

WORKING
TOGETHER
TO PLAN
FOR THE
FUTURE



COMPASS
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION
of Southwest Idaho

On-Board Transit Survey, 2010

Report Number 08-2011

Table of Contents

Survey Methods	1
Report Overview	1
Task 1 – Develop Survey Instrument Procedures	1
Task 2 – Prepare Surveying Plan, Staffing Plan, and Schedule	1
Surveying Plan	1
Staffing Plan	2
Schedule	3
Task 3 – Conduct Survey	3
Staffing Agency Training	3
Survey Administration	3
In-Field Survey Instrument Editing	3
Challenges	4
Task 4 – Clean Up and Enter Data	4
Task 5 – Geocode the Origin and Destination Data	5
Task 6 – Prepare Tech Memo for Tasks 1-5	5
Task 7 – Analyze the Survey Results	5
Data Weighting and Expansion	5
Linked Trip Factor	7
Survey Results	8

Data Collection and Final Report by :

206 Wild Basin Rd., Suite A-300
Austin, Texas 78746

Contact: Fred G'sell, Project Manager
(512) 306-9065

fax (512) 306-9077

www.ptvnustats.com

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Sample Size at the Route Level	2
Table 2: Time of Day Distribution	8
Table 3: Fare by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*	8
Table 4: Number of Buses in Trip by Time of Day	8
Table 5: Origin Place Type by Time of Day	9
Table 6: Access Mode by Time of Day	9
Table 7: Destination Place Type by Time of Day	10
Table 8: Egress Mode by Time of Day	10
Table 9: Wait Time by Time of Day	11
Table 10: Travel Time by Time of Day	11
Table 11: Trip Frequency by Time of Day	12
Table 12: Driver's License Possession by Time of Day	12
Table 13: Age by Time of Day	12
Table 14: Employment Status by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*	13
Table 15: Gender by Time of Day	13
Table 16: Ethnicity by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*	13
Table 17: Number of Household Vehicles by Time of Day	14
Table 18: Household Size by Time of Day	14
Table 19: Estimated Household Income by Time of Day	14
Table 20: Service Area Distribution	15
Table 21: Fare by Service Area (Multiple Response)*	15
Table 22: Number of Buses in Trip by Service Area	15
Table 23: Origin Place Type by Service Area	16
Table 24: Access Mode by Service Area	16
Table 25: Destination Place Type by Service Area	17
Table 26: Egress Mode by Service Area	17
Table 27: Wait Time by Service Area	18
Table 28: Travel Time by Service Area	18
Table 29: Trip Frequency by Service Area	19
Table 30: Driver's License Possession by Service Area	19
Table 31: Age by Service Area	19
Table 32: Employment Status by Service Area (Multiple Response)*	20
Table 33: Gender by Service Area	20
Table 34: Ethnicity by Service Area (Multiple Response)*	20
Table 35: Number of Household Vehicles by Service Area	21
Table 36: Household Size by Service Area	21
Table 37: Estimated Household Income by Service Area	22

Table 38: Route Distribution	22
Table 39: Fare by Route (Multiple Response)*	23
Table 40: Number of Buses in Trip by Route	24
Table 41: Origin Place Type by Route	25
Table 42: Access Mode by Route	26
Table 43: Destination Place Type by Route	27
Table 44: Egress Mode by Route	28
Table 45: Wait Time by Route	29
Table 46: Travel Time by Route	30
Table 47: Trip Frequency by Route	31
Table 48: Driver's License Possession by Route	32
Table 49: Age by Route	33
Table 50: Employment Status by Route (Multiple Response)*	34
Table 51: Gender by Route	35
Table 52: Ethnicity by Route (Multiple Response)*	36
Table 53: Number of Household Vehicles by Route	37
Table 54: Household Size by Route	38
Table 55: Estimated Household Income by Route	39

Survey Methods

Report Overview

This report provides details of Tasks 1–7 of the Boise On-Board Survey.

Task 1 – Develop Survey Instrument Procedures

Upon receiving a contract for the Valley Regional Transit On-Board Study on August 10, 2010, COMPASS and PTV NuStats began preparing for the upcoming study, including questionnaire development, surveying plan, staffing plan, and project schedule. These initial efforts were followed by a start-up meeting in Boise on August 26. COMPASS Project Manager (PM), MaryAnn Waldinger, and PTV NuStats PM, Fred G'sell, met to finalize many of the details leading up to data collection, including finalizing the instrument to be used for the on-board surveying effort. A copy of the final questionnaire, both in English and Spanish, are contained separately and will be captured as appendices in the report.

Task 2 – Prepare Surveying Plan, Staffing Plan, and Schedule

In addition to the survey instrument, all other preparatory items were discussed during the start-up meeting and finalized shortly thereafter.

Surveying Plan

The surveying plan used ridership figures provided by Valley Regional Transit, 2009 average daily ridership, to determine appropriate sample sizes. In total, the goal was to collect roughly 1,500 complete and usable records resulting in between a 25–30 percent sample, an ambitious undertaking for this type of study. The following table shows the approximate sample size at the route level.

Table 1: Sample Size at the Route Level

Route	Route Name	Bus Service	2009 Average Weekday Ridership	25% Sample Goal	30% Sample Goal
1	Park center	Boise/Garden City	344	86	103
2	Broadway	Boise/Garden City	199	50	60
3	Vista	Boise/Garden City	285	71	86
4	Roosevelt	Boise/Garden City	262	66	79
5	Emerald	Boise/Garden City	380	95	114
6	Orchard	Boise/Garden City	336	84	101
7	Fairview	Boise/Garden City	629	157	189
8	Chinden/Five Mile	Boise/Garden City	386	97	116
9	State St	Boise/Garden City	794	199	238
10	Hill/Maple Grove	Boise/Garden City	385	96	116
14	Hyde Park	Boise/Garden City	162	41	49
16	VA Hospital	Boise/Garden City	88	22	26
17	Warm Springs	Boise/Garden City	56	14	17
29	Overland	Boise/Garden City	293	73	88
40	Nampa EX	Inter-county	236	59	71
42	Nampa Ltd	Inter-county	166	42	50
43	Caldwell EX	Inter-county	45	11	14
44	Route 44 Express	Inter-county	28	7	8
45	Route 45 Express	Inter-county	42	11	13
51	Nampa S. 12 th Ave	Nampa/Caldwell	61	15	18
52	Caldwell South	Nampa/Caldwell	70	18	21
53	Nampa Garrity	Nampa/Caldwell	77	19	23
54	Caldwell North	Nampa/Caldwell	72	18	22
Total			5,396	1,349	1,619

Staffing Plan

The staffing plan called for data collection to occur over a two-week period. Two PTV NuStats team members staffed data collection for the first week, and a single PTV NuStats team member completed the second, and final, week. While the staffing agency fell under the COMPASS contract, PTV NuStats' field members worked directly with the staffing agency to ensure adequate coverage for the entirety of the study. In addition to the PTV NuStats staff in the field, COMPASS staff provided additional help in the editing of the questionnaires to ensure sufficient data were collected for each questionnaire.

Given of the large percentage of questionnaires needed, 25–30 percent of the total ridership, most bus trips were scheduled to be surveyed. In some instances neither the first nor the last trip were scheduled for a given route because it was not possible to return the surveyor back to where the assignment first began. In a few rare cases some trips were missed because of either surveyor mistake or bus malfunction.

Schedule

In addition, an initial schedule was drafted, though dates eventually changed. Overall, the study began in August 2010 and will conclude in April 2011.

Task 3 – Conduct Survey

Staffing Agency Training

PTV NuStats conducted training for the on-board survey on Monday, September 13, 2010 for a total of 15 surveyors. Following training, data collection began on September 14 and continued until September 23, 2010. The training included a background and purpose of the study, a review of the questionnaire, a description of the process, and an open-ended Q&A section so that all surveyors had the opportunity to clear up any uncertainties thus allowing each to feel comfortable in their role. Surveyors received specific training in comprehension of the surveyor assignment sheet, basic survey procedures and etiquette, and response rate maximization techniques. Following the training, each surveyor conducted a short assignment to ensure he/she was comfortable with the entire process prior to attempting a full length assignment.

Survey Administration

Throughout data collection, at least one PTV NuStats employee, field staff, managed the administration of the on-board survey. The field staff managed the day-to-day activities of data collection concentrating on surveyor production, the number of completed questionnaires collected for each route, and all other relevant issues associated with data collection. In addition to PTV NuStats field staff, COMPASS also provided staff to assist in the process; using local knowledge to help edit the returned questionnaires.

As surveyors completed their assignments, each returned to the command center where field staff processed their efforts. Each assignment was scrutinized by the field staff to ensure that all required elements had been completed, including questionnaires being sufficiently filled out by the rider to be considered usable and that proper record keeping occurred on the assignment sheet. Once field staff confirmed that the assignment was done properly, they gave the surveyor an additional assignment for completion either later in that day or for the following day.

Each assignment consisted of trips on a single “block,” ensuring that transfers would not have to occur during an assignment while creating the most efficient use of staffing hours.

In-Field Survey Instrument Editing

Following surveyor check-in, COMPASS staff, data editors, reviewed all returned questionnaires to determine if each contained enough information for the questionnaire to be considered an “initial complete.” The data editors reviewed each survey instrument and used geographic resources to verify respondent-provided address information. Data editors additionally phoned riders using the respondent-provided phone number from the survey instrument. The callback process allowed additional partial records to be converted to full and complete records.

The required elements for a completed questionnaire were Origin and Destination Addresses, Boarding and Alighting Locations, Origin and Destination Purpose, Access and Egress Mode, and Route Sequence/Number of Transfers.

After reviewing each survey instrument, the data editors organized the questionnaires by trips allowing the PTV NuStats field staff to tally completed questionnaires at the trip level. This information was captured in an Excel spreadsheet so progress could be easily monitored at the trip and, more importantly, the route level.

Challenges

Data collection was completed without any significant issues.

Task 4 – Clean Up and Enter Data

PTV NuStats used ScanTron scanning technology to assist in data entry and to minimize human error resulting from traditional data entry methods. The scanning process involved electronically scanning batches of approximately 20 questionnaires to produce an image file of the documents. After scanning, the data results derived from the image files were individually reviewed and verified by comparing the scanned image to the data contained in the data file. Text data (primarily origin and destination address information) were reviewed for the purpose of correcting misspellings and verifying that the scanner correctly read numeric data. The raw data file output from scanned documents was maintained unaltered for comparison purposes, if necessary.

A data items matrix and data dictionary were developed based on the survey instrument and scanning programs using the following process:

- Data items matrix identified variable names, variable descriptions, data types, field widths, code sets, skips, and exact question wording as it appeared in the survey instrument.
- Data dictionary was based on variables listed in the data items matrix. The data dictionary consisted of variable names, data types, field widths, variable labels, and response labels. The labels were abbreviated as necessary to accommodate database field width restrictions.
- Data dictionary was checked to ensure agreement with the hard-copy survey instrument.
- Data structure was checked to ensure consistency for all data files created for the study.

Following the duplication of the original database, the data contained in the database copy were checked for data integrity. Various edit routines were programmed to check the consistency of data and to identify reporting, scanning, or entry errors. Data in the control file were then matched against survey data to ensure that all information was consistent between the two files. Routine edit checks were conducted to examine survey instrument responses for reasonableness and consistency across items. Routine checks included:

Response Checks

- Checking for proper data skips and patterns of answering questions consistent with prior answers.
- Checking for realistic responses.
- Checking for high frequency of item non-response (missing data).

Range Checks

- All categorical values were verified within the expected range.
- Outliers in continuous variables (variables that represent a continuum of values and do not have a code set) were reviewed and flagged.

Skip Checks

- Skip patterns were verified to be programmed correctly.

Open-Ends Preparation (non-categorical, text variables)

- Text variables associated with an “other” type category were reviewed. Text responses that belonged to one of the categories in the response list/code set were re-coded.
- All text responses were corrected for any spelling or typographical errors.

Logic Checks

- The logical consistency of responses was verified. Data cleaning included consistency checks that were not possible to include in the scanning program.

Other Standard Checks

- The total number of records in the data file was checked to determine if the amount was equal to the total number of scanned questionnaires.
- If duplicate records were identified, all duplicated data were checked against the original record. If all data were not identical, data were flagged for review. Otherwise, duplicates were corrected or removed (duplicate unique identifier).
- Multiple-response variables (if any) were prepared by splitting them into the variables specified by the matrix.
- Ten percent of data entry was re-verified.

Task 5 – Geocode the Origin and Destination Data

For this study, COMPASS conducted the geocoding of the origin and destination addresses, as well as the boarding and alighting locations. This geocoding was conducted at the TAZ level for each of these addresses/locations. PTV NuStats then used the geocoded variables to conduct additional cleaning of the route sequence question, where inconsistencies occurred. The final processing determined if a record contained sufficient information for it to be considered a “final complete” and included in the final data file.

Task 6 – Prepare Tech Memo for Tasks 1-5

This report contains details for Tasks 1–5 and 7.

Task 7 – Analyze the Survey Results

The first step in preparing the survey results was to conduct the weighting and expansion of the data set.

Data Weighting and Expansion

From a finite population sampling theory perspective, analytic weights are needed to develop estimates of population parameters and, more generally, to draw inferences about the population that was sampled. Without the use of analytic weights, population estimates are subject to biases of unknown (possibly large) magnitude.

In on-board surveys, the universe of trips operated by transit routes cannot be sampled. At the same time, all the riders who board the sampled routes cannot be surveyed due to non-response. All these factors lead to biases in the survey data. Consequently, sample weighting and expansion is critical to account and correct for these biases. In particular, sample weighting adjusts for non-response at the bus trip level and accounts for sampling trips at the route level. Sample expansion, on the other hand, expands the weighted sample to reflect the population ridership at the system-wide level. The next

section describes the sample weighting procedure, followed by the sample expansion procedure, calculation of the final analytic weights, and calculation of linked trip factor that translates boardings (i.e., unlinked trips) to linked trips.

Sample Weighting

Sample weighting is a critical consideration to account and correct for biases in the survey data. As a simple example, one route may have 1,000 passengers per day, and another, 100 passengers. If 50 questionnaires were collected on each route, the percentage collected would be 5 and 50 percent, respectively. Without weighting, the data collected on the route with 100 passengers would be over-represented in the results. Thus, weighting balances these differences and aligns the weighted sample to the known distribution of population ridership.

The sample weighting process includes calculation of two weights: (1) response factor that corrects for non-response at the bus trip level and (2) vehicle factor that corrects for sampling trips at the route level. The boarding factor, or final weight, is the product of the response factor and vehicle factor. Each of these factors is discussed below in detail.

Response Factor

The response factor adjusts for non-response associated with boarding passengers who do not return usable surveys¹ for each trip. In order to capture all the non-responding boarding passengers, the response factor is calculated at the bus trip level.

$$\text{Response Factor} = \text{Total Adult Boardings}^2 \text{ by Trip} / \text{Usable Surveys by Bus Trip}$$

Vehicle Factor

The vehicle factor accounts for the non-surveyed trips at the route level. The total one-way trips and total sampled trips will be calculated for each route based on this population run cut file. For example, Route 1 has a total of 38 trips, and because only 35 were surveyed, its vehicle factor is 38 divided by 35, or 1.0857.

$$\text{Vehicle Factor} = \text{Total Trips per Route} / \text{Sampled Trips per Route}$$

Boarding Factor

Following the calculation of the two weighting factors, the boarding factor is calculated by multiplying the response and vehicle factors.

$$\text{Boarding Factor} = \text{Response Factor} * \text{Vehicle Factor}$$

Sample Expansion

Sample expansion factors increase the weighted sample to the total boardings at the system-wide level. In particular, the survey data is expanded to represent the 2009 average daily ridership at the route level. The calculation of the expansion factor is described below.

¹ Each record in the database represents a usable survey (i.e., one that has passed all quality assurance procedures).

² An adult boarding is defined as one made by an individual 16 years of age or older.

Expansion Factor

The expansion factor is calculated at the route level using the formula below. As an example, the weighted sample ridership for Route 1 is 411.5, and the population average daily weekday ridership for this route is 344. This produces an expansion factor of 0.836 (344 divided by 411.5).

$$\text{Expansion Factor} = \text{Population Average Daily Ridership} / \text{Ridership Weighted by Boarding Factors}$$

Expansion Weight

The final sample “weighing and expansion” weight is referred to as the expansion weight. In particular, the expansion weight is calculated by multiplying the boarding factor (i.e., weighting factor) by the expansion factor. Following the application of the expansion weight, the weighted data represent the population boardings (i.e., unlinked trips). Specific ridership data for Routes 8X: Chinden-Five Mile Express and Route 11: Garden City were not available therefore, Routes 8 and 8X were combined and Routes 11 and 14: Hyde Park were combined in the expansion portion.

$$\text{Expansion Weight} = \text{Boarding Factor} * \text{Expansion Factor}$$

Linked Trip Factor

The linked trip factor translates boardings (i.e., unlinked trips) to linked trips. This factor accounts for the rider’s transfer before or after the surveyed bus. A rider who did not transfer during the completion of a one-way transit trip would carry a linked trip factor of 1.0. A rider who transferred from another route before boarding the surveyed bus, but did not intend to transfer again, would have a weight of 0.5, as would a rider who did not transfer before boarding the surveyed bus, but who intended to transfer in order to get to the ultimate destination. A rider who transferred to and from the surveyed bus would have a weight of 0.333. The linked trip factor is calculated for every rider who completed the survey. This weight will be provided as a stand-alone weight. Following the application of this factor to the weighted data (i.e., data weighted by the expansion weight), the information can be expressed as “linked” trips instead of individual boardings.

Based on the methodology outlined in this section, the survey data was appropriately weighted and expanded to be representative of all the unlinked trips, i.e., individual boardings.

Survey Results

Table 2: Time of Day Distribution

		%	%
Time of Day	AM Peak	1585	29.4%
	Mid-day	2225	41.2%
	PM Peak	1586	29.4%
	Total	5396	100.0%

Ridership is highest at Mid-day, 41.2 percent, while ridership during the AM and PM Peak periods is at 29.4 percent.

Table 3: Fare by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
How did you pay for the bus where you were given this survey?	Cash	29.4%	34.2%	22.4%	29.3%
	Monthly Pass	24.9%	22.5%	22.8%	23.3%
	Card (Multi-trip Card)	9.6%	12.9%	11.6%	11.6%
	Transfer	2.0%	4.3%	3.1%	3.3%
	Free	14.3%	14.7%	19.1%	15.9%
	Other, SPECIFY	20.9%	13.9%	22.8%	18.6%
	Missing	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

Mid-day riders pay cash at a higher percentage, 34.2 percent. Monthly passes are used most during the AM Peak time, and free rides are used most often during the PM Peak time.

Table 4: Number of Buses in Trip by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Total number of buses to make one-way trip (imputed)	1	64.4%	56.6%	62.2%	60.5%
	2	33.7%	38.2%	35.5%	36.1%
	3	1.7%	4.8%	1.9%	3.0%
	4	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sixty-four percent of riders in the AM Peak time and 62.2 percent of riders in the PM Peak time are more likely to use only one bus to make their one-way trip. Mid-day riders are more likely to use more than one bus to make their one-way trip.

Table 5: Origin Place Type by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Origin Trip Purpose	Home	91.9%	53.4%	20.6%	55.1%
	University/College	0.9%	7.1%	17.6%	8.3%
	Shopping	0.7%	7.2%	5.8%	4.9%
	Social, Eat Out, Recreational, Religious, Community or Personal Business	1.2%	11.5%	6.2%	6.9%
	Work or Work-Related	3.5%	12.5%	38.8%	17.6%
	High School/Middle School	1.1%	4.1%	8.5%	4.5%
	Medical Services	0.6%	4.3%	2.4%	2.7%
	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

During the AM Peak time, 91.9 percent of riders start their trip from home. During the PM Peak time, 38.8 percent of riders start from work or work-related locations. Mid-day ridership is much more varied.

Table 6: Access Mode by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Access Mode	Walked/Wheelchair	71.4%	84.9%	88.8%	82.1%
	Dropped Off	8.4%	4.4%	3.0%	5.2%
	Drove Alone	10.9%	1.9%	1.3%	4.4%
	Carpooled	0.9%	0.6%	0.1%	0.5%
	Bicycled	8.3%	8.3%	6.6%	7.8%
	Taxi	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The access mode overall is more than 80 percent walk/wheelchair. The AM Peak time has the highest percentage of drive-based access at 11.8 percent.

Table 7: Destination Place Type by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Destination Trip Purpose	Home	2.4%	24.9%	67.7%	30.9%
	University/College	19.5%	14.2%	4.5%	12.9%
	Shopping	4.3%	14.2%	5.9%	8.9%
	Social, Eat Out, Recreational, Religious, Community or Personal Business	10.3%	19.8%	8.2%	13.6%
	Work or Work-Related	54.7%	17.2%	11.0%	26.4%
	High School/Middle School	3.0%	1.9%	.5%	1.8%
	Medical Services	5.8%	8.0%	1.9%	5.5%
	Other, Specify	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

During the AM Peak time, 54.7 percent of riders end their trip at work. During the PM Peak time, 67.7 percent of riders end their trip at home. Mid-day ridership is much more varied.

Table 8: Egress Mode by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Egress Mode	Walk/Wheelchair	88.1%	87.2%	78.5%	84.9%
	Ride My Bicycle	2.1%	3.3%	3.5%	3.0%
	Drive My Car	0.6%	1.6%	9.1%	3.5%
	Get Picked Up By Someone	1.5%	0.1%	1.0%	0.8%
	Carpool	7.7%	7.7%	7.8%	7.7%
	Taxi	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The egress mode overall is 84.9 percent Walk/Wheelchair. The PM Peak time has the highest percentage of drive-based egress at 10.1 percent.

Table 9: Wait Time by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
How long did you wait for the bus? (minutes)	5 or Less	51.9%	36.9%	41.5%	42.7%
	6–10	32.8%	27.6%	25.9%	28.6%
	11–15	6.9%	13.3%	9.7%	10.4%
	16–20	3.6%	8.7%	8.2%	7.1%
	21–30	2.3%	5.7%	6.8%	5.0%
	More than 30	0.5%	5.6%	5.4%	4.0%
	Missing	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall, 42.7 percent of riders have to wait five minutes or less for their bus during the AM Peak time, but wait times are higher during the Mid-day and PM Peak times, where 5.6 percent and 5.4 percent, respectively, have to wait more than 30 minutes.

Table 10: Travel Time by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
How many minutes will you be traveling on THIS BUS for THIS TRIP?	10 or Less	20.1%	21.7%	23.8%	21.9%
	11–20	43.2%	39.0%	37.7%	39.8%
	21–30	15.6%	22.3%	19.4%	19.5%
	31–40	9.3%	9.9%	8.6%	9.3%
	More Than 40	10.3%	6.0%	10.1%	8.5%
	Missing	1.5%	1.2%	0.4%	1.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Forty-three percent of riders travel by bus for 11–20 minutes during the AM Peak time, and 37.7 percent ride for a similar time during the PM Peak time. Around 10 percent of riders ride the bus for more than 40 minutes during peak periods.

Table 11: Trip Frequency by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
How many days a week do you usually make this trip?	6 days per week	8.3%	9.8%	10.5%	9.6%
	3–5 days per week	76.4%	52.9%	64.8%	63.3%
	1–2 days per week	8.0%	18.6%	13.8%	14.1%
	Less often	5.7%	18.2%	10.5%	12.2%
	Missing	1.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall, 76.4 percent of the ridership makes the same trip 3–5 days a week during the AM Peak time, while the frequency is only 64.8 percent for the PM Peak ridership. Mid-day trip frequencies are typically less often.

Table 12: Driver’s License Possession by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Driver’s License	Yes	61.7%	43.9%	49.9%	50.9%
	No	37.2%	54.1%	48.9%	47.6%
	Missing	1.1%	2.0%	1.2%	1.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

AM Peak riders are more likely to have a driver’s license (61.7 percent) than riders are at the other times of day: 43.9 percent for the Mid-Day and 49.9 percent for the PM Peak.

Table 13: Age by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Age	Under 18*	3.2%	4.3%	9.6%	5.5%
	18 to 25	18.5%	27.5%	21.2%	23.0%
	26 to 34	20.8%	18.5%	21.5%	20.1%
	35 to 54	36.8%	32.9%	30.8%	33.4%
	55 to 64	13.5%	10.8%	12.7%	12.2%
	65+ Years of Age	6.1%	5.0%	3.7%	4.9%
	Missing	1.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Passengers under age 16 were not surveyed.*

During the AM Peak time of day, nearly 37 percent of the riders are age 35–54, and 6.1 percent of the riders are age 65+ years of age. During the PM Peak time, 30.8 percent of riders are in the 35–54 age group, and 3.7 percent of the riders are 65+ years of age.

Table 14: Employment Status by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Employment Status	Full- or Part-time Worker	69.9%	49.1%	63.5%	59.4%
	Homemaker	3.4%	6.0%	0.9%	3.7%
	Student	25.3%	30.9%	36.2%	30.8%
	Retired	3.9%	9.1%	4.5%	6.2%
	Other, SPECIFY	5.2%	11.1%	5.4%	7.7%
	Missing	2.8%	3.1%	2.8%	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

During the AM Peak hours, 69.9 percent of riders are full- or part-time workers; during the PM Peak hours, 63.5 percent riders are full- or part-time workers. Slightly under half of the Mid-day ridership is employed, with 30.9 percent being students.

Table 15: Gender by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Gender	Female	51.7%	52.3%	50.9%	51.7%
	Male	45.5%	45.9%	47.9%	46.4%
	Missing	2.8%	1.8%	1.3%	2.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall ridership includes a slightly higher level of female passengers.

Table 16: Ethnicity by Time of Day (Multiple Response)*

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
What is your ethnicity?	Asian	4.3%	4.8%	6.5%	5.2%
	Black/ African American	4.9%	3.2%	6.3%	4.6%
	Hispanic	5.4%	6.3%	5.0%	5.7%
	Native American	2.6%	4.1%	1.9%	3.0%
	White/ Caucasian	80.7%	79.9%	78.2%	79.7%
	Other, SPECIFY	2.4%	5.4%	6.3%	4.8%
	Missing	2.2%	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

White/Caucasian riders make up nearly 80 percent of the ridership.

Table 17: Number of Household Vehicles by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Number of Household Vehicles	None	35.0%	48.7%	37.3%	41.4%
	1	28.6%	25.4%	28.4%	27.2%
	2	25.7%	16.3%	23.3%	21.1%
	3 or More	8.7%	8.2%	9.5%	8.7%
	Missing	2.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall, 41.4 percent of riders do not own a household vehicle.

Table 18: Household Size by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Household Size	1	22.9%	27.9%	24.0%	25.3%
	2	29.7%	28.7%	27.1%	28.5%
	3	16.4%	20.4%	19.4%	18.9%
	4 or More	29.5%	21.5%	28.9%	26.0%
	Missing	1.5%	1.5%	0.6%	1.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Time of day and household size do not show a correlation.

Table 19: Estimated Household Income by Time of Day

		Time of Day			
		AM Peak	Mid-day	PM Peak	Total
		%	%	%	%
Estimated Household Income (2009)	Less Than \$10,000	34.1%	51.8%	38.5%	42.7%
	\$10,000–\$24,999	17.3%	19.3%	19.0%	18.6%
	\$25,000–\$49,999	18.8%	12.3%	14.8%	14.9%
	\$50,000–\$74,999	14.6%	5.1%	10.9%	9.6%
	\$75,000 or More	8.2%	4.2%	6.3%	6.0%
	Missing	7.1%	7.3%	10.4%	8.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Nearly 52 percent of Mid-day riders' income level is \$10,000 or less, while only 34.1 percent of AM Peak riders and 38.5 percent of the PM Peak riders fall into this income category. Four percent of Mid-day riders' income level is \$75,000 or more; only slightly more AM Peak riders (8.2 percent) and PM Peak riders (6.3 percent) fall into this income category.

Table 20: Service Area Distribution

		Count	%
Service Area	Ada County	4599	85.2%
	Inter-County	517	9.6%
	Canyon County	280	5.2%
	Total	5396	100.0%

Ada County routes service 85.2 percent of passengers; 9.6 percent are served by the inter-county routes, and 5.2 are served by Canyon County routes.

Table 21: Fare by Service Area (Multiple Response)*

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
How did you pay for the bus where you were given this survey?	Cash	30.5%	8.1%	49.6%	29.3%
	Monthly Pass	24.9%	12.6%	16.7%	23.3%
	Card (Multi-trip Card)	11.9%	7.4%	13.6%	11.6%
	Transfer	3.2%	3.2%	4.1%	3.3%
	Free	13.7%	40.0%	7.5%	15.9%
	Other, SPECIFY	17.4%	34.0%	10.3%	18.6%
	Missing	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

Just under half of riders pay cash in Canyon County, while 30.5 of percent riders pay cash in Ada County, and only 8.1 percent use cash for the inter-county routes. Forty percent of riders ride free on Inter-County routes, but only 13.7 percent in Ada County and 7.5 percent in Canyon County ride for free.

Table 22: Number of Buses in Trip by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Total number of buses to make one-way trip (imputed)	1	57.5%	81.7%	70.9%	60.5%
	2	39.1%	14.6%	26.5%	36.1%
	3	3.0%	3.8%	2.6%	3.0%
	4	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Over 81 percent of inter-county riders use only one bus on their trip, with 70.9 percent of Canyon County riders and 57.5 percent of Ada County riders using only one bus. Only 3 percent of all riders take three or more buses.

Table 23: Origin Place Type by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Origin Trip Purpose	Home	56.0%	45.8%	57.2%	55.1%
	University/College	6.6%	23.7%	7.9%	8.3%
	Shopping	5.2%	1.7%	6.3%	4.9%
	Social, Eat Out, Recreational, Religious, Community or Personal Business	7.7%	0.5%	5.3%	6.9%
	Work or Work-Related	16.8%	24.9%	16.3%	17.6%
	High School/Middle School	4.9%	0.0%	6.2%	4.5%
	Medical Services	2.7%	3.5%	.9%	2.7%
	Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The place of origin is home for 56 percent of riders in Ada County, 45.8 percent of riders on inter-county routes, and 57.2 percent of riders of Canyon County. The inter-county routes serve the highest percentage of university student ridership at 23.7 percent.

Table 24: Access Mode by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Access Mode	Walked/Wheelchair	84.7%	54.8%	88.9%	82.1%
	Dropped Off	4.4%	13.1%	3.4%	5.2%
	Drove Alone	2.1%	26.3%	0.6%	4.4%
	Carpooled	0.4%	2.3%	0.0%	0.5%
	Bicycled	8.4%	3.5%	7.1%	7.8%
	Taxi	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Nearly 85 percent of riders in Ada County, 54.8 percent of riders on inter-county routes, and 88.9 percent of riders in Canyon County walk or use a wheelchair as their access mode.

Table 25: Destination Place Type by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Destination Trip Purpose	Home	29.5%	41.6%	33.1%	30.9%
	University/College	10.4%	32.7%	17.3%	12.9%
	Shopping	9.7%	.3%	10.5%	8.9%
	Social, Eat Out, Recreational, Religious, Community or Personal Business	14.6%	4.2%	14.3%	13.6%
	Work or Work-Related	27.7%	20.2%	16.4%	26.4%
	High School/Middle School	2.1%	0.4%	0.0%	1.8%
	Medical Services	5.9%	0.5%	8.4%	5.5%
	Other, Specify	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The final destination for trips is more likely to be home for passengers on inter-county routes, while Canyon County routes serve the largest percentage of medical trip destinations.

Table 26: Egress Mode by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Egress Mode	Walk/Wheelchair	86.7%	66.2%	90.2%	84.9%
	Ride My Bicycle	2.6%	6.9%	2.4%	3.0%
	Drive My Car	1.7%	21.5%	0.6%	3.5%
	Get Picked Up By Someone	0.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.8%
	Carpool	8.4%	2.7%	6.8%	7.7%
	Taxi	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Inter-county riders are much more likely to drive alone to their final destination (21.5 percent) than riders in Ada County (1.7 percent) and Canyon County (.6 percent).

Table 27: Wait Time by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
How long did you wait for the bus? (minutes)	5 or Less	44.1%	41.2%	22.5%	42.7%
	6– 10	28.4%	28.7%	31.8%	28.6%
	11– 15	10.2%	9.5%	14.1%	10.4%
	16– 20	7.0%	4.0%	14.3%	7.1%
	21– 30	5.2%	2.9%	6.1%	5.0%
	More than 30	3.0%	10.0%	9.5%	4.0%
	Missing	2.1%	3.7%	1.8%	2.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Wait times of five minutes or less are most common in the Ada County and inter-county service areas, with 44.1 percent of riders in Ada County and 41.2 percent riders in inter-county. Riders in Canyon County typically have to wait a little longer for the bus.

Table 28: Travel Time by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
How many minutes will you be traveling on THIS BUS for THIS TRIP?	10 or Less	24.4%	.9%	18.9%	21.9%
	11–20	43.2%	8.6%	42.2%	39.8%
	21–30	19.6%	14.1%	27.6%	19.5%
	31–40	7.3%	27.6%	8.4%	9.3%
	More Than 40	4.4%	47.4%	2.7%	8.5%
	Missing	1.1%	1.3%	0.3%	1.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Inter-county routes are more likely to be at least 40 minutes in length, while the single county routes are most commonly 11–20 minutes long.

Table 29: Trip Frequency by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
How many days a week do you usually make this trip?	6 days per week	10.7%	1.0%	6.8%	9.6%
	3–5 days per week	60.9%	84.2%	63.8%	63.3%
	1–2 days per week	14.3%	12.3%	13.1%	14.1%
	Less often	13.1%	2.3%	16.3%	12.2%
	Missing	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Inter-county riders are the most likely to take their trips 3–5 days per week, at 84.2 percent. Ada County and Canyon County riders make trips at the same frequency for 60.9 percent and 63.8 percent of their ridership, respectively.

Table 30: Driver's License Possession by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Driver's License	Yes	47.9%	78.8%	47.5%	50.9%
	No	50.5%	20.8%	50.0%	47.6%
	Missing	1.6%	0.4%	2.5%	1.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Just under half of Ada County and Canyon County riders possess a driver's license, while 78.8 percent of inter-county riders possess a driver's license.

Table 31: Age by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Age	Under 18*	6.1%	1.1%	5.2%	5.5%
	18 to 25	22.0%	32.8%	21.3%	23.0%
	26 to 34	20.5%	17.6%	18.3%	20.1%
	35 to 54	33.9%	30.0%	31.8%	33.4%
	55 to 64	11.5%	15.1%	18.2%	12.2%
	65+ Years of Age	5.1%	3.4%	5.2%	4.9%
	Missing	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Passengers under age 16 were not surveyed.*

Of the inter-county riders, 32.8 percent are 18 to 25 years of age; only 22.0 percent of Ada County riders and 21.3 percent of Canyon County riders fall into this age group.

Table 32: Employment Status by Service Area (Multiple Response)*

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Employment Status	Full- or Part-time Worker	59.5%	64.7%	48.8%	59.4%
	Homemaker	3.9%	0.5%	6.5%	3.7%
	Student	28.1%	53.1%	33.8%	30.8%
	Retired	6.8%	0.7%	6.2%	6.2%
	Other, SPECIFY	8.2%	1.2%	11.9%	7.7%
	Missing	3.4%	0.0%	1.5%	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

Inter-county routes are more likely to serve both students and workers than the other service areas. Nearly 65 percent of inter-county riders are employed, 59.5 percent of Ada County riders are employed, and less than half of Canyon County riders are employed.

Table 33: Gender by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Gender	Female	51.8%	46.9%	58.0%	51.7%
	Male	46.1%	52.0%	39.7%	46.4%
	Missing	2.0%	1.1%	2.3%	2.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Inter-county routes are the only routes that have more male riders than female riders.

Table 34: Ethnicity by Service Area (Multiple Response)*

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
What is your ethnicity?	Asian	5.8%	1.5%	2.0%	5.2%
	Black/African American	4.4%	5.1%	7.6%	4.6%
	Hispanic	4.8%	10.0%	11.6%	5.7%
	Native American	3.0%	1.8%	5.9%	3.0%
	White/Caucasian	79.4%	84.2%	76.2%	79.7%
	Other, SPECIFY	5.5%	1.3%	0.0%	4.8%
	Missing	2.0%	0.2%	2.1%	1.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

Ada County routes serve a larger Asian ridership, while Canyon County serve a larger Hispanic ridership than routes in other service areas.

Table 35: Number of Household Vehicles by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Number of Household Vehicles	None	43.7%	13.9%	53.3%	41.4%
	1	27.8%	22.8%	25.8%	27.2%
	2	20.2%	37.8%	6.2%	21.1%
	3 or More	6.8%	25.5%	10.2%	8.7%
	Missing	1.6%	0.0%	4.4%	1.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Inter-county riders are much more likely to have a household vehicle than riders are in the other areas, with 25.5 percent having three or more household vehicles. In Ada and Canyon Counties, 43.7 percent and 53.3 percent, respectively, do not own a household vehicle.

Table 36: Household Size by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Household Size	1	26.6%	10.2%	31.4%	25.3%
	2	28.1%	34.8%	23.8%	28.5%
	3	19.9%	14.4%	10.6%	18.9%
	4 or More	24.0%	40.7%	33.3%	26.0%
	Missing	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	1.3%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Just over 25 percent of riders in Ada County, 10.2 percent of inter-county riders, and 31.4 percent of Canyon County riders are in one-person households. Twenty-four percent of riders in Ada County, 40.7 percent of inter-county riders, and 33.3 percent of riders in Canyon County have a household size of four or more.

Table 37: Estimated Household Income by Service Area

		Service Area			
		Ada County	Inter-County	Canyon County	Total
		%	%	%	%
Estimated Household Income (2009)	Less Than \$10,000	43.8%	23.0%	60.4%	42.7%
	\$10,000–\$24,999	19.1%	14.5%	19.0%	18.6%
	\$25,000–\$ 49,999	15.2%	15.8%	9.2%	14.9%
	\$50,000–\$74,999	8.7%	21.3%	1.8%	9.6%
	\$75,000 or More	5.4%	12.8%	2.7%	6.0%
	Missing	7.7%	12.7%	6.9%	8.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Household income is most likely to be \$10,000 or less on the Canyon County (60.4 percent) and Ada County (43.8 percent) routes. Only 23 percent of inter-county ridership falls into this category.

Table 38: Route Distribution

		Count	%
Route name	1	344	6.4%
	2	199	3.7%
	3	285	5.3%
	4	262	4.9%
	5	380	7.0%
	6	336	6.2%
	7	629	11.7%
	8	312	5.8%
	8X	74	1.4%
	9	794	14.7%
	10	385	7.1%
	11	42	0.8%
	14	120	2.2%
	16	88	1.6%
	17	56	1.0%
	29	293	5.4%
	40	236	4.4%
	42	166	3.1%
	43	45	0.8%
	44	28	0.5%
	45	42	0.8%
	51	61	1.1%
	52	70	1.3%
53	77	1.4%	
54	72	1.3%	
Total	5396	100.0%	

Overall, Routes 7 and 9 have the highest average ridership.

Table 39: Fare by Route (Multiple Response)*

		How did you pay for the bus where you were given this survey?							
		Cash	Monthly Pass	Card (Multi-trip Card)	Transfer	Free	Other	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	26.7%	13.5%	6.6%	0.0%	29.7%	25.9%	0.7%	100.0%
	2	29.7%	26.6%	7.8%	0.0%	20.2%	17.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	28.6%	32.5%	6.3%	0.0%	22.9%	12.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	23.8%	33.8%	12.4%	6.6%	5.6%	17.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	25.6%	31.5%	17.5%	3.9%	13.0%	9.2%	0.5%	100.0%
	6	29.4%	24.4%	13.8%	4.0%	11.3%	19.0%	1.2%	100.0%
	7	36.6%	28.2%	9.6%	5.2%	9.5%	12.7%	1.2%	100.0%
	8	34.3%	20.2%	12.3%	10.7%	5.4%	17.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	34.5%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	37.4%	22.2%	13.9%	2.6%	9.3%	16.7%	0.5%	100.0%
	10	30.3%	26.3%	12.4%	1.9%	12.9%	16.0%	0.9%	100.0%
	11	7.3%	35.4%	25.0%	0.0%	32.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	24.2%	25.0%	6.4%	0.0%	25.3%	23.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	7.4%	28.0%	30.7%	4.0%	10.0%	15.9%	4.0%	100.0%
	17	46.3%	12.3%	19.8%	3.7%	0.0%	17.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	23.7%	18.3%	11.6%	1.1%	22.7%	27.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	40	2.3%	8.7%	10.7%	0.0%	43.0%	41.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	21.5%	18.9%	4.9%	10.0%	35.5%	14.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	0.0%	20.2%	.0%	0.0%	24.2%	55.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	3.1%	12.5%	18.8%	0.0%	56.3%	9.4%	0.0%	100.0%
45	0.0%	1.7%	.0%	0.0%	47.0%	61.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
51	58.3%	17.9%	23.4%	0.4%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
52	38.1%	21.6%	9.5%	16.1%	2.3%	11.1%	1.4%	100.0%	
53	44.2%	12.5%	9.0%	0.0%	19.2%	16.9%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	59.1%	15.5%	14.3%	0.0%	2.8%	11.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	29.3%	23.3%	11.6%	3.3%	15.9%	18.6%	0.5%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

Over 60 percent of riders on Route 45 used some other method of payment for paying their fare. Nearly 60 percent of Route 54 riders used cash as their method of payment. Route 44 has the highest percentage of riders who ride free, at 56.3 percent.

Table 40: Number of Buses in Trip by Route

		Total number of buses to make one-way trip (imputed)				
		1	2	3	4	Total
		%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	49.7%	48.7%	1.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	2	48.7%	48.2%	0.0%	3.1%	100.0%
	3	62.1%	37.0%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	48.3%	43.6%	5.6%	2.5%	100.0%
	5	51.8%	42.7%	4.8%	0.7%	100.0%
	6	63.0%	34.1%	2.3%	0.7%	100.0%
	7	52.4%	43.1%	4.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	8	62.2%	36.2%	1.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	91.5%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	66.7%	32.3%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	67.0%	29.6%	3.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	11	32.3%	67.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	41.8%	58.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	32.1%	57.9%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	22.2%	74.1%	3.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	62.3%	29.6%	8.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	40	96.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	55.1%	33.2%	11.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	79.8%	20.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	93.8%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	83.8%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	75.3%	24.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
53	68.1%	29.1%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	58.7%	34.1%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	60.5%	36.1%	3.0%	0.3%	100.0%

All Route 44 riders take one bus for their trip, while riders on Routes 2 and 4 are the most likely to take four buses.

Table 41: Origin Place Type by Route

		Origin Trip Purpose								
		Home	University /College	Shopping	Social, etc.	Work or Work-Related	High School/ Middle School	Medical Services	Other	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	64.9%	14.5%	0.0%	1.1%	14.5%	2.4%	2.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	2	54.9%	6.3%	0.0%	4.7%	25.9%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	54.9%	12.1%	0.0%	10.0%	21.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	54.2%	0.0%	1.7%	13.1%	20.4%	1.9%	8.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	58.0%	3.3%	4.2%	13.9%	15.4%	2.6%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	64.2%	0.5%	0.9%	9.1%	16.2%	6.7%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	53.3%	3.4%	16.4%	7.0%	11.6%	3.9%	4.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	8	57.1%	7.5%	6.3%	5.8%	16.7%	5.8%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	48.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	46.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	59.2%	4.4%	5.4%	7.8%	14.6%	6.9%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	56.1%	5.1%	3.2%	5.9%	17.5%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	11	29.2%	0.0%	25.0%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	57.8%	9.6%	0.0%	6.4%	23.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	36.6%	9.6%	4.0%	2.2%	20.4%	8.0%	19.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	37.0%	14.8%	0.0%	11.1%	28.4%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	47.2%	22.8%	8.1%	3.8%	14.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	40	45.0%	20.0%	0.0%	1.0%	34.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	42.5%	27.4%	5.3%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	51.2%	16.3%	0.0%	0.0%	32.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	53.1%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	52.5%	45.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	46.4%	10.6%	0.0%	4.7%	14.0%	24.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	39.6%	13.1%	3.6%	9.7%	26.8%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
53	69.2%	8.2%	4.4%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	70.6%	0.0%	16.3%	7.1%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	55.1%	8.3%	4.9%	6.9%	17.6%	4.5%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%

The most common trip origin is home for Route 54 riders (70.6 percent). The place of origin for 46.7 percent of riders on Route 8X is work-related. For Route 45, 45.7 percent of riders' place of origin is University/College.

Table 42: Access Mode by Route

		Access Mode						
		Walked/ Wheelchair	Dropped Off	Drove Alone	Carpool	Bicycled	Taxi	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	90.4%	0.8%	2.1%	0.0%	6.1%	0.5%	100.0%
	2	90.1%	3.9%	3.5%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	90.8%	1.9%	0.0%	0.8%	6.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	94.9%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	89.0%	3.3%	1.6%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	83.8%	2.6%	0.0%	0.7%	13.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	85.6%	3.5%	0.4%	0.5%	9.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	8	88.4%	2.9%	1.7%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	87.6%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	72.7%	10.7%	6.4%	0.5%	9.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	78.2%	2.5%	0.6%	0.8%	17.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	11	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	94.1%	4.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	81.6%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	90.7%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	86.7%	1.9%	3.7%	0.6%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	40	52.6%	9.7%	34.1%	2.5%	1.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	59.0%	20.1%	14.1%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	72.5%	7.9%	11.8%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	53.1%	9.4%	31.3%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	32.5%	12.5%	43.1%	5.5%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	79.6%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	88.1%	3.4%	2.3%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	53	89.2%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	54	97.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	Overall	82.1%	5.2%	4.4%	0.5%	7.8%	0.0%	100.0%

Walk/Wheelchair is the most common access mode for all routes except Route 45, where only 32.5 percent of passengers walk and 43 percent drive alone. Getting dropped off is most common for riders on Routes 16 and 42; carpool is highest on Routes 40, 43, and 45; and bicycle is highest on Routes 6, 10, 11, and 51.

Table 43: Destination Place Type by Route

		Destination Trip Purpose								
		Home	University /College	Shopping	Social, etc.	Work or Work-Related	High School/ Middle School	Medical Services	Other, Specify	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	30.5%	29.2%	5.8%	2.8%	26.2%	0.7%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	2	23.4%	7.5%	15.0%	12.4%	36.1%	1.5%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	33.4%	13.7%	2.1%	21.9%	18.4%	3.5%	5.1%	1.8%	100.0%
	4	28.1%	4.9%	4.2%	24.8%	23.8%	1.6%	12.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	23.2%	5.5%	18.9%	15.6%	26.7%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	25.1%	9.8%	7.5%	18.1%	29.5%	3.9%	6.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	29.4%	4.0%	15.9%	13.8%	24.1%	1.9%	10.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	8	23.5%	12.4%	4.6%	12.9%	41.4%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	52.0%	8.5%	17.0%	0.0%	22.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	28.0%	7.6%	11.2%	18.0%	28.1%	4.3%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	37.3%	9.0%	2.5%	14.1%	34.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	11	45.8%	0.0%	32.3%	7.3%	7.3%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	31.3%	15.5%	2.7%	18.9%	29.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	22.4%	4.4%	0.0%	20.7%	34.8%	4.0%	13.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	51.9%	0.0%	9.3%	11.1%	20.4%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	33.0%	23.1%	12.5%	5.6%	21.3%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	40	44.6%	29.7%	0.0%	3.3%	22.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	40.8%	35.4%	0.0%	8.4%	12.5%	1.4%	1.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	48.8%	11.8%	3.9%	0.0%	35.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	46.9%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
45	17.0%	76.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
51	47.2%	0.0%	10.6%	12.8%	12.3%	0.0%	17.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
52	47.0%	3.9%	14.2%	11.0%	20.4%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
53	12.7%	36.5%	11.6%	12.6%	15.3%	0.0%	11.3%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	29.4%	24.6%	5.6%	20.6%	17.1%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	30.9%	12.9%	8.9%	13.6%	26.4%	1.8%	5.5%	0.1%	100.0%

Over 50 percent of riders record home as their destination in Routes 8X and 17. Over 75 percent of riders' destination for Route 45 is University/College.

Table 44: Egress Mode by Route

		Egress Mode						
		Walk/ Wheelchair	Ride My Bicycle	Drive My Car	Get Picked Up	Carpool	Taxi	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	91.2%	0.8%	2.5%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	2	91.7%	3.9%	0.0%	2.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	93.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	90.2%	3.1%	1.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	86.1%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	86.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	86.0%	3.9%	0.4%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	8	90.2%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	8X	55.9%	0.0%	32.0%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	85.5%	2.7%	3.3%	0.3%	8.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	75.5%	3.6%	0.4%	4.5%	15.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	11	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	96.9%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	94.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	89.0%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.5%	100.0%
	40	52.7%	7.7%	34.6%	1.9%	3.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	81.6%	7.8%	7.8%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	75.8%	0.0%	3.9%	20.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	62.5%	3.1%	28.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	73.0%	9.0%	16.3%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	79.6%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	90.4%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	53	91.8%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	54	97.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
		Overall	84.9%	3.0%	3.5%	0.8%	7.7%	0.0%

One-hundred percent of Route 17 riders use walk/wheelchair as their egress mode, while bicycle is comparatively higher among Routes 40, 42, and 45. Egress by driving is over 30 percent for riders on Routes 8X and 40, and getting picked up is highest egress mode for riders on Route 43.

Table 45: Wait Time by Route

		How long did you wait for the bus? (minutes)							
		5 or Less	6 – 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 30	More than 30	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	50.5%	24.1%	11.5%	6.4%	2.8%	4.2%	0.5%	100.0%
	2	37.5%	34.5%	17.1%	1.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.5%	100.0%
	3	44.2%	30.5%	6.4%	10.0%	2.7%	5.1%	1.0%	100.0%
	4	50.4%	24.1%	4.1%	5.9%	11.6%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	43.4%	21.1%	14.6%	9.2%	3.1%	6.7%	1.9%	100.0%
	6	52.7%	24.7%	11.2%	1.1%	6.0%	1.3%	3.0%	100.0%
	7	45.8%	22.7%	7.6%	14.2%	6.4%	1.8%	1.5%	100.0%
	8	43.7%	22.3%	7.7%	11.0%	7.7%	0.0%	7.7%	100.0%
	8X	8.5%	41.7%	33.8%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	44.3%	34.0%	9.4%	5.3%	3.3%	2.1%	1.7%	100.0%
	10	43.8%	45.6%	2.2%	1.5%	3.6%	2.4%	0.9%	100.0%
	11	60.4%	7.3%	32.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	53.9%	26.3%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	100.0%
	16	39.9%	27.2%	13.3%	10.4%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	41.4%	31.5%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%	100.0%
	29	26.9%	26.6%	14.7%	9.9%	12.8%	7.6%	1.6%	100.0%
	40	55.7%	30.2%	6.5%	2.0%	0.0%	1.0%	4.6%	100.0%
	42	24.9%	22.9%	13.9%	1.9%	7.5%	28.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	39.9%	43.8%	0.0%	16.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	59.4%	18.8%	6.3%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	6.3%	100.0%
	45	13.3%	33.0%	21.0%	11.4%	4.5%	1.7%	15.1%	100.0%
51	16.6%	8.9%	17.4%	23.4%	4.3%	25.1%	4.3%	100.0%	
52	9.3%	46.7%	10.0%	11.9%	11.5%	7.2%	3.4%	100.0%	
53	26.2%	29.8%	15.1%	19.3%	8.2%	1.4%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	36.1%	38.9%	14.3%	3.6%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	42.7%	28.6%	10.4%	7.1%	5.0%	4.0%	2.2%	100.0%

Wait times of five minutes or less are the most common on Routes 11 and 44, with 60.4 percent and 59.4 percent respectively. Riders on Routes 42 and 51 are most likely to wait more than 30 minutes.

Table 46: Travel Time by Route

		How many minutes will you be traveling on THIS BUS for THIS TRIP?						
		10 or Less	11-20	21-30	31-40	More Than 40	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	30.4%	42.1%	16.1%	4.5%	5.4%	1.5%	100.0%
	2	17.0%	46.2%	21.6%	11.3%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	40.1%	42.8%	7.7%	3.1%	5.0%	1.4%	100.0%
	4	17.8%	50.2%	13.7%	9.9%	7.2%	1.3%	100.0%
	5	20.1%	50.5%	20.9%	4.8%	2.7%	1.0%	100.0%
	6	22.8%	48.8%	20.4%	7.2%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	17.5%	50.6%	24.0%	4.5%	0.8%	2.6%	100.0%
	8	9.6%	23.5%	34.7%	20.1%	10.0%	2.1%	100.0%
	8X	22.3%	15.3%	35.7%	21.3%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	23.8%	50.7%	17.3%	5.0%	2.6%	0.6%	100.0%
	10	23.2%	28.8%	27.6%	8.8%	10.6%	1.1%	100.0%
	11	25.0%	21.9%	20.8%	7.3%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	66.9%	28.5%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	44.1%	32.2%	19.2%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	37.0%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	29.1%	43.6%	12.1%	11.5%	3.3%	0.5%	100.0%
	40	2.1%	9.6%	17.0%	25.9%	43.5%	1.9%	100.0%
	42	0.0%	12.2%	3.7%	24.0%	60.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	36.0%	60.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	28.1%	56.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	0.0%	3.4%	49.5%	42.5%	0.0%	4.6%	100.0%
	51	28.1%	41.7%	29.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	8.7%	57.0%	21.0%	12.2%	0.0%	1.1%	100.0%
53	8.7%	37.3%	34.4%	16.7%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	31.7%	33.3%	25.0%	2.8%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	21.9%	39.8%	19.5%	9.3%	8.5%	1.1%	100.0%

Trips of 10 minutes or less are most common on Routes 14 and 16. Longer trips are more common on the Inter-County routes.

Table 47: Trip Frequency by Route

		How many days a week do you usually make this trip?					
		6 days per week	3–5 days per week	1–2 days per week	Less often	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	10.8%	72.4%	10.5%	4.9%	1.3%	100.0%
	2	7.6%	78.3%	10.1%	1.1%	2.8%	100.0%
	3	6.2%	52.2%	23.1%	18.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	15.3%	52.3%	21.7%	10.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	14.1%	48.0%	20.8%	14.8%	2.3%	100.0%
	6	8.8%	57.6%	16.5%	17.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	16.7%	52.4%	10.6%	18.8%	1.5%	100.0%
	8	0.0%	72.6%	15.9%	9.4%	2.1%	100.0%
	8X	0.0%	73.7%	4.0%	22.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	15.0%	65.1%	7.6%	12.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	13.0%	65.7%	7.8%	11.9%	1.7%	100.0%
	11	0.0%	21.9%	53.1%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	0.0%	65.1%	22.1%	12.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	0.0%	61.6%	24.7%	13.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	0.0%	72.8%	14.8%	12.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	8.7%	58.2%	19.2%	12.7%	1.1%	100.0%
	40	1.1%	85.6%	9.8%	3.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	1.6%	80.0%	16.3%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	0.0%	96.1%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	0.0%	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	0.0%	78.1%	19.3%	0.0%	2.6%	100.0%
	51	5.1%	75.7%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	5.9%	71.0%	18.1%	5.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	53	15.3%	51.7%	22.0%	11.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	54	0.0%	59.5%	9.9%	30.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	Overall	9.6%	63.3%	14.1%	12.2%	0.9%	100.0%

Riders of Route 7 are the most likely to ride the bus more frequently during the week (16.7 percent), followed by riders of Routes 4, 9, and 53 (15 percent each). Route 43 has the highest percentage of riders who make the same trip 3 to 5 days a week, at 96.1 percent.

Table 48: Driver's License Possession by Route

		Driver's License			
		Yes	No	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%
Route name	1	60.8%	37.9%	1.3%	100.0%
	2	49.2%	50.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	50.5%	49.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	35.7%	64.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	41.9%	56.6%	1.6%	100.0%
	6	40.2%	59.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	39.8%	56.6%	3.7%	100.0%
	8	49.5%	48.4%	2.1%	100.0%
	8X	91.5%	8.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	52.6%	45.5%	1.9%	100.0%
	10	50.5%	48.1%	1.4%	100.0%
	11	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	62.2%	36.0%	1.8%	100.0%
	16	62.1%	37.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	41.4%	58.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	43.7%	53.1%	3.2%	100.0%
	40	87.7%	12.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	57.8%	42.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	96.1%	3.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	90.6%	9.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	85.6%	9.8%	4.6%	100.0%
	51	36.2%	63.4%	0.4%	100.0%
	52	47.3%	50.5%	2.3%	100.0%
53	56.5%	43.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	47.6%	45.2%	7.1%	100.0%	
	Overall	50.9%	47.6%	1.5%	100.0%

Over 90 percent of passengers on Routes 8X, 43, and, 44 have driver's licenses, while less than 40 percent of riders on Routes 4, 11, or 51 have a driver's license.

Table 49: Age by Route

		Age							
		Under 18*	18 to 25	26 to 34	35 to 54	55 to 64	65+ Years of Age	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	6.6%	41.2%	21.1%	23.1%	4.3%	2.4%	1.3%	100.0%
	2	7.9%	17.3%	11.2%	24.7%	16.6%	22.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	3.4%	21.5%	21.2%	28.5%	18.0%	7.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	1.9%	12.3%	16.8%	42.9%	21.3%	1.1%	3.8%	100.0%
	5	0.6%	28.3%	28.3%	29.8%	8.8%	2.7%	1.5%	100.0%
	6	10.7%	10.9%	16.5%	45.6%	13.0%	3.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	4.4%	19.0%	22.0%	40.2%	10.6%	2.0%	1.7%	100.0%
	8	0.0%	16.3%	24.4%	45.4%	7.6%	4.1%	2.1%	100.0%
	8X	0.0%	17.0%	27.3%	28.8%	26.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	9.8%	20.3%	20.8%	31.9%	8.4%	8.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	11.2%	24.9%	18.2%	29.6%	10.9%	4.1%	1.1%	100.0%
	11	7.3%	53.1%	32.3%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	17.9%	4.9%	10.3%	40.9%	26.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	8.0%	10.4%	0.0%	39.5%	28.8%	13.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	8.6%	0.0%	45.7%	9.3%	16.0%	20.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	0.6%	41.2%	19.6%	32.9%	3.6%	1.0%	1.1%	100.0%
	40	1.5%	30.6%	16.1%	28.8%	17.7%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	1.4%	42.1%	18.9%	31.0%	4.5%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	0.0%	3.9%	24.2%	28.1%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	0.0%	3.1%	12.5%	50.0%	28.1%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	0.0%	58.2%	16.8%	21.5%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	19.6%	30.6%	20.0%	20.9%	0.4%	8.5%	0.0%	100.0%
52	3.6%	27.8%	17.5%	33.6%	15.3%	2.3%	0.0%	100.0%	
53	0.0%	19.2%	14.5%	34.5%	27.1%	4.7%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	0.0%	9.5%	21.8%	36.5%	26.6%	5.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	5.5%	23.0%	20.1%	33.4%	12.2%	4.9%	0.8%	100.0%

**Passengers under age 16 were not surveyed.*

Route 45 has the highest concentration of ridership in the 18 to 25 age group at 58.2 percent, while Routes 2 and 17 have the highest concentration of age 65+ ridership at 22.2 percent and 20.4 percent, respectively.

Table 50: Employment Status by Route (Multiple Response)*

		Employment Status						
		Full- or Part-time Worker	Home-maker	Student	Retired	Other	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	59.1%	2.9%	47.0%	0.0%	6.4%	3.1%	100.0%
	2	69.0%	1.1%	24.6%	6.0%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	58.1%	0.0%	36.8%	13.6%	1.1%	2.1%	100.0%
	4	48.0%	8.7%	18.3%	8.8%	12.1%	6.3%	100.0%
	5	50.5%	7.3%	19.0%	7.0%	21.9%	2.6%	100.0%
	6	60.5%	4.3%	18.3%	8.0%	12.3%	2.9%	100.0%
	7	60.2%	5.4%	21.1%	8.4%	9.4%	5.0%	100.0%
	8	79.7%	0.0%	18.6%	7.5%	4.5%	3.1%	100.0%
	8X	69.2%	8.5%	13.8%	0.0%	5.3%	8.5%	100.0%
	9	55.3%	4.7%	30.6%	8.0%	7.7%	3.7%	100.0%
	10	70.1%	1.5%	30.9%	0.8%	3.0%	3.0%	100.0%
	11	32.3%	28.1%	32.3%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	68.9%	0.0%	40.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	100.0%
	16	38.0%	0.0%	26.8%	30.4%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	67.3%	0.0%	23.5%	20.4%	3.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	52.3%	2.8%	45.8%	2.0%	7.6%	3.9%	100.0%
	40	69.3%	1.0%	46.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	60.1%	0.0%	62.6%	2.1%	3.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	68.0%	0.0%	32.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	87.5%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	37.9%	0.0%	94.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	58.7%	6.8%	36.6%	8.5%	4.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	45.0%	9.7%	22.9%	5.0%	16.4%	5.9%	100.0%
53	51.3%	0.0%	50.0%	1.4%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
54	41.3%	9.9%	24.6%	10.7%	13.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	59.4%	3.7%	30.8%	6.2%	7.7%	2.9%	100.0%

**Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.*

Ninety-six percent of riders on Route 45 are students, while 87.5 percent of Route 44 riders are full- or part-time workers. Riders on Route 16 are the most likely to be retired at 30.4 percent.

Table 51: Gender by Route

		Gender			
		Female	Male	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%
Route name	1	54.9%	43.8%	1.3%	100.0%
	2	56.6%	43.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	51.3%	48.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	40.2%	53.7%	6.1%	100.0%
	5	57.2%	41.4%	1.4%	100.0%
	6	46.3%	53.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	55.6%	41.3%	3.1%	100.0%
	8	33.7%	62.1%	4.2%	100.0%
	8X	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	55.4%	41.7%	2.9%	100.0%
	10	48.9%	50.0%	1.1%	100.0%
	11	67.7%	32.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	58.4%	41.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	16	54.7%	45.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	91.4%	8.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	48.7%	48.8%	2.6%	100.0%
	40	48.0%	52.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	50.0%	47.2%	2.8%	100.0%
	43	24.2%	75.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	56.3%	43.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	46.8%	50.7%	2.6%	100.0%
	51	36.2%	63.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	52	61.5%	38.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	53	62.4%	34.4%	3.2%	100.0%
54	68.3%	26.2%	5.6%	100.0%	
	Overall	51.7%	46.4%	2.0%	100.0%

Female ridership is highest on Route 17 at 91.4 percent, while male ridership is highest on Route 43 at 75.8 percent.

Table 52: Ethnicity by Route (Multiple Response)*

		What is your ethnicity?							
		Asian	Black/ African American	Hispanic	Native American	White/ Caucasian	Other, SPECIFY	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	8.3%	5.5%	3.7%	1.5%	78.2%	5.6%	2.6%	100.0%
	2	1.5%	11.7%	1.9%	8.3%	81.2%	1.7%	1.7%	100.0%
	3	4.6%	5.6%	3.4%	1.4%	71.0%	12.6%	1.4%	100.0%
	4	1.9%	2.1%	2.2%	5.5%	88.0%	3.9%	5.2%	100.0%
	5	2.4%	6.5%	5.4%	2.6%	86.1%	1.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	6.2%	0.9%	4.0%	5.3%	81.6%	4.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	5.7%	2.0%	4.1%	2.9%	83.0%	7.8%	2.9%	100.0%
	8	8.9%	2.1%	8.4%	0.0%	76.9%	0.0%	6.4%	100.0%
	8X	5.3%	0.0%	8.5%	4.0%	71.2%	0.0%	10.9%	100.0%
	9	7.6%	7.2%	2.9%	2.7%	77.6%	6.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	10	5.5%	4.4%	11.2%	2.5%	75.7%	5.3%	2.2%	100.0%
	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	85.5%	1.8%	2.7%	100.0%
	16	0.0%	9.2%	0.0%	5.2%	77.2%	13.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	58.0%	8.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	6.4%	2.8%	8.3%	1.8%	77.7%	3.9%	1.1%	100.0%
	40	2.0%	1.5%	11.5%	1.1%	86.1%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	0.0%	13.7%	9.2%	3.2%	77.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	3.9%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	92.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	6.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	3.0%	0.0%	15.9%	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	2.8%	100.0%
	51	4.7%	4.7%	15.3%	13.6%	71.1%	0.0%	4.3%	100.0%
	52	1.4%	16.1%	10.9%	5.9%	68.1%	0.0%	1.1%	100.0%
	53	2.2%	1.4%	8.5%	0.0%	84.8%	0.0%	3.1%	100.0%
54	.0%	8.3%	12.3%	5.6%	79.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	5.2%	4.6%	5.7%	3.0%	79.7%	4.8%	1.8%	100.0%

*Percentages may not add up to 100 percent per category due to multiple responses.

The routes with the highest Asian ridership are Routes 1, 8, 14, and 17. The Black/African American ridership is highest on Routes 2, 42, and 52. The Hispanic ridership is highest on Routes 45 and 51, and the Native American ridership is highest on Routes 17 and 51.

Table 53: Number of Household Vehicles by Route

		Number of Household Vehicles					
		None	1	2	3 or More	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	31.1%	33.7%	23.5%	9.8%	1.9%	100.0%
	2	34.0%	24.8%	26.5%	6.8%	8.0%	100.0%
	3	36.6%	40.9%	11.1%	11.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	62.3%	25.7%	8.5%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	5	66.5%	19.0%	10.3%	3.5%	0.8%	100.0%
	6	58.1%	26.1%	12.4%	3.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	7	57.2%	20.7%	16.7%	3.0%	2.5%	100.0%
	8	34.0%	20.7%	26.1%	15.0%	4.2%	100.0%
	8X	5.3%	25.5%	48.6%	20.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	42.4%	22.9%	27.4%	6.7%	0.5%	100.0%
	10	20.3%	44.8%	24.5%	9.4%	1.1%	100.0%
	11	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	16.6%	40.4%	33.2%	3.4%	6.4%	100.0%
	16	51.6%	29.2%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	17	38.9%	34.6%	26.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	40.4%	36.8%	14.5%	7.8%	0.5%	100.0%
	40	3.4%	17.3%	45.4%	33.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	36.1%	23.7%	28.4%	11.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	3.9%	40.4%	27.5%	28.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	3.1%	37.5%	40.6%	18.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	2.8%	21.9%	40.8%	34.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	57.9%	16.6%	8.5%	10.6%	6.4%	100.0%
	52	54.1%	29.2%	9.6%	4.8%	2.3%	100.0%
53	50.1%	29.8%	7.2%	4.0%	9.0%	100.0%	
54	52.0%	26.2%	0.0%	21.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	41.4%	27.2%	21.1%	8.7%	1.6%	100.0%

Three-quarters of riders on Route 11 and 66.5 percent of riders on Route 5 do not own any household vehicles. While 48.6 percent of the riders of Route 8X own, on average, two vehicles per household, riders on Routes 40 and 45 are the most likely to have, on average, three or more vehicles, at 33.8 percent and 34.5 percent, respectively.

Table 54: Household Size by Route

		Household Size					
		1	2	3	4 or More	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	27.4%	22.5%	18.8%	28.8%	2.6%	100.0%
	2	18.8%	38.8%	18.9%	23.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	3	24.8%	15.5%	47.1%	12.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	4	34.3%	34.6%	9.7%	16.1%	5.2%	100.0%
	5	37.0%	29.8%	12.7%	20.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	6	41.7%	23.8%	20.8%	12.8%	0.9%	100.0%
	7	31.3%	29.4%	16.0%	21.3%	1.9%	100.0%
	8	32.1%	18.7%	12.4%	32.5%	4.2%	100.0%
	8X	5.3%	30.9%	30.5%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	9	14.5%	33.8%	19.4%	32.0%	0.3%	100.0%
	10	24.5%	24.1%	22.8%	27.5%	1.1%	100.0%
	11	28.1%	14.6%	57.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	18.4%	48.6%	11.4%	18.8%	2.7%	100.0%
	16	47.3%	25.0%	15.2%	8.4%	4.0%	100.0%
	17	24.1%	21.0%	20.4%	34.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	29	17.6%	28.1%	24.2%	29.6%	0.5%	100.0%
	40	7.2%	31.0%	11.3%	50.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	42	13.6%	40.1%	12.7%	33.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	43	3.9%	48.3%	32.0%	15.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	28.1%	37.5%	6.3%	28.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	7.9%	18.4%	24.5%	49.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	51	19.6%	35.7%	10.6%	33.6%	0.4%	100.0%
	52	30.0%	3.4%	15.8%	50.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	53	26.9%	34.0%	10.7%	25.4%	3.1%	100.0%
54	47.6%	22.6%	5.2%	24.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Overall	25.3%	28.5%	18.9%	26.0%	1.3%	100.0%

Routes 16 and 54 serve the largest percentage of single-person households at 47.3 percent and 47.6 percent, while 50.7 percent of the riders of Route 52 have a household size of four or more persons.

Table 55: Estimated Household Income by Route

		Estimated Household Income (2009)						
		Less Than \$10,000	\$10,000–\$24,999	\$25,000–\$49,999	\$50,000–\$74,999	\$75,000 or More	Missing	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Route name	1	33.4%	18.6%	22.0%	12.3%	7.6%	6.1%	100.0%
	2	29.0%	23.5%	15.3%	18.0%	2.9%	11.3%	100.0%
	3	37.4%	22.4%	13.5%	6.2%	8.2%	12.3%	100.0%
	4	56.4%	23.8%	10.6%	1.6%	0.0%	7.6%	100.0%
	5	61.9%	20.6%	9.8%	7.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
	6	47.6%	26.4%	8.7%	4.5%	7.2%	5.6%	100.0%
	7	53.8%	18.7%	13.7%	3.5%	1.4%	8.9%	100.0%
	8	23.2%	24.4%	20.1%	10.6%	13.4%	8.3%	100.0%
	8X	17.0%	13.8%	12.1%	19.2%	21.9%	16.0%	100.0%
	9	44.9%	15.9%	18.1%	10.2%	4.9%	6.0%	100.0%
	10	34.6%	15.1%	14.6%	16.8%	8.2%	10.7%	100.0%
	11	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	14	33.8%	6.6%	19.4%	6.8%	20.5%	12.8%	100.0%
	16	45.4%	11.4%	27.8%	7.4%	.0%	8.0%	100.0%
	17	45.7%	14.8%	12.3%	17.9%	.0%	9.3%	100.0%
	29	48.5%	20.1%	12.9%	6.9%	3.0%	8.5%	100.0%
	40	13.0%	16.9%	18.2%	26.9%	13.7%	11.3%	100.0%
	42	34.2%	9.2%	18.5%	11.3%	7.3%	19.6%	100.0%
	43	24.2%	3.9%	3.9%	43.8%	24.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	44	21.9%	12.5%	9.4%	21.9%	34.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	45	34.8%	34.0%	8.6%	4.3%	2.8%	15.5%	100.0%
	51	68.1%	16.2%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	100.0%
	52	65.4%	7.3%	10.9%	5.7%	0.0%	10.6%	100.0%
53	53.8%	18.6%	14.2%	1.4%	3.2%	8.8%	100.0%	
54	56.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	3.6%	100.0%	
	Overall	42.7%	18.6%	14.9%	9.6%	6.0%	8.2%	100.0%

Over 60 percent of the ridership on Routes 5, 11, 51, and 52 have a 2009 household income of less than \$10,000. Household income is more likely to be in the highest bracket on Routes 8X, 14, 43, and 44.