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I Introduction

The purpose of this report is to present information from the surveys of businesses that was not covered in the main evaluation report. The information will be presented in three sections:
- Methodology
- Characteristics of responding businesses
- Opportunities to implement new programs
- Recommendations for adjustments to FHWA TDM model default values

II Methodology

A total of 1,392 surveys were mailed to Human Resource Directors (HRDs) of employers in the RIDESHARE! (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. Those areas were defined by the following zip codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOACA</th>
<th>AMATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44131, 44144, 44122</td>
<td>44306, 44202, 44203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44143, 44114, 44115</td>
<td>44333, 44223, 44236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44113, 44124, 44145</td>
<td>44056, 44224, 44241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44106</td>
<td>44087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCATS</th>
<th>EDATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44720, 44718, 44702</td>
<td>44512, 44406, 44446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44646, 44601, 44708</td>
<td>44482, 44425, 44515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44663, 44622, 44647</td>
<td>44420, 44502, 44484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44615</td>
<td>44509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
III Characteristics of Businesses

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

![Types of Employer Organizations in Northeast Ohio area](chart.png)

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

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

2. Only 20 responses were received from retail-oriented organizations. Even if the responses are “generally” representative of retail organizations’ attitudes, the effect of any “outliers”, i.e. organizations that have opinions that deviate widely from the norm for this type of organization, would be quite significant. This wouldn’t be as much of a problem if the entire sample base were larger (say, 150 retail organizations). However, given the current situation, re-weighting may do as much (if not more) harm than good.

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

The majority of the responding employers are “white collar” office-related businesses, such as services, financially oriented business, and administration. There is also a large number of manufacturers in the sample.
Companies were also asked how many employees they had at their individual worksites. The survey was designed to garner responses primarily from companies with 100 or more employees, as well as some companies with 50 to 99 employees. For the most part, the responses received followed that pattern. Again, results are compared with the full sample universe.

Types of Employer Organizations in Northeast Ohio area

This is a comparison of self-reported number of employees versus a database figure. Here there is a much greater probability of mis-classification by employee size in the original database (due to layoffs, other organizational changes, etc.). Also, the percentages are reasonably close for the three categories. The differences here were determined to be insufficient to warrant further investigation.
Surveys were sent to companies in proportion to the number of companies in each LRA’s area of responsibility, along the corridors specified by RS. Responses came back in very much the same magnitudes:
The next set of charts show the level of concentration of surveyed employers, in terms of other employers in the same buildings, and how many of the businesses are in Central Business Districts (CBD’s) and how many are in Corporate/Industrial Parks. The majority of businesses surveyed are in CBD’s. Furthermore, 88% of all businesses surveyed said they had 6 or more other businesses within ½ mile of their worksite.
The surveys indicate that this area has a number of highly concentrated, office-oriented businesses which provide the best likelihood for the development of successful ridesharing programs. Opportunities to implement new programs within the local businesses will be discussed in the next section.
IV Opportunities to Implement New programs within the Business Community

HRD’s at surveyed businesses were asked to provide information on what new programs they might be willing to consider, and for which programs they might want Ridesharing agency assistance.

Businesses were specifically asked if they had ETC’s in place, and if not, if they would be willing to designate time to have them. The results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Establishing Employee Transportation Coordinators in Northeast Ohio area Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 2% of businesses said they had an ETC-like position already set up. However, 16% of larger businesses, and 13% of all businesses, said they would be willing to designate time for an ETC position (generally 4 hours per week). Research reports that ETC’s are a cornerstone of successful implementation of commute alternative programs through businesses. What the survey indicates is that in 1 of 6 contacts with larger businesses, RS might very well be able to successfully recommend a limited development of an ETC position.
A summary of programs offered and what might be considered is also displayed in the chart below:

Larger businesses are more apt to offer some kind of incentive program (which includes bike racks, company cars, and so forth) than smaller businesses. Size is neither a factor in businesses’ consideration of implementing new programs, nor an indicator of wanting rideshare agency help.
Specific programs that employers would consider setting up are shown in the chart below:

Only 27% of businesses would consider offering any programs. For those companies, about 33% (or about 9% of ALL businesses) would be willing to offer programs such as coupon books/discounts, subsidies for using transit, a GRH program, preferred pool parking, and so forth.

About 1 in 10 businesses that would consider offering programs (2-4% of all businesses) would like RS help to set up the programs, particularly for GRH, the coupon books/discount incentives, transit subsidies, and so forth. There was very little difference between large and small businesses on their interest in having RS help set up programs.
V  Recommendations for adjustments to FHWA TDM Model Default Values

The FHWA TDM model makes a number of assumptions about how many businesses will participate in various types of incentive programs, based on the results of surveys in California with a few adjustments from nationwide results. The RIDESHARE! program has the opportunity to customize the TDM model assumptions by using the results of these surveys.

The TDM model essentially provides two default values: one for business under 100 employees, and one for businesses with 100 or more employees. The results from the surveys will be presented in the same fashion.

The sections that can be customized are listed below, together with the corresponding result. The results were obtained by adding together the number of businesses that currently offer the programs with ½ of the businesses that “would consider” offering the program. Additionally, an alternative assumption is provided if all the employers who said they “would consider” the program are added in.

It should be noted that these values are averages for the entire area in corridors specified by the LRA’s. Certain subareas (either geographic, or by certain types of businesses) may have differing participation rates.

1. Level of Employer Support (ETC’s, and so forth)
   - Always set to Level 1.
     - Under 100 employees: Set participation to 5% (including all that would consider: 9%)
       Default value is 4%
     - 100 or more employees: Set to 10% (including all that would consider: 18%)
       Default value is 37%

   Only 13% of employers indicated a willingness to establish ETC’s (part-time), and even fewer (11% to 12%) indicated that they would consider (or already offered) a GRH program.

2. Employer participation in preferential parking for vanpools/carpools.
   - Under 100 employees: Set participation to 8% (including all that would consider: 13%)
     Default value is 1%
   - 100 or more employees: Set to 8% (including all that would consider: 11%)
     Default value is 7%

3. Employer participation in transit subsidies
   - Under 100 employees: Set participation to 6% (including all that would consider: 12%)
     Default value is 1%
   - 100 or more employees: Set to 7% (including all that would consider: 11%)
     Default value is 7%
4. Employer participation in carpool or vanpool subsidies  
   Under 100 employees: Set participation to 4% (including all that would consider: 8%)  
     Default value is 1%  
   100 or more employees: Set to 3% (including all that would consider: 5%)  
     Default value is 7%  

5. Employer participation in guaranteed ride home  
   Under 100 employees: Set participation to 5% (including all that would consider: 8%)  
   100 or more employees: Set to 8% (including all that would consider: 13%)  

6. Employer participation in compressed work weeks  
   Under 100 employees: Set participation to 17% (including all that would consider: 20%)  
     Default value is 4%  
   100 or more employees: Set to 18% (including all that would consider: 20%)  
     Default value is 37%  
   
   Set employee eligibility to 37% (for all participating employers)  

7. Employer participation in telecommuting  
   Under 100 employees: Set participation to 11% (including all that would consider: 13%)  
     Default value is 4%  
   100 or more employees: Set to 11% (including all that would consider: 13%)  
     Default value is 37%  
   
   Set employee eligibility to 27% (for all participating employers)  
   
   TDM model default values suggest the following breakdown for telecommuters:  
     6.4% telecommute 1 day per week  
     12.8% telecommute 2 days per week  
     19.2% telecommute 3 days per week  
     25.6% telecommute 4 days per week  
     32.0% telecommute 5 days per week  

Appendix: Copy of Employer Survey
NORTHEAST OHIO AREA EMPLOYER TRANSPORTATION SURVEY

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  (1)
- Construction  (2)
- Transportation, Public Utilities  (3)
- Finance/Insurance/Real Estate  (4)
- Services (business, personal)  (5)
- Mining  (6)
- Manufacturing  (7)
- Wholesale Trade  (8)
- Retail Trade  (9)
- Public Admin  (10)

2. Is your organization located in:

- a central business district?  (1)
- a corporate/industrial park?  (1)

3. Does your organization share a building or corporate/industrial park with: (check ONE)

- 1-5 other employers  (1)
- 10-25 other employers  (2)
- No other employers  (5)
- Over 25 other employers  (4)

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)
- 20-49  (4)
- 50 - 99  (5)
- 500 or more  (7)

6. How many parking places does your organization provide for your employees? (Check ONE)

- Less than 5  (1)
- 20-49  (4)
- 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)

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)

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 do not offer the program or no one participates)  
   Flextime  __ %  __ %  
   Compressed work weeks (4 days/40 hours, 9/80, etc.)  __ %  __ %  
   Telecommuting  __ %  __ %  

12. For the following facilities, please check all of those that are available at or near (1/4 mile or less) your site:  
   Medical services ☐ (1)  Banking ☐ (2)  Snack Bar ☐ (3)  
   Dry Cleaners ☐ (4)  Post Office ☐ (5)  Dentist ☐ (6)  
   General Retail ☐ (7)  Convenience ☐ (8)  Exercise ☐ (9)  
   Shopping ☐ (10)  Store ☐ (8)  Facility ☐ (9)  
   Restaurant/Cafeteria ☐ (10)  Child Care ☐ (1)  Facility ☐ (11)  

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)  4 hours/wk ☐ (1)  10 hrs/wk ☐ (2)  
   20 hrs/wk ☐ (3)  30 hrs/wk ☐ (4)  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)  4 hours/wk ☐ (1)  10 hrs/wk ☐ (2)  
   20 hrs/wk ☐ (3)  30 hrs/wk ☐ (4)  40 hrs/wk ☐ (5)  

16. And if no-cost training could be provided, how much training would your organization allow your ETC to attend? (Check ONE)  
   None ☐ (0)  1 day/year ☐ (1)  2 days/yr ☐ (2)  
   3 days/yr ☐ (3)  4 days/yr ☐ (4)  5+ days/yr ☐ (5)  

17. How many other locations does your organization have in the Northeast Ohio Area? (Check ONE)  
   None ☐ (0)  1 ☐ (1)  2-4 ☐ (2)  
   5-9 ☐ (3)  10 or more ☐ (4)
Table 3
Summary of Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Time Performance</th>
<th>Dwell Time</th>
<th>On-Time Performance</th>
<th>Dwell Time</th>
<th>Ride Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Pick-up Log-Sch^1 (minutes)</td>
<td>(B) Pick-up AVL-Sch^2 (minutes)</td>
<td>(C) Pick-up Log-AVL^3 (minutes)</td>
<td>(D) Dwell Time^4 (minutes)</td>
<td>(E) Drop-off Log-Sch^5 (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE #119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-3 (early)</td>
<td>0 (on-time)</td>
<td>-7 (before)</td>
<td>0 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13 (late)</td>
<td>17 (late)</td>
<td>-1 (before)</td>
<td>6 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE #201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-4 (early)</td>
<td>3 (late)</td>
<td>-10 (before)</td>
<td>5 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>10 (late)</td>
<td>15 (late)</td>
<td>-6 (before)</td>
<td>12 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE #303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0 (on time)</td>
<td>-2 (early)</td>
<td>-27 (before)</td>
<td>1 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1 (late)</td>
<td>29 (late)</td>
<td>2 (after)</td>
<td>11 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE #429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-7 (early)</td>
<td>-6 (early)</td>
<td>-8 (before)</td>
<td>1 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>8 (late)</td>
<td>12 (late)</td>
<td>0 (on time)</td>
<td>13 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average All Vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-7 (early)</td>
<td>-6 (early)</td>
<td>-27 (before)</td>
<td>0 (wait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13 (late)</td>
<td>29 (late)</td>
<td>2 (after)</td>
<td>13 (wait)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ (0)</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 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>0</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 (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>Ridesharing agency helped to set up program (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>Would consider offering (Check all that apply)</th>
<th>Would like to get assistance from ridesharing agency to implement (Check all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike racks or lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers &amp; clothing storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime work schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 days/40 hours, 9 days/80 hrs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow employees to work at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to provide a shuttle to/from remote parking facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to provide a shuttle to lunch places/banks/dry cleaners during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved parking spaces for vanpools/carpools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for mass transit or shuttle use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/vanpool subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company cars for employee business travel during the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional vacation days as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupon books/discounts as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Free tickets to sports events, movies, symphony, etc. as a reward for using commute alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Organization: ___________________________ Contact Name: ___________________________
Address: ____________________________________________________________

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

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME IN FILLING OUT THIS SURVEY. THE RESULTS WILL BE USED TO REDUCE TRAFFIC AND PARKING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHEAST OHIO AREA.

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