

**TDM EVALUATION GROUP
MEETING NOTES
March 13, 2007**

1. Introductions

(Please see attached attendance sheet)

Mr. Ramfos distributed the schedule for data collection activities for the Commuter Connections TDM Evaluation project. The schedule included timelines for the TDM Evaluation Framework Document, State of the Commute, and Guaranteed Ride Home surveys.

2. GRH Applicant Survey

Lori Diggins discussed the draft GRH telephone survey questionnaire. There was a comment period beginning from January 16th to January 30th. There were some minor edits made to the survey. Ms. Diggins stated that if there were any additional edits that they should be sent to Mr. Ramfos within the next few days. The survey will begin in early April and programming needs to begin early next week.

Next, the group discussed the proposed GRH Internet survey. One interesting fact is that COG has discovered that 13% of the households in the region do not have land-line phones and use cell phones as their main telephone line. This is a test and the data will not be combined with the telephone survey for GRH. Once the telephone sample is pulled the rest of the database will be reviewed and those records with e-mail addresses will be used for the survey. The goal is to survey 300 GRH applicants via Internet. A larger sample is being proposed which may result in a lower response rate than from the telephone survey. The starting sample will be 1,000. Gus Robey stated that perhaps the first 250 samples should be offered an incentives (i.e. a \$5 Starbucks coupon),. Mr. Ramfos said that this can be done to check whether or not the Internet applicants would have a higher response as opposed to those who did not receive the coupon. Walter Daniel asked what the length of the questionnaire was. Ms. Diggins stated that she did not know how long the Internet survey would be, but the phone survey was about 11 to 12 minutes.

Half of the respondents will be notified by postal mail initially and the other half by e-mail notification. A second e-mail will go out to remind the sample group to participate in the survey with a survey link that will have a link with a code. The code will not allow a second access. Half of the respondents will be notified by postal mail initially and the other half by e-mail notification. Respondents can

complete the questionnaire on-line or will have the option to participate by telephone. The survey will be kept open for three weeks. If there is a low response rate, the survey period may be extended.

Next, Ms. Diggins discussed the Internet questionnaire, which has been re-designed for visualization. Some questions will be mandatory and if not answered, the respondent will not be able to go on to the next page. Next, Ms. Diggins discussed the analysis of the GRH survey between the telephone and online methods. Mr. Ramfos asked whether or not the results from the Internet survey would be included in the TERM Analysis results. Ms. Diggins stated that it's too early to tell, however, the added results could boost the statistical validity of the survey. Ms. Diggins then discussed other changes made to the questionnaire for the Internet version.

Comments on the Internet survey should be submitted to Nicholas Ramfos by next Friday, March 23rd.

3. Commuter Connections TERM Evaluation Framework Methodology Document Update

The group discussed the overall goals for the Commuter Connections TERMS. Daivamani Sivasailam discussed the revised goals spreadsheet and changes made to the spreadsheet on VT and VMT as well as participation goals. Mr. Ramfos stated that the revised TERMS goals spreadsheet would be presented to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on March 20th for approval.

Next, Ms. Diggins distributed a handout outlining the changes made to the most recent draft of the Framework Methodology document. Changes included adding that PM2.5 goals would be calculated. Next, she reviewed other changes made to the evaluation components for each individual TERM, descriptions of the data sources, and to evaluation schedules and responsibilities.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the current TERM Evaluation Framework Methodology draft document would be presented to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on March 20th and a comment period would be established through April 6th. The TDM Evaluation Work Group would review the document again in April and a 4th comment period would be established through April 24th. The Commuter Connections Subcommittee would be asked to approve the final document on May 15th and the TPB Tech Committee would be briefed on June 1st. The final document would be released by June 30th.

4. State of the Commute Survey

Lois Wauson with CIC Research briefed the group on the status of the State of the Commute survey. There are 3,011 surveys completed, which is about the halfway mark. It is expected that the survey would be conducted by mid to late April. 6,600 surveys will need to be completed. Ms. Diggins stated that there were 3 minutes added to the questionnaire. There maybe other areas in the project where dollars would need to be reduced. Ms. Wauson stated that 0.8 surveys were being completed per hour. Mr. Ramfos stated that additional dollars will be needed to cover the costs of the added questions and time and this could include possible cuts from other areas of the project.

5. Stakeholder Input

Ms. Diggins stated that the Stakeholder input task may have to be pared back depending on budget adjustments that need to be made for the SOC survey. Ms. Diggins also stated that measurements usually include participants in a TDM program along traditional TDM measurements such as transportation and emission impacts. The data that is collected and the way that it is reported will be reviewed in this phase of the project. Stakeholders could include elected officials, regional transit agencies, travelers, and employers. Some selected elected officials could be interviewed along with COG/TPB staff and local jurisdictions. A net conference could be held as an open forum to discuss what they would like to see in terms of how this information is being packaged. Gus Robey stated that an important question to ask is what the public benefit is as a result of TDM. What should the performance measure be to assess the public benefit? Is anyone looking at it differently than we are? What is the measure? Ms. Robey felt that we needed to define it. Ms. Diggins stated that a webinar could be held in tandem with interviews. Mr. Ramfos stated that a special work session could be conducted with TPB members. Mr. Sivasailam stated that there is a new Congestion Management Process and that this could be part of the discussion. Mr. Ramfos believed that this could dovetail nicely with the new federal planning regulations and the Congestion Management process.