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Executive Summary

The survey results presented in this report give Gold Coast Commuter Services (GCCS) baseline figures. Future evaluations should be based on changes from these baseline figures. Other information collected includes commuter traveling behavior and advertising awareness, GCCS Database member evaluations as well as awareness, provision of programs, and evaluation of GCCS 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 GCCS database, as well as awareness of advertising among members of the general public. Businesses were asked about their awareness of GCCS and whether they provided incentives for use of commute alternatives by employees. The surveys were developed, conducted and analyzed by CUTR.

The purpose of collecting this information was primarily to set baseline 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, Gold Coast Commuter Services should be able to set meaningful, measurable goals for performance in 1998 and future years.

The goal setting process should take the following form:
- Review program direction and determine which of the goals listed in the performance measures report are most relevant to GCCS' current direction.
- Select the performance measures within those goals that are most appropriate
- Select target levels for those performance measures that reflect a reasonable level of performance improvement. For those performance measures where the data is derived from survey results, target levels should be set in one of two ways:
  - statistically significant increases from baseline levels, or
  - 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.

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

Operational recommendations from this survey are necessarily limited, since this project was intended to measure baseline levels. The recommendations that could be made are summarized at the end of the report.

The major recommendations are those related to goal-setting as reported above.
I  Background

The purpose of this report, and the companion report on performance measures baselines, is to provide baseline levels for future evaluation of the effects of activities of the Gold Coast Commuter Services Program (GCCS) in the South Florida area. The report also provides GCCS with a travel behavior profile of commuters in the area and within the GCCS database. An additional objective was to use the information from the surveys to provide some operational recommendations for the GCCS program. The report is based on the results of surveys conducted in the area with the general public, with members of the GCCS database, and with local employers. GCCS area of responsibility includes Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach counties in South Florida.

The data collected in this survey should serve as a baseline for future evaluations of GCCS. Future surveys of the public and GCCS 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 GCCS Service area:

a. Survey of the general public.

Three hundred commuters in the GCCS service area were interviewed by telephone and asked about their current commuting habits and their awareness of GCCS. Sample for this survey was developed using a Random-Digit-Dialing technique, and should therefore be adequately representative of the region’s commuter population. The interviews were conducted by Intersearch Corporation of Horsham, Pennsylvania. The cooperation rate (analogous to a response rate) was approximately 52.5% of eligible respondents.

b. Survey of members of the GCCS Database.

The Rideshare Database survey was performed using sample provided by GCCS. Two hundred and thirteen (213) members of the commuter database were interviewed by telephone. Of those interviewed, however, 48 (or 22.5%) indicated that they had never heard of Gold Coast Commuter Services nor had they ever signed up with a commuter assistance program. This was sufficient to terminate the interviews, as further questions regarding interaction with Gold Coast would have been pointless.

A subsequent check of the database file was conducted by merging the original database file with a second file that should have only held confirmed database members. This procedure revealed that 15.6% of database members were indeed supposed to be deactivated because they did not want to be members of the database.
Furthermore, for the purposes of projecting results from these interviews to the entire database, the effective database size was adjusted from 835 records (the original sample sent to CUTR by GCCS) to 724 (the total number of confirmed database members, including employees of Gold Coast Commuter Services and the Florida Department of Transportation). GCCS and FDOT employees were not interviewed as part of the evaluation based on potential bias that might be introduced into the interviews. However, they are included in the calculations of overall impact of GCCS activities within the ridesharing database.

One hundred and sixty-five (165) database members (who either had heard of Gold Coast 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 GCCS. For the purposes of calculating confidence intervals and so forth, this is equivalent to a sample size of 213 because of the small total size of the database (724 total members).

The overall cooperation rate among database members was 84%. These interviews were also conducted by Intersearch Corporation.

c. Survey of local businesses

In total, 1,190 surveys were mailed to Human Resource Directors (HRDs) of employers in the GCCS Service area. The employers selected were located within the three-county area of Palm Beach, Broward, and 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 GCCS 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.

In total, 199 surveys were returned. Also, 23 surveys were returned with bad addresses. The overall response rate was approximately 17%. This response rate is rather low, but not unexpected for a non-pre-recruited and non-follow-up mail survey to local business executives. A (substantially more expensive) procedure that could be followed to encourage higher response rates would include pre-notification, survey distribution, individual identification of each survey so that returns could be tracked, follow-up by phone with companies that had not returned surveys, and an offer to collect the data by phone if that would be more convenient for the respondent.

An in-depth analysis of the returns by employer size and category (based on Standard Industrial
Classification (SIC) codes) is included. While responses by SIC code for survey respondents did not match up with the full sample of businesses, CUTR did not reweight the survey for reasons explained later.

d. Analytical approach

GCCS 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, GCCS 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 GCCS 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 GCCS database
- Trips and Vehicle Miles reduced (based on survey responses)
- Awareness of GCCS’s messages
- Awareness of GCCS, including business community awareness and understanding
- Number of commuters contacting GCCS and joining the GCCS database
- Alternative commuting arrangements provided by the business community
- Database members' and business community evaluation of GCCS
- Opportunities for GCCS to implement new programs within the business community

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

a. General Public

It is extremely important to capture data from “occasional” users of commute alternatives. It is unlikely that a large number of commuters who currently drive alone to work can be completely converted to using alternatives. Studies conducted by CUTR in Orlando and in the Tampa Bay area, for example, indicate that while most commuters use their vehicles during their commute to perform some basic functions (shopping, banking, etc.), the majority do not do so every day of the week. A clear opportunity exists to convert at least some of those commuters to occasional ridesharing. If 25% can be convinced to share a ride just once per week, the net overall vehicle reduction would be a full 5%, which would have a substantial effect on traffic congestion.

Part-time use of commute alternatives represents the degree of market penetration. As the following chart shows, more than 17% of South Florida area commuters use some form of alternative commute at least once per week. This includes 13.2% that carpool and 3.3% that use transit.

Baseline data for comparison purposes are generally not available. Census data collected in 1990.
is now seven years old. Also, census journey-to-work mode choice data is compiled from a single question on how the respondent journeys to work, without respect to frequency or use of multiple modes.

In terms of total commute trips, the results are a bit lower - 8% of all work-related trips are conducted in carpools, and 3% using transit. A comparison to the percentage of commuters in the previous chart shows clearly that many commuters are not using commute alternatives for all of their trips.

![Percent of Trips made by South Florida Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes](chart.png)
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. Over one-third of all users of commute alternatives identified themselves as occasional users.

Since one of GCCS's ultimate 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
5. Maximize use/Increase frequency of use among those who try product and stick with it

GCCS must continually attempt either to increase the number of people who try commute alternatives and/or increase the frequency of use (or the duration of use) of the alternatives. 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 results are summarized in the chart above.

The first chart on Page 7 shows that close to one out of three people in the service area have at least tried ridesharing.
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 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 301 valid responses in the survey of South Florida residents for this analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total annual trip and VMT statistics per commuter - Entire Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total labor force over 16 not working at home (1990 Census - Journey to Work) = 1,856,345; by County: Broward 588,089; Dade 887,9967; Palm Beach 380,260.

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 17.5 by the total number of commuters, or 1,856,345.

Prior data on these measures do not exist. These data points can serve as a baseline for future trending efforts. These data can also be used in the development of several performance measures, using other information such as the GCCS budgets to determine costs per trip provided. Those performance measures are presented in a separate report.
b. GCCS Database Members

Since database members have already shown a high level of interest in use of alternative commute modes by contacting GCCS, database members should have a much higher proportion of use of alternative modes than the general public. This hypothesis is clearly borne out by the survey results, as shown below.
The same results hold true for the percentage of trips conducted using alternative modes. Substantially more trips are made using alternative modes by database members than by members of the general public.

% of Trips made by South Florida Commuters and GCCS Database Members Using Alternative Commute Modes
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The current survey indicates that 19% of commuters in the database are in a pooling arrangement. A total of 31.6% use commute alternatives (including transit) regularly, and a further 20% have used commute alternatives in the past.

This information provides a baseline measure of effectiveness in promoting use of alternatives within GCCS ridesharing database. Future evaluations should continue to evaluate this statistic.
Again, using the battery of questions used to determine commuting patterns, it is possible to develop 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 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 165 valid responses in the survey of GCCS Database Members (equivalent to 213 for the purposes of statistical significance, due to the small size of the total database).
This information is analyzed in two ways. The first is without respect to the mode that the commuters were using before they joined the GCCS 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval (+/-)</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval (+/-)</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided</th>
<th>95% Conf. Interval (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>455.3</td>
<td>169.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>601.6</td>
<td>241.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>229.2</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1286.1</td>
<td>355.9</td>
<td>120.1 provided</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced - GCCS had influence</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>671.3</td>
<td>293.4</td>
<td>59.6 Provided</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8577.1 total miles</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second takes into account the mode that commuters were using before they contacted GCCS, and thus shows only the difference between that mode and how database members commuted after contacting GCCS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean Trips Reduced</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval (+/-)</th>
<th>Mean Miles Reduced</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval (+/-)</th>
<th>Mean Trips Provided</th>
<th>95% Conf. Interval (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>443.8</td>
<td>199.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>228.9</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>963.7</td>
<td>324.5</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced - GCCS had influence</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>571.3</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td>45.4 provided</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8577.1 total miles</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>486 total trips</td>
<td>6.0</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 724 by 42.0 (if prior mode were taken into account) or 64.2 if prior mode were not taken into account.

These measures can serve as benchmarks for the next evaluation. Also, several performance measures, as detailed in the accompanying performance measures report, can be developed.
c. Types of Employers by SIC codes

The first charts show a brief description of the companies surveyed. Companies were asked to identify themselves by type, according to a generic SIC classification. The respondents had a distribution of types somewhat different from the total eligible sample, as shown in the chart below:

It should be noted particularly that companies in retail trade under-responded to the survey, whereas manufacturers over-responded. While some of the differences may be due to differences in SIC classifications between the respondents (self-reported) and the original database, it seems clear that retail trade-oriented organizations did under respond.
It would be possible to re-weight the results of the survey based on SIC codes, to account for the different levels of response. However, for the following reasons, CUTR has chosen not to do so:

1. The businesses that responded are probably those most interested in transportation issues. The conclusion that should be drawn is that retail trade organizations are less interested in transportation issues for their employees than other types of organizations. If this is the case, re-weighting the surveys would not serve any discernible purpose.

2. Only 16 responses were received from retail-oriented organizations. Even if the responses are "generally" representative of retail organizations' attitudes, the effect of any "outliers", i.e. organizations that have opinions that deviate widely from the norm for this type of organization, would be quite significant. This wouldn't be as much of a problem if the entire sample base were larger (say, 150 retail organizations). However, given the current situation, re-weighting may do as much (if not more) harm than good.

3. CUTR did examine results derived from a re-weighting procedure, and found that, for the most part, even though percentages and averages did change some, the major conclusions that would be drawn from the data would not be changed.

The majority of the responding employers are "white collar" office-related businesses, such as services, financially oriented business, and administration. There is also a large number of manufacturers in the sample.
d. Physical Characteristics of Local Businesses that affect Commuting Patterns

The survey of employers, which was addressed to the HRD at each business, included a number of measurements of physical characteristics of business which might affect commuting patterns, such as amount and cost of parking and services 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. About 11% of smaller businesses had shortages without alternative parking within 1/4 mile. Another 18% of businesses had shortages but also had alternate parking within 1/4 mile. The remainder had either about the right amount of parking or excess parking.

![Parking Availability Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Availability in relation to Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most businesses provide free parking. Only 6% of the responding organizations indicated that employees pay for parking.
Businesses were also asked what services were available within 1/4 mile of their site. The availability of certain basic services within 1/4 mile might relieve commuters of the necessity of having their cars available during the day, and thus promote use of commute alternatives. Dining establishments and banks were available for over 60% of businesses. Between 25%-40% of business had most of the remaining services (medical, dental, dry cleaners, etc.) available within 1/4 mile.
Finally, businesses were asked to describe the characteristics of the nearest bus stop, in terms of distance and whether the stop was lit, sheltered, and connected to the worksite. These results are presented in the chart below.

These data provide more of a framework of characteristics of local businesses than any sort of evaluation of GCCS. Clearly, GCCS could not be expected to reduce the amount of free parking available or to increase the number of businesses available. Where GCCS 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.
IV Awareness of Gold Coast Commuter Services and GCCS Activities and Resulting Effects on Commuting

GCCS' 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. GCCS' chosen methods of influencing behavior will be essentially three-fold:

1. Use mass media advertising to promote the idea of carpooling and vanpooling
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.

In order to determine the impact that GCCS is having in future evaluations, GCCS will need to compare the baseline data presented in this report to results from future evaluations.

The following elements are measurable from the surveys of the general public, as well as from the database survey:
- Awareness of carpool and vanpool advertising
- Content recall
- Unaided and aided awareness of GCCS and the GCCS 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 the ridesharing agency) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of South Florida Area Commuters Who Recall Carpool/Vanpool-related Advertising by Market Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recall Ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Recall Ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In absolute terms, the awareness of messages is slightly lower than awareness levels in other municipalities where CUTR has done evaluation of advertising campaigns for rideshare programs. Future evaluations, where intensive, targeted marketing efforts have been put in place, should see increases in overall awareness.
b. Source & Content Recall

Among members of the general public, the most commonly recalled source of carpool/vanpool related messages is television and billboards. It should be noted a response of “billboards” or “highway signs” may relate to the same type of sign, based on inexact respondent recall. There is a minimal amount of recall of other sources of carpool/vanpool messages.

Where South Florida Area Commuters have seen Carpool/Vanpool-related advertising
Percent of All Commuters who have seen/heard Advertising on:

- TV: 10%
- Billboards: 10%
- Newspaper: 5%
- Radio: 3%
- At Work: 1%
- All Other: 1%

It should also be noted that the messages recalled may relate to transit or any number of other messages that members of the general public have confused with carpool-vanpool related messages. This figure provides a baseline from which to measure the impact of GCCS upcoming advertising campaigns.
When message content recall is examined, it becomes clear that no coordinated, specific message is recalled. In other areas, it is common for commuters to recall that there was a message about a number that could be called for assistance. However, this message has not clearly come through from existing carpool/vanpool messages in the South Florida area.

South Florida Area Commuters
Advertising Content Recall
Percent of All Commuters who recall Messages about:

- Rideshare Saves Money: 4%
- Rideshare Saves Time: 4%
- Rideshare Number: 4%
- All Other: 5%
- No Content Recalled: 20%
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c. Awareness of GCCS and the RIDE Numbers

1. General Public

Unaided awareness of GCCS and the RIDE numbers, as determined by asking respondents, "Are you aware of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool?" is very low - around 1%.

While it might be ideal for GCCS to be 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, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect a ridesharing assistance organization to achieve top-of-mind awareness.

The basis for measurement should be aided awareness, that is, the number of people who, when prompted, will say that they have heard of GCCS. These figures are presented in the chart below:

In an evaluation of awareness of ridesharing organizations in the Tampa Bay area (with admittedly a different budget and organizational structure), awareness levels among the general
public were at about 34%. This gives GCCS an idea of what other Florida organizations have achieved after conducting focused marketing campaigns.

However, it is more important that the current figure be used as a baseline to measure future efforts than that an evaluation be made on the basis of the absolute level of awareness at this time. A future comparison using the same type of sample should show whether or not GCCS promotional efforts are having an effect of increasing awareness.

Future evaluations should be tied with annual goals to maintain or increase awareness, and examine the market to see if those goals have been achieved. Future evaluations should also set objectives for specific types of messages that are being placed into the market, and measure whether those particular messages are understood by the general public.
2. GCCS Rideshare Database

What is perhaps somewhat surprising is the low level of awareness of GCCS among database members, as shown below. In other database surveys, nearly universal awareness of the ridesharing organization is observed among database members. This may be due in part to the structure of current database member recruiting efforts, where the local TMA is seen as the sponsor of the ridesharing effort rather than GCCS. The importance of these levels of awareness is a factor that will need to be determined by GCCS and FDOT.

![Percent of Rideshare DB Members and the General Public that have Heard of GCCS and the RIDE Numbers](chart)

- General Public Unaided
- Database Unaided
- General Public Aided
- Database Aided
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GCCS database members were asked how they had heard about GCCS or the ride number rather than what messages they might have recalled. This serves to give GCCS an idea of what efforts have had the most impact among database members.

Where GCCS Database Members heard about GCCS or Ride Number

![Bar Chart]

Clearly, most of the current members were recruited through work and at special events, which may in many cases reflect the same thing - a Transportation day held at or near the database members' work site. Other sources (advertising, road signs, etc.) have had a negligible impact on current database members.
3. Local Businesses

Human Resource Directors in surveyed businesses were asked about their awareness levels of GCCS and GCCS activities. These results are presented below. 83% of businesses in the area have not heard of GCCS.

![South Florida Businesses' Familiarity with GCCS](image)

GCCS should seek to significantly decrease the percentage of businesses who are not familiar with GCCS, and increase the percentages of businesses that say they are familiar with some of GCCS activities and particularly the percentage that say they have a "sound working knowledge of GCCS programs."

For comparison purposes, a similar evaluation conducted among business in the Cleveland, Ohio area revealed an awareness level of over 80% for the local ridesharing organization.
d. Stated mode choice effects of advertising

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:

Among respondents, 2.3% (+/- 1.7%) of all commuters reported that they actually tried carpooling or vanpooling after hearing or seeing the message, and an additional 6.3% (+/- 2.7%) said they considered trying it. Only 0.3% (i.e., 1 respondent) said they tried to call a RIDE number. These are baseline figures that GCCS should target for increases in future evaluations.
e. Correlation of Advertising and GCCS Awareness and Mode Choice

1. General Public

This section deals with the potential _unstated_ effects of advertising on mode choice, which is important for reasons listed in the introduction to this section. While the source of causation is an issue to be considered (i.e., are people changing modes because of advertising, or are they more aware of the advertising because they changed modes?), there is valuable insight to be gained through examination of this relationship.

The first chart shows, for all commuters in the South Florida area, the relationship between awareness of carpool/vanpool advertising and current or past mode choice. There is actually a counter-intuitive relationship between awareness of messages and use of alternate modes at the present time. What may be occurring is that those who are in a ridesharing/alternative mode use commuting situation are effectively "tuning out" messages about ridesharing, whereas those who are not currently ridesharing (and therefore for whom the messages should have the most effect) are more likely to be aware of those messages.
For informational purposes, the percentage of those that considered carpooling/vanpooling is shown in the above chart as well. (This statistic cannot be shown for people unaware of advertising, since the question that was asked was “After seeing/hearing this advertising, did you consider trying carpooling or vanpooling?”)
f. Analysis of Provision of Incentives by Employers

Employers were asked if they provided any of the following programs: flextime, working at home, and compressed work weeks, as well as provision of shuttles, showers, bike racks, pool parking, pooling and transit subsidies, and guaranteed rides home. The results are summarized in the charts below.
Employers were asked further what types of programs not currently in place that they would consider offering. These are also summarized below:

Local business seem to be most amenable to offering programs involving prizes and other in-kind benefits for use of commute alternatives, as well as priority parking. However, only about 1 in 10 businesses shows interest in offering any specific incentive.
Employers were asked to provide information about flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting in detail. The results show the percentage of organizations that offer the programs, and average eligibility and participation in the programs.

**Percentage of Organizations With Employees Participating in Commute Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Weeks</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The figures, including the initial chart showing the types of programs that employers offer, show that about one in four businesses offer flextime (some of which probably relates to shift work - particularly for services such as hospitals, fire departments, policing/security, and so forth), and that 15% or less offer compressed work weeks and telecommuting. Participation in any of these programs is quite low.
These figures represent baselines for GCCS that should be examined in future evaluations. GCCS should seek increases in participation rates and percent of businesses offering these programs. Flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting programs will do as much to reduce traffic congestion as pooling arrangements. If GCCS does not currently have goals set for establishing these programs, CUTR strongly recommends their implementation.
g. Stated Effect of Assistance provided by GCCS on Mode Choice

GCCS staff have indicated that information provided about the Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program has been very limited. However, 35% of the database members recall having received information on the ERH program. A total of 91% recalled receiving some type of ridesharing information.

GCCS Database members were also asked what effect the ERH information and all of the information provided by GCCS as a whole had on their mode choice. The results are presented in the chart below.

Effect of Emergency Ride Home and GCCS Information on Mode Choice for GCCS Database Members
Approximately 57% of the database members were not asked how much influence the ERH program and GCCS information had on their mode choice because they never tried ridesharing (or did not recall ever contacting GCCS). For 17% of database members, however, the ERH program had at least some influence on their decision to try ridesharing, and for 22% the information they received as a whole had some influence on their decision to rideshare.

This is not, however, a particularly significant result; Instead, GCCS should focus on continuing to increase the total number of people in the GCCS database that currently use an alternative commuting arrangement, the frequency of use of that alternative, and the duration that the person stays with the alternate mode.
V. Evaluation of GCCS by Database Members and Local Businesses

a. GCCS Database Members Evaluation

Database members evaluated the performance of GCCS in two ways:
- Responding to questions about specific actions GCCS took or did not take
- Providing subjective ratings on a 1-10 scale on their satisfaction with GCCS

GCCS database members were asked what types of assistance GCCS had provided to them - Specifically, if GCCS 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).

![Assistance provided by GCCS When contacted by Database Members](chart)

The chart above shows that about one-third of the database members recall receiving ERH information. However, this has not been a focus area for GCCS to this point and it is perhaps surprising that as many as 30% of the database members say they have received this information. Only 39% recall receiving tips on how to start carpooling. This is an area where GCCS needs to achieve increases for future evaluations.
A total of 89% said they received a list or a letter stating that no matches had been found. GCCS should set a specific goal and seek to increase this percentage for future evaluations.

60% received a carpooler list, and 30% received a letter saying no matches had been found. GCCS should seek to increase the percentage receiving useable matching information by a statistically significant amount (i.e., to at least 70%-75%) for future evaluations. The chart below shows how the list, where provided, was used by members.

The most important statistic from the evaluation is the use of the list of potential matches. 77% of those who received the list did not use it. Six percent said they formed a pool with the information they received.

To maximize the percentage of people using the list, GCCS should focus on the following items:

1. The quality of the list - people who are no longer interested in the service should be inactivated from the database (but they should be kept for future marketing efforts, such as introductions of new services).

2. The number of people who receive “tips” on forming a pool, so that people are not left wondering where to start.

3. The number of people who receive a follow-up call.
Surprisingly, only 55% of database members said they had received a follow-up call. This may be a coincidence of the number of people who were registered immediately prior to the administration of the survey and the amount of manpower to conduct the follow-ups. However, it is an area where substantial improvement should be made in future evaluations.

GCCS Database members were also asked to subjectively evaluate GCCS performance in a number of different areas based on their experiences. These results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of GCCS by Database Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Not surprisingly, the lowest scores come on the usefulness of the information and the quality of the lists. GCCS 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 GCCS control.

As a rule of thumb in these types of surveys, a result of 7.0-7.2 indicates a reasonably good score. GCCS should, however, focus more on improving the subjective performance scores than on the absolute levels of those scores. These results should be used as a baseline to compare the results of future evaluations.
It should also be noted that the sample here is a random sample of all current database members who may or may not have further contact with GCCS. Future comparisons should not just resample the entire database to determine if there have been changes in GCCS performance, since many of the members of the database may not have contacted GCCS in the intervening time period. Future evaluations based on these subjective ratings should focus only on ratings given by people who are in contact with GCCS subsequent to the time of this evaluation, i.e., after August 1997.

One method GCCS can use to improve scores is to more consistently provide information to database members. The next chart shows overall satisfaction scores by whether or not certain types of information were received.

![Overall Satisfaction Rating of GCCS by Database Members](chart)

There is a marked difference between members who received information versus those who did not. There is clearly a positive effect on satisfaction from providing information promptly and consistently.
Finally, GCCS database members were asked if they would recommend GCCS to other people seeking assistance in carpooling or vanpooling. GCCS received very strong results from this question:

GCCS should set a goal to increase the percentage of people saying they would “definitely recommend” Gold Coast's commuter services.
b. Local Business evaluation

Businesses were asked about the alternative commute incentives they provided, results of which were presented in an earlier section. Businesses were also asked about whether GCCS had helped set up incentive programs, and what their overall evaluation of GCCS was. The summary chart is shown here:

[Bar chart showing:
- 52% of employers offer any programs
- 28% would consider any programs
- 7% want GCCS help for any programs
- 1% of employers say GCCS helped set up any programs]

Virtually none of the employers said that GCCS had helped in setting up the programs.
Businesses HRDs provided information about their previous interactions with GCCS. These are presented in summary below:

Only 3% of business said they had been contacted by GCCS. Since GCCS has not really begun its major marketing efforts, this provides a suitable baseline that should see marked improvement in future evaluations. Specific future goals should be set to reach higher levels for all of these categories.

Businesses were also asked to provide a rating, on a 1-10 scale, of their perception of the effectiveness of GCCS activities. Over 90% indicated that they were not familiar enough with GCCS to provide a rating. This is clearly an area where GCCS should target substantial improvements, at least in having more businesses be familiar enough with GCCS to provide ratings for future evaluations.
VI. Recommendations

As mentioned in the Executive Summary, operational recommendations from this survey are limited. This project's purpose was to set baseline levels of performance and to identify potential goal areas and performance measures for future evaluations. The major recommendation from this survey is for GCCS to conduct a goal selection and target-setting process as described in the executive summary.

However, several recommendations do arise from the process of conducting the surveys and from the results of the survey analyses:

- Future surveys of database members should be conducted on database members who joined the database after the period covered by this survey. This should be done for two reasons:
  - to avoid resurveying the same respondents
  - the more recent database members will present opinions based on GCCS performance during the evaluation period in question, reflecting any changes GCCS may have made after this evaluation.

- Future database sample should be drawn from database members who are neither set for deactivation, or members of organizations closely affiliated with GCCS (such as the local office of the Florida Department of Transportation), due to potential bias that may be introduced.

- GCCS should use caution in setting goals related to increasing awareness of GCCS among database members. Since much of the ridesharing recruitment efforts are made through coordination with local TMA's, awareness of GCCS may not be an appropriate performance measure.

- GCCS should work closely with local businesses to increase awareness of GCCS and provision of incentives for commute alternatives, and also programs such as flextime, compressed work weeks, and telecommuting.

- GCCS should seek to rapidly implement and promote the Emergency Ride Home program.

- GCCS should increase the provision of information to database members, such as tips on how to start carpooling and information about the ERH program as mentioned above.
Appendices

Commuter Survey
Database member Survey
Employer Survey
Good evening. My name is ______ and I am with ________, a market research company. This evening we are conducting a 5 minute survey on commuting and traffic issues in the Broward/Dade/Palm Beach county area. We are conducting this survey on behalf of the Florida Department of Transportation. We are not attempting to sell you anything, we are only interested in your opinions.

(Ask to speak to an adult if respondent is clearly not an adult, and repeat)

1. How many persons 18 years or older in your household work outside the home 35 or more hours per week?
   a. ____________ # persons who work full time [If 0, thank respondent and terminate interview]

   [if more than 1 person works full-time outside the household, ask:] b. Of the persons working full time, I need to speak with the person who had the most recent birthday. Would that person be you? [If "No," ask for that person and repeat intro]

QUOTA 50% MALE 50% FEMALE

2. Do you currently hold more than one job?
   a. Yes [If YES, say] Please answer the questions in this survey with respect to your primary job.
   b. No

3. How many days do you usually travel to work in a week? ___________
   [If "0" this is not a person working outside of the home: TERMINATE]

3a. And about how far is your commute, one-way, in miles? _______

4. 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, please only enter the mode used for most of the trip.]
   ["carpooling" is driving with someone else to the worksite - taking a child to school does not count as carpooling for this question]
   [When the days for all modes are added the total should equal the answer in Q.2 and definitely not exceed 7 days. When responses equal the total number of days worked, go on to q. 5]
   a. Drive alone * _______
ASK: When you drive to work, do you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car?
  Yes (continue with 4b) / No (go to 4c if applicable)

b. Carpool ______ (If >0 ask q. 6)

If 4a and 4b are >1, verify - “So you drive to work alone (4a) days per week and carpool (4b) days per week?”

c. Vanpool, that is, ride to work in
   a van with 7-14 other people ______ (If >0 ask q. 9)
d. Ride the bus to work ______ (If >0 ask q. 12)
e. Ride the train to work ______ (If >0 ask q. 13)
f. Ride a bicycle ______ (if >0 ask q. 14)
g. Walk or jog ______ (if >0 ask q. 15)
h. Do something else ______ (Specify ____________________________)

5. 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, please only enter the mode used for most of the trip.

[“carpooling” is driving with someone else from the worksite - picking up a child from school does not count as carpooling for this question]

[When the days for all modes are added the total should equal the answer in Q.2 and definitely not exceed 7 days. When responses equal the total number of days worked, go on to q. 6]

a. Drive alone ______

ASK: When you drive home from work, do you ever carpool, that is, go home from work with someone else in the car?
  Yes (continue with 5b) / No (go to 5c if applicable)

b. Carpool ______ (If >0 ask q. 6)

If 5a and 5b are >1, verify - “So you drive home alone (5a) days per week and carpool (5b) days per week?”

c. Vanpool ______ (If >0 ask q. 9)
d. Ride the bus to work ______ (If >0 ask q. 12)
e. Ride the train to work ______ (If >0 ask q. 13)
f. Ride a bicycle ______ (if >0 ask q. 14)
g. Walk or jog ______ (if >0 ask q. 15)
h. Do something else ______ (Specify ____________________________ )
ASK Q6-Q8 ONLY IF Q4B>0 OR Q5B>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?

   ___ (Record number, probe if “don’t know”)

8. With whom do you regularly carpool? (Check all mentions)

   1- Household members   2- Non-household relatives   3 - Co-workers
   4 - Neighbors          5 - Other

ASK Q9-Q11 ONLY IF Q4C>0 OR Q5C>0

9. How long have you been in your current vanpool?

   ___ Days   ___ Weeks   ___ Months   ___ Years

10. Including yourself, how many people are usually in the van when you vanpool?

    ___ (Record number, probe if “don’t know”)

11. With whom do you regularly vanpool? (Check all mentions)

    1- Household members   2- Non-household relatives   3 - Co-workers
    4 - Neighbors          5 - Other

ASK Q12 ONLY IF Q4D OR Q5D>0

12. In the past 12 months have you usually been taking the bus to or from work at least twice per week?

    1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don’t know

ASK Q13 ONLY IF Q4E OR Q5E>0

13. In the past 12 months have you usually been taking the train to or from work at least twice per week?

    1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don’t know
ASK Q14 ONLY IF Q4F>0 OR Q5F>0

14. In the past 12 months have you usually been riding your bike to or from work at least twice per week?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don't know

ASK Q15 ONLY IF Q4G>0 OR Q5G>0

15. In the past 12 months have you usually been walking or jogging to or from work at least twice per week?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don't know

ASK Q16 ONLY IF Q4B, Q4C, Q4D, Q4E, Q4F, AND Q4G = 0

16. Since the last time either you moved or your job changed locations, have you tried carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, riding the train, or walking to or from work at least once?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don't know

17. Have you heard, seen or read any advertising or other messages related to carpooling or vanpooling in the past 6 months?
   1 Yes   2 No (SKIP TO Q 26)   9 Refused/Don't know

18. Where did you see or hear this advertising? [All that apply]
   (DO NOT READ LIST)
   a. Newspaper
   b. Radio
   c. Television
   d. At work
   e. In the mail
   f. On billboards
   g. On road signs
   h. Received a phone call
   i. At bus stop/on a bench
   j. On the side of buses/vans
   k. Special event/transportation day
   l. DN/RF
19. What message do you recall from this advertising? [All that apply]
   (DO NOT READ CHOICES)
   a. None
   b. That one should rideshare [Probe for why and specify ________________]
   c. That you can call a number for car/vanpool info/the RIDE phone number
   d. Ridesharing saves time
   e. Ridesharing is less stressful
   f. Ridesharing is more enjoyable
   g. Ridesharing saves money
   h. Driving alone is a hassle
   i. Other ________________ (specify)
   j. DN/RF

20. Have you heard, seen or read any other advertising for carpooling or vanpooling in the past 6 months?
   1 Yes  2 No (SKIP TO Q. 26)  9 Refused/Don't know

21. Where did you see or hear this advertising? [All that apply]
   (DO NOT READ LIST)
   a. Newspaper
   b. Radio
   c. Television
   d. At work
   e. In the mail
   f. On billboards
   g. On road signs
   h. Received a phone call
   i. At bus stop/on a bench
   j. On the side of buses/vans
   k. Other
   l. Special event/transportation day
   m. DN/RF
22. What message do you recall from this advertising? [All that apply] (DO NOT READ CHOICES)
   a. None
   b. That one should rideshare [Probe for why and specify __________________________ ]
   c. That you can call a number for car/vanpool info/the RIDE phone number
   d. Ridesharing saves time
   e. Ridesharing is less stressful
   f. Ridesharing is more enjoyable
   g. Ridesharing saves money
   h. Driving alone is a hassle
   i. Other __________________________ (specify)
   j. DN/RF

23. Did you try carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it?
    1 Yes (SKIP TO Q. 26)  2 No  9 Refused/Don't know

24. Did you consider trying carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it?
    1 Yes (SKIP TO Q. 26)  2 No  9 Refused/Don't know

25. Did you consider contacting any organizations to get more information about carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing the advertising?
    1 Yes  2 No  9 Refused/Don't know

26. Have you heard of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool?
    1 Yes  2 No (SKIP TO Q. 28)  9 Refused/Don't know
27. Which organizations have you heard of? (All that apply)  
(DO NOT READ LIST)  
a. Gold Coast Commuter Services  
b. 1-800-234-Ride  
c. 525-Ride  
d. MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit authority)  
e. BCt (Broward County Transit)  
f. Palmtran (palm beach transit)  
g. The Electric wave, or miami beach shuttle  
h. TMAX  
i. Expresso shuttle  
j. Tri-rail  
k. Tri-rail shuttle  
l. Civic center TMO  
m. Miami Beach TMA  
n. South Florida Education Center TMA  
o. Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA  
p. Downtown Miami TMA  
q. Transportation Management Organizations (non-specific)  
r. Other (Specify __________________________)  

28. (DO NOT ASK IF Q 26-A MENTIONED)  
Have you ever heard of Gold Coast Commuter Services?  
1 Yes  2 No  9 Refused/Don't know  

29. (DO NOT ASK IF Q.26-B MENTIONED)  
Have you ever heard of any commuter information numbers such as "1-800-234-RIDE" or "525-Ride"?  
1 Yes  2 No  9 Refused/Don't know  

30. Have you ever contacted Gold Coast Commuter Services or GCCS, the 1-800-234 RIDE number or the 525-Ride number, or some other group for carpool or vanpool information?  
1 Yes  2 No (SKIP TO d1)  9 Refused/Don't know  

31. Who did you contact? [All that apply]  
1. Gold Coast Commuter Services (or GCCS)  
2. 1-800-234-RIDE  
3. the 525-ride number  
4. Other (Specify __________________________)  
5. DN/RF
d1. Now I just have a few questions remaining that are for statistical and classification purposes only. Your answer will remain completely anonymous and confidential. What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Divorced/Separated
- Widowed

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

- Yes 1
- No 2

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

- Yes 1
- No 2

d4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- 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

d5. What is your race?

- White 1
- African-American 2
- Hispanic 3
- Asian 4
- American Indian 5
- Other, specify _________ 6
- 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
- Refused (DON'T READ) 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 1996?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number</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 (DON'T READ)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey. For verification purposes, etc.
GCCS Evaluation Rideshare Database Survey

Good evening. My name is ________________ and I am with ________________, a market research company. This evening we are conducting a short survey on commuting in the Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach county area. We are conducting this survey on behalf of the Florida Department of Transportation. We are not attempting to sell you anything, we are only interested in your opinions.

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

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?
   _____

3. Are you aware of any organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling or make it easier for commuters to carpool or vanpool, or not?

   1 Yes       2 No (Skip to q. 5)       9 Don’t Know/Refused (SKIP TO Q5)

4. Which organizations have you heard of? (probe: any others?) (ALL THAT APPLY)
   (DO NOT READ LIST)
   a. Gold Coast Commuter Services
   b. 1-800-234-Ride
   c. 525-Ride
   d. MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit authority)
   e. BCt (Broward County Transit)
   f. Palmtran (palm beach transit)
   g. The Electric wave, or Miami beach shuttle
   h. TMAX
   i. Expresso shuttle
   j. Tri-rail
   k. Tri-rail shuttle
   l. Civic center TMO
   m. Miami Beach TMA
   n. South Florida Education Center TMA
   o. Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
   p. Downtown Miami TMA
   q. Transportation Management Organizations (non-specific)
   r. Other (Specify ________________________)
5. DO NOT ASK Q5 IF Q4-a MENTIONED
Have you ever heard of Gold Coast Commuter Services?
1 - Yes 2 - No 9 Don’t Know/Refused

6. DO NOT ASK Q6 IF Q4-b or 4-c MENTIONED
Have you ever heard of the commuter information numbers "1-800-234-RIDE" or “525-ride”, or not?
1 Yes 2 No 9 Refused/Don’t Know

7. ASK Q7 IF Q5=1 OR Q4-a MENTIONED
How did you hear about Gold Coast Commuter Services? (Check all that apply)

a. Newspaper
b. Radio
   Was this ad part of a traffic report? Yes ____ No ____
c. Television
d. At work
e. In the mail
f. On billboards
g. On road signs
h. Received a phone call
i. At bus stop/on a bench
j. On the side of buses/vans
k. Other
l. Special event/transportation day
m. DN/RF

8. ASK Q8 IF Q6=1 OR Q4-b or 4-c MENTIONED
How did you hear about the commuter information number?

1 - Newspaper ad
2 - Television ad
3 - Billboard
4 - received something in the mail
5 - Commuter fair/transportation event/transportation day
6 - From friends/co-workers/relatives
7 - Radio ad
8 - Employer
9 - Road sign
10 - Other (Specify ____________________ )

9. Have you ever contacted Gold Coast Commuter Services, 1-800-234-RIDE, 525-ride or any other local group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?
1 Yes 2 No (SKIP TO Q11) 9 Don’t Know/refused (SKIP TO Q11)
10. Whom did you contact? [All that apply - DO NOT READ]
   a. Gold Coast Commuter Services
   b. 1-800-234-Ride
   c. 525-Ride
   d. MDTA (Metro-Dade Transit authority)
   e. BCt (Broward County Transit)
   f. Palmtran (palm beach transit)
   g. The Electric wave, or Miami beach shuttle
   h. TMAX
   i. Expresso shuttle
   j. Tri-rail
   k. Tri-rail shuttle
   l. Civic center TMO
   m. Miami Beach TMA
   n. South Florida Education Center TMA
   o. Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
   p. Downtown Miami TMA
   q. Transportation Management Organizations (non-specific)
   r. Other (Specify ______________________)

11. Have you ever signed up or had your name registered with Gold Coast Commuter Services or some other South Florida carpool/vanpool service, or not?
   1 Yes  2 No  9 Refused/Don’t Know

12. Is your name still registered with that service, or is it no longer registered?
   1 Yes, still registered (SKIP TO Q14)
   2 No, not registered
   3 Don’t Know
   4 Refused

13. Why did you decide to remove your name from that service? Any other reasons? (Probe - do not read) [ALL THAT APPLY]
   1 Didn’t get any use out of it
   2 Already got started in a carpool/vanpool
   3 Didn’t like carpooling/vanpooling
   4 Didn't provide any names for carpooling/vanpooling
   5 Only needed for emergencies
   6 Moved
   7 Changed jobs
   8 Other reasons

14. (IF Q9=1 OR Q11=1, CONTINUE. IF Q9 NE 1 AND Q11 NE 1, TERMINATE.)
    Before you contacted the agency, were you driving to work alone every day you worked, or not?
    1- Yes (continue)  2 - No (Skip to 15)  9- Don’t Know/refused
14a. When you drove to work, did you ever carpool, that is, go to work with someone else in the car?
   Yes (continue with 15) / No (go to 22)

15. How many days per week were you carpooling to work?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped) - IF 0, SKIP TO Q. 17

16. About how many people were usually in your carpool, including the driver?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

17. How many days per week were you vanpooling to work, that is, riding in a van with 7 to 14 other people?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped) IF 0, SKIP TO Q. 19

18. About how many people were usually in your vanpool, including the driver?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

19. How many days per week were you riding the bus to work?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

20. How many days per week were you getting to work in some other way?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped) (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]

1 List of potential carpoolers
2 Bus schedules & routes
3 List of potential vanpoolers
4 Information about leasing vans for vanpools
5 Letter stating that no carpool/vanpool matches were found
6 Information about Park & Ride lots
7 Information about shuttle services
8 Information about Emergency Ride Home program
9 Tips on what to do next to start carpooling/vanpooling
10 Information about the commuter club
11 Other (Specify ________________________)
12 Information about Tri-Rail
99 Don’t know/Refused
23. Did they provide you with ________________________, or not? (DO NOT ASK ANY MENTIONED IN Q. 22)
   RECORD: Yes 1  No 2  Don’t know 3  Refused 9
   a Tips on what to do next to start carpooling or vanpooling
   b Information about the Emergency Ride Home program
   c a list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers;
      IF Q23c=2, ASK:
         C2 Did they send a letter stating that no carpool or vanpool matches were found?
      IF Q23c=1 or q22-1 mentioned or q22-3 mentioned, ASK:
         c3 Thinking about the list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers you were provided with, did you try to contact anybody on the list?
      IF Q23C3=1, ASK:
         c4 And did you successfully join a carpool or vanpool with someone from this list?
   CONTINUE

24. Did you ever carpool to or from work after you received the information, or not?
   1- Yes  2- No (Skip to Q. 32)  9- Don’t Know/refused
   (Ask 24a only if either (23c3 ne 1 or 23c4=2) AND q24=1)

24a. And how did you start this carpool?

25. Are you still carpooling?
   1- Yes  2- No (Skip to Q. 29)  9- Don’t Know/refused

26. About how many days per week are you carpooling both to and from work?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)
   (ASK Q. 26A ONLY IF Q26 < Q1)

26a. And how many days do you carpool only one-way, either to or from work?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

27. About how many people are usually in your carpool, including the driver?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

28. About how long have you been carpooling?
   _____ Days  _____ Weeks  _____ Months  _____ Years
   [SKIP TO Q. 32]
29. About how long were you in your carpool?
   _____ Days   _____ Weeks   _____ Months   _____Years

30. How many days per week were you carpooling?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

31. About how many people were usually in your carpool, including the driver?
   _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

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?
   1- Yes          2 - No (Skip to Q. 40)         9- Don’t Know/refused

33. Are you still vanpooling?
   1- Yes          2 - No (Skip to Q.37)         9- Don’t Know/refused

34. About how many days per week are you vanpooling both to and from work?
    _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

(ASK Q. 34A ONLY IF Q34 < Q1)

34a. And how many days per week are you vanpooling only one-way, either to or from work?
    _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

35. About how many people are usually in your vanpool, including the driver?
    _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

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?
    _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

39. About how many people were usually in your vanpool, including the driver?
    _____ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

40. Did you ever ride the bus to or from work after you received the information, or not?
    1- Yes          2 - No (Skip to q. 46)         9- Don’t Know/refused

41. Are you still riding the bus?
    1- Yes          2 - No (Skip to Q.44)         9- Don’t Know/refused
42. About how many days per week are you riding the bus both to and from work? 
______ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)
(ASK Q. 42A ONLY IF Q42 < Q1)

42a. And how many days per week are you riding the bus only one-way, either to or from work?
______ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

43. About how long have you been riding the bus?
______ Days ______ Weeks _______ Months _______ Years

[SKIP TO Q. 46]

44. About how long were you riding the bus to work?
______ Days ______ Weeks _______ Months _______ Years

45. About how many days per week were you riding the bus to work?
______ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

46. Is there any other way you used to get to work since you received the information?
1- Yes 2 - No (Go to Q. 53) 9- Don’t Know/refused

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

48. And are you still getting to work by (INSERT ANSWER TO Q. 47)?
1- Yes 2 - No (Skip to Q. 51) 9- Don’t Know/refused

49. About how many days per week are you (INSERT ANSWER TO Q. 47) both to and from work?
______ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)

(ASK Q. 49A ONLY IF Q49 < Q1)

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

[GO 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)?
______ (Enter 0 if question is skipped)
53. (ASK Q14 IF Q24, Q32, Q40 OR Q46=1; OTHERWISE SKIP TO q55)
To what extent did information or assistance from Gold Coast Commuter Services influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...
1 Have a great deal of influence
2 a moderate influence
3 a small influence, or
4 no influence at all
9 Don’t Know/refused (DO NOT READ)

54. To what extent did the emergency ride home program influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...
1 Have a great deal of influence
2 a moderate influence
3 a small influence, or
4 no influence at all
5 Don’t understand/know about the guaranteed ride home program (DO NOT READ)
9 Don’t Know/refused (DO NOT READ)

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 3       Refused 9

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

   (ROTATE LIST. RECORD ANSWER AS 1-10, OR 99 FOR DON’T KNOW/REFUSED)
   a. The accuracy of the information they provided
   b. The usefulness of the information they provided
   c. The promptness with which they provided the information
   d. Their courtesy and professional attitude
   e. Their handling of any questions or problems you had

   (ASK F ONLY IF Q22-1 OR Q22-3 MENTIONED OR Q23C=1)
   f. The quality and usefulness of the list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers that they sent you.

57. And still using this scale, overall how satisfied are you with this agency’s performance?
And if a friend or relative were to ask you about this ridesharing agency and whether they should use their services, would you...,

Definitely recommend using this agency (1)
Probably recommend using this agency (2)
Maybe/maybe not recommend them (3)
Probably no recommend them (4)
or definitely not recommend them (5)

Don’t know/refused (DO NOT READ) (9)
d1. Now I just have a few questions remaining that are for statistical and classification purposes only. Your answer will remain completely anonymous and confidential.

What is your marital status?

- Single 1
- Married 2
- Divorced/Separated 3
- Widowed 4
- Refused (Don’t Read) 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 Choices)

- 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 race?

- White 1
- African-American 2
- Hispanic 3
- Asian 4
- American Indian 5
- Other, specify __________ 6
- 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
- Refused (DON'T READ) 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 1996?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 or more</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused (DON'T READ)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
BROWARD/DADE/PALM BEACH COUNTY EMPLOYER TRANSPORTATION SURVEY

Please fill out and return this survey by August 21, 1997.

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 Trade
   - Retail Trade
   - Public Admin

2. Is your organization located in:
   - a central business district? ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2)
   - a corporate/industrial park? ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2)

3. Does your organization share a building or corporate/industrial park with: (check ONE)
   - 1-5 other employers ☐ (1) 6-9 other employers ☐ (2)
   - 10-25 other employers ☐ (3) Over 25 other employers ☐ (4)
   - No other employers ☐ (6)
     (i.e., you have your own building that is not located in a corporate/industrial park)

4. Not including the building or corporate/industrial park where your organization is located, how many other employers are located within ½ mile? (check ONE)
   - None ☐ (1) 1-5 ☐ (2) 6 or more ☐ (3)

5. How many employees do you have at this location? (Check ONE)
   - Less than 5 ☐ (1) 5-9 ☐ (2) 10-19 ☐ (3)
   - 20-49 ☐ (4) 50-99 ☐ (5) 100-499 ☐ (6)
   - 500 or more ☐ (7)

6. How many parking places are available for your employees within 1/4 mile of your worksite? (Check ONE)
   - Less than 5 ☐ (1) 5-9 ☐ (2) 10-19 ☐ (3)
   - 20-49 ☐ (4) 50-99 ☐ (5) 100-499 ☐ (6)
   - 500 or more ☐ (7)

7. How much do your employees pay to park in those spaces?
   (Put 0.00 if parking is free) $ __ . __ per day

8. How far is the nearest alternate parking that your employees can use? (Check ONE)
   - Under 1/4 mile ☐ (1) 1/4 to ½ mile ☐ (2)
   - ½ mile to 1 mile ☐ (3) Over 1 mile ☐ (4)

9. How far is the nearest bus stop from your worksite? (Check ONE)
   - Under 1/4 mile ☐ (1) 1/4 to ½ mile ☐ (2)
   - ½ mile to 1 mile ☐ (3) Over 1 mile ☐ (4)
10. And does the bus stop have: (Check all that apply)
   A shelter □ (1) Good lighting □ (2)
   Seating □ (3)
   a paved lighted sidewalk that connects to your site □ (3)

11. What percentage of your organization's employees are:
   currently eligible for: (Put 0 if you do not offer the program)
   currently participating in: (Put 0 if you don't offer the program or no one participates)

   Flextime __ __ % __ __ %
   Compressed work weeks (4 days/40 hours, 9/80, etc.) __ __ % __ __ %
   Telecommuting __ __ % __ __ %

12. For the following facilities, please check all of those that are available at or near (1/4 mile or less) your site:

   Medical services □ (1) Banking □ (2) Snack Bar □ (3)
   Dry Cleaners □ (4) Post Office □ (6)
   General Retail Convenience Exercise
   Shopping □ (7) Store □ (8)
   Restaurant/Child Care Facility □ (11)
   Cafeteria □ (10)

13. Some companies designate an employee as an "Employee Transportation Coordinator" (ETC). An ETC has the responsibility of:
   - designing and coordinating programs/incentives for employees to use commute alternatives
   - informing employees of the programs and incentives.

   Does your organization have an ETC? □ Yes (1) □ No (2)
   (GO TO Q. 14) (SKIP TO Q. 15)

14. How much employee time does your organization designate for your ETC? (Check ONE)

   None □ (0) 1-4 hours/wk □ (1) 5-10 hours/wk □ (2)
   11-20 hrs/wk □ (3) 21-30 hrs/wk □ (4) 31-40 hrs/wk □ (5)
   (SKIP TO Q. 16)

15. How much employee time would your organization be willing to designate for an ETC? (Check ONE)

   None □ (0) 1-4 hours/wk □ (1) 5-10 hours/wk □ (2)
   11-20 hrs/wk □ (3) 21-30 hrs/wk □ (4) 31-40 hrs/wk □ (5)

16. And if no-cost training could be provided, how much training would your organization allow your ETC to attend? (Check ONE)

   None □ (0) 1 day/year □ (1) 2 days/yr □ (2)
   3 days/yr □ (3) 4 days/yr □ (4) 5+ days/yr □ (5)
17. How many other locations does your organization have in the Broward/Dade/Palm Beach county area? (Check ONE)

- None [☐ (0)]
- 5 - 9 [☐ (3)]
- 10 or more [☐ (4)]

18. How many employees do you have working at other locations within the Broward/Dade/Palm Beach county area? (Check ONE)

- None [☐ (0)]
- 10 - 19 [☐ (3)]
- 100 - 499 [☐ (6)]
- 2 - 4 [☐ (1)]
- 20 - 49 [☐ (4)]
- 500 + [☐ (7)]
- 5 - 9 [☐ (2)]
- 50 - 99 [☐ (5)]

19. Please make a check mark by the statement which best describes your knowledge of Gold Coast Commuter Services (GCCS) (Check ONE)

- a. You have heard of GCCS but don't know what they do [☐]
- b. You are familiar with some of GCCS activities [☐]
- c. You have a sound working knowledge of GCCS's programs [☐]
- d. You have never heard of GCCS [☐]

20. Please make a check mark by each of the following statements that correctly describes your organization's interaction with Gold Coast Commuter Services (Check all that apply)

- a. Your organization has been contacted by GCCS [☐]
- b. GCCS has made a presentation to your organization [☐]
- c. GCCS's activities have had a significant impact in meeting your organization's employee transportation needs [☐]
- d. Your organization will probably contact GCCS in the near future [☐]
- e. Your organization might contact GCCS in the near future [☐]

21. Please CIRCLE THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of how effective the Gold Coast Commuter Services' activities are:

Not at all Effective Extremely Not familiar with

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 0
22. What types of programs or amenities:
   a) does your organization currently offer your employees for commuting purposes?
   b) did a ridesharing agency help you set up?
   c) would your organization consider offering as incentives for use of commute alternatives?
   d) would your organization like to get assistance in implementing from GCCS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently offer (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>GCCS helped to set up program (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>Would consider offering (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>Would like to get assistance from GCCS to implement (Check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Bike racks or lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showers &amp; clothing storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Flextime work schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Compressed work weeks (4 days/40 hours, 9 days/80 hrs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Allow employees to work at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Helping to provide a shuttle to/from remote parking facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Helping to provide a shuttle to lunch places/banks/dry cleaners during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reserved parking spaces for vanpools/carpoools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Subsidies for mass transit or shuttle use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Carpool/vanpool subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Emergency Ride Home program, which provides an free taxi ride for eligible users of commute alternatives who have emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Company cars for employee business travel during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Additional vacation days as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Coupon books/discounts as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Providing Free tickets to sports events, movies, symphony, etc. as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/DADE/PALM BEACH COUNTY AREA.

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact:
Francis Cleland at CUTR (813) 974-3120, or
David Burr at GCCS (800) 234-RIDE