1981 RIDERSHIP TRACKING STUDY

## PEAK-HOUR EXPRESS LINES



APRIL, 1982

Page
BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES ..... 1
MAJOR FINDINGS ..... 4
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS ..... 8
Age of Rider ..... 8
Rider Gender ..... 15
Ethnic Background ..... 19
Annual Household Income ..... 23
Household Size ..... 31
TRIP-RELATED CHARACTERISTICS ..... 33
Type of Fare ..... 33
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass ..... 42
Frequency of Bus Use ..... 51
Number of Buses To Complete Linked Trip ..... 61
Mode Cf Access To RTD System ..... 72
Trip Purpose ..... 79
Riders Rate RTD Service ..... 89
Methodology ..... 99
APPENDIX ..... 103

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

## Number

Title
Page

Table 1
Table 2
Table 3
Table 4
Table 5
Table 6
Table 7
Table 8
Table 9
Table 10
Table 11
Table 12
Table 13
Table 14

Table 15

Table 16
Table 17
Table 18
Table 19
Table 20
Table 21
Table 22
Table 23
Table 24
Table 25
Table 26
Table 27
Table 28
Table 29
Table 30
Table 31
Table 32
Table 33

Ridership And Subsidies By Line 3
Rider Age By Bus Line 10
Rider Age By Time Of Day 11
Rider Age By Residence Sector 12
Rider Age By Gender 13
Rider Age By Ethnic Background 14
Rider Gender By Bus Line . 16
Rider Gender By Time Of Day 17
Rider Gender By Residence Sector 18
Ethnic Background By Bus Line 20
Ethnic Background By Time Of Day 21
Ethnic Background By Residence Sector 22
Annual Household Income By Bus Line 25
Number of Persons In Household by
Annual Household Income
Comparison Between Bus Rider Median
Household Income and Poverty Levels By
Household Size and Type of Service
Annual Household Income By Time of Day 28
Annual Household Income By Residence
Sector
Annual Household Income By Ethnic
Background
Household Size By Bus Line 32
Type of Fare By Bus Line 35
Type of Fare By Time Of Day 36
Type of Fare By Residence Sector 37
Rider Age By Type of Fare 38
Rider Gender By Type of Fare 39
Ethnic Background By Type Of Fare 40
Type of Fare By Annual Household Income 41
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By Bus
Line
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By Time
Of Day
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By 46
Residence Sector 46
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By Rider
Age
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By Gender 48
Reason For Not Üsing RTD Pass By Ethnic
Background
49
Reason For Not Using RTD Pass By Aninual
Household Income

Table 34
Table 35
Table 36
Table 37
Table 38
Table 39
Table 40
Table 41

Table 42

Table 43

Table 44

Table 45

Table 46

Table 47

Table 48

Table 49

Table 50

Table 51
Table 52
Table 53
Table 54
Table 55
Table 56

Table 57
Table 58
Table 59
Table 60

Frequency of Bus Úse By Bus Line 53
Frequency of Büs Use By Time Of Day 54
Frequency of Bus Use By Type Of Fare 55
Frequency of Bus Use By Residence Sector 56
Frequency of bus Use By Rider Age 57
Frequency of Bus Use By Gender 58
Frequency of Bus Use By Ethnic Background 59
Frequency of Bus Use By Annual Household Income
Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Bus Line63

Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Type $\quad 64$
Of Fare
Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Trip Purpose65

Number of Büses Required To Complete
Trip From Origin To Destination By Time
Of Day ..... 66

Number of Buses Required To Complete
Trip From Origin To Destination By
Residence Sector ..... 67
Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Rider Age ..... 68
Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Gender ..... 69Number of Buses Required To CompleteTrip From Origin To Destination ByEthnic Background70
Number of Buses Required To Complete Trip From Origin To Destination By Annual Household Income ..... 71
Mode of Access To RTD System By Bus Line ..... 73
Mode of Access To RTD System By Residence Sector ..... 74
Mode of Access To RTD System By Rider Age ..... 75
Mode of Access To RTD System By Gender ..... 76Mode of Access To RTD System By EthnicBackground77
Mode of Access To RTD System By Annual Household Income ..... 78
Trip Purpose By Bus Line ..... 81
Trip Purpose By Type Of Fare ..... 82
Trip Purpose By Time Of Day ..... 83
Trip Purpose By Residence Sector ..... 84
Number Title Page
Table 61

Trip Purpose By Rider Age 85Table 62Table 63Table 64
Table 65
Table 66
Table 67
Table 68
Table 69
Table 70
Table 71
Table 72
Table 73
Figure 1
Table A-I
Table A-II
Table A-III
Table A-IV
Trip Purpose By Gender 86
Trip Purpose By Ethnic Background 87
Trip Purpose By Annual Household Income 88
Riders Rate RTD Service By Bus Line 91
Riders Rate RTD Service By Type Of Fare 92
Riders Rate RTD Service By Time Of Day 93
Riders Rate RTD Service By Residence
Sector
94
Riders Rate RTD Service By Rider Age 95
Riders Rate RTD Service By Gender 96
Riders Rate RTD Service By Ethnic
Background97
Riders Rate RTD Service By Annual Household Income98Survey Coverage of Peak-Hour ExpressLines100
Passenger Survey Questionnaire ..... 101
Boarding By Type Of Line (Ranked By Boardings per Bus Hour) ..... 103
Ridership and Subsidies By Line, Park and Ride Lines ..... 104
Ridership and Subsidies by Line, Random Sample Of Regular - Service Lines ..... 105
Survey Activity By Time Period ..... 106

The market for public transit in Los Angeles is made up of widely diverse elements -- different types of people with different trip needs. In order to meet the demands of the fragmented market for transit services, the SCRTD operated 226 bus lines in 1981. These lines fell into eight different categories descriptive of the type of service provided:

1) 124 Local lines
2) 8 Local lines providing some express trips during peak hours
3) 24 Local lines providing day-long exipress service over a portion of their routes
4) 9 Park and Ride lines
5) 17 Express lines operating only during peak hours
6) 10 Subscription lines
7) 11 Local lines operating only during peak hours (the BEEP lines), and
8) 23 Special service lines providing service to the Hollywood Bowl, Greek Theater, Dodger Stadium, race tracks, etc.

Table $A-I$ in the Appendix contains boarding data by type of service.

This report is one of a series of four reports to be issued by Market Research under the umbrella of the 1981 Ridership Tracking Study. The reports in this series analyze the demographic, attitudinal and transit trip characteristics of riders on:

1) The RTD system overall,
2) Regular-Service lines (essentially local lines, some of which offer a few express trips or day-long express service over a small portion of their routes).
3) Subscription lines, and
4) Peak-Hour Express lines.

The purpose of this report is to examine the demographic, attitudinal, and trip characteristics of Peak-Hour Express line riders in comparison with the characteristics of riders on other types of RTD lines. The 17 Peak-Hour Express lines represent $7.5 \%$ of the RTD lines in existence in 1981. These lines account for approximately $6.4 \%$ of the daily boardings. The number of boardings per bus hour on Peak-Hour Express lines is $13.6,47 \%$ to $77 \%$ lower than the boarding figures on Park and Ride or any of the three categories of Regular-Service lines. As a group, then, the Peak-Hour Express lines appear to be among the least efficient in terms of riders per bus hour. Table 1 provides more detailed data by bus line. The number of riders per bus hour on Peak-Hour Express lines ranges from 8.? to 25.5.

The Peak-Hour Express lines are among the most expensive to operate. According to data obtained from the line Performance Trends Report the subsidy per boarding on these lines ranges from $\$ 2.43$ to $6: 34$. The median subsidy is $\$ 4.69$ per boarding, $93 \%$ higher than the subsidy for each Park and Ride line boarding and nearly five times the subsidy on the 50 Regular-Service lines which were surveyed in 1981. Tables $A-I I$ and $A-I I I$ in the Appendix provide comparative ridership and subsidy data for Park and Ride and Regular-Service lines.

TABLE 1

## RIDERSHIP AND.SUBSIDIES BY LINE

## FY' 8 '2 VALUES

| Line No. | Daily <br> Board- <br> ings | ```percent Of Category``` | Riders <br> per <br> Bus Hour | Revenue Per Boarding | Subsidy <br> Per <br> Boarding | Date of <br> Fare Check |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 X | $6 \cdot 3$ | . $8 \%$ | NA | NA | $\dot{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{A}$ | - |
| 122 | 279 | 3.5 | 25.5 | \$ . 81 | \$4.94 | 2/24/81 |
| 123 | 70 | . 9 | 13.6 | $1 . .56$ | $4 . .52$ | 10/09/80 |
| 144 | 964 | 12.2 | 23.3 | .76 | 3.56 | 4/15/81 |
| 176 | 1149 | 14.5 | 23.7 | .47 | 2.43 | 1/26/81 |
| 410 | 196 | 2.5 | NA | NA | NA | - |
| 481 | 1229 | 15.5 | NA | NA | NA | - |
| 489 | 946 | 11.9 | NA | NA | NA | - |
| 492 | 32.3 ' | 4.1 | 16.1 | 1.02 | 3.95 | $4 / 3 / 81$ |
| 494 | 340 | 4.3 | 19.4 | .79 | . 4.92 | 4/3/81 |
| 601 | 146 | 1.8 | 11.8 | 1.46 | 4.88 | 2/22/80 |
| 602 | 320 | 4.0 | 11.3 | 1.01 | $5 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$ | 2/22/80 |
| 604 | 62.4 | 7.9 | 16.1 | . 79 | 4.35 | 2/13/80 |
| 605 | 237 | 3.0 | 9:5 | 1.50 | 6.34 | 2/13/80 |
| 606 | 324 | 4.1 | 14.8 | 1.01 | 4.39 | 2/13/80 |
| 608 | 163 | 2.1 | 8.2 | . 88 | 4.85 | 5/14/80 |
| 814 | 550 | 6.9 | 12.7 | . 44 | 5.39 | 2/2/81 |
| OVER- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL | 7923 | 100.0\% |  |  | ' |  |
| MEDIAN | $321: 5$ |  | 13.6 | \$. 845 | \$ 4.685 |  |

Source: Line Performance rrends Report, Service Analysis Section

## 1. RIDER AGE

The median age of RTD Peak-Hour Express line riders is 35.6, over 8 years older than the average Regular-Service weekday rider, but about the same as the average Park and Ride patron.

Median rider age varies by bus line, from less than 30 years old to nearly 42.

The median age of Peak-Hour Express line riders varies by residence sector.

Male riders on Peak-Hour Express lines are 1.5 years older than the females, on average.

At 36.9, White riders on Peak-Hour Express lines are the oldest, on average. Latino riders, at an average age of 31 years, are the youngest.

## 2. RIDER GENDER

Overall, women constitute $65 \%$ of the Peak-Hour Express line ridership. On Regular-Service lines they account for about $54 \%$ of the ridership.

The gender mix varies by bus line from $86 \%$ female to only $45 \%$ female.

Gender mix varies by residence sector.

## 3. ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Unlike Regular-Service lines, on which up to $63 \%$ of the riders are members of a minority, Peak-Hour Express lines carry $60 \%$ to $70 \%$ White riders (depending on whether the atypical 176 line is included in the calculations). Ethnic mix varies by bus line, from $6 \%$ White to $90 \%$ White riders.

Ethnic mix varies by residence sector.
4. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

The median annual household income reported by Peak-Hour Express line riders is about $\$ 22,000$ or more, at least twice as high as that reported by Regular-Service weekday riders.

Household income varies by line. The lowest figure is reported by riders on the 176 line, only $\$ 6,547$. The income on other Peak-Hour Express lines ranges from $\$ 14,050$ to $\$ 26,633$.

Annual household income varies by residence sector. Income also varies by ethnic background, from about $\$ 11,000$ in Black households to over $\$ 25,000$ among Whites.
5. HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Peak-Hour Express riders live in somewhat less populous households than do Regülar-Service riders. Express riders average 3.1 persons per household, and the Regular-Service riders average 3.6.
6. TYPE OF FARE

The proportion of cash riders on Peak-Hour Express lines is about $32 \%$ overall, as compared to $48 \%$ of Regular-Service riders.

The percentage of Peak-Hour Express line riders paying cash fares varies by bus line, from $18 \%$ to $59 \%$.

Use of the express pass accounts for $44 \%$ of the Peak-Hour Express line boardings, as opposed to only $4 \%$ of
Regular-Service boardings.
Fare mix varies by residence sector.
Riders using an express pass or "other" type of fare have the highest median household incomes, $\$ 24,000$ to over $\$ 26,000$. The lowest median income is reported by riders using a regular pass to board Peak-Hour Express lines.

Only $3 \%$ of the cash riders on Peak-Hour Express lines say they don't know where to buy a pass, as opposed to nearly $7 \%$ of the cash riders on Regular-Service lines. Up to $10 \%$ of the former, and only $7 \%$ of the latter, however say there is no convenient outlet at which they may purchase a pass.

## 7. FREQUENCY OF BUS USE

Only about $10 \%$ of Peak-Hour Express line riders use the bus more than five days a week, as opposed to $35 \%$ of Regular-Seríice weekday riders who ride more than five days.

Nearly threequarters of the express line riders ride five days a week. Only 41\% of Regular-Service riders are in this category.

Bus use frequency varies by bus line.
Bus use frequency also varies by type of fare. Larger than average proportions of cash riders and Senior Citizen pass riders ride less than five days a week. The frequency of bus use varies by residence sector.

Frequency of bus use tends to decline with age -- highest among riders under 19 years old and lowest among those over 62.

Latino riders on Peak-Hour Express lines are most likely to ride more than five days a week. White riders are least likely.

There is a relationship between household income and frequency of bus use. The proportion of express riders riding five days a week increases from only $52 \%$ among low-income riders to $80 \%$ among those in the upper income brackets. The proportion of Express line patrons riding more than five days a week declines as income increases - from over $20 \%$ of low-income patrons to only $3 \%$ of high-income patrons.
8. BOARDINGS PER LINKED TRIP

Peak-Hour Express line riders tend to ride fewer buses than do Regular-Service riders -- 1.7 buses, on average, as opposed to 1.8. Nearly $60 \%$ of express line riders ride just one bus to complete their trips from origin to destination.

The number of linked trip buses varies by bus line.
The number of buses ridden also varies by type of fare. Nearly 70\% of the cash riders take just one bus.

The number of buses also varies by trip purpose. Riders on work trips tend to ride the fewest buses; 61\% of them ride just one bus to get to or from work.

The number of linked trip buses varies by residence sector.
Riders under 19 years of age tend to ride more buses to complete their linked trips than do older riders.

White riders are more likely than minority riders to ride just one bus to complete their linked trips; $70 \%$ of Uhites, as opposed to $40 \%$ of Blacks or Latinos and 53\% of Asian/ Pacific Islanders, ride just one bus.

The number of buses ridden on a linked trip tends to decine as household income rises.
9. MODE OF ACCESS TO RTD

Only 63\% of Peak-Hour Express line riders get to the bus on foot. At least $90 \%$ of Regular-Service riders walk to the bus. Conversely, $36 \%$ of express riders, but only $9 \%$ of Regular-Service riders, get to the bus by car.

Access patterns vary by bus line and by residence sector.
Male express line riders are more likely to walk to the bus than are females.

As household income rises, express line riders are less likely to access the RTD system on foot and more likely to access by car.

10: TRIP PURPOSE
Over $90 \%$ of the Peak-Hour Express line riders are on work trips, as opposed to roughly half of Regular-Service riders.

Trip purpose patterns vary somewhat by bus iine, but work and school trips predominate, accounting for at least $92 \%$ of the trips on any express line.

School trips account for $73 \%$ of the express line boardings made by riders under 19 years old and $11 \%$ of the boardings made by those between 19 and 29.
11. RIDER ATTITUDE ABOUT RTD SERVICE

Overall, $83 \%$ of Peak-Hour Express line riders rate RTD service "somewhat" or "very" favorably; 76\% of Regular-Service riders gave comparable ratings.

# DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PEAK-HOUR EXPRESS LINE RIDERS 

## AGE OF RIDERS

The clientele of RTD's Peak-Hoür Express lines tend to be older than Regular-Service riders. The median age of Peak-Hour Express riders is 35.6 , a full 8.2 years higher than the median age of Regular-Service riders. Peak-Hour Express line patrons are most like Park and Ride patrons in terms of average age. The 1980 on-board survey of Park and Ride patrons ascertained their median age to be 35.1. Compared to Regular-Service lines, neither Peak-Hour Express line nor Park and Ride lines carry large proportions of young riders. Over $21 \%$ of the riders on Regular-Service lines are under 19 years of age, whereas only 4.2\% of the Express line riders and $1 \%$ of the Park and Ride riders are in that age group. Senior citizen ridership is also lower on Express and Park and Ride Iines, $5.9 \%$ and $4.0 \%$, respectively, as compared to 8.5\% on Regular-Service lines.

Table 2 shows that the age distribution of Express line riders varies by bus line - from a median age of 29.6 on the 601 line up to over 41.5 on the 410 and 34 lines. It is noteworthy that six of the Peak-Hour Express lines surveyed recorded no boardings by riders under 19 years of age. Young riders accounted for $35 \%$ of the boardings on the 601 line, on the other hand.

Although the Express lines surivey have been classified as peak hour, a small proportion of trips fall outside the narrow definition of peak service hours. In-bound trips were categorized into time periods according to when their mid-point occurred. A trip whose mid-point occurs before 6 AM , then, would be in the pre-AM peak period, while one whose mid-point occurs between $8: 30 \mathrm{AM}$ and noon would be in the morning base period. Table A-IV in the Appendix shows that only $8 \%$ of the trips surveyed, or 7 out of 86 trips, were not classified as peak hour trips. The table also shows that the number of respondents per trip varies by time period, from 13.9 on inbound trips during the afternoon peak period up to 30.7 on trips before the morning peak period.

Table 3 shows that age distribution of riders on inbound trips varies by time period. About $4 \%$ of the Express line riders take the 122 or 144 line in-bound before the morning peak. These riders tend to be the oldest of the Express line riders, with a median age of 43. The youngest riders are those on line 489 or 814 who
ride in-bound trips during the afternoon base period. Their median age is 29.8, 13.2 years less than the median age of the pre-AM peak Express riders. Among weekday Regüar-Service riders the oldest and youngest riders are also those riding during the pre-AM peak and $P M$ base periods, but the range is only 2.5 years. The pre-AM peak riders have a median age of 28.6 and the PM base riders average 26.1.

The effects of residence sector on rider age distribution are seen in Table 4. The highest median age, 43.7 is recorded by riders the North Central sector. Riders from the San Gabriel Valley are the youngest Express line riders, with a median age of 34.9.

The men riding Peak Hour Express lines tend to be somewhat older than the women. The median age of the men is 36.5 and of the women 35.0. Among weekday Regular Service riders, the median age of male and female riders is nearly the same-27.1 and 27.5. respectively.

The oldest Regular-Service riders are White. Table 6 shows that Whites also constitute the oldest ethnic group among Express line riders. With an average of 36.9. Whites are 1.2 years older than the average Black Express rider and 5.9 years older than the average Latino.

| Bus Line | Under 19 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \text { to } \\ 29 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \text { to } \\ 39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \text { to } \\ 49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \text { to } \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | 62 or older | Total | Median Age | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 x | - | 40\% | $5 \%$ | 30\% | 15\% | 10\% | 100\% | 41.7 | 20 |
| 122 | - | 26 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 100 | 38.7 | 54 |
| 123 | - | 7 | 50 | 25 | 11 | 7 | 100 | 38.6 | 28 |
| 144 | 1\% | 29 | 25 | 17 | 22 | 6 | 100 | 37.9 | 242 |
| 176 | 9 | 27 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 7 | 100 | 37.1 | 202 |
| 410 | 6 | 27 | 15 | 18 | 29 | 6 | 100 | 42.6 | 34 |
| 481 | 1 | 32 | 32 | 17 | 16 | 3 | 100 | 35:4 | 397 |
| 489 | 9 | 38 | 23 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 100 | 31.3 | 215 |
| 492 | - | 24 | 26 | 24 | 22 | 6 | 100 | 40.4 | 51 |
| 494 | 6 | 31 | 32 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 100 | 34.0 | 65 |
| 601 | 35 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 7 | 6 | 100 | 29.6 | 81 |
| 602 | 2 | 44 | 23 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 100 | 32.1 | 124 |
| 604 | 2 | 32 | 32 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 100 | 35.1 | 185 |
| 605 | 3 | 29 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 3 | 100 | 36.9 .9 | 107 |
| 606 | - | 47 | 28 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 100 | 31.1 | 51 |
| 508 | 5 | 25 | 33 | 21 | 13 | 3 | 100 | 35.8 | 39 |
| 814 | - | 30 | 31 | 16 | 18 | 6 | 100 | 36.5 | 173 |
| OVER- <br> ALL | 48 | 31\% | 26\% | 15\% | 17\% | 6\% | 100\% | 35.6 | 2068 |
| Response Rate: 73\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Time Period | Under $19$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 29 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30- \\ & 39 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40- \\ 49 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50- \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | 62 or Older | Total | Median Age | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM Peak | - | 21\% | 23\% | 21\% | 22\% | 148 | 100\% | 43.0 | 86 |
| AM Peak | 4 | 32 | 27 | 16 | 17 | 6 | 100 | 35.5 | 1771 |
| AM Base | 12 | 26 | 21 | 12 | 27 | 2 | 100 | 35.6 | 50 |
| PM Base | 18 | 33 | 21 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 100 | 29.8 | 28 |
| PM <br> Peak | 9 | 35 | 25 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 100 | 32.2 | 133 |
| OVER- ALL | 4\% | 31\% | 26\% | 15\% | 17\% | $6 \%$ | 100\% | 35.6 | 2068 |
| Respons | Rate: | 738 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Residence Sector | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & 19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \hline 29 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30- \\ \hline 39 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40= \\ 49 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50- \\ & 61 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 62 or Older | Total | Median <br> Age | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando <br> Valley | 2\% | 28\% | 26\% | 17\% | 21\% | 7\% | 100\% | 38.1 | 258 |
| North <br> Central | - | 17 | 28 | 12 | 37 | 5 | 100 | 43.7 | 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { San Gabriel } \\ & \text { Valley } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 33 | 27 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 100 | 34.9 | 566 |
| West Los Angeles | 6 | 30 | 28 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 100 | 35.1 | 403 |
| South <br> Central | 6 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 23 | 11 | 100 | 39.5 | 154 |
| East <br> Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 7 |
| East Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | -- | - | - | -* | 11 |
| South Bay | - | 35 | 28 | 13 | 19 | 6 | 100 | 35.6 | 166 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 3 |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 4 |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1 |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Ventura County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 31\% | 26\% | 15\% | 17\% | 6\% | 100\% | 35.6 | 1632 |
| Response Rate: 58\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Sample size | too s | mall to | allo | vali | sta | tical | 1 comp | ison |  |

TABLE 5
RIDER AGE
BY GENDER

| Gender | Under 19 | $\begin{gathered} 19- \\ 29 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30- \\ \quad 39 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40- \\ 49 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50- \\ 61 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 62 or Older | Total | Median Age | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 5\% | 278 | 29\% | 148 | 18\% | $8 \%$ | 100\% | 36.5 | 774 |
| Female | 4 | 34 | 25 | 17 | 15 | 5 | 100 | 35.0 | 1275 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 4\% | 31\% | 268 | 15\% | 17\% | 68 | 100\% | 35.6 | 2050 |
| Response Rate: 73\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ethnic <br> Back- <br> ground | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unde } \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ \quad 29 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 39 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ 49 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ 61 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 62 or Older | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Median } \\ & \text { Age } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 4\% | 29\% | 26\% | 15\% | 20\% | $7 \%$ | 100\% | 36.9 | 1290 |
| Black | 8 | 29 | 22 | 15 | 18 | 8 | 100 | 35.7 | 235 |
| Latino | 4 | 43 | 29 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 100 | 31.0 | 303 |
| Asian <br> or <br> Pacific <br> Islander | 4 | 28 | 33 | 18 | 15 | 3 | 100 | 35.4 | 186 |
| American Indian | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 3 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 16 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 31\% | 26\% | 15\% | 17\% | 6\% | 100\% | 35.6 | 2033 |
| Response | Rat | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7 shows that gender mix varies by bus line, from over $86 \%$ female on the 176 line to $55 \%$ male on the 606 and 608 ines. Overall. $65 \%$ of Express line riders are women. The proportion of women riding the Peak-Hour Express line is significantly higher than the $54 \%$ proportion riding Regular-Service iines and the 51\% proportion riding Park and Ride lines.

Table 8 shows that the proportion of women riding the express lines is highest on in-bound trips classified as morning base and afternoon base period, when they comprise up to $75 \%$ of the riders.

Rider gender mix also varies by residence sector, as seen in Table 9. Three-quarters of the Express riders from the South Central sector are women, but women comprise only a little more than half the Express line riders from the West Los Angeles and South Bay sectors.

| Bus Line | Male | Female | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $34 \times$ | 29\% | 718 | 100\% | 24 |
| 122 | 42 | 58 | 100 | 62 |
| 123 | 55 | 45 | 100 | 31 |
| 144 | 35 | 65 | 100 | 258 |
| 176 | 14 | 86 | 100 | 253 |
| 410 | 40 | 61 | 100 | 38 |
| 481 | 29 | 71 | 100 | 423 |
| 489 | 35 | 65 | 100 | 231 |
| 492 | 35 | 65 | 100 | 54 |
| 494 | 37 | 63 | 100 | 68 |
| 601 | 41 | 59 | 100 | 81 |
| 602 | 44 | 56 | 100 | 129 |
| 604 | 51. | 49 | 100 | 203 |
| 605 | 44 | 54 | 98 | 114 |
| 606 | 55 | 45 | 100 | 56 |
| 608 | 55 | 45 | 100 | 40 |
| 814 | 47 | 53 | 100 | 184 |
| OVERALL | $35 \%$ | $65 \%$ | 100\% | 2249 |
| Response | te: 8 |  |  |  |

TABLE 8
RIDER GENDER
BY TIME OF DĀY

| Time <br> Period | Male | Female | Total | Number of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pre-AM <br> Peak | $40 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $100 \%$ | 94 |
| AM Peak | 36 | 64 | 100 | 1918 |
| AM Base | 25 | 75 | 100 | 59 |
| PM Base | 27 | 73 | 100 | 30 |
| PM Peak | 32 | 68 | 100 | 147 |
| OVERALL | $35 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $100 \%$ | 2248 |
| Response Rate: $80 \%$ |  |  |  |  |


| Residence Sector | Male | Female | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando V̇alley | 37\% | 63\% | 100\% | 266 |
| North Central | 35 | 66 | 100 | 28 |
| San Gabriel Valley | 31 | 70 | 100 | 584 |
| West Los Angeles | 49 | 51 | 100 | 425 |
| South Central | 11 | 89 | 100 | 171 |
| East Central | - | - | - | 7* |
| East Los Angeles | - | - | - | 7* |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | 13* |
| South Bay | 47 | 53 | 100 | 171 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | 9* |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | 3* |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | 5* |
| Orange County | - | - | - | 1* |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | 8* |
| Ventura County | - | - | - | 9* |
| OVERALL | 35\% | 65\% | 100\% | 1707 |
| Response rate: | 60\% |  |  |  |

## ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Table 10 shows that ethnic mix on Express lines varies by line, but that on all except one of the lines surveyed, White riders are in the majority. The atypical line is the 176 , the so-called "maids' line" which is reputed to transport domestic workers from their homes in South Central Los Angeles to the homes of their employers in Beverly Hills, Brentwood and Pacific Palisades. Over 65\% of the riders on the 176 are Black and nearly $26 \%$ are Latino. Only 6\% are White. Excluding data from the 176 line, nearly 70\% of Peak-Hour Express line riders are White, while $13 \%$ are Latino, $10 \%$ are Asian or Pacific Islander and only $6 \%$ are Black. The ethnic mix on Regular-Service lines is quite different; well over $60 \%$ of the riders on those lines are members of a minority group.

Table 11 makes the point that ethnic mix on Express line in-bound trips tends to vary by time of day. The highest proportion of White riders on in-bound trips occurs before and during the morning peak - 78\% and 60\%, respectively. The lowest proportion of White riders is found on in-bound trips during the morning base period - only 32\%. During the morning base, over $40 \%$ of the riders are Black. This high proportion of Black riders during this time period results from the fact that only two lines make in-bound trips during this period - the 489 and the 176.

The ethnic mix of Express line riders varies by residence location as depicted in Table 12. The majority of riders from the San Gabriel Valley, North Central. West Los Angeles Sector, the San Fernando Valley, and South Bay are White. The majority of South Central riders are Black.

TABLE 10
ETHNIC BACKGROUND
BY BUS LINE

| Bus Line | White | Black | Latino | Asian or pacific Islander | Anierican Indian | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 X | 718 | 8 \% | 88 | 13\% | - | - | 100\% | 24 |
| 122 | 78 | - | 12 | 9 | - | 2 | 100 | 59 |
| 123 | 80 | - | - | 13 | - | 7 | 100 | 30 |
| 144 | 81 | 4 | 4 | 9 | - | 1 | 100 | 252 |
| 176 | 6 | 65 | 26 | 2 | - | - | 100 | 248 |
| 410 | 69 | 3 | 23 | 5 | - | - | 100 | 39 |
| 481 | 59 | 8 | 16 | 15 | - | 1 | 100 | 412 |
| 489 | 57 | 4 | 22 | 15 | - | 1 | 100 | 227 |
| 492 | 63 | 2 | 17 | 19 | - | - | 100 | 54 |
| 494 | 51 | 6 | 30 | 13 | - | - - | 100 | 70 |
| 601 | 63 | 5 | 29 | 4 | - | - | 100 | 83 |
| 602 | 80 | 5 | 9 | 5 | - | 1 | 100 | 129 |
| 504 | 75 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 1\% | 2 | 100 | 198 |
| 605 | 72 | 8 | 16 | 4 | - | $-$ | 100 | 110 |
| 605 | 83 | 9 | 2 | 6 | - | - | 100 | 54 |
| 508 | 90 | 3 | 3 | 5 | - | - | 100 | 40 |
| 814 | 81 | 3 | 12 | 4 | - | 1 | 100 | 181 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 60\% | 15\% | 15\% | 9\% | - | 1 | 100\% | 2210 |
| Exicl. <br> Line <br> 176 | 70\% | 6\% | 138 | 10\% | - | 18 | 100\% | 1962 |

Response Rate: 78\%

TABLE 11
EIHNIC BACKGROUND EY TIME OF DAY

| Time Period | White | Black | Latino | Asian or Pacific Islander | American Indian | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM Peak | 78\% | - | 9\% | 12\% | - | 18 | 100\% | 91 |
| AM <br> Peak | 60 | 15\% | 15 | 9 | - | 1 | 100 | 1890 |
| AM <br> Base | 32 | 41 | 14 | 14 | - | - | 100 | 54 |
| PM <br> Base | 51 | 3 | 36 | 10 | - | - | 100 | 30 |
| PM Peak | 52 | 11 | 25 | 11 | 1\% | 1 | 100 | 145 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 60\% | 15\% | 15\% | 98 | - | 18 | 100\% | 2210 |


| Residence Sector | White | Black | Latino | Asian or Pacific Islander | American Indian | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando Valley | 79\% | 2\% | 8\% | 10\% | - | 1\% | 100\% | 263 |
| North Central | 69 | 15 | 16 | - | - | - | 100 | 28 |
| San Gabriel Valley | 57 | 5 | 20 | 17 | - | 1 | 100 | 578 |
| West Los Angeles | 72 | 9 | 11 | 7 | - | 1 | 100 | 420 |
| South Central | 1 | 80 | 18 | 1 | - | 1 | 100 | 167 |
| East Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7* |
| East Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8" |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13* |
| South Bay | 84 | 3 | 8 | 4 | - | 1 | 100 | 171 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9* |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $3{ }^{\text {m }}$ |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5* |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $9 \%$ |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7* |
| Ventura County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| OVERALL | 60\% | 15\% | 15\% | 9\% | . $2 \%$ | . $8 \%$ | 100\% | 1688 |
| Response Rate: | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ANNÜAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Peak-Hour Express line patrons tend to be relatively affluent, although median income does vary by bus line as shown in Table 13. With the exception of the 176 line, median income figures are between $\$ 14,050$ and $\$ 26,633$. The riders on the 176 line report a median income equal to only $47 \%$ of the median income on the next lowest ranking line, the 410. If the 176 ine data are included in the calculation of overall Express ine median income, the figure is $\$ 21.812$. If line 176 data are excluded, the median income leaps $\$ 1,600$ to $\$ 23,412$.

The average household income of Peak-Hour Express ine riders is approximately twice that of Regular-Service weekday riders and about $85 \%$ to $90 \%$ as high as the median income of Park and Ride patrons.

Table 14 shows that household size tends to deciine as income increases to the $\$ 25,000$ level. At that point average household size rises again. Table 15 shows the relationship between the poverty levels for different size households and median income by type of service. The table also points out the relationship between the median household income of Express and Regülar-Service riders by size of household. The a verage household income of Express line riders is 64\% to $116 \%$ higher than that of Regular-Service riders living in comparable size households. As among Regular-Service rider households, there is a tendency for Express rider average incomes to be closer to poverty levels as household size increases. Unlike the situation among Regular-Service riders, however, the median income of Express riders does not descend below poverty levels among large households. The average income of Express riders living in households of seven or more persons is 23\% above poverty levels. Among express riders living in smaller households, average income is two to four times higher than the poverty level.

According to the Survey of Buying Power, the median household effective buying income (EBI) for Los Angeles County is \$21,231. Whereas the median household income of RTD Regular-Service weekday riders is equivalent to only $52 \%$ of the EBI, the income of Express line riders is $3 \%$ to $10 \%$ higher than the EBI (depending upon whether line 176 income data are included in calculations of Express rider median income).

Average Express rider income does vary according to time of day during which the in-bound tripis made. The highest incomes are reported by riders before and during the morning peak - $\$ 25,040$ before the peak and $\$ 21,838$ during the peak. In-boünd trips made during the base or afternoon peak periods carry less affluent riders with median household incomes between $\$ 14,034$ and $\$ 19.152$. More detail is provided in Table 16.

Income distribution by residence sector is shown in Table 17. Median income of Express riders ranges from $\$ 5,425$ among those from South Central Los Angeles to nearly $\$ 25,000$ among those from the South Bay or West Los Angeles sectors.

Household income distribution also varies by ethnic background, as demonstrated in Table 18. Black express riders have the lowest average income, $\$ 10,987$. Latiños also report a relatively low median household income, \$12,217. White riders are the most affluent, with an average household income of over $\$ 25,000$.

TABLE 13
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME
BY BUS LINE

| Bus Line | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 5000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000- \\ & \$ 19999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 2500$ or More | Total | Median Income | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $34 \times$ | - 5\% | 118 | 268 | 258 | $5 \%$ | $26 \%$ | 100\% | \$15.502 | 19 |
| 122 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 11 | 26 | 40 | 100 | 23,030 | 53 |
| 123 | 4 | 4 | - | 23 | 8 | 62 | 100 | 25,943 | 26 |
| 144 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 21 | 12 | 44 | 100 | 22,336 | 237 |
| 176 | 41 | 28 | 18 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 100 | 6,547 | 133 |
| 410 | 10 | 19 | 25 | 7 | 16 | 23 | 100 | 14.050 | 31 |
| 481 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 49 | 100 | 24,780 | 384 |
| 489 | 7 | 7 | 19 | 12 | 17 | 37 | 100 | 21,301 | 191 |
| 492 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 13 | 42 | 100 | 22,105 | 45 |
| 494 | 3 | 7 | 23 | 21 | 7 | 39 | 100 | 19,014 | 61 |
| 601 | 18 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 10 | 49 | 100 | 24,490 | 51 |
| 602 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 48 | 100 | 24,338 | 118 |
| 504 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 43 | 100 | 22,246 | 167 |
| 605 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 61 | 100 | 25,933 | 99 |
| 506 | 4 | - | 14 | 12 | 16 | 55 | 100 | 25,446 | 51 |
| 608 | 8 | - | - | 10 | 8 | 74 | 100 | 25,633 | 39 |
| 814 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 22 | 47 | 100 | 24,332 | 166 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 9\% | 8\% | 168 | 1.38 | 148 | 418 | 100\% | \$21,812 | 1871 |
| Exclu <br> Line <br> 176 | ding $5 \%$ | 58 | $16 \%$ | 148 | 15\% | 45\% | 100\% | \$23,412 | 1738 |
| Respon | nse Ra | : $66 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 14
NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Number of Persons in Household

|  | - |  |  | 机 |  |  |  |  | Median |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fousehold Income | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven or More | Total | Number of Persons | Number of Respondents |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 5000 \end{aligned}$ | $26 \%$ | 218 | 138 | 18\% | 10\% | 6\% | 68 | 100\% | 3.3 | 136 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \end{aligned}$ | 24 | 23 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 6 | 100 | 3.2 | 126 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$10000- } \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 31 | 26 | 21 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 2.8 | 281 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$15000- } \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 29 | 28 | 22 | 1.0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 2.8 | 240 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 37 | 19 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 100 | 2.9 | 260 |
| $\$ 25000$ <br> or more | 8 | 36 | 22 | 18 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 3.3 | 803 |
| OVER- <br> ALL | 18 | 31 | 20 | 16 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 3.1 | 1845 |
| Median Income: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$15 | 61 \$2 | 337 | 3256 \$ | 24403 | \$21741 | \$240 | 75 \$188 | 57 \$21 |  |  |
| Response | Rate: | 65\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 15
COMPARISON BETWEEN BUS RIDER
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND POVERTY LEVELS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND TYFE OF. SERVICE

| Nutien of Periscir: in fousehcind | 198 Poverty <br> Level* | 1981 Rus Rider Median Household Income |  | Relation of Express Rider Income to Regular-Service Rider Income | Relation of Household Incone to Poverty Level. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Regular-Service Riders | Peak-Hour Express Riders |  | Regular-Service Riders | Peak-hour Express Piders |
| OnE | 5,655 | 5. 9,464 | \$ 15,561 | +64\% | +103\% | +2348 |
| Tw | 5,958 | 12,366 | 24,337 | +97\% | +108\% | +309\% |
| THPEE | 7,294 | 11,411 | 23,256 | +104\% | +56\% | +219\% |
| FOUR | 9,347 | 12,180 | 24,403 | +100\% | +30\% | +1E1\% |
| FIVE | 11,072 | 12,931 | 21,741 | +68\% | +17\% | +96\% |
| SIX | 12,519 | 11,173 | 24,075 | +116\% | -11\% | +92\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEYR ON } \\ & \text { MORE } \end{aligned}$ | 15,504 | 11,371 | 19,040 | +67\% | -27\% | +23\% |

*1981 Poverty Levels are estimates based on 11.18 annual increase in
Conswmer Price Index in Los Angeles area as of Ausust, 1981. Official
Census Bureau poverty level figrres for 1981 will be released in'1982.

TABLE 16
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME
BY TIME OF DAY

| Time Períod | Under $\$ 5000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5000 \\ \$ 9999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000 \\ & \$ 14999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000 \\ & \$ 19999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 20000 \\ \$ 24999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\$ 25000$ <br> or More | Total | Median Income | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM <br> Peak | 18 | 48 | 14\% | 9\% | 22\% | $50 \%$ | 100\% | \$25,040 | 82 |
| AM Peak | 8 | 7 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 41 | 100 | 21,838 | 1610 |
| AM Base | 20 | 14 | 21 | 5 | 12 | 29 | 100 | 14,034 | 39 |
| PM Base | 8 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 14 | 32 | 100 | 19,152 | 22 |
| PM Peak | 17 | 11 | 19 | 5 | 11 | 38 | 100 | 18,235 | 118 |
| OVER- ALL | 9 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 14 | 41 | 100 | \$21,812 | 1871 |
| Response | Rate: | - 66\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Residence Sector | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 5000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 9999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 14999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 19999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 24999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 25000 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { More } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Median <br> Income | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |
| Valley | 3\% | 2\% | 18\% | 19\% | 16\% | 42\% | 100\% | 22,500 | 254 |
| North Central | 19 | 27 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 27 | 100 | 14.388 | 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { San Gabriel } \\ & \text { Valley } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 6 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 45 | 100 | 23,268 | 532 |
| West Los Angeles | 7 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 50 | 100 | 24,775 | 373 |
| South Central | 48 | 26 | 17 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 100 | 5,425 | 103 |
| East Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 4 |
| East Los <br> Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 12 |
| Souuth Bay | 2 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 50 | 100 | 24.933 | 158 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | -* | 3 |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 3 |
| North Los Angeles County | , | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 2 |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1 |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Ventura County | , | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| OVERALL | 9\% | 8\% | 16\% | 13\% | 14\% | 41\% | 100\% | \$21,812 | 21492 |
| Response Rate: | 53\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 18
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

| Ethinic Background | Under $\$ 5000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 9999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 14999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 19999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 20000 \\ \text { to } \\ \$ 24999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 25000 \\ \text { or } \\ \text { More } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total | Median <br> Income | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 3\% | 4\% | 13\% | 15\% | 15\% | 51\% | 100\% | \$25,079 | 1219 |
| Black | 27 | 18 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 100 | 10.987 | 191 |
| Latino | 20 | 21 | 20 | 9 | 12 | 18 | 100 | 12,217 | 230 |
| Asian or Pacific Is. | 6 | 4 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 44 | 100 | 22,914 | 177 |
| Amer. <br> Indian | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 2 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 16 |
| overall | 9\% | 8\% | 16\% | 13\% | 14\% | 41\% | 100\% | \$21,812 | 1835 |
| Response | Rate: | 65\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

## HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Table 19 shows that the average household size among Peak-Hour Express line riders is 3.1 persons. Regular-Service riders report a higher average household size of 3.6 persons. Nearly 18\% of Express line riders live alone, and another 31\% live with one other persons (only $22 \%$ of Regular-Service riders live in two-person households). About $16 \%$ of express line riders live in households of five or more persons (as opposed to Regular-Service riders, more than $25 \%$ of whom live in households of five or more).

Household size does vary by bus line, ranging from 2.3 persons on the 606 line to 4 persons on the 601.

Number of Persons in Household

| Bus Line | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seven } \\ & \text { or } \\ & \text { More } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total | Median <br> Number of Persons | Number of Respon dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 X | 198 | 298 | 198 | 148 | 10\% | $5 \%$ | 5\% | 100\% | 3.1 | 21 |
| 122 | 15 | 38 | 21 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 100 | 2.9 | 61 |
| 123 | - | 39 | 11 | 39 | 11 | - | - | 100 | 3.9 | 28 |
| 144 | 20 | 35 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 100 | 2.9 | 252 |
| 176 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 17 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 100 | 3.7 | 208 |
| 410 | 30 | 22 | 22 | 16 | 3 | - | 8 | 100 | 2.9 | 37 |
| 481 | 11 | 24 | 25 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 3.6 | 415 |
| 489 | 11 | 28 | 25 | 19 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 100 | 3.4 | 222 |
| 492 | 10 | 26 | 35 | 16 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 100 | 3.4 | 51 |
| 494 | 11 | 26 | 28 | 14 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 100 | 3.5 | 65 |
| 601 | 14 | 9 | 27 | 24 | 19 | 5 | 3 | 100 | 4.0 | 79 |
| 602 | 29 | 42 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 100 | 2.5 | 127 |
| 604 | 29 | 39 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 2.5 | 195 |
| 605 | 28 | 42 | 14 | 10 | 3 | - | 4 | 100 | 2.5 | 110 |
| 605 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 100 | 2.3 | 53 |
| 508 | 10 | 39 | 8 | 31 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3.2 | 39 |
| 814 | 23 | 41 | 18 | 11 | 6 | - | 1 | 100 | 2.7 | 177 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 18\% | 31\% | 20\% | 16\% | 8\% | 48 | 48 | 100\% | 3.1 | 2140 |
| Respo | Se Ra | te: | 75.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TYPE OF FARE

Overall, more than $44 \%$ of the Express line riders use an express pass, and another $11 \%$ ùse a regülar pass. Among Regular-Service riders only 4\% use an express pass and $23 \%$ use the regular pass. Express line riders are less likely to pay a cash fare than are Regular-Service riders. Less than a third of Express riders pay cash, whereas nearly half of Regular-Service riders do.

Student pass use is considerably less on Express lines that it is on Regular-Service lines. Only $2 \%$ of Express line riders use the student pass, as opposed to 11\% on Regular-Service lines. At 5\% of boardings, college/vocational pass is of equal proportion on Express and Regular-Service lines.

Senior citizen pass use accounts for only $5 \%$ of Express line boardings, versus $7 \%$ of Regular-Service boardings.

Table 20 shows that the fare mix varies by bus line. The proportion of cash riders, for example, ranges from 18\% to 59\%. (The range of cash riders on the surveyed Regular-Service lines was from 30\% to 75\%).

Fare mix tends to vary by time of day during which in-bound trip is made as shown in Table 21. Only 25\% of the boarding passengers before the morning peak period pay cash fares, whereas $32 \%$ to $33 \%$ of the passengers during the morning and afternoon peak and the morning base periods pay cash. Over half the riders on in-bound express trips during the afternoon base period pay cash fares.

Table 21 shows that use of the express pass declines throughout the day, from $60 \%$ of the boardings before the morning peak to $18 \%$ during the afternoon base period and $23 \%$ düring the afternoon peak.

Where an express rider lives has an effect on the type of fare, as demonstrated in Table 22. Riders from the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys are least likely to pay cash fares. Riders from the west Los Angeles sector are most likely to pay cash fares.

In view of the myriad of age-linked fare options available, a relationship is expected between type of fare and rider's age. Student pass users riding express lines average 14.6 years old, approximately similar to the age of Regular-Service riders using this pass. College/vocational pass users on Express lines are a bit older than Regular-Service college pass users, on average 25.5 versus 24.7. Senior citizen pass users average 67 and 67.7 , respectively on Express and Regular-Service lines. Regular pass users on Express lines have a median age of 38.9, while those on Regular-Service lines have an average of 29.9. Express pass users on Express lines are somewhat older, too - 36.8 versus 33.1. Cash riders on Express lines are also older (33.6) than Regular-Service cash riders (26.1). Table 23 provides a detailed breakdown of rider age by type of fare paid on Express lines.

Gender mix also tends to vary by type of fare paid. Overall, men account for only 35 \% of the ridership on Express lines, but they account for $40 \%$ to $45 \%$ of the riders using a student, collegel vocational or senior citizen pass. They account for only $24 \%$ of the regular pass users on Express lines. Table 24 provides details.

Ethnic mix also varies by type of fare, as seen in Table 25. Black riders account for $15 \%$ of the boardings on the lines surveyed (including the 176 line), but they account for $26 \%$ of the regular and senior citizen pass boardings and $35 \%$ of the student pass boardings. Latinos, too, account for only $15 \%$ of all boardings, bút $36 \%$ of regular pass boardings. Asian and Pacific Islanders account for $9 \%$ of the Express line boardings, but over 23\% of the college/vocational pass users. White riders represent $60 \%$ of the Express line riders, overall, but between 64\% and $66 \%$ of the riders using cash fares or a senior citizen or express pass are White.

Type of fare varies by household income, according to Table 26. Regular pass users report the lowest income, $\$ 11,759$, followed closely by student pass users at $\$ 12,063$. College/vocational and senior citizen pass users report median incomes of $\$ 13,640$ and $\$ 13,783$, respectively. Cash riders say their average income is $\$ 22,968$. The most affluent riders use an express pass. This group reports a median income of $\$ 24,114$.

TYPE OF FARE
BY BUS LINE


TYPE OF FARE
BY TIME OF DAY

Cash,
Ticket, Reg- Ex- Pass Coll/Sr. Hand- Tour-
Stdnt
mrans- pres Time Trans- ular press
(udr Voc. Cit. icap ist

Pass Pass
Pass Pass
Pass Other Total
Number of ResponPeriod fer
pass pass
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$3 \% 60 \%$
$-$
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AM
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { peak } & 32 & 11 & 46 & 18 & 4 & 4 & 1 & - & 1 & 100 & 1887\end{array}$

AM

$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\text { PM } \\ \text { Base } & 51 & 5 & 18 & 4 & 7 & 11 & - & - & 4 & 100 & 28\end{array}$

| PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak | 33 | 19 | 23 | 6 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 148 |



Response Rate: 78.48

TABLE 22
TYPE OF FARE
BY RESIDENCE SECTOR

| Residence Sector | Cash, Ticket or Transfer | Regular pass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exprs } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Stdint } \\ \text { pass } \\ \text { (udr 19) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | College/ <br> Voc. <br> pass | Sr. cit. pass | Fandicap Pass | Tourist pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando Valley | 288 | 58 | 58\% | - | 38 | 48 | 1* | - | 28 | 100\% | 264 |
| North Central | 35 | 27 | 39 | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | 100 | 27 |
| San Gabriel valley | 28 | 6 | 54 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 100 | 580 |
| West tos Angeles | 40 | 12 | 33 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 1 |  | 1 | 100 | 422 |
| South Central | 32 | 27 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 10 | - | - | 2 | 100 | 168 |
| East Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 * |
| East los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $1.2 *$ |
| South Bay | 32 | 3 | 55 | - | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 169 |
| Dowintow Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 * |
| Long Beach | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | $3 *$ |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $5 *$ |
| Orange Cointy | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 * |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $8 *$ |
| Ventura County | $\sim$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $9 *$ |
| OVERALL. | 32\% | 11\% | 448 | 3 | $5 *$ | 58 | \% | - | 18 | 100\% | 1690 |
| Response Rate: | 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison.

| Type of Fare | Under 19 | $\begin{aligned} & 19- \\ & 29 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30- \\ 39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40- \\ & 49 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50- \\ 61 \end{gathered}$ | 62 or Older | Total | Median Age | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket or Transfer | 5\% | 35\% | 27\% | 14\% | 15\% | 4\% | 100\% | 33.6 | 655 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regular } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 3 | 100 | 38.9 | 181 |
| Express <br> Pass | . 3 | 29 | 30 | 19 | 21 | 1 | 100 | 36.8 | 916 |
| Student <br> Pass <br> (Under 19) | 83 | 12 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 100 | 14.6 | 42 |
| College/ <br> Vocational Pass | 8 | 72 | 19 | 1 | 1 | - | 100 | 25.5 | 106 |
| Senior <br> Citizen <br> Pass | - | - | - | - | 4 | 96 | 100 | 67.0 | 85 |
| Handicap <br> Pass | - | - | - | $=$ | - | - | - | -* | 15 |
| Tourist <br> Pass | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Other | 2 | 29 | 40 | 17 | 12 | - | 100 | 34.8 | 28 |
| overall | 4\% | 31\% | 26\% | 15\% | 17\% | 6\% | 100 | 35.6 | 2033 |
| Response Rat | ate: | 72\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]| Type of fare | Male | Female | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket |  |  |  |  |
| or Transfer | 39\% | 61\% | 100\% | 6.91 |
| Regular |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 24 | 76 | 100 | 200 |
| Express |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 33 | 67 | 100 | 986 |
| Student Pass (Under 19) | 40 | 60 | 100 | 43 |
| College/ <br> Vocational |  |  |  |  |
|  | 45 | 55 | 100 | 110 |
| Senior |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 45 | 55 | 100 | 95 |
| Handicap |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | - | - | - | 15* |
| Tourist |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | - | - | - | 5* |
| Other | 40 | 60 | 100 | 30 |
| OVERALL | 35\% | 65\% | 100\% | 2175 |
| Response Rate: | 77\% |  |  |  |

TABLE 25
ETHNIC BACKGROUND BY TYPE OF FARE

| Type of Fare | White | Black | Latino | Asian or Pacific Islander | American <br> Indian | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket or Transfer | 64\% | 16\% | 14\% | 5\% | $-$ | 1\% | 100\% | 682 |
| Regular Pass | 32 | 26 | 36 | 4 | 1\% | 1 | 100 | 201 |
| Express Pass | 66 | 9 | 12 | 12 | - | 1 | 100 | 957 |
| Student Pass (Under 19) | 40 | 35 | 20 | 5 | - | - | 100 | 42 |
| College/Vocational Pass | 48 | 19 | 9 | 23 | - | - | 100 | 108 |
| Senior Citizen Pass | 65 | 26 | 3 | 5 | - | 1 | 100 | 92 |
| Handicap Pass | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| Tourist Pass | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5* |
| Other | 57 | 14 | 17 | 12 | - | - | 100 | 30 |
| OVERALL | 60\% | 15\% | 15\% | 9\% | -\% | 1\% | 100 | 2132 |

Response Rate: 75.5\%

TSample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

TYPE OF FARE
BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

| Annual <br> House- <br> hold <br> Income | Cash, Ticket or Trf. | Regular Pass | Ex- <br> press <br> Pass | Stdn <br> Pass <br> (Udr <br> 19) | Coll/ <br> Voc <br> Pass | Sr . Cit. Pass | Handicap <br> Pass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tour- } \\ & \text { ist } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under $\$ 5000$ | .24\% | 27\% | 22\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 1\% | 1\% | - | 100\% | 140 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \end{aligned}$ | 39 | 18 | 21 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 2 | - | 1 | 100 | 126 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 31 | 7 | 46 | 1 | 9 | 6 | - | - | - | 100 | 282 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000- \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 29 | 7 | 55 | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | - | 1 | 100 | 238 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000-1 \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 27 | 6 | 55 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 100 | 259 |
| $\$ 25000$ or more | 34 | 4 | 55 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 100 | 800 |
| OVERALL | 32 | 11 | 44 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | 1 | 100 | 1845 |
| MEDIAN <br> INCOME | 968 \$1 | 759 \$ | 241141 | 12063 | \$13640 | \$13783 | * | * | * | \$21812 |  |

* Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison


## REASON FOR NOT USING RTD PASS

Nearly 53\% of Express riders and $46 \%$ of Regular-Service riders who pay cash fares say they do not ride the bus often enough to justify purchase of a pass. The $13 \%$ proportion of Express riders who say they cannot afford a pass is ten percentage points less than the proportion of Regular-Service riders who give this reason. Only $3 \%$ of Express cash riders say they don't know where to buy a pass, but $7 \%$ of Regular-Service cash riders give this as a reason. Express riders are more likely to say there is no convenient sales outlet at which they can buy a pass; 10\% give this reason, but only 7\% of Regular-Service riders do. Fear of losing their pass is much lower among Express riders than among Regular-Service riders -- $4 \%$ versus $7 \%$. Table 27 shows that the reason for not using a bus pass varies by bus line.

Relatively infrequent bus riding prevents $51 \%$ to $59 \%$ of the Express line cash riders from buying a pass. The proportion of cash riders unable to afford a monthly pass ranges from $12 \%$ to 14\%. The largest proportion of cash riders who don't know where to purchase a monthly pass are to be found on afternoon peak in-bound trips. Lack of a convenient pass sales outlet affected the largest proportion of riders, $11 \%$, during the morning peak period. Table 28 provides additional detail of reasons for use of cash fares given by cash riders during different time periods.

Table 29 shows variation by residence sector in reasons for not using an RTD pass. The proportion of cash riders who cannot afford a pass ranges from $7 \%$ to 22\%. The largest proportion of riders who say there is no convenient pass sales outlet is from the San Fernando Valley - 18\%.

Table 30 shows that riders in the 30 to 39 age group are most likely to indicate that they don't ride the bus often enough to use a monthly pass. The 19 to 29 age group has the largest proportion of riders who don't use a pass because they can't afford it (15\%) or don't know where to buy a pass (6\%).

Table 31 shows significant differences in the reasons given by men and women for not using a monthly pass for their Express line trip. Sixty-one percent of the men, but only $47 \%$ of the women say they don't ride the bus often enough to justify purchase of a pass. Among Regular-Service riders there are only slight differences by gender; $45 \%$ of the women and $48 \%$ of the men said they don't ride the bus often enough. Another significant difference between the reasons given by men and women for not buying a pass is seen in the fact that only $6 \%$ of the men riding an Express line say they can't afford a pass, but 18\% of the women give this as a reason. Among Regular-Service riders there was a large proportion of both men and women who said they can't afford a pass - 22\% and 23\%, respectively.

Table 32 shows that reasons for not using a pass do vary by ethnic background. The proportion of White and Asian Pacific Islander cash riders who say they can't afford a pass is only $7 \%$ and $10 \%$, respectively, whereas the proportion of Black and Latino riders is $26 \%$ and $28 \%$, respectively. Latinos are most likely to say they don't know where to buy a pass, and Whites or Asian/Pacific Islanders are most likely to say there is no convenient outlet at which they may purchase a pass.

Differences by household income level are shown in Table 33. The highest median income, $\$ 25,471$, is reported by Express riders who say they don't ride the bus often enough to buy a pass. The lowest median income, $\$ 9.942$, is reported by riders who say fear of losing a pass prevents them from buying one. The median income of Express line cash riders who say they can't afford a pass is also relatively low, $\$ 11,284$.

| Bus Line | Don't <br> Ride <br> Enough | Can't Afford Pass | Don't Know Where to Buy | No Convenien outlet | Might <br> Lose <br> pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $34 \times$ | 50\% | - | 138 | 138 | 13\% | 138 | 100\% | 8 |
| 122 | 47 | - | - | 6 | 6 | 41 | 100 | 17 |
| 123 | 42 | 25\% | - | - | 8 | 25 | 100 | 12 |
| 144 | 40 | 13 | - | 24 | 5 | 18 | 100 | 67 |
| 175 | 46 | 24 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 100 | 55 |
| 410 | 43 | - | 29 | - | - | 29 | 100 | 7 |
| 481 | 48 | 19 | - | 11 | 1 | 21 | 100 | 83 |
| 489 | 50 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 100 | 65 |
| 492 | 53 | 18 | - | 18 | - | 12 | 100 | 17 |
| 494 | 35 | 21 | - | 14 | - | 29 | 100 | 14 |
| 601 | 55 | 14 | - | - | 14 | 18 | 100 | 22 |
| 602 | 65 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 100 | 51 |
| 604 | 52 | 11 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 22 | 100 | 64 |
| 605 | 67 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 22 | 100 | 51 |
| 606 | 57 | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | 19 | 100 | 21 |
| 608 | 63 | - | 4 | 4 | - | 29 | 100 | 24 |
| 814 | 60 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 13 | 100 | 48 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 538 | 13\% | 38 | 10\% | 48 | 17\% | 100\% | 625 |


| Time Period | Don't <br> Ride <br> Enough | Can't <br> Afford <br> Pass | Don't <br> Know <br> Where <br> to Buy | No Convenient Outlet | Might <br> Lose <br> Pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM <br> Peak | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20* |
| AM Peak | 51 | 14\% | 3\% | 11 | 4 | 17 | 100 | 533 |
| AM Base | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 16* |
| PM Base | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11** |
| PM Peak | 59 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 100 | 46 |
| OVERALL | 53\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 4\% | 17\% | 100\% | 626 |
| Response Rate: 90\% of respondents paying cash fares |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Sample | ze too | $a l 1$ to | low val | statis | cal co | nparis |  |  |


| Residence Sector | Don't Ride <br> Enoügh | Can't Afford Pass | Don't <br> Know <br> Where <br> to Buy | No Convenient Outlet | Might Lose <br> Pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando Valley | 41\% | 8\% | 4\% | 18\% | 4\% | 25\% | 100\% | 71 |
| North Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7* |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { San Gabriel } \\ & \text { Valley } \end{aligned}$ | 53 | 17 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 16 | 100 | 140 |
| West Los <br> Angeles | 59 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 22 | 100 | 162 |
| South Central | 46 | 22 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 100 | 37 |
| East Centrial | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2* |
| East Los <br> Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2* |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6* |
| South Bay | 59 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 18 | 100 | 44 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1* |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventüra County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5* |
| OVERALL | 53\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 4\% | 17\% | 100\% | 477 |
| Response Rate: | 68\% of | f respon | ndents p | paying c | ash far |  |  |  |

[^1]TABLE 30
REASON FOR NOT USING RTD PASS
BY RIDER AGE

| Age | Don't Ride Enough | Can't Afford Pass | Don't <br> Know <br> Where <br> to Buy | No Convenient Outlet | Might <br> Lose <br> Pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 19 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25* |
| 19 to 29 | 46 | 15 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 19 | 100 | 211 |
| 30 to 39 | 63 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 12 | 100 | 164 |
| 40 to 49 | 52 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 23 | 100 | 79 |
| 50 to 61 | 58 | 9 | - | 9 | 5 | 19 | 100 | 84 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 62 \text { or } \\ & \text { Older } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 22* |
| overall | 53\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 4\% | 17\% | 100\% | 585 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN } \\ & \text { AGE } \end{aligned}$ | 35.0 | 30.0 | 26.9 | 29.9 | 32.8 | 33.2 | 35.6 |  |
| Response | : 84 | of resp | dents p | ing cash | fares |  |  |  |


| Gender | Don't Ride Enough | Can't Afford pass | Don't <br> Rnow <br> Where <br> to Bury | No Convenient outlet | Might Lose <br> Pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 618 | 68 | 48 | 98 | $3 \%$ | 17\% | 100\% | 260 |
| Female | 47 | 18 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 18 | 100 | 359 |
| OVERALL | $53 \%$ | 138 | 38 | 10\% | $4 \%$ | 17\% | 100\% | 619 |
| Response | Rate: | 89\% of | esponde | ts payin | cash | fares |  |  |

## TABLE 32 <br> REASON FOR NOT USING RTD PASS <br> BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

| Ethnic Background | Don't Ride <br> Enough | Can't Afford Pass | Don't <br> Know <br> Where <br> to Buy | No Convenient Outlet | Might Lose Pass | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 56\% | 7\% | 3\% | 11\% | 3\% | 20\% | 100\% | 410 |
| Black | 40 | 26 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 100 | 77 |
| Latino | 43 | 28 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 100 | 69 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 62 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 100 | 44 |
| American Indian | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6" |
| overali | 53\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 4\% | 17\% | 100\% | 606 |
| Response | ate: | \% of r | spondent | paying | cash fa |  |  |  |


| Annual |  |  | Don't |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household Income | Don't <br> Ride <br> Enough | Can't <br> Afford <br> Pass | Know <br> Where to Buy | No Convenient outlet | Might <br> Lose <br> Pass | Other | rotal | Number of Respondents |
| Under |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$5000 | 28\% | 29\% | 7\% | 10\% | 17\% | 10\% | 100\% | 35 |
| \$5000- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$9999 | 42 | 36 | - | 9 | 8 | 6 | 100 | 41 |
| \$10000- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$14999 | 35 | 19 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 11 | 100 | 71 |
| \$15000- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$19999 | 56 | 10 | 3 | 13 | - | 19 | 100 | 63 |
| \$20000- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$24999 | 52 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 26 | 100 | 67 |
| \$25000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| or more | 65 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 21 | 100 | 260 |
| OVERALL | 53\% | 13\% | 3\% | 10\% | 4\% | 17\% | 100\% | 53.7 |
| MEDIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INCOME | \$25471 | \$11284 | \$14453 | \$17727 | \$9942 | \$25957 | \$21812 |  |
| Response | Rate: | 77\% of r | sponden | ts paying | cash f | ares |  |  |

The largest component of Express line patrons, 73\%, rides the bus five days a week. Only $41 \%$ of Regular-Service riders say they ride five days a week. Whereas about $11 \%$ of Express line riders say they ride more than five days a week, up to $35 \%$ of Regular-Service riders say they ride that frequentiy. It appears that the bus use frequency pattern of express line riders is nearly similar to that of Park and Ride patrons. About 83\% of the respondents on each type of service report riding five or more days per week, and the proportion riding at each frequency level declines until only about $1 \%$ report riding less than one day a week.

Table 34 shows that the patterns of bus use by Express line patrons vary by line. The proportion of riders using the bus five days a week varies from $50 \%$ on the 176 line to $88 \%$ on the 34 line. The proportion riding more than five days a week varies from none on the 34 and 608 Ines to about $24 \%$ on the 176 and 601 lines. Overall, the average frequency of bus use by Express line riders is 4.8 days per week, as compared to an average of 5.0 days among Regular-Service patrons.

That Express riders on in-bound trips at different times of the day tend to vary in their frequency of bus use is shown in Table 35. Riders on in-bound trips during the afternoon base and peak periods tend to use the bus more frequently. Between $14 \%$ and $22 \%$ ride more than five days a week, as opposed to riders during other periods, of whom only $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ ride that often. Whereas 69\% to 77\% of the inbound Express riders in the morning ride five days a week, only $51 \%$ to $57 \%$ of the afternoon riders limit their riding to five days.

Table 36 indicates that of all Express line riders, pass users in general tend to ride the bus more frequentiy than cash riders. Cash riders use the bus 4.5 days per week, on average, as opposed to an average of about 5.1 days among pass users. Senior Citizen pass users are the exception, riding an average of 4.5 days a week. On both Express lines and Regular-Service lines, the lightest users of transit are cash riders.

In Table 37 there is evidence that transit use frequency does depend somewhat upon where a rider lives. About $18 \%$ of the Express riders living in the South Central sector ride the bus more than five days a week. Among residents of other sectors, the percentage riding the bus more than five days a week ranges from 4\% to 12\%.

Frequency of bus use tends to decine as age increases. Table 38 shows that, on average Express riders under 19 years of age ride 5.1 days a week, riders between 19 and 61 ride 4.8 to 4.9 days and riders 62 or older ride only 4.3 days.

There is no real difference in frequency of bus úse by gender: females average 4.9 days of bus use per week, males 4.8 Table 39 shows that $9 \%$ of male Express line patrons ride the bus more than five days a week, as opposed to nearly $12 \%$ of the female Express patrons. This pattern is much different than that found among Regular-Service riders. Over $38 \%$ of the male and $32 \%$ of the female riders in the latter category ride more than five days a week.

Table 40 shows that White Express line patrons tend to use transit less frequently than riders who are members of other ethnic groups. Among Regular-Service riders, too, it is true that Hhites ride least often, on average. The heaviest transit users tend to be Latinos, over $19 \%$ of whom ride the bus more than five days a week, as opposed to $18 \%$ of Blacks, $11 \%$ of Asians and Pacific Islanders and only $7 \%$ of Whites.

Frequency of bus use is shown in Table 41 to decline as household income increases. Nearly 23\% of the group of Express line riders earning under $\$ 5000$ per year report riding the bus more than five days a week, as opposed to $20 \%$ of those earning $\$ 5000$ to $\$ 10,000$, $15 \%$ of those in the $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 15,000$ bracket, $10 \%$ of those in the $\$ 15,000$ to $\$ 20,000$ bracket, $8 \%$ of the $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 25,000$ group and only $3 \%$ of the over $\$ 25,000 \mathrm{group}$. Among Regular-Service riders, too, the frequency of bus use tends to decline as household income increases.


## TABLE 35

FREQUENCY OF BUS USE
BY TIME OF DAY

| Time <br> period | Seven | Number of Days Per Meek |  |  |  | Two | One | Less <br> Than <br> One | rotal | Mean Number of Days | Number of Respon dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Six | Five | Four | Three |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pre-AM } \\ & \text { Peak } \end{aligned}$ | 2\% | 6\% | 77\% | 8\% | 38 | 1\% | - | 3\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 91 |
| AM Peak | 4 | 6 | 74 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 1878 |
| AM Base | 3 | 7 | 69 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 5 | - | 100 | 4.7 | 59 |
| PM Base | 10 | 4 | 51 | 10 | 14 | 7 | 4 | - | 100 | 4.5 | 29 |
| PM Peak | 12 | 10 | 57 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 4.9 | 146 |
| OVERALL | $4 \%$ | 6\% | 73\% | 8\% | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | 1\% | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 4.8 | 2203 |
| Response | Rate: | 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Number of Days

| Type of Fare | Seven | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two | One | Less <br> Than <br> One | Total | Mean Number of Days | Number <br> of Respon dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket or Trf. | 2\% | 5\% | 61\% | 14\% | 8\% | 5\% | 2\% | 3\% | 100\% | 4.5 | 689 |
| Regular <br> Pass | 15 | 11 | 58 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 5.1 | 201 |
| Express <br> Pass | 3 | 6 | 86 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 100 | 5.1 | 982 |
| Student <br> Pass <br> (udr 19) | 5 | 12 | 77 | - | 6 | - | - | - | 100 | 5.1 | 43 |
| College/ <br> vocation <br> Pass | 12 | 10 | 71 | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | 100 | 5.2 | 110 |
| Senior <br> Citizen <br> Pass | 4 | 3 | 63 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 4.5 | 88 |
| Handiciap Pass | - | - | - | - | $=$ | - | - | - | - | -* | 15 |
| Tourist <br> Pass | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 6 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 30 |
| OVERALI | 4\% | 6\% | 73\% | $8 \%$ | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 4.8 | 2164 |
| Response | Rate: | 77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]TABLE 37
FREQUENCY OF. BUS USE
BY RESIDENSE SECTOR

|  |  |  | Numbe | $r$ of | Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residence Sector | Seven | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two | One | Less Than $\qquad$ | Total | Mean Number of Days | Number of Respon dents |
| ```San Fernando Valley``` | 6\% | 5\% | 82\% | 5\% | 1\% | - | - | 1\% | 100\% | 5.0 | 262 |
| North Central | 4\% | - | 85 | 9 | 2 | - | - | - | 100 | 5.0 | 27 |
| San Gabriel valley | 2 | 5 | 82 | 5 | 4 | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 1 | 100 | 4.9 | 580 |
| West Los Angeles | 7 | 5 | 67 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 419 |
| South Central | 6 | 12 | 53 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 100 | 4.6 | 165 |
| East Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | -* | 7 |
| East Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 13 |
| South Bay | 1 | 5 | 75 | 9 | 7 | 3 | - | - | 100 | 4.8 | 169 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 7 |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 3 |
| North Los Angeles County | y | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1 |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Ventura County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 6\% | 73\% | $8 \%$ | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 1683 |
| Response Rate: | : 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^3]TABLE 38
FREQUENCY OF BUS USE
BY RIDER AGE

## Number of Days Per Wंeek

| Age | Sevien | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two | One | Less <br> Than <br> One | Total | Mean <br> Number <br> of Daýs | Number <br> of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 12\% | 13\% | 66\% | 3\% | 3\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 100\% | 5.1 | 89 |
| 19 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 3 | 7 | 75 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 4.9 | 631 |
| 30 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | 4 | 6 | 73 | 9 | 3 | 4 | - | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 541 |
| 40 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | 4 | 5 | 75 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 312 |
| 50 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | 5 | 5 | 76 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 4.8 | 339 |
| 62 or |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Older | 2 | 4 | 60 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 4.3 | 109 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 6\% | 73\% | 8\% | 4\% | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 1\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 2021 |
| MEDIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE | 34.9 | 32.3 | 35.4 | 36.4 | 35.2 | 37.8 | 45.1 | 14.3 | 435. |  |  |
| Response | Rate: | 72\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 39
FREQUENCY OF BUS USE

> BY GENDER

| Gender |  | r | Day | er |  |  | One | Less Than One | Total | Mean <br> Number <br> of Days | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Seven | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 5\% | 4\% | 72\% | 10\% | 5\% | 3\% | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 4.8 | 789 |
| Female | 4 | 8 | 74 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 4.9 | 1372 |
| overall | 4\% | $6 \%$ | 7.3\% | 8\% | 48 | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 2161 |
| Response | Rate: | 77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 40
FREQUENCY OF BUS USE
BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

| Number of Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnic <br> Back- <br> ground | Seven | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two | One | Less <br> Than <br> One | Total | Mean Number of Days | Number of Respondents |
| White | 3\% | 4\% | 76\% | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 1347 |
| Black | 7 | 11 | 61 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 258 |
| Latino | 9 | 11 | 67 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | - | 100 | 5.0 | 299 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2 | 9 | 84 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 100 | 5.0 | 198 |
| American Indian | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | -* | 4 |
| Other | - | - |  | - | - |  | $\dot{-}$ | - |  | -* | 16 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 6\% | 73\% | 8\% | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 4.8 | 2122 |
| Response | Rate: | 75\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^4]TABLE 41
FREQUENCY OF BUS USE

## BY ANNUÄL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

## Number of Days Per Week

|  |  |  |  | \% We |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\qquad$ | Seven | Six | Five | Four | Three | Two | One | Less <br> Than <br> One | rotal | Mean <br> Number <br> of Days |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unider } \\ & \$ 5000 \end{aligned}$ | 7\% | 16\% | 52\% | 10\% | 6\% | 6\% | 1\% | 2\% | 100\% | $4 . .8$ | 136 |
| $\$ 5000$ $\$ 999$ | 10 | 11 | 58 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 100 | 4.8 | 126 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 10 | 74 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 4.9 | 280 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000 \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 5 | 77 | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | 2 | 100 | 4.9 | 236 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 5 | 82 | 7 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 100 | 4.9 | 261 |
| $\$ 25000$ <br> or more | 1 | 2 | 80 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 4.7 | 801 |
| OVERALL | 4\% | 6 | 73\% | 8\% | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 4.8 | 1840 |
| MEDIAN <br> INCOME | \$12898 | \$12565 | \$23084 | \$25020 | \$22126 | \$15071 | \$13324 | \$18619 | \$21812 |  |  |
| Response | Rate: 6 | 65\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## NUMBER OF BUSES TO COMPLETE LINKED TRIP

Over $76 \%$ of Park and Ride patrons take only one bus to travel from origin to destination, whereas 59\% of Express ine patrons ani uniy $45 \%$ of Regular-Service patrons require just one bus to complete their linked trips. Only $19 \%$ of the Park and Ride patrons, but $32 \%$ of Express line patrons and $39 \%$ of Regular-Service patrons, ride two buses.

Overall. the average number of buses required to complete a one-way linked trip varies from 1.3 among Park and Ride patrons to 1.5 among Express line patrons and 1.8 among Regular-Service patrons.

Table 42 shows that the average number of buses ridden by Express line patrons varies by bus ine, from 1.2 to 2.1 buses.

The number of buses used to complete a linked trip also tends to vary by type of fare as shown in Table 43. Cash riders and express pass users ride the fewest buses, on average -- only 1.4. Senior citizen pass users ride 1.6 buses. college/vocational pass users ride an average of 1.8 buses, while student pass users ride 2.4 and regular pass users average 2.0 buses per inked trip.

Table 44 shows how the number of buses ridden varies by trip purpose. Riders on work trips average 1.5 buses per linked trip, and those on school trips average 1.8 buses.

Table 45 illustrates that the number of linked trip buses varies by time of day the in-bound express trip is taken. Before and during the morning peak period the average is 1.4 to 1.5 buses. During the base period, the average is 1.8 buses per linked trip. Express line riders on in-bound trips during the afternoon peak period ride an average of 2.0 buses.

The number of linked trip buses also tends to vary by where a rider lives. Those Express riders living in the Hest Los Angeles sector ride the fewest buses, on average - 1.4. Those from South Central ride 1.9 buses. Riders from other sectors ride an average of 1.5 to 1.6 buses to complete a linked trip. Detail is provided in Table 46.

Overall, younger riders tend to use more buses to complete a linked trip. Express line riders under 19 years of age average 1.7 buses, but all older groups average 1.5. Table 47 shows that the median age tends to decrease as the number of buses ridden increases. Among riders using one or two buses, the median age is nearly 36, while the median age of those who ride three or four buses is around 33 .

## TABLEA-IV

SURVEY ACTIVITY BY TIME PERIOD

Time
Period Hours

| Pre-AM | Midnight- |
| :--- | :--- |
| Peak | $5: 59 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| AM Peak | 6:00 AM - |
|  | $8: 29 \mathrm{AM}$ |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { AM Base } & 8: 30 \mathrm{AM-} \\ & 11: 59 \mathrm{AM}\end{array}$
2
2.3

59
2.6
29.5

PM Base Noon 3:29 PM

2
2.3

30
1.3

15
PM Peak 3:30 PM6:29

11
12.8

153
6.8
13.9

Evening 6:30 PM11:59 PM

OVERALL
92
4. 1\%
30.7
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { AM Peak } & 6: 00 \text { AM - } \\ & 8: 29 ~ A M ~\end{array}$
$68 \quad 79.1$
1921
85.2
28.3
6:29
$0 \quad 0 \quad 0$
$86 \quad 100.0 \% \quad 2255$
100.0\% 26.2

| Number | Percent | Number | Percent Respon- |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| of | of | of | of | dents |
| Trips | Trips | Respon- Respon- Per |  |  |
| Survey- | Survey- dents | dents | Trip |  |
| ed | ed |  |  |  |

TABLE 42
NUMBER OF BUSES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM ORIGIN TO DESTINATION
BY' BUS LINE

| Bus Line | arie | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean <br> Number <br> of Buses | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $34 \times$ | 12.8 | $68 \%$ | 20\% | - | - | 1008 | 2.1 | 25 |
| 122 | 77 | 18 | 2 | 38 | - | 100 | 1.3 | 60 |
| 123 | 77 | 19 | 3 | - | - | 100 | 1.3 | 31 |
| 144 | 58 | 34 | 6 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.5 | 257 |
| 176 | 30 | 47 | 18 | 3 | 2\% | 100 | 2.0 | 247 |
| 410 | 63 | 32 | 5 | - | - | 100 | 1.4 | 38 |
| 481 | 62 | 33 | 5 | - | - | 100 | 1.4 | 422 |
| 489 | 55 | 36 | 8 | - | 1 | 100 | 1.6 | 233 |
| 492 | 42 | 55 | 2 | - | - | 100 | 1.6 | 55 |
| 494 | 63 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1:5 | 71 |
| 601. | 42 | 45 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 100 | 1.8 | 85 |
| 602 | 74 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 1.5 | 132 |
| 604 | 74 | 23 | 3 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.3 | 204 |
| 605 | 74 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 1.4 | 115 |
| 606 | 87 | 7 | 4 | 2 | - | 100 | 1.2 | 55 |
| 508 | 80 | 18 | 3 | - | - | 100 | 1.2 | 40 |
| 814 | 76 | 21 | 2 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.3 | 185 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | 598 | 32\% | 7\% | 18 | 1\% | 100\% | 1.5 | 2255 |
| Respon | se Rate: | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 48 shows that there is a tendency for women to ride more buses on a linked trip. Over $66 \%$ of the men ride just one bus, as opposed to only $55 \%$ of the women.

Table 49 shows variation by ethnic background in the number of linked trip buses ridden. White Express iine patrons ride the fewest búses, only 1.4. Latino and Black patrons ride the most, 1.8 and 1.9 buses, respectively.

Table 50 indicates a relationship between annual household income and the number of linked trip buses ridden. Generally, the number of buses ridden decreases as income levels increase. Riders whose household incomes are below $\$ 10,000$ ride an average of 1.8 to 2.0 buses. Those in the $\$ 10,000$ to $\$ 20,000$ category ride 1.5 buses, while those earning $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 25,000$ ride 1.4 buses. The fewest number of buses - 1.3 - is reported by riders earning the highest incomes. The median income can be seen to deciine steadily as the number of buses increases, from $\$ 25,040$ among riders using only one bus, down to $\$ 7,500$ among those riding five or more.

| Trip <br> Purpose | Number of Buses |  |  |  |  |  | Mean <br> Number of Buses | Number <br> of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One | Two | Three | Four | or <br> More | Total |  |  |
| Work | 61\% | 31\% | 6\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.5 | 1988 |
| School | 41 | 43 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 100 | 1.8 | 163 |
| Shopping | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 11 |
| Medical | - | - | - | - | - | - | -** | 6 |
| Social/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recrea- <br> tional | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 15 |
| OVERALL | 59\% | 32\% | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.5 | 2192 |
| Response | ate: | 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^5]TABLE 43
NUMBER OF BUSES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM ORIGIN TO DESTINATION BY TYPE OF FARE

| Type of <br> Fare | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean <br> Number of Buses | Number <br> of Respor dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, <br> Ticket <br> Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 69\% | 25\% | 4\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.4 | 700 |
| Regular |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 27 | 49 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 100 | 2.0 | 207 |
| Express |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 65 | 30 | 4 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.4 | 991 |
| Student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pass } \\ & \text { (Udr 19) } \end{aligned}$ | 36 | 35 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 100 | 2.0 | 44 |
| College/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vocational Pass | 38 | 44 | 15 | 3 | - | 100 | 1.8 | 112 |
| Senior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Citizen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 51 | 40 | 9 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.6 | 95 |
| Handicap |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | -* | 16 |
| Tourist |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 6 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 30 |
| OVERALL | 59 | 32 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.5 | 2201 |
| Response | ate: | 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

TABLE 46
NUMBER OF BUSES REQUIRED TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION
BY RESIDENCE SECTOR

| Residence Sector | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean Number of Buses | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fernando |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valley | 608 | 328 | 5\% | 28 |  | 100\% | 1.5 | 264 |
| North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | 55 | 35 | 10 | - | - | 100 | 1.6 | 28 |
| San Gabriel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valley | 59 | 35 | 5 | - | 18 | 100 | 1.5 | 587 |
| West Los Angeles | 70 | 24 | 5 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.4 | 427 |
| South |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | 33 | 49 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 1.9 | 174 |
| East |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 7 |
| East Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1.3 |
| South Bay | 79 | 17 | 2 | 2 |  | 100 | 1.5 | 168 |
| Downtown Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 3 |
| North Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Orange |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1 |
| San Bernardino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Ventura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| OVER- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL | 59\% | 338 | 7\% | 18 | $1 \%$ | 100 | 1.5 | 1710 |
| Response Rate: 61\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 45
NUMBER OF BUSES RIDDEN TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM ORIGIN TO DESTINATION BY TIME OF DAY
Number of Buses

| Time <br> Period | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean Number of Buses | Number of Respor ${ }^{-}$ dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM <br> Peak | 72\% | 21\% | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.4 | 92 |
| AM <br> Peak | 61 | 31 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.5 | 1921 |
| AM <br> Base | 35 | 56 | 6 | 4 | - | 100 | 1.8 | 59 |
| PM <br> Base | 50 | 24 | 24 | 3 | - | 100 | 1.8 | 30 |
| PM <br> Peak | 30 | 50 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 100 | 2.0 | 153 |
| OVERALL | 59 | 32 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.5 | 2255 |
| Response | te: | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 48
NLMBER OF BUSES RIDDEN TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM ORIGIN TO DESTINATION

BY GENDER

## Number of Buses

| Gender | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Total | Mean | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 66\% | 28\% | 5\% | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.4 | 801 |
| Female | 55 | 35 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.6 | 1406 |
| OVERALL | 59\% | 328 | 7\% | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 1.5 | 2207 |
| Response | Rate | 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 47
NUMBER OF BUSES RIDDEN TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION
BY RIDER ÄGE

| Age | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean Number of Buses | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 19 | $45 \%$ | 418 | 138 | 18 | - | 100\% | 1.7 | 89 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { to } \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | 60 | 31 | 7 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.5 | 636 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30 \text { to } \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | 50 | 32 | 6 | 1 | 28 | 100 | 1.5 | 554 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40 \text { to } \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ | 60 | 33 | 6 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.5 | 318 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50 \text { to } \\ & 51 \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 33 | 4 | - | 1 | 100 | 1.5 | 340 |
| 62 or older | 59 | 32 | 8 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.5 | 117 |
| OVERALL | 598 | 328 | 78 | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 1.5 | 2054 |
| METIAN AGE | 35.8 | 35.6 | 33.1 | 33.6 | * | 35.6 |  |  |
| Response | Rate: | 738 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^6]TABLE 50
NUMBER OF BUSES RIDDEN TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION
BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

| Annual <br> Household Income | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean Number of Buses | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 5000 \end{aligned}$ | 33\% | $46 \%$ | 15\% | 5\% | 2\% | 100\% | 2.0 | 142 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \end{aligned}$ | 36 | 50 | 13 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.8 | 127 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 58 | 35 | 6 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.5 | 285 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000- \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 57 | 35 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.5 | 240 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 62 | 33 | 5 | - 3 | - | 100 | 1.4 | 250 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 25000 \\ & \text { or More } \end{aligned}$ | 75 | 23 | 2 | 1 | - | 100 | 1.3 | 808 |
| OVERALL | $59 \%$ | 328 | 7\% | 2\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1.5 | 1862 |
| MEDIAN <br> INCOME \$250 |  | \$17966 | \$12881 | \$11726 | \$7500 | \$21812 |  |  |
| Response P | ate: | $66 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 49
NUABER OF BUSES RIDDEN TO COMPLETE TRIP FROM
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION
BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

| Ethnic Background | One | Two | Three | Four | Five or More | Total | Mean Number of Buses | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 70\% | 25\% | 4\% | - | - | 100\% | 1.4 | 1365 |
| Black | 38 | 45 | 13 | 28 | 2\% | 100 | 1.9 | 27.2 |
| Latino | 40 | 42 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 100 | 1.8 | 311 |
| Asian or pacific Islander | 53 | 37 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1.6 | 200 |
| American Indian | - | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 4 |
| Other | - | - |  | - | - | - | -* | 17 |
| OVERALL | 59\% | 32\% | 78 | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 1.5 | 2169 |
| Response | Rate: | $77 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

TABLE 51
MODE OF ACCESS TO RTD SYSTEM
BY BUS LINE
Bus Was
Line Drove Driven Walked other Total Rumber of

| $34 \times$ | 298 | 298 | 468 | - | 1008 | 24 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 122 | 22 | 11 | 65 | 2 | 100 | 63 |
| 123 | 43 | 27 | 30 | - | 100 | 30 |


| 144 | 29 | 13 | 56 | 2 | 100 | 250 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 176 | 3 | 10 | 86 | 2 | 100 | 227 |


| 410 | 11 | 5 | 84 | - | 100 | 38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 481 | 59 | 18 | 22 | 2 | 100 | 411 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 489 | 15 | 13 | 71 | 1 | 100 | 227 |


| 492 | 36 | 20 | 44 | - | 100 | 55 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 494 | 31 | 9 | 60 | - | 100 | 67 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 601 | 5 | 13 | 80 | 1 | 100 | 76 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 602 | 18 | 5 | 75 | 2 | 100 | 129 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 504 | 15 | 5 | 79 | 1 | 100 | 204 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 605 | 12 | 5 | 84 | - | 100 | 110 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 606 | 4 | 4 | 93 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 |  | 100 | 56 |  |  |  |


| 608 | 46 | 8 | 46 | - | 100 | 39 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 814 | 19 | 10 | 71 | 1 | 100 | 184 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

OVER-
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { ALL } 24 \% & 12 \% & 63 \% & 1 \% & 100 \% & 2190\end{array}$
Response Rate: 78\%

Most Regular-Serevice riders, $90 \%$ or more, gain initial access to the RTD system on foot, whereas only 63\% of the Express line Fitrons and 14\% of the Park and Ride patrons walk to the bus. At least $81 \%$ of the Park and Ride Patrons, $36 \%$ of the Express line patrons and only about 5\% of the Regular-Service riders access the RTD system by car, either as driver or passenger.

Table 51 shows how mode of access patterns can vary by bus line. The percentage of riders walking to the bus ranges from $22 \%$ of line 481 riders to $93 \%$ of line 606 riders. Conversely, the percentage who drive to the bus ranges from only $3 \%$ of line 176 riders to 59\% of line 481 riders.

Mode of system access also varies according to residence sector of Express line patrons. Pedestrian access ranges from less than half to $90 \%$ or more of the riders. Table 52 shows that access by automobile also varies over a broad range, from about $11 \%$ of the riders from the South Central Sector to $54 \%$ of the riders from the San Gabriel Valley.

Table 53 shows that there is a slight difference in system access patterns by age of the rider. The median age of riders who access by walking is lowest, 34.5. The riders who access as passengers in a car are oldest, 38 . Those who say they drive to the bus average about 36.5 years old.

The figures in Table 54 suggest that male Express line riders are more likely to walk to the RTD system than female riders are. Only $60 \%$ of the women walk, as opposed to $70 \%$ of the men. Women are somewhat more likely to drive, however; over a quarter of the women say they drive, but only $21 \%$ of the men say they access by car. Women are twice as likely, too, to say they get to the RTD system as passengers in a car; 14\% report being driven to the bus, as opposed to $7 \%$ of the men who use this mode.

Table 55 indicates that mode of access patterns vary by ethnic background. Only 21\% of Black Express line patrons get to the bus by car, whereas $36 \%$ to $47 \%$ of other patrons say they drive or ride in a car.

Mode of system access patterns by income group are detailed in Table 56. The proportion of Express line riders who drive to the bus tends to increase as annual household income increases. Fewer than 8\% of the riders from low income household drive to the bus, whereas a third of those from high income households do. Conversely, the percentage of riders who walk to the bus decreases as income increases, from 83\% of the low income riders to 53\% of the high income riders. The median income of Express line riders who get to the bus by car, either as drivers or passengers, is over $\$ 25,000$. The mediaz income of those who walk to the bus is under $\$ 20,000$.

TABLE 53
MODE OF ACCESS TO RTD
BY RIDER AGE

| Age | Drove | Was <br> Driven | Walked | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 48 | 21\% | $76 \%$ | - | 100\% | 88 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { to } \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 10 | 67 | 18 | 100 | 623 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30 \text { to } \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | 30 | 10 | 59 | 1 | 100 | 544 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40 \text { to } \\ & 49 \end{aligned}$ | 29 | 15 | 54 | 2 | 100 | 305 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50 \text { to } \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | 24 | 12 | 64 | 1 | 100 | 324 |
| 62 or Older | 20 | 9 | 70 | 1 | 100 | 115 |
| OVERALT | 248 | 128 | 538 | 18 | 100\% | 1999 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN } \\ & \text { AGE } \end{aligned}$ | 36.5 | 38.0 | 34.5 | 36.6 | 35.6 |  |
| Response | ate: 7 |  |  |  |  |  |

BY RESIDENCE SECTOR


| Ethnic <br> Background | Drove | Was <br> Driven | Walked | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 28\% | 10\% | 62\% | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 1346 |
| Black | 9 | 12 | 79 | 1 | 100 | 262 |
| Latino | 22 | 14 | 63 | 2 | 100 | 28.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 24 | 23 | 51 | 1 | 100 | 196 |
| American Indian | - | - | - | - | - | 4* |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | 18* |
| OVERALL | 248 | 12\% | 63\% | 1\% | 100\% | 2111 |
| Response Rat | e: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |

*Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

| Gender | Drove | Was Driven | Walked | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 218 | 7\% | 70\% | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 796 |
| Female | 25 | 14 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 1350 |
| OVERALL | 24\% | 12.8 | 638 | $1 \%$ | 100\% | 2146 |
| Response | Rate: |  |  |  |  |  |

About half the Regular-Service riders are on trips to or from work, but over $90 \%$ of the Express line riders and $98 \%$ of the Park and Ride riders are on work trips. School trips are an important component of Regular-Service ridership, accounting for 21\% of the trips, but are less apparent on Express and Park and Ride lines. Only $7 \%$ of Express line patrons and $1 \%$ of Park and Ride patrons are on trips to or from school. On Regular-Service lines, nearly 29\% of the riders are on shopping, medical, social/recreational or "other" trips. On Express lines, only $2 \%$ of the riders state these trip purposes and on Park and Ride lines, only about $1 \%$.

Table 57 shows how trip purpose patterns can vary by bus line. The proportion of work trips ranges from $67 \%$ to $100 \%$, school trips from none to $33 \%$.

Trip purpose also varies by type of fare. Most notable of Table 58's findings are that $75 \%$ of college/vocational pass users and 86\% of student pass users are on school trips. With the exception of these two fare types, most other riders are on work trips, ranging from 88\% of senior citizen pass users to $100 \%$ of express pass users.

Trip purpose mix varies by time of day during which an in-bound trip is made on an Express line, as shown in Table 59. Before and during the morning peak period, $93 \%$ of the trips are work trips. Only 57\% of afternoon base period trips are to or from work and $74 \%$ of afternoon peak period trips. The proportion of school trips is between $18 \%$ and $24 \%$ after the morning peak period, significantly higher than the $6 \%$ proportion recorded during the peak.

Table 60 shows trip purpose by residence sector. Work predominates as the primary trip purpose among Express line riders from all sectors, ranging from 89\% to 95\%.

Table 61 shows trip purpose mix by rider age. School trips account for $73 \%$ of the Express line travel by riders under 19 and 11\% of the travel by those between 19 and 29. Work accounts for 85\% to over $98 \%$ of the trips by express line riders over 18 years of age. Senior citizens account for the largest proportion of shopping trips (5\%) and social/recreational trips (5\%).

Table 62 indicates that male Express line riders are somewhat more likely to be on school trips; $9 \%$ of the males and $6 \%$ of the females say they are travelling to or from school.

| Annual <br> Household <br> Income | Drove | Was Driven | Walked | Other | Total | Number of Respon dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$5000 | 8\% | $8 \%$ | 83\% | 2\% | 100\% | 128 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 10 | 77 | 3 | 100 | 126 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 9 | 65 | 1 | 100 | 279 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000- \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 9 | 63 | 2 | 100 | 238 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 29 | 11 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 255 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 25000 \\ & \text { or more. } \end{aligned}$ | 33 | 14 | 53 | 1 | 100 | 793 |
| OVERALL | 248 | $12 \%$ | 538 | 1\% | 100\% | 1819 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN } \\ & \text { INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | \$25164 | \$25088 | \$19778 | \$16801 | \$21812 |  |
| Response | e: 64\% |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 57
TRIP PURPOSE
BY BUS LINE

| Dus Line | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number Of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 x | 92\% | 48 | - | 48 | - | - | 100\% | 25 |
| 122 | 90 | 2 | $2 \%$ | 2 | - | 5\% | 100 | 61 |
| 123 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 30 |
| 144 | 97 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 256 |
| 176 | 88 | 10 | - | - | 18 | - | 100 | 230 |
| 410 | 90 | 10 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 39 |
| 481 | 95 | 4 | - | $\because$ | - | - | 100 | 414 |
| 489 | 75 | 18 | 3 | - | 1 | 3 | 100 | 228 |
| 492 | 98 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 56 |
| 494 | 87 | 9 | 2 | - | 3 | - | 100 | 68 |
| 601 | 67 | 33 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 81 |
| 602 | 95 | 3 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 100 | 128 |
| 604 | 91 | 7 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 100 | 198 |
| 605 | 89 | 8 | - | - | 1 | 3 | 100 | 113 |
| 606 | 98 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 55 |
| 608 | 93 | 5 | - | - | - | 3 | 100 | 40 |
| 814 | 96 | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 100 | 187 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OVER- } \\ & \text { ALL } \end{aligned}$ | $91 \%$ | 78 | 18 | $-$ | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 2209 |
| Respo | Re Rate: | 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The largest proportion of school trips can be found among Blacks (11\%) and Asian/Pacific Islanders (13\%). Only about 6\% of White or Latiño Express line riders are on school trips. Table 63 pruviues detail.

Table 64 shows that the proportion of work trips tends to increase as household income increases, from $82 \%$ among riders from low income households to $96 \%$ among those from high income households. School trips are most prevalent among riders from households earning less than $\$ 10,000$ per year. Between $12 \%$ and $16 \%$ of these riders are on school trips. The lowest median incomes are reported by riders on medical ( $\$ 5.915$ ) and social/recreational trips (\$7,833). The highest income is reported by riders on work trips (\$22,591).

TABLE 59
TRIP PURPOSE
BY TTME OF DAY

| Time Period | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak | 938 | 18 | 1\% | 18 | - | 38 | $100 \%$ | 93 |
| AM Peak | 93 | 6 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 1885 |
| AM Base | 72 | 24 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 100 | 56 |
| PM Base | 57 | 18 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 100 | 28 |
| PM Peak | 74 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 147 |
| OVERALL | 91\% | 78 | 18 | - | 1\% | 18 | 100\% | 2209 |
| Response Rate: 78\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 58
TRIP PURPOSE BY TYPE OF FARE

| Type of Fare | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket or Transfer | 91\% | 5\% | 1.\% | 18 | 18 | 2\% | 100\% | 695 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regular } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | 95 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 100 | 202 |
| Express <br> Pass | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 981 |
| Student <br> pass <br> (Under 19) | 12 | 85 | - | 2 | - | - | 100 | 44 |
| College/ Vocational pass | 25 | 75 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 104 |
| Senior Citizen pass | 88 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 100 | 93 |
| Handicap pass | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $15^{*}$ |
| Tourist pass | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $4^{*}$ |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
| OVERALL | $91 \%$ | 7\% | 18 | - | 18 | 18 | 100 | 2169 |
| Response R | Rate: | 77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]| Age | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 19 | 218 | 73\% | 1\% | 1\% | - | 48 | 100\% | 88 |
| 19 to 29 | 88 | 11 | - | - | - | 1 | 100 | 628 |
| 30 to 39 | 95 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 545 |
| 40 to 49 | 98 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 314 |
| 50 to 61 | 98 | - | - | - | 18 | - | 100 | 338 |
| 62 or Older | 85 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 100 | 114 |
| OVERALI | 91\% | 78 | 18 | - | 18 | 1\% | 100\% | 2027 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN } \\ & \text { AGE } \end{aligned}$ | 36.7 | 21.6 | 62.0 | 35.4 | 63.0 | 28.4 | 35.6 |  |

Response Rate: 72\%

TRIP PURPOSE
BY RESIDENCE SECTOR

| Resifence Sector | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Fernando Valley | 95\% | 48 | - | - | - | 18 | 100\% |
| North Central | 93 | 4 | 48 | - | - | - | 100 |
| San Gabriel Valley | 89 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 1 | 100 |
| West Los Angeles | 91 | 8 | - | - | - | 1 | 100 |
| South Central | 89 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 100 |
| East Central | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| East Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | $=$ | - | - |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| South Bay | 96 | 3 | - | - | 1 | - | 100 |
| Downtown Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Long Beach | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| North Los Angeles County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura County | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| OVERALL | 918 | 7\% | 18 | - | 18 | 18 | 100\% |
| Response Rate: 50\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^8]TABLE 63
TRIP PURPOSE
BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

| Ethnic <br> Background | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 928 | 68 | 1\% | - | - | 18 | 100\% | 1349 |
| Black | 86 | 11 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 1 | 100 | 259 |
| Latino | 92 | 7 | - | - | 1 | - | 100 | 307 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 86 | 13 | - | - | - | 1 | 100 | 199 |
| American Indian | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 * |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 17 * |
| OVERALL | 91\% | 7\% | 18 | - | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 2134 |
| Response Ra | te: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

TABLE 62
TRIP PURPOSE
BY GENDER

| Gender | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social/ <br> Recrea- <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 89\% | 9\% | 18 | - | 18 | 18 | 100\% | 791 |
| Female | 92 | 6 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1382 |
| OVERALL | 91\% | 78 | 18 | - | 18 | 18 | 100 | 2173 |
| Response | Rate: | 77\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 64
TRIP PURPOSE
BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

| Annual Household Income | Work | School | Shopping | Medical | Social <br> Recrea <br> tional | Other | Total | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under $\$ 5000$ | 82\% | 16\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | - | 100\% | 137 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5000- \\ & \$ 9999 \end{aligned}$ | 84 | 12 | - | 1 | 3 | 1\% | 100 | 124 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10000- \\ & \$ 14999 \end{aligned}$ | 91 | 8 | 1\% | - | - | - | 100 | 278 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15000- \\ & \$ 19999 \end{aligned}$ | 93 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 100 | 239 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 20000- \\ & \$ 24999 \end{aligned}$ | 91 | 7 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 100 | 255 |
| $\$ 25000$ <br> or more | 96 | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 100 | 803 |
| OVERALL | 91\% | 7\% | 1\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | 100\% | 1836 |
| MEDIAN <br> INCOME | \$22591 | \$14011 | \$19017 | \$5915 | \$7833 | \$20219 | \$21812 |  |
| Response | Rate: 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The proportion of Express line riders rating RTD service as somewhat or very favorable is over 6 percentage point higher than the proportion of Regular-Service riders giving similar ratings -- 82.6\% versus 76. $3 \%$.

A measure called the "satisfaction index" has been developed to measure relative ratings of service made by RTD patrons. The index number ranges from 1 to 4 . A satisfaction index of 1 would indicate that respondents have "very unfavorable" opinions about RTD service; an index of 2 would indicate a rating in the "somewhat unfavorable" range.; 3 would denote "somewhat favorablen, and 4 would indicate "very favorable."

The overall nsatisfaction index", however, is the same for riders on both Regular-Service and Peak-Hour Express ines - 3.0. Table 65 indicates how service ratings vary by bus line. Positive ratings range from 65\% of the riders on the 34 line to 95\% on the 601 line, and the satisfaction index ranges from 2.6 to 3.4,

Table 66 shows how service ratings vary by type of fare. The range in satisfaction index level extends from 3.0 among Express pass users to 3.2 among senior citizen pass users.

Table 67 shows that opinions of Express line riders vary by time of day the in-bound trip is made. Clearly, the most satisfied with RTD is the group of riders during the afternoon base period. Their satisfaction index is 3.7. The lowest index, 2.9, is reported by riders before the morning peak period.

Table 68 shows ratings of RTD service made by Express line patrons by residence sector. The lowest ratings are from respondents living in the San Fernando Valley. The highest are given by those from the South Central and South Bay sectors.

Table 69 shows that the satisfaction index does not vary much by age. Generally, however, riders giving RTD service a "very unfavorable" rating tend to be the oldest group with a median age of 39.9. The next oldest group, with a median age of 37.2 , consists of riders who rate RTD service as nsomewhat unfavorablen. The youngest riders, averaging 34.3, give the service a "somewhat favorable" rating.

Males and females do not differ in their rating of RTD service, as shown in Table 70 .

Table 71 indicates that there are only small differences in levels of satisfaction by ethnic group. White and Black Express riders tend to be least satisfied with the service. Their satisfaction index is 3.1. Latinos and Asian Pacific Islanders, with a 3.2 index, are most satisfied of the major ethnic groups.

Table 72 shows that the satisfaction index tends to decifne somewhat as household income increases. Riders from households earning under $\$ 10,000$ have a satisfaction index of 3.2. Those earning above $\$ 10,000$ have an index of 3.0 to 3.1. Riders who Bive RTD service a "very unfavorable" rating are likely to have the lowest income. Their median household income is only $\$ 18,036$. The highest incomes are reported by riders who rate RTD service in the middle range, either "somewhat favorable" ( $\$ 22,550$ ) or "somewhat unfavorable" (\$22,797).

| Bus <br> Line | Very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Somewhat unfavior able | Very <br> Unfavor- <br> able | Total | Satisfaction Index | Number of Respon dents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 X | 22\% | 448 | 22\% | $13 \%$ | 100\% | 2.6 | 23 |
| 122 | 20 | 51 | 20 | 9 | 100 | 2.8 | 59 |
| 123 | 45 | 45 | 10 | - | 100 | 3.4 | 31 |
| 144 | 18 | 53 | 22 | 6 | 100 | 2.8 | 250 |
| 176 | 40 | 43 | 10 | 8 | 100 | $3 . .1$ | 209 |
| 410 | 25 | 54 | 11 | - | 100 | 3.2 | 35 |
| 481 | 27 | 53 | 15 | 3 | 100 | 3.0 | 411 |
| 489 | 34 | 54 | 10 | 2 | 100 | 3.2 | 221 |
| 492 | 26 | 56 | 13 | 6 | 100 | 3.0 | 55 |
| 494 | 33 | 52 | 12 | 3 | 100 | 3.1 | 67 |
| 601 | 38 | 57 | 5 | - | 100 | 3.3 | 79 |
| 602 | 26 | 61 | 11 | 2 | 100 | 3.1 | 126 |
| 604 | 24 | 63 | 10 | 4 | 100 | 3.1 ; | 198 |
| 605 | 45 | 38 | 16 | 1 | 100 | 3.3 | 110 |
| 606 | 19 | 59 | 22 | - | 100 | 3.0 | 54 |
| 608 | 38 | 55 | 8 | - | 100 | 3.3 | 40 |
| 814 | 38 | 52 | 8 | 2 | 100 | 3.3 | 181 |
| OVERALL | 30\% | 53\% | 14\% | 48 | 100\% | 3.0 | 2150 |
| Response | e Rate: | 768 |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 66
RIDERS RATE RID SERVICE
BY TYPE OF FARE

| Type of Fare | Very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Somewhat unfavorable | Very Unfavorable | Total | Satisfaction Index | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash, Ticket or Transfer | 318 | 548 | 128 | 38 | 100\% | 3.1 | 585 |
| Regular <br> Pass | 37 | 44 | 14 | 5 | 100 | 3.1 | 191 |
| Express Pass | 26 | 55 | 15 | 5 | 100 | 3.0 | 954 |
| Student pass (Under 19) | 28 | 63 | 3 | 7 | 100 | 3.1 | 42 |
| College/ Vocational pass | 28 | 56 | 13 | 4 | 100 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Senior Citizen Pass | 34 | 53 | 11 | 2 | 100 | 3.2 | 88 |
| Handicap Pass | 45 | 31 | 19 | 5 | 100 | -* | 16 |
| Tourist <br> Pass | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 28 |
| OVERALL | 30\% | 53\% | 148 | 48 | 100\% | 3.0 | 2120 |
| Response R | Rate: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^9]TABLE 67
RIDERS RATE RTD SERVICE
BY TIME OF DAY

| Time <br> Period | Very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Somewhat Unfavorable | Very Unfavor able | Total | Satis- <br> faction <br> Index | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-AM Peak | 22\% | 49\% | 22\% | 88 | $100 \%$ | 2.9 | 91 |
| AM Peak | 29 | 53 | 14 | 4 | 100 | 3.1 | 1835 |
| AM <br> Base | 40 | 53 | 6 | 2 | 100 | 3.3 | 53 |
| PM <br> Base | 65 | 35 | - | - | 100 | 3.7 | 29 |
| PM <br> Peak | 32 | 52 | 15 | 2 | 100 | 3.1 | 142 |
| OVERALL | 30\% | 53\% | 148 | 48 | 100\% | 3.0 | 2150 |
| Response | Rate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Residence Sector | very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Somewhat Unfavorable | Very <br> Unfavor- <br> able | Total | Satis- <br> faction <br> Index | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fernando |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| valley | $21 \%$ | 538 | $19 \%$ | 78 | 100\% | 2.9 | 257 |
| North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | 30 | 52 | 15 | 4 | 100 | 3.1 | 28 |
| San |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gabriel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| valley | 31 | 55 | 12 | 2 | 100 | 3.1 | 572 |
| West Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles | 30 | 55 | 12 | 2 | 100 | 3.1 | 415 |
| South |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | 45 | 39 | 9 | 8 | 100 | 3.2 | 154 |
| East |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 7 |
| East Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Cities | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 12 |
| South Bay | 34 | 56 | 9 | 1 | 100 | 3.2 | 168 |
| Downtown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 7 |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beach | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 2 |
| North Los |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angeles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 5 |
| Orange |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 1 |
| San Bernardino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 8 |
| Ventura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County | - | - | - | - | - | -* | 9 |
| OVERALI | 30\% | $53 \%$ | 148 | 48 | 1008 | 3.0 | 1653 |
| Response Rate: 59\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparisoñ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | - 94 |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 69
RIDERS RAY'E RID SERVICE
BY RIDER AGE

| Age | Very <br> Favorable | Somewhat Favor able | Somewhat Unfavor able | Very <br> Unfavor able. | Total | Satisfaction Index | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 33\% | 59\% | 5\% | 3\% | 100\% | 3.2 | 82 |
| 19 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 25 | 59 | 14 | 2 | 100 | 3.1 | 622 |
| 30 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | 32 | 53 | 12 | 3 | 100 | 3.1 | 531 |
| 40 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | 30 | 50 | 16 | 5 | 100 | 3.0 | 309 |
| 50 to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | 30 | 50 | 17 | 4 | 100 | 3.1 | 328 |
| 62 or 3710 - 1000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Older | 37 | 48 | 10 | 5 | 100 | 3.2 | 113 |
| OVER- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALU | 30 | 53 | 14 | 4 | 100 | 3.0 | 1985 |
| MEDIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE | 36.4 | 34.3 | 37.2 | 39.9 | 35.6 |  |  |
| Respon | Rate: | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |



TABLE 71
RIDERS RATE RID SERVICE
BY EIFNIC BACKGROUND

| Ethnic Backgroünd | Very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Somewhat Unfavorable | Very Unfavorable | Total | Satis- <br> faction <br> Index | Number of Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 26\% | 568 | 15\% | 38 | 100\% | 3.1 | 1326 |
| Black | 34 | 46 | 12 | 8 | 100 | 3.1 | 249 |
| Latino | 38 | 48 | 12 | 2 | 100 | 3.2 | 297 |
| Asian <br> or Pac. Islander | 34 | 54 | 10 | 3 | 100 | 3.2 | 192 |
| American Indian |  |  | - | - |  | - * | 3 |
| Other |  |  |  | - |  | -* | 15 |
| OVERALL | $30 \%$ | 53\% | 148 | 48 | 100\% | 3.0 | 2082 |
| Response | Rate: 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 72
RIDERS RATE RTD SERVICE BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME


APPENDIX

## FIGURE 1 （Cont＇d）

## CUESTIONARIO PARA PASAJEROS


 detullmanmente si es ponible．Le agradecemon su syudn

1．¿Comisi legód al primer matobus que abordo boy？

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ | Me Tamon Mon Amb | $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \square \\ & \square \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | － |  |





20．iFn al opinion，cual mésodo debe is RTD user parn



22．La trifu básica conriente e $65^{\circ}$ ．¿Qux́ haría Ud．ei cambian la trife a low miquientes precios？

|  | 50 | 分 | 75－ | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ［ $<1$ | ［6．1 | 口 $\square^{\text {a }}$ | ［1） |
|  | ［． 2 | E | ［．－2 | ［－2 |
| lisaia a mbluis inal | З 3 | － | ［ 3 | － |
|  | ロ＊ | $\square$ | $\square$－ | $\square$ |

EL NÚMERO TOTAL DE VECES QUE Ud．USA UN AUTOBÚS AL DIA SE DEBE USAR PAKA CONTESTAR PREGUNTAS 23,24 y 23．ANADA LAS VECES QUE USA EL SERVICIOEN UN DIA TJNAAO Y DOS PAMA VOLVER A SC＇HOGAR，EL TOTAL DEBE DE SER CUATRO AUTOBUSES，（Y NO DOS VINJES）．


81 ABORDO CON TARSPA EN EPECTIVO，CON＂TICKET＂ （DOLETO DE TABIFA）O DOLETO DE TRANSBORDO GOI FAVOI CONTLSTIL LA SIGUIENTE PRIGUNTA：

36 iPor que do une el pair mensual RTD purn viniger por mutobis？
11．¿Culle an impraido de nevicio de ba RTD？

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 i Donde vive Ud．？ |  |  |  |  |
| Numerto <br> （7111 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Civen } \\ & \text { (t2 } 21, \end{aligned}$ | Аррититлио （02．24 | Cindind (as) | $z_{i o n}^{x+i+1}$ |




QUESTIONS 23.24 AND 25 DEAL WTTH THE TOTAL NLMBER OF THMES YOU BOARD ANY ETD BUS DUTING AN AVERAGE DAY, ADD UP ALI TEE TIMRSYOU USUALIY GIT ON A BL ON A TYPICAL DAY AND WRITE THE TOTAL IN THE SPACE
FOVIDD. FOR HYANPLE, EF TOU RTDE TWO BUSES TO FOVDED. FOR HKANPLE, EF TOU BDDE TWO BUSES TO WORE AND TWO BUSES HONE RROM WORK, THE TOTAL WOURD EE FOUR.
23. How many timea do you board an RTD but cs an averafe meekdiy?
24. How meny imen do you bourd an RTD bus on an avcrate Sarurday?
$\qquad$
25. How many times do you board an RTD hum oban averae Sundry?
(14; i3)

YOU USED, CASH FARE, TICEETS OR A TRANSFER
26. Why didn't you ure an RTD pase mbourd the bua?


| Line | Number of Inbound Trips | ```Number Of Trips Surveyed``` | ```Percent Of Trips Surv.eẏed``` | Number of <br> Daily <br> Boardings. | ```Number Of Riders*``` | Number of Question naires Distrïbuted. | -Percent <br> of Riders Survey.ed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 63 | 32 | 28 | 88\% |
| 122 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 279 | 140 | 79 | 56 |
| 123 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 70 | 35 | 41 | 100 |
| 144 | 12 | 9 | 75 | 964 | 482 | 347 | 72 |
| 176 | 8 | 8 | 100 | 1149 | 575 | 300 | 52 |
| 410 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 196 | 98 | 43 | 44 |
| 481 | 14 | 11 | 79 | 122.9 | 615 | 563 | 92 |
| 489 | 12 | 9 | 75 | 946 | 473 | 322 | 6.8 |
| 49.2 | 4 | 2 | 50 | 323 | 162 | 81 | 50 |
| 494 | 4 | 2 | 50 | 340 | 170 | 89 | 52 |
| 601 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 146 | 73 | 99 | 75 |
| 60.2 | 8 | 7 | 88 | 320 | 160 | 161 | 88 |
| 604 | 9 | 7 | 78 | 62.4 | 312 | 225 | 72 |
| 605 | 8 | 6 | 75 | 237 | 119 | 130 | 75 |
| 606 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 324 | 162 | 65 | 40 |
| 608 | 3 | 2 | 67 | 163 | 82 | 45 | 55 |
| 814 | 11 | 9 | 82 | 550 | 275 | 207 | 75 |
| OVERALL | 108 | 85 | 85\% | 7923 | 3962 | 2825 | $71 \%$ |

[^10]
## METHODOLOGY

The 1981 Survey of Peak-Hour Express Line Ridership examines the demographic, attitudinal and trip-related characteristics of just one segment of the market served by RTD. After the 226 lines operated by RTD in 1981 had been stratified by type, as shown in Table A-I in the Appendix, it became obvious that all the peak-hour express lines could be surveyed in one day and that all in-bound trips could be surveyed. The key to achieving these goals was to obtain the cooperation of RTD drivers. On the day of the survey, division dispatchers gave each driver a package of questionnaires to be distributed to each boarding passenger on in-bound trips. Table 73 shows that $85 \%$ of the in-bound trips on the peak-hour express lines were surveyed. (The remainder of the trips were surveyed by CALTRANS, using a different questionnaire). The RTD survey reached about $71 \%$ of the riders on these lines.

The questionnaire used is the basic standard bi-lingual on-board instrument developed by Market Research in 1977. In order to gauge the effects of the 1981 fare increase, however, four attitudinal questions were added to the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is included in this section of the report.

Because of the cooperation of drivers in distributing questionnaires, no additional labor costs were incurred.

| Type of Line | Number of Lines | Total <br> Number of Boardings | Number of Riders Per BusHour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Median | Low | High |
| Local | 124 | 965,813+ | 37.5 | 10.3 | 110.6 |
| Local with Peak Hour Express | 8 | 159,679 | 58.3 | 20.1 | 94.9 |
| Local with Day Long Express | 24 | 90,535 | 25.4 | 12.5 | 44.3 |
| SubTotal | 156 | 1,216;027+ |  |  |  |
| Park \& Ride | 9 | 8;240 | 33.1 | 27.8 | 48.5 |
| Express--Peak Hour Only | 17 | 7,923 | 13.6 | 8.2 | 25.5 |
| Subscription | 10 | 1,217 | NA | NA | NA |
| Local--Peak Hour Only (Beep) | 11 | 417 | NA | NA | NA |
| Special Services | 23 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | 225 | 1,233,824 | -- | - | - |


| Iine |  | Riders |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Per |  |  |  |
|  | Daily | Bus <br> HOUr |  |  | Date of |
|  | Boardings |  | $\frac{\text { Revenue }}{\$}$ | $\frac{\text { Subsidy }}{\$}$ | Fare Check |
| 716 | 398 | 27.8 | 1. 58 | 4. 2.6 | 2/17/81 |
| 721 | 968 | 33.3 | 1.16 | 3.28 | 3/12/81 |
| 737 | 360 | 34.8 | 1.48 | 2.82 | 1/15/80 |
| 755 | 1066 | 32.8 | 1.62 | 2.47 | 1/30/80 |
| 757 | 1591 | 48.5 | 1.14 | 2.38 | 1/30/80 |
| 758 | 567 | 32.8 | 1.36 | 3.34 | 1/31/80 |
| 760 | 1361 | 37.2 | 1.59 | 2.09 | 12/18/79 |
| 762 | 1192 | 31.9 | 1.43 | 2.28 | 3/18/81 |
| 764 | 737 | 39.2 | 1.90 | 1.59 | 1/31/80 |
| OVER- |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL | 8240 | - | - | - | - |
| MEDIAN | 915.5 | 33.05 | \$1.455 | \$2.425 |  |

Source: Line Performance Trends Report, Service Analysis Section

TABLE.A-III
RIDERSHIP AND SUBSIDIES BY LINE RANDOM SAMPLE OF REGULAR-SERVICE LINES.

| Type of Line | Line <br> sumber | Daily <br> Boardings | Percent $0 f$ Category | Riders <br> Per <br> Bus <br> Hour | Revenue <br> Per <br> Boarding | ```Subsidy Per``` Boarding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ |
| LOCAL | 29 | 28,879 | 3.0\% | 106.3 | . 40 | . 17 |
|  | 12 | 17.235 | 1.8 | 79.5 | . 38 | . 29 |
|  | 89 | 19,820 | 2.1 | 79.5 | . 24 | .35 |
|  | 96 | 32,755 | 3.4 | 69.7 | . 38 | . 19 |
|  | 32 | 5,553 | . 6 | 67.2 | . 41 | . 37 |
|  | 47 | 1.1.441 | 1.2 | 58.1 | . 35 | . 30 |
|  | 210 | 17.809 | 1.8 | 58.1 | . 38 | . 29 |
|  | 826 | 7,943 | . 8 | 55.2 | . 48 | . 49 |
|  | 354 | 1.356 | . 1 | 50.4 | . 37 | . 81 |
|  | 157 | 4.196 | . 4 | 50.0 | . 48 | . 38 |
|  | 81 | 8,055 | . 8 | 49.2 | .36 | . 52 |
|  | 840 | 4,989 | . 5 | 47.7 | .42 | 1.88 |
|  | 18 | 2,822 | . 3 | 45.0 | .43 | . 41 |
|  | 164/165 | 9,859 | 1.0 | 43.6 | . 49 | . 50 |
|  | 152 | 5,648 | . 6 | 40.0 | . 49 | . 48 |
|  | 155/160 | 5,583 | . 6 | 39.1 | . 46 | . 97 |
|  | 73 | 3,390 | . 4 | 31.5 | . 25 | . 78 |
|  | 166/168 | 3,529 | . 4 | 30.3 | . 53 | 1.15 |
|  | 425 | 3,720 | . 4 | 30.0 | . 40 | . 83 |
|  | 169 | 2,825 | . 3 | 29.5 | . 48 | 1.16 |
|  | 175 | 1,246 | .1 | 27.7 | . 29 | . 41 |
|  | 424 | 1,887 | . 2 | 27.3 | . 46 | 1.29 |
|  | 435 | 2,469 | . 3 | 27.2 | . 47 | 1.44 |
|  | 114 | 1,029 | . 1 | 27.0 | . 52 | . 95 |
|  | 156 | 1.740 | . 2 | 24.6 | . 48 | 1.06 |
|  | 872 | 704 | . 1 | 24.5 | . 31 | . 73 |
|  | 846 | 1,448 | . 1 | 24.3 | . 52 | 1.31 |
|  | 871 | 3,436 | . 4 | 23.1 | . 44 | 1.52 |
|  | 822 | 1,010 | . 1 | 22.8 | . 51 | 1.44 |
|  | 844 | 989 | . 1 | 22.5 | . 55 | 2.08 |
|  | 867 | 627 | . 1 | 22.0 | . 55 | 1.52 |
|  | 869 | 2,032 | . 2 | 18.9 | . 49 | 1.66 |
|  | 431 | 1,052 | . 1 | 18.5 | . 48 | 1.86 |
|  | 821/831 | 1,014 | . 1 | 18.0 | . 53 | 1.89 |
|  | 861 | 506 | . 1 | 17.3 | . 51 | 1.83 |
|  | 451/453 | 1.216 | . 1 | $1: 5.0$ | . 50 | 2.10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 452 / 454 \\ & \text { sub- } \end{aligned}$ | 779 | . 1 | 11.5 | . 50 | 4.50 |
|  | Total 2 | $220,591$ | 22.88 |  |  |  |
|  | Median | $2,823$ |  | 30.2 | . 465 | .89 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local } \\ & \text { Peak } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Express | 44 | 38,385 | 24.08 | 94.9 | . 40 | .13 |
|  | 91 | 38,990 | 24.4 | 79.7 | . 26 | . 25 |
|  | 86 | 7,594 | 4.8 | 42.4 | .42 | $\because 88$ |
|  | Sub- |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 84,969 | 53.28 |  |  |  |
|  | Median | 38,385 |  | 79.7 | . 40 | . 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local- } \\ & \text { Day } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long |  |  |  |  |  | . 41 |
| Express | 484 | 6,603 | 7.3 | 30.0 | . 63 | . 87 |
|  | 488 | 1,968 | 2.2 | 23.6 | . 64 | 2.27 |
|  | 813 | 2;529 | 2.8 | 23.1 | . 77 | 1.37 |
|  | Sub- |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 21,576 | .23.8\% |  |  |  |
|  | Median | 4,566 |  | 26.8 | . 635 | 1.12 |
|  | total 3 | 327,136 | 26.9* |  |  |  |
|  | MEDIAN |  |  |  | \$ .47 | \$ . 95 |

Source: Line Performance Trends Report, Service Analysis Section

## TABLEA-IV

## SURVEY ACTIVITY BY TIME PERIOD




[^0]:    * Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^1]:    * Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^2]:    *Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^3]:    *Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^4]:    *Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^5]:    *Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^6]:    * Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison.

[^7]:    * Sample size too small to allow valia statistical comparison

[^8]:    * Sample size too small to allow valid statistical comparison

[^9]:    * Sample size too small for valid statistical comparison

[^10]:    *1/2 Daily Boardings

