



TMASF Connects
2011 COMMUTER BEHAVIOR SURVEY

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION
CASE #2010.0081U**

PREPARED BY:
KEMA SERVICES, INC.
155 GRAND AVENUE
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA
APRIL, 2011

TMASF Connects 2011 Commuter Behavior Survey

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology.....	2
Commute Modes and Drive-Along Rate	5
Home Counties.....	7
Commute Changes	8
Changed Commute Pattern.....	8
Commute Characteristics.....	8
Ridesharing Characteristics.....	8
Arrival and Departure Time.....	9
Parking.....	10
Commute Assistance Services.....	10
Other	13
Job Type.....	13
Age Range.....	13
LEED-EB:O&M Alternative Commuting Transportation.....	14
Summary and Recommendations	16
Appendices	17
Appendix A –TMASF Buildings.....	17
Appendix B – Home City.....	19
Appendix C – Other Commute Assistance Services Used.....	21
Appendix D – Commuter Satisfaction and Expressed Needs.....	25
Appendix E – Survey Instrument.....	32

Introduction

The Transportation Management Association of San Francisco (TMA SF) is a not-for-profit organization that is incorporated as a 501-1(c)(4) mutual benefit agency. The association was incorporated in 1989 and began operation of the program in April 1990. The TMA SF was established to help building managers and owners comply with mandated transportation demand management requirements per the terms of their development permits. Current membership consists of 53 buildings in San Francisco's Financial and South of Market districts. A coded list of buildings with full membership status is provided in Appendix A.

TMA SF members largely share a requirement as a condition of their building permit to mitigate the impacts of development upon the transportation system. The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) has an official *Transit First Policy* that has been in effect since the late 1980s. The TMA SF is authorized through City Planning Resolution to offer a compliance program in accordance with accepted transportation demand management principles. The program is monitored and this survey is an important tool used by the City to evaluate the TMA SF members' fulfillment of their transportation demand management responsibilities.

The purpose of this transportation survey is to learn about the commuting behavior of employees who work in TMA SF buildings and to guide program components to most effectively encourage commuters who drive alone to work to change their commute mode. This report, along with the survey process and analysis phase, was conducted independently by KEMA Services, Inc. as consultant to the TMA SF, consistent with the City's requirements. Completion of this survey report fulfills the City and County of San Francisco's requirement for monitoring program effectiveness. This report provides a summary and analysis of the survey results, broken into the following categories:

- Commute Modes and Drive Alone Rates
- Commute Changes and Mode Statistics
 - Carpool/Ridesharing
 - Arrival and Departure Times
 - Parking Locations
- Commute Assistance Services
 - Service Awareness and Availability
 - Service Use and Demand
- Commuter Needs and Satisfaction Issues
- Demographics: Home Counties, Job Classification, Age Range
- LEED-EB:O&M Alternative Commuting Transportation Rate
- Summary and Recommendations

Methodology

The City Planning Department established the random sample methodology to assure they would receive a clear picture of TMASF member commute behavior. For the purpose of this survey, we followed the established City random sampling protocol.

The TMASF collected building occupant counts from each member building before the survey period opened on January 27, 2011. This preliminary occupant survey indicated a total of 47,661 employees and 1008 tenant companies working within the 53 member buildings, with individual building occupant counts used to determine each member's required sampling interval. On January 26, a meeting was conducted with representatives of all TMASF member buildings to review the survey process, random sampling methodology and specific compliance requirements. Each building representative was provided with a packet containing survey forms for completion, along with clear instructions and guidance for both the building manager and tenant representative responsible for distributing and collecting the individual surveys. All TMASF members were requested to return the completed surveys to the TMASF office by February 11, 2011.

Consistent with prior TMASF surveys, the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) mandated that transportation surveys be completed by 1% of the member building population. The CCSF requires that the established random sample methodology and protocols be utilized to assure they would receive an accurate picture of commute behavior by TMASF building occupants. Consistent with CCSF's requirements, a total of 483 surveys were distributed and collected within three weeks, achieving the target 100% response rate from each member building.

As shown in Appendix A, the number of surveys required for each building was assigned based on occupant count, with 1% minimum response rate required. For example, Building 18 with 1500 employees was given 15 surveys for completion. A total of 483 surveys (vs. 477) were distributed, due to rounding up of occupant counts to ensure that the minimum response rate was achieved without oversampling bias for any particular building. A list of the buildings was compiled in alpha numeric order and each building was assigned a letter for the tenant company and employee last name. The list was generated in A-Z order with the same letter assigned to each building, as a starting point for both the selection of the tenant company as well as for the individual employee to be surveyed from within that company.

Building managers were instructed to select the tenant to be surveyed whose company name starts with letter assigned to their building. If no tenant name begins with the assigned letter, members were instructed to select the tenant starting with the next letter of alphabet. Similarly, if a tenant refused to participate or if surveys from more than one company were required, members were instructed to systematically select the tenant alphabetically, starting with their assigned letter. Tenant representatives were instructed to follow a similar process, by selecting employees in alphabetical order starting with employees whose last name starts with the assigned letter, and then continuing alphabetically through the employee roster until the required surveys were completed.

For example, Building 6 was assigned the letter "F" and is required to return 35 completed surveys. *First Data* is the only tenant starting with the letter "F" and has 75 employees -- the tenant would then distribute surveys to 35 of its employees in alphabetic order, starting with employees whose last name begins with "F". If *First Data* only had 20 employees, for example, the building manager would select the next tenant alphabetically from the tenant roster, starting with the letter "G" and so on until all 35 surveys were completed. However, to maintain consistency and avoid confusion with the written survey guidance provided, each participating tenant is instructed to choose employees for survey starting with the letter assigned to the building ("F" in this example).

Based on the timely and complete survey response, as well as feedback from our members, we believe this systematic random sampling methodology was highly successful in enabling the participants to understand and comply with the instructions and selection criteria. Since every employee in a building has an equal chance of being surveyed, the results are random and thus representative of the larger population. Additionally, any survey non-respondents are counted as drive-alone commuters as required by TMASF and the City of San Francisco Planning Commission.

The sample set of 483 out of a total number of tenant employees of about 47,661 results in a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of about 4.4. (This is true for characteristics that are represented in about 50% of the population; the confidence interval is better, i.e. lower, for characteristics represented in a greater or smaller portion of the population, such as the 5% walk rate.) This means that with a confidence interval of 4, if 47% percent of the sample picks an answer you can be "sure" that if you had asked the question of the entire relevant population, between 43% (47-4) and 51% (47+4) would have picked that answer. The confidence level tells you how "sure" you can be, and represents how often the true percentage of the population who would pick an answer lies within the confidence interval. For example, a 95% confidence level means you can be 95% certain that the true percentage of the relevant population who would pick an answer lies within the confidence interval of 4. (Most researchers use the 95% confidence level.)

The Commuter Behavior Survey has been previously conducted in 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2007, and 2009, with this 2011 being the 10th TMASF survey conducted to demonstrate ongoing program compliance. While there have been some significant changes in the survey instrument over the years, the primary methodology and commute mode metrics have been consistent to enable comparison across the years. The most significant change in this year's survey instrument compared to 2009 is the reduction of survey form from four (4) to two (2) pages, in order to make it more user-friendly. A few questions were deemed unnecessary or removed (i.e., questions about the smartphone trial program) but overall the survey form was reduced by consolidating questions and formatting. Additionally, the 2009 survey provided the option of completing the survey on either paper or electronically, via Zoomerang. The buildings did not find the electronic option easier and it was actually more challenging to track completion and manage the survey process. Therefore, the 2011 Commuter Survey returned to the paper format and overall process assisted in achieving the survey program goals in an accurate and efficient manner.

Commute Modes and Drive-Alone Rate

The survey asked respondents how they usually travel to work, considering the longest portion of their commute. The 2011 survey results and breakdown of reported commute modes are shown in Table 1, along with survey data from the past five (5) surveys over the period 1999-2009. Overwhelmingly, most respondents (73%, shown in Table One) ride public transportation. As shown in Table One, the majority of transit users (38%) ride BART to work as their primary mode, followed by Muni at 21%. Based on the survey results and analysis, the reported Drive-Alone rate is 11.6%, meaning that 11.6% of the respondents reportedly drive to work alone (single occupancy) in their vehicles most frequently as their primary commute mode.

Table One
Commute Mode

Mode	2011	2009	2007	2005	2002	1999
Transit	73.1%	71.8%	68.3%	62.3%	72.1%	71.5%
BART	37.7%	35.4%	31.8%	29.7%	36.8%	31.6%
Muni	21.3%	22.4%	24.5%	25.3%	20.7%	23.2%
Caltrain	3.5%	3.5%	4.8%	1.8%	2.7%	1.7%
AC Transit	2.1%	3.1%	0.8%	1.4%	3.0%	2.7%
Golden Gate Ferry	1.2%	2.3%	1.3%	1.6%	2.7%	4.6%
Samtrans	0.6%	1.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%
Golden Gate Transit Bus	3.9%	1.0%	1.5%	1.8%	4.1%	6.0%
Alameda/Oakland/Vallejo Ferry	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%			
Presidio Shuttle	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%			
Other	0.5%	1.0%	1.2%	0.2%		
Drive alone	11.6%	13.0%	13.5%	15.2%	13.5%	13.8%
Auto, gas powered	10.8%	12.2%	13.5%	15.2%	13.5%	13.8%
Auto, hybrid	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%			
<i>Auto, uses car for work</i>	3.7%	3.5%	6.8%	7.3%	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>
Motorcycle/scooter	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	2.1%		
Rideshare	7.9%	8.3%	9.1%	15.2%	11.3%	7.9%
Carpool	5.4%	5.4%	4.5%	7.1%	10.2%	7.2%
Casual carpool	2.3%	2.3%	2.8%	7.6%		
Vanpool	0.2%	0.6%	1.8%	0.5%	1.1%	0.7%
Other	7.0%	6.4%	6.8%	5.3%	3.0%	6.7%
Walk	5.6%	3.5%	5.5%	3.9%	2.4%	5.3%
Bicycle	1.2%	2.5%	1.0%	1.4%	0.6%	1.4%
Work at home/telecommute	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%			
n=	483	483	400	435		

Table Two provides a summary of the survey results by clustered commute modes. The 2011 Commuter Survey results are fairly consistent with the 2009 survey, reflecting a 1.3% increase in public transportation use and a corresponding 1.4% decrease in the drive alone rate. As discussed below, we believe this to be an accurate assessment of the Drive Alone rate for TMASF member buildings.

Table Two
Clustered Commute Modes

Mode	2011	2009	2007	2005	2002	1999
Transit	73.1%	71.8%	68.3%	62.3%	72.1%	71.5%
Drive alone	11.6%	13.0%	14.8%	15.2%	13.5%	13.8%
<i>Drive alone by choice</i>	7.9%	9.5%	6.8%	7.3%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Rideshare	7.9%	8.3%	9.1%	15.2%	11.3%	8.0%
Other	7.4%	6.9%	6.8%	7.4%	3.0%	6.8%

Based on the initial survey tabulation, an in-depth evaluation of mixed and secondary commute modes was conducted, with an emphasis on providing an accurate assessment of the overall Drive Alone rate. In fact, of the 483 respondents, only 41 selected Drive Alone only (gas or hybrid) as their primary commute mode. While the vast majority of respondents (93%) clearly indicated their primary commute mode, there were approximately 32 surveys requiring further analysis based on the selection of multiple primary commute modes in answer to Question 5. These respondents appear to have a more complex and variable commute pattern due to multiple commute modes used in their daily trip (i.e., carpool to BART) or on a weekly basis (carpool 2 days, BART 2 days, drive 1 day). Fortunately, many of these respondents provided comments such as noted above, whereby a reasonable assessment of their primary mode could be made. Emphasis was placed identifying drivers that likely do drive alone in their own vehicles, so as not to overstate the Drive Alone rate, which is the key metric for the CCSF and the TMASF. Where unclear or where comments or answers to other questions (i.e., parking or carpool information) appeared to indicate that the respondent frequently drove alone to work, KEMA conservatively assumed the respondent as a “Drive Alone” for their primary commute mode.

Similarly, many respondents indicated that more than one form of public transportation was used in answer to Question 6 of the survey. All efforts were made to reasonably assess primary public transit services used, and we believe the results to be an accurate assessment and generally consistent with prior survey results. Additionally, a number of who did not check Public Transportation as their primary commute mode also answered Question 6 and identified specific forms of public transportation used (i.e., BART, AC Transit, Muni). The following table provides a summary of the frequency of public transit modes selected and reportedly used by *all* survey respondents:

Table Three

Public Transportation Modes selected by All Respondents

Public Transit Mode	Times Selected	Percentage
BART	208	46.4%
Muni	149	33.3%
Golden Gate Transit-Bus	23	5.1%
Caltrain	20	4.5%
AC Transit	17	3.8%
Alameda/Oakland/Vallejo Ferry	10	2.2%
Golden Gate Transit-Ferry	8	1.8%
Samtrans	5	1.1%
Other Public Transit	8	1.8%
n=483	448	

Includes public transportation modes selected by all 483 respondents, including secondary commute modes and respondents who selected more than 1 public transportation mode.

Additionally, only 15% of the total respondents did not check any public transportation modes, which appears to indicate a higher (85%) overall rate of public transportation use for work and other activities.

Home Counties

As in past years, the survey clearly indicates that the largest percentage of workers live in San Francisco. While there appears to be a slight increase in commuting distance based on County locations, the results are generally consistent with prior survey results. The population shifts for all counties are displayed in Table Four below and Appendix B displays the home cities of respondents.

Table Four

Home County

County	2011	2009	2007	2005	2002	1999
San Francisco	42.6%	45.0%	48.4%	46.67%	35.1%	39.4%
Alameda	17.7%	19.4%	19.4%	18.39%	19.4%	25.2%
San Mateo	14.3%	13.2%	10.3%	10.34%	12.5%	9.3%
Contra Costa	12.9%	12.6%	9.1%	11.72%	18.9%	9.6%
Marin	6.2%	4.8%	4.9%	5.06%	5.5%	7.7%
Solano	1.7%	1.4%	2.9%	2.99%	1.8%	1.9%
Santa Clara	2.7%	1.4%	2.0%	0.92%	0.9%	1.2%
Sonoma	1.2%	0.6%	1.0%	0.92%	2.1%	2.8%
Napa	0.4%		0.2%			
Inside Bay Area	99.8%	98.6%	98.3%	97.01%	96.3%	97.0%
Outside the Bay Area	0.2%	1.4%	1.7%	2.99%	3.7%	3.0%

Commute Changes

Changed Commute Pattern

The survey asked respondents if they had changed their regular pattern of commuting in the past two years including changing their home or office location. As shown in Table Five, over half of the respondents (54%) indicated they had not made a change, with 46% reporting that they had made some change in their commute pattern. This is consistent with the 2009 survey results, and likely represents a move or other lifestyle change that impacted their commute pattern or transportation choices. With a nearly 50% turnover rate, communicating the broad range of commute options throughout the San Francisco Bay Area should be an ongoing consideration for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) professionals.

Table Five
Changed Your Pattern of Commuting

Answer	Percentage
No	54%
Yes	46%

Commute Characteristics

Ridesharing Characteristics

A total of 37 respondents were selected as using rideshare (carpool, casual carpool, vanpool) as their primary commute mode. Consistent with the methodology described in the Commute Mode section above, respondents who indicated that they occasionally carpool and/or report "1+" passengers were counted as "Drive Alone" in the survey tabulation. The methodology requires that respondents clearly indicate rideshare as their primary mode and provide the number of passengers to be counted as "rideshare".

As shown in Table Six, the most significant finding here is the increase in the average carpool size in 2011 as compared to the 2009 survey results. The average carpool this year carried 3 people as compared to 2.48 people in 2009. One respondent reported that they travel to work in a 14-passenger vanpool.

Table Six
Number of People in Carpools

Number of people in vehicle	2011 %	2009 %
2	39%	64%
3	45%	28%
4	13%	4%
5+	3%	4%

Arrival and Departure Time

Tables Seven and Eight display the arrival and departure times of people working in TMASF member buildings. As shown below, approximately 78% of the commuters arrive at work between 7:01 AM to 9:00 AM, during peak morning commute periods. This percentage increases to 85% considering those respondents reportedly arriving to work at 7:00 AM.

Results for the return trip home are similar and consistent with the evening peak commute, with 80% of respondents reportedly leaving work between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM.

Table Seven
Arrival Times

Answer	Percentage
Before 6 AM	3%
6:01-7 AM	11%
7:01-7:30 AM	13%
7:31-8 AM	23%
8:01-8:30 AM	21%
8:31-9 AM	22%
9:01-9:30 AM	4%
9:31-10 AM	0%
After 10 AM	4%

Table Eight
Departure Times

Answer	Percentage
Before 2 PM	3%
2-3 PM	5%
3:01-4 PM	6%
4:01-4:30 PM	8%
4:31-5 PM	26%
5:01-5:30 PM	20%
5:31-6 PM	20%
6:01-6:30 PM	4%
6:31-7 PM	4%
7:01-8 PM	2%
8:01-9 PM	0%
After 9 PM	1%

Parking

The survey asked respondents who normally drive to work (either alone or with others), where they park their vehicle. Most (52%) park in a parking lot or garage not in their building. However, a significant percentage of respondents do park in their office building (40%), primarily in the “executive/managerial” and professional/technical” job categories which is likely reflective of parking reimbursement or affordability for those individuals.

On average, respondents parking off-site parked an average of 3.2 blocks away from their office, with a median distance of 2.0 blocks from office. Approximately 8% of respondents use on-street parking, a decrease from 16.8% reportedly using on-street parking in the 2009 TMASF survey. Based on these results, it appears that the availability of parking within or proximate to the building continues to be a factor influencing commute decisions.

Table Nine
Parking location

Answer	Percentage
Park in this building	40.1%
Other parking lot or garage	51.7%
On-street parking	7.6%
Special vanpool or carpool parking area	0.6%

Commute Assistance Services

Questions 12 through 18 addressed Commute Assistance Services in order to gain insight into current service awareness, availability and use throughout the TMASF member buildings. Table Ten below summarizes the survey results pertaining to the availability and use of public transit and other commuter resources. The 2009 survey results are also presented, and this year’s results indicate a significant increase in all categories. While this information still appears to minimally influence travel behavior, both the awareness and interest in having information on these resources has increased by at least 10%.

One interesting finding is that many respondents in the same building answered differently (one checked “service is available” and another checked “would like to see offered”). This appears to indicate that services are readily available, but that more communication of these services may be beneficial to increase overall awareness.

Table Ten
 Commute Assistance Services (Questions 12-14)

Answer	Information is available in my office/ building		Information has influenced a change in my travel behavior		I would like to see offered in my office or building	
	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009
Transit information	26.9%	13.8%	10.8%	5.4%	33.5%	24.2%
Rideshare info	13.9%	4.1%	5.0%	1.2%	28.8%	20.9%
Commuter Events	27.3%	12.0%	3.5%	3.1%	31.3%	22.3%

Questions 15 and 16 asked respondents about their awareness and use of specific TMA SF commute assistance services, with responses summarized in Table Eleven. These are new questions designed to gain insight and create a baseline for TMA SF service awareness for future program consideration. While about 15% of respondents are aware of the tmasfconnects.org website, over 30% are aware of the “breaking news alerts and updates” service provided to the buildings by the TMA SF. Further 26% of the respondents reportedly use the “breaking alerts” information, further indicating the level of interest and demand in receiving real-time alerts of traffic or transit conditions impacting their trip to or from work. We believe this to be a significant finding reflecting the value of this TMA SF service to the member buildings.

Table Eleven
 TMA SF Commute Assistance Services (Questions 15-16)

Answer	Am aware of this TMA SF Service	Have used this TMA SF Service
tmasfconnects.org website	15.3%	12.0%
Breaking news alerts and updates	30.4%	26.1%
tmasfconnects.org mobile phone services	4.1%	2.3%
Radio or other media campaigns	5.0%	5.6%
TMA SF Connects events	4.3%	1.9%

Question 17 was an open-ended question asking: *Describe any other commute assistance services that influence your decisions about how to travel to work?* Appendix D lists the individual respondent comments to this question. The most frequently mentioned resources used include:

- 511.org
- BART.gov website and email updates to handheld
- SF Muni: Nextbus.com/nextmuni.com; SF Muni webpage and iPhone apps
- Commuter checks

Question 18 was an open-ended question asking: *If there was one thing you could change to make your commute better, what would that be?* While there is a very broad range of comments, overcrowded BART trains and bus service, along with unreliable Muni bus service, were the most prevalent issues raised. One noted difference from previous surveys is the reduction in comments regarding traffic and street conditions. Appendix D lists the individual respondent comments to this question, with frequently commuter needs expressed as follows:

- Less crowded trains and buses and more frequent service, especially for Muni and BART during rush-hour commute
- Improved reliability and on-time service for SF Muni
- Cleaner trains and buses, especially BART
- Decreased transit costs and commute assistance
- Better parking availability at BART stations
- Cheaper parking and more parking availability in City/building
- Lack of bicycle parking and bicycle access on transit, especially during peak commute

The survey also asked employees if they checked transit or traffic conditions prior to their commute, and where they obtain transportation information (Table Twelve). The majority of respondents (59%) do not check conditions. The most common source of information is the internet with 15%, television at 10%, with radio and phone/handheld usage both reported at approximately 8%. Responses are consistent with the prior 2009 survey, with the exception of phone/handheld use, which increased by 5%. From the survey and individual responses to Question 17, there appears to be a marked increased usage of mobile devices for transit information.

Table Twelve
Sources for Transportation Information

Source	Percent mentioned
Internet	15%
TV	10%
Radio	8%
Phone/Handheld	8%
I do not check conditions	59%

Respondents who did check conditions were then asked if that information influenced a change in their commute. Approximately 54% of these respondents indicated that yes, this did influence their commute. We believe this to be a relevant finding indicating the value of timely, accurate information on transit interruptions and traffic conditions.

Other

Job Type

As in past years, job classification was fairly evenly split between administrative/clerical (23%), professional/technical (45%), and executive/managerial (22%) and as shown in Table Thirteen.

Table Thirteen
Job classification

Job classification	Percentage
Administrative/Clerical	23%
Executive/Managerial	22%
Professional/Technical	45%
Sales	10%

Age Range

Table Fifteen displays the ages of respondents. The largest age group represented (39%) is in the 25-34 age range.

Table Fourteen
Age range

Age range	Percentage
18-24	7%
25-34	39%
35-44	23%
45-54	20%
55+	11%

LEED-EB:O&M Alternative Commuting Transportation

In 2009, the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) approved the TMA SF 2009 Commuter Survey results for use by member buildings pursuing credit for alternative transportation use under the LEED for Existing Buildings: Operations & Maintenance Rating System. All member buildings in good standing who participated in the survey have the ability to achieve points for LEED-EB:O&M Sustainable Sites Credit 4 (SSc4 Alternative Commuting Transportation) by providing the submittal documentation prepared by the TMA SF and approved by the USGBC. The USGBC's approval of the TMA SF aggregate survey results to demonstrate compliance with SSc4 Option 2 (*Formal commute reduction tracking and participation in a government-sponsored commute reduction program other than SCAQMD*) was granted under the following conditions:

- 1) The program requires that all participating buildings use Option 2 when applying for LEED-EB:O&M (in order to capture any potential outliers).
- 2) The program shall encompass a small and cohesive enough area to assume reasonable similarity of alternative transportation access.
- 3) The survey methodology for the aggregate survey is of equivalent or greater stringency than SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District, Rule 2202).

The 2011 TMA SF Commuter Survey was conducted in conformance with the USGBC's conditions of approval with aggregate survey results to be provided to qualifying member buildings seeking LEED-EB:O&M certification or renewal. The LEED-EB:O&M Rating System specifically defines "alternative transportation" under SSc4 as the following:

Telecommuting, compressed workweeks, mass transit, walking, bicycles or other human-powered conveyances, carpools, vanpools, and low emitting or fuel-efficient or alternative-fuel vehicles.

In accordance with the LEED-EB:O&M Rating System and mode calculation guidance by SCAQMD Rule 2202, the reduction in conventional commuting trips has been calculated as follows:

- Public transportation = 0
- Single-occupant vehicle (drive alone) – gas powered = 1
- Single-occupant vehicle (drive alone) – hybrid/alternative-fuel = 0
- Carpool = 1 divided by number of people in carpool
- Vanpool = 1 divided by number of people in vanpool
- Motorcycle, moped, motorized scooter, motor bike = 1
- Walking, biking and other non-motorized transportation modes = 0

- Telecommuting = 0

The following table provides the calculated reduction in commuting trips along with the AVR (Average Vehicle Ridership) as defined by the SCAQMD Rule 2202.

Table Fifteen

LEED-EB:O&M SSc4 Alternative Commuting Transportation
Calculation of Reduction in Conventional Commuting Trips

Travel Mode	Mode Reported	Total Weekly Trips	Weekly Conventional Trips
Public Transit	353	1765	0
Single occupancy vehicle – gas powered	52	260	260
Single occupancy vehicle – hybrid/alternative fuel	4	20	0
Carpool – 2 passengers	15	75	37.5
Carpool – 3 passengers	17	85	28.3
Carpool – 4 passengers	5	25	6.3
Vanpool – 14 passenger	1	5	0.4
Motorcycle/scooter	2	10	10
Bicycle	6	30	0
Walk	27	135	0
Work at home/telecommute	1	5	0
TOTAL	483	2415	342.5

Reduction in Conventional Commuting Trips: 85.8%

2072.5 trip reduction (2415-342.5) / 2415 total trips

Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR): 7.1

2415 total trips / 342.5 conventional trips

In accordance with the LEED-EB:O&M SSc4 credit requirements (Option 2) the results of the 2009 Commuter Survey demonstrate an 85.8% reduction in conventional commuting trips. As discussed throughout this report, we have taken a conservative position in the allocation of trip reduction modes vs. drive-alone single occupancy vehicles, and where questionable, the respondent has been categorized as a “drive-alone” for survey tabulation purposes.

Summary and Recommendations

The TMASF 2011 Commuter Behavior Survey was conducted in compliance with the CCSF required protocols and random sampling methodology. We believe this year's survey process was very successful and accurately depicts the commute modes of the member buildings and the TMASF geographical area. The primary survey findings and any recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. The Drive-Alone rate is 11.6%, a decrease of 1.4% compared to the 2009 survey results.
2. The overall Alternative Commuting Transportation rate represents an 85.8% decrease in conventional commuting trips, as defined by LEED-EB:O&M Credit SSc4.
3. Public transportation is clearly the most prevalent work commute mode with at least 73% of respondents using public transit, primarily BART and Muni service.
4. While it may not change their commute mode as the vast majority are already using public transit, commuters do utilize and value commuter assistance services, especially accurate transit schedules and real-time information on service interruptions.

In conclusion, many overriding factors influence commute behavior and make public transportation the commute mode of necessity as much as choice -- availability and cost of parking, price of gas and tolls, and traffic being primary considerations. Given the option, most commuters will choose alternative modes (public transit, ridesharing) if it saves them time and money. Negative factors influencing commuter satisfaction include unreliable transit schedules, over-crowding and cleanliness which may drive some commuters to use their car, if it is a feasible alternative. Increased use and reliance on handheld devices (iPhone, Blackberry, etc.) is also evident and enables commuters to receive real-time transit and traffic information.

We believe that the TMASF plays a valuable role in providing the member buildings with a wide range of commute assistance services, timely updates and access to commute alternatives. It is recommended that the TMASF continue to develop and expand its services consistent with expressed commuter needs, and work with its members to make these services visible and convenient to the building occupants.

Appendices

Appendix A –TMA SF Buildings

<i>Office Building Code</i>	Tenant Count	Employee Count	Surveys Requested (1%)	Surveys Received
1	19	650	7	7
2	11	300	3	3
3	11	650	7	7
4	45	1650	17	17
5	22	300	3	3
6	50	3500	35	35
7	17	700	7	7
8	23	1300	13	13
9	25	300	3	3
10	17	1200	12	12
11	9	800	8	8
12	5	100	1	1
13	10	1200	12	12
14	10	1200	12	12
15	11	1300	13	13
16	17	2000	20	20
17	4	400	4	4
18	1	1500	15	15
19	10	1400	14	14
20	4	475	5	5
21	3	365	4	4
22	17	225	3	3
23	20	550	6	6
24	30	1000	10	10
25	43	1200	12	12
26	9	300	3	3
27	1	500	5	5
28	50	1300	13	13
29	9	1000	10	10
30	12	3000	30	30
31	25	225	3	3
32	25	300	3	3
33	14	800	8	8

<i>Office Building Code</i>	Tenant Count	Employee Count	Surveys Requested (1%)	Surveys Received
34	25	500	5	5
35	30	400	4	4
36	28	450	5	5
37	30	1000	10	10
38	13	150	2	2
39	8	985	10	10
40	20	650	7	7
41	24	800	8	8
42	24	1400	14	14
43	15	900	9	9
44	20	2200	22	22
45	21	300	3	3
46	19	1200	12	12
47	45	500	5	5
48	32	500	5	5
49	17	661	7	7
50	22	1800	18	18
51	10	100	1	1
52	22	1200	12	12
53	4	275	3	3
	1008	47,661		483

Appendix B – Home City

CITY	COUNTY	COUNT
San Francisco	San Francisco	204
Oakland	Alameda	34
Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	14
Alameda	Alameda	13
Daly City	San Mateo	13
Berkeley	Alameda	11
San Bruno	San Mateo	9
Concord	Contra Costa	8
San Rafael	Marin	8
Mill Valley	Marin	7
San Jose	Santa Clara	7
San Mateo	San Mateo	7
Vallejo	Solano	7
Fremont	Alameda	6
Lafayette	Contra Costa	6
Millbrae	San Mateo	6
Novato	Marin	5
Pacifica	San Mateo	5
Richmond	Contra Costa	5
S. San Francisco	San Mateo	5
Foster City	San Mateo	4
Martinez	Contra Costa	4
San Ramon	Contra Costa	4
Petaluma	Sonoma	4
Albany	Alameda	3
Belmont	San Mateo	3
Castro Valley	Alameda	3
Danville	Contra Costa	3
Hayward	Alameda	3
Kentfield	Marin	3
Livermore	Alameda	3
Orinda	Contra Costa	3
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	3
Redwood City	San Mateo	3
San Carlos	San Mateo	3
Antioch	Contra Costa	2
Brisbane	San Mateo	2
Burlingame	San Mateo	2

CITY	COUNTY	COUNT
Corte Madera	Marin	2
El Cerrito	Contra Costa	2
Emeryville	Alameda	2
Menlo Park	San Mateo	2
Pleasanton	Alameda	2
Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	2
Tiburon	Marin	2
Union City	Alameda	2
American Canyon	Napa	1
Bay Point	Contra Costa	1
Campbell	Santa Clara	1
Clayton	Contra Costa	1
Colma	San Mateo	1
El Granada	San Mateo	1
El Sobrante	Contra Costa	1
Fairfax	Marin	1
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	1
Hercules	Contra Costa	1
Hillsborough	San Mateo	1
Los Altos	Santa Clara	1
Moraga	Contra Costa	1
Mountain View	Santa Clara	1
Napa	Napa	1
Palo Alto	Santa Clara	1
Piedmont	Alameda	1
Pinole	Contra Costa	1
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	1
Rohnert Park	Sonoma	1
San Anselmo	Marin	1
San Leandro	Alameda	1
San Lorenzo	Alameda	1
San Pablo	Contra Costa	1
Sausalito	Marin	1
Sonoma	Sonoma	1
South San Francisco	San Mateo	1
Tracy	Outside Bay Area	1
Vacaville	Solano	1

Appendix C – Other Commute Assistance Services Used

Describe any other commute assistance services that influence decisions about how to travel to work?

#9 - Sometimes for client Meetings. #17 - I sometimes check traffic online (usually not). Perhaps additional alerts for bad Bay Bridge traffic b/c that affects the immediate area around this building.
511, if I see heavy traffic or hear if from the radio
511.org
511.org BART Updates
511.org site
511.org Traffic
511.org; Google
AC transit website – Nextbus
AC Website/Radio/from the building management. Also uses Radio in questions 15 and 16.
advise from fellow workers
Android app; next bus website
at caltrain on Twitter
BART Parking
BART updates via Blackberry
BART.gov
BART.gov
Better, cleaner, more reliable Muni service
Bike Racks
Breaking news
Bus transportation from San Ramon/Danville to Walnut Creek BART.
Communication alerts on outages or any other disruptions to service.
Commuter checks
Commuter checks
Commuter checks
Convenience locations to purchase fast pass/clipper card.
Cost
cost of parking in the city
Costs;
Cut down on pollution, save the planet, save \$
Emails, team building
Fastrack, Translink
Ferry
Flex spending account
free samTrans bus to Millbrae Center to catch train
Frequency of transit travelling it takes me an hour
Google Maps
Great mileage vehicle

has influenced a change in my commute behavior
Holidays - light traffic I will drive in
how busy the service is
I cannot think of any now
I commute to work everyday to lesson the impact on the environment
I do not drive to work. But I check next bus every morning
I don't use any commuter assistance services
I like to check the news channels traffic reports online B/C it seems the most current and up to date.
I regularly check the muni schedule online or through the Iphone app to see real times.
I use Iphone - check the traffic (GPS)
I use nextbus and/or google maps. Did not know building provided any thing.
I walk due to short distance but took free shuttle when I lived in Knob Hill or biked.
I walk, so a lot of this doesn't apply to me.
I would like to receive information on the L-Taravel line when there is a problem after work -- need alternate coach line to the Sunset/Parkside districts.
IBART - iPhone
I'd bike to work if I knew I'd have a spot for my bike in the garage. Don't want to park outside where my seat could be stolen.
if Bay Bridge is closed
If it is raining I take the bus.
Internet
Internet
I've only used 511.org
Knowing about delays in BART schedule would allow me to stay at work longer and take a later train instead of being stuck at the station.
Late work hrs; crowded buses
Length of time between bus lines
Maybe a reduction in building parking (office building) costs will motivate me to drive.
media and 511.org
Mobile phone
More frequent bus service
Morning news
Mostly news alerts - if there were a widget app w/updates, I would utilize that.
Motorcycle and scooter parking in a garage, not on street
Muni alerts on Twitter.
Muni is my only option; assistive services averted to route selection i.e. which of the two infrequent routes as a bus coming sooner
Muni web page
Muni.com
My caltrain, pocket Muni Iphone APPS
My cell phone
My firm offers Wage Works
news updates/building updates
Next bus (SF Muni) & bus frequency

Next Muni Droid Application
Nextbus, BART live train arrive
nextbus.com
nextbus.com
Nextbus.com gives you timing on your bus.
Nextbus.com to check on Muni arrivals
Nextmuni
Nextmuni.com, able to go to other bus line if original is not on time.
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None - I take a ferry, 4 min. from my house. Simple.
None, dependent on BART
None. I only use BART unless I have to drive, but very infrequently.
Not sure
Oakland city alerts
Our company offers a commuter pre-tax program
Parking assistance & availability
Pick up shuttle from train station
Provide updates on an addition of new service to public transport
Radio, internet, HWY signs
Real time gps information on arrival departure of my bus.
road electronic signs
Rowtsy - Iphone App
Safe parking environment in the East Bay
sfgate.com; sfmuni
Spare the Air Days not ????
The digital info at the bus stop
the pre-tax option for commuting and parking may allow me the option of driving to work once in a

while.
Time, price, parking
Timely update on unexpected events on public transportation on the website.
To be able to have additional commute choices from Concord area i.e. Direct commuter bus like A/C transit to from East Bay - SF terminal. Few commute choices are available that provide flexibility other than BART/driving. What about Ferry service - Martinez to SF.
Traffic
Traffic report on radio
Train std update signs
Transit 511.org, BART rider phone app, MuniAlerts phone app
TV news
Twitter
Weather channel
Weather, sometimes will cab if it is raining really bad
word of mouth
work load @ work
www.511.org
www.nextmuni.com

Appendix D – Commuter Satisfaction and Expressed Needs

If there was one thing you could change to make your commute better, what would that be?

10 Car trains on BART during heavy commute
A 5:00 am Golden Gate Ferry - from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal to San Francisco Ferry Terminal
A bus picking-up/dropping off throughout SF & even greater area, just like Genentech has.
A bus line that runs from Nob Hill to FiDi/Market Street
A decrease in "no show" Muni buses.
A shuttle or bus that stops at Crow Canyon Rd. and Deerwood Road to Walnut Creek BART or Castro Valley BART.
Access BART in Antioch instead of Pittsburgh.
Affordable parking in bldg.
Alert on the specific website we can check or send the alert to my personal email.
alerts to my cell about breakdowns
As the traffic has increased, I am thinking about taking the train.
ban mobile phone use on Caltrain; I don't want to listen to others' personal lives in a cramped public space.
barrier fast track lanes at toll higher up to stop lane changes into fast track so close to the booth's.
BART escalators at Embarcadero - always malfunctioning
BART have express trains, i.e. not stop at all stops.
BART is very convenient, but at some stations the door opens for a few seconds so that you miss the train--while at other stations the trains sits idle with doors open many minutes in a row. If the doors could be a little more people friendly that would be a big help.
BART runs pretty consistent
BART to Mill Valley
BART to the North Bay
BART train is longer, so that I will have seats.
BART trains less crowded & some express trains (IE Every other stop)
Bathrooms in the Transbay Terminal
Be able to be dropped w/o worrying about tickets - Somewhere legal to be picked up.
Be able to take AC transit instead of BART.
Better (more frequent) bus schedules
Better (more) parking near Glen Park BART station
better app to find out when Muni will arrive
Better bike routes marked on Streets in SF
better buses, less crowding, nicer drivers
Better customer service reps for Clipper card users.
Better idea of problems on BART system
Better parking at BART.
better parking options
Better traffic flow around Trans bay Terminal Construction
Better traffic flow inside Muni underground services
Bike parking can be more accessible
Bullet train from SF to SJ after 7:00 pm

bus arriving on time
Bus direct from Pacifica to downtown - this was eliminated by Sam Trans
Bus would arrive timely and less crowded. Do not skip stops.
Caltrain Annual pass available to individuals
Caltrain expanding baby bullet hours of service
Car Pool
Carpool
carpool lane on 101 north
Casual Carpool
Cheaper
Cheaper monthly parking for building
cheaper parking
cheaper parking
cleaner BART
Cleaner BART & Muni, from food to panhandling kids to drunks
cleaner BART trains
Cleaner BART trains
Cleaner BART Trains & Stations
Cleaner passenger cars on BART; better MUNI on-time schedules & better connections between transit services; more frequent Caltrain service.
Cleaner trains
Cleaner, on time BART trains
Commute assistance
Commute is great already
company reimbursement; \$70 a month is a lot for a part time employee and full time student.
Complete transbay terminal asap. Make the Temporary terminal better to reduce hardship on commuters.
creation of express trains, more trains, cheaper fares
Currently satisfied
Decreased crowding on BART ... longer trains
Difficult, I work irregular hours
Direct train from SF @ Fremont unavailable after 7:15 pm.
Downtown to office shuttle, carpool w/in SF City
Drive more often
driving with more people in order to use carpool lane
Easier access to Caltrain & walking distance to office
eliminate hills since I walk
Enforce bus/Taxi only lanes downtown
express lanes for non-carpool vehicles
Extension of the BART line further south, wifi/cellular coverage through the whole BART line from Millbrae to SF
Faster bus - later departures home
Faster transportation
Fewer panhandlers bothering me as I walk to work

Find someone to carpool w/and share parking expenses
Fix Muni
for my morning commute earlier & later express bus times.
For the BART to not be so loud
free commute
free employee parking :)
Free Muni pass w/ferry tkt (again)
frequency of trains or more options
Fully fund Caltrain to keep it running
Get more people to van pool or use mass transit
Greater enforcement of fare cheats...
Greater frequency of BART trains
have a BART station closer to my home, so my commute isn't as long.
Have a shorter commute.
have an Ipod
Have Muni run on schedule, and have enough buses during commuter hours to be able to get on the bus. A seat would be even better.
have the 30X start earlier and end later!
Having accurate information as when the train arrives
House closer to BART Station
I currently take the bus then take BART to work. It would be great if I could only take one form of transportation to work.
I do not have any complaints
I find my Muni commute easy.
I park @ work but live 5 blocks away. There is a free shuttle to some locations. 12-14 offer in more prominent location.
I wd like to receive information about BART delays or traffic condition
I wish it were easier to learn when the Muni Market Street underground is in meltdown/backed up.
I would ideally change the frequency of BART Trains.
if BART didn't have as many interruptions/delays
If it would take less time
If there was a free shuttle from BART to the Caltrain station.
I'm happy with the way it is.
Improve MUNI dependability
Improvements in MUNI - I use the N Judah. More regular/reliable service, more accurate arrival/departure info
Improve Muni!!
Increase number of baby bullet trains
Increased frequency of bullet trains for Caltrain
information about crowding/human traffic on Muni buses,
Job closer to home
Larger capacity and/or more frequent buses to relieve over-crowding
less cars on road
Less cars on the roads

Less commuting!
Less crowded bus
less crowded buses
Less crowded buses that move more quickly
Less crowded Muni Trains or more frequent trains
Less crowded trains
Less delays
Less delays on the Muni.
Less downtown traffic.
Less expensive
Less Expensive
Less expensive parking & self parking
Less Force
Less homeless people or that do not pay & cause disruption. Train to be on-time.
Less Muni delays
less people on the 1 Bus
less people on the bus
less stops on the express bus
Less Traffic
Live closer to work
Longer BART trains, more police presence on cars
longer trains to accommodate sitting instead of standing.
Lotto winner
Lower tolls
Make it cheaper
Make Muni run on time
Modernize BART
more accurate arrival times
More available parking
More BART parking
More BART train from downtown SF to SFO or Millbrae
More BART trains
More BART trains during commuter hours, so it would not be so packed on the trains.
More BART trains to Millbrae/Airport SFO
More Bicycle access on BART!
More bike cars on BART
More bike lanes! (or fewer cars...)
More bike Racks! Bike lane on Market St
More buses coming through
More buses on the California 1!
More buses to lessen over crowding on 30X
More China Basin shuttle Schedule
More convenient, less expensive parking

More courtesy from other drivers on Bay Bridge
more dedicated bicycle lanes; free motorcycle parking
More evening buses. Always very full and have to wait longer then in morning.
More ferries from Sausalito to SF and feeder buses from Sausalito to Manzanita Park N Ride
More frequency during rush hours
More frequency during rush hours
more frequent BART trains
More frequent buses
More frequent busses
More frequent caltrain baby bullets to Mountain View.
more frequent service
more frequent shuttle routes to and from office
More frequent trains space available for bike commuters.
More lanes less 1 ways
More Muni trains
More parking at BART
more parking options & cheaper rates; later bus services - Transbay
more predictability
more real time info about AC Transit service or delays
More reliable late night transit options. During hours when BART isn't running, muni is not a consistent/reliable alternative.
More reliable Muni service
more Richmond/ San Francisco Trains
More routes
More seats on the bus.
More seats on train
More trains - increased frequency
More trains (BART)
More trains from Caltrain
More trains on BART - I have no real complaints about my commute
Motorcycle and scooter parking in my building, not on street.
Move back to San Francisco 100%
Move into SF
Muni & buses are correctly indicated on arrival boards/mobile devices
Muni - add cars to existing trains to increase capacity. Problem is extremely crowded conditions, not train frequency. Longer trains for more people would help. BART = smooth sailing 24/7 no problems.
Muni would run efficiently (on-time, no breakdowns, no short turns)
Muni's service needs to be more dependable more trains during peak times and less hold ups.
My commute is fine.
N/A, BART or Bust
Never have to wait for a car on the days I carpool.
Never heard of TMASF. No traffic accidents and less people on the road.
No - I just hope service is not cut on Caltrain
No change

No commute..
No traffic
non - I need a car
None
None
None
None
None - I am satisfied with my commute
Not as crowded/too many people crammed onto a bus
Not come to work
Not locking the front doors of my listing
Not much, commute is pretty good
Nothing
Nothing
Nothing
Nothing currently
nothing, happy w/my commute
Nothing. It is a very stress-free commute.
obtaining the muni pass (monthly). I'd prefer the building to offer these passes.
on time Muni
online service to match drivers and passengers for carpools
on-site parking
On-time for Muni buses
Paring Rates
Parking \$ more reasonable
Parking availability by the BART station where I park
parking, always have trouble parking in morning to go to carpool location.
Price of ferry cheaper
Real - time next arrival BART information easily accessible
Reduce CB shuttle delays
Reduce congestion at the toll booths
Reduce traffic and/or make parking available at BART .. Sometimes all full by 7:30 am
Reimbursement programs
reliability and increase the number of the buses
Reliability, on-time
Renovate BART
Restroom on the BART Train
Riding the 38 is slightly less gross than walking through the Tenderloin.
Safer from crime
Scooter parking
see above - would love to take bus if service was reliable.
Shorter
Shorter! Less gross people on BART.

Shuttle service from the Ferry Building, up California St.
Since I walk to office, it may be nice to have a map which shows the recommended route to walk.
Stairs from the garage to the lobby. Hate waiting for that elevator.
stereo system
Telecommute
Telecommute everyday.
Telecommute; business services on Transportation - Free Wifi; increased East Bay bus schedule pick-up/drop-off times/rates.
That my train on NUMI (N) would pass more often in the evening
The clean-up of Howard between 5th & 4th. Conditions are undesirable at all hours of the day/night.
The cost
The ferry more reliable with a few more options
the last direct train to Fremont is 7:15 pm. It's better to have direct train even later.
The length of time
the organization of the parking
Timely Muni Schedules
To have a "limited 38L or 31L" at 5:30 am, 5:15 am & 5:45 am.
To have a free parking at the building :)
Traffic
Transit-only lanes w/independent traffic signaling so that buses not affected by peak hour traffic.
Trash cans on BART platforms
When I drive, my commute is about 30 minutes. When I take Muni is about 45 minutes. I would take Muni more if it was faster and this estimate doesn't include long delays, share are not infrequent.
WiFi access on bus
WiFi on Caltrain
wifi on Muni & more comfortable seats
Work closer to Market St.
Work from home
work from home twice a week instead of once a month a week



 of

Appendix E – Survey Instrument

Building #: _____

Building Address: _____

COMMUTER SURVEY

1. What is the City of your home residence? _____
2. Have you changed your regular pattern of commuting to work in the past 2 years (including if you moved your home or work location)? _____ Yes _____ No
3. What time do you typically arrive at work? _____ AM / PM (Within a half hour range)
4. What time do you typically leave work for home? _____ AM / PM (Within a half hour range)
5. How do you usually travel to work? Indicate how you travel for the longest portion of your commute.

<input type="checkbox"/> Public transportation (BART, Caltrain, ferry, bus, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Walk
<input type="checkbox"/> Drive Alone, gas powered vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle
<input type="checkbox"/> Drive Alone, hybrid/electric/alternative fuel	<input type="checkbox"/> Motorcycle/scooter
<input type="checkbox"/> Work at home/telecommute	<input type="checkbox"/> Vanpool
<input type="checkbox"/> Carpool (same people everyday)	<input type="checkbox"/> Casual Carpool (whoever picks me up/I pick up)
<input type="checkbox"/> Employer or other shuttle service	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
6. If you use public transportation, which form of transit brings you in to the City? (If you already live in San Francisco, please indicate which service you use.)

<input type="checkbox"/> BART Train	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrain
<input type="checkbox"/> AC Transit (Local/Transbay Bus)	<input type="checkbox"/> Golden Gate Transit (Bus)
<input type="checkbox"/> MUNI (SF) Bus or Lightrail	<input type="checkbox"/> Golden Gate Transit (Ferry)
<input type="checkbox"/> SamTrans Bus	<input type="checkbox"/> Alameda/Oakland/Vallejo Ferry
<input type="checkbox"/> other public transit (describe) _____	
7. If you drive, carpool or vanpool, how many people (including yourself) are in the vehicle? _____
8. If you drive to work, where do you usually park?

<input type="checkbox"/> In this Building	<input type="checkbox"/> On-street _____ blocks from my office
<input type="checkbox"/> Special vanpool or carpool parking area _____ blocks from my office	<input type="checkbox"/> Other parking lot or garage _____ blocks from my office

9. If you regularly drive alone, is it because your job requires you to have access to a vehicle? Yes No

10. Before you begin your morning or evening commute, do you check transit or traffic conditions? (Check all that apply)

- yes, on the internet yes, on the radio yes, on TV yes, by phone/handheld
 yes, I check someplace else (please describe): _____ no, I do not check

11. If yes, does that information influence a change in the way you commute? Yes No

In the questions below, please provide information about services available in your building or through your employer.

12. Information on public transit routes and schedule information (check all that apply)...

- is available through the building management or my employer. I would like to see offered in my office or building.
 has influenced a change in my commute behavior.

13. Information on 511 Carpool/Vanpool/Bike Buddy matching services (check all that apply)...

- is available through the building management or my employer. I would like to see offered in my office or building.
 has influenced a change in my commute behavior.

14. Information about Commuter Events (check all that apply)...

- is available through the building management or my employer. I would like to see offered in my office or building.
 has influenced a change in my commute behavior.

15. The TMASF provides commute assistance resources to this building. These services are available to employees in the building. Please indicate which services you are aware of:

- tmasfconnects.org website tmasfconnects.org mobile phone services tmasf connects events (held or sponsored)
 breaking news alerts and updates Radio or other media campaigns

16. Please indicate which TMASF services and resources you have used:

- tmasfconnects.org website tmasfconnects.org mobile phone services tmasf connects events (held or sponsored)
 breaking news alerts and updates Radio or other media campaigns

17. Describe any other commute assistance services that influence your decisions about how to travel to work:

18. If there was one thing you could change to make your commute better, what would that be?

19. What is your job classification?

- Executive/Managerial Clerical Sales
 Professional/Technical Other (describe) _____

20. What is your age range?

- Under 18 18-24 25-34
 35-44 45-54 55+