

**TDM EVALUATION GROUP
MEETING NOTES
JANUARY 16, 2007**

1. Introductions

(Please see attached attendance sheet)

2. Commuter Connections TERM Evaluation Framework Methodology Document Update

Nicholas Ramfos stated that the Framework Methodology was updated from the 2002 version that was distributed to the group in November. Eric Schreffler discussed the contents of the document. The individual TERMS that would be covered include Telework, GRH, Employer Outreach, Mass Marketing, InfoExpress Kiosks, and the Commuter Operations Center. He also discussed the description of the data sources. The document also includes the basic method for calculating the program impacts and the sample calculations using 2005 data. A VTR factor explanation was also given which includes those making travel mode changes.

Next, Mr. Schreffler discussed the substantive changes made to the Framework methodology document. The Telecenter Occupancy surveys would not be conducted during this evaluation period. Employer's providing bicycling options would be included in the overall Employer Outreach efforts. The Metrochek/SmartBenefits survey would also not be conducted. Mr. Schreffler also stated that the EPA COMMUTER 2.0 model would be used for the comparison to the CUTR Worksite Trip Reduction Model. Mr. Schreffler also stated that the 2.0 COMMUTER model is fundamentally different than the CUTR Worksite Trip Reduction model. Mr. Ramfos asked that COG/TPB staff be involved in the analysis steps of these two models.

Mr. Schreffler stated the InfoExpress kiosk has been separated from the Integrated Rideshare TERM and will be calculated separately. Lori Diggins stated that the software upgrades portion of Integrated Rideshare will be captured in the Commuter Operations Center. Mr. Ramfos asked if the InfoExpress kiosk goals needed to be adjusted to reflect the fact that the project was discontinued mid-way through the evaluation cycle. Daivamani Sivasailam stated that the goals would need to be adjusted.

Next, Mr. Schreffler discussed how data is collected and analyzed for each of the TERMS. Mr. Ramfos asked if PM2.5 emission reductions would need to be included in the analysis. Mr. Sivasailam stated that by 2008 this data would be

needed for the analysis. Mr. Ramfos also asked if overall participation goals needed to be revisited. Mr. Sivasailam stated that the participation goals for many of the TERMS are in maintenance, however the participation rates and goals will be re-examined.

Robert Moore asked why the goals were not shown in the sample calculations. Lori Diggins stated that goals are not part of the calculations and are in Section 4 of the document. Mr. Sivasailam stated that the results are shown in the TERM Analysis report at the end of the project. He also mentioned that the goals were all changed based on the results from the 2005 TERM Analysis. Ms. Diggins stated that the emission factors are for 2008. The group stated that a footnote should be added that the factors may change based on modeling changes.

Mr. Ramfos asked that the group submit edits/comments on the document to him by February 5, 2007. A clean version of the document would be presented at the February 13, 2007 meeting. The document would be presented in draft format to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee in March.

Next, Ms. Diggins distributed an outline for a process to assess the needs and expectations of Commuter Connections' key stakeholders. Phil Winters discussed the approach which would include interviews with key stakeholder groups, and then a series of web forums to allow the sharing of the interview of information, lastly recommendations would be prepared for the future direction of the evaluation process. Mr. Winters then discussed some of the specific questions that would be asked of the stakeholders. Lori Diggins suggested that perhaps the media could be added as a secondary stakeholder group. The group discussed the overall approach and the process. Mr. Ramfos stated that the group would have an opportunity to discuss the overall approach and finalize it at the February 13th meeting. He also stated that the goal is to shape the final TERM Analysis report and how the information is reported to the various stakeholders. The group was asked to provide comments on the outline by February 5, 2007.

3. 2007 GRH Applicant Survey

Ms. Diggins distributed the draft questionnaire of the GRH Applicant survey. She explained that the survey was conducted in 2001 and 2004 with 1,000 current and past applicants. "One Time GRH Ride Exceptions" were included as a third group in the survey. The final sample was 12% past applicants and about 86% current applicants. Ms. Diggins stated that because the past applicants dropped out of the program because of a move, they are difficult to reach. She also stated that because of this, it may be difficult to capture information for the GRH Rewards and Loyalty Incentive program.

Next, Ms. Diggins discussed some of the questionnaire changes which included the addition of telework questions. An internet access question is also asked in

the Demographic section as a way to gauge the level of access that will help with the Internet based surveys questionnaire being developed.

Next, Ms. Diggins discussed the objectives of the survey which included the current travel patterns, the percentage of GRH participants that have made travel changes in response to the program, estimating the level of GRH on mode change decisions, estimating the transportation and emission impacts resulting from GRH mode changes, and lastly identifying the use and satisfaction with the GRH program.

Next, Ms. Diggins went through each of the sections of the survey and stated that the survey will take about 9 to 10 minutes to administer. Lois Wauson stated that the timing of the survey for fielding would be mid to late March. Donna Norfleet asked why "Taxi" was being counted in with Drive Alone for mode split. Ms. Diggins stated the Taxi mode would be counted separately as in the SOC. Mr. Arabia asked if the "One Time GRH Ride Exemptions" are asked why they did not register for the program. Ms. Diggins stated that the question could be added for these respondents.

Next, the group discussed the GRH Rewards and Loyalty incentive program and how retention rates could be measured in the survey. Ms. Diggins stated that the past GRH registrants were very difficult to reach. Past registrants that were reached chose not to re-register for the most part because of changes such as job or residential moves. One way to capture this information would be to ask questions as to why re-registration did not occur at the time of re-registration. Another way to measure retention rates would be to offer the GRH Loyalty and Rewards incentive program through control groups and then measure the rate of re-registrations.

Lastly, Ms. Diggins discussed the GRH Internet survey. A complimentary effort is being proposed to be conducted via e-mail of 300 randomly selected participants in GRH and the results will be compared to the telephone survey. Ms. Diggins then covered some of the on-line issues associated with the survey. The general telephone survey added a question on Internet access to determine how many GRH applicants have Internet addresses. It is not clear whether those GRH applicants who gave e-mail addresses are different from those who did not in terms of analyzing the data. The analysis will be very comprehensive in terms of statistical comparisons. The first step will include sending out a message to those who gave e-mail addresses.

Ms. Diggins explained that the GRH telephone survey would be conducted first and then the sample of those with e-mail addresses would be conducted. The response rate may be lower with the Internet survey. Reminder e-mails would be sent and some type of an incentive would be offered to those who completed the Internet survey. The time of the survey may increase on the Internet due to the fact that the survey respondents will need to have time to read the questions and

respond. Additional issues could include adding all of the selections for the “Do Not Read” questions. Ms. Wauson stated that the shorter the questionnaire, the more apt the user will be to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire will be understood better by including “mouse-overs”, visual cues and more words to the questions. An on-line Help E-mail address will be provided as well as an “800” number to provide assistance on the survey. Skip patterns will be similar to the telephone survey. The responses will be coded in a database as will the open-ended questions. 300 completed Internet-based surveys will amount to a confidence level comparable to the telephone survey. Costs are much lower for Internet-based surveys than for phone surveys due to the interviewer costs of the telephone survey.

4. The State of the Commute Survey

Ms. Diggins then distributed the draft questionnaire of the State of the Commute survey. She discussed the substantive changes including the addition of a question to measure the Live Near Your Work (LNYW) initiative. Information on use of the Internet for ridematching is being asked and language has been added to a question regarding personal information being kept confidential. Ms. Diggins also noted that those commuters who are participating on COG’s Household Travel Survey will be removed from the SOC. Mr. Moore stated he did not feel that the transit portion of the LNYW new question was appropriate. Mr. Ramfos stated that the “near transit” language portion of the new LNYW question would be separated from the “located near work” language.

Mr. Ramfos stated that if anyone had any additional comments or questions or the SOC survey questionnaire to contact him by tomorrow as the survey will be pre-tested at the end of the month. The pre-test results will be available at the February meeting.