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## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Since 1979, the Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District (AC or AC Transit) has periodically conducted on-board surveys of its riders to learn their demographics (age, gender, race, income, etc.), how often and in what way they use AC Transit buses, and their opinions of service and suggestions for improvement. AC has contracted for nine major on-board rider surveys since 1979 and conducted many additional riders surveys focused on particular lines, areas and topics.

In fall of 2008, Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District (AC Transit) sponsored an onboard rider survey to gather information on the demographics and travel characteristics of its riders. San Francisco State University's Public Research Institute was contracted to conduct the study ${ }^{1}$. PRI conducted the prior Onboard Riders Survey, which was completed in 2002-2003.

For the 2008 update, AC Transit was particularly interested in developing more robust information at the route level in order to be able to analyze route-by-route characteristics of riders and trips.

## System Overview

AC Transit serves a predominantly urban area with a high concentration of minority, immigrant, low-income and disabled riders.
As of March 2007, AC Transit has 105 regular service bus lines, including 78 local service lines in the East Bay and 27 Transbay lines to San Francisco and the peninsula. A total of 8 lines also offer late night and OWL service (after midnight).

AC Transit's FY 2007/2008 annual weekday ridership is 236,000 passengers including Transbay commuters and school children.

The District's service area includes western Contra Costa County and all of Alameda County to the west of the East Bay Hills down to the Fremont area except for Union City, which has its own transit service, although AC connects with Union City Transit.

## Study Purpose

The purpose of the onboard rider survey was to provide an accurate portrait of AC Transit riders at the system-wide level, by service-type, by time of day/time of week and at the route level where possible. This portrait includes the following information:

- Demographic characteristics of riders on every AC Transit route in terms of age, gender, income, race, housing tenure, car ownership, transit dependence and other variables relevant to AC Transit Policy and Planning;

[^0]- Trip characteristics such as trip purpose, pre- and post-trip transit mode, transfer rate, time of day/time of week, and service type;
- Fare payment;
- Frequency of Use;
- Reasons for Riding AC Transit;
- Evaluation of AC Transit Services; and
- Use of Transit Incentives

This report covers the system-wide results of the onboard rider survey.

## Methodology

The following section provides an overview of the methodology used to conduct the 2008/2009 AC Transit Onboard Riders Survey. A more detailed description is provided in a separate stand-alone appendix.

## PopULATION

The population for this study was all AC Transit riders age 13 and above, capable of completing the survey in Spanish, Chinese or English, on all regular AC Transit routes, and a sample of special school routes, during the survey period. Units of analysis were trips, and riders within trips. Children under the age of 13 were not surveyed as prior studies have determined that they are not capable of providing reliable answers to this type of survey.

The study team proposed to collect $23,000-25,000$ survey questionnaires representative of riders on all local and Transbay routes, and a sample of 10 special school supplemental service routes, during the period September - November, 2008.

Actual data collection took place from September 2008 - April 2009, yielding a total of 23,241 survey questionnaires. A modified version of the standards set by the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) was used to calculate response rate. AAPOR has set standards for calculating response rates for random digit dialing phone surveys, listed person mail surveys and household surveys, but not for intercept surveys, so some adjustment was needed. The estimated response rate for this survey was $58 \%$ of eligible riders, not including children under the age of 13.

## SAMPLING PLAN

The primary goal of the study was to survey all local and Transbay routes, and the sample of school routes, in order to obtain the most accurate picture possible of riders on individual routes and throughout the AC Transit system during different days of the week and times of day ${ }^{2}$. The sampling plan was developed to ensure that as much as possible all members of the study population had an equal probability of being

[^1]sampled consistent with the available budget, timeline, and logistical constraints of conducting an onboard survey.

In order to obtain representative data for each route, round trips were sampled within each time period of operation. Trips were divided into the following strata: (a) morning commute (4:01 AM - 9:00 AM); (b) mid-day (9:01 AM - 3:00 PM); (c) evening commute (3:01 PM - 6:00 PM); and (d) night (6:01 PM -- 4:00 AM)3. Because late-night "Owl" service occurs on dedicated routes, there was no need to include it as a separate stratum. Rather than randomizing the selection of interviewing start time by the day of week, weekend routes were included as a separate stratum for random selection. Trips were thus sampled randomly within up to 6 strata (4 time periods during weekdays plus all trips on Saturdays and Sundays).
"Representative data" was defined as sampling error within $\pm 5 \%$ for a $50 \%$ proportion under simple random sampling (SRS) assumptions, at $95 \%$ confidence for each route, with substantially higher precision for AC Transit system as a whole and for the principal sub-parts of the system such as trunk and feeder routes within different geographical areas. While this level of precision was desirable, the study team acknowledged that it would not always be possible to achieve within time and budget. Hence, target quotas were developed for each category of route volume ${ }^{4}$ (see below), with quotas set to achieve route level results as described in column 4.
Table 2. Quotas and Expected Completes By Route Category for $95 \% \mathrm{CI} \pm 5 \%$, allowing larger intervals for low and moderate volume routes

| Route <br> category <br> daily | Average <br> boardings | Frequency | $95 \%$ <br> CI $\pm$ | Quota | Number of <br> completed <br> questionnaires | \% of Total <br> completes |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low | 300 or less | $301-500$ | 25 | 10 | 73 | 1,825 |

The estimated number of trips to obtain this sample size was determined by a) dividing the number of daily trips by the average daily ridership to determine the probable number of passengers per trip, b) multiplying the number of passengers per trip by the expected eligibility rate by the expected response rate to determine the probable survey yield per trip, and then c) dividing the minimum sample size by the probable survey yield per trip.

[^2]> Ex: Route $X$ is a moderate volume route with average daily boardings of 800 . The target sample size is thus $n=280$ for this route. The schedule of Route $X$ involves 10 runs per day in each direction, from 7 AM to 7 PM on weekdays. On average, each run can be thus be expected to carry 80 passengers ( 800 per day / 10 round trips) for a complete round trip. If the expected eligibility rate is $90 \%$ and the response rate is $80 \%$, we can expect to complete up to $80 \times .9 X .8=58$ responses per round trip; correspondingly we will need to complete a minimum of 280 / 58 or 5 round trips.

Sampling commenced with the random selection of one trip within each of the time strata in which each route offered service. After all strata were assigned one round trip, the remaining required trips were assigned by first randomly selecting one stratum and then selecting the next trip in sequence after the initial trip sampled within that stratum, and then the next, until the requisite number of trips was sampled.

## Scheduling and Data Collection

Members of the research team were assigned the task of constructing 4-5 hour survey shift "itineraries" out of the sampled trips. Itineraries were then clustered into shifts for several surveyors, organized by time period and the BART stations from which routes to be surveyed initiated. For roughly the first half of data collection, this method sufficed to allow supervisors to base fairly cohesive shifts around specific BART stations. As data collection progressed, it became more difficult to organize shifts in this fashion and key interviewers were allowed more independence in conducting data collection.

Surveyors were instructed to attempt to survey every passenger 13 years of age and older on each sampled trip. Surveyors were also to track survey response rate, tallying refusals, ineligible passengers, and passengers who could not be surveyed.
Surveyors were provided with "trip packets", which consisted of the maximum estimated number of surveys needed to complete surveying on each one-way trip, and a trip control form for use in tracking survey response for each trip. They were also provided with "messenger bags" filled with survey supplies, including clipboards and golf pencils.
While generally only one surveyor was assigned to each trip, multiple surveyors might be assigned to specific trips due to volume or safety issues.
Throughout the course of data collection, supervisors met surveyors at the start of their shifts with survey supplies, and collected survey packets from them at the end of their shifts. Through much of the survey effort, supervisors were also able to check in on surveyors off and on throughout their shifts.

## DATA EnTRy

All survey packets were returned to the PRI offices, where trip information on survey response and non-response were checked for accuracy and clarity and then surveys were prepared for data entry. Data entry teams entered all survey data into Sawtooth's WinCati survey software via an interface initially intended for phone interviewing. There were several advantages of using this system. First, phone interviewers, who were familiar with the interface, could be trained to perform data
entry between phone survey shifts. Second, WinCati allows multiple users to work on the same database simultaneously. Finally, the software could be programmed to limit anomalous values that might be introduced by data entry error.

## ExECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overarching purpose of this study was to generate a system-wide snapshot of AC Transit riders and accurate route-level data where possible. The following report examines the responses to the onboard riders' survey on the system-wide level. These results reflect the entire system as a whole and will also be broken down by service type and other rider characteristics in other chapters of the main report.

## MAin Findings

The AC Transit riders surveyed were very diverse, and there was considerable variation by type of service and area. The following bullet points represent some generalizations about AC Transit riders surveyed by citing the plurality of riders in each category:

- Gender: Female ............................................. 55\%
- Race/Ethnicity: Black/African American ..... 37\%
- Age: Working age adult (25-64)..................... 50\%
- Car Ownership: Has no car........................... 37\%
- Housing Tenure: Rents ................................. 62\%
- Mode of Access: Walked to/from this stop.... 80\%
- Trip Purpose: Going to or from work ........... 31\%
- \# of Buses Needed for OW Trip: one........... $54 \%$
- Fare Media: Cash .......................................... 39\%
- Frequency: Rides AC 5-7 days a week ......... 69\%
- Reason for Riding: No car ............................ 28\%
- Rates AC Transit Service overall as "Good" $37 \%$


## Demographics

A majority of ACT riders surveyed were female (55\%). More than a fifth (23\%) of those surveyed were youth age 13-17 years ${ }^{5}$; one-half (50\%) were of working age adults (25-64 years) and 5\% were seniors. A plurality of riders(37\%) were African American, followed by Whites (19\%), Latinos (19\%) and Asian or Pacific Islanders (18\%). Five percent of those surveyed (5\%) completed the survey in Spanish, and 2\% completed it in Chinese. Altogether, approximately 72\% of adult respondents were from low income households, with $42 \%$ from extremely low-income households. More than one-third (37\%) of those surveyed had no cars in their households. While 59\% of adult riders were transit-dependent, meaning that they had

[^3]no car, did not drive and/or did not have a driver's license, $41 \%$ were discretionary or "choice" riders who could use another form of transportation.
Seventy-nine percent (79\%) of all riders used the internet, and 73\% of adult riders were registered voters. There was little change in the rate of homeownership or place of residence since the last survey: 62\% of all riders were from renter households. The most common city of residence was Oakland: about $45 \%$ of those surveyed lived in Oakland, followed by Berkeley at a distant 12\%.

## Trip Characteristics

Most riders did not need to wait long for their bus to arrive: $68 \%$ waited 10 or fewer minutes, and $81 \%$ waited 15 or fewer minutes. For just under half of all riders (54\%), one bus is all that is needed to complete a one-way trip. Most (58\%) were using the bus for a round trip, but a sizable minority was only making a one-way trip. This is especially true of those riding school routes, and younger riders in general. More than a third of those in the 13-17 year-old age bracket and those riding school routes (39\%) were not making a round trip on the bus.
Eighty-two percent (82\%) of respondents began or ended their trip at home. Work was the next most common origin or destination (31\%), followed by school (25\%)which includes college as well as high school, middle school and elementary school. Eighty-five (85\%) of work-based trips, and 73\% of school based trips have home as the final destination, although $15 \%$ of work-based trips and $27 \%$ of school based trips have some other destination such as shopping, medical appointments, daycare or social events as their final destination.
The majority of riders accessed the bus stop via walking (80\%). Thirty-four percent (34\%) of riders indicated transferring from or to another form of public transit. Of those transferring from or to transit, roughly half were transferring to or from AC, followed by BART, other bus companies, shuttles, and ferries. The most commonly used transit provider after ACT and BART was MUNI.

Of the riders who walked to or from the bus stop, approximately one third walked one or one block or less to the bus stop, and nearly half walked between one and four blocks. Combined, over three-quarters of riders were within four blocks, or what is typically considered walking distance, of a bus stop.
Compared to 2002 survey results, many fewer respondents reported that they took AC Transit because they had no car ( $28.1 \%$ vs. $44.8 \%$ ). However, the overall proportion of adult transit dependent riders ( $59 \%$ vs. $61 \%$ ) has not changed much over time, suggesting that the difference may be related to changes in the question about why riders chose to take AC Transit. There were increases since 2002 in the proportion of riders reporting they took AC because they had no driver's license ( 22 vs. 17\%), because it was better for the environment or society ( 20 vs. $11 \%$ ), because there was "no car available today" (18 vs. 9\%) and because it was cheaper than other alternatives (18 vs. 12\%).

A large majority of riders (69\%) use AC Transit 5-7 days a week-a proportion which has not changed since $2002 / 3$. About $75 \%$ of youth $13-17$ years of age
reported that they ride the bus to or from school five times a week or more, but 11$13 \%$ of youth riders surveyed reported that they did not always make a round trip on the school bus, suggesting that they might be driven to or from school sometimes.

## Fare Payment

Nearly two-thirds (63\%) of AC Transit riders paid full adult fares, while 37\% paid a discounted fare, whether youth (25\%) disabled (6\%), or senior (6\%). While the most common method of fare payment was cash (39\%), cash use was only slightly higher than the overall use of the 31 day pass (including Senior/Disabled), (35\%). Use of the UC Berkeley Class Pass (9\%) was also relatively high. More than half of AC Transit riders (56\%) used a fare discount (pass or ticket). This is similar to 2002/3 findings.

A little more than a fifth of riders (22\%) use an incentive such as Commuter Checks, free passes from employers, parking cash-out programs, etc. to take public transit. These incentives are meant to encourage commuters, particularly discretionary or "choice" riders, to take transit instead of private vehicles. The most commonly used incentive is the commuter check, which $7 \%$ of riders report using.

## Ratings of AC Transit Service

Riders gave generally positive, if not exuberant, ratings of AC Transit service. A large majority of riders (74\%) found AC Transit service overall to be a positive experience, rating it Good, Very Good, or Excellent. The location of bus stops received the most positive responses, with almost three-quarters of the ridership giving at least a "good" rating. Riders felt least positively about the cost of fares and passes, although the proportion giving this aspect a positive rating was slightly higher than in 2002/3, despite the growing economic crisis. The rating of safety at bus stops has noticeably declined since the 2002/3 survey, while "days and times the bus runs" received more positive ratings in 2008/9 as compared to 2002/3.
The following sections explore these findings in more detail.

## Findings

The following sections examine the responses to the onboard riders' survey on the system-wide level. These results reflect the entire system as a whole and will also be broken down by service type and other rider characteristics in subsequent volumes.

## Rider Demographics

The following section examines the demographics, or basic characteristics, of AC Transit riders. These characteristics include gender, ethnicity, age, household income and other household and personal information.

## Gender

Consistent with other mass transit studies, female riders made up a slight majority of the AC Transit ridership (55\%). Possible reasons for the greater number of women are the lower rates of access to and ownership of cars among low-income women than among low-income men.
While female riders were the majority of those surveyed overall, they made up only $49 \%$ of School route riders surveyed, and $21 \%$ of Owl route riders surveyed.

Figure 1. Gender


## Age

About half (50.2\%) of the AC Transit riders surveyed were within the age range of working adults ( 25 to 64). Overall, seniors comprised a relatively small proportion of surveyed riders (5.2\%). More than one-fifth (22.8\%) of surveyed riders were of school age; however, the youth share is actually higher since children under the age of 13 were not surveyed. Passenger counts conducted during the survey efforts indicate that approximately $6 \%$ of those who boarded the bus were children under the age of 13 . Taking this into account, we estimate that roughly $27 \%$ of AC Transit riders are under the age of 18 .

Figure 2. Age


## Race and Ethnicity

More than one-third of respondents were African American/Black alone (36\%), while White riders comprised approximately one-fifth (19\%) of respondents and Asians and Pacific Islanders were approximately $18 \%$ of those surveyed.

The following figure illustrates the differences across years. While there are some differences over the years, they do not appear to be statistically significant. All proportions except for Multiracial/Other and Latino/Hispanic represent persons who selected the one primary racial/ethnic category shown. The category Multiracial/Other includes persons who reported multiple races, and persons who indicated "other" races than those presented on the survey.

Some respondents gave text answers, which were re-coded (for instance, "Xicano" was re-coded from "Other" to "Latino/Hispanic", and "Southeast Asian" was recoded as "Asian").

Finally, because the category Latino/Hispanic represents a cultural/linguistic background that encompasses many races, any respondent who indicated that $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{he}$ was Latino and Hispanic and one other race was coded as "Latino/Hispanic".

Figure 3. Race and Ethnicity


## Language of Survey

While most surveys were completed in English, 4.7\% were completed in Spanish and $1.7 \%$ were in Chinese. In contrast, in 2002, $10 \%$ of surveys were completed in Spanish and 3\% were completed in Chinese.

Figure 4. Language of Survey


## Household Income

More than half of adult AC Transit riders reported a household income of less than $\$ 25,000$ per year (51.7\%), while nearly three-quarters of those surveyed reported a household income of less than $\$ 50,000$ per year (71.1\%). The relatively low household incomes among the AC Transit ridership were consistent with the tendency of public transportation to serve lower income populations. Please note that household income responses were tallied only for adults aged 18 years and over as younger riders were often unsure of their household income.

Figure 5. Income

*Respondents over the age of 17 only.

## Low Income Status

To assess a household's low income status, we used the thresholds defined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. These thresholds are useful because they are adjusted by area and household size. Extremely low income households are defined as earning up to $30 \%$ of the area median income, while very low income households are defined as earning between $31 \%$ and $50 \%$ of the area media income. The median income in 2008 for the Oakland-Fremont HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area (HMFA), comprising Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, is \$86,100 per year.

## Figure 6. Income Status


*Respondents over the age of 17 only.
Survey income categories overlapped HUD FMR ranges, so the figure above should be viewed as a rough estimate of the income categories of adult respondents to the onboard survey. Making adjustments for household size, we found that almost half of AC Transit riders live in extremely low-income households (42\%). Altogether, approximately 72\% of adult AC Transit riders reported living in households that could be categorized as lowincome.

Riders who were not low-income were less likely to need more than one bus to complete their one way trip, less likely to have waited more than 10 minutes for the bus, more likely to have paid full adult fare and to have used 10-ride tickets, Translink passes and ecash to pay their fare, probably because they were more likely to be riding Transbay routes than were lower-income riders. They were less likely to be using the bus for purposes other than work/home trips, and on average gave AC Transit higher service ratings than did lower-income respondents.

## Cars in Household

More than one-third of AC Transit riders have no household car (37.3\%) while another third have only one car in the household. On the other end of the spectrum, about one-tenth of riders $(10.2 \%)$ live in households with 3 or more cars. While there appear to be more riders without cars in 2008/2009 than in 2002/2003, the difference is not statistically significant.

## Table 1. Car Ownership

| Cars | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 / 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 / 3}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0 Car | 37.3 | 31.9 |
| 1 Car | 32.7 | 33.3 |
| 2 Cars | 19.8 | 22.5 |
| $3+$ Cars | 10.2 | 12.2 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## Transit Dependency

Among adult AC Transit riders, $59 \%{ }^{6}$ were transit dependent riders, meaning they reported that they have no car or were not licensed drivers. Transit dependent riders include riders with disabilities and elderly riders. Please note that youth under the age of 18 were not included in this tabulation.

## Figure 7. Transit Dependency


*Respondents over the age of 17 only.

[^4]
## Internet Use

More than three-quarters (78.8\%) of AC Transit riders reported using the internet. This is an increase from 2002, when the proportion was $63.3 \%$. Not surprisingly, internet use declines as age goes up. About two-thirds of those ages 50 through 64 use the internet (62.33\%), while about a third of persons aged 65 and older use the internet. This suggests that media other than the internet should still be used to reach out to older segments of the population.

Figure 8. Internet Use of AC Transit Riders 2008/2009


Figure 9. Internet Use by Age, 2002/3-2008/9


## Cell Phone Use

Most (83\%) riders reported that they had a cell phone. Cell phone use varied by age and service type. Transbay riders were more likely to own cell phones (92\%) while school service riders were the least likely ( $70 \%$ ) to own them. Those under the age of 50 were more likely to own cell phones (83-92\%), while those 50-64 (72\%) and 65+ (54\%) were less likely to own cell phones.

## City of Residence

More than half of AC Transit riders live in the Oakland-Berkeley area (58\%). The following table demonstrates that the balance of surveyed riders by city of residence has changed little since 2002/2003.

Table 2. Top Five Cities of Residence

| City | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 / 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 / 3}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Oakland | 45.3 | 46.2 |
| Berkeley | 12.3 | 11.0 |
| Hayward | 6.6 | 6.9 |
| Alameda | 5.7 | 5.6 |
| Richmond | 5.3 | 5.5 |

## Voter Registration

Voter registration rates among adult AC Transit riders surveyed were comparable to the rate amongst the general population. Seventy-three percent (73\%) of respondents 18 years of age and above were registered to vote in 2008/2009.

Figure 10. Voter Registration

$\mathrm{N}=14,326$
*Respondents over the age of 17 only.

## Household Size

According to survey results, the average household size of AC Transit riders was 3.7 persons (compared to 3.5 in 2002/3) while the median was 3 persons. Household sizes given ranged from 1 to 600 persons ${ }^{7}$. Sixty-percent (60\%) of riders lived in households composed of 3 or fewer persons, and only $1 \%$ lived in households with more than 11 members.

## Housing Tenure

AC Transit riders were overwhelmingly renters (62\%), outnumbering homeowners by a rate of two to one. In comparison, Census 2000 statistics for the approximate service area show a homeownership rate of $53.7 \%$ and a renter rate of $46.3 \%{ }^{8}$ This proportion has changed little since 2002/3.

Figure 11. Home Ownership


[^5]
## TRIP CHARACTERISTICS

The following section is about how AC Transit riders were using the bus at the time they were surveyed, and how in general they used AC Transit for transportation. Riders were asked to describe how often they rode the bus and for what purpose, how they got to and from stops, how many buses it would take them to make their one-way trip, how far they traveled to and from stops, how they paid their fare, and why they were riding the bus.

## Number of Buses

A vast majority of riders (88.4\%) were able to complete their one-way trips on two or fewer buses. For more than half of riders surveyed (53.7\%), one bus was all that was needed to complete a one-way trip. The number of respondents reporting only one bus is up slightly from 2002/3 when $46.4 \%$ required only one bus to make their oneway trip, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Riders who were White and riders who were not low-income were more likely to report that they needed only one bus to make their trip, possibly because they were more likely to be riding Transbay routes. Eighty-one percent (81\%) of Transbay riders reported needing only one bus compared to an overall average of $54 \%$.

Figure 12. Number of Buses Needed to Make One-Way Trip


## Wait Time

Most riders (68\%) reported waiting 10 or fewer minutes for their bus to arrive, and $81 \%$ reported waiting 15 or fewer minutes. However, some riders reported waits of 16-20 minutes (14\%) and over twenty minutes (8.4\%).

## Round/One Way Trip

A majority of riders surveyed (58\%) planned an entire round-trip on the bus. However, a sizable proportion did not intend to make a round trip on the bus. This is especially true of those riding school routes ( $38.7 \%$ indicated that they were not making a round trip) and those riding OWL service (55.6\%). The younger the rider, the less likely s/he was to indicate not using the bus for a round trip. More than a third of those in the13-17 year age bracket (38.6\%) and more than a third (35.2\%) of 18-24 year-olds were not making a round trip on the bus. However, these $13-17$ year-olds also make up a disproportionate number of those indicating that they "don't know" whether or not they were making a round trip on the bus-a full $50 \%$. Removing from the equation those that "don't know"; a full $50 \%$ of riders in this age group indicated that they were not making a round trip. This is probably because many parents drive their children to school in the morning, but cannot pick them up in the afternoon.

Figure 13. This Trip is Part of a Round Trip on the Bus

$N=17,789$

## Trip Purpose-Where Are You Coming From and Where Are You Going?

Passengers were asked where they were coming from and where they were going to on this trip. A plurality of transit trips began or ended at home. Eighty-two (82\%) of respondents began or ended their trip at home. Work was the next most common origin or destination (31\%), followed by school (25\%)—which includes college as well as high school, middle school and elementary school.

Figure 14. Trip Purpose of Origin and Destination (Combined)


Figure 15. Trip Purpose of Origin and Destination


Thirty-seven (37\%) percent of home-based trips ended at work. Twenty-two percent (22\%) ended at school.

## Figure 16. Destinations of Home-Based Trips



Most work-based trips began or ended at home (85\%). Riders who were not lowincome, and riders who were making Transbay trips, were more likely to be making trips that started or ended at work. Riders who were low-income were more likely to be using the bus for a greater diversity of purposes.
Figure 17. Destinations of Work-Based Trips


Likewise, most school-based trips ended at home (73\%).

Figure 18. Destinations of School-Based Trips


Some passengers indicated that they were both coming from and going to home, work, school, etc. These cases were left out of the analysis since it seemed that many respondents were confused about the distinction between one-way trips and daily round trips.

## Mode of Travel To and From Bus Stop

Riders were asked to indicate how they got to the bus stop for this trip, and how they would get to the final destination from the stop where they were getting off.
Very few riders used an automobile, either as driver or as passenger ${ }^{9}$, to get to or from the bus stop. The vast majority of riders walked to or from the stop. Some surveyed riders indicated transferring to or from public transportation, primarily AC Transit or BART. Overall, slightly more respondents reported walking to stops, and fewer reported other modes of transportation to stops than in 2002/3, except for automobile, which remained at about $4 \%^{10}$. (Percents do not add up to $100 \%$ as passengers might have used multiple modes to access stops.)
Figure 19. Mode of Travel to and from Stops


Mode of travel to and from stops also helps to determine the transfer rate between AC buses, and between AC and other service providers. Thirty-four percent (34\%) of riders indicated transferring from or to another public transit vehicle. In other words, they indicated that they were using another ACT bus, another bus company, BART, a ferry or a shuttle/van service to get to the bus stop at the start of this trip, or from the bus stop at the end of this trip. Twenty-one (21\%) percent of passengers indicated transferring to get to the bus stop where they started this trip, and $20 \%$ reported that they would transfer to another vehicle once they left the AC bus on which they were surveyed. The majority of these transfers was from or to other AC buses, followed by transfers from or to BART. Because respondents indicated multiple transfers, the following percentages total more than $100 \%$.

[^6]Figure 20. Transfers To and From this Bus*


About $1 \%$ of riders indicated that they used some "other" mode to get to or from the bus stop and described these other modes in a write-in question. Other types of transportation to or from the stop included skateboards, wheelchairs, airplanes (airport), scooters, cabs and trains. In a follow-up question, riders were asked whether they used some named alternative modes of transportation on their trip. The following table breaks down the answers to this question.

Table 3. Other Modes of Travel To/From Stops

| Mode | Percent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycle | 1.9 |
| Stroller | 1.3 |
| Wheelchair/Scooter (for disabled) | 1.0 |
| None of the above | 94.8 |
| Total | 100.0 |
|  | $\mathrm{~N}=17682$ |

## Use of Other Transit Providers

About 5\% of all passengers transferred to or from a transit provider other than AC Transit or BART. The following table represents other transit used by passengers transferring to or from AC buses. MUNI was by far the most commonly used operator, followed by WestCat (West Contra Costa County) and Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority. While a total of 509 individuals indicated that they had used another transit service, only 365 of them gave the name of the service operator.

Figure 21. Transfers from Other Bus Companies

| Other Transit | Percent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Altamont Commuter Express | $2 \%$ |
| Amtrak | $5 \%$ |
| Caltrain | $1 \%$ |
| County Connection | $1 \%$ |
| Golden Gate Transit | $2 \%$ |
| Greyhound | $0 \%$ |
| Fairfield-Suisun Transit | $0 \%$ |
| SF MUNI | $58 \%$ |
| Paratransit | $0 \%$ |
| Presidigo | $0 \%$ |
| SamTrans | $1 \%$ |
| Train (unspecified) | $1 \%$ |
| Union City Transit | $4 \%$ |
| Vallejo Transit | $4 \%$ |
| Santa Clara VTA | $11 \%$ |
| WestCAT | $7 \%$ |
| Wheels | $2 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ |

## Blocks Walked To and From Bus Stop

Of respondents who walked to or from the bus stop for this trip, about one third walked less than one block to the bus stop, indicating nearly door-to-door service. Nearly half walked between one and four blocks. Combined, over three-quarters of riders were within four blocks, or what is typically considered walking distance, of a bus stop.

However, a smaller proportion of respondents reported walking 4 or fewer blocks to their stop in 2008/9 (80-81\%) as compared to 2002/3 (87\%); and more reported walking more than 4 and up to 9 blocks ( $14-15 \%$ vs. $9 \%$ in 2002/3). This difference is statistically significant.

Figure 22. Blocks Walked to and from the Bus Stop


## Reasons for Riding AC Transit

Riders were asked their reasons for using AC Transit for this trip. The majority of respondents (57\%) of all ages used AC Transit because they did not have a driver's license or because they did not have access to a car. More than a quarter of AC Transit riders reported riding the bus because they have no car (28\%).

Figure 23. Reasons for Riding AC Transit


While some answer options to this question were different in 2008/9, several categories were retained from 2002/3, allowing for comparisons. There was a large decrease in the percentage of respondents indicating that they were riding AC Transit because there was "No car in household" ${ }^{11}$ and an increase in the percentage who said that they were riding AC Transit because they had "No car available today" or "No driver's license". However, overall the proportion of transit-dependent adults was approximately the same over the years. It appears that many persons selecting these latter two categories are youth who might have previously chosen the category "do not drive" that was included in the 2002/3 survey.
There appeared to be an increase over time in the proportion of those indicating they took the bus because it was "better for environment/society" and because it was "cheaper than other alternatives". However, these differences were not statistically significant.

[^7]Figure 24. Reasons for Riding AC Transit—2002/3 to 2008/9


## Ridership Frequency--Regular Service

AC Transit riders tend to be regular rather than infrequent riders. A majority of respondents (68.5\%) used AC Transit daily. Only 5\% of respondents used AC Transit less than one day a week. These figures are similar to 2002/3 totals.

Figure 25. Ridership Frequency


## Ridership Frequency--School Trips

Three quarters (75\%) youth between 13 and 17 years of age reported that they ride the bus either to or from school five times a week or more. (Youth under 13 years of age were not surveyed.)

Of those who rode the bus to school, $13 \%$ reported that they do not always take the bus from school at the end of the day every day. Likewise, $11 \%$ of those who take the bus from school five days a week reported that they do not always take the bus to school in the morning.
As noted earlier, about $37 \%$ of those between the ages of 13 and 17 indicated that they were not making a round trip on the bus, and about 39\% of School route riders indicated that they were not making a round trip--but about 19\% of School route riders and $21 \%$ of riders age $13-17$ also said that they did not know if they were making a round trip.

Figure 26. Frequency of Riding the Bus to and From School


## FARE PAymEnt

## Fare Type

More than one-third (37.2\%) of AC Transit riders paid a discounted fare, whether youth, disabled, or senior. We should note that the data does not indicate percentages of the ridership that were young, disabled, or elderly. Riders were asked to indicate only one fare category, yet it is possible that a rider could self-identify with more than one category (e.g. youth and disabled).

Fare type varied by race and ethnicity, reflecting age differences amongst groups of riders. A majority ( $90 \%$ ) of White riders paid Adult, Senior or Disabled fares, while nearly a quarter of Asian riders (23\%), and one third of African-American (35\%) and Hispanic/Latino riders (32\%) paid Youth fares.

Figure 27. Type of Fare Paid


## Fare Media

The most common method of fare payment was cash (38.5\%). The 31-day pass was the second most common method of fare payment, followed by the UC Class Pass.
Some categories show increases or decreases from the 2002/2003 survey. The 2008/2009 survey questionnaire included a question about use of the Senior/Disabled monthly sticker - a media that allows the rider to purchase a 31-day pass at half-price. Combining the Senior/Disabled monthly sticker category with the 31-day pass category yields roughly the same proportion of riders using a pass in 2008/9 as 2002/3. Use of Translink has increased as its availability has increased. Other changes can be noted below.

Table 4. Fare Media

| Method of Payment | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 / 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 / 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cash | $38.5 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ |
| Pass (31 day) | $26.8 \%$ | $36.5 \%$ |
| UC Bear or Class Pass | $9.0 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Senior/ Disabled monthly | $8.6 \%$ | N/A |
| sticker |  |  |
| Translink EasyPass | $4.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| 10-Ride ticket | $4.2 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
| AC Transfer | $3.0 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Translink e-cash | $2.4 \%$ | N/A |
| Other | $1.8 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| BART Transfer | $1.1 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| City of Berkeley Ecopass | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| AC/BART Plus | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| Don't know | $0.2 \%$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.1 \%$ |

## Discount Fare Media

More than half of AC Transit riders (56\%) used a fare discount (pass or ticket). Transfers are not considered fare discounts, as one would have to have paid cash fare in order to obtain a transfer.

Figure 28. Discount Fare Use


## Transit Incentives

Transit incentives are primarily financial incentives meant to encourage the use of public transit. Transit incentives may be distributed on the basis of financial need, but the most commonly used incentives are intended to encourage discretionary, or non-transit dependent riders to choose transit as an alternative to driving.

About one-fifth (22\%) of those surveyed reported using an incentive to take public transit. While respondents were not directly asked to describe in detail what incentives they used, in a prior question about how they paid their fare, some respondents noted using dependent passes for family members of AC Transit staff, or passes /badges for employees of AC Transit and Stanford University in particular.

Figure 29. Transit Incentives


## Ratings of AC Transit Service

Riders were asked to rate various aspects of AC Transit service as poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent. A majority of riders responded positively in all service areas. A large majority of riders (74.1\%) found AC Transit service overall to be a positive experience, rating it good, very good, or excellent.
The location of bus stops received the most positive responses, with almost threequarters of the respondents giving at least a "good" rating. Riders felt least positively about the cost of fares and passes, although the proportion giving this aspect a positive rating was slightly higher than in 2002/3, despite the growing economic crisis. The rating of safety at bus stops has noticeably declined since the 2002/3 survey, while "days and times the bus runs" received more positive ratings in 2008/9 as compared to 2002/3.

Figure 30. Positive Ratings of AC Transit Service, 2002/3 and 2008/9


## Distribution of Service Ratings

A look at the distribution of responses for each service area gives a slightly different view of rider ratings. Ratings of overall service fall squarely in the middle ground, with relatively few ratings of "poor" and "excellent". While ratings of driver courtesy were fairly evenly distributed, driver courtesy also shows the highest percentage of "excellent" ratings of all service areas, followed by the location of bus stops. Not surprisingly, on the other end of the spectrum, the cost of fares and passes shows the highest percentage of "poor" ratings of all service areas, followed by "cleanliness".

Figure 31. AC Transit Service Ratings


Different types of riders tended to rate AC service differently. For instance, Transbay riders consistently gave higher ratings than riders on other types of service except in one category, "days \& times the bus runs"-- a category in which they tied Owl riders for the highest average rating. Low income riders and transit-dependent riders gave lower ratings on average.

## Mean Service Ratings

We calculated the mean or average service ratings by assigning a numeric value to each rating. "Poor" was assigned a value of 1 , "Fair" was assigned a value of 2 , "Good" a value of 3, "Very Good" a value of 4, and "Excellent" was assigned a value of 5 . The mean, or average, rating gives again a slightly different view of rider ratings. Consistent with the previous charts, the location of bus stops and overall service have the highest mean service ratings ( 3.23 and 3.18 , respectively). However, whereas we observed earlier that bus safety has a slightly higher percentage of positive ratings than driver courtesy, driver courtesy has the higher mean service rating ( 3.15 to 3.03 for bus safety). The higher percentage of "excellent" driver courtesy ratings is the reason for this difference.

Figure 32. Mean Service Ratings


The ratings for AC Transit overall, the location of stops, courteous drivers and safety on buses all averaged somewhat above "Good" or above the midpoint of the scale, while all other service elements fell between "fair" and "good"-or below the midpoint of the scale.

Preliminary analysis suggests that all of these service elements are strongly and positively correlated, and the days and times the bus runs and location of stops the most strongly related to overall service ratings.

## Appendix A: Questionnaire

(Starting Next Page)
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## APPENDIX B: DETAILED TABLES

The following tables are weighted by route and time of day and week (weekend/weekday) to properly reflect the population of ACT Riders. All numbers including decimal points represent percentages, unless otherwise noted. All counts and percentages are weighted. The term "Valid N" refers to the total number of eligible respondents answering this question. While a total of 23,241 valid complete surveys were collected, many respondents did not answer every question, therefore the Valid N may vary from table to table.

1. How many AC buses will it take to complete this one-way trip today?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
| Valid | 1 | 12194 | 52.5 | 53.7 | 53.7 |
|  | 2 | 7876 | 33.9 | 34.7 | 88.4 |
|  | 3 | 1598 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 95.4 |
|  | $4+$ | 1044 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 22713 | 97.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 528 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

2. How long did you wait for this bus to arrive?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Less than 5 minutes | 7624 | 32.8 | 33.8 | 33.8 |
|  | 5-10 minutes | 7623 | 32.8 | 33.8 | 67.7 |
|  | 11-15 minutes | 3038 | 13.1 | 13.5 | 81.2 |
|  | 16-20 minutes | 2348 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 91.6 |
|  | More than 20 minutes | 1892 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 22526 | 96.9 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 715 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

3. What kind of fare did you pay on this bus trip today?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
| Valid | Youth | 5952 | 25.6 | 28.1 | 28.1 |
|  | Senior | 1212 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 33.9 |
|  | Adult | 12389 | 53.3 | 58.5 | 92.4 |
|  | Disabled | 1609 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 21162 | 91.1 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 2079 | 8.9 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

*Tabulation of responses as reported on survey questionnaires.
The following table illustrates some discrepancies between fare type and age reported.
3. What kind of fare did you pay on this bus trip today? * 11. Age -- Crosstabulation
\% within 11. Age

|  | 11. Age: --Please choose one |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $13-17$ | $18-24$ | $25-34$ |  | $35-49$ |  | $50-64$ |

4. How did you pay your fare on this bus trip today?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Palid |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Cash | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
|  | 10-Ride ticket | 8683 | 37.4 | 38.5 | 38.5 |
|  | 31-Day ticket | 953 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 42.7 |
|  | AC Transfer | 6047 | 26.0 | 26.8 | 69.6 |
|  | BART Transfer | 680 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 72.6 |
|  | UC Bear or Class Pass | 237 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 73.6 |
|  | Senior/Disabled monthly | 2038 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 82.7 |
|  | Translink EasyPass | 1933 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 91.3 |
|  | Translink e-cash | 970 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 95.6 |
|  | City of Berkeley Ecopass | 530 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 97.9 |
|  | Don t know | 37 | .2 | .2 | 98.1 |
|  | Other: | 36 | .2 | .2 | 98.2 |
|  | Total | 400 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 22542 | 97.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Total |  | 699 | 3.0 |  |  |

5. Is your trip today part of a round trip on the bus?"

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percequ |  |
| Valid | Yes | 10381 | 44.7 | 58.4 | 58.4 |
|  | No | 5677 | 24.4 | 31.9 | 90.3 |
|  | Don t know | 1732 | 7.5 | 9.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17789 | 76.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 5452 | 23.5 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

6. Where did this one-way trip START?

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Valid | Home | 11829 | 50.9 | 52.4 | 52.4 |  |
|  | School | 3200 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 66.6 |  |
|  | Work | 3393 | 14.6 | 15.0 | 81.6 |  |
|  | Daycare | 45 | .2 | .2 | 81.8 |  |
|  | Shopping/Errands | 1367 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 87.8 |  |
|  | Medical Appointment | 414 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 89.7 |  |
|  | Sports/Social/Recreational | 616 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 92.4 |  |
|  | Other | 1172 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 97.6 |  |
|  | BART Station/Bus stop | 546 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 22582 | 97.2 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Missing | Missing | 659 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |  |

8. Where will this one-way trip END?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
|  | School | 8837 | 38.0 | 40.2 | 40.2 |
|  | Work | 2785 | 12.0 | 12.7 | 52.9 |
|  | Daycare | 4142 | 17.8 | 18.8 | 71.7 |
|  | Shopping/Errands | 116 | .5 | .5 | 72.3 |
|  | Medical Appointment | 2029 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 81.5 |
|  | Sports/Social/Recreational | 675 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 84.6 |
|  | Other | 1035 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 89.3 |
|  | BART Station/Bus stop | 1612 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 96.6 |
|  | Total | 746 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Missing | Missing | 21975 | 94.6 | 100.0 |  |
| Total |  | 1266 | 5.4 |  |  |

## 7. How did you get to the bus stop for THIS bus? <br> (Percentages)

|  | false | true |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Walk | $18.4 \%$ | $81.6 \%$ |
| Car (as driver) | $98.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Car (as passenger) | $98.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $98.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Another AC Bus | $88.7 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| BART | $90.5 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| MUNI | $99.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Ferry | $99.9 \%$ | $.1 \%$ |
| Shuttle/Van | $99.7 \%$ | $.3 \%$ |
| Other Transit | $98.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Other | $99.4 \%$ | $.6 \%$ |

7. How did you get to the bus stop for THIS bus? (Missing)

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Valid | false | 22451 | 96.6 | 96.6 | 96.6 |  |
|  | true | 790 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 23241 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |

7. Blocks walked to stop, grouped

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
| Valid | 0-1 blocks | 3496 | 15.0 | 31.7 | 31.7 |
|  | 1-4 blocks | 5277 | 22.7 | 47.8 | 79.5 |
|  | 4-9 blocks | 1654 | 7.1 | 15.0 | 94.5 |
|  | 9-15 blocks | 467 | 2.0 | 4.2 | 98.7 |
|  | 15-20 blocks | 55 | .2 | .5 | 99.2 |
|  | 20+ blocks | 88 | .4 | .8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 11037 | 47.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Walked, gave no \# | 7289 | 31.4 |  |  |
|  | Did not walk | 4125 | 17.7 |  |  |
|  | Gave no mode | 790 | 3.4 |  |  |
|  | Total | 12204 | 52.5 |  |  |

9. How will you get to your FINAL

DESTINATION after you leave this bus?
(Percentages)

|  | false | true |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Walk | $20.5 \%$ | $79.5 \%$ |
| Car (as driver) | $98.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Car (as passenger) | $98.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $98.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Another AC Bus | $88.2 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| BART | $91.8 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| MUNI | $99.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Ferry | $99.9 \%$ | $.1 \%$ |
| Shuttle/Van | $99.5 \%$ | $.5 \%$ |
| Other Transit | $98.8 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Other | $99.2 \%$ | $.8 \%$ |


| Missing |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | false | 21760 | 93.6 | 93.6 | 93.6 |
|  | true | 1481 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 23241 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

9. Blocks walked AFTER leaving bus, grouped

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | O-1 blocks | 3493 | 15.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | 1-4 blocks | 5041 | 21.7 | 48.1 | 81.4 |
|  | 4-9 blocks | 1442 | 6.2 | 13.7 | 95.1 |
|  | 9-15 blocks | 416 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 99.1 |
|  | 15-20 blocks | 34 | .1 | .3 | 99.4 |
|  | 20+ blocks | 59 | .3 | .6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 10485 | 45.1 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Walked, gave no \# | 6817 | 29.3 |  |  |
|  | Did not walk | 4458 | 19.2 |  |  |
|  | Gave no mode | 1481 | 6.4 |  |  |
|  | System | 0 | .0 |  |  |
|  | Total | 12756 | 54.9 |  |  |

10. Are you: (Gender)

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
| Valid | Male | 9784 | 42.1 | 45.3 | 45.3 |
|  | Female | 11822 | 50.9 | 54.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 21606 | 93.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 1635 | 7.0 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

11. Age: --Please choose one

|  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | $13-17$ | 4939 | 21.3 | 22.7 | 22.7 |
|  | $18-24$ | 4741 | 20.4 | 21.8 | 44.6 |
|  | $25-34$ | 3635 | 15.6 | 16.7 | 61.3 |
|  | $35-49$ | 4030 | 17.3 | 18.6 | 79.9 |
|  | $50-64$ | 3208 | 13.8 | 14.8 | 94.6 |
|  | $65+$ | 1165 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 21718 | 93.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 1523 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

Q12. Race or Ethnicity (Percentages)

| (Percentages) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| false | true |  |
| Hispanic or Latino | $80.3 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ |
| Black or African American | $59.8 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ |
| White | $77.8 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ |
| Asian | $81.9 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ |
| Native Hawaiian or Other | $97.7 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | $97.3 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Native American or Alaska |  |  |
| Native | $95.4 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |

Q12. Race/Ethnicity (Missing)

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |  |
| Valid | false | 21732 | 93.5 | 93.5 | 93.5 |  |
|  | true | 1509 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 23241 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |

14. What is your total household income?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Under \$15,000 | 5409 | 23.3 | 35.9 | 35.9 |
|  | $\$ 15,000-24,999$ | 2580 | 11.1 | 17.1 | 53.0 |
|  | \$25,000-49,999 | 2802 | 12.1 | 18.6 | 71.6 |
|  | \$50,000-74,999 | 1702 | 7.3 | 11.3 | 82.9 |
|  | \$75,000-99,999 | 893 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 88.9 |
|  | \$100,000-149,999 | 861 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 94.6 |
|  | \$150,000-199,999 | 373 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 97.1 |
|  | \$200,000 or higher | 444 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 15064 | 64.8 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't know | 4535 | 19.5 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 3642 | 15.7 |  |  |
|  | Total | 8177 | 35.2 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

15. How many cars are there in your household?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | O Cars | 7777 | 33.5 | 37.3 | 37.3 |
|  | 1 Car | 6821 | 29.3 | 32.7 | 70.0 |
|  | 2 Cars | 4125 | 17.8 | 19.8 | 89.8 |
|  | 3 + Cars | 2122 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 20845 | 89.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 2395 | 10.3 |  |  |
|  | System | 1 | .0 |  |  |
|  | Total | 2396 | 10.3 |  |  |

16. Where do you live?

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | OAKLAND | 9247 | 39.8 | 45.3 | 45.3 |
|  | BERKELEY | 2519 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 57.6 |
|  | HAYWARD | 1346 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 64.2 |
|  | ALAMEDA | 1170 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 70.0 |
|  | RICHMOND | 1077 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 75.3 |
|  | SAN LEANDRO | 871 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 79.5 |
|  | FREMONT | 850 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 83.7 |
|  | SAN PABLO | 406 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 85.7 |
|  | UNION CITY | 334 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 87.3 |
|  | OTHER | 333 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 88.9 |
|  | SAN FRANCISCO | 329 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 90.5 |
|  | ALBANY | 301 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 92.0 |
|  | EL CERRITO | 233 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 93.2 |
|  | EMERYVILLE | 211 | . 9 | 1.0 | 94.2 |
|  | NEWARK | 198 | . 9 | 1.0 | 95.2 |
|  | PIEDMONT | 180 | . 8 | . 9 | 96.0 |
|  | CASTRO VALLEY | 135 | . 6 | . 7 | 96.7 |
|  | EL SOBRANTE | 131 | . 6 | . 6 | 97.3 |
|  | SAN LORENZO | 128 | . 6 | . 6 | 98.0 |
|  | KENSINGTON | 50 | . 2 | . 2 | 98.2 |
|  | SAN JOSE | 43 | . 2 | . 2 | 98.4 |
|  | PITTSBURG | 36 | . 2 | . 2 | 98.6 |
|  | PINOLE | 35 | . 2 | . 2 | 98.8 |
|  | VALLEJO | 31 | . 1 | . 2 | 98.9 |
|  | CONCORD | 31 | . 1 | . 2 | 99.1 |
|  | SACRAMENTO | 28 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.2 |
|  | WALNUT CREEK | 27 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.4 |
|  | MILPITAS | 20 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.5 |
|  | ANTIOCH | 20 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.5 |
|  | RODEO | 17 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.6 |
|  | HERCULES | 16 | . 1 | . 1 | 99.7 |
|  | PLEASANTON | 11 | . 0 | . 1 | 99.8 |
|  | SAN RAMON | 11 | . 0 | . 1 | 99.8 |
|  | DALY CITY | 11 | . 0 | . 1 | 99.9 |
|  | LIVERMORE | 11 | . 0 | . 1 | 99.9 |
|  | SAN MATEO | 7 | . 0 | . 0 | 100.0 |
|  | SOUTH HAYWARD | 5 | . 0 | . 0 | 100.0 |
|  | TRACY | 4 | . 0 | . 0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 20411 | 87.8 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | MISSING | 2830 | 12.2 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

FOR STUDENTS ONLY: 17. How often do you ride AC Transit buses TO SCHOOL?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Once a week or less | 272 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
|  | 2-4 Times per week | 567 | 11.5 | 13.1 | 19.4 |
|  | 5 times a week or more | 2977 | 60.3 | 68.8 | 88.2 |
|  | Never | 402 | 8.1 | 9.3 | 97.5 |
|  | Not in school | 107 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 4326 | 87.6 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 614 | 12.4 |  |  |
| Total |  | 4939 | 100.0 |  |  |

*Tabulated for those ages 13-17 only.

FOR STUDENTS ONLY: 18. How often do you ride AC Transit buses FROM SCHOOL?

|  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Once a week or less | 302 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
|  | 2-4 Times per week | 751 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 25.3 |
|  | 5 times a week or more | 2721 | 55.1 | 65.4 | 90.7 |
|  | Never | 271 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 97.2 |
|  | Not in school | 116 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 4161 | 84.2 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 779 | 15.8 |  |  |
| Total |  | 4939 | 100.0 |  |  |

*Tabulated for those ages 13-17 only.
19. How often do you ride AC Transit buses?--Please choose one

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 5-7 days a week | 13439 | 57.8 | 68.5 | 68.5 |
|  | 3-4 days a week | 3524 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 86.5 |
|  | 1-2 days a week | 1671 | 7.2 | 8.5 | 95.0 |
|  | Once a month or less | 823 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 99.2 |
|  | First time riding | 157 | .7 | .8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 19613 | 84.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 3628 | 15.6 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

20. On this trip today, did you use a:

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Bicycle | 451 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
|  | Stroller | 293 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 4.2 |
|  | Wheelchair/Scooter (for | 171 | .7 | 1.0 | 5.2 |
|  | disabled) |  |  |  |  |
|  | None of the above | 16767 | 72.1 | 94.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17682 | 76.1 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 5559 | 23.9 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to:

|  | Poor |  | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Excellent |  |  |  |  |  |
| AC Transit service overall | $5.3 \%$ | $20.6 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ |
| The bus comes on time | $15.8 \%$ | $30.2 \%$ | $28.5 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| Location of bus stops | $5.7 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | $22.9 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ |
| Days \& times the bus runs | $10.1 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $35.1 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ |
| Cost of fares/passes | $18.1 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ | $28.4 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Safety on buses | $10.9 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ | $33.8 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ |
| Safety at bus stops | $14.2 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ | $33.8 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
| Clean buses | $17.4 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ | $29.6 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| Courteous drivers | $9.8 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: AC Transit service overall

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 948 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
|  | Fair | 3709 | 16.0 | 20.6 | 25.9 |
|  | Good | 6676 | 28.7 | 37.2 | 63.1 |
|  | Very Good | 4347 | 18.7 | 24.2 | 87.3 |
|  | Excellent | 2287 | 9.8 | 12.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17966 | 77.3 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 457 | 2.0 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 4818 | 20.7 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5275 | 22.7 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

## 21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: The bus comes on time

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 2848 | 12.3 | 15.8 | 15.8 |
|  | Fair | 5441 | 23.4 | 30.2 | 46.1 |
|  | Good | 5132 | 22.1 | 28.5 | 74.6 |
|  | Very Good | 2765 | 11.9 | 15.4 | 90.0 |
|  | Excellent | 1808 | 7.8 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17994 | 77.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 319 | 1.4 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 4929 | 21.2 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5247 | 22.6 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Location of bus stops

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Prequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |  |
|  | Fair | 1008 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
|  | Good | 3543 | 15.2 | 20.0 | 25.7 |
|  | Very Good | 6319 | 27.2 | 35.7 | 61.4 |
|  | Excellent | 4055 | 17.4 | 22.9 | 84.3 |
|  | Total | 2773 | 11.9 | 15.7 | 100.0 |
| Missing | Don't Know | 17698 | 76.2 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Missing | 279 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5263 | 22.6 |  |  |
| Total |  | 5543 | 23.8 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Days \& times the bus

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |  |
| Valid | Poor | 1767 | 7.6 | 10.1 | 10.1 |  |
|  | Fair | 4345 | 18.7 | 24.9 | 35.0 |  |
|  | Good | 6138 | 26.4 | 35.1 | 70.1 |  |
|  | Very Good | 3225 | 13.9 | 18.5 | 88.6 |  |
|  | Excellent | 1997 | 8.6 | 11.4 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 17472 | 75.2 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 430 | 1.8 |  |  |  |


|  | Missing | 5339 | 23.0 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | 5769 | 24.8 |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Cost of fares/passes

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 3131 | 13.5 | 18.1 | 18.1 |
|  | Fair | 5332 | 22.9 | 30.8 | 48.9 |
|  | Good | 4918 | 21.2 | 28.4 | 77.3 |
|  | Very Good | 2279 | 9.8 | 13.2 | 90.4 |
|  | Excellent | 1660 | 7.1 | 9.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17321 | 74.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 508 | 2.2 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 5413 | 23.3 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5920 | 25.5 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Safety on buses

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 1902 | 8.2 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
|  | Fair | 3884 | 16.7 | 22.3 | 33.2 |
|  | Good | 5884 | 25.3 | 33.8 | 67.0 |
|  | Very Good | 3346 | 14.4 | 19.2 | 86.2 |
|  | Excellent | 2405 | 10.3 | 13.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17421 | 75.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 453 | 1.9 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 5367 | 23.1 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5820 | 25.0 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Safety at bus stops

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 2463 | 10.6 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
|  | Fair | 4655 | 20.0 | 26.9 | 41.1 |
|  | Good | 5849 | 25.2 | 33.8 | 74.9 |
|  | Very Good | 2607 | 11.2 | 15.0 | 89.9 |
|  | Excellent | 1749 | 7.5 | 10.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17324 | 74.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 508 | 2.2 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 5409 | 23.3 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5917 | 25.5 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Clean buses

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 3086 | 13.3 | 17.4 | 17.4 |
|  | Fair | 4866 | 20.9 | 27.4 | 44.7 |
|  | Good | 5269 | 22.7 | 29.6 | 74.4 |
|  | Very Good | 2905 | 12.5 | 16.3 | 90.7 |
|  | Excellent | 1648 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17773 | 76.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 230 | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 5238 | 22.5 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5468 | 23.5 |  |  |

21. How would you rate AC Transit's service with respect to: Courteous drivers

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Poor | 1718 | 7.4 | 9.8 | 9.8 |
|  | Fair | 3879 | 16.7 | 22.2 | 32.0 |
|  | Good | 5063 | 21.8 | 28.9 | 60.9 |
|  | Very Good | 3659 | 15.7 | 20.9 | 81.9 |
|  | Excellent | 3172 | 13.6 | 18.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 17492 | 75.3 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't Know | 413 | 1.8 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 5336 | 23.0 |  |  |
|  | Total | 5749 | 24.7 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

## 22. Why did you use AC Transit for this trip today?

(Percentages)

|  | False | True |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bus is faster | $75.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| Better use of time | $84.5 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ |
| No car in household | $71.9 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ |
| No driver's license | $78.4 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ |
| No car available today | $82.0 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ |
| Too much traffic | $92.3 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
| Too costly to park | $90.3 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| Hard to park where I'm going | $91.8 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Cheaper than other | $82.4 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| alternatives | $80.4 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ |
| Better for environment / |  |  |
| society | $90.9 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |

Q22. Why did you use AC Transit for this trip today? (Missing)

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | False | 18416 | 79.2 | 79.2 | 79.2 |
|  | True | 4825 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 23241 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

23. Do you use the internet?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Yes | 15010 | 64.6 | 78.8 | 78.8 |
|  | No | 4032 | 17.4 | 21.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 19042 | 81.9 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Don't know | 195 | .8 |  |  |
|  | Missing | 4004 | 17.2 |  |  |
|  | Total | 4199 | 18.1 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

24. Do you have a cell phone?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Fes | 15844 | 68.2 | 82.9 | 82.9 |
|  | No | 3188 | 13.7 | 16.7 | 99.6 |
|  | Don't know | 72 | .3 | .4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 19104 | 82.2 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 4137 | 17.8 |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |

25. Are you a registered voter?

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Yes | 10361 | 61.8 | 72.3 | 72.3 |
|  | No | 3776 | 22.5 | 26.4 | 98.7 |
|  | Don't know | 189 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 14326 | 85.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | Missing | 2452 | 14.6 |  |  |
| Total |  | 16778 | 100.0 |  |  |

*Note: Tabulation includes only those over the age of 17.
26. Does your family own or rent your home?

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Valid | Own | 5843 | 25.1 | 31.4 | 31.4 |  |
|  | Rent | 11443 | 49.2 | 61.6 | 93.0 |  |
|  | Don't know | 1299 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | Total | 18585 | 80.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Missing | Missing | 4656 | 20.0 |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 23241 | 100.0 |  |  |  |

27. Do you receive any of the following?

|  | False | True |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Commuter checks | $93.3 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |
| Free transit or transit passes $95.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |  |
| from employer | $97.2 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| Free transit tickets/passes <br> from CalWORKS for yourself |  |  |
| or children | $97.6 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Free shuttle service to work | $95.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Pre-tax commute program | $99.4 \%$ | $.6 \%$ |
| Parking cash-out program | $95.4 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| Free transit tickets from other |  |  |
| sources | $22.0 \%$ | $78.0 \%$ |
| None | $99.9 \%$ | $.1 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |

27. Do you receive any of the following? (Missing)

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Percent |
| Valid | False | 16171 | 69.6 | 69.6 | 69.6 |
|  | True | 7070 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 23241 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

## Appendix C: Completion Rates

| DESCRIPTION | RECORDS | Quota | \% of Quota |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 399 | 370 | 108\% |
| 1R | 514 | 370 | 139\% |
| 7 | 452 | 360 | 126\% |
| 9 | 437 | 360 | 121\% |
| 11 | 322 | 360 | 89\% |
| 12 | 328 | 360 | 91\% |
| 13 | 399 | 360 | 111\% |
| 14 | 380 | 360 | 106\% |
| 15 | 392 | 360 | 109\% |
| 18 | 474 | 370 | 128\% |
| 19 | 381 | 360 | 106\% |
| 40 | 368 | 370 | 99\% |
| 41 | 29 | 73 | 40\% |
| 45 | 300 | 360 | 83\% |
| 46 | 78 | 115 | 68\% |
| 47 | 127 | 115 | 110\% |
| 50 | 465 | 370 | 126\% |
| 51 | 643 | 370 | 174\% |
| 52L | 529 | 360 | 147\% |
| 53 | 364 | 360 | 101\% |
| 54 | 378 | 360 | 105\% |
| 55 | 165 | 164 | 101\% |
| 56 | 249 | 360 | 69\% |
| 57 | 419 | 370 | 113\% |
| 59/59A | 74 | 73 | 101\% |
| 62 | 338 | 360 | 94\% |
| 63 | 409 | 360 | 114\% |
| 65 | 207 | 164 | 126\% |
| 67 | 169 | 115 | 147\% |
| 70 | 369 | 360 | 103\% |
| 71 | 389 | 360 | 108\% |
| 72/72M | 387 | 370 | 105\% |
| 72R | 294 | 370 | 79\% |
| 74 | 341 | 360 | 95\% |
| 76 | 418 | 360 | 116\% |
| 77 | 183 | 164 | 112\% |
| 79 | 155 | 115 | 135\% |
| 80 | 191 | 164 | 116\% |
| 81 | 124 | 115 | 108\% |
| 83 | 180 | 164 | 110\% |
| 84 | 349 | 360 | 97\% |
| 85 | 117 | 115 | 102\% |
| 86 | 176 | 360 | 49\% |
| 87 | 21 | 73 | 29\% |
| 88 | 368 | 360 | 102\% |
| 91 | 159 | 164 | 97\% |


| DESCRIPTION | RECORDS | Quota | \% of Quota |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92 | 372 | 360 | 103\% |
| 93 | 117 | 115 | 102\% |
| 94 | 63 | 73 | 86\% |
| 95 | 108 | 115 | 94\% |
| 97 | 348 | 370 | 94\% |
| 98 | 140 | 164 | 85\% |
| 99 | 460 | 360 | 128\% |
| 210 | 423 | 360 | 118\% |
| 211 | 195 | 164 | 119\% |
| 212 | 188 | 164 | 115\% |
| 213 | 364 | 360 | 101\% |
| 214 | 273 | 360 | 76\% |
| 215 | 82 | 73 | 112\% |
| 216 | 83 | 115 | 72\% |
| 217 | 427 | 360 | 119\% |
| 218 | 162 | 164 | 99\% |
| 232 | 200 | 164 | 122\% |
| 235 | 40 | 73 | 55\% |
| 386 | 35 | 73 | 48\% |
| 800 | 116 | 73 | 159\% |
| 801 | 62 | 73 | 85\% |
| 802 | 36 | 73 | 49\% |
| 805 | 14 | 73 | 19\% |
| 840 | 3 | 73 | 4\% |
| 851 | 41 | 73 | 56\% |
| 880 | 4 | 73 | 5\% |
| B | 134 | 73 | 184\% |
| C | 127 | 73 | 174\% |
| E | 155 | 73 | 212\% |
| F | 344 | 360 | 96\% |
| G | 177 | 115 | 154\% |
| H | 115 | 115 | 100\% |
| J | 231 | 115 | 201\% |
| L | 139 | 164 | 85\% |
| M | 191 | 164 | 116\% |
| O/OX | 445 | 279 | 159\% |
| P | 187 | 164 | 114\% |
| S/SA | 184 | 146 | 126\% |
| U | 154 | 115 | 134\% |
| V | 220 | 164 | 134\% |
| W | 128 | 115 | 111\% |
| Z | 54 | 73 | 74\% |
| CB | 63 | 73 | 86\% |
| FS | 150 | 73 | 205\% |
| LA | 125 | 164 | 76\% |
| NL | 405 | 360 | 113\% |
| NX/1/2/3/4 | 485 | 449 | 108\% |
| SB | 266 | 115 | 231\% |
| 610 | 23 | 50 | 46\% |
| 624 | 18 | 50 | 36\% |


| DESCRIPTION | RECORDS | Quota | \% of Quota |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 625 | 62 | 50 | 124\% |
| 629 | 39 | 50 | 78\% |
| 631 | 67 | 50 | 134\% |
| 654 | 91 | 50 | 182\% |
| 655 | 32 | 50 | 64\% |
| 657 | 32 | 50 | 64\% |
| 671 | 22 | 50 | 44\% |
| 683 | 10 | 50 | 20\% |
| Incomplete / Entry Error | 106 |  |  |
| Distributed / Not Returned | 2804 |  |  |
| Sleeping | 165 |  |  |
| Under 13 (too young) | 2590 |  |  |
| Left before got survey | 939 |  |  |
| Language barrier | 1081 |  |  |
| Unable to complete I busy | 1504 |  |  |
| Already completed / Dup | 1809 |  |  |
| Refusal | 9411 |  |  |
| TOTAL <br> ATTEMPTED | 43650 |  |  |
| TOTAL SAMPLE | 43650 |  |  |
| Total Input | 23241 |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For a detailed description of Public Research Institute and data collection subcontractor Wilson Associates, please see Appendix D and Appendix E.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The 2002 sampling plan was designed to provide representative data within route categories, but not necessarily at the level of individual routes. The aim was to ensure representative data across the major types of routes, stratified by (a) weekend or weekday; and (b) time of day.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ These time categories were based on categories used for boarding and alighting counts conducted by AC Transit during 2006 and 2007.
    ${ }^{4}$ Volume categories were based on data from boarding and alighting counts conducted by AC Transit during 2006 and 2007.

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Children under 13 were not surveyed; including these riders, approximately $27 \%$ of riders were under 18 .

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ In 2002/3, 61\% of adults surveyed were transit dependent. This difference is small, but statistically significant at the .05 level.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ Some riders actually wrote in that they were referring to a homeless shelter, dormitory or fraternity house. A large proportion of those citing large "household" sizes also used UC Class Passes to pay their fare, which may mean they are referring to student housing.
    ${ }^{8}$ Comprising Alameda, Berkeley, Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, and West Contra Costa Census County Divisions (CCDs).

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ Including taxis.
    ${ }^{10}$ The difference is statistically significant at the .05 level, although relatively slight ( $77.5 \%$ vs. $81.6 \%$ ).

[^7]:    ${ }^{11}$ This difference was statistically significant at that .05 level.

[^8]:    

