

COMMUTER CONNECTIONS TDM EVALUATION PROJECT

2019 State of the Commute Survey Highlights

Nicholas Ramfos
Transportation Operations Programs Director

Transportation Planning Board Technical Committee
September 6, 2019



Background

- Seventh triennial survey (2001, 2004, 2007, 10, 13, 2019)
- The State of the Commute Survey (SOC) vs. the Regional Travel Survey (RTS)
 - The SOC Survey analyzes commute trends and attitudes to evaluate the effectiveness of COG/TPB's commuter services programs
 - The RTS analyzes detailed household and person trips to develop COG/TPB's regional travel demand forecasting model
 - Both the SOC and the RTS are random sample surveys that use an address based sampling methodology
 - RTS captures all trips (both work and non-work trips)
 - SOC Survey focuses on commute trips and modes only



Differences between RTS and SOC Surveys

	Regional Travel Survey (2017-2018)	State of the Commute Survey (2019)
Frequency	Every 10 years	Every 3 years
Duration	15 months	3 months
Sampling Frame	Households and individuals	Employed persons
Sample Size	15,976	Over 8,000 for 2019 and in 2016 it was 5,903
Recruitment	Mail using address based sampling	
Methodology	Internet with phone option	
Geographic Coverage	TPB Modeled Area	Non-Attainment Region
Primary Data of Interest	Detailed trips and typical weekday travel	Commute patterns and commuter opinions



SOC Survey Methodology

- Interviewed 8,246 employed residents of COG region (95% + 1.1%)
- Address-based sample (ABS) method – randomly-selected postal addresses received postcard in mail with link to Internet survey
- 7,808 Internet interviews ; 438 by telephone follow-up
- Sample plan ensured at least 600 completes in each jurisdiction
- Jurisdiction counts ranged from 664 – 941 (95% + 3.8 for smallest sample)
- County level results were expanded to match the regional population of workers
- Data also were weighted to adjust sample for race/ethnicity, and age
- Survey designed and administered through LDA Consulting, CIC Research, ESTC, and CUTR



SOC 2019 Survey Topics

Continued tracking questions

- Current/past commute patterns
- Telework
- Access to transit, HOV/Express lanes, P&R
- Transportation satisfaction, benefits of alternative mode use
- Mass marketing awareness and influence
- Awareness of CC, regional and local commute services
- Employer commute assistance

New questions in 2019

- Additional info on bikeshare/scooters and ride-hail
- Past use of transit among transit non-riders; why stopped
- Details of Express lane use (roads used, modes, changes made)
- Use of social networking and travel info apps
- Familiarity and interest in driverless cars



COMMUTE PATTERNS

- *Commuter Modes and Trips*
- *HOV and Express Lanes*



Weekly Commute Trips

58% of Commuters' Weekly Commute Trips Were Made by Driving Alone or Taxi/Ride-hail; 24% Were Made by Transit and 10% of Trips Were Eliminated by TW/CWS


By Mode:

Transit
16.6% Metrorail; 1.6% Commuter Rail

Carpool/Vanpool
3.4% Formal; 1.0% Slug; 0.2% Vanpool


Walk/Bike/Scooter
1.7% Walk; 1.5% Bike; 0.1% scooter

Ride Hail/Taxi
1.0% Ride-hail; 0.1% Taxi



Weekly Commute Trips


Drive alone rates were much lower for both residents and workers in the “Inner Core” area (DC, Arlington, Alexandria) than for Middle Ring (Fairfax, Montgomery, Prince George’s) and Outer Ring (Calvert, Charles, Frederick Loudoun, Prince William) respondents



Weekly Commute Trips by Mode Trend

Between 2004 and 2019, the Drive Alone Percentage Fell 13 Points, from 71% to 58%


Telework and transit use increased; other modes remained steady



Ride-Hailing Trips

59% of commute trips would have been made by transit
Half of these commuters said they would have driven in a personal vehicle (28%) or ridden in a taxi (20%)


Commuter Trip Without Ride Hail Service
(multiple responses permitted)



Past Transit Riders

(23%) of past rider respondents said they don't use transit because they had moved either their home or work location and had no transit service available. Travel time (18%), the cost of transit (11%) and the unreliability of transit (9%) were other reasons not to use transit for past riders.

Past Rider Reasons for Not Using Transit




- No Service
- Takes Too Much Time
- Too Expensive
- Unreliability
- Need Car
- Commute Too Short
- Have to Transfer
- Prefer to Drive

HOV and Express Lanes

One-third of Commuters Had HOV Lane Along their Route to Work and 18% Had Access to an Express Lane


One-third of commuters who had access to HOV used the lanes; Nearly half of commuters who had Express lanes available used them



Express Lanes Use

Nearly Half of Express Lane Users Traveled on I-495; One-third Used I-95 in VA and 29% Used I-395

8% of respondents who said they used an Express lane mentioned a non-Express toll road or a road with only HOV lanes, suggesting some confusion about the Express lane concept




Express Lanes Mode Use

73% of Express Lane Users Typically Drove Alone While Using the Lanes, 26% Used CP/VP, 10% Rode Transit

Drive alone use of Express lanes was most common on the Beltway (86% of users drove alone) and on I-66 outside the Beltway (85%)


Carpooling/vanpooling and transit were common on I-95 and I-395



HOV and Express Lanes Mode Shifts

HOV Lane Users were Much More Likely to Make Alt Mode Changes Than Were Those Who Used Only Express Lanes


Most (85%) Express lane users said the lanes had not influenced their travel at all



HOV and Express Lanes Alternative Mode Use

CP/VP Use is 9% When Respondents Have HOV Lane Access vs 3% for No HOV or Express Lane Only

The drive alone rate for HOV lanes is much higher among commuters have access only to Express lanes (85%) or to neither HOV nor Express (75%)



Vehicle Ownership

The trend away from vehicle ownership among young residents might be reversing. 40% of young respondents who lived in the Inner Core reported having a vehicle for each adult household member, vs. 32% in 2016.

Middle Ring was 58% in 2016 to 67% in 2019 and Outer Ring was 73% in 2016 to 83% in 2019

Home Area and Age		1+ Car Available	1+ Car Available	Change (2016-2019)
		2016 SOC	2019 SOC	
Inner Core	Under 35 years (2016 n = 212, 2019 n = 778)	32%	40%	+ 8%
	35 to 54 years (2016 n = 749, 2019 n = 908)	51%	56%	+ 5%
	55 years and older (2016 n = 618, 2019 n = 476)	57%	63%	+ 6%
Middle Ring	Under 35 years (2016 n = 218, 2019 n = 417)	58%	67%	+ 9%
	35 to 54 years (2016 n = 719, 2019 n = 1,065)	69%	75%	+ 6%
	55 years and older (2016 n = 643, 2019 n = 875)	73%	76%	+ 3%
Outer Ring	Under 35 years (2016 n = 272, 2019 n = 483)	73%	83%	+ 10%
	35 to 54 years (2016 n = 1,285, 2019 n = 1,746)	81%	87%	+ 6%
	55 years and older (2016 n = 907, 2019 n = 1,163)	81%	88%	+ 7%



COMMUTE EASE & SATISFACTION

- *Commuter Satisfaction (by geographic area and mode)*
- *Ease of Commute*




Satisfaction by Location & Time

50% of 2019 Respondents Were Satisfied with their Commute, Lower than in 2016, 2013, or 2010

Inner Core residents much more satisfied (63%) than were Middle Ring (50%) or Outer Ring (37%) residents; Satisfaction dropped as travel time increased

Satisfied by
Travel Time

- 1-10 min – 92%
- 11-20 min – 80%
- 21-30 min – 59%
- 31-45 min – 43%
- 46-60 min – 32%
- > 60 min – 26%




Satisfaction by Mode

Bikers/Walkers Were Most Satisfied; CP/VP & DA Were Least Satisfied

Metrorail riders were notably MORE satisfied in 2019 than in 2016;

satisfaction declined for commuter rail, CP/VP, and drive alone commuters



Commute Ease

28% had a More Difficult Commute than a Year Ago- Higher than 2016


Commuters who lived in the Outer Ring and those with long travel times more likely to report a more difficult commute;

Commuters who moved home or work more likely to report easier commute

More Difficult Commute

Home Area: Inner Core – 21%, Middle Ring – 26%, **Outer Ring – 40%**


Distance: 1-20 min – 10%, 21-30 min – 22%, **31-45 min – 31%, 46+ – 40%**



Commute Ease Importance

52% of Commuters who Moved Home/Work Location Said Commute Factors Were Important to the Decision


34% said commute ease was more important than other factors in the decision



Modes Considered as Part of Moving

53% of Commuters who Moved Home/Work Considered Availability of Transportation Services at the New Location

Most likely to consider availability: Younger than 35 years, Limited access to personal vehicle, Use alt mode to commute, Live/work in Inner Core



Teleworking


- *Number of Teleworkers*
- *Telework Frequency*
- *Potential Teleworkers*
- *Teleworkers By Employer Type*
- *Telework Arrangements*



Number of Teleworkers



Telework Has Nearly Tripled Since 2004 – 35% of Regional Commuters Teleworked at Least Occasionally in 2019

Between 2016 and 2019, the region added 196,000 new teleworkers for a total of 1,073,000



Telework Frequency


Nearly six in ten (59%) said they teleworked at least one day per week. On average, teleworkers used this arrangement about 1.20 days per week.



TW Frequency of “Non-Teleworkers”

73% of Respondents who said they were not “teleworkers” but had telework-appropriate jobs worked at home at least once in past year


This represented 22% of all commuters regionwide.



Telework Potential

771,000 Non-teleworkers Had Job Responsibilities that Were Telework-Appropriate and Would Like to Telework

More than half of interested workers would like to telework “regularly”




Teleworker Employer Type

Federal agency employees teleworked at a much higher rate (48%) than the regional average

And much higher than did employees who worked for non-profit organizations (36%), private employers (30%), and state/local agencies (14%).


Employer Type



Teleworker Arrangements

More than six in ten (61%) of all respondents said their employers allowed some telework, either under a formal program (34%) or an informal arrangement (27%)

Employer Telework Arrangement



Marketing Awareness and Employer Services


- *Regional Commute Advertising/Brand Awareness*
- *Advertising Effectiveness*
- *Commute Services Offered and Used at the Workplace*



Brand Awareness

48% of Regional Commuters Knew of Commuter Connections; a Drop from 2016, But Still Overall High Awareness


Use of Commuter Connections dropped slightly, from 7% of regional commuters in 2016 to 5% in 2019



Ad Recall

45% of Respondents Recalled Hearing/Seeing Commute Ads in the Past Year – Lower than in 2016 (54%)

59% who were aware of ads could name a specific message




Actions Taken After Seeing/Hearing Ad

18% of Respondents who Recalled Messages Took an Action to Try to Change their Commute – Twice the 2016 Rate (9%)

10% tried or started using an alternative mode for their commute, more than triple the 3% in 2016 – due in part to end of SafeTrack work

43% who took action said the ad encouraged the action


43% who switched modes were driving alone before



Employer Commute Services Offered

60% of Respondents Said their Employers Offered Commute Services at the Workplace

Availability was higher in 2019 than in 2013 (57%) and 2016 (55%); suggesting service cuts made during the recession have been reversed




Type of Employer Commute Services

Transit/Vanpool Subsidy Was Most Widely Available Service in 2019 (45% of Respondents)

Availability of TR/VP subsidy increased 8 percentage points from 2016; Availability of carshare and bikeshare also increased

Transit/Vanpool Subsidies


- 31% Pre-tax deduction (employee-paid)
- 26% Direct cash payment (employer-paid)
- 10% SmarTrip card or voucher
- 33% Unknown



Use of Employer Commute Services

Transit/VP Subsidy Also Was Most Widely USED Employer Service – by 60% of respondents with access to the service

39% with access used travel option info and 25% used carpool subsidy; other services used by about two in ten with access




Technology Initiatives and Driverless Cars

- *Social Networking Applications*
- *Travel Trip Applications*
- *Driverless Cars*

Social Network Applications

85% of Respondents Had an Account With at Least One Social Networking Application: Facebook (71%), LinkedIn (55%)

Use of accounts declined with increasing age



Respondents with accounts by age:
 Under 35 years – 93%
 35-54 years – 85%
 55-64 years - 77%
 65+ years – 69%




Travel Trip Applications

85% of Respondents Had Used at Least One Travel/Trip Info Application: Wayfinding (63%), Traffic Alerts (50%)

Transit and bike/walk commuters used most apps at a higher rate than did drive alone commuters and carpoolers/vanpoolers

Use at least one travel info app by age:


Under 35 – 91%
 35-44 years – 87%
 45-54 years – 84%
 55-64 years – 82%
 65+ years – 78%



Driverless Cars


One-third of Respondents Were “Very Familiar” with Concept of Driverless Cars; 58% Were “Somewhat Familiar”

Familiarity was higher among males and higher income respondents; there was very little difference by age



Driverless Car Benefits


72% respondents could not describe a benefit, either because they did not feel there were any benefits (17%) or because they weren't sure that there were benefits (55%).



Concerns With Driverless Cars


Respondents were more likely to mention concerns about driverless cars than they were to cite potential benefits.

66% noted at least one concern that they had with driverless cars versus 28% who had mentioned a benefit



Interest in Driverless Cars

Overall level of interest was similar across scenarios, regardless of the type of vehicle described in the scenario and/or whether the vehicle was owned or rented by the respondent.



Next Steps

- Review of [Technical Report](#)/Comment Period
- Finalize Technical Report in FY 2020
- Prepare and Publish General Public Report in FY 2021



Nicholas Ramfos

Transportation Operations Programs
Director
(202) 962-3313
nramfos@mwkog.org

commuterconnections.org

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

