day (T-Day) or doing a more formal presentation, did your company continue to work with SFCS.

☐Yes IF YOUR COMPANY HAS ESTABLISHED A WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH SOUTH FLORIDA COMMUTER SERVICES, PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS 12 THROUGH 22.

☐No IF YOUR COMPANY HAS NOT ESTABLISHED A WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH SOUTH FLORIDA COMMUTERS SERVICES, PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS 23 THROUGH 27.

FOR THOSE IN A WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH SFCS

12. What were the reason(s) your company choose to establish a working relationship with SFCS?

13. How has SFCS helped with employee transportation issues? What programs have they helped you developed or what transportations are they helping you solve?

14. Please CHECK THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the usefulness of the information SFCS provided, either printed or electronic.

1 = Not useful at all 10 = Extremely useful

1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □

Additional Comments:
15. Please CHECK THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the effectiveness of the SFCS employer outreach staff.

   1 = Not effective at all  
   10 = Extremely effective

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

Additional Comments:

16. Are you formally designated as an ETC, an employee transportation coordinator who serves as a link between SFCS and your company?

   □ Yes □ No

17. In terms of contact, how frequently would you like to hear from SFCS?

   a. What is your preferred method of contact?

      □ Mail □ Email □ Phone □ Other:

18. Is your company affiliated with a transportation management association (TMA) or initiative (TMI) associated with SFCS?

   □

19. Who is your primary contact from SFCS?

   □ Don't remember

20. Does your company conduct employee surveys on transportation issues?

   □ Yes □ No

21. Have you recommended SFCS to anyone outside of your company?

   □ Yes □ No

22. What should SFCS do to improve its employer outreach efforts?
FOR THOSE THAT DID NOT DEVELOP A WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH SFCS

23. Why did your company choose not to work with SFCS?

24. Would you consider contacting SFCS in the future if transportation issues arise?
   □ Yes  IF YES, WHY?  □ No  IF NO, WHY?

25. Please CHECK THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the usefulness of the information SFCS provided, either printed or electronic.
   1 = Not useful at all  10 = Extremely useful
   1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □

   Additional Comments:

26. Please CHECK THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the effectiveness of the SFCS employer outreach staff.
   1 = Not effective at all  10 = Extremely effective
   1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □

   Additional Comments:

27. In your opinion, how could SFCS improve their employer outreach approach?