

TDM EVALUATION GROUP
MEETING NOTES
October 20, 2015

1. Introductions

(Please see attached attendance sheet)

2. FY 2016 Regional TDM Evaluation Project Timeline

Nicholas Ramfos, COG/TPB staff reviewed the Regional TDM Evaluation Project timeline that was in the meeting agenda packet for the various data collection activities occurring during FY 2016. This included the update of the Evaluation Framework Methodology document, the Guaranteed Ride Home surveys for both the Washington DC and Baltimore metropolitan regions, the new Retention Rate survey and the 2016 State of the Commute Survey.

3. FY 2015 - FY 2017 Commuter Connections Transportation Emission Reduction Measure (TERM) Evaluation Framework Revised Methodology

Lori Diggins, LDA Consulting, discussed the triennial analysis of the transportation and air quality impacts of the Commuter Connections TERMS. The impacts are estimated for the Maryland Telework, GRH, Employer Outreach and Mass Marketing TERMS. Data is also collected for the Commuter Operations Center that includes the Integrated Rideshare TERM. Ms. Diggins then discussed the evaluation framework and how the report is structured. The key areas include goals and performance indicators, the analysis approach and calculation methodology, required data and data sources, data collection methods, use and reporting of evaluation data, and evaluation challenges and opportunities. The framework document will build on the 2012-2014 data collection cycle and also add some new changes. Those changes include conducting the Retention Rate Survey, exploration of new data collection activities, enhancement of regional planning data, defining the benefits of TERMS, and expanding communication

resulting from TERM survey data. Ms. Diggins then briefly spoke on the evaluation objectives and how the impacts of the TERMS are measured as well as how results are communicated to program stakeholders. The methodology counts individuals who have switched alternative modes regardless of whether they were already in alternative modes or if they increased the frequency of using that alternative mode. Change is not measured against everyone driving alone but rather how they were previously traveling. Ms. Diggins also discussed how the evaluation principals needed to be methodologically sound, efficient, and reliable. Ms. Diggins then discussed the TERM impact indicators that include mode split, alternative mode placements, vehicle trips reduced, VMT reduced, emissions reduced and energy savings. Ms. Diggins then discussed the data collection tools and associated surveys that will be used as part of the evaluation cycle. The surveys discussed included the employee surveys conducted at employer sites through the Employer Outreach TERM as well as the State of the Commute Survey. There are also TERM user surveys including the GRH Applicant Survey, the employer Telework follow-up survey, the Applicant Placement Rate Study, the Bike to Work Day survey, the 'Pool Rewards participant survey, and the new Retention Rate survey. Ms. Diggins also discussed the databases and analysis tools used to track data as part of the Commuter Connections program services. This includes the regional ACT! database, the Telework Assistance database, the TDM system users database for both ridematching and GRH, use of the Commuter Connections web site, documentation of marketing activities as well as event participation tracking for events such as Bike to Work Day and Car Free Day, and 'Pool Rewards participant data. The EPA COMMUTER model is also used to evaluate the Employer Outreach TERM.

Next, Ms. Diggins discussed the updates that include Vehicle Trip (VT), Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) and emission goals to bring everything into alignment with regional goals. The Maryland Telework program was discussed and Fatemeh Allahdoust asked how results from the Tework!VA program in Virginia could be calculated into the regional measure. Mr. Ramfos explained that the regional Telework rate includes subsets of data for Telework including results from the State of the Commute, Maryland Telework, and employers' participation in the

Telework!VA program. However, the shares shown in the TERM Analysis report are only those that directly correlate to initiatives from Commuter Connections. Mr. Ramfos explained that the Telework!VA program was initially a special ‘Governor’s Initiative’ TERM program administered by COG as a pilot program that then went statewide and there was a separate Telework Resource Center program that was implemented as part of the Commuter Connections Work Program. There are no transportation and emission impact goals set for the Telework!VA program and Mr. Ramfos stated that one of the options to capture the data results from the program would be in the regional TERM tracking report as part of the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) or the other would be in the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis report. Ms. Allahdoust stated that she would follow-up on these options with Mr. Ramfos.

Ms. Diggins then discussed the updates needed to the Employer Outreach, Mass Marketing and Commuter Operations/Integrated Rideshare TERMS and the Retention Rate Survey. She stated that the goal for the Retention Rate Survey is to be able to identify credit to carry over from one three year evaluation cycle to the next which would include commuters that participated in Commuter Connections program services before the 2015-2017 evaluation period. This would also be an opportunity to review characteristics of respondents from the survey. A definition would also need to be established regarding ongoing data collection or a one-time survey. Ms. Diggins and Phil Winters then discussed the contributions to regional goals and looking at quantifying regional societal benefits through CUTR's TRIMMS model. Mr. Winters explained that the model can take into account things like noise reduction, health benefits, reduction of accidents and injuries in relation to the use of alternative modes. The benefits that are officially measured are those approved by the TPB but there are also other benefits that can be derived from the analysis. These are results that could be beneficial to public officials as well as for marketing purposes. Data collection options were also discussed including QR codes, and cell phone tracking where respondents opt-in. The goal would be to explore different methods and how they could be used as options in the future. Addressed based samples also need to be investigated for use. The TERM benefits to businesses may need the

addition of some questions for businesses to respond to. How can the use of the data be expanded to be used for stakeholders is another area of exploration.

Comments on the changes to the framework methodology will be needed by October 30th.

4. 2016 State of the Commute Survey

The 2016 State of the Commute Survey was discussed by Ms. Diggins. She explained that the last survey was conducted by both landline and cell phone. The cell phone percentage was 15% of all respondents in 2013 and in 2016 it will be 20%. It is about three times the cost to obtain cell phone sample points. The share of the Spanish version of the survey was about 1.5% of the respondents. Lisa Dumetz-Rosier asked why the share of cell phone is going up given the cost. Lois Wauson stated that the region has about 30% of households that are cell phone-only households. The average time of the survey was about 17.2 minutes in 2013.

Ms. Diggins then explained that internet interviews were proposed as a pilot for the 2016 State of the Commute Survey. Invitation postcards would be sent to a randomly selected addressed based sample. A similar type survey was recently conducted for VDRPT statewide. There were 5,000 surveys collected and a 4% response rate based off of 90,000 postcards sent. There was a stronger response among Northern Virginia employed persons. Ms. Diggins then explained the internet survey variables and confidence levels. There would be 900 internet responses needed for the pilot. Respondents would be grouped into categories that would include the core, inner and outer rings. The confidence levels vary by area. Ms. Dumetz-Rosier asked if COG would incorporate the internet survey in future years. Ms. Diggins answered yes and that results may be used in this TERM Analysis cycle as well. It will be dependent upon comparisons to the telephone survey data and the confidence/response levels. Ms. Dumetz-Rosier also asked whether an incentive would be offered. Ms. Diggins explained that a 5\$ incentive will be offered and is built into the costs of the internet survey. 36,000 postcards

would be sent out randomly through the three ring areas. Results from the pilot would be used to change the approach for the next data collection cycle.

The group was asked to review the questions in the survey and to provide any feedback. Comments on the questionnaire are encouraged and should be sent by October 30th.

5. 2016 Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) Surveys

Mr. Ramfos stated that there were not going to be many changes expected for the GRH surveys; however everyone is encouraged to review the questionnaire and suggest any changes. The surveys for both the Washington survey will not be conducted until next calendar year. Comments and/or edits should be provided no later than October 30th.

6. 2016 Retention Rate Survey

A draft questionnaire would be developed for the Retention Rate survey. The two options for this is to either conduct the survey each year through a panel or to conduct the survey once every six years survey with the first survey being conducted as a baseline. Ms. Allahdoust pointed out that depending on the curve and the retention rate to perhaps choose a year based on when the retention rate falls and perhaps that could be an indication as to when to conduct the survey. This could help with how to retain these commuters. The group felt that a survey conducted every six years would be the preferred direction for this survey.