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Executive Summary

The survey results presented in this report are the fourth set presented to Commuter Services (Commuter Services) starting with baseline report of 1997. The current evaluation is based on changes from the 1999 figures. Other information collected includes commuter traveling behavior and advertising awareness, Commuter Services database member evaluations as well as awareness, provision of programs, and evaluation of Commuter Services activities by businesses. This evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Commuter Assistance Program Evaluation Manual published by the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) under the sponsorship of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

Survey information was collected on the commuting habits of both the general public and members of the Commuter Services database, as well as awareness of advertising among members of the general public. Businesses were asked about their awareness of Commuter Services and whether they provided incentives for use of commute alternatives by employees. The surveys were developed, conducted and analyzed by CUTR.

The major recommendations are divided into three sections:

General Public

- Advertising efforts should focus on increasing the awareness of Commuter Services programs and the Ride Number among the lower-income populations. Awareness among individuals with income levels below $20,000 continues to be lower compared to individuals of higher income levels. From the surveys, correlations indicate a substantially higher incidence of use of carpooling and transit among lower income households. Commuter Services should continue their efforts to reach the Hispanic population within their service area until Hispanic awareness levels reach equality with non-Hispanic awareness levels. There was a 12% increase in awareness among Hispanics since 1999, but non-Hispanic levels continue to be higher. Efforts should also aim on reaching lower-income Hispanics and focus in Miami-Dade County, where the majority of the Hispanics reside. (See Pages 49-50)
Commuter Services should consider the following tactics, related to the “4 P’s” of marketing to better target low-income commuters:

- Target place by distributing information to places likely to be frequented by low-income commuters, such as discount grocery stores or government assistance offices. Also, use Spanish AM radio in drive time.
- Target promotion by communicating benefits to more closely tie in to the interests of low-income commuters. For instance, focus on money-saving as opposed to reducing commuter stress.
- Also, focus communications on the fact that this is a free service, i.e. a low price service
- Make sure the product is delivered in a way that fits the needs of low-income commuters. Is literacy a problem? Perhaps redesign materials to use more pictures and simpler language.

Commuter Services should investigate the use of social marketing techniques to better target these segments of the population and discover innovative means of disseminating the information to these hard-to-reach populations. (See Pages 39-40)

Commuter Services should continue to hold Emergency Ride Home (ERH) registration days at rail and bus stations. In 2000, 53% of bus/train users reported that the ERH program influenced their mode choice. This suggests that many might have stopped using bus or rail had the ERH program not been available. The ERH program is not only an incentive to use an alternative mode, but it also provides a reward for those who already use an alternative mode, such as the bus or train. Also, ERH provides a good way to retain alternative mode users. It is always cheaper to retain an existing customer (or alternative mode user) than to use promotions to get a new one. The increased use of bus and train by database members suggests that ERH registration days at bus and train stations are a good way to increase the value of ERH to South Florida commuters. (See pages 49-50)
Commuter Services Database Members

- It is recommended that Commuter Services conduct qualitative research with current database members (e.g. focus groups) to identify:
  - How and why commuters use the matchlists
  - Factors that inhibit use of the matchlist to form carpools.

As in 1999, 40% of database members received a matchlist but failed to take any action. Furthermore, the quality of the list has received the lowest rating for the third year in a row (1998 average rating: 6.5; 2000 average rating: 6.0). (See pages 61-65)

- 9% of database members heard about Commuter Services from friends, second only to T-Days (49%). Additionally, 47% of all database members said they would ‘definitely’ recommend Commuter Services to a friend. In order to take more advantage of this avenue of distribution, Commuter Services should regularly provide database members with information and marketing materials to give to friends or neighbors. Commuter Services could also develop incentives for database members to register friends. For example, transit passes or additional emergency rides could be used as rewards.

This approach may help to provide Commuter Services with more ‘Origin end’ marketing of commute alternatives, to compliment the ‘Destination end’ tactics of using T-Days at employer locations. (See pages 41-43)

South Florida Businesses

- Commuter Services should continue to organize Transportation Days (T-Days) at South Florida businesses to increase awareness of alternative commute modes. Almost half of database members learn of Commuter Services through T-Day events. T-Days are useful because they concentrate recruitment at a common destination end of the work trip and target those commuters most interested in commute alternatives. (See pages 41-43)

- Commuter Services should continue to seek increases in participation rates and the percent of businesses offering flextime, compressed workweeks, and telecommuting. These alternatives are those most desired by commuters, as determined in the CUTR report *A Market based Approach to Effective TDM Program Design*, an FDOT research idea project.
These alternatives are particularly helpful to businesses in managing parking needs, as they reduce parking and office space requirements. In order to implement this program, Commuter service should:

- Assess current staff knowledge of these programs
- Keep abreast of developments in CUTR’s TDM Marketing project for FDOT, where toolkits for telecommuting implementation are being developed.
  (See pages 47-48)

- Commuter Services should continue to work closely with local businesses to increase awareness of Commuter Services and alternative commute programs. Presentations at businesses should emphasize the Commuter Choice program. Commuter Services could also establish workshops on Commuter Choice to teach employers how implement and maintain a program at their workplace. Commuter choice provides tax benefits under IRS Code section 132(f). Telecommuting, flextime, and compressed work weeks could also be instructional seminar topics.

- Commuter Services should focus on businesses that report parking shortages and increased traffic congestion. While businesses may not perceive the absence of commute alternative programs as a problem, parking shortages and traffic congestion are tangible and have a direct effect on the “bottom line.” Commuter Services’ programs should be marketed as potential solutions to these tangible problems. A list of businesses that reported parking shortages or increased traffic congestion is listed in the Appendix. (See pages 31-33 and Appendix)

The purpose of collecting this information was primarily to measure the changes from the 1999 levels of performance, and to assist in the appropriate setting of goals for future evaluation periods. With the information provided in this report, and particularly in the performance measures report that accompanies this document, Commuter Services should be able to set meaningful, measurable goals for performance in 2001 and future years.
This process should follow the guidelines set forth in CUTR’s *Strategic Marketing for Mobility Managers* seminar. In brief, the goal setting process should take the following form:

1. FDOT and Commuter Services should review program direction and determine which of the goals listed in the performance measures report are most relevant to Commuter Services’ current direction.

2. FDOT and Commuter Services should select the *performance measures* within those goals that are most appropriate.

3. Commuter Services should select *target levels* for those performance measures that reflect a reasonable level of performance improvement, to be approved by FDOT. For those performance measures where the data is derived from survey results, target levels should be set in one of two ways:
   - *minimum performance levels* which, when measurements are taken will have a 95% probability of having been met - i.e., there will be a 95% probability that the true measure is at or above the target level, or
   - *statistically significant increases* from baseline levels.

CUTR will be available to assist in the goal selection and target level setting processes.
The key results from the surveys are summarized below:

- The commute distances for South Florida commuters shifted significantly between the 1999 and 2000 evaluations. There was 5% increase in commuters who travel four miles or less and a 5% decrease in commuters who travel between five and nine miles to work. As a result of this shift, there were proportional decreases in total miles traveled and total miles reduced. (See page 13 and Table 1 on page 21)

- When comparing the three counties in the Commuter Services' service area, Miami Dade, Broward and Palm Beach, commute distances increased for Miami-Dade commuters. Palm Beach County commuters continue to enjoy the highest percentage of short commutes under 10 miles and the lowest percentage of long commutes over 20 miles. Miami-Dade commuters continue to demonstrate the highest use of alternative modes. (See pages 51-52)

- The percentage of South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes once per week or more remained the same at 18%. However, there was a significant decrease in the percent of trips made on either bus or train, and increases in the percentage of trips made by vanpool, bicycling, walking and telecommuting. This suggests that South Florida commuters are not switching to alternatives modes, but rather alternative mode users are switching between alternative modes. (See pages 14-18)

- The percentage of South Florida commuters who regularly use a commute alternative also remained the same at 10%. The percentage of commuters that have never used an alternative commute mode continues to decline, as occasional use and occasional use including telecommuting increased. (See pages 14-18)

- The percentage of Commuter Services database members using alternative commute modes increased to 44%, returning to 1998 levels after a 7% decline in 1999. This increase is primarily due to significantly increased bus and train use by database members. These increases are also reflected in a 9% increase in the percentage of trips using alternative commute modes made by database members. The percentage of database members that have never used an alternative mode decreased significantly by 18%, almost all of which is accounted for in increased regular use. (See Pages 22-24)
• In 2000, 37% of businesses reported a parking shortage, up 5% from 1999. Businesses also reported that traffic congestion is perceived as more of a problem then in 1999. In 2000, 52% of businesses reported that traffic congestion was worse than in 1999, while only 6% stated it was better. (See pages 31-33)

• Awareness of advertising (i.e., of any message related to carpooling or vanpooling) among the general public grew from 33% to 46% between 1999 and 2000, and has increased by 20% since 1998. In spite of this increase, there is not a corresponding increase in awareness of the Ride Number. Additionally, the percentage of people who heard an advertisement but could not recall a specific message increased from 10-16%. (See pages 35-37)

• In 2000, awareness of either Commuter Services or the Ride Number among Hispanics increased to 42%, up from 30% in 1999. However, despite increases in 2000, awareness among those with lower income levels still remain the lower compared to higher income levels (28% among those with income levels below $20,000 and 51% for those with incomes about $20,000). (See pages 39-40)

• Aided awareness increased substantially with 19% more recalling Commuter Services and 91% of database members recalling either Commuter Services or the Ride Number. (See page 42)

• Almost half of new database members heard of Commuter Services at work or from T-days, an 11% increase. Knowledge of Commuter Services from billboards increased significantly by 5%. Three new categories, knowledge of Commuter Services from friends, the yellow pages and Tri-rail, also appeared in this year's evaluation. The percentage of new database members that do not know where they heard about or were not aware of Commuter Services decreased significantly from 51-21%. (See page 43)
• Overall business awareness of Commuter Services remained consistent with the 1999 evaluation. Although, the level of familiarity with Commuter Services among businesses has increased from 16-22%. (See page 44)

• The influence of Commuter Services information on database members’ mode choices shifted between 1999 and 2000. In 2000, 27% of database members reported that Commuter Services’ information had influenced their mode shift, up from 19% in 1999. There was a 17% decrease in the percentage of database members that never did rideshare after receiving information from Commuter Services. (See pages 49-50)

• Specifically in terms of ERH Program, 29% of database members reported that the ERH Program influenced their mode choice, up from 15% in 1999. 11% more indicated that the ERH Program was of “great influence” on their mode choice. (See page 50)

• In all counties, awareness of carpool/vanpool advertising continues to increase significantly. Palm Beach and Broward Counties each reported an 11% increase, while Miami-Dade’s figure increased by 17%. (See pages 58-59)

• A significantly higher percentage of database members (8%) reported that they attempted to contact a person on their matchlist, but the percentage that formed carpools remained the same at 3%. For the third straight year, the quality of the matchlist has received the lowest rating. (See pages 62-63)

• Evaluations of Commuter Services by database members were not significantly different than 1999 figures. Overall, 75% would probably or definitely recommend Commuter Services to others seeking carpool/vanpool assistance, down from 78% in 1999. (See pages 64-65)

• 8% fewer businesses reported being contacted by Commuter Services. (See page 60)
I Background

The purpose of this report, and the companion report on performance measures baselines, is to provide an update to the 1999 evaluation of the effects of activities of the South Florida Commuter Services (Commuter Services) program in the Miami/Fort Lauderdale area. The report also provides Commuter Services with an updated travel behavior profile of commuters in the area and within the Commuter Services database. An additional objective was to use the information from the surveys to provide some operational recommendations for the Commuter Services program. The report is based on the results of surveys conducted in the area with the general public, with members of the Commuter Services database, and with local employers. Commuter Services area of responsibility includes Broward, Miami-Dade, and Palm Beach counties in South Florida.

The data collected in this survey serves as an evaluation of Commuter Services activities during the August 1999 – July 2000 period, and provides a baseline for the next evaluation of Commuter Services. Future surveys of the public and Commuter Services database members will determine improvement in the effectiveness and quality of the services provided by the organization.

II Methodology

CUTR conducted three surveys in the Commuter Services Service area:

a. Survey of Members of General Public.

Seven hundred and fifty (750) commuters in the Commuter Services service area were interviewed by telephone and asked about their current commuting habits and their awareness of Commuter Services. Sample for this survey was developed using a Random-Digit-Dialing technique, and should, therefore, be adequately representative of the region’s commuter population. Western WATS of Orem, Utah conducted the interviews. The cooperation rate (analogous to a response rate) was approximately 76% of eligible respondents, up from 41% a year ago.
b. Survey of Members of Commuter Services Database.

The Rideshare Database survey was performed using sample provided by Commuter Services. The interviewing firm attempted contact with 5,131 households. Of those interviewed, however, 216 indicated that they had never heard of Commuter Services nor had they ever signed up with a commuter assistance program. A further 70 indicated they did not commute to work or school. Each of the respondents was verified as being the person named as the database member in the Commuter Services database list. Another 717 telephone numbers had no person with the name indicated in the database listing living there. Either of these conditions was sufficient to terminate the interviews, as further questions regarding interaction with Commuter Services would have been pointless. These changes result in an effective database size increase for 2000 of 3,407 members.

Seven hundred and fifty (750) database members (who either had heard of Commuter Services or recalled registering with a Commuter Assistance group) were asked about their current commuting habits, interaction with the commuter assistance program, and a number of questions to determine their satisfaction with the services provided by Commuter Services. For the purposes of calculating confidence intervals, this is equivalent to a sample size of 825 because of the small total size of the database (10,160 total members, excluding FDOT and Commuter Services employees), adjusting the total number of database entries by the incidence of people unaware of Commuter Services who also had not signed up with a commuter service agency, or did not commute, or had non-working telephone numbers and whose participation could thus not be verified). The overall cooperation rate among database members was 81%. Intersearch Corporation of Horsham, Pennsylvania conducted these interviews.

c. Survey of Local Businesses

800 surveys were mailed to Human Resource Directors (HRDs) of randomly selected employers in the Commuter Services service area. The employers selected were located within the three-county area of Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade counties. Employers were asked to provide information on the characteristics of their worksites, programs that they offered to encourage use of commute alternatives, and interest in developing new programs. They were also asked about their awareness of and interaction with the Commuter Services organization. Sample for this survey was obtained commercially from American Business Lists (ABL) of Omaha, Nebraska. The sample was
drawn to maximize the number of companies in the sample with 100 or more employees. No surveys were sent to companies identified in the ABL database as having fewer than 50 employees. The responses should therefore represent the opinions, attitudes, and knowledge of larger employers in the area.

The surveys were sent out first-class mail with a business reply envelope. Those companies that did not respond within two weeks were re-contacted by telephone to encourage their response. The mailout resulted in 147 returns. The response rate was approximately 18%.

A further 610 surveys were sent to employers identified by Commuter Services as target employers that had been contacted in the past. Companies in this group returned 120 surveys, a response rate of 20%. Results from these surveys were re-weighted to represent these companies appropriately in terms of their presence in the service area. The surveys for the targeted employers were also sent out first-class mail with a business reply envelope.

In total, 267 surveys were returned. The overall response rate was approximately 19%.

The Business surveys were re-weighted to account for differential response rates between the targeted and non-targeted samples.

d. Analytical Approach

Commuter Services efforts are aimed in large part at reducing peak hour congestion on area roadways. Commuters have a number of choices on how to reach their worksites, including driving alone, carpooling, vanpooling, using public transportation, and, for some commuters, walking and riding a bicycle. Arranging alternative work schedules (working at home, compressed work weeks, and so forth) is another option that can reduce traffic congestion. Historically, Commuter Services has concentrated most of its efforts on increasing the number of car and vanpoolers through direct contacts with large employers (to publicize and coordinate ridesharing programs and incentives), and through mass-market advertising (radio, TV, highway signs, etc.).
The effectiveness of Commuter Services efforts, from the perspective of the public and the business community, should be evaluated on several levels:

- Current commuting habits and/or past trial of carpooling and vanpooling for the general public and the Commuter Services database
- Trips and Vehicle Miles reduced (based on survey responses)
- Awareness of Commuter Services messages
- Awareness of Commuter Services, including business community awareness and understanding
- Number of commuters contacting Commuter Services and joining the Commuter Services database
- Alternative commuting arrangements provided by the business community
- Database members' and business community evaluation of Commuter Services

Each of these areas was covered in the surveys conducted by CUTR. The results are summarized below.
III Current Commuting Habits

a. General Public

While most of the impact of Commuter Services’ activities is expected to be seen in the response of the rideshare database, some of the mass media promotion and other activities in the public forum may impact the commute behavior of area residents. In order to measure these “indirect” effects, it is important to investigate the changes in commute patterns within the general public during the evaluation period.

The first figure shows the distribution of commute distances for area residents:

![Commute Distances for South Florida Commuters](image)

There were two notable changes in commute distances for 2000. There was a 5% increase in the 0-4 mile category and a 5% decrease in the 5-9 mile category. Both of these increases are statistically
significant. This shift in commuter distances resulted in proportional decreases in total miles traveled and total miles reduced (See Table 1).

The next chart shows the comparison of the incidence of use of alternative commute modes (i.e., any form of commute that is not a single occupant vehicle or SOV). The results show little change in commute patterns during the evaluation period.

![Percent of South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more](chart)

Figure 2: Percent of South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more

Sufficient sample was drawn from each county to perform a county-by-county analysis. This data is also handled in a separate section of the report.
In terms of total commute trips, the percent of trips made by commuters using alternative modes in general, the 2000 figures are virtually indistinguishable from the previous year, except for a statistically significant decrease of 2% in bus/train use.

![Percent of Trips made by South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes](image)

Figure 3: Percent of Trips made by South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes

The percentage of South Florida commuters using alternative commute modes once per week or more remained the same at 18%. However, there was a significant decrease in the percent of trips made on either bus or train, and increases in the percentage of trips made by vanpool, bicycling, walking and telecommuting. This suggests that South Florida commuters are not switching to alternatives modes, but rather alternative mode users are switching between alternative modes.
Commuters were also asked if they had been regularly using their commute alternative for the past 12 months. This helps to distinguish between occasional users and true regular users of commute alternatives. The only statistically significant increase appears in the bike/walk category.

Figure 4: Percent of South Florida commuters that are regularly using a commute alternative at least twice per week for the last 12 months
Since one of Commuter Services' primary objectives is to maximize the number of people using non-SOV commuting modes, it should follow the same process to market its services and the benefits of those services as classic product and service marketing - namely:

1. Create/Increase awareness
2. Provide information about options
3. Facilitate arrangement
4. Induce trial use
5. Maximize use/Increase frequency of use among those who try product and continue to use it

The level of awareness of Commuter Services and related issues are analyzed in section IV of this report.

Commuter Services must increase the number of people who try commute alternatives, increase the frequency of use, and/or the duration of use of the alternatives to show continual improvement in reducing vehicle miles of travel and vehicle trip. This data is also measured in the surveys, in terms of the percentage of people who have tried ridesharing since their job or home last changed locations. The chart below gives an evaluation of trial use and regular use within the general public. “Regular use” is defined as use of an alternative at least twice per week. Occasional use is defined as less than twice per week and “Used in the past” means that commuters have not used an alternative commute mode for the past year. The 2000 data indicates a significant increase of 4% in occasional use and a 3%, although not significant, increase in occasional use including telecommuting.
Figure 5: Percent of South Florida Commuters who are using or have used Alternative Commute Modes

The survey is not precise enough to measure increments of one percentage point. However, this trend should be monitored carefully. It is particularly important to watch related statistics, such as those presented in the following trip reduction tables, to determine if there is a significant impact on total levels of traffic.
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.

There were 750 valid responses in the survey of South Florida residents for this analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in the table below on the next page.

The total employed labor force for 1997 is 2,132,063 (1998 Florida Statistical Abstracts). The census lists the figure for the total labor force over 16 not working at home (1990 Census - Journey to Work) is 1,856,345; by county: Broward 588,089; Miami-Dade 887,9967; Palm Beach 380,260.

An updated figure for the total labor force over 16 not working at home is not available. However, it can be estimated by assuming the ratio of the labor force over 16 not working at home to the total labor force has remained constant. The 1990 figure for the total employed labor force in the three-county area is 1,918,319. This yields a 1997 estimate for total labor force over 16 not working at home of 2,063,184.

It should be noted that all of these figures are on a per commuter basis. So, to find the total number of trips reduced by carpools per year, for instance, one would multiply 13.9 by the total number of commuters, or 2,063,184.

These data can also be used in the development of several performance measures, using other information such as the Commuter Services budgets to determine costs per trip provided. Those performance measures are presented in a separate report, the “2000 Performance Measures Report for South Florida Commuter Services.”
The number of annual trips reduced by alternative mode use has decreased, but not significantly, from 1999-2000. Carpooling, biking, walking and telecommuting showed increased trip reduction, while vanpooling, bus and train use decreased. The increase in biking and the decrease in bus use were statistically significant changes.
<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>13.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP &amp; VP</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>168.4</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>350.5</td>
<td>285.6</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>503 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8055 total miles</td>
<td>6733 total miles</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Commuter Services Database Members

Part of Commuter Services mission is to increase the number of commuters in the database. For this evaluation period, Commuter Services added 4,083 commuters in total to the database. However, about 20% of new database members contacted either said they had not signed up for Commuter Services or did not commute to either work or school. Therefore, the estimate of effective active members added in the evaluation period was revised to 3,407, and the total database size from 10,160 to 8,243. In addition, Commuter Services is attempting to maximize the use of commute alternatives by members of the database. Increasing both the size of the database and the rate of use of commuter alternatives by members of the database would be a formidable accomplishment. The comparison of alternative mode utilization rates is shown in the chart below:

![Chart showing percent of Commuter Services Database Members using alternative commute modes once or more per week.

**Figure 6: Percent of Commuter Services Database Members using alternative commute modes once or more per week**
Total alternative mode use increased significantly and returned to 1998 levels following a 7% percent decline in 1999. This increase is primarily due to significantly increased bus and train use by database members. The trend of increasing vanpool use has also continued.

The same results hold true for the percentage of trips conducted using alternative modes. The total percent of trips made by database members using alternative modes returned to the 1998 level. The percent of trips made by bus and train each increased by 4% and the percent of trips by vanpools continued its upward trend.

Figure 7: Percent of trips made by Commuter Services Database Members using alternative commute modes

The fact that bus and train use among the general public is down, while it has increased significantly among database members can be attributed to Commuter Services efforts to register new members at bus and train stations. According to Commuter Services staff, registering commuters for the ERH
Program was the primary goal of the efforts at bus and train stations.

The comparison from 1999 to 2000 indicates that there has been a significant decrease (18%) in the percentage of database members that have never used alternative commute modes. There was a significant increase (16%) in the percentage of database members who regularly use alternative commute modes.

Figure 8: Percent of Commuter Services Database Members who are using or have used Alternative Commute Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Used</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly Use 2/week</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Occasionally</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in the past</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (number of passengers less 1) divided by the number of passengers.

There were 750 valid responses in the survey of 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 Commuter Services database. This calculates the total difference between current commuting modes and what vehicle trips and miles would have been if everyone used an SOV commute mode. This is the method that FDOT applies in evaluating CAP performance.

The first table (p. 20) 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 Commuter Services Database population lies between 178.3 (195 - 16.7) trips annually and 211.7 (195 + 16.7) trips annually per commuter without respect to prior mode. In 2000, Commuter Services and FDOT can be 95% confident that the Commuter Services database population’s true average reduction in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) ranges from 3248 miles to 4150 miles. Furthermore, there is a 95% probability that the true mean number of trips in an alternative to the SOV ranges from 210.9 trips to 243.1 trips per year per commuter.

The second (p. 21) takes into account the mode that commuters were using before they contacted Commuter Services, and thus shows only the difference between that mode and how database members commuted after contacting Commuter Services. In this table, only those commuters who joined Commuter Services in the last year are included. There is a 95% probability that the true total number of trips reduced of the Commuter Services Database population lies between 93.6 and 115.2 trips annually per commuter with respect to prior mode. In 2000, Commuter Services and FDOT can be 95% confident that the Commuter Services database population’s true average reduction in
vehicle miles of travel (VMT) ranges from 1,679 and 2,147 miles. There is a 95% probability that the true mean number of trips in an alternative to the SOV ranges from 102.8 to 125.6 trips per year per commuter.
Table 2

Total annual trips and VMT reduced per commuter - Commuter Services Database
*Without* respect to prior mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 1999</th>
<th>95% C.I. 1999</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. 2000</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 1999</th>
<th>95% C.I. 1999</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. 2000</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 1999</th>
<th>95% C.I. 1999</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>923.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>293.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>370.0</td>
<td>119.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>158.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>3699</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced - Commuter Services had influence</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8549</td>
<td>8278</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>total trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>total miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>total miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>total trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>total trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Total annual trips and VMT reduced per commuter - Commuter Services Database

*With respect to prior mode*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 1999</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. Mean Trips Reduced 2000</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 1999</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. Mean Miles Reduced 2000</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 1999</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided 2000</th>
<th>95% C.I. Mean Trips Provided 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>241.8</td>
<td>294.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>308.3</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>283.8</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>843.2</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>50.8 provided</td>
<td>114.2 provided</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced -</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>534.9</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>30.3 provided</td>
<td>80.3 provided</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services had influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>485 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8548 total miles</td>
<td>8278 total miles</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>485 total trips</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These measures are on a *per commuter* basis. To figure the total number of carpool trips provided for database members, one would multiply the total number of people in the database by 14.1 (if prior mode were taken into account) or 47.3 if prior mode were not taken into account.

Several FDOT-required performance measures, as detailed in the accompanying performance measures report, can be developed using this method.
c. Types of Employers by SIC Codes

Despite the relatively low response rates, results from the business survey were relatively consistent with the prior year’s survey. Companies were asked to identify themselves by type, according to a generic SIC classification. The respondents had a distribution of types very similar to the prior two years’ surveys.

![Types of Employer Organizations in South Florida](image)

Figure 9: Types of Employer Organizations in South Florida

The distribution of SIC classifications of businesses should not be considered to reflect the actual distribution of businesses in the region.
d. Physical Characteristics of Local Businesses that Affect Commuting Patterns

The survey of employers, which was addressed to the Human Resources Director (HRD) at each business, included a measurement relating to the amount of parking available in the area. These data are summarized in the charts below.

The approximate amount of parking that businesses have available for employees was compared to the approximate number of employees in the organization to determine the extent to which there were shortages of parking. In comparing 1999 to 2000, 5% more businesses reported a parking shortage, and 9% fewer businesses reported that the number of available parking equaled the number of employees. However, there was a slight increase (3%) in the number of businesses with excess parking.

![Parking Available in relation to Number of Employees](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parking Shortage</th>
<th>Parking = employees</th>
<th>Excess parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Parking Available in relation to number of employees
For the first time in 1999, businesses were asked to evaluate the extent to which traffic congestion was a problem for employees on a 1-10 scale, and the extent to which congestion had gotten worse, better, or stayed the same compared to a year ago. The ratings of congestion are divided into categories of no problem (1-2 rating), slight problem (3-4 rating), moderate problem (5-7), and serious problem (8-10).

![Employer ratings of how much of a problem traffic congestion is for employees](image)

**Figure 11: Employer ratings of how much of a problem traffic congestion is for employees**

Figures for 2000 indicate that significantly fewer businesses view traffic congestion as a slight problem (8% decrease) and significantly more see it as a moderate problem (7% increase). There was also a 2% increase in businesses that view traffic congestion as a serious problem.
Additionally, employers tend to see congestion as the somewhat worse than a year ago, further supporting the need for Commuter Services’ programs. In 2000, 52% of businesses reported that traffic congestion was worse than in 1999, while only 6% stated it was better.

![Graph showing employer ratings of change in traffic congestion in the last year](image)

**Figure 12: Employer ratings of change in traffic congestion in the last year**

These data provide more of a framework of characteristics of local businesses than any sort of evaluation of Commuter Services. Clearly, Commuter Services could not be expected to reduce the amount of free parking available or to increase the number of businesses available. Where Commuter Services will be able to have some effect is in the number of services that business can provide to alleviate any problems arising from the physical characteristics of the worksites. Commuter Services should not change strategic direction to marketing to businesses.
IV. Awareness of Commuter Services and Commuter Services Activities and Resulting Effects on Commuting

Commuter Services' primary purpose is to influence travel behavior. Travel behavior baseline data were measured and the results of these measurements were presented in the previous section.

However, it is also necessary to measure the effectiveness of the methods used in trying to influence behavior as well as the direct behavioral results themselves. Commuter Services' chosen methods of influencing behavior were essentially three-fold:
1. Use mass media advertising to promote the idea of carpooling, vanpooling and transit use.
2. Use mass media advertising to inform people that there is an organization (and/or a specific number) where you will be provided with information to help you start carpooling and vanpooling.
3. Work through large employers to set up programs that will encourage ridesharing.

The following elements are measurable from the surveys of the general public, as well as from the database survey:
- Awareness of Commuter Services advertising
- Content recall
- Unaided and aided awareness of Commuter Services and the Commuter Services telephone number
- Stated mode choice effects of advertising for those who saw/heard advertising
- Correlation of advertising awareness and mode choice

It is clearly important to measure direct stated effects of advertising, and to develop trends of the stated effects. Where possible, it is also important to examine the correlations between advertising awareness (as well as awareness of Commuter Services) and mode choice that do not necessarily involve "stated" effects. Survey respondents have a difficult enough time recalling messages or advertising that they heard. It can be extremely difficult for them to remember the various causes of behavior changes (such as changes in mode choice), and particularly to recall the relative importance of the different causes. This is not to say that questions about influence of advertising messages should not be asked - they should be asked, and the trends of answers to such questions are meaningful. But these direct, stated data should not be the sole basis for analysis. It is equally (and
perhaps more) important to examine various non-stated correlations to provide supplementary information about the effects of advertising on mode choices.

a. Advertising Awareness

The chart below shows recall of any carpool/vanpool related advertising or messages in the three-county market area.

![Chart showing percent of South Florida Commuters aware of carpool/vanpool related advertising or messages]

Figure 13: Percent of South Florida Commuters that are aware of carpool/vanpool related advertising or other messages

Awareness of advertising messages about carpooling and/or vanpooling increased significantly from 33% in the 1999 evaluation to 46% in 2000. Furthermore, there has been a 20% increase in awareness since the 1998 evaluation. CUTR believes that the data show that the advertising media
campaigns conducted by Commuter Services have in fact been effective. However, it is somewhat misleading to state absolutely that awareness increased by thirteen percentage points.

In spite of the increase in awareness of carpool/vanpool related messages, there has been only a slight increase in the public’s awareness of Commuter Services and awareness of the commuter information number (Ride number, or 1-800-234-RIDE) between 1999 and 2000.

Figure 14: Percent of South Florida commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number
This number is still much higher than what could have been generated by Commuter Services efforts in contacting employers alone.

Figure 15: Message recalled from carpool/vanpool advertising by South Florida commuters

In the 2000 evaluation, 16% of South Florida commuters could not recall an advertising message, a significant 6% increase from 1999 data. While in 1999, 9% of commuters recalled a message about park and ride, less than 1% recalled a park and ride message in the 2000 evaluation. However, one in ten commuters recalled an advertising message for the Ride Number, an significant increase of 7%.
b. Awareness of Commuter Services and the RIDE Numbers

1. General Public

Commuter Services is not a top-of-mind item for commuters, given the amount of advertising clutter and the vast quantities of promotional information that are thrown at the general public every day. Given this clutter and Commuter Services’ limited advertising budget, it is unrealistic to expect Commuter Services or any similar organization to achieve top-of-mind awareness.

The basis for measurement should be aided awareness. Aided awareness is determined by the number of people who, when prompted, will say that they have heard of Commuter Services and/or Commuter Services’ telephone number. This chart was presented in an earlier section but is repeated for convenience here. The figures are presented in the chart below and reflect little change from 1999.

Between 1999 and 2000, there was no significant change in the percent of South Florida commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number.
An examination of the awareness levels for the ride number indicates that awareness of either Commuter Services and the Ride Number is increasing among Hispanic residents, due to the agency’s efforts to reach this population since the last evaluation. In 2000, awareness among Hispanics increased to 42%, up from 30% in 1999. However, despite increases in 2000, awareness among those with lower income levels still remain the lower compared to higher income levels (28% among those with income levels below $20,000 and 51% for those with incomes about $20,000).

Commuter Services should continue shifting targeting strategies to generate greater awareness among lower-income residents and Hispanics, particularly in Miami-Dade County, where the Hispanic population is highest. They are more likely to adopt carpooling as a money-saving strategy. Carpooling is already more prevalent among lower-income households.
Commuter Services should investigate the use of social marketing techniques to better target these segments of the population and discover innovative means of disseminating the information to these hard-to-reach populations. Social marketing is the application of commercial marketing techniques to influence the voluntary behavior of target audience in order to improve their personal welfare and that of their society. The primary aim of social marketing is to promote voluntary behavioral change, such as switching from a single-occupant vehicle commute to an alternative mode.

A social marketing campaign is customer-centered and built around the four P’s: product, price, place and promotion. The product is the behavioral change being offered, promoted or encouraged. The price relates to the benefits and costs of changing or not changing behavior. Place refers to where the marketing materials can be accessed and promotion refers to the medium of the message. In order to identify the right marketing mix (i.e. the best product, the appropriate benefits and costs, and where and how to deliver the message), extensive qualitative research with the target audience is necessary.

For low income and/or minority populations finding the right marketing mix may differ substantially from Commuter Service’s other clients. For example, qualitative research could identify which benefits to emphasize and what costs, such as childcare issues, to mitigate. In terms of place, discount grocery stores, government assistance offices, or thrift stores may be more effective places to promote Commuter Services’ programs. Commuter Services should consider the following tactics, related to the “4 P’s” of marketing to better target low-income commuters:

- Target place by distributing information to places likely to be frequented by low-income commuters, such as discount grocery stores or government assistance offices. Also, use Spanish AM radio in drive time.
- Target promotion by communicating benefits to more closely tie in to the interests of low-income commuters. For instance, focus on money-saving as opposed to reducing commuter stress.
- Also, focus communications on the fact that this is a free service, i.e. a low price service
- Make sure the product is delivered in a way that fits the needs of low-income commuters. Is literacy a problem? Perhaps redesign materials to use more pictures and simpler language.
2. Commuter Services Rideshare Database

What remains surprising is the continued decreasing level of awareness of Commuter Services among Commuter Services’ customers (i.e., database members), as shown below.

Figure 17: Unaided awareness of Commuter Services and Ride Number

There were 8% decreases in unaided awareness of Commuter Services and either Commuter Services or the Ride Number.
Commuter Services database members were asked how they had heard about Commuter Services or the ride number rather than what messages they might have recalled. This serves to give Commuter Services an idea of what efforts have had the most impact among database members. In 1999, the question was revised to account for people who have heard of Commuter Services but could not attribute it to a source. As such, it appears that the percent of database members who have not heard of Commuter Services declined significantly that year. However, most of this shift went to the “Don’t Know” response.

Figure 18: Aided awareness of Commuter Services and Ride Number
In 2000, the percentage of new database members that do not know where they heard about or were not aware of Commuter Services decreased significantly from 51-21%. Almost half of the database member heard about Commuter Services at work or, specifically, T-Days. That represents a significant 11% increase from 1999. Knowledge of Commuter Services from billboards significantly increased from 1% to 6%. There was also a significant 5% increase in the radio and TV category. It is also important to note that three new categories, friends, yellow pages, and Tri-rail, appeared in this year's evaluation.

Figure 19: Where Database Members heard about Commuter Services

(Base: members who joined in last 12 months)
3. Local Businesses

Human Resource Directors in surveyed businesses were asked about their awareness levels of Commuter Services and Commuter Services activities. These results are presented below. Growth in business awareness experienced little change. 6% less reported having heard of Commuter Services, but 6% more reported being familiar with Commuter Services.

![South Florida Businesses' Familiarity with Commuter Services](chart)

Figure 20: South Florida Businesses' Familiarity with Commuter Services

The awareness levels should also be tempered by consideration that those organizations most interested in transportation issues are more likely to return the survey and may be more likely to be aware of commuter services. It is probably exaggerating to estimate that 51% of all HRDs at area business employing 100 or more people are actually aware of Commuter Services and their activities.
c. **Stated Mode Choice Effects of Advertising**

The purpose of advertising is to move commuters along a continuum toward the goal of influencing travel behavior by mode and time of day. The continuum is described by the following points:

1. Create/Increase awareness
2. Provide information about options
3. Facilitate arrangement
4. Induce trial use
5. Maximize use/Increase frequency of use among those who try product and continue to use it

The true value of Commuter Services lies in its ability to move people from awareness to trial use, and from there to increased frequency of use. As previously described, awareness levels have not changed significantly. The next step is to make detectable and significant progress from the standpoint of the general public. Commuters in the general public who recalled seeing advertising or other messages were asked what effect these messages had on their commuting habits. These results are shown below:
Figure 21: Impact of advertising on South Florida commuters

The 2000 evaluation indicates that 3% more commuters are considering ridesharing, but less have tried it.

Although the apparent indication is that the current advertising campaign is not having the intended effect of eliciting action from the general public, this must be tempered with a sense of what the objectives of these campaigns are. It would be sensible for future advertising campaigns to have explicit goals set out for these measures that are agreed upon by all parties as reasonable, and to evaluate advertising impact based on those goals.
d. Analysis of Provision of Incentives by Employers

Employers were asked to provide information about flextime, compressed workweeks, and telecommuting in detail. The results on the following two graphs show the percentage of organizations with employees participating in commute programs and the average percent of employees participating in those programs.

Figure 22: Percentage of organizations with employees participating in commute programs

In 2000, the percentage of employees on flextime increased significantly by 5%. There was also a significant 6% increase in the percentage of employees who telecommute.
Figure 23: Average percent of employees participating in commute programs

The above table shows that the average percentages of employees who work on flextime, compressed work weeks, or who telecommute have remained virtually unchanged since the 1999 evaluation.

Commuter Services should seek increases in participation rates and percent of businesses offering these programs. Flextime, compressed workweeks, and telecommuting programs will do as much to reduce traffic congestion as pooling arrangements. If Commuter Services does not currently have goals set for establishing these programs, CUTR strongly recommends their implementation.
e. **Stated Effect of Assistance Provided by Commuter Services on Mode Choice**

Commuter Services Database members were asked what effect the emergency ride home (ERH) information and all of the information provided by Commuter Services as a whole had on their mode choice. The results are presented in the charts below.

![Effect of Information on Mode Choice for Database Members](chart.png)

**Figure 24: Effect of Information on Mode Choice for Database Members**

The most notable change shown on the above table is a 17% decrease in the percentage of database members that “never did rideshare”.

Those results labeled “no influence” indicate the percentage of respondents who did try an alternative mode, but reported that Commuter Services messages and information had no influence on their choice. This figure increased by 10% between the 1999 and 2000 evaluations.
The proportion of database members saying that the ERH information had "some influence" on their choice of mode increased from 19% in 1999 to 27% in 2000. Furthermore, 6% more database members reported that ERH information had a "great influence" on their mode choice. The number of database members receiving ERH information continues to increase, from 76% to 80% over the last year, and 46% increase over the last four years.

![Effect of Emergency Ride Home on Mode Choice for Database Members](image)

**Figure 25: Effect of ERH on Mode Choice for Database Members**

According to the 2000 evaluation, 19% fewer database members did not rideshare or were unaware of the ERH program. The percentage of database members who indicated that the ERH program was of "some influence" rose from 15% in 1999, to 29% in 2000. This increase is due to an 11% increase in the percentage of database members who reported that the ERH program was of "great influence" on their mode choice.
Analysis of Commute Patterns and Awareness of Commuter Services by County

a. Commute Patterns by County

Sufficient interviews were completed in both the 1999 and 2000 evaluations of the general public to conduct an analysis of commute patterns by county. The analysis shall follow the same sequence as the aggregate analysis of general public commute patterns.

Commute distances increased for Miami-Dade County commuters as they surpassed Broward County commuters with 31% driving 20 miles or more. Palm Beach County commuters enjoy the highest percentage of short commutes with 47% driving under 10 miles, and the lowest percentage of long commutes with just 21% driving over 20 miles.

![Commute Distances for Broward County Commuters](image_url)

Figure 26: Commute Distances for Broward County Commuters
Figure 27: Commute Distances for Miami-Dade County Commuters

Figure 28: Commute Distances for Palm Beach County Commuters
Incidence of alternative mode use by county is shown in the next three charts:

Figure 29: Percent of Broward County Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more

Figure 30: Percent of Miami-Dade Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes Once per week or more
In comparing 1999 to 2000 figures, there are no significant changes within the counties. It is important to note that Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties show a decreasing trend in the percentage of commuters using an alternative mode. Miami-Dade County experienced the largest decline as the percentage of alternative mode use dropped from 24% to 20%. However, Broward County experienced a 2% increase in alternative mode use.
The current mode split as a percentage of trips is shown in the next three charts.

Figure 32: Percent of Trips made by Broward County Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes

Figure 33: Percent of Trips made by Miami-Dade County Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes
Figure 34: Percent of Trips made by Palm Beach County Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes

Broward County commuters demonstrate a decreasing trend in overall alternative mode use. Miami-Dade County residents continue to have the most prevalent use of transit and alternative mode use, probably due to a combination of demographics and existing infrastructure. However, there was a 3% decline in bus/train use by Miami-Dade commuters. This indicates that there are more "occasional" users of alternative commute modes in Broward and Palm Beach Counties.
b. Awareness of Commuter Services and Commuter Services Advertising

The percentage of commuters aware of any carpool or vanpool advertising by county is shown in the chart below:

![Percent of South Florida Commuters Aware of Carpool/Vanpool related Advertising by County: 1998 and 1999](chart.png)

Figure 35: Percent of South Florida Commuters Aware of carpool/vanpool related advertising by County

In all counties, awareness of carpool/vanpool advertising continues to increase significantly. Palm Beach and Broward Counties each showed an 11% increase, while Miami-Dade County awareness increased by 17%.
The pattern of awareness of Commuter Services and the Ride number is demonstrated in the next three charts:

**Percent of Broward County commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commuter Services</th>
<th>Ride Number</th>
<th>Either CS or Ride Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36: Percent of Broward County commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number

**Percent of Miami-Dade commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commuter Services</th>
<th>Ride Number</th>
<th>Either CS or Ride Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37: Percent of Miami-Dade commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number
Figure 38: Percent of Palm Beach County commuters that are aware of Commuter Services and/or the Ride Number

The 2000 figures indicate that awareness in Miami-Dade County increased substantially over the last year passing Palm Beach County in awareness levels. Over the last three years, awareness levels in Palm Beach County have experienced a downward trend. While Broward County levels are down slightly from 1999, their commuters still have the highest levels of awareness.
VI. Telecommuting

In 2000, the percentage of South Florida commuters that telecommuted once per week or more increased to 3%, up from 2% in 1999 (see Chart 2). Telecommuting resulted in a 1% reduction in work trips in 2000 (See Chart 3) As in 1999, only 1% of South Florida commuters reported that they have been regularly telecommuting at least once per week for the last 12 months (see Chart 4).

In a comparison of the counties, Palm Beach commuters reported the highest percentage of telecommuting once per week or more at 5%, an increase of 4% since 1999. 3% of Broward County commuters reported telecommuting once per week or more, up from 1% in 1999 and 2% Miami-Dade County commuters reported telecommuting, a 1% decrease. (See Charts 29-31).

In terms of businesses, 7% indicated that they have employees participating in telecommuting programs, up from 4% in 1999. However, the average percent of employees participating in telecommuting programs remained the same at 1%. (See Charts 22 and 23).
VII. Evaluation of Commuter Services by Database Members and Local Businesses

a. Commuter Services Database Members Evaluation

Database members evaluated the performance of Commuter Services in two ways: Responding to questions about specific actions Commuter Services took or did not take, and providing subjective ratings on a 1-10 scale on their satisfaction with Commuter Services. Commuter Services database members were asked what types of assistance Commuter Services had provided to them - Specifically, if Commuter Services had provided tips on what to do next to start carpooling, information on the ERH program, and a list of potential poolers (or a letter stating that there were no matches).

![Bar chart showing assistance provided by Commuter Services](image)

Figure 39: Assistance provided by Commuter Services when contacted by Database Members
Commuter Services efforts at following up with database members continue to show improvement toward increasing the recall among database members, but the percentage of database member that recall receiving a pooler list or letter dropped by 6%. The percentage that recalled receiving ERH information is higher again for the third straight year, with 80% of database members recalling that they received ERH information in 2000.

Approximately 83% of new database members received a match list from Commuter Services, down 7% from 1999. In 2000, only 31% received a “no match” letter, down significantly from 42% in the previous year. Approximately 40% of new database members received a list but did not take any action, 8% attempted to contact matches doubling last year’s figure, and only 3% actually formed carpools.

![Reception and use of match information by Database Members](chart)

Figure 40: Reception and use of match information by Database Members
To maximize the percentage of people using the list, Commuter Services should focus on the following items:

1. Re-examine the product. As in 1999, 40% of the people receive names but fail to take any action suggests that there could be something inhibiting them from taking action. For the third year in a row, the quality of the list has received the lowest rating of effectiveness by database members.

2. Conduct qualitative research (e.g. focus groups) with database members to identify factors that encourage or prohibit use of the matchlist. If database members understand the steps necessary to form a carpool, what is preventing them from taking the initiative to act?

3. Re-examine Commuter Services' level of assistance in the formation of carpools from matchlists. Do database members require greater assistance and follow-up to form carpools?
Commuter Services Database members were also asked to subjectively evaluate Commuter Services performance in a number of different areas based on their experiences. These results are shown below:

**Figure 41: Ratings of Commuter Services by Database Members**

As in previous years, the lowest scores continue to come on the usefulness of the information and the quality of the lists. Commuter Services can control the quality of the list by making sure the people on it are still interested in the service at periodic intervals, and ensuring that the addresses and telephone numbers are up-to-date. However, some elements, such as the quantity of matches provided, are to a large extent beyond Commuter Services control.

As a rule of thumb in these types of surveys, a result of 7.0-7.2 indicates a reasonably good score. Commuter Services should, however, focus more on improving the subjective performance scores.
than on the absolute levels of those scores.

Finally, Commuter Services database members were asked if they would recommend Commuter Services to other people seeking assistance in carpooling or vanpooling. Commuter Services results dropped 3% from the prior year with 75% of the database members probably or definitely would recommend Commuter Services to others.

**Figure 42: How Database Members would recommend Commuter Services to others**
b. Local Business Evaluation

Business HRDs provided information about their previous interactions with Commuter Services. These are presented in summary below:

![South Florida Businesses' Interaction with Commuter Services](image)

**Figure 43: South Florida Businesses' Interaction with Commuter Services**

The proportion of businesses contacted by Commuter Services dropped 8% in 2000 after a 19% increase between 1998 and 1999. The proportion of businesses saying they had received a presentation from Commuter Services fell by 1%. Specific future goals should be set to reach higher levels for all of the categories listed above.
Businesses were also asked to provide a rating, on a 1-10 scale, of their perception of the effectiveness of Commuter Services activities. The mean score was 4.7 on the 1-10 scale among those who provided a rating. The ratings were distributed as shown below.

Approximately 82% of businesses were not familiar with Commuter Services, and of the 18% that did rate Commuter Services' effectiveness, almost half (8%) reported that the agency was "not at all" effective.
Figure 45: Employer ratings of the usefulness of Commuter Services information:
VIII. Park and Ride Analysis

A portion of the 2000 evaluation of Commuter Services was to update information on the current use and potential interest in using Park & Ride (P&R) lots in the South Florida area. A series of questions were asked about awareness of park and ride lots, whether or not P&R was used, and if P&R were available with certain amenities at a convenient distance (1 mile or less from home) what the likelihood of using P&R would be.

The first issue is awareness of the lots. This question was asked in two stages: Were residents aware of a P&R lot within 5 miles of their home, and if not, were they aware of a P&R lot between their home and worksite. The results are indicated in the chart below.

Overall, 37% of residents are aware of park & ride lots, mainly within 5 miles of their home. There is, of course, no way to verify if this is true since we do not know the exact locations of respondent residences.
The data are consistent with prior studies. No major changes in awareness were indicated in this study.

By county, the results are similar but show declines in awareness in some areas.

![Figure 47 - Awareness of park & ride lots among Broward County commuters](chart)

**Figure 47** - Awareness of park & ride lots among Broward County commuters
Awareness of Park & Ride lots among Miami-Dade County commuters

Figure 48 - Awareness of park & ride lots among Miami-Dade County commuters

Awareness of Park & Ride lots among Palm Beach County commuters

Figure 49 - Awareness of park & ride lots among Palm Beach County commuters
Broward county in particular has had a decline in awareness of P & R lots.

Use of the lots remains extremely limited but is slowly rising. About 8% of residents indicate that they use park and ride lots as often as once per year, and about 2% use them once per week or more.

A relatively large proportion of residents say that they would use an "ideal" park and ride lot if it were located within one mile of their home. The way these lots were described is:

The city is considering building new park and ride lots. These lots would be located in or near residential neighborhoods. There is no cost to park at these lots. You can use the park and ride lots to park your car and take an express bus to downtown Miami or Fort Lauderdale, or meet with carpoolers or vanpoolers to ride to work. They have 24-hour security, and offer services such as banking, grocery stores, dry cleaners and day care on the premises. If there were a park and ride lot located within one mile of your home, how likely would you be to use the park and ride lot to carpool, vanpool, or ride transit to work at least once per week?

The results are shown in the chart on the next page:
Figure 50 - South Florida commuters likelihood of using "ideal" park & ride lots

By county, the results show that Miami-Dade County residents appear to be much more interested in using the lots, and currently already use them more frequently.
Broward County commuters likelihood of using “ideal” park & ride lots

Figure 51- Broward County commuters likelihood of using "ideal" park & ride lots

Miami-Dade County commuters likelihood of using “ideal” park & ride lots

Figure 52- Miami-Dade County commuters likelihood of using "ideal" park & ride lots
A demographic analysis of the data shows that awareness of P&R lots is much lower among Hispanics (25% to 42% for non-Hispanics) and among residents in the area who have incomes between $10,000 and $30,000 (29% to 39%).

As with last year, it appears that there is a reasonably high level of interest in expanding Park & Ride lots, particularly for lower-income residents of Miami-Dade County. Further research should be conducted to determine feasibility of developing P&R lots in those areas and promoting their use to the indicated target groups.
IX Analysis of HOV Lane Perception

In 1995, an initial study of HOV lane awareness, perception, and attitudes was conducted. Some follow-up questions to this survey were done in 1999 and 2000 for trending purposes.

There appears to be a slow but steady increase in the number of people that believe HOV do provide a significant speed advantage. 59% said the lanes provide at least “faster” travel for commuters, compared to 53% last year and 51% in 1995.

![South Florida commuters perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes](image)

*Figure 54- South Florida commuters perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes*
Broward County commuters' perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twice as fast</th>
<th>Significantly faster</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Slower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 55- Broward County commuters' perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes
Figure 56 - Miami-Dade County commuters perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes

Figure 57 - Palm Beach County commuters perception of travel speed improvement when using HOV lanes
This trend is more pronounced in Palm Beach County than in other counties. Given the continued negative press that HOV lanes receive, it is very encouraging to see the value of the lanes mounting in the public's estimation.
X. Characteristics of Commuter Services’ Database Members and General Public

The research suggests that demographic characteristics are not determining factors on whether the individual will be influenced by Commuter Services or use an alternative mode. The only notable variations are the relationships between certain levels of income and age and the use of an alternative mode and the influence of Commuter Services.

The charts below show overall demographic breakdowns for groups where Commuter Service information had no influence on mode choice compared to those for whom Commuter Services’ information did have influence on mode choice. Also shown are demographic breakdown for non-users of commute alternatives in the Commuter Services database versus those who are regular users. Thus, for instance, 25% of those for whom the information had no influence on mode choice are single. 27% of those for whom the information had influence are single. 24% of non-users of commute alternatives are single, and 22% of regular users of commute alternatives are single.

Database members who were influenced by Commuter Services’ information are less likely to be between 25 and 44 (47% to 55% of those who were not influenced by Commuter service’s information) but more likely to be between 45 and 64 (42% to 33%) and those who use alternative modes are less likely to be aged between 25 and 44 (42% to 53% - an 11% difference) but more likely to be between the ages of 45 and 64 (45% to 35% - a 10% difference). In terms of income, database members that were influenced were less likely to earn between $30,000 and $39,999 (9% difference) and those who are alternative mode users are also less likely to earn between $30,000 and $39,999 (9% difference).

The following tables show demographic characteristics of Commuter Services database members. Four groups are shown:

1. Database members for whom Commuter Services’ information was of no influence on mode choice,
2. Database members for whom Commuter Services’ information influence mode choice,
3. Database members who do not use an alternative mode, and
4. Database members who are regular users of an alternative mode.
Table 4: Demographic characteristics of Commuter Services Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have children under 6</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have children 6 to 16</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school degree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/ Technical School</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college/associate degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>Regular User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>Regular User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-59,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-69,999</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $70,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. General Public: Users versus non-users of alternative modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Non-User</th>
<th>User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Non-User</td>
<td>User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-19,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-59,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-69,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $70,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. Recommendations

General Public

- Advertising efforts should focus on increasing the awareness of Commuter Services programs and the Ride Number among the lower-income populations. Awareness among individuals with income levels below $20,000 continues to be lower compared to individuals of higher income levels. From the surveys, correlations indicate a substantially higher incidence of use of carpooling and transit among lower income households. Commuter Services should continue their efforts to reach the Hispanic population within their service area until Hispanic awareness levels reach equality with non-Hispanic awareness levels. There was a 12% increase in awareness among Hispanics since 1999, but non-Hispanic levels continue to be higher. Efforts should also aim on reaching lower-income Hispanics and focus in Miami-Dade County, where the majority of the Hispanics reside. (See Pages 37-38)

  - Commuter Services should consider the following tactics, related to the “4 P’s” of marketing to better target low-income commuters:
    - Target place by distributing information to places likely to be frequented by low-income commuters, such as discount grocery stores or government assistance offices. Also, use Spanish AM radio in drive time.
    - Target promotion by communicating benefits to more closely tie in to the interests of low-income commuters. For instance, focus on money-saving as opposed to reducing commuter stress.
    - Also, focus communications on the fact that this is a free service, i.e. a low price service
    - Make sure the product is delivered in a way that fits the needs of low-income commuters. Is literacy a problem? Perhaps redesign materials to use more pictures and simpler language.

Commuter Services should investigate the use of social marketing techniques to better target these segments of the population and discover innovative means of disseminating the information to these hard-to-reach populations.
• Commuter Services should continue to hold Emergency Ride Home (ERH) registration days at rail and bus stations. In 2000, 53% of bus/train users reported that the ERH program influenced their mode choice. This suggests that many might have stopped using bus or rail had the ERH program not been available. The ERH program is not only an incentive to use an alternative mode, but it also provides a reward for those who already use an alternative mode, such as the bus or train. Also, ERH provides a good way to retain alternative mode users. It is always cheaper to retain an existing customer (or alternative mode user) than to use promotions to get a new one. The increased use of bus and train by database members suggests that ERH registration days at bus and train stations are a good way to increase the value of ERH to South Florida commuters.

Commuter Services Database Members

• It is recommended that Commuter Services conduct qualitative research with current database members (e.g. focus groups) to identify:
  o How and why commuters use the matchlists
  o Factors that inhibit use of the matchlist to form carpools.

As in 1999, 40% of database members received a matchlist but failed to take any action. Furthermore, the quality of the list has received the lowest rating for the third year in a row (1998 average rating: 6.5; 2000 average rating: 6.0).

• 9% of database members heard about Commuter Services from friends, second only to T-Days (49%). Additionally, 47% of all database members said they would ‘definitely’ recommend Commuter Services to a friend. In order to take more advantage of this avenue of distribution, Commuter Services should regularly provide database members with information and marketing materials to give to friends or neighbors. Commuter Services could also develop incentives for database members to register friends. For example, transit passes or additional emergency rides could be used as rewards.

This approach may help to provide Commuter Services with more ‘Origin end’ marketing of commute alternatives, to compliment the ‘Destination end’ tactics of using T-Days at employer locations.
South Florida Businesses

- Commuter Services should continue to organize Transportation Days (T-Days) at South Florida businesses to increase awareness of alternative commute modes. Almost half of database members learn of Commuter Services through T-Day events. T-Days are useful because they concentrate recruitment at a common destination end of the work trip and target those commuters most interested in commute alternatives.

- Commuter Services should continue to seek increases in participation rates and the percent of businesses offering flextime, compressed workweeks, and telecommuting. These alternatives are those most desired by commuters, as determined in the CUTR report *A Market based Approach to Effective TDM Program Design*, an FDOT research idea project. These alternatives are particularly helpful to businesses in managing parking needs, as they reduce parking and office space requirements. In order to implement this program, Commuter service should:
  - Assess current staff knowledge of these programs
  - Keep abreast of developments in CUTR’s *TDM Marketing* project for FDOT, where toolkits for telecommuting implementation are being developed.

- Commuter Services should continue to work closely with local businesses to increase awareness of Commuter Services and alternative commute programs. Presentations at businesses should emphasize the Commuter Choice program. Commuter Services could also establish workshops on *Commuter Choice* to teach employers how implement and maintain a program at their workplace. Commuter choice provides tax benefits under IRS Code section 132(f). Telecommuting, flextime, and compressed work weeks could also be instructional seminar topics.

- Commuter Services should focus on businesses that report parking shortages and increased traffic congestion. While businesses may not perceive the absence of commute alternative programs as a problem, parking shortages and traffic congestion are tangible and have a direct effect on the “bottom line.” Commuter Services’ programs should be marketed as potential solutions to these tangible problems. A list of businesses that reported parking shortages or increased traffic congestion is listed in the Appendix.
The purpose of collecting this information was primarily to measure the changes from the 1999 levels of performance, and to assist in the appropriate setting of goals for future evaluation periods. With the information provided in this report, and particularly in the performance measures report that accompanies this document, Commuter Services should be able to set meaningful, measurable goals for performance in 2001 and future years.

This process should follow the guidelines set forth in CUTR’s Strategic Marketing for Mobility Managers seminar. In brief, the goal setting process should take the following form:

1. FDOT and Commuter Services should review program direction and determine which of the goals listed in the performance measures report are most relevant to Commuter Services' current direction.
2. FDOT and Commuter Services should select the performance measures within those goals that are most appropriate.
3. Commuter Services should select target levels for those performance measures that reflect a reasonable level of performance improvement, to be approved by FDOT. For those performance measures where the data is derived from survey results, target levels should be set in one of two ways:
   - minimum performance levels which, when measurements are taken will have a 95% probability of having been met - i.e., there will be a 95% probability that the true measure is at or above the target level, or
   - statistically significant increases from baseline levels.

CUTR will be available to assist in the goal selection and target level setting processes.
Appendices

Business reporting congestion worse than a year ago
Business reporting more employees than parking spaces
Commuter Survey
Database member Survey
Employer Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Henao</td>
<td>Sunbeam TV Corp</td>
<td>1401 79th Street Causeway</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Crawford</td>
<td>Sonesta Beach</td>
<td>350 Ocean Drive</td>
<td>Key Biscayne</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph E. Silerstein</td>
<td>Walmart #1517</td>
<td>300 W Copans Rd</td>
<td>Pompano Bch</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Nuttal</td>
<td>Media Printing</td>
<td>4300 N Powerline Rd</td>
<td>Pompano Bch</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge M Millan</td>
<td>City of Hialeah Gardens</td>
<td>10001 NW 87th Ave</td>
<td>Hialeah Gardens</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Alejandre</td>
<td>Riverside Care Center</td>
<td>899 NW 4st</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Craycraft</td>
<td>B &amp; L Service, Inc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 950</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazara Marchante</td>
<td>Kendall Medical Ctr</td>
<td>11750 Bird Rd</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Everingham</td>
<td>Merrill-Stevens Dry Dock Co</td>
<td>1270 NW 11st</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda J. Montigny</td>
<td>Life Care Home Health Service Corp</td>
<td>800 NW 17th Ave</td>
<td>Delray Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Mahon</td>
<td>Oriole Homes</td>
<td>1690 S Congress Ave</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Fisher</td>
<td>Fisher-Clark Construction</td>
<td>3600 Investment Lane #101</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Shayton</td>
<td>Palace Gardens</td>
<td>1351 N Krome Ave</td>
<td>Aventura</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Weber</td>
<td>Holiday Inn</td>
<td>1711 N University Dr</td>
<td>Boynton Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ximena Elguera</td>
<td>Coscan Homes</td>
<td>20803 Biscayne Blvd Suite 103</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Glynn</td>
<td>Embassy Suites Hotel</td>
<td>4350 PGA Blvd</td>
<td>WPB</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikey Froehlicher</td>
<td>SDSBS</td>
<td>2139 PB Lakes Blvd</td>
<td>Ft Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilma Rodriguez</td>
<td>Village of Palm Springs</td>
<td>226 Cypress Lane</td>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Ansell</td>
<td>CRC Press</td>
<td>2000 NW Corporate Blvd</td>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Newcomer</td>
<td>Alterman Transport</td>
<td>12805 NW 42 Ave</td>
<td>Opalocka</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Fidel</td>
<td>O'Pelle Enterprise</td>
<td>1501 SW 5th Court &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Machin</td>
<td>Epworth Village</td>
<td>5300 W 16th Ave</td>
<td>Hialeah</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Grant-Brown</td>
<td>YMCA of South Broward</td>
<td>3161 Taft St</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Coleman</td>
<td>Kendale Lakes Elem</td>
<td>8000 SW 142 Ave</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliana Martinez</td>
<td>The Palace at Kendall Nursing/Rehab Cent</td>
<td>11215 SW 84 st</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Throckmartou</td>
<td>Pollo Tropical</td>
<td>7300 N Kendall Dr, 8th FL</td>
<td>Hialeah</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Southern Winds Hospital</td>
<td>4225 West 20 Ave</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lefebvre</td>
<td>Recourse Communications</td>
<td>1655 Palm Beach Lake Blvd #600</td>
<td>WPB</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C Eddy</td>
<td>City of Miami</td>
<td>444 SW 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miami Springs Sr High</td>
<td>751 Dove Ave</td>
<td>Miami Springs</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny O'Neill</td>
<td>Brazilian Court Hotel</td>
<td>301 Australian Ave</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Keegan</td>
<td>FPMC</td>
<td>851 Jupiter Park Ln</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Thompson</td>
<td>Publix Supermarket</td>
<td>3740 West Hillsboro Blvd</td>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo Scalia</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>8300 W Sunrise Blvd</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. roseburr</td>
<td>Plantation Middle</td>
<td>6600 W. Sunrise Blvd</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. gaffor</td>
<td>United Home Care Services, Inc.</td>
<td>5255 NW 8th Avenue suite 400</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Flores</td>
<td>First national bank of South Miami</td>
<td>5750 Sunset drive</td>
<td>South Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cherry</td>
<td>City of Coconut Creek Public Works Depar</td>
<td>Coconut Creek</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle A. Cormier</td>
<td>Land 'N' Sea</td>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Tulloch</td>
<td>Baptist Hospital of Miami</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Haddad</td>
<td>Rexall Sundown</td>
<td>Deerfield Bch</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Torres</td>
<td>St Ives Inc</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Afforte</td>
<td>McDermott Will &amp; Emory</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Lagraves</td>
<td>Office of the State Attorney, 17th Circu</td>
<td>Ft. Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Gayheart</td>
<td>Pilot Training</td>
<td>Virginia Gardens</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Gipe, President</td>
<td>Evans Environmental</td>
<td>Miami Lakes</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S Kwiatkowski</td>
<td>Greenberg Training</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Schaltz</td>
<td>The Ages Group</td>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Day</td>
<td>ADECCO Employment</td>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Baker</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Ramirez-Lopez</td>
<td>Wyndham Biscayne Bay</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyne Boyer</td>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Joyner</td>
<td>Aon Group</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Burne</td>
<td>Sensormatic</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Raitt</td>
<td>Pontoc</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Alexander</td>
<td>Royal Bank of Canada</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.P. Demos</td>
<td>A.P. Demos P.A.</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Siceloff</td>
<td>MIF</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilio Alvarez</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Mathis, Inc.</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Soman</td>
<td>Kennedy-Wilson</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Zuhlke</td>
<td>Swiss Chalet Fine Foods</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Piramon Charoewyao</td>
<td>Thailand Trade Ctr</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Stevens</td>
<td>HPSF</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Harmon</td>
<td>Donors Forum</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Sacher Zelnan</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Unanue</td>
<td>Pacific Photocopy</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kissel</td>
<td>Goya Foods of Fla</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigi Laudisio</td>
<td>Catholic Cemeteries</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustafo Londono</td>
<td>Switchboard of Miami</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Danner</td>
<td>ACIF</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Rocheran</td>
<td>Kane, Hoffam &amp; Danner</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Strube</td>
<td>Everglades Hotel</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Henderson</td>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Angulo</td>
<td>Caterpillar</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Peterson</td>
<td>Seaboard Marine</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace J Grout</td>
<td>White &amp; Case LLP</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan White</td>
<td>Opus South</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Parker</td>
<td>DASA</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company/Office</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Unanue</td>
<td>Goya Foods of Fla</td>
<td>1900 NW 92nd Ave</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kissel</td>
<td>Catholic Cemeteries</td>
<td>11411 NW 25st</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Londono</td>
<td>ACIF</td>
<td>6800 NW 72 St</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Rocheran</td>
<td>Everglades Hotel</td>
<td>244 Biscayne Blvd</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Kujawa</td>
<td>Pam American Hospital</td>
<td>One SE Third Ave 17th Floor</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan White</td>
<td>Opus South</td>
<td>8350 Doral Boulevard</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Parker</td>
<td>DASA</td>
<td>1444 Biscayne Blvd Suite 240</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commuter Survey
SOUTH FLORIDA RIDESHARE STUDY
WAVE III

(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 Broward/Miami-Dade/Palm Beach county 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  -   1  CONTINUE
No   -   2  ASK FOR THAT PERSON AND REPEAT INTRO

RECORD GENDER:
1c. Male  1  (QUOTA 50%)
      Female  2  (QUOTA 50%)

2. Do you currently hold more than one job?

Yes  1  (Please answer the questions in this survey with respect to your primary job.)
No   2

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  | 1  | (CONTINUE WITH Q.4c) |
   | No   | 2  | (SKIP TO Q.4e IF APPLICABLE) |

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 = 0.3, 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
6. 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 - 1 (CONTINUE WITH Q.5c)
No - 2 (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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household members</th>
<th>01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-household relatives</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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")

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 ________________) 97

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 1  
   No 2  
   Don't know 8  
   Refused 9

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 1  
   No 2  
   Don't know 8  
   Refused 9
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 1
   No 2
   Don’t know 8
   Refused 9

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 1
   No 2
   Don’t know 8
   Refused 9

16a. On your way to or from work, do you ever stop to run errands, such as shopping, banking, or dropping somebody off, or do you always drive straight to and from work?
   
   Stop 1
   Straight to work/home 2 – SKIP TO 16D
   Don’t know 8 – SKIP TO 16D
   Refused 9 – SKIP TO 16D

16b. On average, how many days per week do you make a stop on the way to or from work?
   
   (Record exact number: ____ times per week or ____ times per month; don’t know = 99)
16c. And what do you stop to do? (probe: what else?) *record up to 3 mentions*

- Shop 1
- Banking 2
- Get Gas 3
- Drop off kids at school 4
- Drop off carpooler/friend 5
- Pick up carpooler/friend 6
- Post Office 7
- Doctor/dentist 8
- Visit friends/family 9
- Eat/get food 10
- Go to dry cleaners 11
- Exercise 12
- Other (Specify) 13

16d. 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 1
- No 2
- Don’t know 8
- Refused 9

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 1
- No 2
- Don’t know 8
- Refused 9

**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 1
- No 2
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 q20

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

18d. 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 1  CONTINUE
No 2  SKIP TO Q.26
Don’t know 8  SKIP TO Q.26
Refused 9  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

l. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day 12
m. Employer 13
n. Other (SPECIFY: __________________) 97
o. Dk/Ref 99
22. What message do you recall from this advertising? (DO NOT READ LIST)

None 01
That one should rideshare why? 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 97

23. Did you try carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it, or not?

Yes 1  SKIP TO Q.26
No  2  CONTINUE
Don’t know 8  CONTINUE
Refused 9  CONTINUE

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

Yes 1  SKIP TO Q.26
No  2  CONTINUE
Don’t know 8  CONTINUE
Refused 9  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 1
No 2
Don’t know 8
Refused 9
26. Have you heard of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUE

27. Which organizations have you heard of? (DO NOT READ LIST)

**South Florida Commuter Services or Commuter Services**  
_Or Gold Coast Commuter Services_  

- 1-800-234-Ride
- 525-Ride
- 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
- Tri-rail Shuttle
- Civic Center TMO
- Miami Beach TMA
- South Florida Education Center TMA
- Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
- Downtown Miami TMA
- Free T-Shirt people
- "Hang up your Keys" People
- Airport West TMI
- VPSI
- Miami-Dade County Vanpool Program
- Transportation Management Organizations (unspecified)
- South Florida Vanpool program
- Other specify__________________________

01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
97

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

28. Have you ever heard of South Florida Commuter Services, or not? (Probe: Have you ever heard of Gold Coast Commuter services, or not?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Have you ever heard of any commuter information numbers such as '1-800-234-Ride', or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF CODE 02 OR CODE 03 MENTIONED IN Q.27 THEN SKIP Q.29

30. Have you ever contacted South Florida Commuter Services, the 1-800-234-Ride number or some other group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>SKIP TO Q.D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Who did you contact?

South Florida or Gold Coast Commuter Services 01
1-800-234-RIDE 02
Other specify ___________________________ 97

***new questions***

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?

Yes 1 (Skip to 34) no 2 Don't Know/refused 99 (skip to 34)
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)

Have the opportunity 1  
Don't have opportunity 2  
Don't know/refused 99

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

1. Twice as fast or more than people traveling in non-carpool lanes  
2. Significantly faster but not twice as fast  
3. At about the same time  
4. Or less quickly  
99. Don't Know/refused

Note: q19 series moved to here

35a. Park and ride lots are places where you can park your car and take an express bus or train to downtown Miami or Fort Lauderdale, or meet with other carpoolers or vanpoolers to ride to work. Are you aware of any park and ride lots that are within 5 miles of your home, or not?

Yes 1  
No 2  
Don’t know 8  
Refused 9

35b. Are you aware of any park and ride lots that are between your home and your worksite, or not?

Yes 1  
No 2  
Don’t know 8  
Refused 9

If q35a=1 or 35b=1 continue; else skip to q35d.

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

once a week or more 1  
1-3 times per month 2
35d. The city is considering building new park and ride lots. These lots would be located in or near residential neighborhoods. There is no cost to park at these lots. You can use the park and ride lots to park your car and take an express bus to downtown Miami, Fort Lauderdale, or West Palm Beach, or meet with carpoolers or vanpoolers to ride to work. They have 24-hour security, and offer services such as banking, grocery stores, dry cleaners and day care on the premises. If there were a park and ride lot located within one mile of your home, how likely would you be to use the park and ride lot to carpool, vanpool, or ride transit to work at least once per week? Would you:

- Definitely use it at least once per week 1
- Probably use it 2
- Maybe/maybe not use it 3
- Probably not use it 4
- Or definitely not use it 5
- Don't know/refused 8
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 1
- Married 2
- Divorced/Separated 3
- Widowed 4
- Refused 9

(DO NOT READ)

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

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Refused 9

NO Q.D4

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

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

- White 1
- African-American 2
- Hispanic 3
- Asian 4
- American Indian 5
- Other, Specify: 0
- (DO NOT READ) Refused 9

D6. Please stop me when I read the category that contains your age?

- 18 - 24 years old 1
- 25 - 34 2
- 35 - 44 3
- 45 - 54 4
- 55 - 64 5
- 65 or older 6
- (DO NOT READ) Refused 9
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 1998?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey.

Verify:

Name: ____________________________

Phone Number: ____________________
Database Member Survey
Commuter Services Evaluation Rideshare Database Survey (List)

WAVE IV

new**
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 Broward/Miami-Dade/Palm Beach county area. We are not attempting to sell you anything, we are only interested in your opinions.

**new

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

A. Are you currently working outside the home, or are you attending school?
(If ONLY attending school, replace word work with word school in questions 1, 14, 14a, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 26a, 32, 34, 34a, 40, 42, 42a, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 49a, 51, 52, 53, 54)

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?

   Yes 1
   No 2 - SKIP TO Q.5
   Don't Know/Refused 9 - SKIP TO Q.5
4. Which organizations have you heard of? (probe: any others?) *(ALL THAT APPLY) *(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>Gold Coast Commuter Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-800-234-Ride</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-Ride</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>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DO NOT ASK Q.5 IF Q.4-a MENTIONED

5. Have you ever heard of Commuter Services? (If no, probe: “how about South Florida Commuter Services?” if no again probe “how about Gold Coast Commuter Services?”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Commuter Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast Commuter Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Have you ever heard of the commuter information numbers "1-800-234-RIDE", or not?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How did you hear about Commuter Services? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Newspaper</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Radio</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Television</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. At work</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. In the mail</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. On billboards</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. On road signs</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Received a phone call</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. At bus stop/on a bench</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. On the side of buses/vans</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Friends/co-workers/relatives</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Employer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Telephone book/Yellow Pages</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Other (SPECIFY: )</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Dk/Ref</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How did you hear about the commuter information number?

   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
   l. Commuter Fair/Special event/transportation day 12
   m. Employer 13
   n. Telephone book/Yellow Pages 14
   o. Other (SPECIFY: ____________) 97
   p. Dk/Ref 99

9. Have you ever contacted Commuter Services, 1-800-234-RIDE, or any other local group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?

   Yes 1
   No 2 - SKIP TO Q.11
   Don't Know/Refused 9 - SKIP TO Q.11
10. Whom did you contact? (ALL THAT APPLY - DO NOT READ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Florida Commuter Services or Commuter Services</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast Commuter Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-800-234-Ride</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-Ride</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>“Hang up your Keys” 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>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Have you ever signed up or had your name registered with Commuter Services or the “Hang up your keys” people or some other South Florida carpool/vanpool service, or not?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Don't Know/Refused 9

SKIP TO Q.14
12. Is your name still registered with that service, or is it no longer registered?

- Yes, still registered 1 - SKIP TO Q.14
- No, not registered 2
- Don't Know/refused 9 - SKIP TO Q.14

13. Why did you decide to remove your name from that service? Any other reasons? (PROBE - DO NOT READ) (ALL THAT APPLY)

- Didn't get any use out of it 1
- Already got started in a carpool/vanpool 2
- Didn't like carpooling/vanpooling 3
- Didn't provide any names for carpooling/vanpooling 4
- Only needed for emergencies 5
- Moved 6
- Changed jobs 7
- Other reasons 8

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.

NO Q.13a

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 1 - CONTINUE
- No 2 - SKIP TO Q.15
- Don't Know/Refused 9
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: __________________ )
22. Specifically, what types of assistance or information did the agency 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 Emergency Ride Home program
- Tips on what to do next to start carpooling/vanpooling
- Information about the commuter club

Other (SPECIFY: ________________ )

Information about Tri-Rail
Don't know/Refused

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

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

b. Information about the Emergency Ride Home program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. A list of potential carpool or vanpool PARTNERS;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF Q.23c=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 1
No 2

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

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

Yes 1 skip to q. 25
No 2

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 1 - CONTINUE
No 2 - SKIP TO Q.24
Don't Know/Refused 9
24y. When you drove to work, did you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car?

Yes 1 - SKIP TO Q.24a INSTRUCTION
No 2 - GO TO Q.32

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

Yes 1
No 2 - SKIP TO Q.32
Don't Know/Refused 9

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 1
No 2 - SKIP TO Q.29
Don't Know/Refused 9

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
29. About how long were you in your carpool?
   _____ Days _____ Weeks _____ Months _____ Years

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  1
   No  2
   Don't Know/Refused  9
   SKIP TO Q.40

33. Are you still vanpooling?
   Yes  1
   No  2
   Don't Know/Refused  9
   SKIP TO Q.37

34. About how many days per week are you vanpooling both to and from work?

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 1
No 2 - SKIP TO Q.46
Don't Know/Refused 9

40a. Would that be the bus or the train?

Bus 1
Train 2

41. Are you still riding the (bus/train)?

Yes 1
No 2 - SKIP TO Q.44
Don't Know/Refused 9

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
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 1
    No 2  - GO TO Q.53
    Don’t Know/Refused 9

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

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

    Yes 1
    No 2  - GO TO Q.51
    Don’t Know/Refused 9

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 to and from work (q26) 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 Commuter Services influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...

Have a great deal of influence 4
A moderate influence 3
A small influence, or 2
No influence at all 1

(DO NOT READ) Don't Know/Refused 9
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 4
A moderate influence 3
A small influence, or 2
No influence at all 1

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

(DO NOT READ) Don't Know/Refused 9

IF SAMPLE=2 SKIP TO Q. 55a

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?

Yes 1
No 2
Don't know 8
Refused 9

L
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ROTATE LIST)</th>
<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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Their courtesy and professional attitude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK F ONLY IF Q.22-01 OR Q.22-03 MENTIONED OR Q.23C=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 5
- Probably recommend using this agency 4
- Maybe/maybe not recommend them 3
- Probably not recommend them 2
- or definitely not recommend them 1

(DO NOT READ) Don’t know/refused 9
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

**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
d5. What is your ethnicity? (if confused, ask "race")

White
African-American
Hispanic
Asian
American Indian
Other specify
Refused

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

18 - 24 years old
25 - 34
35 - 44
45 - 54
55 - 64
65 or older
Refused

(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 1999?

Under $10,000
$10,000 - $19,999
$20,000 - $29,999
$30,000 - $39,999
$40,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $59,999
$60,000 - $69,999
$70,000 or more
Refused

(DO NOT READ)

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey. For verification purposes, etc.

END: Thank you very much for your cooperation in this survey. Good night.
Employer Survey
Please fill out and return this survey by August 24, 2000.

1. Which of the following categories best describes your organization? (check ONE)

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
- Construction
- Transportation, Public Utilities
- Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
- Services (business, personal)
- Mining
- Manufacturing
- Wholesale
- Retail Trade
- Public Admin

2. Not including the building or corporate/industrial park where your organization is located, how many other employers are located within 2 miles? (check ONE)

- None
- 1-5
- 6 or more

3. How many employees do you have at this location? (Check ONE)

- Less than 5
- 20-49
- 50 - 99
- 500 or more

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 - 99
- 500 or more

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? (circle one number)

- Not a problem at all
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
- A major problem
- 9, 10

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 organization's employees are currently eligible for: (Put 0 if you do not offer the program)

- Flextime
- Compressed work weeks
- Telecommuting

What percentage of your organization's employees are currently participating in:

- Flextime
- Compressed work weeks
- Telecommuting

8. Please make a check mark by the statement which best describes your knowledge of South Florida Commuter Services: (Check ONE)

- a. You have heard of South Florida Commuter Services but don't know what they do
- b. You are familiar with some of South Florida Commuter Services' activities
- c. You have a working knowledge of South Florida Commuter Services' programs
- d. You have never heard of South Florida Commuter Services

CONTINUE ON OTHER SIDE
9. Please make a check mark by any of the following commuter programs of which you are aware:
(Check ALL THAT APPLY)

- Emergency Ride Carpool/Vanpool 1-800 234-RIDE Commuter Assistance Number
- Employer Assistance Employer Newsletter
- Matching Assistance Number
- (Transmissions)

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 organization has been contacted by South Florida Commuter Services
b. South Florida Commuter Services has made a presentation to your organization
c. South Florida Commuter Services' activities have had a significant impact in meeting your organization's employee transportation needs
d. Your organization will probably contact South Florida Commuter Services in the near future
e. Your organization might contact South Florida Commuter Services in the near future

11. If you have been contacted by or received information from Commuter Services, please CIRCLE THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the usefulness of the information they provide.

Not at all Useful Extremely Useful Have not received info from South Florida Commuter Services

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 0

and please CIRCLE THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of the effectiveness of their activities in providing your employees with usable and reasonable transportation options.

Not at all Effective Extremely Effective Not familiar with South Florida Commuter Services

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 0

This survey is completely anonymous and confidential. However, if you would like to receive additional information about commute alternative programs, or about the results of this survey, please provide the information listed below:
Organization: Contact Name: Address:

Would like to receive: (check all that apply)
Information about Commute Alternative programs Results of the survey

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME IN FILLING OUT THIS SURVEY. THE RESULTS WILL BE USED TO REDUCE TRAFFIC AND PARKING PROBLEMS AND IMPROVE AIR QUALITY IN THE BROWARD/MIAMI-DADE/PALM BEACH COUNTY AREA. PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE OR FAX TO 813-974-5168

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact:
Francis Cleland at CUTR (813) 974-9803, or
David Burr at Commuter Services (800) 234-RIDE