The 2009 getDowntown Program Study

Surveys of employers and employees in the downtown Ann Arbor Area

Prepared by Survey Sciences Group, LLC

October 6, 2009(revised)

This page is intentionally left blank

Key Findings

Employer Survey

In terms of transportation-related benefits, about one-half of responding businesses offered a compressed work week, flex, or telecommute schedule to some or all employees, but few offered a commuter tax benefit program or encouraged respondents to live close to work. A good number of businesses provided information about AATA bus services, schedules, and Park and Ride lots, but the provision of information about other commuting services and programs related to carpooling, walking, and biking were less common. A good number of businesses offered some cost-sharing for parking – either in terms of providing free parking on-site or paying part or all of the parking fees.

- Offered a compressed work week, flex, or telecommute schedule to some or all employees: 51% (n=177) of the downtown businesses
- Offered a commuter tax benefit program: 4.3% (n=14) of the downtown businesses
- Provided information about sustainable commuting:
    - At the time of hire: 39.6% (n=142) of the downtown businesses
    - In Human Resources manual: 7.3% (n=26) of the downtown businesses
    - About AATA bus service: 54.6% (n=196) of the downtown businesses
    - In the form of bus schedules: 41.0% (n=147) of the downtown businesses
    - About Park-and-Ride Lots: 41.5% (n=149) of the downtown businesses
    - About carpooling and vanpooling: 11.0% (n=23) of the downtown businesses
    - About locations of bike racks and storage facilities: 11.4% (n=41) of the downtown businesses
- Subsidized parking:
    - Provided free on-site parking: 30.2% (n=109) of the downtown businesses
    - Paid the entire cost of parking for all employees: 19.4% (n=70) of the downtown businesses
    - Paid the entire cost of parking for some employees: 17.5% (n=63) of the downtown businesses

More than three quarters of the businesses reported at minimum a general awareness of the getDowntown Program. Businesses that were aware of the getDowntown Program used the go!pass Program and the getDowntown website. A smaller proportion participated in events such as the Commuter Challenge and Curb Your Car Month.

- 76.5% (n=310) of the downtown businesses reported being aware of the getDowntown Program

For those businesses who said they were aware of getDowntown Program (n=310), we asked about their use of the program's services:

- Provided go!passes to employees: 76.8% (n=205) of the downtown businesses
- Visited getDowntown website: 49.8% (n=133) of the downtown businesses
- Forwarded newsletters to employees: 15.2% (n=67) of the downtown businesses
- Curb Your Car Month: 26.7% (n=94) of the downtown businesses reported as being useful or potentially useful to the businesses
- Commuter Challenge: 25% (n=88) of the downtown businesses reported as being useful or potentially useful to the businesses

Responding businesses reacted favorably to the ideas presented for encouraging sustainable commuting in their workplaces – most notably, the savings on parking and taxes.

- Saving on parking cost: 45.1% (n=181) of the downtown businesses endorsed as a way to encourage sustainable commuting at their workplace
- Information about tax saving: 39.7% (n=159) of the downtown businesses endorsed as a way to encourage sustainable commuting at their workplace
- Information on the benefit to the environment: 32.9% (n=132) of the downtown businesses endorsed as a way to encourage sustainable commuting at their workplace
- Ability to offer additional no-cost or low cost employee benefit: 31.4% (n=126) of the downtown businesses endorsed as a way to encourage sustainable commuting at their workplace
- Recognition: 28.9% (n=116) of the downtown businesses endorsed as a way to encourage sustainable commuting at their workplace

Employee Survey

Over one half of the respondents lived in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, and within 4 miles of their workplace – within busing, walking, and biking distance.

- Residence of downtown employees: 53.2% (n=182) lived in Ann Arbor; 7.9% (n=27) lived in Ypsilanti.
- Distance to/from the workplace: 31.1% (n=107) lived under two miles from work; 19.7% (n=68) lived 2-4 miles from work.

Just over one third of the respondents reported using a sustainable commuting option. Respondents aware of the getDowntown program were more likely to use a sustainable commuting option. Still, the majority drove solo to work.

- Used one of the AATA bus services as the primary commute mode: 15.9% (n=54)
- Walked to work as the primary commute mode: 13.6% (n=46)
- Biked to work as the primary commute mode: 2.3% (n=8)
- Rideshared or carpooled as the primary commute mode: 5.9% (n=20)

When the primary and secondary commuting modes are combined, we see that most employees use a sustainable commuting option as either primary or secondary way to get to and from work.

- While 61.4% (n=208) reported driving solo as the primary commuting mode, only 33.6% (n=112) drove solo as both their primary and secondary commuting mode.
- 28% (n=94) reported that they primarily drove solo to and from work but also used a sustainable commute mode as a secondary option.
- 27% (n=90) of the respondents used a sustainable commute as primary and secondary commuting mode;
- 11.2% (n=37) of the respondents used a sustainable commute as primary commuting mode and solo driving as secondary commuting mode

For the primary commuting mode, solo drivers chose this commute mode as their primary option because of convenience, a real or perceived lack of other options, and time.

- Drove to work alone because of convenience: 39.9% (n=77)
- Drove to work alone because of a lack of other options: 19.9% (n=38)
- Drove to work alone because of time: 11.4% (n=22)

Solo drivers who lived less than four miles from work likewise reported convenience and time as reasons why they drove to work, but additionally reported a need to use their cars during/after work.

- Drove to work alone because of convenience: 40.9% (n=36)
- Drove to work alone because of time: 14.8% (n=13)
- Drove to work alone because of a need of their cars during and after work: 13.6% (n=12)

A small proportion of the respondents changed their primary commute mode in the past year. The main reasons for changing their commuting habits were a desire to be more environmentally friendly, gas prices, and a residential move. The availability of the go!pass and the Commuter Challenge were instrumental, however, in prompting change for some of the respondents.

- Changed commuting because of desire to be more environmentally friendly: (30.1%, n=28)
- Changed commuting because of gas prices: (25.3%, n=23)
- Changed commuting because of a residential move: (26.4%, n=24)
- Changed commuting because of the availability of the go!pass: (23.9%, n=22)
- Changed commuting because of participating in the Commuter Challenge: 13 (14.0%)

About one quarter of the respondents regularly used AATA bus services to travel to and from work each month. The reasons that respondents offered for not taking advantage of the bus services were varied, but the top three reasons were lack of service to their homes, time, and a lack of a need – since their commute was so short.

- Use the bus to commute to work: 24.5%, n=85
- Reasons why respondents didn't use the bus:
  - No service: 33.6%, n=86
  - Time: 27.3%, n=70
  - Commute too short: 20.7%, n=53

A good proportion of the non-bus users reported provision of bus service closer to their homes, more direct bus service, and the Zipcar as provisions that would encourage more frequent bus usage:

- If the bus service was close to my home … would use the bus: 26.6%, n=68
- If the bus service was more direct … would use the bus: 16.0%, n=41
- If I had a car I could use while at work … would use the bus: 9.4%, n=24

Most of the respondents had heard of the go!pass—and learned about it from their employer. About one half of the employee survey respondents reported having a go!pass, and noted that they ride the bus more often as a result of the pass.

- 185 respondents reported having a go!pass
- 156 of the 185 carried the go!pass with them
- 123 of 185 had used the go!pass at least once to take the bus
- 77 of 185 reported that the go!pass was an important workplace benefit

Few respondents biked to work, but almost one quarter walked to work. Distance and time were main determinants for not walking more often, and when asked about provisions that would encourage walking, a ride home in case of an emergency was the top reason.

- Regularly walked to work: 23%, n=79
- Distance as a reason for not walking to work: 73.3%, n=189
- Time as a reason for not walking to work: 51.2%, n=132
- Desire to not get dirty as a reason for not walking to work: 23.6%, n=61

Respondents reported awareness of the RideShare Program, getDowntown Program, Curb Your Car Month, and the Commuter Challenge. Many fewer, however, participated in the programs.

- Familiar with the Rideshare program: 28.0% (n=97)
  - Interested in participating in a rideshare program: 12.7% (n=44)
  - Interest in a vanpooling program: 10.4% (n=36)
- Aware of the getDowntown Program: 52.4% (n=182)
  - Familiar with “Curb Your Car Month”: 37.5% (n=130)
  - Participated in “Curb Your Car Month” in 2008: 11.2% (n=39)
  - Aware of the Commuter Challenge: 58.5% (n=203)
  - Participated in “Commuter Challenge” in 2008: 33.7% (n=117)

The 2009 getDowntown Program Study

The getDowntown Program was formed in 1999 to provide information and services to businesses in the downtown Ann Arbor on sustainable commuting alternatives to driving alone to work. The getDowntown Program provides the go!pass, an unlimited usage bus pass available to all downtown employees, and maintains the city's bike locker program. They further provide a wide variety of educational programs.

In 2009, getDowntown Program conducted a study of downtown Ann Arbor businesses and employees to assess awareness of the getDowntown Program services and to benchmark commuting behaviors.

Study Methodology

The 2009 getDowntown Program evaluation study included two surveys: (a) a survey of downtown businesses and (b) a survey of individuals who work in downtown Ann Arbor businesses.

The employer survey was designed as a mixed-mode survey, utilizing web-based survey and telephone interview. The employer survey included questions about the business itself, such as the industry, size, and number of years in the downtown area; commuting-related benefits provided to employees, awareness of the getDowntown Program and participation in its services and programs. A copy of the survey is provided in the attachment.

The web-based survey was a fully interactive survey, allowing for skip patterns, data fills, preloaded data, and many other advanced features to allow for the most tailored survey experience for each respondent (for example, single-person businesses vs. those that employed people; go!pass participants and non-pass participants). For security purposes, the web survey was administered on a hosted, secure Internet site running under the secure sockets layer (SSL) protocol.

The telephone survey was identical to the web-based version. We used telephone contacts as a follow-up to the web-survey as a way to increase response.

The initial database included 1424 businesses. In collaboration with the getDowntown Program, we identified 240 businesses as no longer in operation, or no longer located in the downtown Ann Arbor area and 55 duplicate listings.

We began our data collection with 1127 businesses: 517 (46%) had a contact person and email address and 610 had minimally a name of the business (and often a street address).

Businesses with a contact person name and an email (46%) addresses were invited to the study by email. Businesses without an email address were invited via a letter. In collaboration with the getDowntown Program, we distributed letters in person (where a personal request was made) and by mail, for businesses that we could not reach in person.

Businesses with a contact person name and email received up to four email reminders, spaced through February and early March. Businesses were reminded only if they had not yet completed the survey. Email contacts included a link to the survey and respondent support information. We provided online and telephone assistance to the businesses with any technical issues or questions about the study.

For businesses without a contact person, we searched the Internet for more information. In some situations, we were able to locate a name for the owner or a manager, and even an email address. Businesses without email were reminded once by way of a mailed letter.

Beginning in March, we conducted telephone interviews with the businesses that had not yet responded. Telephone interviews extended through late April.

During the course of making contact with the businesses in the getDowntown database, we learned that an additional 215 had gone out of business or had moved out of the downtown area. We received 13 refusals to participate, and they were immediately removed from our contact list. Overall, 416 participated in the survey out of 899 eligible businesses (meaning, in business and in the area). The response rate for the employer study was 46.3%[1].

In late March, we launched the survey of individuals who work in downtown Ann Arbor businesses. We used quota sampling in order to achieve representation of both go!pass participants and non-pass participants and industry categories within both participant groups. The getDowntown Program assisted us in contacting the larger businesses to gain their cooperation with the study. Data collection was largely completed by the end of May; however, we extended into May for some businesses that needed additional time to motivate their employees.

Businesses were contacted initially by email or a letter about the employee survey, and then followed up with a telephone call. We prepared a survey package for each business, with an instructional letter for the business contact, a flyer, sweepstakes entry forms, questionnaires, an envelope for the sweepstakes forms, and a box for the questionnaires. We followed up with businesses during data collection to offer support and remind them about participating.

The questionnaire was formatted as an eight page self-administered questionnaire booklet, following survey methodology principles to reduce respondent burden, improve comprehension of the individual questions, and encourage response.[2]

Overall, we invited 45 businesses to participate in the employee survey portion of the study. We received refusals from 13. The overall business response rate was 75.0% (33 participated out of 45 invited). Twenty-three businesses were in the go!pass group and 12 businesses were non-pass group. Upon contact with the businesses, we obtained the number of employees working for the business –either full-time or part-time. We tracked the number of responses per participating business. Overall, we invited 908 employees to participate, and 352 completed a questionnaire, for an individual level response rate of 38.8%.

---

[1] From *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcomes Rates for Surveys*. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2004).
[2] Dillman, D. (2007). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method, Second edition*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

getDowntown Employer Survey

Employer Participants

Out of the 416 businesses that participated in the getDowntown Employer survey, 245 (58.9%) participated in go!pass program (go!pass group) and 171 (41.1%) did not participate in the go!pass program (non-pass group). We had slightly higher participation rate among the go!pass group. In the initial sample file, with the businesses that no longer existed or had moved out of the area removed, 44.3% participated in go!pass program and 55.7% did not participate in the go!pass program.

The majority of participating businesses were in a professional, managerial, or technical industry (38.9%), retail (20.9%), or the food industry (14.2%).

Business Category	Representation among the respondents	
	%	**N**
Professional, managerial, or technical	38.9%	162
Retail	20.9%	87
Food related service	14.2%	59
Healthcare and social services	10.6%	44
Personal care, fitness and services	5.8%	24
Government and education	3.8%	16
Entertainment	3.4%	14
Construction, engineering, utilities, transport	2.4%	10
TOTAL	100%	416

Overall, we saw good representation of the business categories when compared to the initial sample file, with the businesses that no longer existed or had moved out of the area removed. We had slightly lower representation in the healthcare and social services category, and in the personal care category. We saw low participation among churches and from single-person doctor/psychiatrist/counselor offices. For the personal care category, hair salons were difficult to encourage cooperation.

Business Category	Representation in the downtown sample
Professional, managerial, or technical	32.4%
Retail	18.8%
Food related service	16.2%
Healthcare and social services	16.8%
Personal care, fitness and services	9.7%
Government and education	2.8%
Entertainment	2.1%
Construction, engineering, utilities, transport	1.2%
TOTAL	100%

Industry for responding businesses as reported using a more specific list in question A1 is broken out in the table below.

A1. We'd like to learn about your company/organization. Which category best describes {business name}?

Business Category	**%**	**N**
Architecture, arts and design	3.2	36
Business and financial operations	4.2	47
Cleaning and facilities maintenance	--	--
Commercial and residential real estate sales, leasing, and management	1.3	14
Computers, science and engineering	2.4	27
Training and library	.2	2
Entertainment, sports, and media	1.3	14
Food preparation and food service related	5.1	57
Government and education	1.4	16
Healthcare and social services	3.9	44
Legal	3.2	36
Mechanical and electrical equipment installation and repair	.2	2
Office and administrative support	.1	1
Personal care, fitness and services	2.3	26
Sales	7.5	84
Transportation and material moving	.2	2
Other (please specify)	.6	7

The size of participating businesses ranged from the single-person business to ones that employed 101-500 employees. There were 365 businesses that employed others besides themselves and 51 businesses that did not have employees. The majority of businesses that employed someone other than themselves (95%) had 50 or fewer full-time employees.

A2A_1: Full-Time; How many full-time and part-time employees work at {Business Name}'s location in downtown Ann Arbor?

Number of full-time employees	**%**	**N**
One full-time employee	17.5%	64
2-20 full-time employees	73.2%	267
21-50 full-time employees	4.7%	17
51-100 full-time employees	2.5%	9
101-500 full-time employees	1.9%	7
501 or more full-time employees	.3%	1
TOTAL	100.0%	340

Prior to beginning data collection, we did not have information regarding the number of employees for each business in the sample. The 2006 Economic Census data for zip code 48104 (which extends beyond the downtown area) reported that 94% of the businesses had 50 or fewer employees at the time of that census.

Participating businesses were both new and well- established businesses in the downtown Ann Arbor area: 3.25% (n=13) reported being in business for less than one year; 7.25% (n=29) reported being in business for 1-2 years; 22.25% (n=89) for 3-9 years; and 67.25% (n=269) reported 10 years or more.

Transportation-Related Benefits

Flex Schedules and Commuter Tax Benefits

We asked businesses about a number of transportation-related benefits that they provided to their employees. Fifty-one percent   (n=177) reported offering a compressed work week, flex, or telecommute schedule to some or all employees. In contrast, a small proportion (4.3%, n=14) reported offering a commuter tax benefit program that allows employees and them to receive pre-tax benefits for paying the cost of transit and vanpooling to work.

We investigated whether businesses who participated in the go!pass program were more likely to have offered these incentives than non-pass businesses. We found that 50.9% (n=108) of the go!pass group offered a compressed work week, flex, or telecommute schedule to some or all employees, compared to 46.6% (n=69) of the non-pass group, and 4.7% (n=10) of the go!pass group reported offering a commuter tax benefit program compared to 2.7% (n=4) of the non-pass group. There was no statistical significance between the go!pass and non-pass groups.

Overall, only 17 businesses (4.8%) encouraged employees to live close to where they work.

Parking Benefits

The majority of businesses provided some parking benefit: 30.2% (n=109) reported providing free on-site parking while 19.4% (n=70) paid the entire cost of parking for all employees.

AA3. Does {Business Name} offer any of the following parking benefits to its employees? (Select all that apply)

Parking Benefit	**%**	**N**
None	30.2%	109
Free on-site parking	30.2%	109
Entire cost of parking / all employees	19.4%	70
Entire cost of parking / some employees	17.5%	63
Portion of cost of parking / all employees	7.2%	26
Portion of cost of parking / some employees	5.5%	20
Parking allowance	4.4%	16
Parking cash-out program	1.1%	4
Limited use permits	1.1%	4

We created a variable to measure whether the business offered any one of the eight parking benefits provided in question AA3 (e.g., yes, offered at least one parking benefit; no, did not offer any parking benefit at all). We found that the go!pass group was statistically more likely to offer at least one parking benefit than the non-pass group (x^2 =4.22, df =1, p <.04, n=251).

We asked businesses if they provided information about sustainable commuting to their new employees: 39.6% (n=142) reported providing such information at the time of hire, and 7.3% (n=26) reported providing sustainable commuting information in their Human Resource manuals. Businesses who participated in the go!pass program were statistically more likely to provide sustainable commuting information than non-participant businesses (x^2 =40.928, df =1, p <.01, n=332). Just over one half (52.4%; n=111) in the go!pass group offered sustainable commuting information to their employees, compared to 21.1% (n=31) in the non-pass group. Twenty-five go!pass participants (11.9%) included information about sustainable commuting in the Human Resources manuals, compared to one non-pass participant (.7%).

We asked a number of questions about information disseminated to employees about carpooling and vanpooling, bus services, and biking to work. Starting with carpooling and vanpooling, most of the businesses (89.0%, n=316) reported not offering any such information or services to their employees. Looking more closely at the individual items in question AA6 about carpooling, out of the 209 go!pass businesses who responded to the question, 23 (11%) reported offering information about carpooling, compared to 6 out of 146 non-pass businesses (4.1%) who responded to the question. Overall, 29 out of 355 reporting businesses (8.2%) offered information on carpooling. None of the non-pass businesses provided preferential parking for carpoolers or hybrid vehicles or a vanpool program, while 7 of the go!pass businesses did so. A small proportion of each group (7.7% (n=16) of the go!pass group and 3.4% (n=21) of the non-pass group) had an internally organized carpool program.

AA6. Does {Business Name} provide … (Select all that apply)

	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
Carpooling	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Information on carpooling	23	11.0%	6	4.1%	29	8.2%
Preferential parking for carpoolers or hybrid vehicles	7	3.4%	0	0%	7	2.0%
Vanpool program	7	3.4%	0	0%	7	2.0%
Internally organized carpool program	16	7.7%	5	3.4%	21	5.9%

Next, we asked about whether the businesses provided information about buses. Over one half of the businesses (54.6%, n=196) provided information on AATA bus service, and just over 40% provided bus schedules (41%, n=147).

For all bus-related items queried in question AA7, go!pass participants were statistically more likely to provide information than non-pass groups. The go!pass group was more likely than non-pass group to provide information on AATA bus service (x^2 =71.615, df =1, p <.01, n=196). There were 155 out of 212 (73%) go!pass businesses that reported providing employees with information about AATA bus service, compared to 41 out of 147 (27.9%) non-pass businesses.

The go!pass group was also more likely than non-pass group to provide bus schedules to their employees (x^2 =43.428, df =1, p <.01, n=147). More than one half of the go!pass group (55.2%, n=117) provided bus schedules, compared to 20.4% (n=30) of the non-pass group.

Similarly, the go!pass group was also more likely than non-pass group to provide information on Park and Ride lots (x^2 =15.068, df =1, p <.01, n=149). Just over one quarter of the go!pass group

(26.9%, n=57) provided information on Park and Ride lots, compared to 10.2% (n=15) of the non-pass group.

AA7. Does {Business Name} … (Select all that apply)

Bus Service	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information on AATA bus service	155	73.1%	41	27.9%	196	54.6%
Bus schedules	117	55.2%	30	20.4%	147	41.0%
Information on Park and Ride lots	57	26.9%	15	10.2%	72	20.1%
None	50	23.6%	99	67.4%	149	41.5%

The LINK bus is a circulator bus route operated by the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority (AATA) that connects various shopping districts in downtown Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan central campus. The routes operate late August through April and are free to ride. Overall, businesses reported a median score of 3.0 (n=305) on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being "no benefit" and 7 being "a great deal of benefit". Some businesses noted that the LINK was more valuable to their customers than to their employees. There was no significant difference between go!pass and non-pass groups on their perception of the LINK benefit.

Next we asked businesses if they provided information about biking and walking to work, including information on locations of bike racks, storage facilities, lockers and showers, and walking and biking maps. We also asked if the business provided bike racks or storage facilities for their employees and if they organized a lunch-time walking or biking group. A minority of businesses reported providing any biking or walking related information to their employees.

We created a variable to measure whether the business offered any one of the five walking/biking benefits queried in question AA8 (e.g., yes, offered at least one walking/biking benefit; no, did not offer any walking/biking benefit at all). While a statistical significance did not emerge, we found that the go!pass group leaned towards offering at least one walking/biking benefit more than the non-pass group (x^2 =3.07, df =1, p <.08, n=359).

AA8. Does {Business Name} provide … (Select all that apply)

Biking and Walking	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information on locations of bike racks and storage facilities	27	12.7%	14	9.5%	41	11.4%
Lockers or shower facilities	25	11.8%	8	5.4%	33	9.2%
Bike racks or bike storage facilities	21	9.9%	4	2.7%	25	7.0%
Organized lunch-time walk or bike groups	11	5.2%	1	.7%	12	3.3%
Walk or bike maps	8	3.8%	3	2.0%	11	3.1%

Awareness of the getDowntown Program

Overall, 76.5% (n=310) businesses reported being aware of the programs and services of the getDowntown Program. The go!pass group was more likely than non-pass group to be aware of the getDowntown Program (x^2 =56.740, df =1, p <.01, n=405). Out of 241 respondents in the go!pass group, 216 (89.6%) reported awareness of the programs and services that the getDowntown Program offers, compared to 94 out of 164 respondents in the non-pass group (57.3%) reporting awareness.

For those businesses who said they were aware of getDowntown Program (n=310), we asked about their use of the program's services. In the past year, downtown Ann Arbor businesses aware of the program have taken advantage of a number of getDowntown Program services. Looking first at businesses that have employees, at the top of the list was the provision of go!passes to employees: 205 businesses (76.8%) did so in the past year. The website was likewise well received: 133 businesses (49.8%) reported using the getDowntown website to find commuting information in the past year. Very few businesses reported not using any of the programs or services (13.1%, n=35).

Go!pass businesses were statistically more likely than non-pass businesses to have visited the getDowntown Program website (x^2 =9.267, df =1, p <.01, n=133) and to have forwarded newsletters to employees (x^2 =5.855, df =1, p <.02, n=67). There were some businesses in the non-pass group that reported offering go!passes to their employees (n=21). These businesses may have signed up after the database was last updated.

B5. In the past year, has {Business Name} … (Select all that apply)

	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
Programs and Services	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Provided go!passes to employees	184	97.9%	21	26.6%	205	76.8%
Visited www.getdowntown.org	105	55.9%	28	35.4%	133	49.8%
Forwarded newsletters to employees	55	29.3%	12	15.2%	67	25.1%
Referred employees to website	42	22.3%	11	13.9%	53	19.9%
Contacted getDowntown with a question	31	16.5%	10	12.7%	41	15.4%
Attended a getDowntown event	32	17.0%	3	3.8%	35	13.1%
Checked getDowntown blog	13	6.9%	1	1.3%	14	5.2%
Invited getDowntown to do a presentation	5	2.7%	1	1.3%	6	2.3%
None	2	1.1%	33	41.8%	35	13.1%

B6. In the past year, has {Business Name} …

	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
Programs and Services	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Obtained information about bike lockers	7	3.8%	0	0%	7	2.6%
Obtained information about preferential parking for carpoolers	3	1.6%	0	0%	3	1.1%
None	178	95.7%	79	100.0%	257	97.0%

For the single-person businesses, we likewise asked what programs and services they used in the past year. Based All of the go!pass group purchased a go!pass for themselves. Nearly one half (48%, n=12) of the go!pass group visited the getDowntown.org website, while 23.1% (n=3) of the non-pass group did so.

B5_1. In the past year, have you … (Select all that apply)

	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
Programs and Services	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Purchased a go!pass for yourself	25	100.0%	2	15.4%	27	71.1%
Visited www.getdowntown.org	12	48.0%	3	23.1%	15	39.5%
Contacted getDowntown with a question	6	24.0%	0	0%	6	15.8%
Attended a getDowntown event	4	16.0%	0	0%	4	10.5%
Checked getDowntown blog	4	16.0%	0	0%	4	10.5%
Obtained information about bike lockers	4	16.0%	0	0%	4	10.5%
Obtained information about carpooling	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
None	0	0%	9	69.2%	9	23.7%

Overall, 18% (n=56) of the businesses participated in the 2008 Curb Your Car Month, and 17.7% (n=55) participated in the 2008 Commuter Challenge. Most of these businesses were from the go!pass group (50/56 for the Curb Your Car Month participation) and 52/55 for the Commuter Challenge).

Overall, respondents appreciated the getDowntown Program. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being “no benefit” and 7 being a “great benefit”, the go!pass group rated the benefit of getDowntown’s programs and services to employees as 5.1 on a 7-point scale (n=187). The non-pass group rated the benefit of getDowntown’s programs and services to employees as 3.1 on a 7-point scale (n=77). The go!pass group mentioned the provision of the go!passes as tremendously helpful.

On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being “no benefit” and 7 being “a great deal of benefit”, the go!pass group rated getDowntown’s programs and services as a benefit to the business overall as 5.2 on a 7-point scale (n=212). The non-pass group rated the benefit of getDowntown’s programs and services to the business overall as 3.4 on a 7-point scale (n=88).

Regardless of current program use, we asked about the usefulness of the programs and services to the businesses (currently or in the future). Looking first at businesses that have employees, at the top of the list was the provision of go!passes to employees: 197 businesses in the go!pass group (94.6%) reported the go!pass as currently useful, and 48.3% (n=69) of the non-pass group reported the go!pass as potentially useful to their business. The website was selected as the second most useful service: 70.8% (n=148) of the go!pass group and 54.6% (n=78) of the non-pass group selected the getDowntown website as currently or potentially useful.

B13. Which getDowntown programs and services do you think are or would be useful to {Business Name}? (Select all that apply)

Programs and Services	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Go!pass	197	94.6	69	48.3	266	75.6
www.getdowntown.org	148	70.8	78	54.6	226	64.2
Informational materials	106	50.7	49	34.3	155	44.0
Advocacy	91	43.5	44	30.8	135	38.4
Curb Your Car Month	68	32.5	26	18.2	94	26.7
Commuter Challenge	67	32.1	21	14.7	88	25.0
Assistance	43	20.6	15	10.5	58	16.5
GetDowntown blog	42	20.1	16	11.2	58	16.5
Workshops and presentations	27	12.9	16	11.2	43	12.2
None	4	1.9	34	23.8	38	10.8

Turning to the single-person businesses, at the top of the list for rating the usefulness of the programs and services to the businesses (currently or in the future) was the provision of go!passes for themselves: 24 businesses in the go!pass group (96.0%) reported the go!pass as currently useful, and 6 (46.2%) in the non-pass group reported the go!pass as currently or potentially useful to their businesses. Advocacy and the getDowntown website were selected as the next most currently or potentially useful services: 52.0% (n=13) of the go!pass group and 53.9% (n=20) of the non-pass group selected advocacy and 60.0% (n=15) of the go!pass group and 30.8% (n=4) of the non-pass group selected the getDowntown website as currently or potentially useful.

B13_1. Which getDowntown programs and services do you think are or would be useful to you? (Select all that apply)

Programs and Services	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Go!pass	24	96.0%	6	46.2%	30	79.0%
Advocacy	13	52.0%	7	53.9%	20	52.6%
www.getdowntown.org	15	60.0%	4	30.8%	19	50.0%
Curb Your Car Month	7	28.0%	2	15.4%	9	24.0%
Commuter Challenge	7	28.0%	2	15.4%	9	24.0%
Workshops and presentations	5	20.0%	2	15.4%	7	18.4%
GetDowntown blog	4	16.0%	2	15.4%	6	15.8%
None	0	0%	5	38.6%	5	13.2%

Finally, we asked about strategies that might encourage local businesses to participate in sustainable commuting. For both the go!pass and non-pass groups, savings on parking costs and information about tax savings were at the top of the list, with 45.1% (n=181) and 39.7% (n=159), respectively, endorsing those options. Interestingly, over one quarter (28.9%, n=116) reported simple recognition would help encourage them to incorporate information and programs on sustainable commuting in their workplaces.

B16. What would encourage {Business Name} to incorporate information and programs on sustainable commuting in the workplace? (Select all that apply)

Strategy	Go!Pass		Non-Pass		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Saving on parking cost	121	51.1%	60	36.6%	181	45.1%
Information about tax savings	110	46.4%	49	29.9%	159	39.7%
Information about the benefit to the environment	88	37.1%	44	26.8%	132	32.9%
Ability to offer an additional no-cost or low cost employee benefit	95	40.0%	31	18.9%	126	31.4%
Recognition	80	33.8%	36	22.0%	116	28.9%
None	60	25.3%	62	37.8%	122	30.4%

Summary

In terms of transportation-related benefits, about one-half of responding businesses offered a compressed work week, flex, or telecommute schedule to some or all employees, but few offered a commuter tax benefit program or encouraged respondents to live close to work. A good number of businesses provided information about AATA bus services, schedules, and Park and Ride lots, but the provision of information about other commuting services and programs related to carpooling, walking, and biking were less common. A good number of businesses offered some cost-sharing for parking – either in terms of providing free parking on-site or paying part or all of the parking fees.

More than three quarters of the businesses reported at minimum a general awareness of the getDowntown Program. Businesses that were aware of the getDowntown Program used the go!pass Program and the getDowntown website. A smaller proportion participated in events such as the Commuter Challenge and Curb Your Car Month.

Responding businesses reacted favorably to the ideas presented for encouraging sustainable commuting in their workplaces – most notably, the savings on parking and taxes.

The Employee Survey

Employee Participants

The respondents to the employee survey mostly worked full-time in the downtown area: 79% (n=274) reported having a full-time work schedule and 21% (n=73) reported a part-time schedule. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (68.9%, n=222) had flexible work hours that allowed them to vary or make changes in the time they began and ended work. Just over 10% (n=35) reported that their work schedule was part of a flextime or other program offered by their employers, such as a 4 day-10 hour week). Ninety-plus percent of the respondents worked during the week, with slightly fewer working on Fridays. About one quarter of the respondents worked on Saturdays, and 18% on Sundays. They reported working hours largely between the hours of 8 AM and 7 PM.

When asked about the length of time that the respondents had worked in the downtown Ann Arbor area, 44.1% (n=153) reported working downtown for more than 5 years; 11.6% (n=40) reported working downtown for 3-5 years; 31.2% (n=108) for 1-3 years; and 13.3% (n=46) reported working downtown for less than one year.

Respondents were established Southeast Michigan residents, with 76.0% (n=259) reporting that they had lived in Southeast Michigan for more than five years. A smaller proportion 5.0% (n=17) had lived for less than one year; 13.8% (n=47) had lived in the area for 1-3 years; and 5.3% (n=18) for 3-5 years. Most of the respondents lived in one-person or two –person households, 23% (n=78) and 43% (n=148), respectively. Just 35 of the 352 respondents (11.2%)were enrolled in college either part-time or full-time.

Nearly all respondents were licensed drivers (96.3%, n=334) and had a car that they could use to commute to work alone, if so desired (89.8%, n=307).

About one half of the employee survey respondents were under 35 years of age. The table below shows the breakout of the age categories.

G-2. What is your age?

Age Group	%	N
Under 18 years	.9%	3
18-25 years	23.1%	79
26-35 years	27.7%	95
36-45 years	15.7%	54
46-55 years	17.2%	59
56-65 years	13.9%	48
Over 65 years	1.5%	5
Total	100.0%	343

Slightly more women responded to the survey than men: 57.7% (n=199) of the employee survey respondents were women and 42.3% (n=146) were men.

The distribution of household income among the employee survey respondents is shown in the table on the next page. In 2007, the median household income for Washtenaw County was

$61,152 ($50,740 for the U.S. as a whole)[3]. Among the respondents, about one half of them had a household income of $60,000 or more (55.0%, n=176). Thirteen out of the 30 respondents with an income less than $15,000 were students and two respondents with an income less than $15,000were under the age of 18 years.

G-4. What was your household income last year?

Income	%	N
Less than $15,000	9.4%	30
$15,000 - $29,000	10.0%	32
$30,000 - $44,999	13.1%	42
$45,000 - $59,999	12.5%	40
$60,000 - $74,999	12.5%	40
$75,000 and more	42.5%	136
Total	100.0%	320

Commutes

How far do people commute to their workplace in downtown Ann Arbor?

About one half of the respondents (53.2%, n=182) lived in Ann Arbor, and 7.9% (n=27) lived in Ypsilanti. About 30% (n=107) of the respondents lived within a comfortable walking/biking distance of 2 miles or less, while about one-half (n=175) lived within four miles of their workplace – an easy and comfortable bus distance. On the flip side, nearly one-third of the respondents (33.9%, n=120) lived 10 miles or more from their workplace. Travel time to work was 20 minutes or less for about one half of the respondents (50.8%, n=175).

B-1. How far do you travel ONE-WAY from home to work?

Miles	%	N
Less than half a mile	6.4%	22
½ - 2 miles	24.7%	85
2 -4 miles	19.7%	68
4-10 miles	14.2%	49
10-15 miles	11.6%	40
More than 15 miles	23.3%	80
Total	100.0%	344

[3] *U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts:* http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/26/26161.html and http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html. Data derived from Population Estimates, Census of Population and Housing, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Non-employer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits, Consolidated Federal Funds Report.

B-3. How long does it take to travel from home all the way to the front door of your workplace using the transportation mode selected in the previous question?

Minutes	%	N
Less than 10 minutes	20.6%	71
10-20 minutes	30.2%	105
20-30 minutes	21.5%	74
30-45 minutes	19.2%	66
45-60 minutes	7.3%	26
More than 60 minutes	.9%	3

Commute distances that were four miles or less appeared to remain comparable to earlier survey data; however, in 2009, we see slightly fewer 4-10 mile commuters and slightly more 15+ mile commuters.

Commute Distance Reported across Survey Years

Miles	% in 2009	% in 2005	% in 2001	% in 2000
Less than half a mile	6.4%	8.2%	10.2%	7.5%
½ - 2 miles	24.7%	26.2%	22.9%	20.8%
2 -4 miles	19.7%	16.8%	18.2%	20.7%
4-10 miles	14.2%	19.4%	19.3%	23.4%
10-15 miles	11.6%	13.0%	12.0%	13.1%
More than 15 miles	23.3%	16.5%	17.4%	14.5%

How do downtown employees get to work?

A little over one-third of the respondents reported taking a sustainable commute option (38.6%, n=130). Fifteen percent reported using one of the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority (AATA) bus services (15.9%, n=54), a similar number reported walking or biking to work (15.9%, n=54), and 5.9% carpooled to work. Most people who carpooled had just one other person in the carpool.

B-2. How do you normally commute to work? If you use more than one way of getting to and from work, check the one you use for the MAJORITY of your trip.

Primary Commute Mode	%	N
Drive alone	61.4%	208
Walk	13.6%	46
AATA bus	11.8%	40
Rideshare or carpool	5.9%	20
Park and Ride	2.3%	8
Bike	2.3%	8
The Link	.9%	3
Bike and ride the bus	.6%	2
Other	.6%	2
Get dropped off	.3%	1
Ann Arbor-Chelsea Express	.3%	1
Vanpool or shuttle	0%	0

Looking at data from previous survey years, we see fairly consistent patterns in primary mode of commuting to/from work, with a few exceptions. The proportion of respondents who were dropped off at work in 2009 was lower than in previous years. Ridesharing or carpooling seems higher than in previous years, although the proportion remains low.

Commute Mode Reported across Survey Years

	Percent of Respondents			
Primary Commute Mode	**2009**	**2005**	**2001**	**2000**
Drive alone	61.4%	56.4%	61.1%	61.6%
Get dropped off	.3%	3.3%	3.4%	4.1%
Any AATA bus (incl. A2-Chelsea Express; Link)	13.0%	14.7%	9.2%	12.1%
Park and Ride	2.3%	2.7%	2.7%	1.3%
Bike and ride the bus	.6%	.2%	.5%	.4%
Walk	13.6%	15.1%	14.1%	11.8%
Bike	2.3%	4.2%	2.2%	3.6%
Rideshare or carpool	5.9%	3.0%	3.3%	2.8%
Other	.6%	.4%	.1%	.6%

Turning back to the 2009 data, for all respondents, we asked what commuting method they used second most frequently in the past year. About one quarter of the respondents reported driving alone to work (23.1%, n=80). One quarter of the respondents used one of the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority (AATA) bus services (25.5%, n=88), 8.4% (n=29) reported walking or biking to work (15.3%, n=53), 8.1% (n=28) were dropped off, and 7.8% (n=27) carpooled to work.

B-5. What was the second most frequent way you commuted to and from work during the last year?

Commute Option	%	N
Drive alone	23.1%	80
Get dropped off	8.1%	28
AATA bus	13.3%	46
Park and Ride	1.2%	4
Ann Arbor Chelsea Express	.9%	3
The Link	10.1%	35
Bike and ride the bus	0%	0
Walk	8.1%	28
Bike	.3%	1
Rideshare or carpool	7.8%	27
Vanpool or shuttle	0%	0
None	21.6%	75

We then combined primary and secondary modes of transportation into one commute mode variable with four categories:

- Drive solo as both the primary and secondary commuting mode;
- Drive solo as primary commuting mode; use of a sustainable commute as secondary; commuting mode
- Use of a sustainable commute as primary and secondary commuting mode; and
- Use of a sustainable commute as primary commuting mode and solo driving as secondary commuting mode.

By combining the primary and secondary commuting modes, we see an interesting pattern. While 61.4% (n=208) reported driving solo as the primary commuting mode, 28% (n=94) reported that they primarily drove solo to and from work but also used a sustainable commute mode as a secondary option. In fact we see a sizable proportion of respondents who use sustainable modes as the primary, secondary, or both modes of transportation to and from work.

Mode	%	N
Drive solo as both the primary and secondary commuting mode;	33.6%	112
Drive solo as primary commuting mode; use of a sustainable commute as secondary; commuting mode	28.2%	94
Use of a sustainable commute as primary and secondary commuting mode; and	27.0%	90
Use of a sustainable commute as primary commuting mode and solo driving as secondary commuting mode.	11.2%	37
Total	100.0%	333

Next we looked at the differences between respondents who lived a half mile or less from work and respondents who lived 15 miles or more from work. Those who lived a half mile or less from work (n=22) walked, biked, or rode the Link to and from work as their primary mode of commuting. Only 3 of the 22 drove to work as their primary mode.

Those who lived 15 miles or more from work (n=80), mostly drove to work (n=66; 82.5%) but also we see a small proportion who took the bus, used Park and Ride lot, or carpooled (n=13; 17.5%). For those 66 respondents who lived 15 miles or more from work and also drove as a primary mode of transportation, 16 took a sustainable commute option as a secondary choice: their options were split across carpooling, use of the Park and Ride lot, riding the bus, or biking to and from work.

We took a closer look at some respondent characteristics for those who opted to use several categories of commuting modes. For the next set of analyses, we recoded the “Primary Commute Mode” variable into four categories: driving alone, ridesharing/carpooling/vanpooling, use of AATA bus services, including Ann Arbor – Chelsea Express and the Link, and walking/biking. The first detail is a break out of primary commute mode by distance to work.

Primary Commute Mode by Distance to Work

Primary Mode	< .5 Miles	.5 - 2.0 Miles	2 - 4 Miles	4 - 10 Miles	10 - 15 Miles	Over 15 Miles	Total
Drive Alone	3	27	41	36	32	66	205
% within Mode	*1.5%*	*13.2%*	*20.0%*	*17.6%*	*15.6%*	*32.2%*	*100.0%*
% within Distance	*14.3%*	*33.3%*	*61.2%*	*73.5%*	*86.5%*	*84.6%*	*61.6%*
Rideshare	0	6	5	0	0	9	20
% within Mode	*.0%*	*30.0%*	*25.0%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*45.0%*	*100.0%*
% within Distance	*.0%*	*7.4%*	*7.5%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*11.5%*	*6.0%*
Use any of AATA bus services	1	16	16	13	5	3	54
% within Mode	*1.9%*	*29.6%*	*29.6%*	*24.1%*	*9.3%*	*5.6%*	*100.0%*
% within Distance	*4.8%*	*19.8%*	*23.9%*	*26.5%*	*13.5%*	*3.8%*	*16.2%*
Walk or bike	17	32	5	0	0	0	54
% within Mode	*31.5%*	*59.3%*	*9.3%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*100.0%*
% within Distance	*81.0%*	*39.5%*	*7.5%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*.0%*	*16.2%*
Total	21	81	67	49	37	78	333
% within Mode	*6.3%*	*24.3%*	*20.1%*	*14.7%*	*11.1%*	*23.4%*	*100.0%*
% within Distance	*100.0%*	*100.0%*	*100.0%*	*100.0%*	*100.0%*	*100.0%*	*100.0%*

The closer the respondent lived to work, the more likely to take a sustainable commute: more than 85% of the respondents who lived less than ½ mile walked, biked, or bused to work; more than 66% of the respondents who lived a ½ mile to 2 miles from work walked, biked, bused, or ride-shared to work. At the 2-4 mile distance, however, the relationship inverted whereby a larger share of the respondents drove alone to work, compared to taking a sustainable commute.

We compared respondents who lived up to 4 miles from work and those who lived 4 miles and greater from work on whether or not they drove alone to work. Significantly more respondents who lived 4 miles or more from their workplace drove alone (82%, n=134) compared to respondents who lived up to 4 miles (42%, n= 71) (x^2 =55.423, df =1, p <.01, n=333).

Downtown employees who reported being aware of the getDowntown Program were statistically more likely than employees not aware of the getDowntown Program to use the bus or walk/bike to work as their primary mode of commuting (x^2 =12.716, df =4, p <.01, n=334).

Primary Commute Mode by Awareness of getDowntown Program

Primary Commute Mode	Aware of getDowntown	Not Aware of getDowntown	Total
Drive Alone	95 (45.7%)	113 (54.3%)	208
Rideshare	12 (60.0%)	8 (40.0%)	20
Use any of AATA bus services	37 (71.2%)	15 (28.8%)	52
Walk or bike	34 (62.3%)	20 (37.7%)	54
Total	178	156	334

Downtown employees who reported being aware of the Commuter Challenge were statistically more likely than employees not aware of the Commuter Challenge to use the bus or walk/bike to work as their primary mode of commuting than drive solo (x^2 =20.971, df =3, p <.01, n=325).

Primary Commute Mode by Awareness of the Commuter Challenge

Primary Commute Mode	Aware of the Commuter Challenge	Not Aware of the Commuter Challenge	Total
Drive Alone	105 (51.7%)	98 (48.3%)	203
Rideshare	19 (95.0%)	1 (5.0%)	20
Use any of AATA bus services	37 (72.6%)	14 (27.5%)	51
Walk or bike	35 (68.6%)	16 (31.4%)	51
Total	196	129	325

We looked at primary commute for full-time and part-time work status, and by sex of the respondent. There was no statistically significant difference between full-time and part-time employees in their choice of mode of commute, nor between men and women in their choice of mode of commute. There was a trend towards younger respondents to be more likely to use the bus or walk/bike to work than older respondents.

Primary Commute Mode by Full-Time/Part-Time Work Schedule

Primary Commute Mode	Full-Time Work Schedule	Part-Time Work Schedule	Total
Drive Alone	166 (79.8%)	42 (20.2%)	208
Rideshare	20 (100.0%)	0 (.0%)	20
Use any of AATA bus services	42 (77.8%)	12 (22.2%)	54
Walk or bike	41 (75.9%)	13 (24.1%)	52
Total	269 (80.1%)	67 (19.9%)	336

Primary Commute Mode by Sex

Primary Commute Mode	Men	Women	Total
Drive Alone	84 (40.4%)	124 (59.6%)	208
Rideshare	7 (35.0%)	13 (65.0%)	20
Use any of AATA bus services	22 (40.7%)	32 (59.3%)	54
Walk or bike	30 (57.7%)	22 (42.3%)	52
Total	142 (42.8%)	190 (57.2%)	334

Primary Commute Mode by Age

Primary Commute Mode	Up to 25 Yrs	26-35 Yrs	36-45 Yrs	46-55 Yrs	56+ Yrs	Total
Drive Alone	42 (20.6%)	51 (25.0%)	34 (16.7%)	42 (20.6%)	35 (17.2%)	204
Rideshare	1 (5.0%)	11 (55.0%)	4 (20.0%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (5.0%)	20
Use any of AATA bus services	14 (25.9%)	16 (29.6%)	11 (20.4%)	6 (11.1%)	7 (13.0%)	54
Walk or bike	21 (40.4%)	14 (26.9%)	3 (5.8%)	6 (11.5%)	8 (15.4%)	52
Total	78	92	52	57	51	330

Across household income groups, respondents were more likely to drive alone than use a sustainable commute mode to travel to and from work. This difference was most pronounced in the highest income category ($75,000 annual and more). To test the difference, we created two dichotomous variables: one for income (<$75,000; $75,000 or more) and one for solo driving as primary commute (yes; no). Higher income respondents were more likely to report driving solo to work than taking a sustainable commute (x^2 =14.351, df =1, p <.01, n=310).

Primary Commute Mode by Household Income

Primary Commute Mode	<$30K	$30-45K	$45-60K	$60-75K	$75K+	Total
Drive Alone	29 (15.2%)	22 (11.5%)	23 (12.0%)	19 (10.0%	98 (51.3%)	191
Rideshare	0	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	6 (33.3%)	6 (44.4%)	18
Use any of AATA bus services	15 (28.8%)	10 (19.2%)	5 (9.6%)	8 (15.4%)	14 (26.9%)	52
Walk or bike	13 (17.6%)	8 (17.0%)	8 (17.0%)	6 (12.8%)	12 (25.5%)	47
Total	57	42	38	39	132	308

Students were not more likely to take the bus or other sustainable commute than non-students.

Primary Commute Mode by Student-Status

Primary Commute Mode	Not a Student	Student	Total
Drive Alone	191 (93.2%)	14 (9.8%)	205
Rideshare	17 (94.4%)	1 (5.6%)	18
Use any of AATA bus services	46 (85.2%)	32 (59.3%)	54
Walk or bike	44 (84.6%)	8 (15.4%)	52
Total	298	31	329

Solo Drivers

For those 204 respondents who reported driving solo to work *as their primary commuting mode*, the majority lived more than 4 miles away: 17.6% (n=36) lived 4-10 miles from their workplace; 15.6% (n=32) lived 10-15 miles from their workplace; and 32.2% (n=66) lived more than 15 miles from their workplace.

We were interested in the reasons why the respondents choose to drive solo to work. The top reason was convenience (39.9%, n=77), followed by a perceived lack of other options (19.9%, n=38) and time (11.4%, n=22).

B-4. If you normally drive a car all the way to and from work, please indicate the MAJOR REASON for driving.

Reason	%	N
Convenience	39.9%	77
Lack of alternative options	19.9%	38
Time	11.4%	22
Need a car for work trips during the day	9.9%	19
Need car for personal needs during the day or after work	6.4%	13
Other	5.4%	11
Drop off spouse or children	3.6%	7
Comfort	2%	4
Health problem or disability	0%	0
Drive others in a carpool	0%	0
Total	100%	191

Solo drivers parked in a variety of places, but the majority used public parking structures (43.0%, n=89). One quarter had parking available at their workplace (25.1%, n=52). Most found it very easy or easy to find a parking spot (88.7%, n=181).

B-4a. When you drive to work, where do you usually park? (Select all that apply)

Location	%	N
Public parking structure	43.0%	89
Parking at workplace	25.1%	52
Private parking	16.9%	35
Public surface parking	14.0%	28
Street – free	10.6%	22
Street – metered	2.5%	5
Other	2.0%	1

B-4b. On a typical work day, how easy is it to find a parking spot?

Level of Ease	%	N
Very easy	52.6%	108
Easy	35.8%	73
Difficult	10.8%	22
Very difficult	.5%	1
Total	100%	204

We asked the solo drivers if they had any interest in finding an alternative commuting method. On a scale of 1-7, where 1 was not at all interested and 7 indicated very interested, the average response was 3.31 (n=204).

Commuters who Live Four Miles and under from the Workplace

We looked more closely at the respondents who lived within a comfortable busing, walking, and driving distance from their workplaces. About 19% (n=33) used one of the AATA bus services as their primary mode of commuting to and from work; 27% (n=46) walked to work, 4.7% (n=8) biked to work and 6.5% (n=11) carpooled.

B-2. How do you normally commute to work? If you use more than one way of getting to and from work, check the one you use for the MAJORITY of your trip.

Primary Commute Mode	%	N
Drive alone	42%	71
Get dropped off	0%	0
AATA bus	16%	27
Park and Ride	0%	0
Ann Arbor Chelsea Express	.6%	1
The Link	1.8%	3
Bike and ride the bus	1.2%	2
Walk	27.2%	46
Bike	4.7%	8
Rideshare or carpool	6.5%	11
Vanpool or shuttle	0%	0
Other	0%	0

Looking at the reasons why the respondents who lived four miles or under from the workplace chose to drive to work, 40.9% (n=36) reported convenience as the major reason for driving to work, followed by 14.8% (n=13) who reported time. Nearly one quarter reported needing their car during or after work, either for work-related or personal reasons.

B-4. If you normally drive a car all the way to and from work, please indicate the MAJOR REASON for driving.

Reason	%	N
Convenience	40.9%	36
Time	14.8%	13
Need a car for work trips during the day	13.6%	12
Need car for personal needs during the day or after work	9.1%	8
Drop off spouse or children	6.8%	6
Lack of alternative options	3.4%	3
Comfort	3.4%	3
Drive others in a carpool	1.1%	1
Health problem or disability	0%	0
Other	0%	0

Changes in Commute Modes

We asked respondents if they had made any changes in their commuting method in getting to and from work in the past year: 12.0% (n=41) reported that they had changed the way to get to work regularly, and 17.3% (n=59) reported that they changed way to get to work occasionally. Out of the 100 respondents who made some change, 63.5% changed from driving alone.

B-6 What mode did you formerly use to get to work? (Select all that apply.)

Commute Option	%	N
Drive alone	63.5%	61
AATA bus	20.0%	20
Walk	16.0%	16
Rideshare or carpool	9.0%	9
Bike	9.0%	9
Get dropped off	9.0%	9
Park and Ride	2.0%	2
The Link	2.0%	2
Ann Arbor Chelsea Express	1.1%	1
Bike and ride the bus	1.1%	1
Other	2.0%	2

The top three reasons why respondents reported changing their commute habits were: desire to be more environmentally friendly (30.1%, n=28); gas prices (24.0%, n=23); and moved to a new home (26.0%, n=26). Out of the 100 people who changed their commuting method, 22 (22.7%) reported changing due to the availability of the go!pass and 13 (14.0%) reported changing as a result of participating in the Commuter Challenge.

B-6b What factors influenced your decision to change how you get to and from work? (Select all that apply.)

Factors that Prompted Change	**%**	**N**
Desire to be more environmentally friendly	30.1%	28
Gas prices	24.0%	23
Moved to a new home	26.0%	26
Availability of the go!pass	22.7%	22
Convenience	22.7%	22
Health and fitness	18.7%	17
As a result of participating in the Commuter Challenge	14.0%	13
Work schedule changed	12.5%	12
Parking cost	11.5%	11
Parking availability	10.4%	10
Availability of rides from other people	8.5%	8
Availability of a car to drive to work	6.3%	6
Job location changed	4.2%	4
Availability of a bicycle	4.2%	4
Other	13.1%	13

We recoded responses to B6 into a bivariate variable: changed commuting mode (either regularly or occasionally (n=100) in the past year and did not change commuting mode in the past year. We found a significant difference between respondents who were Ann Arbor resident and residents of other cities: Ann Arbor resident respondents were more likely to have changed their commuting mode than non-residents (x^2 =6.187, df =1, p <.013, n=342).

For the Ann Arbor residents who changed their commuting mode (n=63), nearly 97% now use a sustainable commuting option as either their primary or secondary mode of transportation to and from work: 33.3% respondents (n=20) use a sustainable commuting option for both primary and secondary commute options; 23.3% (n=14) have a sustainable primary commuting mode and drive solo as secondary mode; 40% (n=24) drive as a primary mode but use a sustainable option as a secondary mode; and only 3.3% (n=2) drive for both primary and secondary commuting modes.

For the non-Ann Arbor residents who changed their commuting mode (n=37), nearly 89% now use a sustainable commuting option as either their primary or secondary mode of transportation to and from work: 30.6% respondents (n=11) use a sustainable commuting option for both primary and secondary commute options; 16.7% (n=6) have a sustainable primary commuting mode and drive solo as secondary mode; 41.6% (n=15) drive as a primary mode but use a sustainable option as a secondary mode; and only 11.1% (n=4) drive for both primary and secondary commuting modes.

Bus Service

About one quarter of the respondents (24.9%, n=86) reported using AATA bus service to go to and from work at least three times each month in the past year.

For those who did not use AATA bus service to go to and from work at least three times each month in the past year (73.8%, n=256), the reasons were varied. The top three reasons were: (1) no bus service to their homes (33.6%, n=86), (2) time (27.3%, n=70), and (3) their commute was already very short (20.7%, n=53).

C-1a. Which of the following are obstacles to taking the bus to work? (Select all that apply).

Obstacles to Riding the Bus	%	N
No AATA service to my home	33.6%	86
Time	27.3%	70
My commute to work is very short	20.7%	53
Personal comfort	15.6%	40
AATA service is not frequent enough	10.9%	28
Bus stop is too far away from my home	9.8%	25
AATA service does not run late enough	7.8%	20
Lack of information about bus service	6.6%	17
No direct route to my home	5.9%	15
Safety	4.7%	12
Expense	3.5%	9
AATA service does not start early enough	1.6%	4
Other	34%	13.3

We asked non-bus users what would encourage them to take the bus to or from work. The most frequently reported factor was providing service close to their home (26.6%, n=68) followed by more direct service (16%, n=41).

C-1b. What would encourage you to take the bus to or from work more often?

Factor to Encourage Bus Ridership	%	N
Service close to my home	26.6%	68
Express service / More direct service	16.0%	41
A car I could use while at work (“Zipcar”)	9.4%	24
Free or reduced-cost bus pass	5.5%	14
Transit information and advice at my workplace	4.3%	11
A ride home in case of emergency	4.3%	11
More frequent service on weekends	3.9%	10
Improved physical and/or safety conditions of the buses/stops/stations	3.1%	8
More affordable fare	2.0%	5
None of these	38.7%	99

C-1c. Which of the following schedule options would encourage you to take the bus to or from work more often?

Schedule Options	**%**	**N**
Earlier buses on weekdays	7%	18
Earlier buses on weekends	1.6%	4
Later buses on weekdays	10.5%	27
Later buses on weekends	4.7%	12
More frequent service in the daytime	16.8%	43
More frequent service in the evening	9.8%	25
None of these	50.8%	130

Go!pass

Most of the respondents (86.8%, n=297) had heard of the go!pass. Five percent (n=18) was not familiar and wanted to learn more about the go!pass. For those who were aware, overwhelmingly they learned about the go!pass from their employer (75.3%, n=219).

C-2a. How did you learn about the go!pass?

Source	**%**	**N**
Their employer	75.3%	219
Coworker	8.3%	24
getDowntown Program	7.7%	23
Friend	2.7%	8
Newspaper or TV	2.0%	6
AATA	1.3%	4
Brochure	.3%	1
Other	2.0%	6

Out of the 297 respondents who were aware of the go!pass, 258 (88.1%) reported that their employer offered the go!pass, and 185 (62.5%) reported that they had a go!pass.

Of the 185 respondents who had a go!pass, 62.1% (n=119) had it for more than one year, 29.5% (n=55) had it for 6 months to one year, and 8.4% (n=16) had it less than six months.

About one half (n=156) of 185 go!pass holders carried the go!pass with them in their purse or wallet and 13.5% (n=40) had taken advantage of go!pass discounts. Forty-one percent (n=123) had taken the bus using their go!pass.

In summary:

- 258 respondents reported their employer offered the go!pass
  - 185 of 258 respondents had a go!pass
    - 123 of the 185 had ever used the go!pass to take the bus
    - 156 of the 185 carry the go!pass with them

About one quarter (25.9%, n=77) of the respondents who had a go!pass reported that the go!pass was an important workplace benefit; 29% (n=86) reported that it was "a nice thing to have, but doesn't make much of a difference", and 9.8% (n=192) reported that the pass was "not important at all to me."

Finally, we asked respondents how the go!pass has affected their commute to work. Out of the 185 employees who reported having a go!pass, 25.4% (n=47) reported riding the bus more often and 19.5% (n=36) reported that they started riding the bus when they obtained a go!pass.

C-2c6. How has the go!pass affected your commute to work?

Go!pass Impact on Commute	%	N
I ride the bus more	25.4%	47
I didn't start using the bus until I got my go!pass	19.5%	36
I drive less	10%	20
I walk or bike more because I know that I can always take the bus for free	8.1%	15
I gave up my parking pass	2.2%	4
No change	48.1%	89

Bicycling

The fourth section of the employee questionnaire asked about bicycling to and from work. Only 8% (n=28) of respondents reported biking to and from work at least three times each month in the past year.

For all respondents who reported not biking to work, we asked why not. The top reason for not bicycling to work was distance (42.8%, n=131) followed by a desire to not get sweaty or dirty (37.9%, n=116) and time (33%, n=101).

D-1b. Which of the following are obstacles to biking to work? (Check all that apply)

Reason	%	N
Distance	42.8%	131
Don't want to get sweaty or dirty	37.9%	116
Time	33.0%	101
Work clothes	28.1%	86
Safety	23.9%	73
Lack or condition of bike paths and lanes	23.5%	72
Do not own a bike	21.2%	65
Other	14.7%	45
Interest	12.1%	37
Physical ability	7.8%	24
Lack of bike parking	5.2%	16
Costs	.3%	1

D-1c. What would encourage you to bike to work or from work more often? (Check all that apply)

Reason	**%**	**N**
Availability of bike paths	27.1%	83
Improved bike path conditions	19.6%	60
Ride home in case of emergency	18.3%	56
Access to shower	17.6%	54
Employee benefits for bikers	13.1%	40
Access to affordable bikes	12.1%	37
Different dress requirements at work	11.1%	34
Secure places to park my bike	9.8%	30
A car to use while at work	8.5%	26
Bike route information and maps at my workplace	4.9%	15
Contact person for information about biking	2.3%	7
Classes on biking and bike maintenance	0%	0

Walking

We additionally asked about walking to and from work. More respondents walked to work than biked: 23% (n=79) respondents reported walking to and from work at least three times each month in the past year.

For all respondents who reported not walking to work, we asked why not. The reasons that respondents provided for not walking to working are detailed in the table below (respondents were allowed to provide multiple reasons). The top reason for not walking to work was distance followed by time.

E-1b. Which of the following are obstacles to walking to work? (Check all that apply)

Reason	**%**	**N**
Distance	73.3%	189
Time	51.2%	132
Don't want to get sweaty or dirty	23.6%	61
Work clothes	13.6%	35
Safety	8.9%	23
Interest	8.5%	22
Lack or condition of sidewalks	8.1%	21
Physical ability	4.7%	12
Costs	0%	0
Other	8.9%	23

For all respondents who reported not walking to work, the top factor that would encourage more walking to and from work was a ride home in case of an emergency (12.8%, n=33).

E-1c. What would encourage you to walk to work or from work more often? (Check all that apply)

Reason	%	N
Ride home in case of emergency	12.8%	33
Access to shower facilities	9.3%	24
Employee benefits for walkers	9.3%	24
Improved sidewalk conditions	8.5%	22
Different dress requirements at work	7%	18
A car to use while at work	6.2%	16
Classes on personal safety	1.2%	3
Contact person for information about walking	.4%	1

Other Transportation Options

Respondents were asked about the awareness of a number of alternative commuting options in the downtown Ann Arbor area, including the RideShare program, the getDowntown Program, Curb Your Car Month campaign, and the Commuter Challenge. Twenty-eight percent (n=97) were familiar with the Rideshare program, 12.7% (n=44) reported interest in participating in a rideshare program. Slightly less – 10.4% (n=36) reported interest in a vanpooling program.

Just over one half (52.4%, n=182) of the respondents were aware of the getDowntown Program. "Curb Your Car Month" was familiar to 37.5% (n=130) of the respondents – and 11.2% (n=39) had participated in 2008. More of the respondents had heard about the Commuter Challenge: 58.5% (n=203) reported hearing about it and 33.7% had participated in 2008.

Summary

Over one half of the respondents lived in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, and within 4 miles of their workplace – within busing, walking, and biking distance.

Just over one third of the respondents reported using a sustainable commuting option. Respondents aware of the getDowntown program were more likely to use a sustainable commuting option. Still, the majority drove solo to work.

Solo drivers chose this commute mode because of convenience, a real or perceived lack of other options, and time. Solo drivers who lived less than four miles from work likewise reported convenience and time as reasons why they drove to work, but they also reported a need to use their cars during/after work.

A small proportion of the respondents changed their primary commute mode in the past year. The main reasons for changing their commuting habits were a desire to be more environmentally friendly, gas prices, and a residential move. The availability of the go!pass and the Commuter Challenge were instrumental, however, in prompting change for some of the respondents.

About one quarter of the respondents regularly used AATA bus services to travel to and from work each month. The reasons that respondents offered for not taking advantage of the bus services were varied, but the top three reasons were lack of service to their homes, time, and a lack of a need – since their commute was so short.

A good proportion of the non-bus users reported provision of bus service closer to their homes, more direct bus service, and the Zipcar as provisions that would encourage more frequent bus usage.

Most of the respondents had heard of the go!pass—and learned about it from their employer. About one half of the employee survey respondents reported having a go!pass, and noted that they ride the bus more often as a result of the pass.

Few respondents biked to work, but almost one quarter walked to work. Distance and time were main determinants for not walking more often, and when asked about provisions that would encourage walking, a ride home in case of an emergency was the top reason.

Respondents reported awareness of the RideShare Program, getDowntown Program, Curb Your Car Month, and the Commuter Challenge. Many fewer, however, participated in the programs.