



**THE KENSINGTON GROUP, INC.**  
Information and Analysis for Effective Decisions

## **MPO TRANSPORTATION SURVEY**

**JULY, 2002**

**Prepared for:**

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Background and Purpose</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Summary of Findings</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Primary Transportation Mode</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Substitute Transportation Mode - Temporary Loss</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Alternative Transportation Mode - Permanent Loss</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Transportation Habits - Commute Distance</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Transportation Habits - Commute Time</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Transportation Habits/Patterns</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Transportation Characteristics - Descriptions</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Transportation Characteristics - Importance Comparisons</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Transportation Characteristics - County Results</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Transportation Mode - Personal Vehicle Evaluation</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Transportation Mode - Public Vehicle Evaluation</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Respondent Background</b>	<b>21</b>

## Background and Purpose

The Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is in the process of conducting *DIRECTIONS*, the Rapid Transit Study to Improve Regional Mobility. Planners would like to better understand the views of constituents related to transportation in the planning area. The information gathered from this research will be used to support the *DIRECTIONS* planning initiative. The specific objectives guiding this research include:

- To determine the relative importance of transportation selection criteria;
- To determine commuter travel practices and habits;
- To determine commuters' evaluations of transportation criteria relative to public and private modes of transportation;
- To establish transit benchmark for trending.

## Method

In order to accomplish these objectives, a telephone survey was conducted with a sample of Central Indiana residents. The planning area, and, therefore the sampling area, for this project was defined by zip code and by county based upon information provided by the MPO. The counties and associated zip codes in the MPO study area are detailed below. A directory-listed sample was used for this project because of the well-defined sampling parameters. It also contributed to reducing survey costs. This effort helped to ensure that residents of these particular areas were more likely to be included in the sampling area.

<b>Boone</b>	<b>Hamilton</b>	<b>Hancock</b>	<b>Hendricks</b>	<b>Johnson</b>
46052	46011	46040	46077	46106
46069	46032	46055	46112	46110
46071	46033	46064	46113	46113
46075	46034	46126	46118	46124
46077	46038	46130	46122	46131
46112	46040	46140	46123	46142
46149	46051	46161	46149	46143
46167	46055	46163	46157	46151
46268	46060	46229	46158	46160
46278	46064	46235	46167	46162
	46069	46236	46168	46184
	46074	46239	46231	46217
	46077	46259	46234	46227
	46240		46241	46237
	46250		46278	46259
	46256			
	46260			
	46268			
	46280			
	46290			

<b>Madison</b>	<b>Marion</b>	<b>Marion</b>	<b>Morgan</b>	<b>Shelby</b>
46011	46032	46221	46106	46110
46013	46033	46222	46111	46124
46040	46038	46224	46113	46126
46048	46055	46225	46118	46130
46051	46077	46226	46143	46131
46060	46107	46227	46151	46140
46064	46112	46228	46157	46161
	46113	46229	46158	46162
	46123	46231	46160	46163
	46140	46234	46168	46176
	46142	46235		46182
	46143	46236		46259
	46163	46237		
	46201	46239		
	46202	46240		
	46203	46241		
	46204	46250		
	46205	46254		
	46208	46256		
	46214	46259		
	46216	46260		
	46217	46268		
	46218	46278		
	46219	46280		
	46220	46290		

A total of 891 interviews was conducted with 400 interviews being accomplished to represent the views of constituents in the *entire* study area. These interviews were complemented with over-quota interviews to obtain at least 200 completed interviews within the four counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity. The distribution of the representative sample and the number of over-quota interviews are provided below.

	<u>Representative Interviews</u>	<u>Over-quota Interviews</u>	<u>County-specific Interviews</u>
Boone	11		
Hamilton	51	149	200
Hancock	14		
Hendricks	26	174	200
Johnson	32	168	200
Madison	30		
Marion	212	-	212
Morgan	16		
Shelby	8		
Total*	400	491	

\* 400 interviews is +/- 5% (in the worst case scenario) at the 95% confidence level while 200 interviews is +/- 7% (in the worst case scenario) at the 95% confidence level.

Interviewing began on July 18, 2003, and concluded on July 30, 2003. Respondents were screened to meet the following qualifications:

- 21 years of age or older;
- employed full-time or part-time;
- commute at least one mile to work;

Stone Research Services was responsible for all telephone interviewing.

## **Technical Notes**

### Statistical Testing

Statistical tests of significance were used to explore the apparent differences between various populations. The tabulated data shows a significant difference at the 95% and 90% confidence levels. The narrative report will highlight these statistical differences. In addition, an "a, b, c, . . ." has been used to indicate a significant difference between specific data in the identified columns.

When interpreting tables in this report, the reader should remember that statistical significance should not replace sound judgement where extremely slight differences exist. Although differences of one percent may cause one attribute to be ordered ahead of another, this difference is not large enough to support decision-making.

### Rounding

The tables that appear in this report may not add to 100% due to rounding. Generally, a percentage of .5 or greater was elevated to the next whole percent while a percentage of .4 or less was dropped to represent a whole percent. Some variation in this rule was used due to the small base sizes involved.

### Additional Information

Additional information about the survey, such as the questionnaire, sample specifications, and tabulated data, are available from **MPO Senior Planner, Philip Roth, at 317-327-5149 (proth@indygov.org)**.

## Executive Summary

This Executive Summary highlights the primary findings from the MPO Transportation Survey. Readers are directed to the Summary of Findings for more detailed information.

- Almost all (97%) participants reported a personal vehicle as their primary mode of transportation. Use of public transportation was about 2% overall for the study area, all from Marion County.
- Another personal vehicle was the transportation mode of choice for about three-fourths (78%) of the participants if their primary mode was not available for *a day or two*. Intended use of public transportation increased to about 8% in this scenario. About 5% would use another form of transportation, such as walking or biking. However, one in ten (10%) respondents indicated there was “No alternative” or they “Don’t know” what they would do in this situation.
- Individuals representing higher income households significantly more often indicated their substitute mode of transportation would be a personal vehicle in this scenario. In contrast, participants who represent lower income households more often commented that they would use public transportation. This is also true of Marion County residents.
- A scenario of removing the primary mode of transportation *permanently* was presented to participants for consideration. This exercise resulted in 43% indicating some form of personal transportation being used as a substitute. Anticipated use of public transportation increased to 17% while nearly one-third (31%) commented that they had “No alternative” or “Don’t know” what they would do for transportation. Those mentioning another form of transportation, such as walking or biking, increased to 9%.
- The average commute distance (one-way) within the study area was about 15 miles. This compared to an average commute time of about 23 minutes. And, as with distance, those who resided within the three counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity (other than Marion County) had a longer commute.
- It was not surprising that residents who reside within the three counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity reported a longer commute time than did residents of Marion County. Also, male participants and those who made stops during a commute registered a greater travel time.
- The majority of commuters (80%) travel directly from home to work. However, about one-fifth (20%) trip-chain, making one or more stops on their way to or from work. Among those who trip-chain, the majority (74%) makes one stop. About one-fifth (21%) of those who trip-chain, 4% of total survey respondents, made two stops. A few (3%) reported six or more stops. Participants travelling a greater distance more often made a greater number of stops per trip. However, the average number of stops revealed a bimodal distribution. That is, individuals traveling less than 15 minutes or more than 30 minutes more often made a greater number of stops per trip.
- About 10% of the respondents commuted to downtown Indianapolis. The average speed to work was about 35 mph (miles per hour) throughout the study area. However, the speed significantly decreased for residents within Marion County to 31 mph.
- Participants were asked to consider the importance of five general transportation characteristics. During this exercise, respondents were read a rotated pair of characteristics and asked to indicate which of the two is more important to them. The description of each characteristic, as was read to the respondent, is presented below.

- **Personal Safety.** - this refers to protecting you or your belongings while waiting for transportation or while travelling in a vehicle.
- **Reliability** - this refers to the dependability of a particular mode of travel to get you to and from your destinations in the time and manner expected.
- **Travel time** - this refers to the amount of time it usually takes you to get to work or to get home from work.
- **Personal Cost.** - this refers to the amount you pay for transportation including any daily fares for public transportation or the total cost of using a personal vehicle such as fuel, insurance, parking and up-keep.
- **Personal Comfort and Convenience** - this refers to the physical amenities like adjustable seats and climate control, as well as weather-related aspects of travel including the impact of inclement weather and having the flexibility to change your route or schedule as needed.

• Personal Safety and Reliability were most often selected as “more important.” Personal Safety “wins” in each paired importance comparison, while Reliability was selected in all comparisons except when paired with Personal Safety. Travel Time was next most important with Personal Cost and Personal Comfort/Convenience least important.

• Respondents who commuted a greater distance tended to more often focus on the importance of Personal Safety when compared to Travel Time and Personal Comfort/Convenience. Also, these individuals more often placed emphasis on Reliability as compared to Travel Time.

• Individuals representing higher income households more often selected Reliability, Travel Time and Personal Comfort/Convenience as compared to Personal Cost. Similarly, individuals with more formal education frequently placed emphasis on Travel Time and Personal Comfort/Convenience than Personal Cost.

• Some of the specific significant differences within the particular characteristic pairs are highlighted below.

#### Personal Safety - Travel Time

- Participants who commuted a greater distance more often identified Personal Safety as being important when comparing Personal Safety to Travel Time.

#### Reliability - Travel Time

- Respondents who commuted a greater distance placed importance significantly more often on Reliability.

#### Reliability - Personal Cost

- Those who trip-chain and individuals representing higher income households significantly more often selected Reliability when compared with Personal Cost.

#### Travel Time - Personal Cost

- Respondents representing higher income households and individuals who have more formal education significantly more often selected Travel Time as being more important than Personal Cost. Also, it was interesting to note that participants from Johnson County more often selected Personal Cost. Hamilton County residents placed more importance on Travel Time.

#### Personal Cost - Personal Comfort/Convenience

- Wealthier respondents and those who had more formal education more often selected Personal Comfort/Convenience over Personal Cost. In contrast, those representing lower income households and those with less formal education more often selected Personal Cost.

- About one-half or more of the respondents rated favorably (9 or 10 using a 10-point scale) the Personal Safety (46%), Reliability (60%), Travel Time (55%), and Personal Comfort/Convenience (62%) of a personal vehicle. Only one-fifth (19%) viewed Personal Cost favorably.

- In contrast, one-fourth or fewer respondents rate a public vehicle favorably for the same characteristics. However, Personal Cost and Reliability received relatively higher ratings.

- Detailed results revealed several interesting differences in evaluations of the personal vehicle mode of transportation. Females tended to rate most characteristics more favorably than males. In addition, those who represented households with a higher income and those who had more formal education tended to favorably evaluate a personal vehicle mode of transportation for Comfort/Convenience and Reliability.

- Ten percent (10%) of respondents rated the public mode of transportation as a “9”, or “10” overall. Participants with less formal education and those representing a lower income household more often responded with a positive overall evaluation of public transportation.

- Personal Cost (24%) and Reliability (19%) of public transportation were relatively more favorably evaluated as compared to the other transportation characteristics. In contrast, only about 5% viewed the Personal Comfort/Convenience (6%) and Travel Time (5%) favorably.

- Detailed findings revealed that males more favorably evaluated public transportation overall and for Reliability and Personal Safety. Also, those with less formal education and those representing lower income households more favorably evaluated the public transportation overall and for Personal Comfort/Convenience.

## Summary of Findings

This report details the major findings from Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Transportation Survey. Primary focus is on the aggregate results with special emphasis on counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity.

### Primary Transportation Mode

- Nearly all (97%) participants indicated a personal vehicle was their primary mode of transportation for commuting to and from work. However, public transportation was the primary mode of transportation among 2% of respondents in the representative study area, or 4% of Marion county residents.
- There was a tendency for respondents representing higher income households to significantly more often respond that a personal vehicle was their primary mode of transportation. Also, respondents who trip-chain (made stops on the way to and/or from work) significantly more often indicated a personal vehicle as their primary transportation mode.

	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>	<u>Hendricks</u>	<u>Johnson</u>	<u>Marion</u>
Base: Representative Sample	(400)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Primary mode of transportation</u>					
Personal vehicle (Net)	97	100e	100e	100e	95
Public vehicle (Net)	2	-	-	-	4
Other	1	-	-	-	1

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level. (Net) indicates an unduplicated count of the number of similar responses.

\*\* See Q. 1a, tabulated data

### Substitute Transportation Mode - Temporary Loss of Primary Mode

- Participants were presented with a scenario that involved the unavailability of their primary mode of transportation *for a day or two*. Most individuals would continue to use another personal vehicle. This would include requesting a ride with a friend, car pooling, renting a car, etc. The use of public transportation would increase to 8% while a substantial number of respondents (10%) indicated a “Don’t know” or “No alternative” response. The detailed findings revealed that nearly 7% commented that they would be unable to go to work if their primary mode of transportation was unavailable for a day or two. In addition, about 5% indicated that they would find another way to work, such as walking or bicycling.
- Individuals representing higher income households significantly more often indicated their substitute mode of transportation would be a personal vehicle. In contrast, participants who represented lower income households more often commented that they would use public transportation. This is also true of Marion County residents.

Base: Representative Sample	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u> (400) a	<u>Hamilton</u> (200) b	<u>Hendricks</u> (200) c	<u>Johnson</u> (200) d	<u>Marion</u> (211) e
<u>Substitute mode of transportation</u>					
Personal vehicle (Net)	78	78	80	79	78
Public vehicle (Net)	8	3	4	5	12bcd
Other	5	4	4	5	3
No alternative/Don’t know (Net)	10	15e	13e	12e	6

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

(Net) indicates an unduplicated count of the number of similar responses.

\*\* See Q. 1b, tabulated data

### Alternative Transportation Mode - Permanent Loss of Primary Mode

- Survey participants were asked for a solution to an extreme situation that involved *never* having their primary mode of commuter transportation available again. Their responses suggest that public transportation would be the alternative for 17% of the commuters. Participants representing households with a lower annual income (\$50,000 or less), those having a shorter commute, and residents of Marion County significantly more often choose public transportation.
- The frequency with which individuals identify personal transportation as a substitute declined to 43%. However, a dramatic increase was noted in “No alternative” and “Don’t know” responses. Nearly one-third (31%) was unsure of an alternative if their primary mode of transportation was unavailable permanently. Individuals who traveled a greater distance, or a greater amount of time, significantly more often responded in this manner. Similarly, respondents from counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity (except Marion County) significantly more often responded “No alternative/Don’t know.” Some individuals suggested that they would find a new job, quit work, or move to a different location.

Base: Representative Sample	<b>Total</b> (400)	<b>County</b>			
		<b>Hamilton</b> (200)	<b>Hendricks</b> (200)	<b>Johnson</b> (200)	<b>Marion</b> (211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Alternative mode of transportation</u>					
Personal vehicle (Net)	43	41	44	44	42
Public vehicle (Net)	17	9	6	10	26bcd
Other	9	7	10	8	8
No alternative/Don’t know (Net)	31	44e	41e	39e	24

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

(Net) indicates an unduplicated count of the number of similar responses.

\*\* See Q. 1c, tabulated data

## Transportation Habits - Commute Distance

- Slightly more than one-half (56%) of the survey respondents traveled ten or fewer miles one-way to or from work. This compares to nearly one in ten (9%) that traveled in excess of 30 miles to or from work. Individuals in the MPO study area commuted an average of 15 miles one-way. Respondents who reside within counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity (except Marion County) traveled a greater distance. Also, those who trip-chain (making stops during a commute) tended to travel a greater distance.
- Significantly more Marion County residents, almost two-thirds (63%), traveled less than 10 miles to work one-way in contrast to residents in the other counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity. In addition, it appears that higher income households traveled a greater distance as compared to lower income households. Also, it was interesting to note that males traveled a greater distance to and from work than did females.

Base: Representative Sample	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>	<u>Hendricks</u>	<u>Johnson</u>	<u>Marion</u>
	(400)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Miles to Work (one-way)</b>					
1-5 miles	29	19	17	26	28bc
6-10 miles	27	24	23	20	35bcd
11-15 miles	13	16	22e	16	14
16-20 miles	12	21de	14	9	9
21-30 miles	11	15e	14e	17e	8
31-40 miles	4	2	3	5b	2
41-50 miles	2	2	4e	3	1
51 plus miles	3	3	3	7e	2
Mean	15	17e	18e	20e	12

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

\*\* See Q. 2a tabulated data

### Transportation Habits - Commute Time

- As could be expected, commute time appeared to correlate highly with distance to or from work. Slightly more than four of ten respondents (43%) were within 15 minutes of work while eight of ten (79%) were within 30 minutes. The average commute time was 23 minutes (one-way) throughout the study area.
- It was not surprising that residents of the three counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity reported a longer commute time than did residents of Marion County. Also, male participants and those who made stops during a commute registered a greater travel time.

Base: Representative Sample	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u> (400)	<u>Hamilton</u> (200)	<u>Hendricks</u> (200)	<u>Johnson</u> (200)	<u>Marion</u> (211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Minutes to Work (one-way)</b>					
1-5 minutes	6	4	8	6	4
6-10 minutes	18	12	12	19	15
11-15 minutes	19	15	13	14	23bcd
16-20 minutes	17	16	19	13	24bd
21-30 minutes	19	25	25	27	22
31-40 minutes	10	16e	14e	12e	5
41-50 minutes	5	11de	7e	4	2
51 plus minutes	6	3	4	8b	4
Mean	23	27e	25e	28e	21

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

\*\* See Q. 2b tabulated data

## Transportation Habits/Patterns

- Eight of ten (80%) individuals traveled directly from their residence to and from work. Respondents representing lower income households and females significantly more often indicated a direct commute.
- Among the 20% that trip-chain, the majority made only one stop during their commute. However, about one-fifth (21%) of those who trip-chain, 4% of total survey respondents, made two stops. A few (3%) reported six or more stops. Participants travelling a greater distance more often made a greater number of stops per trip. However, the average number of stops revealed a bimodal distribution. That is, individuals traveling less than 15 minutes or more than 30 minutes more often made a greater number of stops per trip.
- About 10% of the respondents commuted to the downtown Indianapolis area which was defined by zip codes 46202 and 46204. More respondents who resided in Marion County commuted to downtown Indianapolis.
- The average perceived speed to work was about 35 mph (miles per hour) for the entire study area. However, the speed significantly decreased for residents within Marion County (31 mph).

Base: Representative Sample	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u> (400)	<u>Hamilton</u> (200)	<u>Hendricks</u> (200)	<u>Johnson</u> (200)	<u>Marion</u> (211)
	<u>a</u> %	<u>b</u> %	<u>c</u> %	<u>d</u> %	<u>e</u> %
<b>Route to work</b>					
Direct to work	80	84	80	78	82
Trip-chain (Stops along way)	19	16	20	23	17
<b>Number of stops</b>					
1	74	69	70	66	81
2	21	19	18	18	17
3	1	3	3	7	3
4	-	3	3	2	-
5	1	3	-	2	-
6 or more	3	3	8	5	-
Average number of stops	1.5	1.6	2.0	2.0	1.2
<b>Work Location</b>					
Indianapolis City Center (46202/46204)	11	8	7	10	14
<b>Speed to Work</b>					
0 - 19 mph	17	11	7	14c	20bc
20 - 29 mph	22	26d	22	15	26d
30 - 39 mph	23	26	28	23	23
40 - 49 mph	21	25	22	26	19
50 plus mph	16	12	19be	21be	11
Average mph***	34	34e	37e	37e	31

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

\*\* See Q. F, 3, tabulated data

\*\*\* 90 mph or greater excluded from average

## Transportation Characteristics - Descriptions

• During the interview, participants were asked to consider the importance of five general transportation characteristics, especially as they relate to their commute to and from work. The five characteristics address the primary concerns that enter into the selection of a transportation mode.

During this exercise, respondents were read a rotated pair of characteristics and asked to indicate which was the more important when compared. A complete set of the ten characteristic pairs was presented to each respondent for review. The description of each characteristic, as read to the respondent, is presented below.

- **Travel Time** - this refers to the amount of time it usually takes you to get to work or to get home from work.
- **Reliability** - this refers to the dependability of a particular mode of travel to get you to and from your destinations in the time and manner expected.
- **Personal Cost** - this refers to the amount you pay for transportation including any daily fares for public transportation or the total cost of using a personal vehicle such as fuel, insurance, parking and up-keep.
- **Personal Comfort or Convenience** - this refers to the physical amenities like adjustable seats and climate control, as well as weather-related aspects of travel including the impact of inclement weather and having the flexibility to change your route or schedule as needed.
- **Personal Safety.** - this refers to protecting you or your belongings while waiting for transportation or while travelling in a vehicle.

### Transportation Characteristics - Importance Comparisons

- The importance of each characteristic in relation to each of the other characteristics is detailed in the following tables. The characteristic selected as more important is listed on the left side of the table along with the percentage of times it is chosen. The paired characteristics and the associated percentage is listed on the right side of the table.
- Personal Safety and Reliability was most often selected as more important. Personal Safety “wins” or was more often selected as being more important in each of its comparisons. Reliability was more important in three of the four pairs while being less often selected when paired with Personal Safety. Travel Time was identified most often in two comparisons and less often when paired with Personal Safety and Reliability. Lastly, Personal Comfort/Convenience and Personal Cost were viewed as least important, relatively speaking.

	<b>Representative Sample</b>		
	<b>% Most Important</b>	<b>% Most Important</b>	
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>80</b>	20	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>74</b>	26	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>71</b>	29	Travel Time
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>59</b>	42	Reliability
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>82</b>	18	Personal Cost
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>80</b>	20	Travel Time
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>77</b>	23	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>63</b>	37	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>58</b>	42	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Cost</b>	<b>53</b>	47	Personal Comfort/Convenience

\*\* See Q. 3, tabulated data

## Transportation Characteristics - Importance Comparisons

- The results were generally consistent throughout the study area and among the various population segments. However, household income and commute distance seemed to influence some selection patterns, especially characteristic pairs involving Personal Cost.
- Some of the specific significant differences within the particular characteristic pairs are highlighted below.

### Personal Safety - Travel Time

- Participants who commuted a greater distance more often identified Personal Safety as being more important than Travel Time.

### Personal Safety - Personal Comfort/Convenience

- Individuals who traveled a greater distance, while not significant, tended to select Personal Safety as being more important than Personal Comfort/Convenience.

### Reliability - Travel Time

- Respondents who commuted a greater distance placed importance significantly more often on Reliability.

### Reliability - Personal Cost

- Those who trip-chain and individuals representing higher income households significantly more often selected Reliability over Personal Cost. Also, females more often selected Reliability in this situation.

### Travel Time - Personal Cost

- Respondents representing higher income households and individuals who had more formal education significantly more often selected Travel Time as being more important than Personal Cost. Also, participants from Johnson County more often selected Personal Cost. Hamilton County residents placed more importance on Travel Time.

### Personal Cost - Personal Comfort/Convenience

- Wealthier respondents and those who had more formal education more often selected Personal Comfort/Convenience over Personal Cost. In contrast, those representing lower income households and those with less formal education more often selected Personal Cost. Also, there was a tendency among those who trip-chain to more often identify Personal Comfort/Convenience as being more important.

### Transportation Characteristics - Importance Comparisons County Results

• The results of the transportation characteristics importance comparisons within counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity are shown in the following tables. The county results were very consistent with one exception. Respondents in Hamilton County tended to more often place importance on Personal Comfort/Convenience than Personal Cost. Residents of the other counties with the highest current and projected commuter activity more often placed importance on Personal Cost in this paired combination.

<b><u>Hamilton County</u></b>			
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
	<b>Most</b>	<b>Most</b>	
	<b><u>Important</u></b>	<b><u>Important</u></b>	
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>80</b>	20	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>73</b>	27	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>69</b>	31	Travel Time
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>53</b>	47	Reliability
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>86</b>	14	Personal Cost
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>78</b>	22	Travel Time
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>77</b>	23	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>68</b>	32	Personal Cost
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>66</b>	34	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Comfort/Convenience</b>	<b>53</b>	47	Personal Cost

<b><u>Hendricks County</u></b>			
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
	<b>Most</b>	<b>Most</b>	
	<b><u>Important</u></b>	<b><u>Important</u></b>	
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>75</b>	25	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>71</b>	29	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>67</b>	33	Travel time
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>54</b>	46	Reliability
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>84</b>	16	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>83</b>	17	Personal Cost
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>76</b>	24	Travel time
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>66</b>	34	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>61</b>	39	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Cost</b>	<b>55</b>	45	Personal Comfort/Convenience

\*\* See Q. 3, tabulated data

## Transportation Characteristics - Importance Comparisons County Results

### Johnson County

	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	
	Most	Most	
	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>79</b>	21	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>73</b>	27	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>70</b>	30	Travel time
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>56</b>	44	Reliability
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>85</b>	15	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>84</b>	16	Travel time
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>84</b>	16	Personal Cost
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>65</b>	35	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>58</b>	42	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Cost</b>	<b>53</b>	47	Personal Comfort/Convenience

### Marion County

	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	
	Most	Most	
	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>80</b>	20	Personal Cost
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>73</b>	27	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>73</b>	27	Travel time
<b>Personal Safety</b>	<b>57</b>	43	Reliability
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>82</b>	18	Personal Cost
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>80</b>	20	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>78</b>	22	Travel time
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>61</b>	39	Personal Cost
<b>Travel time</b>	<b>61</b>	39	Personal Comfort/Convenience
<b>Personal Cost</b>	<b>53</b>	47	Personal Comfort/Convenience

\*\* See Q. 3, tabulated data

## Transportation Mode - Personal Vehicle Evaluation

Respondents were asked to evaluate the personal vehicle mode of transportation overall and in relation to each of the five transportation characteristics. A ten point rating scale was used where a “10” indicates “excellent” and “1” represents “poor.” The percentages of “9” and “10” ratings are shown in the following table.

- One-half (49%) of the respondents rated the personal vehicle mode of transportation favorably overall. This compares to six of ten participants who rated the Personal Comfort/Convenience (62%) and Reliability (60%) of a personal vehicle favorably. Slightly fewer viewed Travel Time (55%) and Personal Safety (46%) as a “9” or “10.” Only one-fifth (19%) evaluated Personal Cost favorably.

- Detailed results reveal several interesting differences in evaluations of the personal vehicle mode of transportation. Females tended to rate most characteristics more favorably than males. In addition, those who represented households with a higher income and those who had more formal education tended to favorably evaluate a personal vehicle for Personal Comfort/Convenience and Reliability.

### % 9/10 Rating\*\*\*

	<u>County</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>	<u>Hendricks</u>	<u>Johnson</u>	<u>Marion</u>
Base: Representative Sample	(400)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
<b>Overall rating</b>	49	48	44	41	49
<b>Personal Comfort/Convenience</b>	62	66	55	60	59
<b>Reliability</b>	60	63	54	55	57
<b>Travel Time</b>	55	52	49	53	57
<b>Personal Safety</b>	46	47	43	41	44
<b>Personal Cost</b>	19	21	15	17	18

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

\*\* See Q. 4, tabulated data

\*\*\* Percentage indicating a 9 or 10 rating using a 10-point scale (10 is excellent and 1 is poor).

### Transportation Mode - Public Vehicle Evaluation

- Ten percent (10%) of respondents rated the public transportation as a “9”, or “10” overall. Participants with less formal education and those representing a lower income household more often responded with a positive overall evaluation of public transportation.
- Personal Cost (24%) and Reliability (19%) of public transportation were relatively more favorably evaluated than were the other transportation characteristics. In contrast, only about 5% viewed the Personal Comfort/Convenience (6%) and Travel Time (5%) favorably.
- Detailed findings revealed that males more favorably evaluated the public transportation overall and for Reliability and Personal Safety. Also, those with less formal education and those representing lower income households more favorably evaluated public transportation overall and for Personal Comfort/Convenience.

#### % 9/10 Rating\*\*

Base: Representative Sample	<b>Total</b> (400)	<b>County</b>			
		<b>Hamilton</b> (200)	<b>Hendricks</b> (200)	<b>Johnson</b> (200)	<b>Marion</b> (211)
	a	b	c	d	e
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Overall</b>	10	8	7	7	11
<b>Personal Cost</b>	24	29	22	28	23
<b>Reliability</b>	19	20	16	21	19
<b>Personal Safety</b>	14	15	13	15	13
<b>Personal Comfort/Convenience</b>	6	6	5	6	6
<b>Travel time</b>	5	7	3	5	5

\* a, b, c, d, e, indicates a significant difference between columns at the 95% confidence level.

\*\* See Q. 5, tabulated data

\*\*\* Percentage indicating a 9 or 10 rating using a 10-point scale (10 is excellent and 1 is poor).