

Visitor/Shopper Intercept Survey Data Guide

June 26, 2014

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Timeline.....	3
1.2	Availability of Data.....	3
2	Overview	4
2.1	Summary of Contents	4
2.2	Data Dictionary.....	5
3	Methodology.....	5
3.1	Survey deployment	5
4	Known Issues	6
4.1	Multi-part questions.....	6
4.2	Time of survey discrepancies.....	7
4.3	Different questions, different order.....	7

1 Introduction

The visitor/shopper intercept surveys utilized a comprehensive and multi-modal approach to determine the level of changed behavior, together with other variables, by quantification of driver shift to public transportation, level of satisfaction with the parking experience, parking search times and on-street occupancy rates of parking spots.

The general methodological approach included an intercept survey on location at multiple pilot and control sites, before and after SFpark. The SFMTA retained Ewald & Wasserman Research Consultants (E&W) for survey design and implementation.

This document provides critical information regarding the availability and use of this dataset.

1.1 Timeline

SFpark staff worked with consultants from Ewald & Wasserman Research Consultants to collect and analyze intercept survey data over two data collection periods:

- Spring 2011: “Before”
- Spring 2013: “After”

1.2 Availability of Data

The complete dataset is available online and includes all intercept survey questions and responses for the evaluation of the SFpark pilot project. A data dictionary defining key elements of the data is included as a separate document. For all data requests and related inquiries, please contact info@sfpark.org and put “SFpark evaluation data request” in the subject line.

The intercept survey data files, formats, and size are as follows:

- File names:
 - Raw data:
 - SFpark_Intercept_Survey_Data2011.csv
 - SFpark_Intercept_Survey_Data2013.csv
 - SPSS files
 - SFpark_SPSS_Intercept_Survey_Data2011.SAV
 - SFpark_SPSS_Intercept_Survey_Data2013.SAV
 - Translated data file

- SFpark_interceptSurveys_20112013.xlsm
- Data dictionary
 - SFpark_Intercept_Survey_Data_dictionary2011.PDF
 - SFpark_Intercept_Survey_Data_dictionary2013.PDF

2 Overview

This section provides information about the content of the dataset.

The survey instrument was developed to illuminate the baseline factors that affect the decision making process for transportation mode choice. These factors included the type and frequency of transportation use, values placed upon time spent looking for parking, perception of parking ease and availability in the area, travel party size, and the type of parking ultimately selected for the trip. The survey data includes demographic information of respondents in addition to their responses about travel behavior.

2.1 Summary of Contents

There are five different survey data files, two are the same data in different files formats ie. The 2011 and 2013 data is available in both a CSV and in SPSS formats. The survey questions and answers are coded. There is an excel workbook that contains both years survey data combined and translated from the coding so it is easily understood at a glance. For significant statistical analyses, using the raw, coded data may be necessary. Also included are the methodological reports and the survey instruments for each year.

Temporal Attributes of the Data

The date and time that the intercept survey was conducted are the only temporal attributes of the data and the times are recorded at the nearest 30 minute break, i.e. 11:00am or 11:30am, not 11:27am.

For each collection period, data was collected in each pilot and control area on weekdays (Monday through Friday) from 9am-7pm, and on Saturdays between 10am-7pm. In 2011, the survey was conducted from April 1st to April 30th, and for 2013 between April 15th and May 14th.

Geographic Attributes of the Data

Survey interviews were conducted in three pilot and all control areas. The only geographic attributes to this dataset are the pilot or control area names, and the residence zip codes of the respondents.

2.2 Data Dictionary

There are detailed data dictionaries for each year's dataset which explain the coding in the zip file. These are necessary for understanding and using the SPSS and raw data files.

3 Methodology

The intercept survey was focused on adults in three pilot site areas and two control site areas in the city of San Francisco. The Visitor and Shopper intercept survey examined factors related to parking and travel behavior, including transportation mode choices, parking perceptions and ultimate choices as well as level of satisfaction with the parking experience. The intercept was conceptualized as a five to six-minute survey offered to pedestrians in one of the targeted locations during the specified intervals of data collection.

Only drivers were asked to complete the entire survey. Intercept participants were classified into three segments: those who had driven to the location the day of the intercept (drivers); those who did not drive to the target area at the time of intercept but had done so in the past year (non-drivers); and those who had never driven to the area (never-drivers). Non-drivers were asked about their motivation not to use a car at the time of intercept. Drivers and non-drivers were asked about transportation mode changes in the past year, awareness of parking availability information, type and location of parking and rational for changes in the type of parking selected over the past year. "Never-drivers" were thanked for their time and were not interviewed further. For respondents who did not drive on the day of the intercept but did drive to the area within the last year, the survey asked them to specify the reasons for the decision not to drive, hence further examining the determination processes behind their travel mode choice.

3.1 Survey deployment

The surveyed population of the study consisted of adults 18 years or older, who had driven in a vehicle on the day of the intercept survey or who had driven to the area of the intercept within the last year. The respondent universe was comprised of residents and visitors of the key commercial corridors of the SFpark project who responded affirmatively to having driven that day or within the last year. The key corridors were selected and defined by parking management districts and distinguished as three pilot and two control areas.

The locations for data collection were selected based on the pilot and control geographic areas delineated by the SFpark project plan. The locations selected would be most appropriate for intercepting visitors, residents and people working in an area. The selection process integrated factors such as pedestrian volume in metered areas, proximity to public and private garages and parking lots, as well as

nearness to commerce, dining and other potential destination points. For larger areas with multiple commercial corridors, such as downtown, surveyors were positioned strategically to achieve a balance between the district's main commercial areas.

Number of completed surveys by area:

2011

- **Pilot**
 - Downtown -289
 - Mission- 254
 - Marina- 243
- **Control**
 - Inner Richmond- 377
 - Union Street- 390
 - **Total 1553**

2013

- **Pilot**
 - Downtown -275
 - Mission- 245
 - Marina- 271
- **Control**
 - Inner Richmond- 391
 - Union Street- 402
 - **Total 1584**

4 Known Issues

The following section notes potential data comparability issues to consider for use of the dataset.

4.1 Multi-part questions

There are a few questions such as question two, “what was reason for your visit today?” which have multiple responses for one respondent. When analyzing this dataset, one must be mindful to only count total number of respondents and not responses.

4.2 Time of survey discrepancies

The discrepancy in the number of people surveyed in the AM vs. PM between 2011 and 2013 could pose an issue in terms of comparing reason for visit, amount paid to park, type of parking, or even parking search time. Making a sub-sample is recommended.

4.3 Different questions, different order

The questions for 2011 and 2013 are almost identical for comparison purposes, but there are a few additional ones in 2013 as well as slightly different ones for the “reason for visit” question. This makes comparisons difficult. The order of questions between 2011 and 2013 are also not the same, for example in 2011 question 13 asked about how much money was spent in the area and in 2013 it is question 10.