# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Executive Summary** .............................................................................................................. 1
  Key Findings ........................................................................................................................ 2

**Introduction** .......................................................................................................................... 5

**Methodology** ........................................................................................................................ 7
  Sampling Plan ......................................................................................................................... 8
  Weighting ............................................................................................................................... 10

**Mid-City Corridor Analysis** .............................................................................................. 13
  Ridership Profile .................................................................................................................... 14
  Trip Characteristics ............................................................................................................... 31
  Customer Satisfaction ........................................................................................................... 57

**I-15 Corridor Analysis** ....................................................................................................... 67
  Ridership Profile .................................................................................................................... 68
  Trip Characteristics ............................................................................................................... 88
  Customer Satisfaction ........................................................................................................... 117

**Mira Mesa Corridor Analysis** ............................................................................................ 127
  Ridership Profile .................................................................................................................... 128
  Trip Characteristics ............................................................................................................... 139
  Customer Satisfaction ........................................................................................................... 159

**Appendix A – Survey Instrument** ..................................................................................... 165

**Appendix B – Mid-City Corridor Weighted Frequency** ....................................................... 169

**Appendix C – I-15 Corridor Weighted Frequency** ............................................................... 177

**Appendix D – Mira Mesa Corridor Weighted Frequency** .................................................... 185
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Survey Completion Rate ............................................................................................................ 9
Figure 2: Mid-City Corridor Routes – Before Rapid ...................................................................................... 13
Figure 3: Mid-City Corridor Routes – After Rapid ...................................................................................... 13
Figure 4: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition ......................................................................................... 14
Figure 5: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 1) ....................................................................... 15
Figure 6: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 7) ....................................................................... 15
Figure 7: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 11) .................................................................... 16
Figure 8: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 15/215) ............................................................ 16
Figure 9: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity ..................................................................................................... 17
Figure 10: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity (Route 1) .................................................................................. 17
Figure 11: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity (Route 7) .................................................................................. 18
Figure 12: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity (Route 11) ............................................................................... 18
Figure 13: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity (Route 15/215) ...................................................................... 19
Figure 14: Mid-City Corridor – Household Income .................................................................................. 20
Figure 15: Mid-City Corridor – Household Income (Route 1) ................................................................. 20
Figure 16: Mid-City Corridor – Household Income (Route 7) ................................................................. 21
Figure 17: Mid-City Corridor – Household Income (Route 11) ............................................................... 21
Figure 18: Mid-City Corridor – Household Income (Route 15/215) ....................................................... 22
Figure 19: Mid-City Corridor – Automobile Availability ....................................................................... 23
Figure 20: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned ..................................................................... 24
Figure 21: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 1) ...................................................... 25
Figure 22: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 7) ...................................................... 25
Figure 23: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 11) .................................................... 26
Figure 24: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 15/215) .......................................... 26
Figure 25: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size ...................................................................................... 27
Figure 26: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 1) .................................................................... 27
Figure 27: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 7) .................................................................... 28
Figure 28: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 11) ................................................................. 28
Figure 29: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 15/215) ............................................................ 29
Figure 30: Mid-City Corridor – Rider Employment .................................................................................. 29
Figure 31: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose ...................................................................... 31
Figure 32: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 1) ....................................................... 32
Figure 33: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 7) ...................................................... 32
Figure 34: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 11) .................................................... 33
Figure 35: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 15/215) .......................................... 33
Figure 36: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode ................................................................. 34
Figure 37: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 1) .............................................35
Figure 38: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 7) .............................................35
Figure 39: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 11) ...........................................36
Figure 40: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 15/215) .....................................36
Figure 41: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode ............................................................37
Figure 42: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 1) .............................................38
Figure 43: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 7) .............................................39
Figure 44: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 11) ..........................................40
Figure 45: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 15/215) .....................................40
Figure 46: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode .................................................................................41
Figure 47: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 1) ..................................................................42
Figure 48: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 7) ..................................................................43
Figure 49: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 11) ................................................................44
Figure 50: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 15/215) .........................................................45
Figure 51: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode ..................................................................................46
Figure 52: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 1) ..................................................................47
Figure 53: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 7) ..................................................................48
Figure 54: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 11) ..................................................................49
Figure 55: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 15/215) .........................................................50
Figure 56: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use ............................................................................51
Figure 57: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 1) ..............................................................52
Figure 58: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 7) ..............................................................52
Figure 59: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 11) ............................................................53
Figure 60: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 15/215) ....................................................53
Figure 61: Mid-City Corridor – Same Trip Prior to June 2014 ............................................................54
Figure 62: Mid-City Corridor – Trip Mode Prior to June 2014 ...........................................................55
Figure 63: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value ......................................................57
Figure 64: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 1) .........................................58
Figure 65: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 7) .........................................59
Figure 66: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 11) ......................................60
Figure 67: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 15/215) .............................61
Figure 68: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value .................................................................62
Figure 69: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 1) ....................................................63
Figure 70: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 7) ....................................................63
Figure 71: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 11) ...................................................64
Figure 72: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 15/215) .........................................65
Figure 73: I-15 Corridor Routes – Before Rapid ..............................................................................67
Figure 74: I-15 Corridor Routes – After Rapid ..................................................................................67
Figure 113: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 960/60) ................................................. 93
Figure 114: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 210/110) ............................................. 94
Figure 115: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 235) ..................................................... 95
Figure 116: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode ........................................................................... 96
Figure 117: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 20) ......................................................... 97
Figure 118: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 960/60) ................................................. 98
Figure 119: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 210/110) .............................................. 99
Figure 120: I-15 Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 235) ..................................................... 100
Figure 121: I-15 Corridor – Access Mode ................................................................................................. 101
Figure 122: I-15 Corridor – Access Mode (Route 20) ............................................................................. 102
Figure 123: I-15 Corridor – Access Mode (Route 960/60) .................................................................... 103
Figure 124: I-15 Corridor – Access Mode (Route 210/110) ................................................................. 104
Figure 125: I-15 Corridor – Access Mode (Route 235) ......................................................................... 105
Figure 126: I-15 Corridor – Egress Mode ................................................................................................. 106
Figure 127: I-15 Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 20) ............................................................................. 107
Figure 128: I-15 Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 960/60) .................................................................... 108
Figure 129: I-15 Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 210/110) ................................................................. 109
Figure 130: I-15 Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 235) ......................................................................... 110
Figure 131: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use ......................................................................................... 111
Figure 132: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 20) .................................................................... 111
Figure 133: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 960/60) ............................................................. 112
Figure 134: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 210/110) ......................................................... 112
Figure 135: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 235) ................................................................. 113
Figure 136: I-15 Corridor – Same Trip Prior to June 2014 ................................................................. 114
Figure 137: I-15 Corridor – Trip Mode Prior to June 2014 ................................................................. 115
Figure 138: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value .............................................................. 117
Figure 139: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 20) .............................................. 118
Figure 140: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 960/60) ................................... 119
Figure 141: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 210/110) ................................... 120
Figure 142: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 235) ........................................... 121
Figure 143: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value .......................................................... 122
Figure 144: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 20) ...................................................... 123
Figure 145: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 960/60) ............................................. 124
Figure 146: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 210/110) ............................................. 125
Figure 147: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 235) ..................................................... 126
Figure 148: Mira Mesa Corridor Routes – Before Rapid ................................................................. 127
Figure 149: Mira Mesa Corridor Routes – After Rapid ................................................................. 127
Figure 150: Mira Mesa Corridor – Age Composition .......................................................................... 128
Figure 189: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value .................................................159
Figure 190: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 921) .....................160
Figure 191: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 237) .....................161
Figure 192: Mira Mesa Corridor – Agreement Mean Value ..........................................................162
Figure 193: Mira Mesa Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 921) ..............................163
Figure 194: Mira Mesa Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 237) ..............................164
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Routes Surveyed .................................................................................................................. 7
Table 2: Truncated Routes with Surveyed Stops .............................................................................. 7
Table 3: Statistical Precision ........................................................................................................... 8
Table 4: Onboard Survey Weights – Peak ....................................................................................... 10
Table 5: Onboard Survey Weights – Off-Peak .............................................................................. 11
Executive Summary

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) commissioned the 2015 Rapid Passenger Satisfaction Survey to measure impacts of the new Rapid service on customer satisfaction. The new Rapid service was implemented in 2014 in the Mid-City, I-15, and Mira Mesa Corridors, with the Rapid routes highlighted in bold:

- Mid-City: Routes: 1, 7, 11, and 215
- I-15: Routes: 20, 60, 110, and 235
- Mira Mesa: Routes: 921 and 237

The 2015 Rapid Passenger Satisfaction Survey was designed to produce statistically valid information on passengers’ demographic profile, trip characteristics, and satisfaction ratings. The survey was developed to be consistent with the previous “before-studies” conducted in 2012 and 2014 so that meaningful comparisons can be made when assessing changes in customer satisfaction.

To reflect changing market conditions, new responses such as Carshare, Taxi, Uber, and Lyft were included in the access/egress mode options. New questions were also added to identify whether the passengers made the same trip prior to the implementation of the new Rapid service.

A total of 3,124 onboard surveys were collected from the: Mid-City Corridor (1,537), I-15 Corridor (908), and Mira Mesa Corridor (679). Overall, survey results yield a ± 1.7 percent margin of error at a 95 percent confidence level.

For this report, the current results are compared with those from the previous studies at the corridor level. Additionally, a route-level comparison is also provided for Routes: 1, 7, 11, 15/215, 20, and 921. In the discussion of the results, individual percentages throughout the report may not add exactly to 100 percent due to rounding.
Key Findings

Mid-City Corridor

- With regard to age and ethnicity the Mid-City Corridor is very similar to 2012 with no change in the distribution by age and the only shift in ethnicity being a slightly lower percentage of Hispanic riders (down 5%).

- However, income levels have increased significantly with an 11 percentage point shift from under $50,000 to $50,000 or more, and a 15 percentage point drop in the proportion of riders with incomes under $20,000.

- In line with increased incomes, the percentage of “choice riders” defined as riders that say they have a vehicle available to make their trip, has increased by five percentage points to 26 percent. The number of households without a vehicle has declined, and the average number of vehicles in households with one or more vehicles has increased.

- The Mid-City Corridor is the lowest income corridor of the three studied with significantly more households below $20,000 and significantly fewer households with $50,000 or more income.

- In line with this, employment is approximately 10 percentage points lower than the I-15 and Mira Mesa Corridors, and “work” as a home-based trip purpose is approximately half the level for the I-15 (52%) and Mira Mesa (48%) corridors.

- 2015 home-based trip purposes show no statistically significant changes from 2012 other than the proportion of Non-home-based trips which has increased from 20 to 25 percent.

- The proportion of Mid-City Corridor riders who use transit at least five days a week has decreased from 75 to 67 percent, offset by an 11 percentage point increase in riders who ride one to four days a week from 17 to 28 percent.

- The Mid-City Corridor is the only corridor to show a decline in overall satisfaction. The decline of the average rating on a 11-point scale of 0.14 is just large enough to be significant, and is driven almost exclusively by the 0.83 decline in overall satisfaction that occurred on Route 1 which experienced significant declines in all satisfaction rating categories. Compared to Route 15, there are two significant positive changes observed on Rapid Route 215 including Availability of Seats and Hours of Services with average value increases of 0.60 and 0.50 respectively.

- Compared to 2012, Mid-City Corridor riders provide lower average agreement ratings across all four positive performance statements about information at stops, safety at stops and onboard, and the value of service. The declines were echoed for all of the individual Mid-City Corridor routes as well.
**I-15 Corridor**

- The age distribution for the I-15 Corridor remains essentially unchanged between 2014 and 2015 with four of the five age categories varying by only one percent. The only change is an increase of three percentage points in the over 65 age group.

- There is a shift, however, in ethnicity towards more diversity; more specifically a decrease of seven percentage points for White riders and an increase of six percentage points for Asian riders.

- The proportion of riders with incomes of $50,000 or more has increased by seven percentage points, and the proportion with less than $20,000 household income declined by an equal amount.

- In line with the increase in income levels, a full third of I-15 Corridor riders (33%) are now “choice riders,” up six percentage points from 27 percent in 2014.

- Although income has increased, there has been no significant change in the proportion of I-15 Corridor riders that are employed, or in the proportion of home-based trips that are for work.

- The distribution of transit use frequency does not show any statistically significant changes.

- I-15 Corridor riders provided a higher overall average satisfaction rating in 2015 than in 2014, rising by 0.49 from 7.82 to 8.31. There were no negative shifts in average satisfaction for any of the individual performance factors, and Hours of Service, Frequency of Service, and Length of Trip Time all experienced significant improvements. Although the I-15 Corridor showed positive improvement in satisfaction overall, as well as for several individual performance factors, the level of agreement for positive performance statements were down for: Information at the Stops is Helpful, You Feel Safe at the Stops, and You Feel Safe on the Vehicles. It was unchanged for The Service is Worth the Fare Paid.

**Mira Mesa Corridor**

- The age distribution for the Mira Mesa Corridor remains unchanged between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study.

- The Corridor’s riders continue to become more diverse with a nine percentage point decline in White riders, offset by increases spread across all other ethnicities with no significant increases for any single ethnicity. The Mira Mesa Corridor is the only corridor where Asian riders represent the largest proportion of riders.

- The Mira Mesa Corridor is the only Corridor to not show an increase in income, and there has also been no reduction in transit dependency as defined by having a vehicle available to make the trip they currently are making on transit.
- The Corridor has also been stable in terms of the employment level and home-based trip purposes with employment at 69 percent and work as the home-based trip purpose for 48 percent of riders.

- The distribution of transit use frequency in 2015 is similar to 2014 with the majority of riders (80%) riding at least four days a week.

- The average overall satisfaction rating for the Mira Mesa Corridor improved measurably from 7.72 in 2014 to 7.96 in 2015. This is supported by higher satisfaction ratings for Frequency of Service (+0.63), Buses Being On-time (+0.59), Length of Time to Make the Trip (+0.46), Hours of Service (+0.45), and Availability of Bus Seats (+0.26).

- In spite of the improvement in satisfaction, two of the positive performance statements for the Mira Mesa Corridor had negative shifts in the average score from 2014 to 2015, with the other two unchanged. Both of the declining items were safety related with Safety at the Stops declining 0.51, and Safety on the Vehicle declining 0.31.
Introduction

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) serves as a forum for regional decision-making, representing 18 cities and county government within its jurisdiction. As a primary metropolitan planning organization in the San Diego region, SANDAG plays a critical role in regional policies about growth, transportation planning, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, public safety, and binational collaboration.

One SANDAG planning initiative aims to expand public transit routes that encourage alternatives to driving solo, using performance measures that are driven by transit passengers. Whenever transit route improvements are planned, SANDAG conducts passenger satisfaction surveys before and after the implementation of the plan to assess the impact. SANDAG has conducted two waves of customer satisfaction studies as a baseline prior to the implementation of the new Rapid services which included studies for the Mid-City Corridor in 2012 and for the I-15 and Mira Mesa Corridors in 2014. In 2015, SANDAG has contracted with Redhill Group to conduct the “after-study” to evaluate satisfaction with the improved routes.

The 2015 “after-study” compares the current survey results with the previous onboard surveys conducted in 2012 and 2014 prior to the implementation of the new transit routes. The onboard survey was designed to yield empirically valid trip characteristics, customer satisfaction, and demographic data at the route, corridor, and day part level, whose ridership is proportionately reflected based on SANDAG ridership data. The grouping of routes into their corresponding transit corridor might not resemble the same grouping that was utilized in the previous studies. For routes that were surveyed in both the current and previous studies, a comparative analysis is conducted when changes are significant.
Methodology

The onboard surveys provide an unbiased sample of weekday riders who have used bus transit in the Mid-City, I-15, and Mira Mesa Corridors. Data collection was conducted on weekdays during a three-week period between October 22 and November 13, 2015 for the following routes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Before Study</th>
<th>After Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City</td>
<td>1, 7, 11, 15</td>
<td>1, 7, 11, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>20, 960, 210</td>
<td>20, 60, 110, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921, 237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to ensure that the targeted routes were representative of the corridor, five routes in the Mid-City and I-15 Corridors were surveyed only for riders boarding or alighting in the relevant section of each route. These "truncated" routes include routes: 1, 7, 11, 20, and 60, and the relevant section of each route is identified in Table 1: Truncated Routes with Surveyed Stops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Surveyed Stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Between El Cajon Blvd/College Ave and the western terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Between Park Blvd/University Ave and the downtown terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Between SDSU and 12th/Imperial Transit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Between Miramar College Transit Center and the northern terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Between I-15/University Ave and Balboa Ave/Ruffin Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyors were assigned a bus route on which they distributed a one-page survey instrument to all boarding passengers. The survey instruments were printed with sequential serial numbers to assist in data management, programming, and distribution. Both English and Spanish versions of the survey instrument were used and can be viewed in Appendix A.
Sampling Plan

Redhill Group developed a sampling plan that provides statistical precision of ± 5% at a 95 percent confidence level for each route with the exception of commuter Routes 60 and 110. For these two routes all runs were surveyed at least once, and the completion rates relative to average daily boardings are 65 and 55 percent respectively. Since the vast majority of riders make two trips per day, this is an extremely high completion rate relative to the actual number of individual riders. Within each route surveys were generally balanced by both daypart (peak and off-peak) and by direction.

The daypart for each survey was assigned by the trip start time as follow:

- Peak – 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM
- Off-Peak – Before 6:00 AM and After 6:00 PM, and 9:01 AM to 2:59 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Collected</th>
<th>Precision at 95% Confidence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>7,492</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,694</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because it was not necessary to attempt to survey all riders on the higher ridership routes to meet sampling objectives, a total of 13,000 riders were approached. Approximately 10 percent were ineligible because of age. Among the 11,686 passengers who were considered eligible, a total of 4,855 surveys were distributed for an initial participation rate of 42 percent. The vast majority of distributed surveys were returned (4,334, an 89% return rate). A total of 1,210 surveys were not sufficiently complete and logical to be used (representing the Not Entered category in Figure 1 below), leaving the final completed survey count of 3,124.
**Figure 1: Survey Completion Rate**

- **Total Approached**: 13,000 (100%)
  - **Ineligible**: 1,314 (10.1%)
  - **Eligible**: 11,686 (89.9%)
    - **Refused**: 6,831 (58.5%)
    - **Distributed**: 4,855 (41.5%)
      - **Not Returned**: 521 (10.7%)
      - **Returned**: 4,334 (89.3%)
        - **Entered to CATI**: 3,124 (72.1%)
        - **Not Entered**: 1,210 (27.9%)
Weighting

Survey data was weighted to ensure that the final results are representative of all passengers for the target transit corridors. The weights were developed based on SANDAG’s data which reflects the ridership for both the Rapid and “truncated” routes with a total of 28,694 boarding passengers. Weights are calculated in a two-step process. First, the total number of boarding passengers for each route is summed based on the daypart and direction categories. In the second step, the number of boarding passengers is divided by the number of completed surveys to produce the weight for each particular route-direction-daypart combination.

Table 4: Onboard Survey Weights – Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Collected Survey</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.9437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.3729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11.7520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.5634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.2165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17.9329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.9940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.9630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.0873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11.7084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33.1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.9747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.2558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiplying the number of completed surveys by the corresponding weight produces results that are in proportion to the number of boarding passengers from the ridership data. Weighting is used to minimize bias resulting from survey collection factors such as varying participation rates for different route, direction and daypart combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Collected Survey</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10.9077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.6837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13.7234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.3423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10.5314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.2315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.2346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22.7739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>17.8582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.8433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9.6681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.4358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.2763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.8646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid-City Corridor Analysis

In the 2012 Rapid Satisfaction Survey, the Mid-City Corridor was defined as MTS Routes 1, 7, 11, and Route 15. The Corridor is the same in 2015, other than the elimination of Route 15 the addition of Rapid Route 215. The data collection for Rapid Route 215 was conducted for the full length of the route in both directions. Route 1 was surveyed between El Cajon Blvd/College Ave and the western terminus. Route 7 was surveyed between Park Blvd/University Ave and the downtown terminus. Route 11 was surveyed between San Diego State University (SDSU) and the 12th/Imperial Transit Center.

**Figure 2: Mid-City Corridor Routes – Before Rapid**

![Mid-City Corridor Routes – Before Rapid](image1)

**Figure 3: Mid-City Corridor Routes – After Rapid**

![Mid-City Corridor Routes – After Rapid](image2)
Ridership Profile

This section reports current demographic characteristics of riders and compares them with the previous 2012 Pre-Rapid Satisfaction Survey for the Mid-City Corridor as well as individually for Routes 1, 7, 11, and Route 15/215.

Age Composition

There is no significant difference in the age distribution between the before and after studies for the Mid-City Corridor with all age categories either matching, or being different by only one or two percentage points. Half of riders in both studies are in the 25 to 54 age group, which accounted for 51 percent in the before-study and 50 percent in the after-study.

The age distribution for the two studies was also compared at the route level including Routes 1, 7, 11 and 15/215. The results for the corridor as a whole are generally comparable to the route level results, although with more variation at the route level due to the smaller sample sizes. The one exception is Route 15/215 which now has an increased proportion in the 18 to 24 age category (33% vs. 23% in 2012) and a reduced proportion in the 25-54 age category (46% vs. 57%). The current age distribution for Route 15/215 is also younger than for the Mid-City Corridor as a whole as shown by 33 percent of respondents in the 18 to 24 age group compared to the 24 percent for the Mid-City Corridor.
The charts comparing the age distribution between the before and after studies for each route follow below.

**Figure 5: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 1)**
(Before n = 144/After n = 290)

**Figure 6: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 7)**
(Before n = 186/After n = 328)
Figure 7: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 11)
(Before n = 199/After n = 356)

Figure 8: Mid-City Corridor – Age Composition (Route 15/215)
(Before n = 362/After n = 361)
Ethnicity

Figure 9: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity
(Before n = 942/After n = 1,443)

The proportion of Hispanic riders in the Mid-City Corridor has declined slightly from 38% to 33% between 2012 and 2015. This is offset by an increased proportion in the “Other” category which is largely comprised of Multi-racial riders. Note that on the 2012 survey, “Multi-racial” was not included as one of the responses on the survey instrument, but was included as an option for the 2015 survey.

Figure 10: Mid-City Corridor – Ethnicity (Route 1)
(Before n = 159/After n = 325)

No significant change in ethnicity has occurred between 2012 and 2015 for Route 1. Ethnicity for Route 1 varies from the Mid-City Corridor as a whole, however, with Route 1 having a slightly smaller proportion of Hispanic riders and a slightly higher proportion of African American riders.
Similar to the corridor distribution, the proportion of Hispanic riders has declined on Route 7 from 47 to 38 percent.

On Route 11, the proportion of African American riders has doubled from eight percent in 2012 to 17 percent in 2015.
In contrast with Route 11, the proportion of African American riders on Route 15/215 has decreased from 22 percent in 2012 to 11 percent in 2015.
Generally, riders in the Mid-City Corridor currently have higher annual household incomes than in the 2012 study¹. The proportion of riders who have a household income of less than $50,000 has dropped from 89 percent to 78 percent. In addition, the lowest income bracket (less than $20,000) experienced the largest decrease from 58 percent in the 2012 before-study to 43 percent in 2015.

The current household income distribution on Route 1 is consistent with what is observed at the corridor level. Also, the proportion with incomes below $50,000 has dropped from 95 percent in 2012 to 86 percent in 2015.

¹ Note: the income figures do not account for any effects from changes in employment or income between the before and after periods.
Consistent with the corridor income distribution, Route 7 also shows a lower proportion of riders who earn less than $50,000 a year (77%) compared to the before-study (88%) with a significant decrease in the lowest income category (< $20,000) from 61 percent in 2012 to 44 percent in 2015.

Following the same pattern as other Mid-City Corridor routes, Route 11 shows a decline in the proportion of riders with household incomes under $50,000 from 90 percent in 2012 to 80 percent in 2015, including a significant 17 percent decline in the under $20,000 category.
The income distribution for Route 215 is similar to the Mid-City Corridor distribution with 75 percent of riders earning less than $50,000 per year. This has dropped 11 percent since the 2012 before-study, when 86 percent were in this income category. Again this is highlighted by a large change in the lowest income category (less than $20,000) dropping from 57 percent in 2012 to 44 percent in 2015.
In line with the increase in income, the proportion of Mid-City Corridor riders that have a vehicle that they could have used to make their transit trip has increased by five percentage points from 21 percent in 2012 to 26 percent in 2015. This indicates that the new system is at least somewhat more effective in attracting choice riders and reducing roadway trips. And although the differences are not statistically significant at the individual line level, they are at least directionally improved for all four Mid-City Corridor routes.
In line with the improving income levels of Mid-City Corridor riders, the proportion of riders that have at least one vehicle in the household has increased from 50 percent in 2012 to 55 percent in 2015. In addition, the average number of vehicles for households with at least one vehicle has also increased slightly.

Changes in the proportion of households that have at least one vehicle at the corridor level were also observed on Routes 1, 11 and the 15/215. However, Route 7 remains at the same level as in 2012 with 45 percent not having any vehicles in the household. An additional significant finding is that although Route 1 showed the same five percentage point decline in households without a vehicle as the corridor as a whole, the proportion of households without a vehicle for Route 1 at 54 percent is significantly higher than the corridor average of 45 percent.
The distributions of available vehicles per household for each route are listed below.

**Figure 21: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 1)**
(Before n = 155/After n = 327)

**Figure 22: Mid-City Corridor – Number of Vehicles Owned (Route 7)**
(Before n = 192/After n = 352)
In addition to showing a five percentage point decline in the proportion of households with no available vehicles, riders on Route 15/215 also experienced an 11 percentage point increase in households that have two or more vehicles available.
Overall household size has increased slightly since the previous 2012 study with a modest, but statistically significant decline of four percentage points in the number of single-person households. Route 11 showed the greatest decline in single person households dropping from 35 percent in 2012 to 21 percent in 2015. Results for the individual routes are generally similar to the corridor as a whole, but with more variation due to the smaller sample sizes. The comparisons for 2012 and 2015 for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 follow below.
Figure 27: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 7) 
(Before n = 185/After n = 347)

Figure 28: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 11) 
(Before n = 201/After n = 390)
Figure 29: Mid-City Corridor – Household Size (Route 15/215)  
(Before n = 368/After n = 371)

Employment Status

Figure 30: Mid-City Corridor – Rider Employment  
(n = 1,365)
Employment status was not captured for the 2012 survey. Accordingly, results are only presented for 2015. Overall in the Mid-City Corridor, the proportion of riders who indicate that they are employed is 64 percent. Route 11 shows the highest proportion of employment at 72 percent with all other routes in the 60 to 64 percent range.
Trip Characteristics

This section explores trip characteristics among transit riders within the Mid-City Corridor. The results are presented first for the corridor as a whole and then for each of the individual Routes 1, 7, 11, 15/215 with comparisons to the previous 2012 study to identify any significant changes. For a clearer understanding of travel, trips that were captured on the way to home have been reversed and treated as “Home-based” trips. Access and Egress modes are then presented separately independent of the trip’s relationship to home.

Home-Based Trip Purpose

Home-based trips are trips that either start from home or end at home. In general, the fluctuation of home-based trip purpose since 2012 is minimal. For the Mid-City Corridor, a relatively low 27 percent of home-based trips are to work. Two of the largest increases are in non-home-based trips and “other” trips such as “Hotel” or “Airport,” which may indicate an increased use of transit for a broader range of purposes. As with previous questions, the results for the individual routes are similar to the corridor as whole, but with more variation due to the smaller sample sizes. The comparisons for 2012 and 2015 for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 follow below.
Figure 32: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 1)  
(Before n = 152/After n = 354)

Figure 33: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Trip Purpose (Route 7)  
(Before n = 186/After n = 373)
For Route 11 the proportion of Work as a trip purpose has increased from 27 percent in 2012 to 35 percent in 2015.

For Route 15/215, the proportion of Work as a trip purpose has increased from 26 percent in 2012 to 25 percent in 2015.
Walking and transferring from other public transit continue to be the top two ways by which Mid-City riders access Rapid from their home. The proportion of riders in 2015 who transferred from a Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak has increased by five percentage points from 23 in 2012 to 28 percent. For the 2015 result, this breaks down into 16 percent bus transfers and 12 percent transfers from the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak. This breakdown was not available for the 2012 data. The remaining access modes each account for one to two percent each with the exception of Driving Alone and Carpooling which were each zero percent for both 2012 and 2015 in this corridor.

The 2015 results for the individual route are generally similar to the Mid-City Corridor as a whole where Walking is prevalent at a range of 63 to 76 percent. Routes 1 and 11 are similar with Walking percentages of 74 and 76 percent respectively, and a transfer rate of 20 percent for each. Routes 7 and 15/215 are also similar to each other with lower Walking percentages of 65 and 63 percent respectively, and higher transfer rates of 31 and 35 percent respectively.
The individual results for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 are presented below comparing the 2012 before-study with the current 2015 after-study.

**Figure 37: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 1)**
(Before n = 129/After n = 248)

Route 1 shows a 12 percentage point decline in Walking to the bus, offset by a nine percentage point increase in transfers from Other Buses, the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak.

**Figure 38: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 7)**
(Before n = 136/After n = 243)
Figure 39: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 11)  
(Before n = 191/After n = 321)

- Walked: 78% (Before), 76% (After)
- Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak: 17% (Before), 20% (After)
- Bicycled: 1% (Before), 2% (After)
- Drove Alone: 1% (Before), 0% (After)
- Carpoled: 0% (Before), 0% (After)
- Dropped-Off: 2% (Before), 2% (After)
- Other: 1% (Before), 1% (After)

Figure 40: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 15/215)  
(Before n = 327/After n = 287)

- Walked: 63% (Before), 71% (After)
- Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak: 23% (Before), 35% (After)
- Bicycled: 3% (Before), 1% (After)
- Drove Alone: 1% (Before), 1% (After)
- Carpoled: 0% (Before), 0% (After)
- Dropped-Off: 1% (Before), 0% (After)
- Other: 1% (Before), 0% (After)
Similar to Route 1, Route 15/215 shows an eight percentage point decline in Walking to the bus, offset by a 12 percentage point increase in transfers from Other Buses, the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak.

**Home-Based Egress Modes**

**Figure 41: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode**

(Before n = 777/After n = 1,114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked-Up</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no significant changes in home-based egress modes between the 2012 before-study and the 2015 after-study with Walking (60%) and transferring to Bus/Rail (34%) having only a one percentage point difference. The egress percentage of Walking (60%) in 2015 is nine percent lower than the home-based access mode (69%) and the egress percentage transferring to Bus/Rail (34%) is six percentage points higher than the home-based access mode (28%). The proportion of transfers to Bus/Rail is comprised of Bus transfers (24%) and transfers to Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (10%).
The 2015 home-based egress results for the individual routes are similar to the Mid-City Corridor as a whole where Walking is prevalent at a range of 57 to 63 percent. Transfers to public transit for the Mid-City routes have a slightly wider range but are also similar to the corridor distribution ranging from 28 to 38 percent.

The individual results for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 are presented below comparing the 2012 before-study with the current 2015 after-study.

Figure 42: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 1) (Before n = 125/After n = 249)
Figure 43: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 7)
(Before n = 130/After n = 245)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked-Up</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 44: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 11)  
(Before n = 188/After n = 324)

Figure 45: Mid-City Corridor – Home-Based Egress Mode (Route 15/215)  
(Before n = 334/After n = 296)
**Access Modes**

The following charts show access modes for all boardings without regard to whether the trip is away from home, back to home, or a non-home-based trip.

![Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode](chart)

Figure 46: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode
(Before n = 984/After n = 1,524)

The main access modes to a boarding stop continue to be Walking and transfer from another public transit mode. The proportion of respondents in 2015 who Walked has decreased from 66 to 57 percent. This is offset primarily by an increase of riders who transferred from a Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak, which has risen from 30 to 36 percent. For 2015 this breaks down into 22 percent of Bus transfers and 14 percent of transfers from the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak. This breakdown was not available for 2012. The remaining access modes each account for one to two percent with the exception of Driving Alone which was zero percent for both 2012 and 2015 within this corridor. Respondents who cited that they Walked were further asked to specify the unit distance. The majority of riders who walk indicate that they walk three blocks or less (83%) which is essentially unchanged from the previous 2012 study (80%).
Results among individual routes are generally similar to the Mid-City Corridor as a whole with the exception of Route 11 where Walking is more prevalent at 63 percent, offset by reduced transfers from other public transit which is lower than the corridor as a whole at 30 percent.

The individual results for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 are presented below comparing the 2012 before-study with the current 2015 after-study.

**Figure 47: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 1)**
*(Before n = 158/After n = 355)*
Figure 48: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 7)
(Before n = 198/After n = 376)

- **Walked**: Before = 54%, After = 65%
- **Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak**: Before = 30%, After = 41%
- **Bicycled**: Before = 0%, After = 2%
- **Drove Alone**: Before = 1%, After = 0%
- **Carpooled**: Before = 1%, After = 2%
- **Dropped-Off**: Before = 2%, After = 1%
- **Other**: Before = 1%, After = 1%

Legend: Orange = Before, Green = After
Figure 49: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 11)
(Before n = 230/After n = 403)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyced</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped-Off</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 50: Mid-City Corridor – Access Mode (Route 15/215)
(Before n = 398/After n = 390)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycled</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped-Off</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no significant changes in egress mode between the 2012 before-study and the 2015 after-study with Walking (62%) exactly matching the previous study and transferring to Bus/Rail (29%) only two percentage points lower. The egress percentage Walking (62%) is slightly higher than for the access mode (57%) and the egress percentage transferring to Bus/Rail (29%) is slightly lower than for the access mode (36%). For the egress mode, the transfer to Bus/Rail is comprised of Bus transfers (21%) and transfers to Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (8%).

For those who walk after getting off the bus, 79 percent walk three blocks or less, which essentially matches the 2012 before-study where this distance accounted for 81 percent.
The results for the individual routes are generally similar to the Mid-City Corridor as a whole with the exceptions of Route 1, where at 68 percent Walking is six percent higher than the Mid-City Corridor as a whole, and Route 15/215 where Walking is less prevalent at 57 percent, five percent lower than the 62 percent for the corridor as a whole. This is offset by increased transfers to other public transit which is higher than the corridor as a whole (29%) at 37 percent.

The individual results for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 are presented below comparing the 2012 before-study with the current 2015 after-study.

**Figure 52: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 1)**
(Before n = 154/After n = 340)

- **Walk**: Before 72%, After 68%
- **Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak**: Before 21%, After 24%
- **Bicycle**: Before 1%, After 2%
- **Drive Alone**: Before 1%, After 0%
- **Carpool**: Before 1%, After 1%
- **Picked-Up**: Before 1%, After 3%
- **Other**: Before 3%, After 2%
Figure 53: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 7)  
(Before n = 192/After n = 348)

- **Walk**: 64% Before, 64% After
- **Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak**: 31% Before, 27% After
- **Bicycle**: 1% Before, 1% After
- **Drive Alone**: 1% Before, 2% After
- **Carpool**: 0% Before, 0% After
- **Picked-Up**: 1% Before, 3% After
- **Other**: 3% Before, 2% After
Figure 54: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 11)  
(Before n = 225/After n = 395)

- **Walk**: 55% (Before) to 64% (After)
- **Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak**: 38% (Before) to 24% (After)
- **Bicycle**: 0% (Before) to 2% (After)
- **Drive Alone**: 0% (Before) to 0% (After)
- **Carpool**: 0% (Before) to 1% (After)
- **Picked-Up**: 3% (Before) to 7% (After)
- **Other**: 3% (Before) to 2% (After)
Figure 55: Mid-City Corridor – Egress Mode (Route 15/215)
(Before n = 395/After n = 371)

- **Walk**: Before 60%, After 57%
- **Bus/Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak**: Before 31%, After 37%
- **Bicycle**: Before 3%, After 1%
- **Drive Alone**: Before 1%, After 1%
- **Carpool**: Before 0%, After 1%
- **Picked-Up**: Before 2%, After 1%
- **Other**: Before 5%, After 1%
The majority of riders in the Mid-City Corridor (80%) ride the bus at least four days a week which is similar to the 2012 proportion of 82 percent. On a more granular level, however, the proportion of riders that report that they ride the bus at least five days a week has decreased from 75 percent to 67 percent. This is offset by increases in the proportion of riders who use the transit four days a week (up from 7% to 13%), three days a week (up from 5% to 8%), and two days a week (up from 3% to 6%).

The results for the individual routes generally are similar to the Mid-City Corridor as a whole. The individual results for Routes 1, 7, 11, and 15/215 are presented below comparing the 2012 before-study with the current 2015 after-study.
Figure 57: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 1)
(Before n = 156/After n = 340)

Figure 58: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 7)
(Before n = 192/After n = 360)
Figure 59: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 11)
(Before n = 206/After n = 395)

Figure 60: Mid-City Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 15/215)
(Before n = 378/After n = 384)
Trips Prior to June 2014

New questions were included on the 2015 Onboard Survey to identify riders’ trip modes prior to the implementation of the new Rapid routes.

New Questions in 2015:
- Did you make this same trip before June 2014?
- If yes, how did you make this trip before June 2014?

![Figure 61: Mid-City Corridor – Same Trip Prior to June 2014 (Mid-City n = 1,473)](image)

Approximately half (52%) of Mid-City Corridor bus riders indicated that they did not make their trip the same way prior to June 2014. The proportion of riders who did not make their trip the same way is similar across the individual routes ranging from 49 to 57 percent.
Figure 62: Mid-City Corridor – Trip Mode Prior to June 2014
(Mid-City n = 660/All Routes n = 156-183)

Another Bus: 47% Mid-City, 36% Route 215
Same Bus: 18% Mid-City, 21% Route 215
Trolley: 12% Mid-City, 11% Route 215
Walked: 6% Mid-City, 4% Route 215
Dropped-Off: 5% Mid-City, 6% Route 215
Drove Alone: 5% Mid-City, 6% Route 215
Bicycle: 3% Mid-City, 4% Route 215
Carpool/Vanpool: 2% Mid-City, 1% Route 215
Other: 2% Mid-City, 2% Route 215

Route 1, Route 7, Route 11, Route 215
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The largest proportion of riders (47%) who made the same trip prior to 2014 rode a Different Bus. An additional 18 percent say they rode the Same Bus and 13 percent used the Trolley or the Coaster.

For Route 215 which was not available before 2014, 75 percent rode Another Bus which predominantly consists of Route 15 and 10 percent used the Trolley. For Routes 1, 7 and 11, there is a declining ratio of riding Another Bus vs. the Same Bus with a 36/21 percent split for Route 1, 31/32 for Route 7, and 21/37 for Route 11. The Trolley was another common previous mode for these three routes at 11, 14 and 17 percent respectively.
Customer Satisfaction

One of the objectives of the Onboard Survey is to evaluate rider satisfaction across a variety of performance attributes before and after the implementation of the new Rapid route. This includes overall satisfaction, specific performance ratings, and agreement to statements that address riders’ riding experience, personnel, safety, and bus amenities. Respondents were asked to rate all of the performance factors in the following chart for the route they were riding on a 11-point scale anchored by Zero for “Extremely Poor” Five for “Neutral,” and 10 for “Extremely Good.”

**Satisfaction Rating**

*Figure 63: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value*  
*(Before n = 956-1,044/After n = 1,462-1,489)*

- **Frequency of service**: Before 7.47, After 7.48
- **Hours of service**: Before 7.25, After 7.35
- **Buses are on time**: Before 7.15, After 6.85
- **Length of time to make this trip**: Before 7.38, After 7.27
- **Stop locations are convenient**: Before 8.03, After 7.75
- **Cleanliness of vehicles**: Before 7.85, After 7.67
- **Comfort of vehicles**: Before 7.68, After 7.44
- **Courtesy of drivers**: Before 8.29, After 7.85
- **Availability of seats**: Before 7.50, After 7.79
- **Overall rating**: Before 7.99, After 7.85
The Mid-City Corridor is the only corridor to show a slight decline in overall satisfaction. The decline of 0.14 is just large enough to be statistically significant, and is driven almost exclusively by the 0.83 decline in overall satisfaction that occurred on Route 1 which experienced significant declines in all satisfaction rating categories. All other routes were within the margin of error when compared to the before-study for overall satisfaction. An MTS system-wide satisfaction survey which was conducted in April 2015 also showed a decline in overall satisfaction (Satisfied or Very Satisfied) for bus riders dropping six points, from 98 percent in 2013 to 92 percent in 2015. The MTS survey measured satisfaction on a 4-point scale from Very Satisfied to Very Dissatisfied.

For the corridor as a whole, the largest decline in mean satisfaction ratings are for Courtesy of Drivers (-0.44), followed by Buses Being On-time (-0.30), and Stop Locations Are Convenient (-0.28).

![Figure 64: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 1) (Before n = 167-179/After n = 336-344)](image_url)
The average performance ratings for Route 1 have declined for the overall satisfaction rating as well as for each of the more specific performance factors. The overall satisfaction rating declined by 0.83. The largest declines for specific performance factors include Stop Location (-1.11), followed by Buses Being On-time (-1.07), Courtesy of Drivers (-0.87), and Length of Time to Make the Trip (-0.85).

In addition to “Buses Being On-time” being the second largest decline in satisfaction for Route 1, it is the lowest average satisfaction rating for any performance factor for any of the Mid-City Corridor routes.

Figure 65: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 7)  
(Before n = 196-213/After n = 353-361)
The overall rating mean value for Route 7 shows no change from the previous study (7.90 in 2012, 7.91 in 2015). In addition, all but one of the individual performance factors received similar ratings in both surveys. The sole exception is for the Availability of Seats which improved by 0.62.

![Figure 66: Mid-City Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 11) (Before n = 217-238/After n = 388-395)](image)

Although the change for the mean value for overall satisfaction is not significant on Route 11 (from 7.84 to 7.74), two performance factors have experienced large declines from the 2012 results. These are Courtesy of Drivers (-0.63) and Buses Being On-time (-0.61). Other performance factors that experienced smaller but significant declines include Comfort of Vehicles (-0.44), Cleanliness of Vehicles (-0.33), and Length of Travel time (-0.27).
The overall satisfaction rating for Route 15/215 has not changed significantly between 2012 and 2015 at 8.09 and 8.07 respectively. In addition, there have been no significant declines in average ratings for individual performance factors, and two factors showed significant positive changes. These are Availability of Seats, up 0.60, and Hours of Services, up 0.50.
Agreement with Performance Statements

Figure 68: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value
(Before n = 960-982/After n = 1,458-1,478)

Mid-City Corridor riders provided lower agreement ratings across all four positive performance statements. The level of decline ranged from -0.73 for Safety at the Stops, to Service Being Worth the Fare Paid at -0.39 with Information at the Stops (-0.56) and Safety on the Vehicle (-0.49) falling in between. The declines observed at the corridor level were echoed at the individual route level for all Mid-City Corridor routes.
As with the performance attribute ratings for Route 1, agreement with positive service statements has declined for all four statements. The largest decline is observed for Information at the Stops (-1.50), followed by Safety at the Stops (-1.31), Service Being Worth the Fare Paid (-0.98), and Safety on the Vehicles (-0.84).

Route 7 experienced significant declines in agreement with Safety at the Stops (-0.83) and Safety on the Vehicles (-0.54).
Figure 71: Mid-City Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 11) (Before n = 217-220/After n = 390-398)

Similar to Route 1, Route 11 experienced declines in average agreement with all four positive performance statements. The largest decline in agreement is for Information at the Stops (-0.77), followed by Safety at the Stops (-0.72), Safety on the Vehicles (-0.61), and Fare payment (-0.43).
For Route 15/215, the only statistically significant decline in average agreement with the positive service statements is for Safety at the Stops which declined slightly by 0.40. All other statements have ratings that are within the margin of error for a change between 2012 and 2015.
I-15 Corridor Analysis

In 2014 the I-15 Corridor was defined as MTS Routes 20, 210 and 960. In 2015 the Corridor is defined as MTS Routes 20, 60, 110, and Rapid Route 235. The data collection for both Routes 110 and 235 was conducted for the full length of the route in both directions. Route 20 was surveyed between Miramar College Transit Station and the northern terminus. For Route 60, the portion of the route surveyed was between I-15/University Ave and Balboa Ave/Ruffin Rd.

Figure 73: I-15 Corridor Routes – Before Rapid

Figure 74: I-15 Corridor Routes – After Rapid
Ridership Profile

This section presents current demographic characteristics of riders for the I-15 Corridor and compares them with the previous study as well as between riders for Route 20.

Age Composition

Figure 75: I-15 Corridor – Age Composition
(Before n = 342/After n = 805)

There is no significant difference in the age distribution between the 2014 before-study and the current 2015 after-study for the I-15 Corridor. The majority of riders in both studies are in the 25 to 54 age group which accounts for 58 and 59 percent of I-15 Corridor riders respectively.
The sample sizes for the two studies for Route 20 are not sufficient to identify statistically significant differences in the age distribution between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study. However, the results for Route 20 are significantly different than the corridor as a whole, with seven percentage points more in the 18 to 24 age category and eight percentage points less in the 25 to 54 age group.
The sample sizes for Route 960 and 60 are not sufficient to provide statistically significant differences in the age distribution. However, Route 60 shows a much higher proportion of riders who are in the age of 25 to 54 (75%) compared to the corridor as a whole (59%).

Similarly, none of the differences among age group categories for Route 210 and 110 are statistically significant due to the small sample sizes.
The age group distribution for Route 235 is very similar to the corridor as a whole. Riders of Route 235 are primarily composed of individuals in the 25 to 54 age group (61%) which is similar to the 59 percent for the corridor as a whole. Less than one-quarter (21%) are in the 18 to 24 age group, and an even lower 17 percent are 55 years old or older.
Compared to the previous study, the current I-15 Corridor the proportion of White riders has declined from 34 to 27 percent, while the proportion of Asian riders has increased from 15 to 21 percent. It should be noted, however, that the change in the percentages may be impacted more by the shift in routes surveyed than by shifts within the same routes. In the before-study, the survey was conducted on the 20, 210, and 960 Routes. In 2015 the 210 and 960 were replaced with the 110, and 60 Routes, and the Rapid 235.
The increase in the proportion of Asian riders is more pronounced on Route 20 than for the I-15 Corridor as a whole with the proportion of Asian riders almost doubling from 13 to 25 percent. This is offset by declines in the proportion of Hispanic riders (from 28 to 18%) and White riders (35 to 26%). The “Other” category also increased from nine to 17 percent, and the majority of this group indicated that they are Multi-racial.
Compared to Route 960, Route 60 has experienced a significant increase in riders who are Hispanic, rising from 20 percent to 38 percent. Although the other ethnicity categories appear to fluctuate, the differences are not statistically significant based on the sample sizes.

The distribution of riders by ethnicity has also changed from the previous route 210 to the current Route 110 with a significant rise in the proportion of Asian riders which increased from 33 percent for Route 210 to 51 percent for Route 110. This is offset by directional decreases in White and Hispanic riders of seven and 11 percentage points respectively.
The distribution by ethnicity for Route 235 is very similar to the I-15 Corridor as a whole with no individual segment varying by more than three percentage points.
The proportion of I-15 Corridor users who have a household income of $50,000 or higher has increased by seven percentage points from 26 percent in the 2014 before-study to 33 percent in 2015. In addition, the under $20,000 category declined seven percentage points from 40 to 33 percent.

There has been no significant shift in income levels for Route 20 riders.

Note: the income figures do not account for any effects from changes in employment or income between the before and after periods.
Similarly, for Route 960/60 riders there has been no significant shift in the proportion of riders under $20,000, under $50,000, or $50,000 and higher.

The income level for Route 110 has increased from the previous Route 210. The proportion of riders who earn less than $50,000 was much higher for Route 210 (62%) than for Route 110 at 33 percent. This significant difference is driven primarily by a significant decline in the proportion of riders with less than $20,000 in household income which dropped from 23 percent for Route 210 to nine percent for Route 110. Conversely, the proportion of riders that earn at least $50,000 has increased significantly from the before study from 39 percent to 68 percent.
Approximately two-thirds (67%) of riders on Route 235 earn less than $50,000 with almost half of this group (33%) in the under $20,000 category. This is in line with the I-15 Corridor as a whole.
Automobile Availability

Figure 90: I-15 Corridor – Automobile Availability
(Before n = 379/After n = 885)

The proportion of riders in the I-15 Corridor that had a vehicle available to make the trip they made by bus is up six percentage points from the 2014 study, at 33 percent. This indicates that the new system in the I-15 Corridor is at least somewhat more effective in attracting choice riders and reducing roadway trips.

Although the proportion of choice riders increased for the I-15 Corridor as a whole, the percentage is unchanged for Route 20 and Route 960/60 riders at 25 and 39 percent respectively. The increase for the I-15 Corridor is primarily driven by the increase on Route 210/110 which jumped 23 percentage points from the before study.
Riders were also asked how many vehicles are available for use by the people in their household. In line with the increased proportion of choice riders, the proportion of riders who do not have a vehicle available has decreased from 37 percent in the previous study to 33 percent in 2015. In addition, among those riders that do have at least one vehicle available, the average number of vehicles in the household has increased slightly.

For Route 20 the proportion of households that do not have a vehicle has declined directionally, but is not quite statistically significant at 95 percent confidence level.
The distribution of the number of vehicles owned does not show any significant changes between Route 960 and Route 60.

The proportion of rider households with at least two vehicles has almost doubled from the before-study with Route 210 (32%) to 60 percent for Route 110 in 2015. This is also 24 percentage points higher than the I-15 Corridor as a whole. The increase in auto ownership is likely influenced by the elimination of two Mid-City stops made by Route 210, but not by Route 110 which goes non-stop from Mira Mesa to downtown. Riders commuting between Mira Mesa and the two Mid-City stops were likely to have a lower level of auto ownership than those commuting directly from Mira Mesa to downtown.
Over one-third (35%) of Route 235 riders do not own any vehicles. Twenty-nine percent own one vehicle, and 36 percent have at least two vehicles in their household. This is in line with the overall I-15 Corridor.

**Household Size**

Household size for the I-15 Corridor has increased slightly since the 2014 before-study with the largest change being in the percentage of single-person households which has declined by five percentage points from 21 to 16 percent.
The results for Route 20 generally follow those for the corridor, either matching exactly or varying by only one to three percentage points.

There are no significant changes in household size between the 2014 before-study on Route 960 and the 2015 study for Route 60.
The only statistically significant change in household size for Route 210/110 is in the proportion of single-person households which has declined from 21 percent to seven percent. This is also lower than the 2015 I-15 Corridor proportion for single-person households of 16 percent.

Household size is distributed relatively evenly across the five categories with only an eight percentage point difference from the lowest category (1 person, 16%) and the highest (3 persons, 24%). This distribution is generally in line with the I-15 Corridor overall.
Employment Status

For the I-15 Corridor the employment status is unchanged between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study with 74 percent indicating that they are employed.

Similar to the corridor distribution, there are no significant changes observed for Route 20 between the before and after studies, and the results in 2015 for Route 20 exactly match the 2015 corridor results.
There is no significant change in employment status for Route 960/60 between the before and after studies, although the high level of 95 percent employment for Route 60 is significantly higher than the 74 percent for the I-15 Corridor as a whole.
Similarly, for Route 210/110 there is no significant change between the before and after studies, but the high level of 93 percent employment is well above the I-15 Corridor average of 74 percent.

Figure 105: I-15 Corridor – Rider Employment (Route 235)
(n = 420)

The majority of riders on Route 235 (73%) are employed which is similar to the corridor percentage at 74 percent.
Trip Characteristics

This section explores trip characteristics for riders within the I-15 Corridor. The results are assessed between users on Route 20 and compared with the previous study to identify any significant changes. For a clearer understanding of travel, trips that were captured on the way to home have been reversed for presentation of “Home-based” trip purpose, and access and egress modes. Access and Egress modes are then presented separately independent of the trip’s relationship to home.

Home-Based Trip Purpose

Home-based trips are trips that either start from home or end at home. The only significant changes in trip purposes between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study are the four percent decline in Medical Trips and the six percent increase in “Other” trips.
The trip purpose distribution for Route 20 is significantly different than for the corridor as a whole with Work Trips being nine percentage points lower at 43 percent.

Work is the primary home-based trip purpose for Route 960/60. At 75 percent, this is significantly higher than the overall I-15 Corridor average. Although there is a 10 percent difference between the 960 in 2014 to the 60 in 2015, it is not a significant change. The only statistically significant change is in the proportion of Non-Home-Based trips which increased by 11 percentage points from six percent to 17 percent.
Work is also the predominant home-based trip purpose for Route 210/110, and this is also significantly higher than the I-15 Corridor average of 52 percent. There were no significant changes in trip purpose between the 210 in 2014 and the 110 in 2015.

The primary home-based trip purpose for Route 235 is Work, accounting for half (51%) of trip purposes overall. School/college (13%) is the second most frequent home-based trip purpose followed by recreation/visiting at five percent. Since the 235 has by far the highest ridership for I-15 Corridor routes, the trip purpose distribution closely matches results for the I-15 Corridor overall. The Other category which includes “hotel,” “airport,” and other miscellaneous trip purposes, accounts for 13 percent of home-based trips.
Walking, transferring from Another Bus, and transferring from the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak continue to be the top three home-based access modes for buses in the I-15 Corridor. However, Walking has moved from the first to the second most common mode with a decline from 40 to 25 percent. This is offset by an increase in riders who transferred from a Bus or the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak which have risen from 33 to 36 percent, and 11 to 18 percent respectively. The implementation of Rapid 235 provides more connectivity between the I-15 Corridor and the rest of the system. The remaining access modes have remained unchanged from 2014 to 2015 with the exception of Driving Alone which has increased moderately from three to eight percent.
Route 20 is atypical of the I-15 Corridor as a whole with Walking as an access mode for Route 20 increasing from 40 percent in 2014 to 56 percent in 2015. This is the reverse of the I-15 Corridor as a whole where Walking decreases from 40 percent to 25 percent. Over the same time period, access by Bus for Route 20 decreases from 34 percent to 21 percent. All other home-based access modes have remained unchanged from 2014.
Given the limited sample sizes in both the before and after studies, no statistically significant changes were observed between Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015. The distribution of home-based access mode for Route 60 is also not significantly different than the I-15 Corridor overall.
The distribution of home-based access modes for Route 210 in 2014, and Route 110 in 2015 are similar with all differences between the two studies being less than five percent. The proportion of Walking for Route 110 is, however, significantly higher than the I-15 Corridor overall average for Walking of 25 percent.
The top three home-based access modes among riders on Route 235 are transferring from a Bus (39%), transferring from Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (20%), and Walking (18%). Walking is a slightly lower proportion as the home-based access mode for Route 235 than the I-15 Corridor average for Walking of 25 percent.
There are no significant changes in home-based egress modes between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study.

The percentage Walking to their non-home destination in 2015 (39%) is 14 percentage points higher than the home-based access mode (25%). Conversely, the percent transferring to a Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak is lower among home-based egress modes (10%) than home-based access modes (18%).
The current Route 20 home-based egress mode results are very similar to the 2014 results with no statistically significant differences. The results for Route 20 also are not significantly different than for the corridor as a whole.
Similar to its access mode counterpart, the home-based egress mode distribution does not reveal any statistically significant differences between Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015. However, Walking (72%) is more prevalent and Bus (24%) less prevalent for Route 60 than for the I-15 Corridor overall where these percentages are both 39 percent.
There are no significant changes in home-based egress modes between Route 210 in 2014 and Route 110 in 2015. However, similar to Route 60, Walking is more prevalent for Route 110 (60%) than for the I-15 Corridor (39%), and transferring to a Bus is less prevalent at 18 percent compared to 39 percent for the I-15 Corridor overall.
Similar to the I-15 Corridor distribution, the two main home-based egress modes on Route 235 are transferring to a Bus (41%) and Walking (37%).
In the previous study, nearly half (47%) of respondents indicated that they Walked to reach the bus stop while 30 percent stated that they transferred from Another Bus. In 2015 the proportion of respondents who Walk has decreased to 29 percent which is offset by the increasing use of Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (15%) and a small increase for those who Drive Alone (6%). The remaining access modes have not shown any significant changes since 2014.

Respondents who say that they Walked or Bicycled were further asked to specify the distance they travel. The majority of riders (75%) who Walk indicated that they walk three blocks or less which is essentially the same as the previous study (77%).
For Route 20, the distribution of access modes can be categorized into two major groups: Walking and transfer from Another Bus. The proportion of riders who indicate that they Walk to the boarding stop has increased from 45 to 57 percent. In contrast, the percentage that mentioned transferring from Another Bus is now lower at 22 percent compared to 31 percent in the before-study. The proportions of Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak usage as well as “Dropped-Off” remain unchanged from last year.

Walk distance (blocks) is similar among the two studies with 79 percent among users in the after-study and 78 percent of those in the before-study indicating they walk three blocks or less.
There are no significant changes in access mode between Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015. However, Walking as the access mode for Route 60 at 42 percent is higher than the I-15 Corridor average of 29 percent.
As with Routes 960/60 there is no significant difference in the distribution of access mode between Route 210 in 2014 and Route 110 in 2015. However, Walking as the access mode for Route 110 at 54 percent is higher than the I-15 Corridor average for Walking of 29 percent. In addition, transferring from a Bus at 13 percent is 21 percentage points lower than the overall I-15 Corridor average of 34 percent.
The top three access modes on Route 235 are transferring from a Bus (38%), Walking (23%), and transferring from the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (17%). This distribution is similar to the I-15 Corridor as a whole where these modes account for 34, 29, and 15 percent respectively. Walking is the only access mode that varies significantly from the Corridor as a whole, being six percent lower for Route 235.
Similar to the access mode, the top two egress modes are Walking and transferring to Another Bus at 35 and 38 percent respectively. There are no significant changes in egress mode from 2014 to 2015.

The proportion of riders who walked three blocks or less is 72 percent in 2015 which is within the margin of error for the before-study at 78 percent.
On Route 20, the distribution of egress modes is similar to I-15 Corridor overall, and there were no significant changes from 2014.
The two major egress modes among riders of Route 960/60 are Walking and transferring to a Bus. There are no statistically significant differences between Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015. However, Route 60 riders are more likely than I-15 Corridor riders to Walk (57 vs. 35%) and less likely to transfer to the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak (3 vs. 13%).
On Route 110, Walking is the most common egress mode among riders (59%), followed by transferring to a Bus (16%), and Driving Alone (14%). There are no significant changes between Route 210 in 2014 and Route 110 in 2015. Walking and Driving Alone are more common for Route 110 than the I-15 Corridor as a whole (59% and 14% vs. 35% and 2% respectively), while Bus and the Trolley/Coaster/Amtrak are lower at 16 and one percent vs. 38 and 13 percent respectively.
The distribution of egress modes on Route 235 closely resembles the distribution of the I-15 Corridor where Walking and transferring to a Bus account for 33 and 40 percent respectively.
**Frequency of Use**

### Figure 131: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use
(Before n = 357/After n = 884)

Generally, the distribution of transit use frequency among riders for the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study does not show any statistically significant change. Directionally, the percentage of riders riding five or more days a week declined by four percentage points, offset by riders riding four days a week which increased by an equal four percentage points. Looking at riders that ride three days per week or more often, there is virtually no change with 87 percent riding three-plus days a week in 2014 and 86 percent in 2015. This is six percentage points higher than for system-wide MTS bus riders, where 80 percent were riding three-plus days per week in an April 2015 satisfaction survey.

### Figure 132: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 20)
(Before n = 239/After n = 278)
Results for Route 20 are generally the same as for the corridor as a whole, and also show a directional change from riders riding five or more days a week, down six percentage points being offset by riders riding four days a week increasing by five percentage points.

![Figure 133: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 960/60) (Before n = 66/After n = 66)](chart)

The vast majority of Route 60 respondents ride five or more days a week (88%). There are no significant changes in ridership frequency between Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015, however, riding five plus days a week is 24 percentage points more common for Route 60 than for the I-15 Corridor as a whole.

![Figure 134: I-15 Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 210/110) (Before n = 52/After n = 102)](chart)
There is no difference in the frequency of use between Route 210 in 2014 and Route 110 in 2015. As with Route 60 the vast majority of Route 110 riders ride five or more days a week which is 17 percentage points higher than the I-15 Corridor average.

The frequency of use for Route 235 is virtually identical to the distribution in the I-15 Corridor with almost two-thirds (64%) travelling five or more days a week.
Trips Prior to June 2014

New questions were included on the 2015 Onboard Survey to identify previous riders and their associated trip modes prior to the implementation of the new corridor structure.

New Questions in 2015:
- Did you make this same trip before June 2014?
- If yes, how did you make this trip before June 2014?

Figure 136: I-15 Corridor – Same Trip Prior to June 2014
(I-15 n = 890/Route 20 n = 280/Route 60 n = 66/Route 110 n = 101/Route 235 n = 443)

For the I-15 Corridor as a whole, 38 percent of riders indicated that they made the same trip before 2014. This ranges from a low of 26 percent for Route 60 to a high of 54 percent for Route 110. Routes 20 and 235 were in the middle at 32 and 39 percent respectively.
Figure 137: I-15 Corridor – Trip Mode Prior to June 2014
(I-15 n = 308/Route 20 n = 82/Route 60 n = 17/Route 110 n = 53/Route 235 n = 156)
The top five previous trip modes for the I-15 Corridor that were five percent or higher included Another Bus (57%), Drove Alone (15%), the Trolley (7%), and Walk or the Same Bus (5% each). Route 60 and Route 235 were the most likely to have used Another Bus at 63 and 62 percent respectively. Route 60, at 26 percent, was also the Route that was most likely to say “Drove Alone.” Route 20 (30%) and Route 110 (20%) were most likely to say “Same Bus,” Route 20 was most likely to say “Walked” and Route 60 was most likely to say “the Trolley.” No other prior trip mode was cited by 10 percent of more by any Route’s riders.

The combined percentages of riders who drove alone, carpooled, or were dropped-off are used to measure the proportion of riders who switched from any form of automobile travel to bus transit. At the corridor level, 21 percent of riders switched from an automobile to transit. The largest transition is observed for Route 60 (26%), followed by Route 110 (24%), Route 235 (21%), and Route 20 (19%).
Customer Satisfaction

One of the objectives of the Onboard Survey is to evaluate rider satisfaction across a variety of performance attributes prior to and after the implementation of the new Rapid route. This includes overall satisfaction and more detailed performance ratings that address riders’ riding experience, personnel, safety, and bus amenities. Respondents were asked to rate all of the performance factors in the following chart for the route they were riding on a 11-point scale anchored by Zero for “Extremely Poor” Five for “Neutral,” and 10 for “Extremely Good.”

Satisfaction Rating

Figure 138: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value
(Before n = 379/After n = 877-892)
For the I-15 Corridor the average overall satisfaction has increased from 7.82 in 2014 to 8.31 in 2015. In addition, there were no negative shifts in average satisfaction for any of the individual performance factors, and Hours of Service, Frequency of Service, and Length of Trip Time all experienced significant improvements of 1.17, 0.95, and 0.81, respectively.

For Route 20, the overall satisfaction rating is unchanged from 2014. Two individual performance factors showed declines in the average ratings and one improved. Comfort of Vehicle and Cleanliness of the Bus were the two that declined by 0.44 and 0.42, respectively. Availability of Seats is the performance factor that showed positive improvement with the average increasing by 0.58.

**Figure 139: I-15 Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 20)**

(Before n = 255/After n = 274-281)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Factor</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of service</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of service</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses are on time</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to make this trip</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop locations are convenient</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of vehicles</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort of vehicles</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy of drivers</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of seats</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall satisfaction for Route 960/60 has increased directionally from 7.80 in 2014 to 8.11 in 2015. The only statistically significant change in an average score was for Length of Time to Make this Trip, where the mean value improved from 7.21 to 8.33.
Overall satisfaction for Route 210/110 is essentially unchanged with a score of 8.02 in 2014 and 7.95 in 2015. As with Route 60, the only performance improvement for Route 110 is for the Length of Time to Make this Trip, which has increased significantly from 7.41 to 8.23. There were no statistically significant changes that were negative.
The average overall rating for Route 235 is 8.41 which is higher than Routes 20, 60 and 110.
Although the rating for overall satisfaction for the I-15 Corridor improved, and there were no negative shifts for any of the individual performance factors, in 2015 riders were less likely to agree with three of the four positive performance statements. Safety at the Bus Stop showed the greatest decline with the average rating dropping by 0.41. This is followed by Safety on the Vehicle (-0.29) and Information at the Stops Being Helpful (-0.24). The Service Being Worth the Fare Paid did not change by a significant amount.
Figure 144: I-15 Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 20)
(Before n = 255/After n = 274-279)

Average ratings for the positive performance statements for Route 20 mirror the I-15 Corridor as a whole with declines in three of the four statements and no measurable change for The Service is Worth the Fare Paid. For the three that declined, the biggest decline was for Information at the Stops (-0.74), followed by Safety at the Stops (-0.67), and Safety on the Vehicles (-0.48).
The ratings for agreement with the performance statements for Route 960 in 2014 and Route 60 in 2015 are similar with no statistically significant differences.
There was one significant change in agreement ratings between Route 210 in 2014 and Route 110 in 2015. This was a decline in agreement with the statement “You Feel Safe at the Stops,” which dropped from an average score of 8.20 to 7.38. Agreement with the other three statements did not change materially.
Average agreement ratings for Route 235 ranged from a high of 8.21 for “The Service Being Worth the Fare Paid” at 8.21 to 7.57 for “Information at the Stops is Helpful.”
Mira Mesa Corridor Analysis

In the 2015 after-study the Mira Mesa Corridor is defined as MTS Routes 237 and 921. In the previous study, the routes surveyed for this corridor were Routes 880 and 921. The data collection for both routes was conducted for the full length of the route in both directions.

Figure 148: Mira Mesa Corridor Routes – Before Rapid

![Mira Mesa Corridor Routes - Before Rapid](image)

Figure 149: Mira Mesa Corridor Routes – After Rapid

![Mira Mesa Corridor Routes - After Rapid](image)
Ridership Profile

This section identifies current demographic profiles of riders for the Mira Mesa Corridor and compares them with the previous 2014 before-study as well as between riders on Route 921.

Age Composition

The majority of riders in the Mira Mesa Corridor continue to be within the age group of 18 to 54 years old. Although the differences between the before-study and the after-study are not statistically significant, the proportion of riders in the working group age of 25 to 54 is directionally four percentage points higher and the 18 to 24-year-old category is directionally four percentage points lower.
Although the sample size for Route 921 is smaller than for the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole, the percentage differences are larger for riders of this route resulting in statistically significant changes from the 2014 before-study. These include a 10 percentage point increase in the proportion of riders in the 25 to 54 age group to 60 percent, and an 11 percentage point decline in the proportion of riders aged 18 to 24 to 25 percent.

Route 237 has a higher proportion of younger, 18-24 year-old riders (38%) than Route 921 (25%), and fewer riders (49%) in the working age group of 25-54 than Route 921 (60%).
The largest proportion of Mira Mesa corridor riders by ethnicity is Asian at 46 percent. This is followed at a much lower level by White (24%) and Hispanic at 13 percent. The only statistically significant change between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study is the nine percentage point decline in White riders from 33 to 24 percent.
The distribution by ethnicity on Route 921 is similar to the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole with no statistically significant differences between the Route and the Corridor. As with the Mira Mesa Corridor, the only significant change between 2014 and 2015 is the 12 percentage point decline in the proportion of White riders from 33 to 21 percent.

The distribution of ethnicity on Route 237 is similar to Route 921 with a slightly lower percentage of Asian riders (40%), which is offset by a higher proportion of White riders (30%).
The proportion of Mira Mesa Corridor users who have a household income of less than $50,000 has not changed by a statistically significant amount, but has declined directionally from 62 percent in 2014 (before-study) to 59 percent in 2015. The percentage of riders in this corridor earning $50,000 to $74,999 has increased by 10 percentage points, which is offset by an eight percentage point decline in those earning between $75,000 and $99,999.

On Route 921, the distribution of household income is generally consistent with what is observed at the corridor level. One variation from the corridor as a whole is that the percentage of riders with a household income below $20,000 has declined from the 2014 before-study by a statistically significant eight percentage points to 22 percent in 2015.

Note: the income figures do not account for any effects from changes in employment or income between the before and after periods.
Similar to Route 921 and the Mira Mesa Corridor overall, 60 percent of Route 237 respondents indicate that they earn less than $50,000 per year. Within this category, over a quarter (27%) of respondents earn less than $20,000 per year.

**Automobile Availability**

Similar to the 2014 results, 39 percent of Mira Mesa corridor riders and a third (33%) of route 921 riders have a vehicle that could have been used to make their current transit trip. Route 237 has a significantly higher proportion of riders that have a vehicle available for their trip at 48 percent.
Respondents were also asked how many vehicles are available for use by the people in their household. The proportion of riders who do not have a vehicle available has not changed by a statistically significant amount, but directionally has decreased from 34 percent in the previous 2014 before-study to 29 percent in the 2015 after-study.

The results for the number of vehicles in the household for Route 921 riders essentially mirrors the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole with differences ranging from one to five percentage points for the different categories.
Thirty-one percent of Route 237 riders do not own a vehicle in their households. A quarter of riders (26%) indicate that they have one vehicle while 43 percent have at least two vehicles in their households. This is generally in line with the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole.

**Household Size**

Household size has fluctuated only slightly since the previous study with all but the three-member household category staying within four percentage points from the levels for the 2014 before-study. The proportion of three member households showed the largest change, increasing by six percentage points to 22 percent.
The distribution of household size for Route 921 mirrors what is observed in the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole. The changes from the 2014 before-study also show similar percentage point changes for each group. The increase in three member households is two percentage points higher than for the corridor as a whole, increasing eight percentage points from the 2014 before-study to 24 percent in 2015.

The household size distribution for Route 237 also mirrors the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole with no variance of category percentages of more than two percentage points when compared to the Corridor.
Employment Status

The percentage of riders who indicated that they are employed did not change significantly from the 2014 before-study to the 2015 after-study, but has directionally decreased from 74 percent in the before-study to 69 percent in 2015.

Figure 167: Mira Mesa Corridor – Rider Employment (Route 921)  
(Before n = 338/After n = 323)

The percentage of riders who indicated that they are employed did not change significantly from the 2014 before-study to the 2015 after-study, but has directionally decreased from 74 percent in the before-study to 69 percent in 2015.
Results for Route 921 essentially mirror the corridor percentages with no statistically significant differences between the before and after studies or between Route 921 and the corridor as a whole.

Figure 168: Mira Mesa Corridor – Rider Employment (Route 237)

(n = 310)

The proportion of Route 237 riders that are employed is identical to the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole at 69 percent.
Trip Characteristics

This section explores trip characteristics for riders within the Mira Mesa Corridor. The results are presented first for the corridor as a whole, and then for Route 921 with comparisons to the previous 2014 before-study to identify any significant changes. For a clearer understanding of travel, trips that were captured on the way to home have been reversed for presentation of “Home-based” trip purpose, and access and egress modes. Access and Egress modes are then presented separately independent of the trip’s relationship to home.

Home-Based Trip Purpose

Home-based trips are trips that either start from home or end at home. In general, the fluctuation of home-based trip purposes since 2014 is minimal with the only statistically significant change being in the proportion of Non-Home-Based trips which increased from 10 to 17 percent.
The distribution of trip purpose on Route 921 is similar to what is observed for the Mira Mesa Corridor. However, the percentages for School/College are one percentage point higher for the 2014 before-study and four percentage points lower for the 2015 after-study, expanding the difference to a 10 percentage point decline which is statistically significant. Other significant changes are the three percentage point decline for Medical Services, the four percentage point increase for “Other” and the eight percentage point increase for “Non-Home-Based” trips.
Work and School are the most common home-based trip purposes on Route 237, which account for 46 and 28 percent respectively. School trips on Route 237 are higher compared to those observed in both Route 921 (17%) and Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole (21%).
2015 home-based access modes for the Mira Mesa corridor are almost identical to the 2014 before-study with results for Walking (54%) and transferring from a Bus (30%) being the two most common modes.
Similar to the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole, Walking and Bus transfers are the two most common home-based access modes for Route 921. However, for Route 921 Walking is 10 percentage points higher at 64 percent. This is partially offset by Driving Alone, which at one percent for Route 921 is six percentage points lower than the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole.
Figure 174: Mira Mesa Corridor – Home-Based Access Mode (Route 237)  
(n = 285)

The home-based access mode for Route 237 is significantly different than for Route 921. Route 237 riders are much more likely to Drive Alone to the bus (16%) than Route 921 riders (1%), or to be Dropped Off (9% vs 3% respectively). Conversely, Route 237 riders are much less likely to Walk (39%) than Route 921 riders (64%).
There are only slight changes in home-based egress modes between the 2014 before-study and the 2015 after-study with transferring to a Bus increasing from 12 to 19 percent. The percentage of Walking as an egress mode (69%) in 2015 is 15 percentage points higher than for the home-based access mode (54%) while the percentage transferring to a Bus (19%) is 11 percentage points lower than transferring from a bus for the home-based access mode (30%).
The current Route 921 home-based egress mode results are generally similar to the 2014 results with the only significant change being an increase in transferring to a Bus which increased 11 percentage points from 12 to 23 percent. There are no significant differences between the 2015 results for Route 921 and the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole.
In contrast to home-based access modes, Walking as a home-based egress mode captures the majority (74%) of Route 237 riders. Transferring to a Bus as a home-based egress mode is much lower at 14 percent than transferring from a Bus as a home-based access mode (30%).
The distribution of access modes to a boarding stop shows no significant change from the previous 2014 before-study. The majority (59%) indicate that they Walked, followed by taking the Bus at 27 percent.

Respondents who indicated that they Walked were further asked to specify how many blocks they walked. The majority of riders who walk indicate that they walk three blocks or less at 82 percent.
Figure 179: Mira Mesa Corridor – Access Mode (Route 921)  
(Before n = 338/After n = 347)

For Route 921, the distribution of access mode is comprised primarily of two significant modes; Walking (61%), and transferring from another Bus (29%). These results are consistent with the corridor level and no significant changes are observed between the 2014 before-study and 2015.

As with the corridor level results, the vast majority of riders that Walk to the bus stop, walk three blocks or less at 84 percent.
As with Route 921, the two most prominent access modes used by Route 237 riders are Walking and transferring from a Bus which account for 56 and 24 percent respectively.
Unlike the access mode, the distribution of egress modes has experienced a significant change. The two primary modes continue to be Walking and transferring to a Bus, however, the proportion transferring to a Bus has increased from 17 percent to 26 percent. The proportion that indicated that they were getting Picked-Up has also increased from one to six percent.

The proportion of riders who Walked three blocks or less is similar to the 2014 before-study at 81 percent.
For Route 921, the distribution of egress modes is similar to Mira Mesa Corridor overall. Although the proportion of riders who Walk from the bus stop does not show a significant change from the 2014 before-study, the proportion of Bus transfers has increased significantly from 17 to 28 percent.

The percentage of riders who Walk three blocks or less is similar to the 2014 before-study (81%) at 83 percent in 2015.
Similar to the access mode distribution, the major egress modes are Walking (55%) and transferring to a Bus (23%). However, Route 237 riders differ from Route 921 riders because their egress mode is eight percentage points less likely to be Walking (55% vs. 63%), and nine percentage points more likely to be by driving alone (10% vs. 1%).
Frequency of Use

In general, the distribution of transit use frequency in 2015 is not significantly different than the 2014 before-study. The majority of respondents (80%) ride the bus at least four days a week, which is essentially unchanged from 79 percent in the previous study.

Route 921 shows a larger decrease in the percentage of riders who indicate that they ride five or more days a week (from 73 to 65 percent) which is a statistically significant change. Although
the difference between the 2014 before-study and 2015 after-study is significant for Route 921, the differences between Route 921 and the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole are not significant.

**Figure 186: Mira Mesa Corridor – Frequency of Use (Route 237) (n = 328)**

The majority of Route 237 riders (73%) ride the bus for at least five days a week, followed by 13 percent who ride four days a week, and 15 percent who ride less than three days a week. The proportion of Route 237 riders that ride at least five days a week is higher than Route 921 riders by eight percentage points.
Trips Prior to June 2014

New questions were included on the 2015 Onboard Survey to identify riders that rode prior to the implementation of the new Rapid routes, as well as their associated prior trip mode.

New Questions in 2015:
- *Did you make this same trip before June 2014?*
- *If yes, how did you make this trip before June 2014?*

**Figure 187: Mira Mesa Corridor – Same Trip Prior to June 2014**
(Mira Mesa n = 675/Route 921 n = 347/Route 237 n = 328)

About one-third of Mira Mesa Corridor riders (34%), Route 921 riders (37%), and Route 237 riders (29%) indicate that they made the same trip prior to June 2014.
For Mira Mesa Corridor riders that made the same trip before 2014, the most common prior modes were by Another Bus (41%), followed by the Same Bus (17%), Driving Alone (12%), Being Dropped Off (10%), and Walking (9%).
For Route 921, the previous mode was split evenly between Another Bus (25%) and the Same Bus (25%). This is followed at a lower level by Walking (14%), Driving Alone (13%), and Being Dropped Off (11%).

For Route 237, the majority of respondents (74%) indicate that they rode Another Bus prior to June 2014. This is followed by Driving Alone (9%) and getting Dropped-Off (7%).

The combined percentages of riders who drove alone, carpooled, or were dropped-off can be used as an indicator of the proportion of riders who switched from any form of automobile travel to bus transit. At the corridor level, 25 percent of riders switched from an automobile to transit. The largest transition is observed for Route 921 (28%), followed by Route 237 (16%).
Customer Satisfaction

One of the objectives of the Onboard Survey is to evaluate rider satisfaction across a variety of performance attributes prior to and after the implementation of the new Rapid route. This includes overall satisfaction and more detailed performance ratings that address riders’ riding experience, personnel, safety, and bus amenities. Respondents were asked to rate all of the performance factors in the following chart for the route they were riding on a 11-point scale anchored by Zero for “Extremely Poor” Five for “Neutral,” and 10 for “Extremely Good.”

Figure 189: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value
(Before n = 361/After n = 669-674)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of service</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of service</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses are on time</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to make this trip</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop locations are convenient</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of vehicles</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort of vehicles</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy of drivers</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of seats</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average overall satisfaction rating for the Mira Mesa Corridor improved measurably from 7.72 in 2014 to 7.96 in 2015. This is supported by higher satisfaction ratings for Frequency of Service (+0.63), Buses Being On-time (+0.59), Length of Time to Make the Trip (+0.46), Hours of Service (+0.45), and Availability of Bus Seats (+0.26). Two performance factors did decline, however. Cleanliness of Vehicles declined 0.28 and Comfort of Vehicles declined 0.27.

**Figure 190: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 921)**

(Before \(n = 338\)/After \(n = 342-348\))
Average satisfaction ratings for Route 921 mirror the Mira Mesa Corridor with a measurable improvement in overall satisfaction, and with the individual performance factors moving up and down in lock-step with the Corridor. Overall satisfaction improved by 0.34 from 7.68 in 2014 to 8.02 in 2015. The same five individual performance factors improved with increases of 0.73 for Frequency of Service, 0.66 for Buses Being on Time, 0.53 for Hours of Service, 0.52 for Length of Trip Time, and Availability of Bus Seats 0.28. Also in line with the Corridor as a whole, the two performance factors with declining satisfaction ratings were Comfort of Vehicles (-0.32), and Cleanliness of Vehicles (-0.30).

![Figure 191: Mira Mesa Corridor – Satisfaction Rating Mean Value (Route 237) (n = 323-327)](chart)

The average overall rating for Route 237 is 7.88, which is slightly lower than Route 921 (8.02) and the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole at 7.96. The ratings for the more detailed performance factors generally mirror the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole.
Two of the positive performance statements for the Mira Mesa Corridor experienced negative shifts in the average score from 2014 to 2015, and two were unchanged. Both of the declining items were safety related with Safety at the Stops declining by 0.51, and Safety on the Vehicle declining by 0.31. Information at Bus Stops and The Service Being Worth the Fare Paid did not change by a measurable amount.
As with the individual performance factors, the level of agreement with positive performance statements for Route 921 mirror the changes in ratings for the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole. The two safety categories declined, with Safety at the Stops dropping by 0.43, followed by Safety on the Vehicles dropping by 0.29. Information at Bus Stops and The Service Being Worth the Fare Paid did not change by a measurable amount for Route 921.
Figure 194: Mira Mesa Corridor – Agreement Mean Value (Route 237) 
(n = 327-328)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information at the stops is helpful</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel safe at the stops</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel safe on the vehicles</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service is worth the fare paid</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average ratings for the positive agreement statements for Route 237 are not significantly different than the Mira Mesa Corridor as a whole.
1. Right now are you traveling ...?
   ① Back to your home ② Away from home to another location ③ Between two non-home locations

2. Right now where did you just come from?
   ① Home ② Shopping ③ Personal Business
   ④ Work ⑤ Recreation/Visit Friends ⑥ Other: ___________________________
   ⑦ School/College ⑧ Medical Services

3. How did you get from there to this bus?
   ① Transferred from another bus (which one? ________) ② Carpooled / Vanpooled
   ③ Transferred from Trolley / COASTER / Amtrak ④ Got dropped off by someone
   ⑤ Walked _______ blocks ⑥ Carshare (car2go, Zipcar, etc.)
   ⑦ Rode bicycle _______ miles ⑧ Taxi, Uber, Lyft, etc.
   ⑨ Drove in my car alone ⑩ Other: ___________________________

4. Where did you get on this bus?
   (Please provide 2 cross-streets / intersection) ① Street 1 ② Street 2
   Landmark (SDSU, UCSD, UTC, etc.): ___________________________

5. Where will you get off this bus?
   (Please provide 2 cross-streets / intersection) ① Street 1 ② Street 2
   Landmark (SDSU, UCSD, UTC, etc.): ___________________________

6. Where are you going now?
   ① Home ② Shopping ③ Personal Business
   ④ Work ⑤ Recreation/Visit Friends ⑥ Other: ___________________________
   ⑦ School/College ⑧ Medical Services

7. After you get off THIS bus, will you...?
   ① Transfer to another bus (which one? ________) ② Carpooled / Vanpooled
   ③ Transfer to Trolley / COASTER / Amtrak ④ Get picked up by someone
   ⑤ Walk _______ blocks ⑥ Carshare (car2go, Zipcar, etc.)
   ⑦ Rode bicycle _______ miles ⑧ Taxi, Uber, Lyft, etc.
   ⑨ Drove in my car alone ⑩ Other: ___________________________

8. Please rate the performance of THIS route for each service aspect. (For each row, please fill in only one rating)
   Frequency of service ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Hours of service ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Buses are on time ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Length of time to make this trip ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Stop locations are convenient ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Cleanliness of vehicles ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Comfort of vehicles ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Courtesy of drivers ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good
   Availability of seats ① Extremely Poor ② Poor ③ Neutral ④ Good ⑤ Extremely Good

9. How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about THIS route? (For each row, fill in only one rating)
   Information at the stops is helpful ① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree
   You feel safe at the stops ① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree
   You feel safe on the vehicles ① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree
   The service is worth the fare paid ① Strongly Disagree ② Disagree ③ Neutral ④ Agree ⑤ Strongly Agree

10. How many days a week do you ride transit?
    ① 5+ days a week ② 2 days a week ③ First time rider
    ④ 4 days a week ⑤ 1 day a week
    ⑥ 3 days a week ⑦ Less than once a week

11. Do you have a vehicle that could have been used to make THIS trip? ① Yes ② No

12. Did you make this same trip before June 2014? ① Yes ② No

13. If yes, how did you make this trip before June 2014? (fill in only one)
    ① Another bus (which one? ________) ② Rode bicycle _______ miles
    ③ Trolley ④ Drove in my car alone
    ⑤ COASTER ⑥ Carpooled / Vanpooled
    ⑦ Amtrak ⑧ Got picked up by someone
    ⑨ Walked _______ blocks ⑩ Other: ___________________________

14. How many vehicles are available for use by the people in your household?
    ① 0 vehicles ② 2 vehicles
    ③ 1 vehicle ④ 3 or more vehicles: how many? ________

15. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
    ① 1 person ② 3 people ③ 5 or more people: how many? ________
    ④ 2 people ⑤ 4 people

16. Do you consider yourself (fill in only one):
    ① Hispanic / Latino ② Asian (non-Hispanic)
    ③ White (non-Hispanic) ④ American Indian/Alaskan Native
    ⑤ African American (non-Hispanic) ⑥ Multiracial
    ⑦ Other: ___________________________

17. In what year were you born? _____ _____ _____ _____

18. Do you currently work for pay? ① Yes ② No

19. What is the total annual income of all the people living in your household?
    ① Less than $20,000 ② $20,000 to $29,999
    ③ $30,000 to $39,999 ④ $40,000 to $49,999
    ⑤ $50,000 to $74,999 ⑥ $75,000 to $99,999
    ⑦ $100,000 to $149,999 ⑧ $150,000 or more
1. AHORA MISMO, ¿usted está viajando a ...?  
   ① De regreso a su casa  ② Fuera de su casa a otro lugar  ③ Entre dos lugares que no son su hogar

2. AHORA MISMO, ¿de dónde vino?  
   ① De Casa  ② De compras  ③ Mandados personales  
   ④ Del trabajo  ⑤ De recreo/visita con amigos  ⑥ Otra opción: 
   ⑦ De la escuela/ colegio  ⑧ Servicios médicos

3. ¿Cómo llegó de ahí a este autobús?  
   ① Me transferi de otro autobús  ② Compartí viaje en coche / van (¿cómo?)  
   ③ Me transferí del Trolley / COASTER / Amtrak  ④ Alguien me dejó en la parada  
   ⑤ Caminé ______ cuadras  ⑥ Compartí coche (car2go, Zipcar, etc.)  
   ⑦ Usé bicicleta ______ millas  ⑧ Tomé un Taxi, Uber, Lyft, etc.  
   ⑨ Conduje mi coche solo/a  ⑩ Otra opción: 

4. ¿Dónde se SUBIÓ a este autobús?  
   (por favor indique 2 calles que cruzan)  
   Calle 1:  Calle 2:  
   Punto de referencia (SDSU, UCSD, UTC, etc.): 

5. ¿Dónde se BAJARÁ de este autobús?  
   (por favor indique 2 calles que cruzan)  
   Calle 1:  Calle 2:  
   Punto de referencia (SDSU, UCSD, UTC, etc.): 

6. ¿A dónde va AHORA?  
   ① A Casa  ② De compras  ③ Mandados personales  
   ④ Al Trabajo  ⑤ De recreo/visita con amigos  ⑥ Otra opción: 
   ⑦ A la escuela / colegio  ⑧ Servicios médicos

7. Después de que se baje de ESTE autobús, ¿usted va a ... ?  
   ① Tomar un autobús (¿cómo?)  ② Compartir viaje en coche/ van  
   ③ Tomar el Trolley / COASTER / Amtrak  ④ Alguien me va a recoger  
   ⑤ Caminar ______ cuadras  ⑥ Compartir coche (car2go, Zipcar, etc.)  
   ⑦ Usar bicicleta ______ millas  ⑧ Tomaré un Taxi, Uber, Lyft, etc.  
   ⑨ Conducir en su coche solo/a  ⑩ Otra opción: 

8. Por favor califique el rendimiento de ESTA ruta para cada servicio con la siguiente escala. (PARA CADA LÍNEA, llene UN círculo)  
   May Muy Muy Bien Muy Mal  
   Frecuencia de servicio  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   Horas de servicio  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   Autobuses a tiempo  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   El tiempo que le toma hacer este viaje  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   La ubicación de las paradas son convenientes  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   Lo limpio de los vehículos  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   La comodidad de los vehículos  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   La cortesía de los conductores  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   La disponibilidad de asientos  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   El rendimiento en general de esta ruta  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 

9. ¿Qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está con las siguientes frases con respecto a ESTA ruta? (PARA CADA LÍNEA, llene UN círculo)  
   La información en las paradas es útil  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   Se siente seguro/a en las paradas  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   Se siente seguro/a en los vehículos  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 
   El servicio valle la tarifa pagada  ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ 

10. ¿Cuántos días a la semana usa el tránsito?  
   ① 5+ días a la semana  ② 2 días a la semana  ③ Primera vez usando el tránsito  
   ④ 4 días a la semana  ⑤ 1 día a la semana  ⑥ Menos de un día a la semana

11. ¿Usted tiene un vehículo que podría haber usado para hacer ESTE viaje?  
   ① Sí  ② No

12. Antes del mes de junio del 2014, ¿hacía este mismo viaje?  
   ① Sí  ② No

13. En caso que sí, ¿hacía este mismo viaje antes del mes de junio del 2014? (llene solamente una opción)  
   ① Otro autobús  ② Usaba mi bicicleta ______ millas  
   ③ Trolley  ④ Conducía en mi coche solo/a  ⑤ COASTER  
   ⑥ Amtrak  ⑦ Alguien me dejaba  ⑧ Caminaba ______ cuadras  
   ⑨ Otra opción: 

14. ¿Cuántos vehículos están disponibles para uso en su hogar?  
   ① 0 vehículos  ② 2 vehículos  ③ 3 vehículos o más; ¿cuántos?  

15. Incluyéndose a usted, ¿cuántas personas viven en su hogar?  
   ① Una persona  ② 3 personas  ③ 5 personas o más; ¿cuántas?  
   ④ 2 personas  ⑤ 4 personas

16. ¿Usted se considera: (llene solamente una opción)  
   ① Hispano/Latino  ② Asiático (no-Hispano)  
   ③ Europeo (no-Hispano)  ④ Indio Americano/Nativo de Alaska  
   ⑤ Afro Americano (no-Hispano)  ⑥ Multirracial  
   ⑦ Otra opción: 

17. ¿En cuál año nació?  

18. ¿Actualmente está trabajando con salario?  
   ① Sí  ② No

19. ¿Cuáles son los ingresos totales de todas las personas viviendo en el hogar?  
   ① Menos de $20,000  ② $20,000 a $29,999  
   ③ $30,000 a $39,999  ④ $40,000 a $49,999  
   ⑤ $50,000 a $74,999  ⑥ $75,000 a $99,999  
   ⑦ $100,000 a $149,999  ⑧ $150,000 o más

¡Gracias!
Appendix B – Mid-City Corridor Weighted Frequency

1. DAYPART

   1. NON-PEAK .................................. 59%
   2. PEAK .................................. 41%

2. ROUTE

   1. 1 .................................. 18%
   2. 7 .................................. 19%
   3. 11 .................................. 26%
   4. 215 .................................. 37%

3. RIGHT NOW ARE YOU TRAVELING... ?

   1. BACK TO HOME .......................... 45%
   2. AWAY FROM HOME TO ANOTHER LOCATION... 30%
   3. BETWEEN TWO NON-HOME LOCATIONS...... 25%

4. HOME-BASED TRIP PURPOSE

   1. WORK .................................. 27%
   2. SCHOOL/COLLEGE .......................... 18%
   3. SHOPPING .............................. 6%
   4. RECREATION/VISIT ......................... 8%
   5. MEDICAL .............................. 3%
   6. OTHER .............................. 13%
   7. NON-HOME-BASED ....................... 25%

5. WHERE DID YOU JUST COME FROM ?

   1. HOME .............................. 31%
   2. WORK .............................. 22%
   3. SCHOOL/COLLEGE .......................... 16%
   4. SHOPPING .............................. 6%
   5. RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS ............ 9%
   6. MEDICAL SERVICES .......................... 2%
   7. PERSONAL BUSINESS .................... 13%
   8. OTHER .............................. 1%
6. HOW DID YOU GET FROM THERE TO THIS BUS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOTHER BUS</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKED</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROVE ALONE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROPPED-OFF</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSHARE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI, UBER, LYFT</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. ACCESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 BLOCKS OR LESS</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TO 5 BLOCKS</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TO 8 BLOCKS</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+ BLOCKS</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. HOME-BASED ACCESS MODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOTHER BUS</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKED</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROVE ALONE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROPPED-OFF</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSHARE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI, UBER, LYFT</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. WHERE ARE YOU GOING NOW?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL/COLLEGE</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPPING</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL BUSINESS</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. AFTER YOU GET OFF THIS BUS, WILL YOU...

1. ANOTHER BUS ......................... 21%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ............... 8%
3. WALK ..................................... 62%
4. BICYCLE ................................... 2%
5. DRIVE ALONE ................................ 1%
6. CARPOOL/VANPOOL ...................... 1%
7. PICKED-UP ............................... 3%
8. CARSHARE .................................. 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ....................... 0%
10. OTHER ..................................... 2%

11. EGRESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

1. 3 BLOCKS OR LESS ....................... 79%
2. 4 TO 5 BLOCKS ........................... 16%
3. 6 TO 8 BLOCKS ............................ 3%
4. 8+ BLOCKS ............................... 2%

12. HOME-BASED EGRESS MODE

1. ANOTHER BUS ............................ 24%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ................ 10%
3. WALK ...................................... 60%
4. BICYCLE .................................... 1%
5. DRIVE ALONE ............................. 1%
6. CARPOOL/VANPOOL ..................... 1%
7. PICKED-UP ............................... 2%
8. CARSHARE .................................. 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ....................... 0%
10. OTHER ..................................... 1%

13. RATING - FREQUENCY OF SERVICE

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ..................... 1%
2. 1 ........................................... 1%
3. 2 ........................................... 2%
4. 3 ........................................... 2%
5. 4 ........................................... 3%
6. 5 .......................................... 15%
7. 6 .......................................... 5%
8. 7 .......................................... 15%
9. 8 .......................................... 16%
10. 9 ......................................... 11%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .................. 28%
### 14. RATING - HOURS OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15. RATING - BUSES ARE ON TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. RATING - LENGTH OF TIME TO MAKE THIS TRIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. RATING - STOP LOCATIONS ARE CONVENIENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>CLEANLINESS OF VEHICLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>COMFORT OF VEHICLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>COURTESY OF DRIVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>AVAILABILITY OF SEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. RATING - OVERALL

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................ 1%
2. 1 ......................................... 0%
3. 2 ......................................... 1%
4. 3 ......................................... 1%
5. 4 ......................................... 2%
6. 5 ......................................... 10%
7. 6 ......................................... 6%
8. 7 ......................................... 14%
9. 8 ......................................... 19%
10. 9 ........................................ 20%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .......... 26%

23. AGREEMENT - INFORMATION AT THE STOPS IS HELPFUL

1. 0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE ............ 3%
2. 1 ......................................... 1%
3. 2 ......................................... 3%
4. 3 ......................................... 3%
5. 4 ......................................... 3%
6. 5 ......................................... 18%
7. 6 ......................................... 8%
8. 7 ......................................... 11%
9. 8 ......................................... 14%
10. 9 ......................................... 10%
11. 10 - STRONGLY AGREE .......... 26%

24. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE AT THE STOPS

1. 0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE ............ 3%
2. 1 ......................................... 1%
3. 2 ......................................... 3%
4. 3 ......................................... 2%
5. 4 ......................................... 5%
6. 5 ......................................... 16%
7. 6 ......................................... 8%
8. 7 ......................................... 12%
9. 8 ......................................... 16%
10. 9 ......................................... 12%
11. 10 - STRONGLY AGREE .......... 23%

25. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE ON THE VEHICLES

1. 0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE ............ 2%
2. 1 ......................................... 1%
3. 2 ......................................... 1%
4. 3 ......................................... 1%
5. 4 ......................................... 3%
6. 5 ......................................... 11%
7. 6 ......................................... 7%
8. 7 ......................................... 12%
9. 8 ......................................... 17%
10. 9 ......................................... 17%
11. 10 - STRONGLY AGREE .......... 29%
26. AGREEMENT - THE SERVICE IS WORTH THE FARE PAID

1. 0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE .................. 4%
2. 1 ........................................... 1%
3. 2 ........................................... 2%
4. 3 ........................................... 2%
5. 4 ........................................... 3%
6. 5 ........................................... 13%
7. 6 ........................................... 5%
8. 7 ........................................... 12%
9. 8 ........................................... 15%
10. 9 .......................................... 12%
11. 10 - STRONGLY AGREE .............. 31%

27. HOW MANY DAYS A WEEK DO YOU RIDE TRANSIT ?

1. 5+ DAYS A WEEK ....................... 67%
2. 4 DAYS A WEEK ......................... 13%
3. 3 DAYS A WEEK ......................... 8%
4. 2 DAYS A WEEK ......................... 6%
5. 1 DAY A WEEK ........................... 1%
6. < ONCE A WEEK ........................... 3%
7. FIRST TIME RIDER ..................... 2%

28. DO YOU HAVE A VEHICLE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN USED TO MAKE THIS TRIP ?

1. YES ........................................... 26%
2. NO ............................................ 74%

29. DID YOU MAKE THIS SAME TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014 ?

1. YES ........................................... 48%
2. NO ............................................ 52%

30. IF YES, HOW DID YOU MAKE THIS TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014 ?

1. SAME BUS .............................. 18%
2. ANOTHER BUS ......................... 47%
3. TROLLEY .................................. 12%
4. COASTER ................................. 1%
5. AMTRAK .................................. 0%
6. WALKED .................................. 6%
7. BICYCLE ................................. 3%
8. DROVE ALONE ........................... 5%
9. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ........... 2%
10. DROPPED-OFF ......................... 4%
11. OTHER .................................. 2%

31. HOW MANY VEHICLES ARE AVAILABLE FOR USE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD ?

1. 0 VEHICLE ............................... 45%
2. 1 VEHICLE ............................... 29%
3. 2 VEHICLES ............................. 19%
4. 3 OR MORE VEHICLES ............... 7%
32. HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

1. 1 PERSON .......................... 24%
2. 2 PEOPLE .......................... 24%
3. 3 PEOPLE .......................... 18%
4. 4 PEOPLE .......................... 16%
5. 5 OR MORE PEOPLE ................ 17%

33. ETHNICITY

1. HISPANIC/LATINO ................... 33%
2. WHITE ............................... 32%
3. AFRICAN AMERICAN ................. 16%
4. ASIAN ............................... 6%
5. AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE .... 2%
6. MULTIRACIAL ........................ 10%
7. OTHER ............................... 1%

34. DO YOU CURRENTLY WORK FOR PAY?

1. YES ................................. 64%
2. NO ................................. 36%

35. TOTAL ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

1. < $20,000 .......................... 43%
2. $20,000-$29,999 .................... 18%
3. $30,000-$39,999 .................... 11%
4. $40,000-$49,999 .................... 6%
5. $50,000-$74,999 .................... 12%
6. $75,000-$99,999 .................... 5%
7. $100,000-$149,999 ................. 3%
8. $150,000+ .......................... 2%

36. DIRECTION

1. NORTH ............................. 25%
2. SOUTH .............................. 20%
3. EAST ............................... 29%
4. WEST ............................... 26%

37. ROUTE CLASSIFICATION

1. RAPID ............................. 37%
2. NON-RAPID .......................... 63%

38. AGE

1. < 18 ................................. 5%
2. 18-24 .............................. 24%
3. 25-54 ............................... 50%
4. 55-65 ............................... 14%
5. 66+ ................................. 7%
Appendix C – I-15 Corridor Weighted Frequency

1. DAYPART
   1. NON-PEAK ........................................ 50%
   2. PEAK ............................................. 50%

2. ROUTE
   1. 20 ................................................. 15%
   2. 60 .................................................. 2%
   3. 110 ................................................. 3%
   4. 235 .................................................. 80%

3. RIGHT NOW ARE YOU TRAVELING... ?
   1. BACK TO HOME .................................. 25%
   2. AWAY FROM HOME TO ANOTHER LOCATION... 60%
   3. BETWEEN TWO NON-HOME LOCATIONS....... 15%

4. HOME-BASED TRIP PURPOSE
   1. WORK ............................................... 52%
   2. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ............................... 14%
   3. SHOPPING ........................................ 2%
   4. RECREATION/VISIT ............................. 4%
   5. MEDICAL ......................................... 2%
   6. OTHER ............................................. 12%
   7. NON-HOME-BASED ............................... 15%

5. WHERE DID YOU JUST COME FROM ?
   1. HOME .............................................. 61%
   2. WORK .............................................. 20%
   3. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ............................... 5%
   4. SHOPPING ........................................ 2%
   5. RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS ................. 4%
   6. MEDICAL SERVICES ............................. 1%
   7. PERSONAL BUSINESS ......................... 6%
   8. OTHER ............................................. 2%

6. HOW DID YOU GET FROM THERE TO THIS BUS ?
   1. ANOTHER BUS .................................... 34%
   2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ...................... 15%
   3. WALKED .......................................... 29%
   4. BICYCLE .......................................... 2%
   5. DROVE ALONE .................................. 6%
   6. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ..................... 1%
   7. DROPPED-OFF .................................. 9%
   8. CARSHARE ....................................... 0%
   9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ............................. 1%
   10. OTHER ........................................... 2%
7. ACCESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

1. 3 BLOCKS OR LESS ......................... 75%
2. 4 TO 5 BLOCKS ............................ 12%
3. 6 TO 8 BLOCKS ............................. 7%
4. 8+ BLOCKS ................................. 6%

8. HOME-BASED ACCESS MODE

1. ANOTHER BUS ............................... 36%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ................. 18%
3. WALKED .................................... 25%
4. BICYCLE .................................... 3%
5. DROVE ALONE ............................... 8%
6. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ................ 1%
7. DROPPED-OFF ............................... 7%
8. CARSHARE .................................. 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT .......................... 0%
10. OTHER ..................................... 2%

9. WHERE ARE YOU GOING NOW?

1. HOME ........................................ 25%
2. WORK ....................................... 38%
3. SCHOOL/COLLEGE .......................... 15%
4. SHOPPING .................................. 2%
5. RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS ............ 6%
6. MEDICAL SERVICES ....................... 2%
7. PERSONAL BUSINESS ..................... 9%
8. OTHER ..................................... 2%

10. AFTER YOU GET OFF THIS BUS, WILL YOU...?

1. ANOTHER BUS ............................... 38%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ................ 13%
3. WALK ........................................ 35%
4. BICYCLE .................................... 2%
5. DRIVE ALONE ............................... 2%
6. CARPOOL/VANPOOL ....................... 1%
7. PICKED-UP ................................... 6%
8. CARSHARE .................................. 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT .......................... 1%
10. OTHER ..................................... 3%

11. EGRESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

1. 3 BLOCKS OR LESS ......................... 72%
2. 4 TO 5 BLOCKS ............................. 15%
3. 6 TO 8 BLOCKS ............................. 9%
4. 8+ BLOCKS ................................. 4%
12. HOME-BASED EGRESS MODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOTHER BUS</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVE ALONE</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPOOL/VANPOOL</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICKED-UP</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSHARE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI, UBER, LYFT</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. RATING - FREQUENCY OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. RATING - HOURS OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. RATING - BUSES ARE ON TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buses On Time</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 16. RATING - LENGTH OF TIME TO MAKE THIS TRIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. RATING - STOP LOCATIONS ARE CONVENIENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18. RATING - CLEANLINESS OF VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 19. RATING - COMFORT OF VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. **RATING - COURTESY OF DRIVERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. **RATING - AVAILABILITY OF SEATS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. **RATING - OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. **AGREEMENT - INFORMATION AT THE STOPS IS HELPFUL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE AT THE STOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE ON THE VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. AGREEMENT - THE SERVICE IS WORTH THE FARE PAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. HOW MANY DAYS A WEEK DO YOU RIDE TRANSIT ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5+ DAYS A WEEK</th>
<th>4 DAYS A WEEK</th>
<th>3 DAYS A WEEK</th>
<th>2 DAYS A WEEK</th>
<th>1 DAY A WEEK</th>
<th>&lt; ONCE A WEEK</th>
<th>FIRST TIME RIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FIRST TIME RIDER</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. DO YOU HAVE A VEHICLE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN USED TO MAKE THIS TRIP?
   1. YES ........................................ 33%
   2. NO ........................................ 67%

29. DID YOU MAKE THIS SAME TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014?
   1. YES ........................................ 38%
   2. NO ........................................ 62%

30. IF YES, HOW DID YOU MAKE THIS TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014?
   1. SAME BUS ..................................  5%
   2. ANOTHER BUS .............................  57%
   3. TROLLEY ....................................  7%
   4. COASTER ....................................  3%
   5. AMTRAK .....................................  0%
   6. WALKED .....................................  5%
   7. BICYCLE .....................................  2%
   8. DROVE ALONE .............................. 15%
   9. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED .................  2%
  10. DROPPED-OFF ..............................  4%
  11. OTHER ....................................  1%

31. HOW MANY VEHICLES ARE AVAILABLE FOR USE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
   1. 0 VEHICLE ..................................  33%
   2. 1 VEHICLE ..................................  31%
   3. 2 VEHICLES .................................  26%
   4. 3 OR MORE VEHICLES .....................  10%

32. HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
   1. 1 PERSON ...................................  16%
   2. 2 PEOPLE ...................................  22%
   3. 3 PEOPLE ...................................  23%
   4. 4 PEOPLE ...................................  18%
   5. 5 OR MORE PEOPLE .......................  21%

33. ETHNICITY
   1. HISPANIC/LATINO ..........................  27%
   2. WHITE ......................................  27%
   3. AFRICAN AMERICAN ......................  15%
   4. ASIAN ......................................  21%
   5. AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE ....  2%
   6. MULTIRACIAL ..............................  7%
   7. OTHER .....................................  1%

34. DO YOU CURRENTLY WORK FOR PAY?
   1. YES .........................................  74%
   2. NO ..........................................  26%
35. TOTAL ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

1. < $20,000 .......................... 33%
2. $20,000-$29,999 .................. 14%
3. $30,000-$39,999 .................. 11%
4. $40,000-$49,999 .................. 10%
5. $50,000-$74,999 .................. 16%
6. $75,000-$99,999 ................. 6%
7. $100,000-$149,999 .............. 6%
8. $150,000+ .......................... 5%

36. DIRECTION

1. NORTH ................................ 46%
2. SOUTH ................................ 54%
3. EAST .................................. 0%
4. WEST .................................. 0%

37. ROUTE CLASSIFICATION

1. RAPID ............................... 80%
2. NON-RAPID ............................ 20%

38. AGE

1. < 18 ................................... 1%
2. 18-24 ................................. 22%
3. 25-54 ................................ 59%
4. 55-65 ................................. 13%
5. 66+ .................................... 4%
Appendix D – Mira Mesa Corridor Weighted Frequency

1. DAYPART
   1. NON-PEAK .......................... 40%
   2. PEAK ............................... 60%

2. ROUTE
   1. 237 ................................. 38%
   2. 921 ................................. 62%

3. RIGHT NOW ARE YOU TRAVELING... ?
   1. BACK TO HOME ........................ 46%
   2. AWAY FROM HOME TO ANOTHER LOCATION... 36%
   3. BETWEEN TWO NON-HOME LOCATIONS...... 17%

4. HOME-BASED TRIP PURPOSE
   1. WORK ................................. 48%
   2. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ...................... 21%
   3. SHOPPING ............................. 4%
   4. RECREATION/VISIT ..................... 4%
   5. MEDICAL .............................. 2%
   6. OTHER ................................. 5%
   7. NON-HOME-BASED ....................... 17%

5. WHERE DID YOU JUST COME FROM ?
   1. HOME ................................. 36%
   2. WORK ................................. 33%
   3. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ...................... 14%
   4. SHOPPING ............................. 5%
   5. RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS ............ 3%
   6. MEDICAL SERVICES ...................... 4%
   7. PERSONAL BUSINESS .................... 4%
   8. OTHER ................................. 0%

6. HOW DID YOU GET FROM THERE TO THIS BUS ?
   1. ANOTHER BUS .......................... 27%
   2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ............... 1%
   3. WALKED ............................... 59%
   4. BICYCLE ............................... 2%
   5. DROVE ALONE .......................... 2%
   6. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ............... 1%
   7. DROPPED-OFF .......................... 5%
   8. CARSHARE ............................. 0%
   9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ...................... 1%
   10. OTHER ............................... 1%
7. ACCESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

1. 3 BLOCKS OR LESS .......................... 82%
2. 4 TO 5 BLOCKS .............................. 10%
3. 6 TO 8 BLOCKS .............................. 3%
4. 8+ BLOCKS ................................. 5%

8. HOME-BASED ACCESS MODE

1. ANOTHER BUS ............................. 30%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ................. 1%
3. WALKED .................................. 54%
4. BICYCLE ................................. 2%
5. DROVE ALONE ............................. 7%
6. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ................. 1%
7. DROPPED-OFF ............................ 5%
8. CARSHARE ................................ 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ........................ 0%
10. OTHER .................................. 0%

9. WHERE ARE YOU GOING NOW?

1. HOME .................................. 47%
2. WORK .................................. 23%
3. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ......................... 13%
4. SHOPPING ................................ 4%
5. RECREATION/VISIT FRIENDS ............. 5%
6. MEDICAL SERVICES ....................... 1%
7. PERSONAL BUSINESS ..................... 6%
8. OTHER .................................. 1%

10. AFTER YOU GET OFF THIS BUS, WILL YOU...?

1. ANOTHER BUS ............................. 26%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK ................. 0%
3. WALK ................................... 60%
4. BICYCLE ................................ 2%
5. DRIVE ALONE ............................. 4%
6. CARPOOL/VANPOOL ....................... 0%
7. PICKED-UP ............................... 6%
8. CARSHARE ............................... 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ......................... 1%
10. OTHER .................................. 1%

11. EGRESS - WALK DISTANCE (BLOCKS)

1. 3 BLOCKS OR LESS .......................... 81%
2. 4 TO 5 BLOCKS .............................. 13%
3. 6 TO 8 BLOCKS .............................. 3%
4. 8+ BLOCKS ................................. 4%
12. HOME-BASED EGRESS MODE

1. ANOTHER BUS .......................... 19%
2. TROLLEY/COAST/AMTRAK .............. 0%
3. WALK ................................ 69%
4. BICYCLE ............................... 2%
5. DRIVE ALONE .......................... 1%
6. CARPOOL/VANPOOL .............. 1%
7. PICKED-UP ............................. 5%
8. CARSHARE .............................. 0%
9. TAXI, UBER, LYFT ................... 1%
10. OTHER ................................. 2%

13. RATING - FREQUENCY OF SERVICE

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................. 1%
2. 1 ........................................ 1%
3. 2 ........................................ 3%
4. 3 ........................................ 3%
5. 4 ........................................ 4%
6. 5 ........................................ 15%
7. 6 ........................................ 7%
8. 7 ........................................ 14%
9. 8 ........................................ 21%
10. 9 ........................................ 12%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD ............. 17%

14. RATING - HOURS OF SERVICE

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................. 2%
2. 1 ........................................ 2%
3. 2 ........................................ 3%
4. 3 ........................................ 4%
5. 4 ........................................ 7%
6. 5 ........................................ 17%
7. 6 ........................................ 9%
8. 7 ........................................ 13%
9. 8 ........................................ 18%
10. 9 ........................................ 10%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD ............. 15%

15. RATING - BUSES ARE ON TIME

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................. 0%
2. 1 ........................................ 1%
3. 2 ........................................ 1%
4. 3 ........................................ 3%
5. 4 ........................................ 3%
6. 5 ........................................ 9%
7. 6 ........................................ 5%
8. 7 ........................................ 13%
9. 8 ........................................ 21%
10. 9 ........................................ 21%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD ............. 24%
16. RATING - LENGTH OF TIME TO MAKE THIS TRIP

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................... 0%
2. 1 ............................................. 0%
3. 2 ............................................. 1%
4. 3 ............................................. 2%
5. 4 ............................................. 4%
6. 5 ............................................. 12%
7. 6 ............................................. 6%
8. 7 ............................................. 16%
9. 8 ............................................. 23%
10. 9 ............................................ 17%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .............. 19%

17. RATING - STOP LOCATIONS ARE CONVENIENT

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................... 0%
2. 1 ............................................. 0%
3. 2 ............................................. 2%
4. 3 ............................................. 1%
5. 4 ............................................. 2%
6. 5 ............................................. 12%
7. 6 ............................................. 6%
8. 7 ............................................. 12%
9. 8 ............................................. 22%
10. 9 ............................................ 21%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .............. 21%

18. RATING - CLEANLINESS OF VEHICLES

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................... 0%
2. 1 ............................................. 1%
3. 2 ............................................. 0%
4. 3 ............................................. 1%
5. 4 ............................................. 1%
6. 5 ............................................. 9%
7. 6 ............................................. 6%
8. 7 ............................................. 10%
9. 8 ............................................. 22%
10. 9 ............................................ 21%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .............. 29%

19. RATING - COMFORT OF VEHICLES

1. 0 - EXTREMELY POOR ................... 0%
2. 1 ............................................. 0%
3. 2 ............................................. 1%
4. 3 ............................................. 1%
5. 4 ............................................. 1%
6. 5 ............................................. 11%
7. 6 ........................................... 8%
8. 7 ............................................. 11%
9. 8 ............................................. 21%
10. 9 ............................................ 21%
11. 10 - EXTREMELY GOOD .............. 24%
20. **RATING - COURTESY OF DRIVERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Extremity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>- EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>- EXTREMELY GOOD</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. **RATING - AVAILABILITY OF SEATS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Extremity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>- EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. **RATING - OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Extremity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>- EXTREMELY POOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. **AGREEMENT - INFORMATION AT THE STOPS IS HELPFUL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 24. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE AT THE STOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25. AGREEMENT - YOU FEEL SAFE ON THE VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26. AGREEMENT - THE SERVICE IS WORTH THE FARE PAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27. HOW MANY DAYS A WEEK DO YOU RIDE TRANSIT ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+ Days A Week</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Days A Week</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Days A Week</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Days A Week</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Day A Week</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Once A Week</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Rider</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. DO YOU HAVE A VEHICLE THAT COULD HAVE BEEN USED TO MAKE THIS TRIP?
   1. YES ................................................. 39%
   2. NO ............................................... 61%

29. DID YOU MAKE THIS SAME TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014?
   1. YES ................................................. 34%
   2. NO ............................................... 66%

30. IF YES, HOW DID YOU MAKE THIS TRIP BEFORE JUNE 2014?
   1. SAME BUS ................................. 17%
   2. ANOTHER BUS ....................... 41%
   3. TROLLEY .................................. 1%
   4. COASTER ............................. 2%
   5. AMTRAK .............................. 0%
   6. WALKED ............................ 9%
   7. BICYCLE ............................. 2%
   8. DROVE ALONE ..................... 12%
   9. CARPOOLED/VANPOOLED ...... 3%
  10. DROPPED-OFF ..................... 10%
  11. OTHER ............................... 3%

31. HOW MANY VEHICLES ARE AVAILABLE FOR USE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
   1. 0 VEHICLE ................................. 29%
   2. 1 VEHICLE ............................... 34%
   3. 2 VEHICLES ......................... 26%
   4. 3 OR MORE VEHICLES ............... 11%

32. HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
   1. 1 PERSON ................................. 16%
   2. 2 PEOPLE ............................... 23%
   3. 3 PEOPLE ............................... 22%
   4. 4 PEOPLE ............................... 22%
   5. 5 OR MORE PEOPLE ................... 16%

33. ETHNICITY
   1. HISPANIC/LATINO ..................... 13%
   2. WHITE .................................. 24%
   3. AFRICAN AMERICAN .................. 8%
   4. ASIAN ................................. 46%
   5. AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE .. 1%
   6. MULTIRACIAL ......................... 7%
   7. OTHER ................................. 2%

34. DO YOU CURRENTLY WORK FOR PAY?
   1. YES ................................................. 69%
   2. NO ............................................... 31%
35. TOTAL ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

1. < $20,000 ................................. 24%
2. $20,000–$29,999 ........................ 15%
3. $30,000–$39,999 ........................ 11%
4. $40,000–$49,999 ........................ 9%
5. $50,000–$74,999 ......................... 16%
6. $75,000–$99,999 ......................... 10%
7. $100,000–$149,999 ..................... 11%
8. $150,000+ ................................. 4%

36. DIRECTION

1. NORTH .................................... 19%
2. SOUTH .................................... 19%
3. EAST ..................................... 28%
4. WEST .................................... 34%

37. ROUTE CLASSIFICATION

1. RAPID ................................... 38%
2. NON-RAPID .............................. 62%

38. AGE

1. < 18 ....................................... 2%
2. 18–24 .................................... 30%
3. 25–54 .................................... 56%
4. 55–65 .................................... 9%
5. 66 + ................................. 3%