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LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS1. East Los Angeles Transit Improvement Program - Map3

The East Los Angeles Transit Improvement Program was implemented on January 25, 1976 in an area roughly bounded by Garfield Avenue, Valley Boulevard, the Los Angeles River and Washington Boulevard. General features of this program are:

- Twenty-one buses added to the daily fleet requirements for a $16 \%$ increase.
- 5,437 additional daily vehicle miles for a $32 \%$ increase.
- Increased frequency and spread of service yielding a more efficient use of equipment.
- Increase weekend service.
- Improved service to educational, medical, shopping and institutional facilities.
- Establishment of 3 new lines.
- Rerouting or extension of 18 existing lines.
- Discontinuance of passenger restrictions on former interurban lines travelling on surface streets within the area.
- More efficient operation complimenting the service provided by Montebello Municipal Bus Lines.

Particular attention was directed to the most salient transit deficiencies of the East Los Angeles community. These points included poor weekend service and incompatible service frequencies between lines. Although the previous system in the study area contained many routes, the actual service was marginally productive for residents due to the incorporation of former established transit properties. The Los Angeles Railway, Pacific Electric, Metropolitan Coach Lines and Eastern Cities Lines operated many varied levels of service, with passenger restrictions. These properties, acquired by the District at different times, were never totally modified to bring full transit service due to lack of funding for necessary improvements. The East Los Angeles Transit Improvement Program addressed these specific requirements by establishing a minimum


Table 1

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Average Weekday Syster-wide Boardings

| Month | Estimated Boardings* | \% Change <br> from June: 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| June 1976 | 1,080,000 | base |
| July 1976 | 1,070,000 | - $1 \%$ |
| August 1976 | 1,010,000 | - 6\% |
| October 1976 | 900,000 | -17\% |
| November 1976 | 1,010,000 | - $6 \%$ |
| December 1976 | 990,000 | - 8\% |
| January 1977 | 1,030,000 | - $5 \%$ |
| February 1977 | 1,050,000 | - \% |
| March 1977 | 1,050,000 | - $3 \%$ |
| April 1977 | 1,070,000 | - $1 \%$ |
| May 1977 | 1,060,000 | - $2 \%$ |

* System boarding estimates are derived from system revenues.

The modifications of this program were tailored to accommodate and benefit the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the East Los Angeles Community. Approximately 20 square miles make up the sector and contain about 290,000 people, according to the 1970 census, or an average density of 14,500 people per square mile. Family income is less than $\$ 5,000$ per year for $50 \%$ of the population and only $20 \%$ have family incomes exceeding $\$ 10,000$ per year (1970 dollars). Over $50 \%$ of the households do not own an automobile although usually more than one member of the family works. Over $50 \%$ of the workers travel to work by bus, bicycle, or on foot. About $35 \%$ of the population is either too old or too young to drive.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT \& SYSTEM REFINEMENTS
Community Involvement
Staff has continued to work closely with organizations representing East Los Angeles including the Transportation Advisory Committee, Supervisor Edelman's staff, East Los Angeles College and The East Los Angeles Community Union. Additionally, the General Manager has conducted a community meeting in East Los Angeles on May 9, 1977 to receive public comment about the service.

The District Planning and Community Relations staff operated a field office in the El Monte Division to serve the San Gabriel Valley and East Los Angeles sectors. Resources of the District were coordinated through the field office to respond to the needs of the community.

Since the strike, however, the field office has operated with reduced staffing and the contacts have been gradually shifted to the Planning and Community Relations departments in the headquarters building in Los Angeles. District's staff has continued to meet the needs of the public and local governments from the central offices through coordinated efforts.

System Refinements

The thrust of the system refinements made since the preliminary evaluation report in June 1976 has been to adjust service frequencies and stop locations in response to public requests for improved service or complaints about bus service on residential streets. Where these requests for local improvements




OBJECTIVES

To determine if productivity is adequate to continue service.

CRITERIA
Productivity of the line at maturity should exceed 20 passengers per bus hour, or 250 passenger miles per bus hour, day \& night, by sector and by line. Transit dependency and system integrity are considered on a subjective basis.

## Methodology

In designing the service evaluation program for projects implemented early in 1976, it was felt that all improvement projects should be evaluated the same way so that any one could be compared with another. Project evaluations for recently implemented service in East Los Angeles, Mid-Cities and the San Gabriel Valley should be comparable to the San Fernando Valley and South Central Grid evaluations performed in 1975.

Sector Boundaries
To satisfy this requirement, the improvement project sectors were clearly defined so that projects were mutually exclusive. Passengers would be counted only within one sector regardless of whether the line operated within the sector or partly outside it. The East Los Angeles sector for the purpose of evaluation is bounded by:

- The Los Angeles River from Washington Boulevard to Mission Road.
- Mission Road from Macy Street to Valley Boulevard.
- Valley Boulevard from Mission Road to the Long Beach Freeway.
- Long Beach Freeway from Valley Boulevard to Ramona Boulevard.
- Ramona Boulevard - Ramona Road from the Long Beach Freeway to Garvey Avenue.
- Garvey Avenue from Ramona Road to Monterey Pass Road.
- Monterey Pass Road from Garvey Avenue to Brooklyn Avenue.
EAST LOS ANGELES TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
POST IMPLEMENTATTON IINE DESCRIPTION
Total One
Way Route
Segment Of Line In Sector
To

| euouey | Teuțuxəu 7SəM |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Uo7 |
|  |  |
| TセuṬux | つTfToed ¢ Uosnets |
| Leuṭuエəu | TセUȚuエəむ |
| TEUŢuJə山 Y̧コON | 070s ¢ UO76uțysem |
| จŢUET7甘 $\bigcirc$ UKTYOOJg | теuṭuxəu 7səM |
| Teuturex 7serg | өtKog $\bigcirc$ ¢7L |
|  | UOTSSTW Y 7st |
| Kəллеђ ヱ ssed Kəлə7uow | teutuxau y\％nos |
| TEUŢuJə山 | Teutuxə |
| Kə八ле曰 ァ ssed Kəлəみuow | Teuturow yqnos |
| Teutuxpu Ч7xon |  |

Passenger counts were intially scheduled so as to allow the evaluation of approximately six months of operation after school resumed in the fall of 1976.

## 100\% Ridership Checks

Passengers are counted by District checkers who ride each trip on a line from end to end. In what is known as a $100 \%$ check, the checker counts the passengers boarding and alighting at each stop and records the type of fare paid and the running time between timepoints. The $100 \%$ check is widely accepted as representative of annual ridership on a line but has limitations because of daily ridership fluctuations of $5 \%$ or more. Inclement weather can cause variations of $10 \%$ or more. The $100 \%$ check is, in reality, a sample and is subject to normal sampling errors when it is used to draw conclusions about the total annual ridership of a line. It took from November 15, 1976 to December 21, 1976 to complete riding checks for the 18 lines involved in the study. Total sector ridership, therefore, contains some inconsistencies introduced by possible variations between lines checked on different days. The same procedure was followed for the initial checks reported in June 1976, except checks were taken in 7 working days from March 29 to April 6, 1976.

The East Los Angeles schedule for $100 \%$ ridership checks was interrupted by the strike, and the checks were not completed until after some East Los Angeles service economies were implemented on October 24,1976 . In order to obtain fast estimates of ridership on the lines impacted by service cutbacks, and to measure recovery from the strike and fare increase, a new method of passenger counts was introduced to supplement the $100 \%$ riding check previously used for line evaluations.

Farebox Vault Checks
The new method is known as a farebox vault check whereby the passengers boarding a line can be estimated from the current line revenue. The cash received on a line is divided by the average cash fare obtained from a previous $100 \%$ riding check to yield the estimated daily boarding passengers.

The procedure is largely clerical and is much less expensive than a full riding check. It has the disadvantage of providing only gross total passengers, so no estimates can be made about passengers by time of day or segment of a line. In addition to the sampling errors over time mentioned above, its point accuracy depends on the assumption that the composition of ridership used in arriving at the average cash fare has not changed between the time the riding check was taken and the time the farebox cash was counted.
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Overall the decrease of $2.6 \%$ recorded after approximately one year of operation while the entire system had only recovered to $3 \%$ below the base level of June 1976 indicates that the East Los Angeles area is performing slightly better than the system as a whole.

Productivity
To determine whether the productivity of service after 9 months and 12 months was as high as productivity after eight weeks, the passengers per line (in the sector at 9 nonths) were divided by the bus hours per line (in the sector at 9 months) to get passengers per bus hour (PPBH).

The overall productivity of lines in East Los Angeles at eight weeks was 49.5 PPBH with individual lines ranging from a high of l05.4 PPBH to a low of 9.7 PDBH . Table 7 compares the sector productivity at eight weeks with figures at 9 months when the overall productivity had slipped to 42.9. Single lines ranged from a high of 99.4 PPBH to a low of 10.3 PPBH . There were 2 lines with productivity in the sector below 20 PPBH, and both were below 10 PPBH at eight weeks compared to 4 lines below 20 PPBH , and none below 10 PPBH at nine months. Average sector night productivity over the same period dropped from 24.0 PPBH to 16.5 PPBH , down $31 \%$.

After twelve months, average productivity for the whole lines had risen to 58.7 PPBH , up $19 \%$ compared to the total line productivity at eight weeks. At eight weeks, there were 3 lines with end-to-end productivity less than 20 PPBH including one line below 10 PPBH ; after 12 months of operation only 2 lines were below 20 PPBH and none were below 10 PPBH .

## CONCLUSIONS

The East Los Angeles bus riders, largely transit dependent because of low incomes, were heavily impacted by the fare increase of July 1,1976 , and the 36 -day strike.

However, East Los Angeles ridership did not decline as sharply as the whole system and appeared to recover slightly faster. Staff will continue to monitor line performance and community input to determine where further modifications may be made in the interests of attracting additional ridership, better serving the community and making additional service economies as necessary.
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