

Commuter Survey

As part of our planning to meet the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act, the City of Cambridge is seeking to reduce traffic congestion and develop employee transportation services. Your answers to the following questions will help us understand the needs of employees so that better transportation services can be designed. All surveys are anonymous.

- 1. Employer
- 2. Department
- 3. Primary Work Site Address
- 4. What is the zip code where you live?
- 5. Do you usually arrive at work between 6:00 am and 10:00 am?
Yes No
- 6. For each of your past five work days, including today, please indicate how you traveled to work (primary work site):
Check one means of transportation for each day.

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
Date							
What time did you arrive at this worksite?(please indicate a.m./p.m.)							
A. Walk							
B. Bicycle							
C. Drive alone in any motor vehicle							
D. Car Pool please indicate # of people - include driver and yourself							
E. Van Pool please indicate # of people - include driver and yourself							
F. Limousine, Taxi Cab please indicate # of people - include driver and yourself							
G. Special needs transportation							
H. Commuter Rail, Subway, Bus							
I. Work at home or another site							
J. Day off due to compressed work week *							
K. Not working: day off, vacation, sick, jury duty, business trip							

* Compressed work week: extended daily work hours over a shorter number of work days, (See examples on attached page)

7. Which statement best describes how your schedule works? (CHECK ONE)
☐ I must arrive and depart at specific times set by my employer
☐ I choose my own start and end times which are approved by my employer
☐ I can vary my start and end times on a day-to-day basis without approvals
8. How long does it typically take you to commute to work? CHECK ONE
☐ Under fifteen minutes
☐ 15-30 minutes
☐ 30-45 minutes
☐ 45 minutes to one hour
☐ More than one hour
9. Do you consider your commute to be: CHECK ONE
☐ Easy ☐ Barely Acceptable
☐ Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable
10. When you drive to work, which of the following stops do you regularly make between your home and your work place? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY
☐ I never drive to work alone
☐ I never stop on my way to or from work
☐ To drop off child or adult at day care
☐ To drop off children at school
☐ To exercise
☐ To do errands
☐ Other (Please Specify) _____
11. Which of the following options would encourage you to commute to work by public or private transit, bicycle or in a car pool or van pool? (CHECK THE 3 MOST USEFUL OPTIONS)
☐ Free or reduced parking costs for carpools
☐ Closer or better parking for carpools
☐ Reduced costs for vanpools
☐ More flexible work hours
☐ More fixed work hours
☐ T pass subsidies
☐ T pass payroll deduction
☐ Guaranteed ride home in case of family emergency or change in schedule resulting in missed ride or transit connection home
☐ Company van pools
☐ Company assistance with ride-share matching
☐ Bus route and schedule information
☐ Child care facilities at or near work
☐ Shuttle service from transit stop to work
☐ Availability of shower facilities at work
☐ Improved bicycle routes
☐ Availability of secure bicycle parking
☐ Nothing would encourage me not to drive alone
☐ Other (Please Specify) _____
12. What is your biggest commuting problem?
13. What could be done to help improve your commute?

If you have questions about filling out this form please contact _____ at _____.

If you would like more information about the transit or ride share services, please phone the Cambridge Transportation Management Program at _____. Thank you for helping us to improve your transportation services.

City of Cambridge

The Traffic and Transportation Committee conducted a public hearing on Thursday, February 16, 1993, beginning at 7:30 p.m. in the Ackermann Room, Second Floor, City Hall.

Vice Mayor Edward N. Cyr, Chair of the above referenced committee, convened the hearing and stated that the purpose of this date's proceedings was to discuss the commuter mobility program with regards to the Pilot Survey Program. Present at the hearing were: Councillor Francis H. Duehay; Michael Rosenberg, Assistant City Manager for Community Development; Ellen Semonoff, Project Assistant to the City Manager; Elizabeth Epstein, Director, Environmental Programs; Richard Easler, Chief Project Planner, Community Development; and John E. Flynn, Deputy City Clerk.

To begin the discussion, the Chair recognized Ms. Epstein for an overview of the Pilot Survey Program to be employed by the City of Cambridge as a planning tool to meet the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act.

Ms. Epstein stated that the city began the process by collecting information about surveys conducted within the city and across the nation with particular attention to those programs recently implemented by municipalities as part of a Clean Air Act SIP. Ms. Epstein highlighted the following governmental units that were successful in collecting data via a commuter survey:

- Chicago
- South Coast Air Quality District
- Westchester County

It was further stated that the Chicago survey, which was conducted in 1992, and included both public and private employers experienced a high participatory rate in response.

Ms. Epstein further identified other sources of consultation to include:

- CSI (Cambridge Systematics, Inc.) - to collect commuting habits of employees (Monday-Friday: when they arrive (6 a.m. to 10 a.m.) and their point of origin and point of destination.
- CARAVAN for commuters
- Participants in the Chicago study
- City of Cambridge Data Processing Department
- Chamber of Commerce - selected employer program.

Ms. Epstein further stated that a preparation meeting with selected employers would be held in late February, 1993.

At this time, Ms. Epstein presented to the committee a "Draft" Commuter Survey for comments and critique. (A copy is attached).

Vice Mayor Cyr noted grouping F of the survey and stated that the taxi industry would not be pleased with this grouping.

Ms. Epstein stated that a pilot program would be conducted during the week of February 22, 1993 with one city department. She further stated that the Traffic and Parking Department had volunteered to be the test department. She noted that a critical element for a high return rate was to introduce the survey concept right up front and to instill in respondents the fact that the city was not trying to change individual commuter habits per say but to offer alternatives for consideration by employees.

Vice Mayor Cyr inquired of Jonathan Ginsberg, Director of Governmental Affairs for the Chamber of Commerce, by what means the city could achieve the same 90% response rate as Chicago from the business community.

In response, Mr. Ginsberg stated that five or six firms have volunteered to participate in this survey but noted that a big issue remains and that being every company is diverse in operational configuration and in behavior. He also stated that the universities might skew the response rate. He also inquired when the required minimum 50 employees firms was eliminated from the survey.

Ms. Semonoff in response stated that at one point it was mandatory but upon review that requirement had been eliminated. Ms. Epstein in a follow-up stated that at present there are no constraints for participation in the survey.

Mr. Ginsberg concurred with the decision to strike that minimum requirement and noted that it opened the field for more members of the Chamber to participate in this survey.

Mr. Easler offered to Mr. Ginsberg a copy of the study conducted in 1988 involving participating members of the Chamber in a mobility survey.

Councillor Duehay inquired of a question 11 of the draft commuter survey why a reference was not made to employees who commute to work and because of their schedule, do not use their vehicle during the work day for official business.

Ms. Epstein in response stated that this option listing represents a short list and that other options were shifted to the selected employer survey.

Councillor Duehay, in a follow-up, noted that differences could exist between employee and employer in commuter options.

Ms. Semonoff concurred with the Councillor and stated that the options would be revisited.

Vice Mayor Cyr noted that in discussing commuter mobility strategies, the underlying issue that must be resolved is behavior.

Councillor Duehay noted that a high response rate could produce some interesting comments and results.

Ms. Semonoff stated that the responses could also identify city issues v. other governmental or private units. She cited the example of commuting by public transportation where the location of a bus stop could cause apprehension is a city issue but riding the bus (with regards to safety) is a "T" issue.

Vice Mayor Cyr noted that one defect of surveys is that if it is long and cumbersome, the mind oftentimes cannot focus and the results become questionable.

Mr. Rosenberg commented on the usefulness of the results of the survey by stating that it is important to look at the locations of businesses and the types of industries.

Vice Mayor Cyr inquired if there would be a follow-up visit after the initial contact of the survey to the selected employers.

Ms. Epstein responded in the negative stating that the city is committed to work with each employer to discuss the most appropriate way to proceed given their individual corporate image. She also stated that the premise of the survey is to keep it simple with pre-coded responses.

Councillor Duehay inquired if those firms presently participating in the commercial recycling efforts will be contacted to participate in the survey.

Ms. Epstein in response stated that it was the goal of the survey to attract a wide spectrum of input from a variety of concerns.

Councillor Duehay inquired of the responses received from the various municipal unions.

Ms. Epstein stated that a majority of the unions have taken a neutral position.

Councillor Duehay inquired if discussions have been held with the School Department and the Cambridge Housing Authority.

Ms. Epstein noted that the School Department is a two-tier system and is a big project. No discussions have been held with the Housing Authority. She noted that work has begun with the Cambridge Hospital.

Vice Mayor Cyr inquired of the schedule to be put in place.

Ms. Epstein in response outlined the following schedule:

- Draft instructions (example sheet completed by 2/19/93)
- Draft calculation sheet completed by 2/24/93
- Draft survey kit available for 1st meeting of Selected Employer Committee the week of 2/22/93.

Councillor Duehay inquired if the survey would produce the number of employees who commute to the workplace by automobile.

Ms. Epstein responded in the affirmative but clarified it depending on the response rate.

Councillor Duehay stated that it was important for all who participate in this survey to be truthful in order for sensible traffic and transportation policies to be developed and implemented.

At this time, Ms. Epstein outlined to the committee the Implementation and Analysis Schedule:

- Early to Mid March - Implement Survey in all city departments except schools, assist employers in devising distribution plans.
- Mid to early April - Implement survey in School Department, assist employers in implementation and any data collating set up.
- April - May - input some city results.
- June through August - Analyze results of city and selected employer surveys, calculate base AER, design commuter mobility program for and with input from city employees, assist Selected Employers in design and implementation of programs at their request.

Councillor Duehay commented on the need to explain why this survey is being conducted and that major changes in commuting patterns will be happening in the years to come.

Ms. Semonoff concurred with Councillor Duehay's comments and noted that because Cambridge is the first community in the Commonwealth to be undertaking the implementation of the provisions of the federal Clean Air Act that the Commonwealth is watching and could mandate the city's program in other locales.

Vice Mayor Cyr noted that the first step is to work the process as outlined through to see if it works but cautioned that the city could skew the results due to the resident sticker program. He also inquired if once the results are in from the Selected Employers Program if others will be contacted for inclusion in this survey.

Ms. Epstein responded in the negative stating that at present, the city will work on a

program for the city but will offer its expertise. The question that exists is who is to administer such a program, the city or the commonwealth.

Councillor Duehay inquired if there will be different rules in Cambridge v. Boston.

Ms. Epstein stated that the City Manager is a member of a Task Force reviewing this issue and looking at a wide range of actions. Ms. Semonoff stated in a follow-up that the City Manager and Boston's Commissioner of Transportation are agitating for a state response.

Councillor Duehay inquired of what agency has the final say on this matter.

Ms. Semonoff in response stated that the EPA has the final say with the DEP having a preliminary say in the matter.

Councillor Duehay stated that the city's position should be clarified to the Governor and the State Legislature along with the business community clarifying their position.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that another piece of the Vehicle Trip Reduction Ordinance requires some zoning ordinance amendments with regards to parking to be considered by the City Council and the Planning Board and that the Community Development Department will forward a memorandum on this matter at an upcoming date.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

For the Committee,

Edward N. Cyr (JCF)

Vice Mayor Edward N. Cyr
Chair

1.
Committee Reports 5-180

Traffic and Transportation Committee
for a hearing held on Thursday, ~~FE~~
February 16, 1993 regarding the
commuter mobility program with regards
to the Pilot Survey Program.

In City Council,

March 15, 1993

*Report accepted
Placed on file*