

**TDM EVALAUTION GROUP
MEETING NOTES
OCTOBER 16, 2007**

1. Introductions

(Please see attached attendance sheet)

2. GRH Applicant Survey

Nicholas Ramfos stated that the updated draft of the GRH Applicant Survey report was in the agenda packet and that changes were made to the document based on comments received. Lori Diggins stated that most of the changes made were minor to the report. A new Table was added (Table 9) "How Respondents Learned About GRH by Pre-GRH Commute Mode" The information source was matched against mode of travel. Additionally, Ms. Diggins stated that those applicants joining the program earlier remembered hearing or seeing ads, however we did not ask people when they had arrived in the metropolitan Washington region. The results did correlate with the period when advertising was more GRH-focused. Ms. Diggins discussed Figure 3 "Influence of GRH" and 37% of respondents stated they did not recall an ad, 21% saw the ad before the registration and 4% saw the ads after they registered. The ads did have influence on registration for GRH.

Robert Moore asked how we capture the reasons why people have left the GRH program. Ms. Diggins stated that many of these applicants may not have answered the question as to why they left. Ms. Diggins also stated that there has been a drop in respondents expressing that they did not know they needed to re-register for the program. Some did not re-register because they realized that they did not need to use the program. There are also consistent patterns in changes of job and home locations.

Next, Ms. Diggins distributed a handout and discussed the results from the 2007 GRH telephone survey versus the GRH Internet survey. The purpose of completing the Internet survey was not to obtain more samples but to see if there were differences in responses to the traditional telephone survey. The purpose was to highlight if there were issues on the visual aspects of the survey versus oral. There was

a 70% response rate. The telephone survey include 793 respondents with an e-mail address and 208 respondents without e-mail addresses. For the Internet survey there were 1,500 records and there was a 30 to 40 percent response rate due to the fact that there were some e-mails that got caught in spam filters and some e-mails that bounced back.. Some respondents were sent an alert letter via mail and others were sent the alert letter via e-mail.

Ms. Diggins stated that there were very few differences between the telephone and the Internet GRH data samples. There was very high Internet availability. 84% of GRH registrants provided e-mail addresses in the database and 99% of respondents stated that they had Internet access. Ms. Diggins stated that this is promising in the sense that this survey could be handled electronically in the future, however those who do not have e-mail would need to be contacted via mail to alert them of the web site availability. The Internet survey would need to have a larger sample, perhaps 3,000 to 4,000 in order to receive a similar response rate for the telephone survey.

Next, Ms. Diggins reviewed the demographics, registration information, GRH information sources, and current travel patterns. Mr. Moore stated that the confidence levels needed to be reviewed and perhaps that some of the differences shown may not be that great between telephone and Internet.

Lastly, Mr. Ramfos stated that an additional comment period would be set for the draft 2007 GRH Applicant survey. The most recent version would be posted to the Commuter Connections Extranet and comments would be due no later than 5:00 p.m. October 30, 2007.

3. State of the Commute Survey

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that a revised draft State of the Commute Technical Report was prepared and was distributed to the group dated October 16, 2007. He also distributed responses that had been received through August 30th during the initial comment period. A handout was also distributed on the changes made to the draft document.

Ms. Diggins then reviewed the substantive changes made to the document. Mr. Moore asked if the information in Table 43 could be shown by miles to transit and perception of transit availability. Ms. Diggins stated that this could be done off-line, however there would be very low cell numbers.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that the current draft report would be posted to the Commuter Connections Extranet and any additional edits or comments should be submitted by 5:00 p.m., October 30th.

4. Regional Carsharing Survey

Mr. Ramfos distributed the draft regional carsharing questionnaire to the group. Ms. Diggins stated that a survey topics outline had been developed and shared with the Carsharing survey work group on September 14th and that a survey was developed based on the feedback received from that group.

Ms. Diggins stated that in administering the survey there could be small numbers of participants that may be in both the Flexcar and Zipcar programs. To address this issue, there could be unique identifiers set-up to limit the response to one.

Next., Ms. Diggins reviewed the draft survey questionnaire including background, general use patterns, details of last carshare use, commute travel patterns, before/after travel patterns, general carshare satisfaction, and demographics.

Mr. Ramfos stated that comments would be accepted through October 24th based on an updated survey that will be distributed to both groups by this Friday, October 19th.

5. FY 2008 Data Collection Activities

Mr. Ramfos distributed a handout outlining the additional data collection activities for the remainder of the FY 2008.