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Executive Summary

The survey results presented in this report give RS a number of areas on which future evaluations should be based, including commuter traveling behavior and advertising awareness, RS Database member evaluations, and business awareness, provision of programs, and evaluation of RS activities. CUTR's recommendations on handling the mechanics of future evaluations and related statistical tests to be performed are contained in a separate document on Performance Measures.

Information of this nature generally needs to be trended to provide meaningful evaluations. Prior surveys provide fairly limited resources to trend the results of the current surveys. The most meaningful information, with trending where available, included:

Prior sources effectively place the estimate of ridesharers within the database at 18%-20%, with a further 3%-7% saying they had been in a pooling arrangement at some time. The current survey indicates that 26% of commuters in the database are in a pooling arrangement, and a further 27% have been in a pooling arrangement in the past. However, some of this percentage increase may be due to the purging of inactive database members.

The awareness of messages is similar to awareness levels in other municipalities where CUTR has done evaluation of advertising campaigns for rideshare programs. From that perspective, RS is performing at a satisfactory (but not exemplary) level. Future evaluations should see increases in overall awareness.

Prior research (from the 1995 NOACA evaluation) states that 1/3 of poolers said the GRH "played a role" in their decision to start pooling. The comparable figure from this survey is 42%, but this is from only the 100 respondents who said they currently do or did at one time use ridesharing, and so has an error factor of +/- 10%. This probably does not reflect a statistically significant change from the 1995 evaluation study's report.

There was a large difference in percentage of commuters carpooling or vanpooling for employers who offered incentives versus employers who don't offer incentives. 15% of those whose employers offer incentives currently carpool or vanpool, versus 7% of those whose employers don't offer incentives. 11% of those who rideshare said their employers offered a GRH program, versus 1% of those who did not rideshare, although there is some question of causation in this result.
The Rideshare Database survey was performed using sample provided by NOACA. The database provided only contained sample effectively representing database members from NOACA, SCATS, and EDATA databases. Therefore, that portion of the evaluation reflects the performance of those three LRA's only and does not necessarily reflect the performance of AMATS. For further discussion of this issue, see the “survey methodology” section.

69% received a carpooler list, and 15% received a letter saying no matches had been found. RS should seek to increase this total percentage from 84% to 90%-95% for future evaluations. 44% of Rideshare database members recall receiving tips on how to start carpooling. However, since tips are only sent to those who receive a carpool list, the effective percentage is 44/69 or 65% of eligible members.

Only 60% said they had received a follow-up call or letter. This reflects the percentage of database members who recall receiving some sort of call or letter after having received the carpool list (or letter stating that no matches had been found). This is another area where future evaluations should show increases.

61% of those who received the list did not use it. This reflects a significant reduction from the 78% reported in the 1995 evaluation. 15% said they formed a pool with the information they received. The 1995 states that “20% of those who received match lists said they were in a pooling arrangement.” The relevant comparison figure for this survey is also 20% (apparently, in addition to the 15% noted above, 5% of those who received lists were already in a pooling arrangement or formed one without using the list), so there is no change from the prior evaluation.

A total of 26% of small businesses and 19% of larger businesses have not heard of Rideshare!

RS is definitely having a positive impact on business ridesharing activities, based on the correlation of familiarity with RS and the number of programs offered. Businesses that are more familiar with RS would offer substantially more incentives than those businesses that are not familiar with RS.

However, RS still has plenty of room for improvement in explicit business attribution of credit for ridesharing programs. Only 17% percent of large businesses (100+ employees), and 12% of all businesses, said they have been contacted by RS. Only 5% of larger (and 6% of all) businesses have had presentations made to them by RS, and only 2% of all businesses say that RS has had a significant impact on their ridesharing programs.
I  Background

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the effects of activities of the RIDESHARE! (RS) Program of Northeastern Ohio. The report is based on the results of surveys conducted in the area with the general public, with members of the RS database, and with local employers. RS's area of responsibility is divided into four parts, each served by a separate Local Ridesharing Agency (LRA):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRA</th>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMATS</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Portage, Summit, Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCATS</td>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Carroll, Stark, Tuscarawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDATA</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>Ashtabula, Mahoning, Trumbull</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation of specific policies, procedures, and the organizational structure of the RS Organization was provided in a previous technical memorandum. This report, therefore, will provide information on the perspective of the public on the effectiveness of RS activities. The data collected in this survey should serve as a baseline for future evaluations of RS. Future surveys of the public and RS 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 RS Service area:

a. Survey of members of the general public.

One hundred commuters in each of the LRA service areas were interviewed by telephone and asked about their current commuting habits and their awareness of RS, as well as their awareness of incentives provided for use of commute alternatives by their employers. 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, PA. The cooperation rate (analogous to a response rate) was approximately 47.5% of eligible respondents.
b. Survey of members of the RS Database.

The Rideshare Database survey was performed using sample provided by NOACA. The sample was drawn from callers to the regional 1-800 number, and did not contain database members who had joined through employer contact or through calls made directly to the LRA’s. Analysis conducted after it had been discovered that not all database members were included in the original sample indicated that the database of 1-800 number callers contained just over 50% (113 out of about 200) of the names in the SCATS database and over 40% (194 of 476) of the names in the EDATA database. However, information from AMATS indicates that 25% or less of the names from the AMATS database are contained in the 1-800 database.

From this information, SCATS and EDATA should have made up about 19% of the sample, but in fact made up about 10%. In the strictest terms, the data might be considered invalid for further analysis, and should be considered to only represent callers to the regional 1-800 number. However, CUTR recommends that RIDESHARE! consider the data appropriate for an evaluation of SCATS and EDATA (as well as NOACA), since nearly 50% of the SCATS and EDATA members were available for sampling. AMATS, however, was clearly not represented properly in the sampling plan. Therefore, this part of the evaluation can not be considered a fair representation of AMATS performance.

CUTR recommends that the next round of evaluations include a sampling from the entire set of RS Databases, including locally derived database members. Benchmarks should be re-set at that time for future trend analysis using the results from that survey. Should database member privacy considerations make surveying portions of the database member population impossible, that fact should be duly noted.

Two hundred members of the RS commuter database were interviewed by telephone. They were asked about their current commuting habits and their awareness of incentives provided for use of commute alternatives by their employers, as well as a number of questions to determine their satisfaction with the services provided by RS.
Analysis of some of the response patterns compared to the full RS database indicated that a disproportionately high percentage of respondents had long commutes - 73% of respondents were listed as having commutes of 15 or more miles, compared to 62% of the 1-800 database as a whole. The cooperation rate of eligible respondents was 79%, so it is unlikely that there was a major bias involving differences between people who agreed to cooperate and people who did not. Rather, the cause of this result probably lies in the characteristics of the eligible sample likely to be reached. The most likely possible causes of this difference are:

1. People who live further from work are also more likely to be living in their own homes then to be renting. A previous analysis of Florida Census data from the 1990 Census partially confirms this hypothesis. People living in single-family homes had an average (estimated) commute distance of about 1.2 miles further than people living in multi-unit dwellings. They are also less likely to be relatively transient residents, and so telephone numbers from the database are more likely to be useable for people who own their homes than telephone numbers from people who are renting their homes.

2. It is also possible that people who live further from work are more likely to be home during regular evening interviewing hours, and will be more likely to be reached. People who live closer to work (and probably in more urbanized areas, with more evening entertainment and other distractions) are more likely to be unreachable. Demographic data, if available for the entire database, would probably show that survey respondents had more children, were more likely to be married, were older and had higher incomes than the database as a whole.

The interviews were conducted by QCS Research of Cleveland, OH.

c. Survey of local businesses

A total of 1,392 surveys were mailed to Human Resource Directors (HRDs) of employers in the RS Service area. The employers selected were located along certain corridors specified by RS staff as being of particular interest, and so do not necessarily represent a balanced opinion of employers in the entire area. 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 RS 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.
A total of 255 surveys were returned, for a response rate of approximately 19%. 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 SIC codes) is included in a separate technical memorandum. 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 in that technical memorandum.

d. Analytical approach

The ultimate goal of RS efforts is to reduce 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. RS 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 RS 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 RS database
- Trips and Vehicle Miles reduced (based on survey responses)
- Awareness of RS's messages
- Awareness of RS, including business community awareness and understanding
- Number of commuters contacting RS and joining the RS database
- Alternative commuting arrangements provided by the business community
- Database members' and business community evaluation of RS
- Opportunities for RS 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

Baseline data for comparison purposes are generally not available. Each of the potential sources has certain defects:

- Census data collected in 1990 is now six 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.
- Previous surveys done for RS do not provide data for comparable geographic areas.

The 1994 Decision Research Corporation (DRC) Survey was conducted only on residents in NOACA’s service area, and even then only on residents who said they had been “inconvenienced” by roadway construction. Data are not provided on the number of residents who terminated based on this question. The 1995 Survey conducted by Knupp & Watson (K&W), by Research Director James W. Peltier, was conducted with 400 residents in the entire state of Ohio. Both of these surveys also asked residents only how they “usually” commute to work. Furthermore, both of those surveys were conducted only with residents who commute to work at least five miles.

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.

Data from the current surveys indicate that over 5% of respondents currently both drive alone to work and use a commute alternative. A further 2% of commuters use multiple modes that do not involve driving alone. In total, 7% of commuters using some alternative transportation mode to work would be excluded from the data collected in the 1994 and 1995 surveys.
Data collected in this survey shows that 16% of Northeast Ohio area commuters use some form of alternative commute at least once per week. This includes 9.7% that carpool and 7.4% that use transit.

The NOACA service area has a substantially higher use of commute alternatives than the other NE Ohio service areas - 13% of the residents in NOACA’s service area carpool at least once per week, and 14% use transit. None of the respondents in the other service areas reported using public transit even once per week. Clearly the availability of transit in the other areas is a major factor in these results.

The results cannot be meaningfully compared to the 1994 DRC survey because only 77 respondents to the current survey both lived in the NOACA service area and had a commute of at least five miles. Carpool share would have had to double in the last two years just to have shown a statistically significant change between the two surveys. (due to the comparable sample size of 77 respondents)
In terms of total commute trips, the results are a bit lower - 5% of all work-related trips are conducted in carpools, and 6% 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, but only for a fraction.

### Percent of Trips made by Northeastern Ohio Commuters Using Alternative Commute Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>NOACA</th>
<th>AMATS</th>
<th>SCATS</th>
<th>EDATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Jog</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuter Study May 1998
Data weighted by county population, 1990 census estimates
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. Only two percent identified themselves as occasional users.

**Percent of Northeastern Ohio Area Commuters Who are Using or Have Used Commute Alternatives Since Their Job/Home Last Changed Locations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never Used</th>
<th>Regularly Use 1/Week</th>
<th>Use Occasionally *</th>
<th>Used In Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMATS</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCATS</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDATA</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuter Study May 1996
* Includes Commuters who use any Alternative at least 1/Week
Data weighted by county populations, 1990 census estimates

**Percent of Northeastern Ohlo Area Commuters that have been Regularly Using a Commute Alternative at least Once per Week for the last 12 Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total *</th>
<th>Carpooling</th>
<th>Riding Bus</th>
<th>Bike/Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMATS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCATS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDATA</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuter Study May 1996
Data weighted by county populations, 1990 census estimates
While RS's ultimate objective is to maximize the number of people using non-SOV commuting modes, it should follow the same marketing process 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

RS must continually attempt either to increase the number of people who try commute alternatives and 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 data table attached to the chart on Page 9 shows that about 1/3 of the people in the service area have at least tried ridesharing. Again, this number is quite a bit higher for NOACA's service area (42%) than for the others, due at least to some extent to the greater availability of transit for Cleveland residents.

Unfortunately, due to the rather fragmentary nature of previous data, as well as the fact that prior surveys were designed for different geographies and for different purposes, CUTR is unable to draw conclusions on the effectiveness of RS efforts in increasing ridesharing activity by the population of the area.
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)/number of passengers

There were 383 valid responses in the survey of Cleveland residents for this analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in the tables below:

<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>11.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool &amp; Vanpool</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>55.66 provided</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>500 total trips</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6322 total miles</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>500 total trips</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total labor force over 16 not working at home (1990 Census - Journey to Work) = 1,699,634

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 11.7 by the total
number of commuters, or 1,561,895.

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 LRA budgets to determine costs per trip provided. Those performance
measures are presented in the report on performance measures and techniques.
b. RS Database Members

Since database members have already shown a high level of interest in use of alternative commute modes by contacting RS, it is expected that database members will 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.

![Percent of RIDESHARE! Database Members Using Alternative Commute Modes at least Once per Week Compared to all NE Ohio Area Commuters](image)

Since carpooling and vanpooling are services that RS promotes and provides services for, it is not surprising that the bulk of the difference is in the percentage of commuters using carpooling or vanpooling.
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.

NOACA’s 1995 evaluation states the following results from prior surveys:

“An estimated two thirds of new commuters contacting RS for information were provided with a list of potential car pool or van pool options. Of 134 that received these match lists, 20% said they were in a pooling arrangement.”

“The standard for reporting the number of poolers to ODOT has been based on 20% (a national standard for RS databases) of the LRA’s database.”

“A marketing survey done in 1992 revealed that 20-25% of the commuters in RS’s database were currently or at some point in a pooling arrangement. According to the evaluation questionnaire distributed to new commuters, approximately 18% of the respondents said they were in a pooling arrangement...”
These sources effectively place the estimate of ridesharers within the database at 18%-20%, with a further 3%-7% saying they had been in a pooling arrangement at some time.

The current survey indicates that 26% of commuters in the database are in a pooling arrangement (see previous chart). A total of 27.5% use commute alternatives (including transit) regularly, and a further 27% have been in a pooling arrangement in the past.

Compared to those results, the current survey shows a slight increase in pooling by database members since those surveys were conducted (significant at the 90% confidence level, but not at 95%), and a substantial increase in the number that say they have been in a pool in the past.

CUTR concludes that, in the area of increasing trial of non-SOV transportation modes among members of the RS Database, the Rideshare! Organization has done an effective job. However, there is not enough evidence to conclude that RS has increased current use of alternative modes, particularly since inactive records from the database as of the time of the prior survey may have been purged prior to the current survey. 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)/number of passengers

There were 200 valid responses in the survey of RS Database Members.

<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>36.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1140.9</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>324.7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>648.0</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool &amp; Vanpool</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1465.5</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reduced</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2163.2</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>113.7 provided</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>14073.3 total miles</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>490 total trips</td>
<td>7.9</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 3569 (total database members including local members of EDATA and SCATS) by 63.3.
Except in the case of AMATS, these measures can serve as benchmarks for the next evaluation. The survey methodology section contains recommendations on re-setting the benchmarks after the next round of evaluations to fairly represent all members of all RS databases. Also, several performance measures, as detailed in the accompanying performance measures report, can be developed.
c. 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 get a sense of the extent to which there were shortages of parking. About 6% of smaller businesses (under 100 employees) had shortages, whereas 10% of larger businesses had shortages without alternative parking within 1/4 mile. 23% and 28% of smaller and larger 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.
Most businesses provide free parking. Only 12% of the responding organizations indicated that employees pay for parking.
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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 2/3 of businesses. About ½ of business had the remaining services (medical, dental, exercise facility, dry cleaners, etc.) available within 1/4 mile.
Finally, business 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 RIDESHARE! Clearly RS could not be expected to reduce the amount of free parking available or to increase the number of businesses available. Where RS 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 Rideshare! And Rideshare!'s activities and Resulting Effects on Commuting

RS' primary goal is to influence behavior. Behavior baseline data, as well as changes (where possible) were measured and the results of these measurements were presented in the previous section.

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. RS' chosen methods of influencing behavior are 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.

The following elements are measurable from the surveys of the general public, as well as from the rideshare service evaluation survey:

- Awareness of carpool and vanpool advertising
- Content recall
- Unaided and aided awareness of RS and the RS number
- Stated mode choice effects of advertising for those who saw/heard advertising
- Correlation of advertising awareness and mode choice
- Awareness of Employer-provided incentives to carpool, vanpool, or use other commute alternatives
- Effect and Correlation of mode choices and incentives

It is clearly important to measure direct stated effects of advertising, and to develop trends of the stated effects. However, 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

1. General Public

The chart below shows recall of any carpool/vanpool related advertising or messages by market area. The recall of advertising appears to be slightly lower in NOACA's service area (Greater Cleveland), but this difference is not statistically significant.

The DRC survey of 1994 did not contain advertising awareness questions. The 1995 K&W survey, which covered all Ohio residents, asked if residents had “seen or heard a promotion for the local rideshare program.” 52% of Ohio residents recall hearing or seeing a promotion for a local rideshare program. Clearly, the result is not directly comparable since it covers many respondents who are in completely different areas, whose rideshare agencies may or may not be conducting programs similar to the programs in Northeast Ohio. Even if the programs were judged to be comparable, the way the question is asked is subtly different from the method employed in the current evaluation survey. The rideshare program is mentioned earlier and explained to the respondent - only then is the question of recall of advertising or other messages raised.
Even if the question formats are judged to be comparable, the difference between the 46.4% of Northeast Ohio residents (who live over 5 miles from their worksite) who are aware of messages and the 52% of Ohio residents that are aware of messages is not significant at the 95% confidence level (though it is significant at the 90% confidence level.)

Given all of these factors, the K&W survey does not provide a truly suitable baseline for measurement. The level of advertising/message awareness provides baseline data for future evaluations, but existing prior sources do not provide data suitable for evaluation of program effectiveness. Future surveys of residents of the same areas should provide useful comparisons of advertising and message awareness.

In absolute terms, the awareness of messages is similar to awareness levels in other municipalities where CUTR has done evaluation of advertising campaigns for rideshare programs. From that perspective, RS is performing at a satisfactory level. Future evaluations should see increases in overall awareness.

2. Rideshare database

Eighty-two percent of the members of the RS database were aware of some form of messages about carpooling and vanpooling. No prior survey effort has set baselines for awareness levels among database members. From an absolute perspective, this is a very high level of awareness to maintain in any given population. It may be difficult to significantly increase this percentage. Future evaluations should see a maintenance of this level of awareness.
b. Source & Content Recall

1. General Public

Among members of the general public, the most commonly recalled source of carpool/vanpool related messages is Highway Signs, followed by 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.
The most commonly recalled message, by a wide margin, is that you can call a number for information about carpooling or vanpooling (the RIDESHARE number). Other recalled messages include that carpooling saves energy and/or is good for the environment, that carpooling saves money, etc., but none of these messages has any significant amount of recall - except in the Canton area, where 9% of respondents recalled messages about saving energy or the environment.

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuters
Advertising Content Recall
Percent of All Commuters who recall Messages about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOACA</th>
<th>AMATS</th>
<th>SCATS</th>
<th>EDATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Number</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/Environment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saves Money</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Rideshare</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Location</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Rideshare Database

Rideshare database members remembered many more messages, but most were about the RS number, or that ridesharing saves money. A few (1.5%) remembered messages about avoiding construction.

Where RIDESHARE! Database Members have seen Carpool/Vanpool-related advertising
Percent of all Members seeing/hearing ads on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising Medium</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Signs</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mall</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Work</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Vans/Buses</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Data drawn from responses to Q. 14, Q. 17, Q. 20, Q. 26, Q. 29a, Q. 27a, Q. 27b

RIDESHARE! Database Members' Advertising Content Recall
Percent of All Members who Recall Messages about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Number</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saves Money</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/Environment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable/Less Stress</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Rideshare</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuter Study May 1998
Future evaluations should 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. Currently, the main message that is getting through is that there is a number commuters can call. The awareness levels that have been achieved for that number are discussed in the next section.
c. Awareness of RIDESHARE! and the RIDESHARE! Number

1. General Public and RS Database

Unaided awareness of RS and the RS number, 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 RS 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 RS. That figure is presented in the chart below:

![Percent of Northeastern Ohio Area Commuters that have Heard of RIDESHARE! and the RIDESHARE! Number](image)

This question appears in both the K&W survey and the DRC survey for comparisons. The DRC survey, however, is so restrictive in terms of sampling as to render it rather questionable for
comparisons (Live in NOACA service area only; 5 miles or more commute; inconvenienced by road construction - for which DRC does not provide incidence rates; only people who drive alone to get to work). On an even more technical standpoint, there is evidence that indicates that asking a simple yes/no question without use of the phrase “or not” or some other form of equally encouraging a negative response can significantly increase the percentage of respondents answering “yes.”

With those restrictions in mind, for the 53 respondents from the current survey who fit that sampling pattern, there was a significant decline in awareness of Rideshare! from the DRC survey. If awareness for RS and the RS Number are combined, the awareness level in the current survey rises to 63.8%, and the difference is significant only at the 90% confidence level.

For the K&W survey (to reiterate, which covers all of Ohio), the awareness level was 68%. For a comparable sample (282 respondents) of the current survey, the awareness level was 63.3%. The difference is not significant at the 95% (or even 90%) confidence level.

It is more important that the current figure be used as a baseline to measure future efforts than that statistical gymnastics are attempted to compare these results to prior information. A future comparison using the same type of sample should show whether or not RIDESHARE!’s promotional efforts are having an effect of increasing awareness. It should be noted that quite a reasonable marketing effort will need to be made to merely maintain a 50% awareness level.
Almost all RS database members were aware of RS and the RS number, as shown below. This result does not really provide very much meaningful information, since one would expect virtually universal awareness of RS among database members.

From an absolute perspective, RS is maintaining an awareness level similar to awareness levels in the rest of the state. In an evaluation of awareness of ridesharing organizations in the Tampa Bay area (with admittedly a completely different budget and organizational structure), awareness levels were at about 34%, not really even close to the levels achieved by RS. The conclusion is that RS efforts have been successful in creating awareness for RS and the RS number. 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.
2. Local Businesses

Human Resource Directors in the businesses were asked about their awareness levels of RS and RS activities. These results are presented below, again by size of the responding business. 26% of small businesses and 19% of larger businesses have not heard of RIDESHARE!

With this result as a baseline, RS should seek to decrease this percentage, and increase the percentages of businesses that say they are familiar with some of RS activities and particularly the percentage that say they have a "sound working knowledge of RS programs."
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:

0.8% (+/- 0.8%) of all commuters reported that they actually tried carpooling or vanpooling after hearing or seeing the message, and a further 5.3% said they considered trying it. 0.5% (a total of 2 respondents) said they tried to call the Rideshare number. These are three baseline figures that RS should be targeting for increases in future evaluations.
For members of the RS database, effects were much more dramatic. Forty-two percent of those who recalled advertising (about 1/3 of all database members) said they tried carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing ads, in addition to the 13% (of those who recalled advertising) that already do carpool or vanpool. Again, these reflect baseline figures that should be increased in future evaluations.
e. Correlation of Advertising and RS 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 NE Ohio area, the relationship between awareness of RS advertising and current or past mode choice. While there is no discernible relationship between current ridesharing activity and advertising awareness, there are very clear relationships between advertising awareness and awareness of the RS program and between advertising awareness and having tried ridesharing in the past.

These correlations show clearly that the advertising is having a significant impact, although it should be reiterated that there is a question about the nature of the causation in this analysis.
Future evaluations, to show an increase in advertising effectiveness, should show even larger differences in behavior and awareness between the groups that are and are not aware of RS advertising.

For informational purposes, the percentage of those that considered carpooling/vanpooling is shown in the above chart as well. (This statistic can not 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?")

Awareness of RIDESHARE! or the RS Number (as opposed to awareness of RS advertising) did not, however, show any significant impact on ridesharing behavior, past or present. Actually, use of commute alternatives (including transit) is higher among those not aware of RS than those who are aware of RS. This finding is due to two factors:

1. RS targeting of people who live over 5 miles from work - 63% of those who live 5 miles or more from work are aware of RS or the RS Number, versus 51% of those who live under 5 miles from work.

2. Use of transit concentrated among people who live under 5 miles from work.

### Effect of Awareness of RSI on Northeastern Ohio Area Commuters
Percent of those Aware vs. those Unaware of RS or the RS Number who...

![Bar Chart](image.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Use Alter.</th>
<th>Currently Car/Vanpool</th>
<th>Have tried Ridesharing</th>
<th>Are aware of RS ads</th>
<th>Considered Car/Vanpool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This analysis is not suitable for database members, since only 18% are unaware of messages about carpooling or vanpooling, and this does not constitute a suitable sample size for analysis.
2. Local Businesses- Effect of Awareness of RS on Programs Offered

HRD's at businesses were asked about what kinds of incentive programs they offer employees to use commute alternatives. While these will be analyzed in detail in the section below, there is one element of that analysis that relates to awareness of RS. If RS is having a positive impact on businesses, it would stand to reason that those businesses that are more familiar with RS would offer more incentives than those businesses that are not familiar with RS. This analysis assumes that those businesses more familiar with RS have been more influenced by RS activities (whether or not they specifically cite RS as an influence in setting up the program - see page x for further discussion of this assumption), and if that has resulted in creation of ridesharing incentives, RS should receive some credit for that program. While this may not be wholly accurate on a case-by-case basis, if in the aggregate firms more familiar with RS have more programs available than firms unfamiliar with RS, RS should certainly receive credit for that finding. The chart below details the results of that analysis:

The results clearly show a significant relationship between awareness of RIDESHARE! and the availability of incentives at Northeast Ohio companies. RS has definitely made a difference in this area. For future evaluations, RS should set a goal to increase the programs offered by companies familiar with RS, in addition to increasing the overall percentage of companies familiar with RS.
f. Analysis of Employer-provided incentives: Commuter Awareness and Provision of incentives by Employers

The next two charts show awareness of employer-provided incentives for, respectively, all commuters and rideshare database members. The results are quite similar, although database members are somewhat more aware of employers providing transit passes, preferential parking for vanpools, and showers for people who bike or walk to work.
These results are also consistent with the results of the survey of employers. Employers were also asked about provision of programs for flextime, working at home, and compressed work weeks, as well as provision of shuttles. For the questions asked in both surveys - showers, bike racks, pool parking, pooling and transit subsidies, and guaranteed ride home, the results are very consistent.
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 by Size of Organization**

- Flextime: 25% (Total), 15% (<100 Emps), 11% (100+ Emps)
- Compressed Work Weeks: 23% (Total), 11% (<100 Emps), 10% (100+ Emps)
- Telecommuting: 6% (Total), 6% (<100 Emps), 0% (100+ Emps)

**Average Percent of Employees Eligible for Commute Programs by Size of Organization**

- Flextime: 14% (Total), 10% (<100 Emps), 18% (100+ Emps)
- Compressed Work Weeks: 5% (Total), 4% (<100 Emps), 6% (100+ Emps)
- Telecommuting: 2% (Total), 1% (<100 Emps), 3% (100+ Emps)
The figures 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 10% or less offer compressed work weeks and telecommuting. Participation in any of these programs is quite low.

These figures represent baselines for RS that should be examined in future evaluations. RS 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 RS does not currently have goals set for establishing these programs, CUTR strongly recommends their implementation.
g. Stated Effect of Incentives on Mode Choice

The only specific incentive where effects were explicitly tested was for the Guaranteed Ride Home Program among RS Database members. RS Database members were also asked what effect the information provided by RS as a whole had on their mode choice. The results are presented in the chart below.
Approximately 46% of the database members were not asked how much influence the GRH program and Rideshare! information had on their mode choice because they never tried ridesharing. (or did not recall ever contacting RIDESHARE!) For 17% of Database members, however, the GRH program had a moderate to great influence on their decision to try ridesharing, and for 25% the information they received as a whole had a moderate to great influence on their decision to rideshare.

Prior research (from the 1995 NOACA evaluation) states that 1/3 of poolers said the GRH "played a role" in their decision to start pooling. The comparable figure from this survey is 42%, but this is from the 100 respondents who said they currently do or did at one time use ridesharing, and so has an error factor of +/- 10%. This does not reflect a statistically significant change from the 1995 evaluation study's report.

The 1995 evaluation states that "60% of (the 18% that pooled) respondents said being in a pooling arrangement was a result of the information RS sent them." This indicates that in total, about 11% of database members said their mode choice was impacted by the information sent to them by RS. The current survey results indicate that 9% said the information had a "great influence", 13% said the information had a "moderate influence", and 7% said it had a "small influence."

These results serve to indicate that the aid provided by the RS program is having a significant impact on mode choices made by database members - at least in absolute terms. Also, since the database is growing each year, it appears that the total number of commuters whose mode choice is directly affected by RS is growing. However, it is not clear that the percentage of database members whose mode choices are affected is growing at all. Further increases should be sought for this statistic in future evaluations.

This is not, however, a particularly significant result; Instead, RS should focus on continuing to increase the total number of people in the RS 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.
h. Correlation of Available Incentives and Mode Choice

The first analysis is between commuters whose employers offer "some" incentives and commuters whose employers offer no incentives. The relevance of this analysis is somewhat suspect since the majority of employers who offer incentives are offering either bike racks or showers. Also, the question of causation is especially relevant in this analysis, since it is much more likely that commuters who are using commute alternatives will be aware of incentives.

The results are fairly consistent with the results of the correlation of advertising awareness and mode choice with one major exception. There was a large difference in percentage of commuters carpooling or vanpooling for employers who offered incentives versus employers who don't offer incentives. There was no correlation of offering incentives with current use of alternative modes, and some minor but not statistically significant correlation with having tried ridesharing and being aware of RS. Specifically, 15% of those whose employers offer incentives currently carpool or vanpool, versus 7% of those whose employers don't offer incentives, 23% of those whose employers offer incentives have tried ridesharing, versus 18% of those whose employers don't offer incentives, and 53% and 45% respectively for awareness of RS. None of these differences are significant at the 95% confidence level.
The RS database survey did not have sufficient sample to conduct this type of analysis.

There is such a small percentage of commuters who are aware of any specific incentives that an analysis of the impacts of the specific incentives cannot be conducted. It is however possible to break the population down into those who carpool or vanpool (or have at some point tried) and those who don't. Then the percentage of each group who have incentives available can be determined. The results of that analysis appear below:

The only incentive for which a significant difference appeared was for the Guaranteed Ride Home Program. It should be repeated that there is some doubt as to the cause of this result - does use of carpooling or vanpooling increase awareness of the GRH program or vice-versa? However, this is another supporting piece of evidence for the importance of a good Guaranteed Ride Home Program.

The size of the RS database survey sample does not permit this type of analysis for RS Database members.
V. Evaluation of RIDESHARE! By Database Members and Local Businesses

a. RS Database Members Evaluation

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

RS Database members were asked what types of assistance RS had provided to them - Specifically, if RS had provided tips on what to do next to start carpooling, information on the GRH program, and a list of potential poolers (or a letter stating that there were no matches).

The chart above shows that about half of the database members recall receiving GRH information. However, members who joined more recently showed a much greater tendency to recall receiving GRH information. The “Last Action Date” field from the RS database with responses provided by database members, and receipt of GRH information was crossed against this field. Although sample sizes do not permit a thorough analysis, 48 of 67 members who had a last action date within the last two years said they received GRH information, versus 28 of 99 members who an older Last Action date. It appears that RS is doing a very satisfactory job of
providing this information to newer database members.

Only 44% recall receiving tips on how to start carpooling, and this percentage does not vary by how recently the members joined the database. This is an area where RS needs to achieve increases for future evaluations.

A total of 84% said they received a list or a letter stating that no matches had been found. RS should set a specific goal and seek to increase this percentage for future evaluations.

69% received a carpooler list, and 15% received a letter saying no matches had been found. RS should seek to increase this total percentage from 84% to 90%-95% for future evaluations. 44% of Rideshare database members recall receiving tips on how to start carpooling. However, since tips are only sent to those who receive a carpool list, the effective percentage is 44/69 or 65% of eligible members.

A total of 69% of database members said they had received a list of carpoolers (and 15% said they received a “no-match” letter). The chart below shows how the list was used by members.
The most important statistic from the evaluation is the use of the list of potential matches used. 61% of those who received the list did not use it. This reflects a significant reduction from the 78% reported in the 1995 evaluation. 15% said they formed a pool with the information they received. The 1995 evaluation states that “20% of those who received match lists said they were in a pooling arrangement.” The relevant comparison figure for this survey is also 20% (apparently, in addition to the 15% noted above, 5% of those who received lists were already in a pooling arrangement or formed one without using the list), so there is no change from the prior evaluation.

To maximize the percentage of people using the list, RS 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
RS Database members were also asked to subjectively evaluate RS performance in a number of different areas based on their experiences. These results are shown below:

Not surprisingly, the lowest scores come on the usefulness of the information and the quality of the lists. RS 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 RS control.

As a rule of thumb in these types of surveys, a result of 7.0-7.2 indicates a reasonably good score. RS should, however, focus more on improving the subjective performance scores than on what the absolute levels of those scores is. 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 RS. Future comparisons should not just re-sample the entire database to determine if there have been changes in RS performance, since many of the members of the database may not have contacted RS 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 RS subsequent to the time of this evaluation, i.e., after May 1996.
One method RS 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. Receipt of GRH information is not shown since many people became database members before the GRH info was made available.

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, RS database members were asked if they would recommend RS to other people seeking assistance in carpooling or vanpooling. RS received very strong results from this question:

RS definitely receives a positive mark from this result. RS should set a goal to increase the percentage of people saying they would "definitely recommend" RS.
Strong recommendations are closely tied to high satisfaction levels, as shown in the next chart:

![Chart showing correlation of agency recommendation and overall satisfaction]

Correlation of Agency Recommendation and Overall Satisfaction
Mean Satisfaction score by how Database Member would Recommend Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Level</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely Recommend</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Recommend</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe/Pr. Not/Def Not</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northeastern Ohio Area Commuter Study May 1998

Clearly, more satisfied RS database members will provide better recommendations for other potential RS customers.
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 RS had helped set up incentive programs, and what their overall evaluation of RS was. The summary chart is repeated here:

Virtually none of the employers said that RS had helped in setting up the programs. The only program where as many as 1% (i.e., 3 respondents) of businesses said RS had helped to set the program up was the GRH program. It should be noted that structurally, RS offers the GRH program - the employers are technically not involved. It is possible that some employers did not make the interpretation that a GRH program was available to their employees through RS. CUTR recommends that future surveys have a re-worded question, which asks if company employees have a GRH program available to them. RS should either see a large increase in the percentage of positive responses to this revised question, or set a goal for future evaluations to make a substantial increase in this area.
Businesses HRDs provided information about their previous interactions with rideshare. These are presented in summary below, broken down by size of business:

Seventeen percent of large businesses (100+ employees), and 12% of all businesses, said they have been contacted by RS. Only 5% of larger (and 6% of all) businesses have had presentations made to them by RS, and only 2% of all businesses say that RS has had a significant impact on their ridesharing programs.

These results will all serve as baselines for future evaluations of RS performance. 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 RS activities. 71% indicated that they were not familiar enough with RS to provide a rating. For the 70 companies that did provide a rating, the average score was 3.92 (±/ 0.4). This is clearly an area where RS should target substantial improvements for future evaluations.
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Northeast Ohio General Awareness Survey 1996

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 Northeast Ohio area. 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?
   1 Yes [If YES, say] Please answer the questions in this survey with respect to your primary job.
      2 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]
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, enter only 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.3 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, or not?

Yes (continue with 4b) / No (go to 4c if applicable)

b. Carpool

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

d. Ride the bus to work

e. Ride a bicycle

f. Walk or jog

g. 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 with someone else in the car, or not?

   Yes (continue with 5b) / No (go to 5c if applicable)

b. Carpool

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

c. Vanpool

d. Ride the bus to work

e. Ride a bicycle

f. Walk or jog

g. Do something else ______ (Specify ________________________________ )
6. ASK Q6-Q8 ONLY IF Q4B>0 OR Q5B>0
   How long have you been in your current carpool?
   ___ Days   ___ Weeks   ___ Months   ___ Years

7. Including yourself, what is the number of people 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 - People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist
   6-Other (Specify ________)

9. ASK Q9-Q11 ONLY IF Q4C>0 OR Q5C>0
   How long have you been in your current vanpool?
   ___ Days   ___ Weeks   ___ Months   ___ Years

10. Including yourself, what is the number of people 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 - People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist
    6-Other (Specify ________)

12. ASK Q12 ONLY IF Q4D>0 OR Q5D>0
    In the past 12 months have you usually been riding the bus to or from work at least once per week, or not?
    1 Yes   2 No   9 RF/DN

13. ASK Q13-Q16 ONLY IF Q4E>0 OR Q5E>0
    In the past 12 months have you usually been riding your bike to or from work at least once per week, or not?
    1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don’t Know

14. Are there any months of the year that the weather or other reasons prevent you from biking to work, or not?
    1 Yes   2 No (Skip to Q. 17)   9 RF/DN (Skip to Q. 17)
15. What are those reasons? (DO NOT READ, CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

A - weather
b - School
c - time change
D - other (specify _______________)

16. And what months are those? (ALL THAT APPLY)
   January -1 February -2 March -3, etc., through December -12

17. ASK Q17-Q20 ONLY IF Q4F>0 OR Q5F>0
   In the past 12 months have you usually been walking or jogging to or from work at least once per week, or not?
   1 Yes       2 No       9 Refused/Don’t Know

18. Are there any months of the year that the weather or other reasons prevent you from walking or jogging to work, or not?
   1 Yes       2 No (Skip to Q. 21)       9 RF/DN (Skip to Q. 21)

19. What are those reasons? (DO NOT READ, CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   A - weather
   b - School
   c - time change
   D - other (specify _______________)

20. And what months are those? (ALL THAT APPLY)
   January -1 February -2 March -3, etc., through December -12

21. ASK Q21 ONLY IF Q4B, Q4C, Q4D, Q4E, AND Q4F = 0
   Since the last time either your residence or your job changed locations, have you tried carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, or biking or walking to or from work at least once, or not?
   1 Yes       2 No       9 Refused/Don’t Know

22. If you were to drive directly from home to work, without any side trips, about what distance would your commute be, in miles? _____ (Record number, 999 for don’t know)

23. And about how much time would driving directly from home to work take?
   _____ Hours    _____ Minutes
24. Are you aware of any incentives your employer offers to carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work, or not?
   1 Yes 2 No (SKIP TO Q26) 3 Don’t Know/ref (Skip to Q 26)

25. What incentives does your employer offer? (Probe - DO NOT READ LIST)
   [ALL THAT APPLY]
   1 Transit subsidies or discounted transit passes
   2 Preferential parking for carpools
   3 Preferential parking for vanpools
   4 Bike racks or lockers
   5 Showers
   6 Guaranteed Ride Home for people who carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work
   7 Rewards such as prizes, coupons, free tickets
   8 Other (Specify ____________________________)

26. Does your employer offer the following programs, yes or no:
   (ROTATE LIST. DO NOT READ ANY CHOICES MENTIONED IN Q. 25 record Yes - 1 No - 2 Don’t Know/refused - 9)
   a. Transit subsidies or discounted transit passes
   b. Preferential parking for carpools
   c. Preferential parking for vanpools
   d. Subsidies for carpoolers or vanpoolers
   e. Bike racks or lockers
   f. Showers for people who bike or walk to work
   g. Guaranteed Ride Home for people who carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work
   h. Rewards for people who carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work such as prizes, coupons, free tickets

27. Have you heard, seen or read any advertising or other messages related to carpooling or vanpooling in the past 6 months, or not?
   1 Yes 2 No (SKIP TO Q32) 9 Don’t Know/Refused (SKIP TO Q 32)
28. Where did you see or hear this advertising? [All that apply]
   (PROBE - was there any other advertising that you saw? Where?
   DO NOT READ LIST)
   1 Newspaper
   2 Radio
   Was this ad part of a traffic report? Yes ___ No ___
   3 Television
   4 At work
   5 In the mail
   6 On billboards
   7 Received a phone call
   8 At bus stop/on a bench
   9 On the side of buses/vans
   10 Other
   11 Rideshare Week/Earth Day
   12 Highway road signs, blue signs
   99. Don’t Know/Refused

29. What message do you recall from this advertising? [All that apply]
   (PROBE - Any other messages you recall?)
   (DO NOT READ CHOICES)
   1 None
   2 That one should rideshare [Probe for why and specify ___________________]
   3 That you can call a number for car/vanpool info/the RIDE phone number
   4 Ridesharing saves time
   5 Ridesharing is less stressful
   6 Ridesharing is more enjoyable
   7 Ridesharing saves money
   8 Driving alone is a hassle
   0 Other __________________________________________ (specify)
   9 DN/RF

30. Did you try carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it, or not?
   1 Yes (Skip to q. 32) 2 No 9 Don’t Know/Refused

31. Did you consider trying carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about
    it, or not?
   1 Yes 2 No 9 Don’t Know/refused

32. 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. 34) 9 Don’t Know/Refused (SKIP TO Q43)
33. Which organizations have you heard of? (All that apply) (DO NOT READ LIST)
   1 Rideshare!
   2 NOACA, or Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency
   3 EDATA, or Eastgate Development And Transportation Agency
   4 SCATS, or Stark County Area Transportation Study
   5 AMATS, or Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study
   6 Transportation Management Organizations (non-specific)
   7 Rideshare! Number, 1-800-825-RIDE
   8 Other (Specify ______________________)

34. ASK Q34 ONLY IF Q33-1 NOT MENTIONED
   Have you ever heard of the Rideshare! Organization, or not?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don’t Know

35. ASK Q35 ONLY IF Q33-7 NOT MENTIONED
   Have you ever heard of the Rideshare number, "1-800-825-RIDE", or not?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Refused/Don’t Know

36. Have you ever contacted Rideshare!, the Rideshare number, or any other local group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?
   1 Yes   2 No   9 Don’t Know/refused

37. Since you’ve been living in the local area, have you gotten your name registered with a carpooling or vanpooling service, or not?
   1 Yes   2 No   (SKIP TO D1)   9 Refused/Don’t Know (SKIP TO D1)

38. Have you ever asked to have your name removed from the register, or not?
   1 Yes, had it removed
   2 No, did not have it removed (SKIP TO D1)
   3 Don’t Know
   4 Refused

39. And what made you decide to stop having your name registered with 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 other reasons
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 1995?

Under $10,000 1
$10,000 - $19,999 2
$20,000 - $29,999 3
$30,000 - $39,999 4
$40,000 - $49,999 5
$50,000 - $59,999 6
$60,000 - $69,999 7
$70,000 or more 8
Refused (DON'T READ) 9

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey. For verification purposes, etc.
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 Northeast Ohio area. We are not attempting to sell you anything, we are only interested in your opinions. (Ask to speak to person named on sample sheet - repeat intro if necessary)

1. How many 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]

2. Do you currently hold more than one job?
   1 Yes [If YES, say] Please answer the questions in this survey with respect to your primary job.
   2 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]
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, enter only 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.3 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, or not?

Yes (continue with 4b) / No (go to 4c if applicable)

b. Carpool _____ (If >0, check CARPOOL box on tally sheet)

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 _____ (If >0, check VANPOOL box on tally sheet)
d. Ride the bus to work _____ (If >0, check BUS box on tally sheet)
e. Ride a bicycle _____ (If >0, check BIKE box on tally sheet)
f. Walk or jog _____ (If >0, check WALK/JOG box on tally sheet)
g. 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 to work with someone else in the car, or not?

Yes (continue with 5b) / No (go to 5c if applicable)

b. Carpool _____ (If >0, check CARPOOL box on tally sheet)

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, check VANPOOL box on tally sheet)
d. Ride the bus to work _____ (If >0, check BUS box on tally sheet)
e. Ride a bicycle _____ (If >0, check BIKE box on tally sheet)
f. Walk or jog _____ (If >0, check WALK/JOG box on tally sheet)
g. Do something else _____ (Specify ____________________________ )
6. ASK Q6-Q8 ONLY IF CARPOOL BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET - IF CARPOOL BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO Q9

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

7. Including yourself, what is the number of people 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 - People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist 6 - Other (Specify ____________ )

9. ASK Q9-Q11 ONLY IF VANPOOL BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET - IF VANPOOL BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO Q12

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

10. Including yourself, what is the number of people 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 - People from a carpool/vanpool matchlist 6 - Other (Specify ____________ )

12. ASK Q12 ONLY IF BUS BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET - IF BUS BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO Q. 13

In the past 12 months have you usually been riding the bus to or from work at least once per week, or not?
1 Yes 2 No 9 RF/DN

13. ASK Q13-Q16 ONLY IF BIKE BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET - IF BIKE BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO Q. 17

In the past 12 months have you usually been riding your bike to or from work at least once per week, or not?
1 Yes 2 No 9 Refused/Don’t Know

14. Are there any months of the year that the weather or other reasons prevent you from biking to work, or not?
1 Yes 2 No (Skip to Q. 17) 9 RF/DN (Skip to Q. 17)
15. What are those reasons? (DO NOT READ, CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   A- weather
   b - School
   c - time change
   D - other (specify ________________)

16. And what months are those? (ALL THAT APPLY)
    January - 1 February - 2 March - 3, etc., through December - 12

17. ASK Q17-Q20 ONLY IF WALK/JOG BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET -
    IF WALK/JOG BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO Q. 21
    In the past 12 months have you usually been walking or jogging to or from work at least
    once per week, or not?
    1 Yes  2 No  9 Refused/Don’t Know

18. Are there any months of the year that the weather or other reasons prevent you from
    walking or jogging to work, or not?
    1 Yes  2 No (Skip to Q. 21) 9 RF/DN (Skip to Q. 21)

19. What are those reasons? (DO NOT READ, CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   A- weather
   b - School
   c - time change
   D - other (specify ________________)

20. And what months are those? (ALL THAT APPLY)
    January - 1 February - 2 March - 3, etc., through December - 12

21. ASK Q21 ONLY IF NO BOXES CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET -
    IF ANY BOXES ARE CHECKED, SKIP TO Q. 22
    Since the last time either your residence or your job changed locations, have you tried
    carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, or biking or walking to or from work at least once,
    or not?
    1 Yes (CHECK TRIED RIDESHARE BOX ON TALLY SHEET)  
    2 No  9 Refused/Don’t Know

22. If you were to drive directly from home to work, without any side trips, about what distance
    would your commute be, in miles? ____ (Record number, 999 for don’t know)

23. And about how much time would driving directly from home to work take?
    ____ Hours  ____ Minutes
24. Does your employer offer the following incentives to carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, or walk or bike. Please answer yes or no for each incentive:

(Rotate List)

| Record | Yes - 1 | No - 2 | Don’t Know/Refused - 9 |

a. Transit subsidies or discounted transit passes
b. Preferential parking for carpools
c. Preferential parking for vanpools
d. Subsidies for carpoolers or vanpoolers
e. Bike racks or lockers
f. Showers for people who bike or walk to work
g. Guaranteed Ride Home for people who carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work
h. Rewards for people who carpool, vanpool, ride the bus, bike or walk to work such as prizes, coupons, free tickets

25. Have you heard, seen or read any advertising or other messages related to carpooling or vanpooling in the past 6 months, or not?

1 Yes 2 No (Skip to Q29) 9 Don’t Know/Refused (Skip to Q. 29)

26. Where did you see or hear this advertising? [All that apply]

(PROBE - was there any other advertising that you saw? Where?)

DO NOT READ LIST

1 Newspaper
2 Radio
3 Television
4 At work
5 In the mail
6 On billboards
7 Received a phone call
8 At bus stop/on a bench
9 On the side of buses/vans
10 Other
11 Rideshare Week/Earth Day
12 Highway road signs, blue signs
99 Don’t Know/Refused
27. What message do you recall from this advertising? [All that apply]  
   (PROBE - Do you recall any other messages?)  
   (DO NOT READ CHOICES)  
   1 None  
   2 That one should rideshare [Probe for why and specify ______________________]  
   3 That you can call a number for car/vanpool info/the RIDE phone number  
   4 Ridesharing saves time  
   5 Ridesharing is less stressful  
   6 Ridesharing is more enjoyable  
   7 Ridesharing saves money  
   8 Driving Alone is a hassle  
   0 Other __________________________________________ (specify)  
   9 DN/RF  

28. Did you try carpooling or vanpooling after seeing or hearing advertising about it, or not?  
   1 Yes 2 No 9 Don’t Know/Refused  

29. 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. 31) 9 Don’t Know/Refused (SKIP TO Q31)  

30. Which organizations that promote carpooling or vanpooling have you heard of?  
   (All that apply)  
   (DO NOT READ LIST)  
   1 Rideshare!  
   2 The Rideshare number (1-800-825-RIDE)  
   3 NOACA, or Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency  
   4 EDATA, or Eastgate Development And Transportation Agency  
   5 SCATS, or Stark County Area Transportation Study  
   6 AMATS, or Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study  
   7 Other (Specify ________________________)  
   9 Don’t Know/refused  

31. DO NOT ASK Q31 IF Rideshare! MENTIONED IN QUESTION 30  
   Have you ever heard of Rideshare! ?  
   1- Yes 2 - No 9 Don’t Know/Refused  

32. DO NOT ASK Q32 IF Rideshare Number MENTIONED IN QUESTION 30  
   Have you ever heard of the Rideshare number "1-800-825-RIDE", or not?  
   1 Yes 2 No 9 Refused/Don’t Know
33. Have you ever contacted Rideshare!, the Rideshare number, 1-800-825-RIDE, or any other local group for carpool or vanpool information, or not?
   1 Yes (CHECK CONTACTED RIDESHARE BOX ON TALLY SHEET)
   2 No  (SKIP TO Q35)    9 Don’t Know/refused (SKIP TO Q35)

34. Whom did you contact? [All that apply - DO NOT READ]
   1 Rideshare!
   2 The Rideshare number (1-800-825-RIDE)
   3 NOACA, or Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency
   4 EDATA, or Eastgate Development And Transportation Agency
   5 SCATS, or Stark County Area Transportation Study
   6 AMATS, or Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study
   7 Other (Specify ____________________)
   9 Don’t Know/refused

35. Have you ever gotten your name registered with Rideshare! or some other Northeastern Ohio carpool/vanpool service, or not?
   1 Yes  (CHECK CONTACTED RIDESHARE BOX ON TALLY SHEET)
   2 No  (SKIP TO Q38)    9 Refused/Don’t Know (SKIP TO Q38)

36. Did you request to have your name removed from the register, or not?
   1 Yes, had it removed
   2 No, did not ask to have it removed (SKIP TO Q38)
   3 Don’t Know
   4 Refused

37. And what made you decide to stop having your name registered with 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 other reasons
38. ASK Q38 ONLY IF CONTACTED RIDESHARE BOX IS CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET;
   If CONTACTED RIDESHARE BOX IS NOT CHECKED SKIP TO D1
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 (CHECK LIST PROVIDED BOX ON TALLY SHEET)
   2 Bus schedules & routes
   3 List of potential vanpoolers (CHECK LIST PROVIDED BOX ON TALLY SHEET)
   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 Guaranteed Ride Home program
   9 Tips on what to do next to start carpooling/vanpooling
   10 Information about the commuter club
   11 Other (Specify ________________________ )
   99 Don’t know/Refused

39. Did they provide you with _____________________________ or not?
   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 Guaranteed Ride Home program
   c a list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers (IF YES, CHECK LIST PROVIDED BOX ON TALLY SHEET)

IF LIST PROVIDED BOX NOT CHECKED, ASK:
   C2 Did they send a letter stating that no carpool or vanpool matches were found?
   (RECORD ANSWER, SKIP TO Q. 40)

IF LIST PROVIDED BOX IS CHECKED, 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 C3 IS YES, ASK:
   c4 And did you successfully join a carpool or vanpool with someone from this list? (IF YES, CHECK TRIED RIDESHARE BOX ON TALLY SHEET)

GO TO NEXT QUESTION
If none of those boxes is checked, skip to Q42.

To what extent did the guaranteed ride home program influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...
1 Have a great deal of influence
2 have a moderate influence
3 have a small influence, or
4 have 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)

To what extent did information or assistance from the agency influence your choice of how you commute to or from work? Did it...
1 Have a great deal of influence
2 have a moderate influence
3 have a small influence, or
4 have no influence at all
9 Don’t Know/refused (DO NOT READ)

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

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 you with
b. The usefulness of the information they provided you with
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 LIST PROVIDED BOX CHECKED ON TALLY SHEET)

f. The quality and usefulness of the list of potential carpoolers or vanpoolers that they sent you.
44. And still using this scale, overall how satisfied are you with this agency’s performance?

45. 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 not 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 1994?

- Under $10,000 1
- $10,000 - $19,999 2
- $20,000 - $29,999 3
- $30,000 - $39,999 4
- $40,000 - $49,999 5
- $50,000 - $59,999 6
- $60,000 - $69,999 7
- $70,000 or more 8
- Refused (DON'T READ) 9

Thank you very much. That concludes our survey. For verification purposes, etc.
TALLY SHEET FOR SURVEY

CARPOOL
VANPOOL
BUS
BIKE
WALK/JOG

TRIED RIDE SHARE
CONTACTED RIDE SHARE
LIST PROVIDED
Please fill out and return this survey by May 29, 1996.

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:
   - 1-5 other employers (1)
   - 6-9 other employers (2)
   - 10-25 other employers (2)
   - Over 25 other employers (5)
   - No other employers (5)
   - (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)
   - 20-49 (4)
   - 50-99 (5)
   - 100-499 (6)
   - 500 or more (7)

6. How many parking places does your organization provide for your employees? (Check ONE)
   - Less than 5 (1)
   - 5-9 (2)
   - 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 is the bus stop: (Check all that apply)
    - Sheltered (1)
    - Well-lit (2)
    - Located on 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 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
- Banking
- Snack Bar
- Dry Cleaners
- Post Office
- Dentist
- General Retail Shopping
- Convenience Store
- Exercise Facility
- Restaurant/Child Care Cafeteria
- Facility

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)
- 20 hrs/wk □ (3)
- 4 hours/wk □ (1)
- 30 hrs/wk □ (4)
- 10 hrs/wk □ (2)
- 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)
- 20 hrs/wk □ (3)
- 4 hours/wk □ (1)
- 30 hrs/wk □ (4)
- 10 hrs/wk □ (2)
- 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)
- 3 days/yr □ (3)
- 1 day/year □ (1)
- 4 days/yr □ (4)
- 2 days/yr □ (2)
- 5+ days/yr □ (5)

17. How many other locations does your organization have in the Northeast Ohio Area? (Check ONE)

- None □ (0)
- 5-9 □ (3)
- 1 □ (1)
- 2-4 □ (2)
- 10 or more □ (4)
18. How many employees do you have working at other locations within the Northeast Ohio Area? (Check ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500+</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Please make a check mark by the statement which best describes your knowledge of the Rideshare! Agency (Check ONE)

- You have heard of Rideshare! but don't know what they do [ ]
- You are familiar with some of Rideshare's activities [ ]
- You have a sound working knowledge of Rideshare's programs [ ]
- You have never heard of Rideshare! [ ]

20. Please make a check mark by each of the following statements that correctly describes your organization's interaction with the Rideshare! Agency (Check all that apply)

- Your organization has been contacted by Rideshare! [ ]
- Rideshare! Has made a presentation to your organization [ ]
- Rideshare!'s activities have had a significant impact on your organization's ridesharing programs [ ]
- Your organization intends to contact the Rideshare! Agency in the near future [ ]

21. Please CIRCLE THE NUMBER that best reflects your opinion of how effective the Rideshare! agency's activities are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Not familiar with Rideshare!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 the Rideshare! Agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently offer</th>
<th>Ridesharing agency helped to set up program</th>
<th>Would consider offering</th>
<th>Would like to get assistance from ridesharing agency to implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike racks or lockers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers &amp; clothing storage</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime work schedules</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work weeks</td>
<td>(4 days/40 hours, 9 days/80 hrs, etc.)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow employees to work at home</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to provide a shuttle to/from remote parking facilities</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to provide a shuttle to lunch places/banks/dry cleaners during the day</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved parking spaces for vanpools/carpools</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for mass transit or shuttle use</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/vanpool subsidies</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home program, which provides an 80% discount on a taxi ride for users of commute alternatives who have emergencies</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company cars for employee business travel during the day</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional vacation days as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupon books/discounts as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Free tickets to sports events, movies, symphony, etc. as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</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 IN THE NORTHEAST OHIO AREA.

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact:
   Dan Rudge at CUTR (813) 974-3120, or
   Maribeth Issue at NOACA (216) 241-2414