

**2001**  
**CONGESTION MITIGATION**  
**SURVEY**

**Prepared for**

**SWRPA**  
*South Western Regional Planning Agency*

**&**

**WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES**

**November - 2001**

## **Statement of Confidentiality and Ownership**

---

All of the analyses, findings, data, and recommendations contained within this report are the exclusive property of South Western Regional Planning Agency with offices located in Stamford, Connecticut.

As required by the Code of Ethics of the National Council on Public Polls and the United States Privacy Act of 1974, The Center for Research and Public Policy maintains the anonymity of respondents to surveys the firm conducts. No information will be released that might, in any way, reveal the identity of the respondent.

Moreover, no information regarding these findings will be released without the express written consent of an authorized representative of the South Western Regional Planning Agency.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**SECTION 1**  
Introduction..... Page 3

**SECTION 2**  
Methodology..... Page 5

**SECTION 3**  
Highlights ..... Page 6

**SECTION 4**  
Summary of Findings..... Page 10

- Current Modes*..... 10
- Perceptions*..... 11
- Employment*..... 12
- Alternative Modes*..... 14
- Locational Issues*..... 15
- Customer Service / Satisfaction*..... 16
- Planning* ..... 18
- Environment*..... 19
- Demographics*..... 20

**SECTION 5**  
Appendix..... Page 22

- Survey Instrument*
- Crosstabulation Tables*
- Composite Aggregate Data*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

The Center for Research & Public Policy (CRPP) is pleased to present the results of a regional research study conducted on behalf of the South Western Regional Planning Agency.

The Southwestern Regional Planning Agency commissioned CRPP, working with Wilbur Smith Associates to gauge current awareness, perception, usage, and attitude among commuters of the southwestern Connecticut I-95 corridor.

The Center for Research & Public Policy conducted a telephone survey of 1002 commuter in a designated region of Connecticut.

This report summarizes statistics collected from the telephone survey conducted October 29 – November 3, 2001

The research included the following areas for investigation:

- Current modes of transportation;
- Reasons for car use;
- Perceptions of traffic congestion;
- Perceptions of highway safety;
- Employment status;
- Employer initiatives;
- Alternative modes of transportation;
- Perceptions of alternatives;
- Employment and housing relationships;
- Home selection consideration;
- Customer service satisfaction;
- Unmet/undermet commuter services;
- Planning awareness and understanding;
- Concerns on environmental impact; and
- Demographics.

Commuters living in the following towns were included in the survey:

Greenwich	Danbury	Derby
Stamford	Bethel	Ansonia
Darien	Newtown	Seymour
Norwalk	Fairfield	Milford
New Canaan	Bridgeport	Orange
Wilton	Trumbull	West Haven
Weston	Monroe	New Haven
Westport	Easton	East Haven
Ridgefield	Stratford	Branford
Redding	Shelton	Bridgewater
Brookfield	New Fairfield	New Milford
Sherman		

Section II of this report contains a review of the Methodology employed in completing the survey while Section III holds Highlights.

Section IV is a Summary of Findings while Section V is an Appendix containing a copy of the survey instrument used in fielding, crosstabulation tables, and composite aggregate data.

## METHODOLOGY

---

The Center for Research & Public Policy utilized a quantitative research design to collect information from current Connecticut commuters.

CRPP research staff completed 1002 surveys throughout designated regions in the state of Connecticut. Respondents were eighteen years of age or older, and currently commuting or driving others to work on a regular basis.

Residents were contacted between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. weekdays and 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. on weekends. The survey was conducted between October 29 and November 3, 2001.

CRPP employs a super random digit sampling procedure to ensure listed as well as unlisted households are included in the original sample.

The procedure also ensures random selection of households with each household having an equal opportunity for selection, proportional to population contribution of the towns represented within the regions.

CRPP used a callback procedure to ensure the randomness of the sample and to reduce non-response bias. When a randomly selected resident was not available during the first telephone contact, additional callbacks were made in order to complete the interview.

All interviews were conducted from CRPP headquarters in New Haven, Connecticut. Moreover, CRPP's senior staff and researchers completed all facets of the Study.

These aspects included: survey design, sample selection, survey pre-test, computer programming, fielding, coding, validation, logic checks, data entry, computer analysis, and data analysis.

Completion rates are a critical aspect of any telephone survey research. Because one group of people might be easier to reach than another group, it is important that concentrated efforts are made to reach all groups to an equal degree. A high completion rates means that a high percentage of the households within the sample were actually contacted and that the resulting sample is not biased toward one potential audience.

CRPP maintained a 78% completion rate on all calls made.

The margin for error for a sample of 1002 respondents is +/-3.0% at a 95% confidence level. The error range is higher as the sample decreases. In addition to sampling error, other unspecified and unmeasured sources of error may affect the outcome of any survey such as this, even though every attempt is made to measure public opinion accurately.

# HIGHLIGHTS

---

## **On Modes of Transportation...**

---

- **Large majorities of respondents include cars as a mode of transportation used for shopping (95.3%), medical trips (95.3%), work trips (92.1%), and school trips (86.9%).**
- **Train and bus are also mentioned as a mode of transportation for work at 3.5% and 3.3%, respectively**
- **“Their car” is reported to be the mode used most frequently for work by 91.5% of all respondents**
- **And, the primary reasons for using their car for work included: convenience (61.0%), no mass transit (22.7%), like driving (5.2%), need vehicle for work (4.7%), odd work hours (2.4%), and proximity to work (2.3%).**

## **On Traffic Congestion and Highway Safety...**

---

- **Just 14.4% of residents in the identified region suggest traffic congestion is not a problem. Two thirds (68.6%) consider traffic congestion a very serious problem.**
- **Further, 89.8% believe that traffic has remained congested (22.7%) or has become more congested (67.1%).**
- **Commuter suggestions, cited most frequently, for reducing congestion include: widening highways, car pooling, more mass transit, fewer trucks on the road, provide incentives for alternative modes, construction at night, more train service, more bus service and fix/improve route 7.**
- **Nearly half of all commuters surveyed, 46.3%, suggest that highway safety has decreased (29.3%) or remained unsafe (17.0%).**
- **Nearly the same percent (41.7%), however, note that highway safety has increased or remained safe.**

## **On Employment...**

---

- **The average number of months employed at their current jobs is 114.**
- **Further, the average number of miles traveled for a one-way work commute is 17.85.**

- **The average one way commute time to work, in minutes, is reported to be 25.23.**
- **Just under one fifth, 18.5%, of all respondents note that their employer permits them to telecommute.**
- **And, 17.6% said that they regularly telecommute from home (6.6%) or telecommute infrequently (11.1%).**
- **Only 6.5% of employed commuters report their employer offers ridesharing**

#### **On Alternative Modes...**

---

- **One quarter of all respondents report having an alternative mode of transportation to reach work. These include:**
  - **Bike 9.8%**
  - **Walk 19.6%**
  - **Car 12.7%**
  - **Bus 19.2%**
  - **Train 16.3%**
  - **Car to train 2.0%**
  - **Car pool 8.2%**
  - **Van pool 1.6%**
  - **Other 10.6%**
- **Three quarters of respondents, 75.4% suggest they are very (46.5%) or somewhat aware (28.9%) of alternative modes available.**

#### **On Employment/Housing Relationships...**

---

- **Just over half of all respondents, 52.5%, said they found their current employer before finding their current home.**
- **Surprising percentages of commuters, 48.8%, would “commute the distance”, if their employer relocated 30 minutes farther away. And, of this group, 56.7% would still “commute the distance” if their employer relocated 45 minutes away.**
- **Significant numbers of respondents report being very or somewhat likely to try...**
  - **Flex-time 48.8%**
  - **Staggered/modified work hours 45.3%**
  - **An alternative to driving a car 39.3%**
  - **Try telecommuting 38.4%**
- **Top considerations when selecting a new home, in declining order, are: quality of life in the area, affordability of the area, and cost of housing.**

## On Customer Service/Satisfaction...

---

- **Low positive ratings were recorded for all the state of Connecticut service characteristic measures. These include:**

➤ Condition of state roads and highways	37.7%
➤ Keeping commuters informed of planning activities	31.0%
➤ Efforts to make mass transit available and accessible	28.1%
➤ Efforts to reduce traffic congestion on roads and highways	22.3%
➤ Planning efforts for the area's roads and highways	20.6%
➤ Having sufficient pathways for travel on foot or bike	17.1%
➤ Innovative efforts to remedy traffic congestion	15.8%

- **Services that commuters could use but are not available, or not available enough, include: more bus service, more train service, more car pooling, buses to parking lots and trains, more mass transit, more parking at train stations.**

- **Commuters who have used train station parking over the past three years (41.3%) provided poor-moderate positive ratings on four parking characteristics.**

➤ Safety/Security	68.1%
➤ Parking cost	65.2%
➤ Overall parking	53.1%
➤ Availability of parking	47.8%

### **On Planning...**

---

- **Just one quarter of respondents, 27.0%, suggest they recall seeing, hearing, or reading about planning efforts to reduce highway congestion.**
- **Things heard, seen or read are wide in range with little focus. The campaign will need to focus their mission.**
- **Interestingly, more than half of all respondents (59.2%) report being very or somewhat willing to pay \$100.00 more in annual taxes to secure a reduction in traffic congestion.**
- **This willingness varies by geographic and demographic subgroup.**

### **On Environment...**

---

- **Large majorities, 86.2% report being very or somewhat concerned about traffic and congestion having negative environmental impact.**
- **And, 59.7% would be very or somewhat likely to pay an additional (compounded) \$100.00 annually to reduce the environmental impact of traffic and congestion. This willingness varies by geographic and demographic subgroup.**

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS



Readers are reminded that this section summarizes statistics collected from a random sample telephone survey among commuters within the designated region.

The survey was conducted on behalf of the South Western Regional Planning Agency. Interviews took place during October 29 to November 3, 2001.

## Current Modes

All respondents were asked which modes of transportation they used for work, school trips, shopping, or medical purposes. Multiple responses were accepted.

The following table depicts the results.

Mode of Transportation	Car	Train	Bus	Car Pool	Van Pool	Bike	Walk
a. Work trips	92.1%	3.5%	3.3%	0.5%	0.4%	1.5%	2.2%
b. School trips	86.9	1.4	9.2	-	-	0.9	1.3
c. Shopping	95.3	1.0	1.5	0.4	-	0.8	1.0
d. Medical trips	95.3	1.3	1.9	0.4	0.4	0.8	1.1

All respondents were asked which mode of transportation they used most frequently for work trips.

The following table presents the results obtained.

Use most frequently for work trips	Percent
Car	91.5%
Train	1.4
Car to train	1.2
Bus	2.4
Car Pool	0.6
Van Pool	0.4
Bike	0.8
Walk	1.7
Telecommute	-
DK	-

In an open-ended format question, respondents who traveled by car to work, or for work trips, were asked to provide reasons.

The following table presents the top 6 most frequently cited responses:

Why do you travel by car	Percent
Convenience	61.0%
No Mass Transit	22.7
Like driving	5.2
Need vehicle for work	4.7
Odd work hours	2.4
Proximity to work	2.3

Other reasons, mentioned with less frequency included: bus and train too far away, feel safer driving, and less expensive.

## Perceptions

---

All respondents were asked the following question: *“Some find traveling on area highways difficult because of traffic congestion, while others do not. Please tell me how serious a problem you see traffic congestion in the area. Please use a scale of one to ten where one means traffic congestion is not at all a problem, while ten means it is a very serious problem”*

While 14.4% of respondents suggested that traffic congestion is not a problem, more than two thirds, 68.6% suggested the problem is very serious.

All respondents were asked if traffic congestion on the area highways was becoming less congested, more congested, remained uncongested, or remained congested. While a 6.9% of respondents indicated that traffic congestion was either *“Less Congested”* (4.5%), or *“Remain uncongested”* (2.4%), a large majority, 89.8%, noted that roads had *“Remained congested”* (22.7%), or were *“More Congested”* (67.1%).

All respondents were asked to provide suggestions that may contribute to reducing highway congestion. The table below presents the top 10 most frequently cited responses.

Suggestions	Percent
None	24.2%
Widen the highways	15.5
Car pooling	9.0
More mass transit	7.9
Less trucks on the roads	6.3
Give incentives for people to use public transportation	5.3
Do construction work at night	5.2
More train service	2.3
More bus service	2.1
“New” Rt. 7 (Fix, Repair, Expand)	2.1

Other less frequently cited responses included: work more from home, employers provide more flexible times, raise age of new drivers, build less new high-rises, employers providing vans/shuttle buses, fix the roads, 24 hours bus service, better traffic signals, raise taxes on gasoline, car pooling lanes, more police on the road, less expensive public transportation, a special traffic station on the radio, fewer exits on I-95, more roads, tolls, rail between New Haven and Hartford, more self control driving, block the accidents from other drivers' view, and more electric cars.

All respondents were asked the following: *“Would you say safety on our highway has increased, decreased, remained unsafe, or remained safe over the past two years?”*

While 41.7% suggested that safety *“Increased”* (13.9%), or *“Remained Safe”* (27.8%), another 46.3% suggested that safety on highways had either *“Decreased”* (29.3%), or *“Remained Unsafe”* (17.0%).

In an open-ended follow-up question, all respondents were asked to provide the reason why they thought that safety on highways had increased or remained safe.

Reasons provided included: Better cars, better lit road signs, more construction, wider highways, more police, less accidents, less traffic jams, drivers are more considerate, drivers are more careful, and less construction.

In a second open-ended question, researchers asked respondents why they felt safety decreased or remained unsafe. The following are the reasons cited: careless, reckless driving, more cars on the road, more construction, lack of state troopers, cell phones, ts, more trucks, increase in speed limit, bad roads.

## **Employment**

---

A large majority of respondents, 97.0% indicated being currently employed, *“full-time”* (83.7%), or part-time (13.3%). Only 3.0% indicated not currently having a job.

Researchers asked employed respondents the following question: *“How long in months have you been employed at your current work site?”*

Almost a quarter, 22.9%, indicated having been at their current work site less than 22 months. Half (50%) reported less than 62 months, or 5 years. Three quarters (75.1%) said less than 170 months, or 14 years. The average number of months employed was 114, or 9.5 years..

All respondents were asked the following: *“Please estimate how many miles from home to work, one way”*

Just under one quarter, 23.8% indicated traveling less than 4 miles from home to work. More than half, 53.5% said less than 10 miles, while more than three-quarters, 78.4%, suggested less than 20 miles. The average miles traveled, one way, from home to work was 17.85.

Researchers asked employed respondents, to provide an estimate for their traveling time from home to work (one way) in minutes.

More than one quarter, 28.8%, said their traveling time from home to work, one way, was less than 10 minutes; while almost half, 48.8%, said their traveling time was less than 18 minutes. Three quarters, 77.4% suggested their traveling was less than 30 minutes. And, 100% of all respondents reported traveling time as less than 150 minutes. The average one-way commute time was 25.23 minutes.

Respondents that were employed were asked if their employer permitted them to telecommute or work from home. Under a quarter, 18.5% responded “Yes”, while a large majority, 80.6% responded “No”.

Among employed respondents, 17.6% noted that they telecommute from home regularly (6.6%), or infrequently (11.1%). A large percent, 82.3%, did not telecommute.

Respondents presently holding a job were also asked the following question: “Does your employer offer assistance to employees to avoid traveling by car to work such as Ridesharing program, vans, or telecommuting (for some employees)?”

The table below presents the results as collected.

Assistance	Yes
Ridesharing program	6.5%
Vans	8.7
Telecommuting (for some employees)	15.4

Employed respondents were asked the following: “How willing would you say your employer would be to develop programs to help employees avoid driving cars to work? Would you say: Very Willing, Somewhat Willing, Somewhat Unwilling, or Not at all willing”.

More than one quarter, 28.4%, suggested their employers were either “Very Willing” (7.8%), or “Somewhat Willing” (20.6%) to develop such programs. More than half, 55.3%, suggested their employers were “Somewhat unwilling” (7.0%), or “Not at all willing” (48.3%) to help employees avoid driving their cars to work.

Finally, only respondents who use their cars for work-related trips, were asked the following question: “In miles, approximately how many miles would you say you use your car weekly or work related trips, excluding to and from work?”

Just under a quarter, 24.2% responded less than 14 miles. Almost half, 46.7% suggested less than 40 miles. And, three quarters, 75.8%, suggested 100 miles or less. And, 100% suggested they travel less than 1040 miles weekly, on work-related trips. The average miles driven for work-related trips are 56.5 miles.

## Alternative Modes

---

Researchers asked employed respondents the following: *“Do you have an alternative mode of travel for work, other than the one(s) you cited earlier?”*

Nearly one quarter, 24.9%, responded *“Yes”*, while three-quarters, 75.1%, responded *“No”*.

Among those indicating having an alternative mode of transportation (24.9%),, researchers asked the following question: *“And, which mode would you include as the alternative to get to work?”*

The table below depicts the results.

Alternative to go to work	Percent
Bike	9.8%
Walk	19.6
Car	12.7
Bus	19.2
Train	16.3
Car to train	2.0
Car pool	8.2
Van pool	1.6
Other	10.6

Once respondents identified their alternative mode of transportation, researchers asked each how they viewed their alternative mode in a number of areas.

Do you view your alternative mode as more:	Bike	Walk	Car	Bus	Train	Car to train	Car Pool	Van Pool
Safe than your primary mode	16.7%	28.9%	19.4%	51.1%	65.0%	100.0%	5.0%	0.0%
Secure than your primary mode	8.3	2.2	45.2	68.1	60.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
Comfortable than your primary mode	0.0	22.2	48.4	44.7	47.5	60.0	10.0	0.0
Convenient than your primary mode	16.7	20.0	51.6	23.4	17.5	40.0	15.0	0.0
Expensive than your primary mode	0.0	0.0	51.6	55.3	67.5	60.0	35.0	100.0

Researchers asked employed respondents the following question: *“How aware would you say you are of alternative modes of transportation available to you for work? Would you say very aware, somewhat aware, somewhat unaware, or not at all aware?”*

Three quarters, 75.4%, said they were either “Very Aware” (46.5%), or “Somewhat Aware” (28.9%). Another 21.9% indicated being “Somewhat Aware” (2.2%), or “Not at all Aware” (19.7%).

## Locational Issues

---

All employed respondents, were asked the following question: *“Did you find your current employer before or after finding your current home?”*

Almost half, 45.2%, suggested they found their current employer before finding their current home, while 52.5% said after finding their current home.

Employed respondents were asked the following: *“If your employer relocated and added 30 minutes to your commute each way, would you likely seek other employment, move closer to work, or commute the distance?”*

The table below presents the results.

<b>If employer relocated 30 minutes...</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Seek other employment	28.8%
Move Closer	7.9
Commute the distance	48.8
DK/Unsure	14.5

Among those who would commute the distance or did not know, 13.5% suggested they would *“Seek other Employment”* if their employer relocated, and added 45 minutes to their commute each way. A few 2.6% said they would *“Move closer”*, while more than half, 56.7% said they would *“Commute the distance”*. However, more than one quarter, 27.2% of this subgroup were still not sure or did not know.

Researchers asked employed respondents the following: *“And, how willing would you be to: try telecommuting, try an alternative to driving your car to work, flextime, and staggered/ modified work hours”.*

The following table presents the percent of respondents saying very and somewhat likely.

<b>Willing to try...</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Flex time	48.0%
Staggered/modified work hours	45.3
An alternative to driving car to work	39.3
Telecommuting	38.4

All respondents were asked the following question: *“When selecting a home, how important were the following considerations? For each please tell me if the following were very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, or not at all important.”*

The following table presents the percent of respondents saying very or somewhat important.

<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Quality of life in the area	93.0%
Affordability of the area	89.8
Cost of housing	89.6
Proximity to recreation	71.9
Quality of local schools	69.9
Proximity to work	69.3
Proximity to major cities	68.2
Proximity to area schools	66.2

### **Customer Service/Satisfaction**

---

All respondents were asked the following question: *“Now, for a moment, please think of yourself as a customer of transportation services in Connecticut. Please rate the government as the provider of these services, on a number of important characteristics. Please use a scale of one to ten where one is very good and ten is very poor.”*

The following table presents the positive cumulative totals for those responding one through four.

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Condition of state roads and highways	37.7%
Keeping commuters informed of planning activities	31.0
Efforts to make mass transit available and accessible	28.1
Efforts to reduce traffic congestion on roads and highways	22.3
Planning efforts for the area’s roads and highways	20.6
Having sufficient pathways for travel on foot or bike	17.1
Innovative efforts to remedy traffic congestion	15.8

In an open-ended format question, all respondents were asked to tell us about services that commuters could use, but are not available, or available enough today.

The following table presents the top 7 most frequently cited responses

<b>Service commuters use but are not available/enough</b>	<b>Percent</b>
None	26.6%
More bus service	17.7
More train service	6.8
More car pooling	5.1
Buses to parking lots & trains	4.2
More mass transit	3.6
More parking at train stations	3.2

Other services mentioned with less frequency included: better bus schedules, shuttle buses to malls, special transportation for disabled seniors, a new highway for commuters, employers providing vans or shuttle buses, a lane for buses/trucks/taxis, better traffic reports, more taxi services, better highways, more ferries to NY, bike routes, buses need to be on time, better road signs, 24 hrs public transportation, more highway patrol, less expensive public transportation, monorail on Merritt Parkway, incentives to use public transportation, more free commuter parking, Metro system, and an Amtrack stop in Greenwich.

All respondents were asked if they had used train station parking over the past three years. Almost half, 41.3%, indicated using the train station parking on weekdays (15.9%), on weekends (10.9%), and both on weekends and weekdays (14.6%).

Researchers asked those using train station parking (41.3%) to rate the station parking overall and on cost, using a scale of one to ten, where one is very good and ten is very poor.

The following table presents the cumulative total positive ratings of one through four.

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Safety/Security	68.1%
Parking cost	65.2
Overall parking	53.1
Availability of parking	47.8

## Planning

---

All respondents were asked if they recall hearing, reading, or seeing information about planning efforts related to reducing traffic congestion along state highways.

Just over one quarter, 27.0%, suggested they recalled seeing, hearing, or reading information about planning efforts, while 70.7% had not.

In an open-ended format question, respondents were asked to tell us what had they heard regarding planning efforts related to reducing traffic congestion along state highways.

The following table depicts the top 10 most frequently cited responses.

<b>What you have heard</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Widen Quinnipiac Bridge	20.3%
More frequent buses & trains	12.5
Read, but no specifics	11.8
Car pooling	9.6
Widen Rt. 7	7.7
Public trans. Improvement	3.7
Less trucks on roads	3.3
Governor Rowland initiatives	3.3
Increase approach lanes on Merritt	2.6

Other responses cited less frequently included: using I-95 for express not local transportation, the state would invest more funds into highways, reducing congestion on I-84, a mall and traffic problem on Long Wharf, closing exit ramps in Bridgeport, casinos in Bridgeport not approved because of traffic, they will let people know about road work, more railway stops, train station in West Haven, highway bypasses, fixing roads, and another rail line on Metro North.

Respondents were asked how willing they were to pay an additional \$100.00 in taxes each year to reduce traffic congestion.

More than half, 9.2%, suggested being very willing (24.7%), or somewhat willing (34.5%). While another 35.2 said they were either somewhat unwilling (9.9%) or not at all willing (25.4%) to pay an additional \$100.00.

## Environment

---

All respondents were asked how concerned they are that traffic and congestion may be having a negative impact on the environment.

A large majority, 86.2%, said they were either “*Very concerned*” (48.9%), or “*Somewhat concerned*” (37.3%). A small percent, 13.2% indicated being “*Somewhat unconcerned*” (4.9%) or “*Not at all concerned*” (8.3%).

All respondents were also asked how willing they are to pay an additional \$100.00 in annual taxes to reduce the environmental impact of traffic congestion.

More than half, 59.7%, were either “*Very Willing*” (25.5%), or “*Somewhat willing*” (34.1%) to pay an additional \$100.00 in taxes to reduce the environmental impact of traffic and congestion; while more than a third (35.3%) said they were “*Somewhat unwilling*” or “*Not at all willing*”.

## Demographics

---

Age	Percent
18 to less than 25	5.6%
25 to less than 35	13.4
35 to less than 45	23.0
45 to less than 55	32.6
55 to less than 65	18.0
65 and over	5.6
Refused	1.9

Education	Percent
Some high school	1.5%
High school graduate	22.3
Some college	16.3
College graduate	34.7
Post-Grad work	25.2

People working in household	Percent
0	0.9%
1	33.4
2	49.8
3	12.6
4	2.0
5	1.1

How many vehicles	Percent
0	1.7%
1	20.0
2	44.0
3	12.6
4	8.7
5	1.9
6	0.8

Car always accessible	Percent
Yes	95.0%
No	4.6
DK	0.4

<b>Pay for parking at work</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	5.2%
No	93.7
DK	0.6
Don't work	0.5

<b>Cost of Parking Monthly</b>	<b>Percent</b>
\$14 - \$28	25.0%
\$14 - \$40	51.9
\$14 - \$75	73.1
\$14 - \$500	100.0

<b>How many people live in household</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	11.1%
2	36.7
3	20.6
4	17.9
5	7.2
6	5.3
7	0.5
8	0.2
9	0.2

<b>Income</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Under \$20,000	0.8%
\$20,000<\$35,000	6.5
\$35,000<\$50,000	8.9
\$50,000<\$65,000	10.7
\$65,000<\$80,000	13.3
\$80,000<\$95,000	7.0
\$95,000<\$120,000	4.7
\$120,000<\$135,000	3.4
\$150,000 or more	7.5

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	45.3%
Female	54.7

# APPENDIX

---

## INTERPRETATION OF AGGREGATE RESULTS

The computer processed data for this survey is presented in the following frequency distributions. It is important to note that the wordings of the variable labels and value labels in the computer-processed data are largely abbreviated descriptions of the Questionnaire items and available response categories.

The frequency distributions include the category or response for the question items. Responses deemed not appropriate for classification have been grouped together under the “Other” code.

The “NA” category label refers to “No Answer” or “Not Applicable”. This code is also used to classify ambiguous responses. In addition, the “DK/RF” category includes those respondents who did not know their answer to a question or declined to answer it. In many of the tables, a group of responses may be tagged as “Missing” – occasionally, certain individual’s responses may not be required to specific questions and thus are excluded. Although when this category of response is used, the computations of percentages are presented in two (2) ways in the frequency distributions: 1) with their inclusion (as a proportion of the total sample), and 2) their exclusion (as a proportion of a sample subgroup).

Each frequency distribution includes the absolute observed occurrence of each response (i.e. the total number of cases in each category). Immediately adjacent to the right of the column of absolute frequencies is the column of relative frequencies. These are the percentages of cases falling in each category response, including those cases designated as missing data. To the right of the relative frequency column is the adjusted frequency distribution column that contains the relative frequencies based on the legitimate (i.e. non-missing) cases. That is, the total base for the adjusted frequency distribution excludes the missing data. For many Questionnaire items, the relative frequencies and the adjusted frequencies will be nearly the same. However, some items that elicit a sizable number of missing data will produce quite substantial percentage differences between the two columns of frequencies. The careful analyst will cautiously consider both distributions.

The last column of data within the frequency distribution is the cumulative frequency distribution (Cum Freq). This column is simply an adjusted frequency distribution of the sum of all previous categories of response and the current category of response. Its primary usefulness is to gauge some ordered or ranked meaning.