2008 Arlington Commercial Building Study
Highlights of the Research Findings

Key Findings from the Research

Transportation and Location Choices

- Transportation factors influenced employers’ choice of a business neighborhood; 79% of the employers surveyed said ease of access for customers was an important consideration, 79% said the variety of commute options available to employees, and 77% cited ease of commute for employees.

- Nearly eight in ten (79%) employers surveyed said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the Arlington County transportation system and 90% said Arlington County’s transportation system had a positive impact on their business operations, especially on employees’ ability to travel for work-related meetings, clients’ ability to reach the business location, and employee recruitment.

- Commute factors also were important considerations for employees when deciding where to work; 42% said ease of commute was an important factor in deciding to move to the current location and 34% cited availability of commute options. A quarter of employees said commute factors were “more important” even than income and job satisfaction and 42% said commute factors were “as important.”

- About half of the employees surveyed said they were satisfied with their current commute. Employees who primarily used transit, carpool, bike, and walk to get to work were more satisfied with their ability to relax and with overall commute cost than were employees who drove alone to work. But they were less satisfied than their drive alone co-workers with parking at work, parking cost, and commute comfort.

Worksite Parking Conditions

- Nearly all of the buildings in the study limited the amount of employee parking allocated to each tenant. Eight in ten of the employers surveyed said they offered parking to some employees at the worksite. But most employers did not have sufficient parking for all employees. So overall, employers could offer parking to only 60% of the employees at the worksites.

- But even with the restrictions, employees who wanted to park on-site generally were able to do so; 77% of employees said they parked (or would park) on-site on days they drove to work. This indicates that parking capacity in the building existed beyond tenants’ official allocation for purchase of individual monthly parking contracts or daily parking by employees working in the building.

- Most employers that provided parking offered it to employees at no charge or for less than $100 per month. But employees whose employers did not provide parking had to pay if they wanted to park, at a nearby commercial lot or garage. Only 23% of employees said they actually had free parking.
Availability of Employee Commute Services

- Most of the building owners/managers in the study offered only limited commute assistance to tenants or employees. About half offered bicycle racks or lockers, but only a few buildings offered other commute assistance, typically limited to information about commute options such as transit schedules and bicycle route information.

- By contrast, 95% of employers surveyed said they offered at least one commute assistance service and many offered more than one. The most common services were telework / work at home, flextime, and transit subsidies, offered by 69%, 69%, and 58%, respectively of employers. About four in ten offered pre-tax accounts that employees could use to pay commute expenses.

- Employers that offered employee commute services, such as transit subsidies and commute information, said they achieved business benefits from offering these services, including enhanced morale (64%), enhanced recruitment (60%), and increased productivity (57%).

- A third of employers that offered commute services said they received assistance to plan or implement the services. Among employers that had used the free services of Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP), 93% said the services were useful and 73% said they would be likely to recommend ATP’s services to another employer.

- Some employees did not realize they had access to all of the commute assistance services that employers and building management offered to them. Only two-thirds of employees whose employers offered transit subsidies knew this service was available. This suggests the employers and building managements might not be realizing the full impact of their investment in the services.

Location, Transit Access, and Employees’ Travel Choices

- About half (51%) of the weekly commute trips made by employees who responded to the employee survey were made by train, bus, carpool, bicycle, or walking. This was a higher share of non-drive alone trips than has been noted for Arlington overall (37%), but reflects the disproportionate number of employers in the survey whose offices were close to Metrorail stations.

- Employees who worked close to Metrorail used bus and train more often and drove alone less often than did employees who worked farther away. Employees who worked within five blocks of a Metrorail station made 42% of their work trips by transit, compared with 19% of trips for employees who worked more than five blocks from Metrorail. Being closer than 5 blocks did not appear to increase use of transit; the transit percentage for employees who worked 3 to 5 blocks from Metrorail was statistically the same as the percentage for employees who worked 0 to 2 blocks from Metrorail.

Parking and Commute Assistance Services and Employees’ Travel Choices

- Parking fees had an influence on employees’ travel choice, but only when the fee reached $100 per month. Employees who paid between $100 and $124 per month made half of their work trips by driving alone, compared to about two-thirds of trips for those who paid $100 or less. Driving alone was even less common when employees paid $125 per month for parking; these employees made only 30% of their weekly trips by driving alone.
• Employees who had access to commute assistance services, such as transit subsidies, commute information, preferential carpool parking, bike racks, and other services, were more likely to use bus and train and less likely to drive alone to work.

• The drive alone rate was most influenced by financial incentives, but drive alone rates fell further when additional services were offered. The drive alone rate was 62% when no financial incentives were offered, 47% when an incentive was offered alone, and 40% when an incentive and at least three additional assistance services were offered.

• A quarter of employees who had received commute information or services to start transit, carpool, bike, or walk said they were not likely or only somewhat likely to have started using these forms of transportation without the service.
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SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

Arlington County Background

In 2008, Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS) conducted the Commercial Building Study to explore the role of public transit, parking, pedestrian facilities, and other transportation services on commercial location decisions in Arlington County and on the choices employees make in how they travel to work. This study was outlined in ACCS’ 2006-2008 Research and Evaluation Plan as an effort to assess the value of ACCS’ services to employers and employees and to define the role of ACCS’ services relative to site location and transportation infrastructure factors that also might influence employees’ travel choices.

Visionary “Urban Villages” Planning and Multi-Modal Transportation Infrastructure – More than 30 years ago, Arlington County leaders envisioned a development approach characterized by coordinated urban planning and transportation design. Since then, the County has invested in mixed-use “urban village” land development combined with an inter-connected, multi-modal transportation system. Arlington planners have concentrated high-density commercial and residential development around Metrorail stations in the Rosslyn-Ballston and Jefferson Davis Metrorail corridors, while maintaining lower density residential neighborhoods in the rest of the County.

The County also has supported a high level of public transit, non-motorized facilities, and transportation amenities to maximize non-driving travel options. The Metrorail train system that serves the Washington metropolitan region provides superior transit access through 11 neighborhood-based Metrorail stations with high density development focused around each. Two interstate highways, I-395 and I-66, provide road connections to and through the County, with HOV access points serving high-density development nodes. Extensive local bus service is offered by Metrobus and Arlington Transit (ART) and regional express bus is operated by Metro and services that originate in neighboring counties. The County also is served by commuter rail bicycling and walking options are well-developed through the “Complete Streets” approach to accommodating all modes and a system of off-street trails.

The result is a network of walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods well-served by public transportation and pedestrian facilities. This visionary approach has created an environment that fosters mobility and accessibility, but visionary development alone does not ensure success, when placed in the middle of a vehicle-dependent region. Travelers must learn of the variety of travel options available, understand how they work, and consider how to incorporate them into their personal trip decision-making process.

Comprehensive Transportation Assistance - Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS) performs this task for Arlington County by implementing programs that promote public transit, walking, biking, carpooling, vanpooling, telework, and other options that reduce the demand for vehicular travel. As the County’s transportation information and educational resource center, ACCS informs travelers about available services and facilities, shows how to use them, and provides individual and customized support to plan trips. ACCS also facilitates delivery of transit fare media and travel incentives, such as transit fare discounts, that are available from employers and other organizations, and assists employers to implement worksite-based services to encourage employees to choose non-drive alone types of transportation for their travel to work.
ACCS serves both external and internal audiences. Externally, ACCS assists residents, visitors, employers and workers with travel to and within the County. On a “wholesale” level, ACCS works with Arlington business managers and executives, property managers, and hotel managers who, in turn, work with their respective employees, tenants, and guests on advancing travel options. These groups serve as intermediaries between ACCS and travelers and extend ACCS’ outreach. On a direct end-user, “retail” level, ACCS provides public information and education to residents, employees, and visitors via County-wide information campaigns, commuter websites, direct mail, bus stop information placement, and commuter retail stores.

Internally, ACCS staff works with Arlington County planners and agencies such as transportation groups within the Arlington County Department of Environmental Services (DES), the Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development (CPHD), Arlington Economic Development (AED), and the Transportation Commission. In this supporting role, ACCS represents the “voice of the customer,” providing end-user insights and customer-oriented programming concepts.

**Study Objectives**

The 2006 Research and Evaluation Plan defined a data collection and analysis approach to assess the success of ACCS’ programs in influencing travel behavior. But the plan acknowledged that the urban villages development and the extensive transportation infrastructure available in Arlington also could have a significant impact on travel decisions, even if ACCS’ services did not exist. Thus, it was important to explore and, as much as possible, quantify the separate contributions of the policy, transportation infrastructure, and ACCS’ services toward non-SOV travel. In essence, does the ACCS “software” make the urban villages development policy and infrastructure “hardware” more successful?

The primary objective of the Commercial Building Study was to explore the relative roles of four factors in influencing employers’ business location decisions and employees’ travel mode choices for their trip to work:

- Characteristics of the location – e.g., “urban-ness”
- Availability of transit and other transportation services
- Availability and cost of parking
- Availability of commuter assistance services

Secondary objectives included exploration of the following for employers and employees:

**Employers**
- Estimate availability of employer-sponsored commuter assistance services
- Examine employers’ perceptions of potential benefits of offering commuter assistance services
- Assess employers’ awareness and use of transportation-assistance services available in Arlington County

**Employees**
- Assess employees’ awareness and use of employer-sponsored commuter assistance services
- Examine employees’ awareness and use of transportation-assistance services available in Arlington County
**Study Methodology**

The study included three data collection components: on-site interviews with property managers, telephone survey of employers, and online survey of employees.

**Building Selection and Property Manager Interviews** – First, property managers at 19 commercial buildings were interviewed about building amenities, parking facilities, and transportation services offered to tenants. The property manager interview outline is shown in Appendix A. The buildings were selected to provide a mix of characteristics related to location, transit and parking availability, building size, occupancy, and tenant composition. Ten of the buildings were in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor, six buildings were located in the Crystal City-Pentagon City area, and three buildings were located in other areas of the County.

To minimize influence from factors related to employer and employee characteristics, the study included only buildings exclusively or predominately occupied by office tenants that would be expected to have standard daytime business hours and that would not receive substantial visitor travel. This excluded buildings with significant medical, educational, retail, and customer service uses. Additionally, small retail tenants that were housed in the buildings were excluded from the employer and employee surveys.

Arlington Economic Development staff assisted the study team to identify buildings that met various criteria and Arlington County staff made an initial contact to 22 property managers to request their cooperation. Property managers were asked to assist in four study activities:

1) participate in one-hour on-site interview
2) provide list of tenants, with contact name and telephone number to the study team
3) contact tenants through email or phone to introduce the study and encourage them to participate
4) permit Arlington County staff to install tube counters at parking lot/garage entrances for one-day counts.

**Employer Survey** – The study next surveyed employers located in those buildings about factors they considered when selecting the particular neighborhood and building, how transportation affects the firm’s operation, and travel assistance services offered to employees. Appendix B presents the employer survey questionnaire.

Property managers provided a total of 234 employer tenants. Seventeen were omitted from the survey because the property managers indicated they had fewer than five employees at that location, the cut-off established for the survey. A few employers that were under this limit were included in the survey because the researchers did not know their employee count until after they were called. When they were removed, 219 employers were available for the survey.

Employer interview took between 15 and 30 minutes to complete and most were completed through a scheduled call-back at a time selected by the respondent. Some employers felt it was necessary to obtain permission from a higher management level to participate. For these employers and others that wanted more information about the research before agreeing to participate, the study team had prepared a one-page summary of the project and provided copies of the employer and employee survey questionnaires when employers requested.
Interviews were completed with 125 (57%) of the eligible employers. Thirty-five employers (16%) were reached by phone but refused to participate. The remaining 59 employers (27%) could not be reached by phone or email; at least ten attempts were made with each employer.

The size distribution of employers that participated in the survey was compared against the distribution of all employers in the buildings, as defined by the tenant lists provided by the property managers. The distributions were very close, so no weighting factors were needed for the employer survey.

Employee Survey – Finally, the study conducted an online survey of employees who worked in the buildings about how they traveled to and around the site and why they choose the types of transportation they use. Appendix C presents the employee survey questionnaire. This survey required the cooperation of employers. Employers that completed the employer survey and that had 15 or more employees at the site were asked to send employees an email introducing the employee survey and providing a link to the survey website.

Each employer was given a unique link to permit the study team to segregate employee responses by employer and building and to customize the survey with the employers’ name, street address, and other relevant information on the survey entry screen and on several questions. For the employers’ convenience, the study team prepared sample emails that employers could paste into their email format and send by broadcast internal email to employees.

Of the 125 employers that participated in the employer survey, 101 had 15 or more employees and were asked to send the employee survey link email. Fifty-one employers (51%) sent the email and 1,520 employees completed enough of the questionnaire to be deemed a valid response. About 4,900 employees received the email invitation, resulting in an overall response rate of about 31%. Response rates at individual sites ranged from 3% to 85%, with 30 of the 51 employers having an individual response rate of 25% or more.

- 21 sites (41%) with less than 25% response
- 12 sites (24%) with 26 to 39% response
- 10 sites (20%) with 40 to 59% response
- 8 sites (16%) with 60% or greater response

As was done for the employer survey, the employer size distribution of the employee survey data was compared against the distribution of all employees in the buildings. This showed that large worksites were over-represented and small worksites were under-represented in the employee sample, so the employee survey data were weighted by employer sizes to adjust the sampled employees to represent the total employee population:

- Responses for employees at sites with 1 to 30 employees – weight of 15
- Responses for employees at sites with 31 to 149 employees – weight of 8
- Responses for employees at sites with 150 or more employees – weight of 7

Survey Timing and Incentives – The employer and employee surveys were conducted between September 2007 and March 2008. Surveys were conducted with employers on a rolling basis, as property managers provided tenant lists. Employee surveys were administered as soon after the employer survey as employers were willing to send the email to employees. The study team tracked responses to the employee surveys one week and two weeks following the targeted survey start dates. Employers that had
no employee responses were sent an email advising the employer that no responses had been received and requesting the employer to send the survey link email. Employers with response rates less than 10% were sent an email asking them to resend the survey link email to try to boost response rate.

Employees that completed the survey were offered a $5 Starbucks coupon. The offer was noted in both the introductory email and in the survey website home page. Because the survey process covered a seven-month period, ACCS sent Starbucks coupons in three waves, to minimize wait time. Additionally, ACCS sent $5 Starbucks coupons to each employer that participated in the survey and $15 coupons to the property managers that were involved.

**Analysis**

Following are the primary topics covered by each of the three data collection efforts: property manager interviews, employer survey, and employee survey.

**Property manager interviews**
- Building background (year built, number of tenants, number of employees)
- Building amenities and personal and business service facilities in and around the site
- Role of transportation in attracting tenants and managing property
- Parking facilities and operating conditions
- Access to transit and pedestrian services
- Commute assistance services offered by the property management to tenants
- Awareness of regional and local transportation services available to employers

**Employer survey**
- Employer characteristics and background
- Length of time in this building, previous location, other locations considered
- Factors considered in selecting location, reasons for choosing this building
- Importance of travel, transportation services, parking availability in location decision
- Satisfaction ratings for Arlington transportation services
- Number of parking spaces available for employees and visitors and parking allocation approach
- Parking charge to employees
- Commute assistance services offered to employees, reasons for offering services, and benefits obtained by the company in offering services
- Awareness and use of transportation services available to employers
- Assistance received in developing services and source of assistance and satisfaction with employer transportation services

**Employee survey**
- Employee travel patterns (travel modes, reasons for using current modes, distance to work)
- Parking location on days driving to work and parking cost, if any
- Frequency of non-work trips during the workday and types of transportation used
- Length of time working in Arlington, working at this location
- Role of location / access to transportation services in influencing job choice
- Sought travel information in past year
- Changed travel mode to work since moving to this location
- Overall satisfaction with commute and satisfaction with Arlington transportation system
• Awareness of transportation services offered by employer, building management, other source
• Use of services and satisfaction with services
• Demographics

An overall objective of the survey analysis was to define how various transportation and location factors influenced employers’ location choices and employees’ mode choices. Various data of interest to these questions were collected in one or more of the three study components. Thus, the analysis linked building-level data collected from the property manager interviews with the employer-level data from the employer survey. Several building-level and employer-level variables also were carried over to the records from the employee survey. So, for example, each employee survey record also included variables related to their building location, distance to Metrorail, commute assistance services available in the building and from the employer, and parking availability. These variables then were used in analyses of employees’ mode choice.

The analysis phase of the study examined the employer survey and employee survey results overall and by six analysis variables. Additional definitions for these variables are provided in the results sections of the report.

• Distance to Metrorail – 0 to 2 blocks, 3 to 5 blocks, 6 to 10 blocks, more than 10 blocks
• Area of the County – Ballston/Courthouse, Crystal City-Pentagon City, Rosslyn, Other Area
• Level of “urban-ness” – Low, Moderate, High, Very High
• Availability of commuter services
  – Low, defined as no financial incentive, 0 to 2 support services
  – Medium, defined as financial incentive, plus 0 to 2 support services
  – High, defined as financial incentive, plus 3 or more support services
• Parking availability (spaces per employee)
• Parking charge ($ charge per month)

**Report Organization**

This following sections of the report present key results of the survey and offers conclusions based on the results. The report is divided into two sections following this introduction:

• Section 2 – Key findings from property manager interviews
• Section 3 – Key findings from employer and employee surveys

Following these sections are three appendices dealing with survey procedures. They include: Appendix A – Property manager interview outline, Appendix B – Employer survey questionnaire, and Appendix C – Employee survey questionnaire. Additional details of the survey results are provided in a Power Point presentation slides available through the ACCS Research Website www.commuterpage.com/research.
SECTION 2 – KEY FINDINGS FROM PROPERTY MANAGER INTERVIEWS

This section of the report presents the key findings of the property manager interviews, with particular emphasis on:

- The role of transportation as a factor in managing a property
- Parking facilities and commute assistance services offered at the building

Due to the small sample of property managers interviewed, the results are shown as counts of responses, rather than percentage responses. Note also that two of the properties were owned by the sole employer tenant. These two managers were not included in some questions, because they did not actively try to attract tenants or lease space. And three property managers each managed two buildings in the sample, thus, questions about the managers’ personal awareness were asked of 16 managers.

Transportation as a Factor in Managing Property

Transportation Factors were Among the Top Factors as Influential in Attracting Tenants – Property managers were asked to rate how important various factors were in attracting tenants to the property. As illustrated in Figure 1, on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important), “availability of transit services” topped the list of important factors – 15 of 16 property managers rated this factor as important or very important. But parking availability was a close second in importance. It was cited by 13 of the property managers as important.

More than half (10 of 16) said the “general business climate in Arlington” was a factor in attracting tenants and about half mentioned personal services in the neighborhood of the building, building amenities, and business services in the area. When asked if any other factors that were important, 8 of the 16 property managers volunteered that access or proximity to clients or customers was important, to said access to highways was an important factor, and two said Arlington’s location as “close to Washington DC but not in DC” was a selling point.

![Figure 1: Factors Important in Attracting Tenants (n = 16)](image)
Access to Transit Contributed to Ease in Renting the Property – Property managers generally said they had little difficulty renting space in their buildings. The average rating was a 4.0 on a scale of 1 (very difficult) to 5 (very easy) and only three of the buildings were rated as less than a 4. Access to Metro and other transit services was one reason that property managers cited as making it easier; 8 of the 16 managers volunteered this reason when asked why they gave a high rating for ease of renting. Five managers named a reason related to the quality of the building or building amenities. And two managers said being “close to retail/services” gave them an edge in renting the space.

Transportation had a Generally Positive Impact on Property Management Tasks – Managers were asked to rate the extent to which the quality of the transportation system affected their ability to manage four aspects of the property: attracting tenants, maintaining the reputation of the property, maintaining the price at the desired level, and ease of managing building operations (e.g., obtaining deliveries). They were asked if transportation had a very or somewhat negative impact (rating of 1 or 2), a somewhat or positive impact (4 or 5), or neutral/no impact (rating of 3). Table 1 shows the results for this question.

### Figure 2
Impact on Property Management Tasks – Number of Managers Reporting
(n = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attract tenants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain property reputation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain price</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage building operations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, managers said Arlington’s transportation system had a positive impact on their ability to attract tenants; 12 of 16 managers gave either a 4 or 5 rating for this management task. Nine managers said transportation also positively affected their property’s reputation and their ability to maintain the price they wanted to charge for office space. Managers were divided on the impact of transportation on management of building operations, such as receiving deliveries or scheduling contractors to undertake building maintenance. But half of the managers said this task was not affected at all by transportation, so the overall rating was close to neutral (3.3).
Managers Gave High Marks for Satisfaction with Transportation in Arlington – Finally, managers were asked to rate their personal level of satisfaction with transportation services in Arlington County and in the Washington metropolitan region overall. Managers gave much higher ratings for satisfaction with transportation in Arlington than they did for the metropolitan region overall. Out of a possible 5 points, they rated Arlington a 4.2, much above the 2.9 rating for the region.

They cited various reasons for this disparity, but one common reason was their impression that it was easier to get around Arlington and that Arlington had more non-driving travel options than did the region as a whole.

- “The region has not enough cooperation. The lack of a funding source for Metro is outrageous.”
- “It’s easy to get around Arlington, but North Glebe is a problem sometimes. In the DC region, you have to drive and deal with road infrastructure. That makes travel uncertain.”
- “Downtown DC parking is expensive and tight. It’s easy for Crystal City to compete with DC, but harder to compete with Rosslyn-Ballston.”
- “Need more Metro routes – too many transfers now. ART bus is great. Tenants use it to reach satellite offices. Bike paths also are great.”
- “Arlington has plenty of open road, no traffic, and lots of transit. You can walk anywhere - it’s easy for pedestrians to get around. The DC area has too much congestion; it’s a parking lot 24-7.”
- “Arlington has lots of transportation choices so it’s easy to get around. Transit service is packed going to DC. But Arlington needs more bike paths and sidewalks.”
- “It’s easy to get around both Arlington and the DC region by Metro. Arlington also has close proximity to I-66, DC, and the Pentagon. You don’t have to drive too far from Arlington to get to what you need.”
- “I have high regard for Arlington County planning; they are trying to help, but Arlington needs to build more parking. DC has too much auto traffic and the region is abysmal.”
- “Arlington’s transportation is better than the region as a whole.”
- “There’s not enough short-term parking in Arlington; it hinders retail and is not visitor-friendly.”
- “Road maintenance in Arlington is terrible and there is not enough public parking. Public transportation has declined in recent years.”

Parking and Commute Assistance Services at the Building

All property managers were asked a series of questions to determine how much parking was available at the site, how parking was allocated to tenants and various parking operations conditions. Tables 1 and 2 summarize key results from this section.
Table 1
Parking Operations Summary
(n = 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Operations Activity/Feature</th>
<th>Number of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking managed by outside operator</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking offered to non-tenant parkers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking advertised to public</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking shared with other/multiple buildings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Operations were Typically Separate from Building Operations – As shown in Table 1, nearly all of the buildings contracted with a parking vendor or operator. Only four managers said they managed the parking. Two of these buildings were single-tenant buildings and the other two buildings had open, no-fee parking, thus had little incentive to pay for an outside operator. Most managers said the parking vendor handled all parking transactions, such as payment for and distribution of monthly passes to tenants and employees and maintained parking facilities as part of the operations contract.

Fifteen of the managers said parking in the building was open to the public, for a daily or hourly fee and seven of those managers said the parking vendor advertised parking availability through outside signs at the parking entrances. More than half (12) of the managers also said that parking was not exclusive to the tenants in a single building, but was shared with occupants of another building. In most cases, the other building was also an office structure, but several buildings shared parking with hotels or residential complexes. A few said were in close proximity to retail space and also served short-term retail parking patrons.

Nearly all Buildings in the Study Limited Parking Allocations and Assessed a Charge for Parking – Table 2 presents results for questions to managers about parking costs. One question asked if tenants had a parking allocation or limitation or if parking was unlimited. Nearly all of the managers said tenants’ leases assigned a maximum number of spaces for their use, generally based on the square footage of the office space they leased. With few exceptions, the allocation was below the total number of workers employed by the tenants. In practice, this did not preclude additional employees of these tenants from parking in the building, but they would be required to purchase a monthly parking contract or daily parking directly from the parking vendor, if parking was available for purchase.

In 13 of the 17 building that had an allocation, tenants had an option to purchase fewer spaces if did not need the full allocation. As determined by the employer survey questions about parking, very few tenants actually purchased less than their allocation, however, and many said they would like to have more spaces to offer to employees.
Only three of the properties did not assess tenants a charge specifically for parking. But two of these properties were owner-occupied buildings, so in practice, only one of the properties actually bundled the parking cost in the lease cost and offered “free parking.” All other buildings assessed a per space charge. Five of the managers said the cost was between $50 and $99 per month, 10 said the charge was between $100 and $149 per month, and one manager said the charge was $150 or more. The average for the 16 buildings was $115 per month.

**Buildings Offered Only Limited Commute Assistance to Tenants or Employees** – A key goal of the study was to examine the role of commute assistance services, relative to other factors, in influencing commuters’ use of alternative modes.

Commute services would include services offered by the building management, which would be available to all employees working in the building, but also services provided by employers. Since the latter services likely would vary across a single building, employees in the building could have access to quite different packages of services. Thus, the study team defined three TDM service categories:

- Building TDM – services offered by the property/building management
- Employer TDM – services offered by a particular employer
- Total TDM – combination of services offered by any organization

To define Building TDM, the study team asked property managers if they offered any of a standard set of services and if they offered other services that had not been specifically mentioned by the study team. As shown in Figure 3, the most common service, offered by 16 of the buildings, was bicycle racks or lockers. But only a few PMs reported offering other commute assistance services and this assistance was generally limited to information. About a third of buildings offered bike route or transit schedule/route information. Four buildings offered a shuttle bus to a Metrorail station, three set-aside preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools, and three provided trip planning assistance.
Buildings that provided commute services promoted them through a variety of means. The most common method was to include transportation information in welcome packets to new tenants (7 buildings), however, these handbooks were typically given to the employer, so employees’ awareness of the services would require that employers pass the information to employees. Three managers sent messages through internal email, and two posted notices on a bulletin board in a common area of the building. Two said the concierge in the lobby provided most information services.

Buildings that offered services other than bike racks generally did so to recruit or retain tenants (4 managers). One building was required by an agreement with the County to offer the services. One cited wanting to be a “good neighbor” and another said it was a “socially conscious” thing to do.

About Half of the Managers were Aware of Arlington Commute Service Organizations – Finally, property managers were queried about their awareness of four organizations that provide commute information or assistance in Arlington. All 16 PMs said they knew of Metro/WMATA and all except one had heard of the regional assistance program, Commuter Connections. Half of the managers knew of ACCS and half knew of Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP), which provides assistance to employers. When asked if they knew of any other services or organizations, five volunteered knowing about one of the Commuter Stores, a service operated by ACCS.
Figure 4
Commute Services Known to Property Manager
Number of Managers Citing Awareness (n = 16)
SECTION 3 – KEY FINDINGS OF EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE SURVEYS

This section of the report presents the key findings of the employer and employee surveys:

- Overview of employers in the survey
- Transportation as a factor in employers’ and employees’ work location choices
- Worksite parking availability and fees
- Availability of employee commute services
- Transportation and commute assistance as factors in employees’ travel choice
- Employees’ satisfaction with transportation and search for new options

Overview of Employers in the Sample

Employers were Concentrated in Metrorail Corridors (Table 3 and Table 4) – It is important to state at the outset that the employer sample does not represent a cross-section of employers in Arlington County. While the intention of the survey was to include a range of employer types and locations in the survey sample, the primary areas of interest were Arlington’s two Metrorail corridors and employers in the sample reflects this interest.

More than half of the employers surveyed were in Rosslyn-Ballston corridor along Metrorail’s Orange Line; 22% in Ballston, 28% in Rosslyn, and seven percent in the Courthouse station area. One in three (32%) employers was located in the Crystal City-Pentagon City area along Metrorail’s Blue Line. About one in ten (11%) employers was located in areas outside a Metrorail corridor.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Area</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballston-Courthouse</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal City-Pentagon City</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosslyn</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the distribution of employers by two important study variables. The first was Metro distance; that is the distance in blocks from the work location to the closest Metrorail station. The second was “Urban-ness,” defined roughly by the density of development and availability of shopping / retail services in the immediate area of the site and the walkability of the site area. Classifications for this variable were Low, Medium, High, and Very high.
Table 4

Employer Sample – Distribution by Metro Distance, and Urban-ness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrorail Distance</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 125)</th>
<th>Urban-ness</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 blocks</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 blocks</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 blocks</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 blocks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three quarters of the employers in the sample were located within five blocks of a Metrorail station, one in ten (9%) was located between six and ten blocks from a station, and 16% were more than 10 blocks away from Metrorail. This was consistent with the distribution of County locations with most employers being located in a Metrorail corridor. The Metrorail station spacing in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor is relatively close – between one-half and three-quarters of a mile between stations. Thus, it’s logical to expect that most employers in this area would be within five blocks of a station.

The distribution by Urban-ness also was predominantly toward the high end of the scale. About six in ten (62%) of the employers were in High or Very High Urban areas. Three in ten (31%) were located in Medium Urban areas and seven percent were in Low Urban areas. Again, this is consistent with the focus on Arlington’s Metrorail corridors, which reflect the County’s urban village development policy.

Employers Represented Varied Types and Sizes (Table 5) – The employer sample was dominated by private employers (70%). The remaining 30% were divided evenly between government and non-profit organization. Most private employers said their primary business was either professional services or business service.

Table 5

Employer Sample – Distribution by Employer Size and Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Number of Employees)</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 125)</th>
<th>Employer Type / Primary Business</th>
<th>Percentage (n = 125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Private, professional services</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 49</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Private, business services</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 99</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Private, banking/finance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 249</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Private, manufacturing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Private, other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employers in the sample also were predominantly small. Nearly three-fourths (73%) had fewer than 50 employees at the surveyed worksite. Only 14% had 100 or more employees. But, as noted earlier, this distribution was very close to the distribution of all companies in the buildings.

Most Employers had Prior Experience with Arlington but Arlington was a Popular Location Even Among Employers that were New to the County (Figure 5) – More than half (54%) of the employers surveyed moved from another Arlington location and another nine percent said this office in Arlington was the only location the company has ever had. Other surveyed employers moved to Arlington from another jurisdiction in the Washington region or from outside the metropolitan region. About 17% moved from Washington, DC and 10% moved from Fairfax County, VA.

![Figure 5](previous_business_location.png)

Half of all employers surveyed considered only Arlington when choosing the location for this office. Arlington was the only jurisdiction considered by 63% of employers that moved from another Arlington location, but Arlington was popular even among employers that were previously located elsewhere; 38% of employers that moved from another jurisdiction also had considered only Arlington.

Transportation as a Factor in Employers' and Employees' Work Location Choices

Employers Cited High Satisfaction with Transportation (Table 6) – Employers in the survey were generally satisfied with Arlington County’s transportation system – 79% rated their satisfaction a 4 (48% satisfied) or 5 (31% very satisfied) on a 1 to 5 scale. As indicated by the results in Table 6, there were no significant differences in transportation system satisfaction for employers located in the three urban levels; more than three-quarters in each area rated it a 4 or 5.
Table 6

Employer Satisfaction with Transportation – Rating of 4 (Satisfied) or 5 (Very Satisfied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percentage Rating 4</th>
<th>Percentage Rating of 5</th>
<th>Total 4 and 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employers (n = 116)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Moderate (n = 39)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (n = 41)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High (n = 36)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrorail Distance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 blocks (n = 50)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 blocks (n = 34)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more blocks (n = 37)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington (n = 61)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland-Virginia (n = 15)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia (n = 16)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But employers that were located closer to Metrorail were more satisfied than were employers located farther away; 84% of employers located within five blocks of Metrorail were satisfied with transportation, compared to 68% of employers located more than five blocks away. And employers that had been previously located in the District of Columbia or another Arlington location gave higher ratings for transportation satisfaction than did employers previously located in Maryland or another Virginia location.

Transportation Services Supported Business Operations (Figure 6) – Employers felt Arlington County’s transportation system had a positive impact on business operations, especially on employees’ ability to travel for work-related meetings (74% rated a positive impact), clients’ ability to reach the business location (70%), and employee recruitment (67%). More than half of the employers said Arlington’s transportation system had a positive or very positive impact on employees’ attendance and on their morale/productivity.
Many Employers Cited Transportation Factors as Reasons for Choosing a Particular Neighborhood (Figure 7) – When asked to rate various factors in the choice of their current neighborhood, 84% of employers surveyed said cost per square foot was important. But several transportation factors also received high ratings: ease of access for customers (79%), variety of commute options available to employees (79%), and ease of commute for employees (77%). Two thirds (65%) said highway access was important. These factors all were rated as more important than the availability of parking, employees’ willingness to move, and the presence of shops and other personal service establishments in the neighborhood.
Employers that located near Metrorail stations appeared to do so at least in part for access to a wider range of travel options; 90% of employers located within two blocks of Metrorail rated *commute options for employees* as important, compared with 63% of employers that were located five or more blocks away from Metrorail.

And different Arlington neighborhoods appeared to attract employers with different transportation needs. Crystal City employers rated *access for customers* and *highway access* higher than did employers in other areas. Rosslyn employers were very concerned about *employees’ ease of commute* and their *willingness to move*, but were less concerned about *parking*.

**Transportation Also was a Factor in Employers’ Choice of a Particular Building (Figure 8)** – The cost per square foot of leased space topped the list of important factors in employers’ selection of a particular building. Nearly nine in ten (88%) rated it as 4 or 5. Lease duration was noted by 75% of employers as an important building choice consideration, but two transportation factors, distance to Metrorail and parking availability, each was rated as a 4 or 5 by 60% or more of employers. These transportation factors were rated as more important that the range of technology services in the building, the distance to the nearest bus stop, building amenities, and the mix of tenants in the building.

**Figure 8**
Importance of Factors When Selecting an Office Building *(n = 125)*
Percentage of Employers Rating Factor as Important or Very Important

![Importance of Factors When Selecting an Office Building](chart)

Ratings for importance of both Metrorail and bus access decreased as Metrorail distance increased. About four in ten (44%) employers that were located more than five blocks from Metrorail said the distance to Metrorail was an important factor in their building choice, compared to 70% of employers located three to five blocks from Metrorail and 90% of employers located within two blocks. Similarly, the distance to bus stops was a much more important factor to employers located within two blocks (66%) and three to five blocks away from Metro (36%) than it was to employers in located more than five blocks away (28%). The amount of parking that was available was rated as equally important by all employers, regardless of their Metro distance.
Seven in Ten Employees Considered Commute Factors when Deciding Where to Work (Figure 9) – The employee survey also asked about the role transportation played in their decision to accept a job offer at or transfer to this location. When employees were asked about factors they considered when deciding to move to their current work location, 42% mentioned ease of commute and 34% cited availability of commute options. Job and income considerations topped the list of important factors, but a quarter of employees said commute factors were “more important” than other factors and 42% said commute factors were “as important.”

![Figure 9](image-url)

**Figure 9**

**Importance of Factors When Deciding to Work at the Current Work Location (n = 1,478)**

Percentage of Employees Rating Factor as Important or Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of commute</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute options</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay with employer</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of commute</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near family/friends</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops/entertainment</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksite Parking Availability and Fees

Many research studies have documented the role parking plays in influencing travel mode and this study examined several questions related to parking. Property managers were asked how many spaces were available in all lots/garages associated with the building, how those spaces were allocated to tenants and visitors, and how the parking facilities were managed. Employers were asked several questions designed to assess the parking availability and parking charges at individual employer locations: How many employees work at this site? How many parking spaces are available in this building for your employees’ use? What fee do you charge employees for parking? Finally, employees were asked; on days that you drive to work, where do you park and how much do you, or would you, pay to park at this location?

The employer and employee data were used to define two parking variables:

- **Parking ratio** – This was defined as the number of spaces available per employee. A value of 1.0 would mean that the employer had a space for each employee. A value of 0.5 meant that the employer had one parking space for every two employees; in other words, the employer had parking for only half the employees.

- **Parking fee** – This was defined as the fee per month that was paid or would be paid if the employee drove to work. Both employers and employees were asked about parking charges. But because most employers did not offer parking to all employees and assessed a fee for some, but not all, employees, the parking fee was defined as the fee reported by the employee. All employees
were asked to report their parking charge. Employees who said they did not usually drive to work were asked how much they “would pay” if they drove, even on an occasional basis. Some employees were not able to answer the question, presumably because they had never driven. Other employees reported the charge as a daily charge. These rates were converted to a monthly charge by multiplying by a 20-workday month. These aggregate monthly rates were likely higher than an employee would actually pay if driving alone regularly, because monthly contracts for parking probably could be obtained, if employees desired.

The Amount of Parking the Employers Provided to Employees was Dictated Largely by their Lease Agreements, but Most Agreements Offered Employers Parking Supply Flexibility – Two-thirds (66%) of employers said the parking they had available for employees was equal to the number of spaces allocated to the employer in the building lease agreement. Even if they wanted more parking, it was not available to them. Seven percent said the parking they could offer to employees was more than the standard lease allocation. The remaining quarter (27%) said they did not have a parking limit defined in their lease.

More than eight in ten (85%) employers said they leased parking spaces separately, rather than bundled in the building space lease cost. Thus, they could buy fewer spaces than the allocation if they had less demand for parking from employees. But very few employers actually bought less than their allocation and most said they would have liked to have more parking.

Employee Parking was Limited at Many Worksites (Figure 10) – Eight in ten of the employers surveyed said they offered parking to at least some employees at the worksite and 29% said they had a space for nine in ten employees. This was essentially “full parking availability,” when absenteeism is taken into account. The remaining 20% of employers said they offered no parking at all.
But even among employers that did provide some parking, most did not have sufficient parking for all employees and large employers were less likely to offer parking to all employees, so the actual parking availability from the employees’ perspective was different than it appeared from that of employers. When these limitations were factored in, only six percent of employees worked at sites where parking was available to all employees and 45% of employees worked at sites where parking was available to fewer than one in two employees. These results are displayed in Figure 10, on the following page. Overall, employers had parking allocations for just 60% of employees.

Parking was least available for Rosslyn employees; only four percent worked at sites where parking was available to more than half of the employees, compared to 62% of Crystal City employees, 72% of Ballston area employees, and 64% of employees in “Other” areas outside of Metrorail corridors.

Employees located six or more blocks from Metro were much more likely to have parking than were employees located closer to Metrorail. Three-quarters (75%) worked at sites with parking for at least half of the employees, while only about half (51%) of employees located five or fewer blocks from Metro worked at sites with parking for at least half of the employees.

Most Employees had Access to On-site Parking for Days they Drove to Work (Figure 11) – Three-quarters of employees said they parked, or would park, in a garage or lot at the worksite on a day that they drove to work. Fourteen percent said they parked/would park in a public garage or lot, six percent parked/would park on the street, and three percent parked/would park in an employer-owned/leased garage or lot off-site.

On-site parking was most common for employees who drove alone to work, with 88% of these employees using onsite parking. But onsite parking appeared to be available also for occasional use; 64% of employees who primarily rode transit to work said they parked/would park onsite on days they drove to work. This indicates that the parking allocation defined by lease agreements did not typically account for the total number of spaces in the garage/lot and that some spaces were available for daily use parking.
Three-quarters of Employees Said they Paid or Would Pay to Park at Work (Figure 12) – Two-thirds of employers that provided parking said they did not charge any fee to employees (56%) or charged between $1 and 100 per month (13%).

But since most employers did not have enough parking for all employees, many employees who wanted parking might still have to pay, at a commercial lot or garage. Only a quarter of employees (23%) said they actually had free parking. One in five (20%) paid between $1 and $100 per month, 13% paid $101 to $149, and 16% paid more than $150 per month. A quarter (27%) said they did not know what they would pay to park, presumably because they never drive to work. But most of these employees probably would have to pay and likely would pay market rates.

![Figure 12](https://example.com/figure12.png)

**Employee Parking Fees (Monthly rate)**

Percentage of Employees Paying to Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 / mth</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-$49</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$100</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101-$149</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150+</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of parking fees varied by the employees’ work locations. Only in “Other” areas outside Metrorail corridors was free parking truly available to a large share (93%) of employees. In Crystal City, about half (46%) of employees said they had free parking, but only 30% of Rosslyn employees and 11% of Ballston area employees had free parking.

**Availability of Employee Commute Services**

An important objective of the study was to determine how valuable commute services were in influencing commute behavior and questions about services were included in each of the three study components. As noted earlier, property managers were asked what services they provided to tenants in the building. Employers were asked in their survey about services they offered to employees at this site or that they knew were available from another organization and that they promoted to their employees, for example, ridematching and Guaranteed Ride Home, or bike racks, showers, and personal lockers. These Building TDM and Employer TDM services were combined to define the Total TDM that actually would be available to an employee who worked for that employer in that building.

But other research has indicated that employees are not always aware of all the services available to them, so the employee survey asked employees what services they believed were available and these data were used to assess the perceived service level, from the viewpoint of employees.
The analysis classified three levels of commute service packages for Total TDM and Perceived TDM, defined by the type and number of services offered:

- **Low level of services** – No financial incentive, and fewer than three non-financial support services (e.g., Guaranteed Ride Home, preferential parking, commute information, bus schedules, bike racks, showers/lockers, flextime, etc)
- **Moderate level of services** – Financial incentive for one or more modes, but fewer than three support services
- **High level of services** – Financial incentive for one or more modes, plus three or more support services

**Most Employers Offered Commute Assistance Services and Some Building Managements Offered Additional Services** (Figure 13) – Nearly all employers interviewed (95%) said they offered at least one commute assistance service. The most common were telework / work at home, flextime, and transit subsidies, offered by 69%, 69%, and 58%, respectively of employers. Other common services offered by employers included pre-tax accounts that employees can use to pay commute expenses, bus/train information, carpool / vanpool subsidies, showers/lockers, and bike racks.

![Figure 13: Commute Assistance Services Available to Employees](n = 125)

Percentage of Employers Offering Services, Percent of Other Organizations Offering Services

- **Telework** 69%
- **Flextime** 69%
- **Transit subsidy** 58%
- **Bike racks** 12%, 31%
- **Bus/train info** 28%, 12%
- **Pre-tax account** 39%,
- **Showers/lockers** 14%, 18%
- **CP/VP subsidy** 18%, 1%
- **Ridematch** 8%, 4%
- **Preferential Parking** 7%, 7%
- **GRH** 10%, 5%

Blue bars represent services provided by the employer, and green bars represent services provided by other organizations.
Employees in some buildings also had access to commute services provided by the building management or another organization. For example, 10 of the 19 buildings offered building amenities or services, such as bike racks, showers/lockers, bus or train information, and preferential parking for carpools or vanpools, which could help employees with their travel to work. Figure 13 also highlights services offered by building managements and other organizations.

When both employer and “other organization” services were combined, the service packages resulted in 29% of worksites offering a High level of services, 43% offering a Moderate level, and 28% offering a Low level of services.

Employers Reported Significant Business Benefits from Offering Commute Services (Figure 14) – Most employers cited “business benefit” reasons for their motivation to offer commute services, such as to provide a new employee benefit (49%), recruit/retain employees (14%), or enhance productivity (6%). But some employers gave a “social conscience” reason: environmental concern (14%), be a good neighbor (12%), or traffic concern (6%). About two in ten employers said they did not know why these services were first offered, likely because the program start-up pre-dates their involvement.

When asked what benefits they actually had received from offering commute services, an even greater share of employers said they had generated business benefits from offering these services. The most common benefits included enhanced morale (64%), enhanced recruitment (60%), increased productivity (57%), and/or attracting more qualified employees (51%). These percentages indicate that even employers that had not been motivated by bottom line influences to start offering commute services had realized a business benefit.

![Figure 14: Business Benefits from Offering Commute Services](n = 104)
Employers that Received Assistance to Implement Commute Services Found the Assistance Valuable – A third of employers that offered commute services said they received assistance from an outside organization to plan or implement the services; 18% received assistance from Metro/WMATA and 10% said Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP) provided the assistance. A quarter (25%) of the employers that received assistance said they would have been unlikely or very unlikely to implement the services without the assistance. Among employers that had used ATP services, 87% said they were satisfied with the service, 93% said the services were useful, and 73% said they would be likely to recommend ATP’s services to another employer.

Employees were Not Aware of all the Commute Services Offered by Employers but Reported Access to Additional Services from Other Organizations (Figure 15) – When asked what commute assistance services were available to them at work, employees reported a wide range of services. Most common were transit subsidies, transit schedules, and telework information. Carsharing and several bike/walk services were available to at least a third of employees. As shown in Figure 15, employees noted seven commute services that were more common than free parking, which was available to only 31% of respondents.

Note that these percentages will not match the percentages shown in Figure 13 for “employer and other organization provided” services for three reasons. First, the employee survey results reflect difference in service availability between large and small employers. Second, some employees did not realize they had access to all of the services that employers and building managements said they offered. For example, only two-thirds of employees whose employers offered transit subsidies knew this service was available. Third, some of the services cited by employees, such as ridematching, are most likely offered by regional or local commuter service organizations, such as ACCS or the regional Commuter Connections program.
Most Employees in the Survey had Access to Moderate to High Levels of Commute Services Overall (Figure 16) – Because the analysis explored employees’ response to a complete package of commute services that were available to them, all services offered to employees were combined to define a total commute service package for the analysis of employees’ mode choice. When all services were included, regardless of the source, 41% of employees worked at sites with High level of services, 48% worked at locations with Moderate levels of services, and 11% worked at sites with Low services.

The level of commute services offered at worksites varied by several study variables.

- Moderate to High levels of services were most common among worksites in High Urban and Very High Urban areas. More than three-quarters (78%) of worksites in these areas offered Moderate to High service levels, compared to 60% of worksites in Low to Moderate Urban areas.

- Worksites within five blocks of Metrorail were more likely to offer Moderate to High service levels (76-80% of worksites) than were worksites located farther away (56%).

- But worksites farther from Metro were more likely to offer High service levels (financial incentive with three or more support services), while worksites closer to Metro were more likely to offer Moderate levels of services (financial incentive with fewer than three support services). This could suggest that these employers felt they need to “try harder” to attract employees to non-SOV modes to overcome the inconvenience of the longer access distance. Perhaps employers located within two blocks of Metro felt they could “coast” on their inherent site advantage.

- Employers that moved from another Arlington location were more likely to offer Moderate or High service levels (80%) than were employers that moved from DC (68%) and much more likely to do so than employers that moved from Maryland or other Virginia areas (47%). This might reflect a longer Arlington tenure or greater awareness and use of Arlington commuter service programs.
Transportation and Commute Assistance as Factors in Employees' Travel Choice

An earlier section of this report noted that many employees in the survey said commuting conditions and the availability of transportation options were important considerations for them in deciding whether to accept a new job or location change to this office location.

This was consistent with results of the 2007 regional State of Commute survey conducted by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, which also found transportation to be a factor in employees' job and home location choices. Taking this one step further, one of the primary objectives of this study was to determine how much location characteristics and transportation factors and services influenced employees' choice of the specific types of transportation they used to get to the surveyed locations.

To collect data on mode use, employees in the survey were asked how many days per week they typically traveled to the survey location and how many days per week they would use various types of transportation to get to the worksite. They also were asked about any commute changes they had made since beginning to work at this location. These travel data were used in combination with data from the property manage interviews and employer survey to link mode choice to site and transportation characteristics.

Half of the Employees Surveyed Traveled to Work by Train, Bus, Carpool, Bike, or Walk (Figure 17) – Only 49% of weekly commute trips made by employees who were surveyed in the commercial building study were made by driving alone. This was compared to 63% of work trips made by employees to all work locations across Arlington, as measured by the 2007 State of the Commute survey. Use of bus and train among surveyed employees was much higher (37% of weekly work trips) than for Arlington workers overall (24% of weekly work trips).

These results reinforce the caution noted earlier that the commercial building study data are not representative of Arlington commuting patterns overall. However, it is reasonable to believe they adequately represent travel in the Metro corridors and other settings in which the survey was conducted.
Train Use was Much Higher for Employees who Worked Near Metrorail (Figure 18) – The percentage of trips made by bus and train was much higher and percentage of trips made by driving alone was considerably lower for employees who worked closer to Metrorail. More than four in ten (42%) employees who worked within five blocks of a Metrorail station used transit to get to work, compared with 25% who worked between six and ten blocks from Metrorail and only 11% of employees who worked more than 10 blocks away.

Interestingly, there was little difference in drive alone and transit use for sites located very close to Metro (0 to 2 blocks) and those located slightly farther away (3 to 5 blocks). This is counter to conventional transit planning wisdom that assumes that one-quarter mile (2 to 3 blocks) is the maximum distance that most riders will walk to get to a transit stop. Rather, it suggests users are willing to walk twice that distance, if satisfactory pedestrian facilities are in place.

![Figure 18](image)

*Figure 18
Type of Transportation Used by Distance from Work to Metrorail Station
Percentage of Trips to the Worksite Made by Driving Alone and Percentage Made by Transit
(0 to 2 blocks n = 388, 3 to 5 blocks n = 837, 6 to 10 blocks n = 173, >10 blocks n = 122)*

Drive Alone Rates were Similar for all Metro Corridor Areas but the Distribution of Non-SOV Modes Differed by Area (Figure 19) – The share of weekly trips made by driving alone was similar for Ballston (47%), Rosslyn (48%), and Crystal City (41%), but was dramatically higher (79%) for areas outside Metro corridors.

But the three Metro corridor areas had slightly different distributions for non-SOV modes. For example, Crystal City and Rosslyn had the highest transit share. By contrast, Ballston had higher bike/walk use than did other areas, likely reflecting the highly diversified mix of employment and housing in this urban village neighborhood. Carpool and vanpool use was similar in the three Metro corridors and slightly lower in “Other” areas.
Train Use was Much Higher Among Employees whose Employers Offered Commute Assistance (Figure 20) – The percentage of trips made by bus and train also increased substantially and the use of driving alone decreased when employees had access to higher levels of commute services. When commute assistance was High, defined as employees were offered a financial incentive plus at least three other support services, 44% of weekly commute trips were made by transit, compared to 21% when commute assistance was Low, defined as no transit incentive and fewer than three support services. Bike/walk and carpool/vanpool rates were essentially the same for the three levels of services.
The decrease in drive alone rate and increase in transit use from Low services to Moderate services shows the impact of a financial incentive for non-SOV use on employees’ mode choice. This relationship has been well documented in other research as well. But the drive alone rate continued to drop when the commute service level increased from Moderate to High services, when only support services were added. This suggests that a robust package of support services, such as preferential parking, transit information, Guaranteed Ride Home, and bike/walk support can provide additional motivation to use non-SOV modes, above the influence of incentives.

Drive Alone Rates Increased When Parking was Abundant (Figure 21) – The drive alone rate rose as the parking ration increased – as more parking was available, more employees chose to drive to work. But rates increased only slightly until parking was available for nearly all employees. This suggests that even when very few employees were provided parking by their employers, employees who wanted to drive to work could find parking, either in onsite parking or in a nearby lot or garage.

![Figure 21](image)

Type of Transportation Used by Parking Availability
Percentage of Trips to the Worksite Made by Driving Alone
(0 - 25% n = 216, 26 - 50% n = 389, 51 - 75% n = 618, 76 - 90% n = 116, 91% or more n = 101)

Employees Who Had to Pay for Parking were Much Less Likely to Drive Alone to Work (Figure 22) – Parking fees had a distinct influence on employees’ travel choice, but only when the fee reached $100 per month. At that point, the percentage of weekly trips made by driving alone fell sharply. Only half of employees who paid between $100 and $124 per month drove alone to work, compared to about two-thirds of those who paid $100 or less. Driving alone was even less common when employees paid $125 per month for parking; these employees made only 30% of their weekly trips by driving alone.
Employees’ Satisfaction with Transportation and Search for New Options

Half of Employees Were Satisfied with their Commute (Figure 23) – About half of the employees surveyed said they were satisfied (22%) or very satisfied (25%) with their current commute. A quarter said they were not satisfied and 29% gave a middle of the road rating (3).

Employees who worked in High or Very high Urban areas appeared to be slightly more satisfied with their commute (50% were satisfied / very satisfied) than were employees in Low to Moderate Urban areas (43% satisfied / very satisfied), but this could be related to the higher share of bike/walk commuters in these areas rather than characteristics of the setting. Employees’ satisfaction with commuting did not seem to be related to how they traveled. For example, employees who primarily drove alone to work were equally satisfied (45% satisfied / very satisfied) as were employees who primarily used transit, carpool, bike or walk (47% satisfied / very satisfied).

As shown in Figure 23, when asked to rate specific features of their commutes, 70% of employees rated parking at work as good / very good and 48% said their commute comfort was good / very good. Employees were less satisfied with other commute features – particularly overall cost, parking cost, and parking at train stations.
Employees who primarily used transit, carpool, bike, and walk to get to work were more satisfied with their ability to relax and with overall commute cost than were employees who drove alone to work. But they were less satisfied than their drive alone co-workers with parking at work, parking cost, and commute comfort.

Half of the Employees Surveyed Sought Travel Assistance – Dissatisfaction with one’s commute could motivate employees to take actions to try to improve their commute and the survey results suggest this could be so. Half (49%) of the employees surveyed said they had sought information about transportation they could use to get to or around Arlington since they moved to their current work location. Four in ten (40%) looked for transit route or schedule information and a quarter looked for information on transit fares or passes, suggesting employees were willing to try new types of transportation and were likely receptive to learning about new options that might improve their commuting experience.

Employees who used transit or other non-SOV modes for their commute were much more likely to seek transportation information than were employees who primarily drove alone to work. Half of non-SOV mode users sought information, compared to only 37% of drive alone commuters.

Many Employees Were Willing to Consider Using other Types of Transportation (Figure 24) – It’s possible some of the employees who sought information subsequently tried a new mode. Nearly half (46%) of the employees surveyed said they had used or tried another type of transportation since starting to work at the current location. The most common modes tried were Metrorail (28%), bus (13%), and driving alone (15%).
Awareness of Local Commute Organizations Appeared to be Reinforced by Employer-Sponsored Commute Programs (Figure 25) – More than half of the employees surveyed said they were familiar with ART Transit (62%) and with the Commuter Stores (56%). About two in ten were aware of Bike Arlington (25%), CommuterPage.com (24%), ACCS (21%), and WalkArlington (20%). Employees who said they had access to commute services at their worksite were more likely to say they knew of these local commute services.
Commute Information and Benefits Influenced Employees’ Travel Choices (Figure 26) – Three-quarters of employees who used transit, carpool, bike, or walk said they received commute information or services that encouraged or helped them start using this type of transportation; half said they received a transit subsidy to start using bus or train. A quarter of these employees said they were not likely or only somewhat likely to have started using these forms of transportation without the service.

Figure 26
Commute Services Received to Start Using Transit, Carpool, Bike, or Walk (n = 743)
Percentage of Employees Naming the Service

- Transit subsidy: 50%
- Transit information: 11%
- Bike route: 8%
- Telecommute: 6%
- GRH: 4%
- Matchlist: 3%
- Carpool incentive: 3%

9% who received services said they were “not likely” to have started using transit, carpool, bike, or walk without the service. 17% said they were only “somewhat likely” to have started.
Appendices
Appendix A
Property Manager / Building Owner Interview Questions

Property Address/Building
Property manager interviewed, Contact phone, email

**Background**

Year built

Number of tenants

Number of tenants >100 employees (Names on separate sheet)

Number of tenants >25 employees (Names on separate sheet)

Percentage occupied

Types of tenants – business types

Estimated number of employees at location

Building services, amenities available in building / complex

Costs included in common area maintenance fee

**Transportation Satisfaction, Importance**

Factors important in attracting tenants – rate on scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Availability of parking, Transit availability, Building amenities, Access to business services in area,
Access to personal services in area, Access to workforce, General business climate in Arlington, Other

Ease of leasing this building compared to others owned/managed – Rating from 1 (difficult) to 5 (easy)

Comments/why easy or difficult:

Way / extent does quality of the transportation system affect your ability to manage the property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very negatively</th>
<th>Somewhat negatively</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat positively</th>
<th>Very positively</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Affects ability to attract tenants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Affects reputation of property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affects ability to maintain price at desired level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affects ease of operations (e.g. deliveries, service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall satisfaction ratings for transportation services – Rating from 1 (Low) to 5 (High)

Services in Arlington
Services in DC region
Parking Services

Who manages parking? (Building management, Parking management company, Other)

Number of parking spaces available: Total, Spaces leased to tenants, Set aside for non-tenants

Parking characteristics:
- Valet parking
- Van clearance
- Carpool, vanpool spaces available
- Bike parking available – if so, type (Lockers, Racks, Bike room, Other)
- Parking open for general public
- Advertise parking to public
- Parking shared with other bldgs
- Is parking adequate

How is parking allocated to tenants
- Parking bundled in building lease
- Minimum parking to each tenant – if yes, how many spaces / 1000 sq ft
- Can tenants pay for less parking than allocation?
- Can tenants buy more than lease allocation?
- Tenant/building negotiate
- Other

Are spaces reserved for individual tenants? (e.g., signed as reserved)

Parking charge to tenants - $ per month / per day, Extra cost for reserved parking

TDM Services Offered by Building Management

Read list of transportation information services or benefits that you or another organization might make available to tenants to help them get around Arlington or around the Washington region.

How interested have tenants/employees been? (1 – Low, 5 – High)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Benefit</th>
<th>Available now</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Employee Interest (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Transit schedules, transit maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Other onsite transportation information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Information on bicycle routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bicycle lockers or racks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Help planning public transportation trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Metro SmarTrip cards for bus or train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Metro bus tickets or tokens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Shuttle to Metro station or other destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reserved or preferential parking for CP/VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are services promoted to employee occupants (e.g., Internal email, Flyers, Mailings, Through employers, Self-service display, Other)

When were services first offered in the building

Reasons for offering services (e.g., Recruit tenants, Retain tenants, Government requirement, Reduce parking demand, Good neighbor, Socially conscious, Ease traffic around site, Other)

Received any assistance in developing services? What and from whom?

**Awareness and Use of Transportation Assistance**

Aware of: Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP), Arlington County Commuter Services, WMATA/Metro, Commuter Connections

**ATP services used or referred tenants to services**

- Brochure service – transportation information brochures
- Transportation info events and promotions in the building
- Self-service, “take-one” displays
- Metro trip planner – asst for planning Metrorail/Metrobus trips
- Support for commuter benefits coordinator
- Assistance to set up parking management
- Services for commuters (links to regional organizations
- Commuter Direct.com corporate services
- Assistance setting up free use of local bus as shuttle
- Other

Satisfaction with ATP services – Rating from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (Very satisfied)

In what ways have the services been useful?

How likely to recommend ATP services to other property managers
Rating from 1 (not at all likely) to 5 (Very likely)

**Demographics**

Position/department of interviewee
Length of time with company
Live in Arlington
Gender

**Other Comments**
Appendix B
Employer Tenant Interview/Survey Questionnaire

Organization Background

1 What is the primary work or business of your organization?

2 Which of the following best describes your organization type?
   1 Private company
   2 State or local government agency
   3 Federal government agency
   4 Non-profit organization or association
   6 Other (specify) ______________________
   9 Don’t know

3 How many employees work for your organization at this location?

4 Does your organization have other worksites in the Washington metropolitan region? (IF RESPONDENT ASKS, “what is included in the Washington metropolitan region?” SAY, “This would include the City of Washington and the Virginia and Maryland suburbs surrounding the City.”)

   IF employer has more than one location, ask Q5

5 About how many employees work for your organization at ALL locations in the Washington metropolitan region?

6 How often do clients, customers, or colleagues visit your organization at this location? Would you say it was... every day, a few times a week, a few times a month, or less than once per month?

Experience with Building / Location

10 How long has your organization been located in this building?

11 In what county was your organization located prior to moving to this building?

   IF employer was previously located in Arlington County, ask Q11a

11a Where in Arlington County was your office previously located?

12 When you were [selecting an office location, making the move to this building], what counties in the Washington metropolitan region did you consider, in addition to Arlington County?
13 Now I’m going to ask about factors <ORGANIZATION NAME> might have considered when moving to this location. First, how important was each of the following factors in considering in which neighborhood or area to locate? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means “very unimportant” and 5 means “very important.” How important was <FIRST RESPONSE> in selecting the neighborhood or area? <OTHER RESPONSES>

ROTAPE
1 _____ Ease of access for customers or clients
2 _____ Access to restaurants or shops in the neighborhood
3 _____ Cost per square foot of lease space
4 _____ Ease of commute for employees
5 _____ Commuting options that would be available to employees (e.g., train or bus service)
6 _____ Amount of parking available
7 _____ Willingness of existing employees to move to the new location
8 _____ Access to major highways

13a Were there any other factors you considered in your decision to select this neighborhood or area?

14 How important were the following factors in considering which specific building to select? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means “very unimportant” and 5 means “very important.”

ROTAPE
1 _____ Mix of tenants or types of tenants in the building
2 _____ Amenities in the building, for example, fitness center or convenience shopping
3 _____ Cost per square foot of lease space
4 _____ Duration of the lease
5 _____ Technology services available
6 _____ Distance to Metrorail
7 _____ Distance to bus stops
8 _____ Amount of parking available

14a Why did you select this building instead of other buildings you considered?

15 How satisfied you are with the transportation system in Arlington County? “Transportation system” means “transportation services and options that make it possible to travel around the County, as well as the quality of those services.” This would include such things as bus and train routes and stops, the quality of the buses, the quality of the roads, support services for transit, bicycling, walking, carpooling, and so forth. Overall, how satisfied are you with the County’s transportation system?

16 What concerns or comments, if any, do you have regarding Arlington County’s transportation system?
Next, I’ll read ways in which the availability or quality of the transportation system in Arlington County might affect your organization. For each, please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means the transportation system affects your business “very negatively” in this way and 5 means it affects your business “very positively.” A rating of 3 would mean transportation does not affect your organization in this way. First, how does the availability or quality of transportation affect <FIRST RESPONSE>?

ROTATE
1  ______ Your ability to recruit employees
2  ______ Employee attendance
3  ______ Employee morale or productivity
4  ______ Customers’ or clients’ ability to reach your business location
5  ______ Employees’ ability to travel for work-related meetings
6  ______ Cost or time to obtain supplies or deliveries

TDM Services Offered at Worksite or in Building

Now I want to ask about employees’ work schedules. Do any employees work any of the following compressed work schedules, in which they work a full-time schedule in fewer than five days per week?

1  4/40 schedule – four 10-hour days per week
2  3/36 schedule – three 12-hour days per week
3  9/80 schedule – nine days in two weeks, with a day off in alternating week

IF any employees work compressed schedule, ask Q20a
20a About what percentage of employees work a compressed schedule?

Next I’ll read a list of commute information services or benefits that <ORGANIZATION NAME> or another organization might make available to your employees to help with their travel to work. For each service that I mention, please tell me if <ORGANIZATION NAME> offers this to employees, if another organization offers it, or if it is not available.

(ROTATE)
1  Bus or train schedules or maps
2  Guaranteed Ride Home for employees who don’t drive alone to work and have a personal emergency during the work day
3  Reserved parking for carpools or vanpools
4  Metrochek, SmarTrip, or other financial benefit for employees who ride trains or buses to work
5  Cash or other financial benefit for employees who carpool or vanpool
6  Assistance finding a partner for a carpool or vanpool (ridematching)
7  Pre-tax account employees can use to pay transportation costs (“Commuter Choice”)
8  Bike racks or lockers.
9  Showers and personal lockers for employees who bicycle to work
10 Flextime or flex schedules – work schedules that permit employees to choose their work hours as long as they work a required number of hours
11 Telework or work at home or at a telework center at least occasionally
21a Are there other commute services or benefits that your organization offers to employees?

If any services are offered, ask Q22-Q23
22 How interested have employees been in these services? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means employees have been “not at all interested” and 5 means they have been “very interested.” How interested have employees been in <FIRST SERVICE NAME>? And in <OTHER SERVICE NAMES>?

23 In what year did your organization first offer commute information or assistance services to employees?

24 Why did your organization decide to provide these services?

25 When you were planning or implementing these services, did you receive any information or assistance from any organization or other resource that helped you implement them?

If any assistance was received, ask A26-Q27
26 What organization or resource provided the assistance?

26a What assistance did you receive?

27 If this assistance had not been available to you, how likely would you have been to implement these services? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means “very unlikely” to implement the services and 5 means “very likely” to implement them.

28 Now I’m going to read a list of benefits employers might receive from offering commute services to employees. For each, rate the level of benefit <ORGANIZATION NAME> has received. Please use a scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 means <ORGANIZATION NAME> has received “no benefit” in this area from offering services and 5 means you’ve received a “great benefit” in this area. How much has <ORGANIZATION NAME> benefited in <FIRST RESPONSE> from offering commute services? <ADDITIONAL BENEFITS>

1 Enhancing employee recruitment
2 Reducing need for parking, reduced parking-related costs
3 Fulfilling obligation that came with building
4 Reducing need for office space
5 Attracting more qualified employees
6 Reducing operating costs
7 Enhancing employee morale
8 Reducing absenteeism
9 Increasing employee productivity

Parking Services

30 Does your organization own or lease parking in the building for employees’ use?

31 How many parking spaces are available in this building for your employees’ use?

If any parking is leased, ask Q31a-Q32a
31a Is this also the number of spaces allocated to your organization in your lease agreement?

32a Is the cost of this parking included in the building space lease or can your organization pay for fewer parking spaces than allocated in the lease?
32b  Is the parking that is available in this building adequate to meet employees' parking needs?

33  Does your organization own or lease parking spaces in another location for use by employees at this location?

   If any parking is leased, ask Q33a-Q33b
33a  How many spaces do you own or lease at this other location?
33b  How far from this location is this additional parking? (blocks)

35  Do employees pay to park at any of the parking that your organization owns or leases?

   If any parking fee is charged, ask Q35a-Q35b
35a  What amount do employees pay?
35b  Does your organization pay part or all of the parking cost for some or all employees?
35c  What amount does your organization pay per employee? (Please enter the amount in one of the boxes below, but not both.)

36  Does your organization own or lease additional parking spaces for use by clients, customers, or other visitors?

   If any parking is leased for visitors, ask Q36a
36a  How many spaces do you own or lease for visitors?
36b  Do visitors pay a charge to park? (Please check all that apply) (NOTE TO PROGRAMMER: DO NOT ACCEPT MULTIPLES FOR 1 OR 9)

   If any parking fee is charged to visitors, ask Q36c
36c  What is the parking charge for visitors?

Awareness and Use of Transportation Assistance

40  Now I’ll read names of several organizations and programs that provide transportation information and assistance in Arlington. For each, please indicate if you have heard of the organization or program.

   ROTATE LIST
1  Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS)
2  The Commuter Store
3  CommuterPage.com
4  CommuterDirect.com
5  Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP)
6  Arlington Transit (ART)
7  Metro / Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
8  Commuter Connections

   If aware of any service, ask Q41 for services mentioned in Q40
41  Have you used any services provided by these organizations or referred employees to these services?
If used any ATP service, ask Q42-Q44
42 How satisfied have you been with the services you have received from ATP? Please use a scale of 1 to 5 for your answer, where “1” means “not at all satisfied” and “5” means “very satisfied.”

If not satisfied with ATP service, ask Q42a
42a For what reasons have you not been satisfied with ATP’s services?

43 How useful have ATP’s services been to your organization? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where “1” means not at all useful and “5” means “very useful.”

43a In what ways have the services been useful to your organization?

44 How likely are you to recommend ATP services to other companies? Are you, very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, neither unlikely nor likely, somewhat likely, very likely to recommend ATP?

Open-Ended Comment Box

Finally, is there anything else you’d like to comment on, related to transportation around Arlington County?

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Appendix C
Employee Travel Survey Questionnaire

Introductory Page for Online Questionnaire:

Arlington County Commuter Services is conducting this online survey about transportation issues and services among employees in the County. [COMPANY] is assisting the County with the survey and we thank you for participating. Your answers will be completely confidential. The survey will take about 10-15 minutes.

Employees who complete the survey will be entered into a prize drawing for $200 gift certificates to Giant grocery, Target, and Amazon. The first [Starbucks cap] employees who complete the survey will receive a $5 Starbucks gift card as an additional thank you gift.

Please complete this survey by [Survey End Date], 2007.

For most questions, simply click your response or write your answer in the text box provided. To go back to earlier questions, just use your browser’s back button. There is a link on every page that you can click to get help if you have any problems or questions.

To go to the first question, simply click the [CONTINUE] button below.

Work Schedule and Travel to Work

1  In a TYPICAL week, how many weekdays (Monday – Friday) do you work? If the number of days varies from one week to another, please check the number that is most typical.

   1  1 day
   2  2 days
   3  3 days
   4  4 days
   5  5 days
   6  4 days one week and 5 days the next week (9/80 compressed work schedule)

2  In a typical week, how many weekdays do you work at [street address], for all or part of the day? If the number of days varies from one week to another, please check the number that is most typical. If you work a compressed schedule, please check the number of days you are at this location in a week you DO NOT have your compressed schedule day off.”

   1  1 day
   2  2 days
   3  3 days
   4  4 days
   5  5 days
   0  0 days (SKIP TO Q4)
3 How many weekdays do you typically use each of the following types of transportation to get to [street address]? If you use more than one type on a single day (e.g., walk to the bus stop, then ride the bus), count only the type you use for the longest distance part of your trip.

IF RESPONDENT ADVANCES TO NEXT QUESTION AND SUM OF Q3, R1-R8 NE Q2, PROMPT, “You said you typically work at this location [Q2 days]. Please indicate how you travel for all of those days.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Transportation</th>
<th>Number of Weekdays Used (0–5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Drive alone, motorcycle, taxi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ride a bus (Metro, ART, other bus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ride Metrorail or subway train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ride a commuter train (VRE, MARC, Amtrak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Carpool or vanpool (ride or drive with others in a car, truck, van, or SUV, dropped off)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other (describe) ___________________________</td>
<td>TOTAL WEEKDAYS (SUM OF 1-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF Q3, RESPONSE 5 = 0 OR BLANK, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q4

3a Including yourself, how many people usually ride in your carpool or vanpool? ______________

INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q4
IF Q1 = 6 (9/80 SCHEDULE) AND Q3 SUM = 5, AUTOCODE Q4, RESPONSE 7 = 1, THEN SKIP TO Q5
IF Q1 NE 6 AND Q3 SUM = 5, SKIP TO Q5

4 On the weekdays that you DO NOT work at this location, how many days do you do each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Number of Weekdays (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Have a compressed work schedule days off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Have a regular day off – not compressed work schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Work at home all day (telework, telecommute)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Work at client’s or customer’s office in the Washington metro area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Travel outside the Washington metro area for business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Some other situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 9/80 compressed schedule day off (AUTOCODE ONLY, DO NOT SHOW ON SCREEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF Q4, RESPONSE 3 (TELEWORK) = 1 OR 2, AUTOCODE Q5 = 1, AUTOCODE Q5a = 3, THEN SKIP TO Q6
IF Q4, RESPONSE 3 (TELEWORK) = 3 OR 4, AUTOCODE Q5 = 1, AUTOCODE Q5a = 4, THEN SKIP TO Q6
IF Q4, RESPONSE 3 (TELEWORK) = 5, AUTOCODE Q5 = 1, AUTOCODE Q5a = 5

IF Q2 = 0, AND Q4, RESPONSE 3 (TELEWORK) > 0, SET PRIMARY MODE = TELEWORK, THEN SKIP TO Q7
IF Q2 = 0 AND Q4, RESPONSE 3 (TELEWORK) = 0, SET PRIMARY MODE = UNKNOWN, THEN SKIP TO Q7
5 Do you ever telework or telecommute; that is, do you ever work at home or at a telework center for an entire work day, instead of traveling to [street address]?

1 Yes
2 No (SKIP TO Q6)
9 Don’t know (SKIP TO Q6)

5a How often do you usually telework / telecommute?

1 Less than one time per month
2 1–3 times a month
3 1–2 days a week
4 3–4 days a week
5 5 or more days a week
6 Other (Please describe__________________________)
7 Don’t know

6 When you work at [street address], at what time do you usually arrive at work and what time do you leave work? If your arrival or departure times vary from one day to the next, please enter what is most typical.

6a Arrive at work: _______________
6b Leave work: _______________

7 About how many miles is it from your home to this work location?

_______
888 Don’t know

IF Q2 = 0, SKIP TO Q13

8 And how many minutes does your trip to work usually take you?
Number of minutes ___________
888 Don’t know

9 On days that you drive to work, where do you park? If you don’t usually drive to work, please check where you would park, if you needed to drive.

1 In a lot or garage at this work location
2 In a company-owned/leased lot or garage off-site
3 In a public or private lot or garage nearby
4 On the street
5 Other location (please describe) ______________________
9 Don’t know (SKIP TO Q10)

9a How much do you, or would you, pay to park at this location?

$_______ per: day / month (check one)
999 No charge, I park or would park for free
Trips Around the Work Location

10 In a typical week, how many days do you make trips in the neighborhood or area around your work location at lunch or other times during your workday?

1 Never  **(SKIP TO Q13)**
2 1 to 2 days per week
3 3 or more days per week
9 Don’t know  **(SKIP TO Q13)**

11 How often do you use each of the following types of transportation for these trips?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Transportation</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 days per week</th>
<th>3 or more days per week</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Drive alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Carpool / ride with another person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ride a bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ride Metrorail / other train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commute Satisfaction

13 How long have you worked in this building?

_________ months / years (select one)

9 Don’t know

14 Before you started working in this building, in what jurisdiction did you work?

1 I didn’t work then
2 Arlington County, VA
3 City of Alexandria, VA
4 District of Columbia
5 Fairfax County, VA
6 Loudoun County, VA
7 Montgomery County, MD
8 Prince George’s County, MD
9 Prince William County, VA
10 Other location ____________________
9 Don’t know
15 When you were considering working in this building, what factors were important to your decision? (Please check all that apply). If you have changed jobs or positions since you started working at this location, please answer for the first job you had at this location.

ROTATE RESPONSES 1 - 9
1  Wanted to stay with this employer, employer was moving to this building
2  Length, ease of commute
3  Cost of commuting
4  Commuting options that would be available (e.g., transit)
5  Job location near family or friends
6  Entertainment, shopping, services nearby
7  Income, salary
8  Job satisfaction
9  Career advancement
19  Don’t know

15a Were any other factors important to you? If yes, please list them below. (Open-ended)

__________________________________________________________________________

16 How important to your decision were transportation or commuting factors compared to the other factors you considered? Were they less important than other factors, more important, or about the same importance?

1  Less important
2  More important
3  About the same importance
9  Don’t know

IF PRIMARY MODE = TELEWORK, SKIP TO Q19
IF PRIMARY MODE = UNKNOWN, SKIP TO Q25

17 Overall, how satisfied are you with your trip to work now? Please use a scale of 1 to 5 for your answer, where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you rate your trip to work on each of the following features? Please use a scale of 1 to 5 for your answer, where “1” means “very poor” and “5” means “very good.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation features</th>
<th>Rating for Your Trip to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Variety of transportation options I could use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ability to relax on the trip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parking expense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Availability of parking at work location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Availability of parking at train station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total time required to make the trip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Consistency/reliability of travel time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Define Primary Mode

Primary mode = Q3 mode used most days
If tie for primary mode, choose in this order: ride metrorail, ride a commuter train, ride a bus, carpool/vanpool, walk, bicycle, drive alone, use another type of transportation. Do not allow compressed schedule to be primary mode.

You said you typically <primary mode: drive alone, ride Metrorail, ride a commuter train, ride a bus, carpool or vanpool, walk, bicycle, use another type of transportation> to work. How long have you been using this type of transportation?

_________ months / years (select one)

9 Don’t know

What prompted you to start using this type of transportation?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

If primary mode = Drive alone, skip to Q22
21 Did you receive any of the following types of information or services from your employer, from an organization that provides commute information, or any other person or organization that encouraged or helped you to work?

1. Free or discounted transit pass, transit subsidy (ex Metrochek, SmarTrip)
2. Carpool subsidy or financial incentive (NuRide)
3. Transit route or schedule information
4. Help finding carpool / vanpool partner
5. Reserved parking for carpools or vanpools
6. Bicycle route information
7. My employer/supervisor let me start telecommuting
8. Guaranteed ride home (GRH)
9. Some other service (please specify)________________________
10. No, didn’t receive any information or service
88. Don’t know

21a If these services had not been available to you, how likely would you have been to?

1. Very likely
2. Somewhat likely
3. Not likely
9. Don’t know

22 Since you started working in this building, have you used or tried any type of transportation for your trip to work, that you are not using now? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Yes
2. No (SKIP TO Q24)
9. Don’t know (SKIP TO Q24)

22a What type or types of transportation did you use or try? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Drive alone
2. Bus
3. Metrorail
4. Commuter rail (VRE, MARC, Amtrak)
5. Carpool or vanpool
6. Bicycle
7. Walk
8. Other _____________________________
23 Did you receive any of the following types of information or services from your employer, from an organization that provides commute information, or any other person or organization that encouraged or helped you use or try this type of transportation?

1 Free or discounted transit pass, transit subsidy (ex Metrochek, SmarTrip)
2 Carpool subsidy or financial incentive (NuRide)
3 Transit route or schedule information
4 Help finding carpool / vanpool partner
5 Reserved parking for carpools or vanpools
6 Bicycle route information
7 My employer/supervisor let me start telecommuting
8 Guaranteed ride home (GRH)
9 Some other service (please specify)__________________________
10 No, didn’t receive any information or service
88 Don’t know

IF PRIMARY MODE = TELEWORK, SKIP TO Q25

Awareness and Use of Travel Services

24 Listed below are services or benefits that might be available to you at work to help you with your trip to work. They could be offered by your employer, by the company that manages the building you work in, or by another organization. For each service or benefit, indicate ... if the service is available and you have used it at any time, if it is available but you have not used it, if it is not available, or if you’re not sure.

Service or Benefit | 1 - Available and I have used it | 2 - Available, but I have not used it | 3 - Not available | 9 - Not sure
-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------
1 Help finding carpool / vanpool partners, “carpool matchlist”
2 Transit schedule or route information
3 Telecommuting/telecommute information
4 Bicycle/walking information
5 Guaranteed Ride Home in case of emergencies
6 Short-term use of shared vehicle during the workday (e.g., carsharing, ZipCar, FlexCar)
7 Discounted transit pass or other financial benefit for employees who ride trains or buses to work
8 Cash or other financial benefit for employees who carpool
9 Cash or other financial benefit for employees who vanpool
10 Reserved or preferential parking for carpools/vanpools
11 Secure parking for bicycles
12 Personal lockers or showers for employees who bicycle
13 Free parking
14 Other (describe ____________________________)
IF Q24 = 1 (available and I have used) OR 2 (available, but I have not used it) for any response 1 - 13, ASK Q24a, OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q25.
IN Q24a, SHOW ONLY Q24 RESPONSES THAT WERE MARKED AS 1 OR 2

24a Who provides these services or benefits? For each service, indicate if it is provided by your employer, by the company that manages the building you work in, or by another organization.

ALLOW RESPONDENTS TO SKIP INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Benefit</th>
<th>Employer provided</th>
<th>Building management</th>
<th>Other organization</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Help finding carpool / vanpool partners, “carpool matchlist”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transit schedule or route information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Telecommuting/telecommute information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bicycle/walking information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Guaranteed Ride Home in case of emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Short-term used of shared vehicle during the workday (e.g., carsharing, ZipCar, FlexCar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Discounted transit pass or other financial benefit for employees who ride trains or buses to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cash or other financial benefit for employees who carpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cash or other financial benefit for employees who vanpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Reserved or preferential parking for carpools/vanpools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Secure parking for bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Personal lockers or showers for employees who bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Free parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 In the past year, have you sought information on transportation you could use to get to [street address] or around Arlington? This could have been for travel to work, school, shopping, or other purposes.

1 Yes
2 No (SKIP TO Q26)
88 don’t know (SKIP TO Q26)

25a What sources did you use or contact to obtain this information or services?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
25b What information or services were you seeking? (check all that apply)
ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES FOR 1 – 13 ONLY

1. Transit schedule / route information
2. Carpool, vanpool (rideshare) information
3. Help finding carpool/vanpool partners, matchlist
4. Guaranteed ride home
5. Parking information
6. Telecommute information
7. Bicycle, walking information
8. Road construction information
9. MetroChek, SmarTrip
10. Metro fares, Metro passes
11. Travel directions, driving directions
13. Other (please describe ____________________________)

88. Don’t know

26 Shown below is a list of organizations and programs that provide transportation information and assistance in employees in Arlington. For each, please indicate if you have heard of the organization or program and if you have used services provided by the organization.

ALLOW RESPONDENTS TO SKIP INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization / Program</th>
<th>Have used services of the organization</th>
<th>Know of organization but have not used services</th>
<th>Don’t know of the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Commuter Store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CommuterPage.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CommuterDirect.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Walk Arlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bike Arlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Arlington Transit (ART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Metro / Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Commuter Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF Q26 = “have used services” for any response 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 OR 6, ASK Q27, OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q28
27. Which of the following services provided by these organizations have you used? (check all that apply) 

ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES FOR 2 – 13 ONLY. DO NOT ACCEPT MULTIPLES WITH RESPONSES 1 OR 88.

1. None of these services
2. Guaranteed ride home
3. Rideshare (carpool/vanpool) information
4. Help finding carpool/vanpool partners, matchlists
5. Transit schedule/route information
6. HOV lane information
7. Park & ride lot information, parking information
8. Telecommute information
9. Bicycle/walking information
10. Road construction information
11. Carsharing, ZipCar, FlexCar
12. Metrochek, SmartTrip, transit passes
13. Other (please describe ______________________)

88. Don’t know

IF Q24 = 1 (used service) FOR ANY RESPONSE 1-12 OR Q27 = ANY OF 2-12, ASK Q28, OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q30

28. How useful were these services you used to you? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where “1” means not at all useful and “5” means “very useful.”

Not at all useful

1  2  3  4  5  9

Very useful

Don’t know

IF Q28 = 1, 2, OR 9, SKIP TO Q30
IF Q28 = 3, 4, OR 5, ASK Q28a

28a. In what ways have the services been useful to you?
______________________________________________________________

DEMOGRAPHICS

30. In what year were you born?

19 ___ ___

31. In total, how many motor vehicles, in working condition, including automobiles, trucks, vans, and highway motorcycles are owned or leased by members of your household?

_______ number of vehicles

88. Prefer not to answer

32. What is your zip code at home? ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
33 How far from your home is the nearest bus stop?

1 Less than ½ mile
2 Between ½ mile and 1 mile
3 More than 1 mile but less than 2 miles
4 2 or more miles
9 Don’t know

34 How far from your home is the nearest train/subway station (ex., Metrorail, VRE, MARC)?

1 Less than ½ mile
2 Between ½ mile and 1 mile
3 More than 1 mile but less than 2 miles
4 2 or more miles
9 Don’t know

35 Which of the following best describes your job or occupation?

1 Professional, such as doctor, lawyer, engineer
2 Executive, Administrative, Managerial
3 Administrative support or technical support
4 Retail or sales
5 Service, such as a restaurant worker
6 Building/development/construction
7 Other (please describe _________________________)
9 Prefer not to answer

36 Which one of the following best describes your racial background?

1 African-American or Black
2 American Indian or Alaska Native
3 Asian
4 Hispanic or Latino
5 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
6 White, non-Hispanic
7 Other. Specify: ______________________________
9 Prefer not to answer

37 Which category best represents your household’s total annual income

1 Less than $20,000
2 $20,000 - $29,999
3 $30,000 - $39,999
4 $40,000 - $49,999
5 $50,000 - $59,999
6 $60,000 - $79,999
7 $80,000 - $99,999
8 $100,000 - $119,999
9 $120,000 - $139,999
10 $140,000 - $159,999
11 $160,000 or more
88 Prefer not to answer
38 Are you female or male?

1 Female
2 Male
9 Prefer not to answer

Open-Ended Comment Box

Is there anything else you’d like to comment on, related to your trip to work, or transportation around your work location, in Arlington, or around the Washington metropolitan region? If so, please describe it here.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey. Your input is very important!

We are entering all employees who complete the survey into a drawing for $200 gift certificates to Giant grocery, Target, and Amazon.

We also are sending $5.00 Starbuck’s gift card to the first [Starbucks cap] employees who complete the survey as a thank you for participating. If you would like to be entered into the drawing or receive the gift card, please provide your name and phone number or email address below.

This contact information will be used only for this survey. We will not provide your contact information to any other organization for any purpose.

Name _________________________________________________________________
Email or Phone number _________________________________________________