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1 INTRODUCTION

Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., led a data collection effort with the help of County Connection staff for the County Connection fixed-route public transit system to understand travel patterns, fare media usage, demographic characteristics of riders, and recommendations for service improvement. This report summarizes the findings from three data collection efforts: an on-board passenger survey, a paper fare transfer analysis, and a visual inspection of school routes. The on-board surveys asked riders of fixed-, non-school routes about their usage of, and opinions about the County Connection transit system. The paper transfers were collected by bus line and direction for an entire day of weekday service to analyze transfer patterns. Last, County Connection conducted a visual inspection of the 600-series routes for Title VI considerations using on-board video footage; data from this effort was analyzed by Nelson\Nygaard. The following sections detail each data collection effort and provide a summary of the findings.
2  ON-BOARD SURVEY ANALYSIS

OVERVIEW

The survey data collection took place on February 27th and 28th, March 1st, 6th and 7th, for weekday service\(^1\), and on Saturday, March 24th, 2018.

The survey, available in both Spanish and English, included 25-questions and was printed on paper to distribute to passengers on all fixed routes except the 600-series routes. Survey questions were designed to capture information regarding travel patterns, personal demographic characteristics, and recommendations for service improvements.

A total of 907 surveys were collected over the survey period, including 704 by weekday passengers and 203 by weekend passengers, and including 35 in Spanish. The response rate by route was sufficient to provide a confidence level of 95% with a margin of error of 5% at the system level. As shown in Figure 2-1, survey responses collected were proportionate to ridership by route.

On weekdays, the highest percentages of surveys were completed by passengers on Routes 4 and 20, accounting for 20% and 10% of collected surveys, respectively. These are two of County Connection’s highest ridership routes. Route 10 was the only other route to contribute more than 5% of total collected surveys (6%). Routes 2 and 3 carry fewer than 100 daily boardings, among the lowest in the system. They received no more than 1% of total collected surveys. On the weekend Routes 4 and 6 had the highest percentages of completed surveys, making up 15% each of the total collected weekend surveys. Route 4 carries 25% of average weekend ridership, the most of any weekend route, while Routes 301 and 315 serve just 2% of weekend ridership, respectively.

\(^1\) Weekday data was collected on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays to capture typical weekday travel behaviors.
Figure 2-1  Weekday Survey Responses by Route

Figure 2-2  Weekend Survey Responses by Route
DEMOGRAPHICS

Where Riders Live

The distribution of completed surveys by riders’ home zip code is shown in Figure 2-3. Zip codes located in Martinez, Concord, Walnut Creek, and Pittsburg had the highest number of surveyed County Connection passengers, with 30 or more survey responses per zip code in these cities. Other east Contra Costa County cities, such as Lafayette, Pleasant Hill, and San Ramon, had the between 8 and 30 responses per zip code.

Figure 2-3 Home Zip Codes of Combined Weekday and Weekend Surveyed Riders
Race/Ethnicity

Among weekday respondents, 20% identify as Hispanic or Latino (Figure 2-4). A somewhat larger portion of weekend respondents, 28%, identify as Hispanic or Latino. Results of racial self-identification questions collected and displayed in Figure 2-5 show further information about the demographic characteristics of County Connection passengers who took the survey. The largest percentage of passengers self-identified as White (46%) followed by Hispanic or Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black/African American, which comprise 19%, 19%, and 16%, respectively. The “Other” category was selected by 12% of respondents and about 46% of those wrote in Latino/Hispanic as their identification in the survey. On weekdays, the routes most likely to be ridden by communities of color were Routes 7, 16, 35, and 96X.

On weekends, 41% of respondents self-identified as White, followed by 28% Hispanic or Latino, 20% Asian/Pacific Islander, 19% Black/African-American, 12% Multiracial (12%), and 8% selected “Other.” About half of the 8% who self-identified as “Other” wrote in Hispanic/Latino as their race/ethnicity. County Connection routes are likely to attract varying levels of racial/ethnic diversity in their rider cohorts, as shown in Figure 2-6. On weekends, people of color were most likely to ride Routes 6, 310, 314, and 321.

Figure 2-4 Respondents Identifying as Hispanic or Latino

![Figure 2-4 Respondents Identifying as Hispanic or Latino](image)

Figure 2-5 Passenger Racial Self-Identification

![Figure 2-5 Passenger Racial Self-Identification](image)
Figure 2-6  County Connection Route by Racial Self-Identification, Weekday

Figure 2-7  County Connection Route by Racial Self-Identification, Weekend
Language

Among respondents, over one-third of weekday riders (38%) speak a language other than English at home (Figure 2-8). On weekends, this portion is 37%. Spanish is the most common language other than English spoken at home, with 15% of weekday riders and 21% of weekend riders reporting it is spoken at home. Filipino/Tagalog (4%) and Chinese (2%) are the only other languages that were selected by 2% or more of respondents. Riders who speak less commonly reported languages were asked to list them under the general category, “Other.” Some of the languages included French (1.2%), Hindi (1.1), Russian (0.8), Vietnamese (0.8%), Farsi (0.6%), and Japanese (0.6%).

The multi-lingual passengers identified in the survey effort tend to be proficient in English, as shown in Figure 2-9. This result is likely influenced by selection bias and underestimates the percentage of riders with limited English proficiency, as the group of passengers who responded to the printed survey was biased towards those passengers who felt confident taking the survey. The survey was offered in Spanish, but most surveyors were not Spanish speaking and the survey was not available in other languages. Of weekday riders, 85% responded that they speak English “very well,” while 11% marked that they speak English at an “acceptable” level. Only 4% stated they did not speak English well or at all. This pattern is similar among weekend riders, 81% of whom reported that they speak English “very well.” About 8% of weekend riders do not speak English well or at all.
Figure 2-9 English Proficiency of Passengers

- Very well: 85% (Weekday 81%, Weekend 85%)
- Acceptable: 11% (Weekday 11%, Weekend 11%)
- Not well: 3% (Weekday 3%, Weekend 6%)
- Not at all: 1% (Weekday 1%, Weekend 2%)

n = 652
Age

The age distribution of surveyed riders is shown in Figure 2-10. Surveyors noted that younger passengers were typically more reluctant to fill out a survey. On both weekday and weekend surveys, just 8% of respondents were under the age of 18.

Figure 2-10 Passenger Age Distribution
Gender

The gender balance of surveyed riders mirrors the gender balance nationally. Out of 606 weekday respondents, 51% self-identified as female, and 49% identified as male (Figure 2-11). During the weekend, male survey respondents made up 53% of the riders.

Figure 2-11 Passenger Gender

n = 771

Female

Male
Income

Weekend respondents were more likely to have lower household income levels than weekday riders, as shown in Figure 2-12. Out of 603 weekday respondents, 51% live in households that make under $35,000 per year, compared to 63% of weekend respondents. The $35,000 household income threshold is commonly used to designate “low-income” communities because it is just below 150% of the federal poverty line for a family of four.

Some County Connection routes are more likely to have low-income riders, as shown in Figure 2-13. On weekdays, Routes 14 and 16 are most likely to serve low-income communities, as more than 80% of surveyed riders reported household incomes below $35,000. On weekends, these include Routes 6, 311, 314, and 316, of which 70% of riders live in low-income households.

Figure 2-12 Approximate Annual Passenger Household Income
Figure 2-13  County Connection Route by Household Income, Weekday

Note: Routes with fewer than 10 reported household incomes are excluded from the graphic above.

Figure 2-14  County Connection Route by Household Income, Weekend

Note: Routes with fewer than 10 reported household incomes are excluded from the graphic above.
Employment Status

The employment status of County Connection passengers surveyed is shown in Figure 2-15. Out of 595 weekday rider responses, 68% were employed at least part-time. Likewise, 67% of 174 weekend riders indicated they were employed at least part-time.

![Figure 2-15 Passenger Employment Status](image)

Student Status

Students made up a higher proportion of respondents on weekdays than on weekends, as shown in Figure 2-16. Full or part-time students made up just over a quarter of the weekday survey responses, with 17% enrolled full-time and 8% enrolled part-time out of 595 responses compared to 22% full-time and 9% part-time on weekends.

![Figure 2-16 Passenger Student Status](image)
TRAVEL PATTERNS

Choosing County Connection

Surveyed riders were asked their primary reason for choosing County Connection for their current trip (Figure 2-17). While the survey asked for a single response, some people chose multiple reasons. The patterns were similar between weekday and weekend answers, with convenience and lack of a car accounting for almost half of all reasons for riding County Connection on weekdays, and over half on weekends. Based on write-in comments, it could be useful in future surveys to clarify the lack of car being due to hardship or due to choice, and unable to drive being due to choice or not. There were cases when people indicated that they were unable to drive because they did not have a car. Those responses were reclassified as lack of having access to a car. These results suggest that a significant portion of County Connection passengers do not have access to a vehicle, and that, as a result, County Connection is likely their primary means of transportation.

People who answered “Other” also commonly cited “work” or “going to work” as why they chose to ride. This could indicate that people ride because it is paid for or subsidized by their employer or because they don’t have access to a vehicle, or that they prefer to commute this way. Those responses were kept as “other.” On weekends, there were a small number of people who were riding for fun with their kids.

Figure 2-17  Primary Reason for Riding County Connection
Frequency of Use

Riders were asked how often they rode County Connection. Out of 687 weekday respondents, 305 (or 44%) rode five or more days per week, as shown in Figure 2-18, compared to only 32% of the 198 weekend respondents. Surveyed weekend riders were more likely to take County Connection infrequently, with 24% of respondents using the service less than one day a week, compared to 10% of weekday respondents.

Figure 2-18 Frequency of Use on County Connection
Trip Purpose

Respondents were asked about the origins and destinations of their current trip (Figure 2-19). Out of 695 weekday respondents, 39% were traveling home, and 27% were going to work. Shopping made up 8% of reported weekday trip purposes. Among those who answered “Other”, 14 respondents wrote in they were connecting to BART (20%) and nine wrote in the library (13%). The vast spread of trip purposes speaks both to the time of day of survey data collection, as well as the many varied destinations people can reach on County Connection. On weekends, a much higher portion of riders were making shopping-related trips (19%, compared to 8% on weekdays). Out of 26 responses from weekend riders who selected a trip purpose of “Other,” nine were attending the “March for Our Lives” demonstration in Walnut Creek.

Figure 2-19 Passenger Trip Purpose
Access to Backup Transportation

Respondents were also asked about how they would make their trip if County Connection were not available (Figure 2-20). Taxi/Uber/Lyft was the most common choice, selected by 22% of surveyed weekday riders and a quarter of weekend respondents, followed by walking (21%) and driving a personal vehicle (16%). These results were similar for weekend riders, of whom 27% of respondents selected Taxi/Uber/Lyft, 26% selected walking, and 13% selected driving a personal vehicle. A significant portion of riders, 15%, would not make their trip at all without County Connection, highlighting the service’s importance for riders who do not have alternative mobility options available.

Figure 2-20  How Would Respondents Make Trip without County Connection
Transfers

Surveyed riders were asked if they had to transfer to another bus at any point to complete their trip. Out of 688 weekday respondents, 322 (47%) needed to transfer at least once to complete their trip, as shown in Figure 2-21. This proportion fell to 34% for the 198 weekend riders.

Figure 2-21  Number of Transfers per Trip, Weekdays and Weekends

Of the 322 riders who required a transfer to complete their trip, 56% did so within the County Connection system, as shown in Figure 2-22.² Figure 2-23 shows the distribution of routes of these internal transfers. Routes 20, 98X, and 15 had the highest number of respondents that had transferred from them at 12%, 11%, and 10%, respectively. On weekends, the most common transfer destination was to Route 4.

Figure 2-22  Agencies Use to Complete Trip

² The number of weekend responses to this question was too low to establish a level of significance. Therefore weekend information of transfers by transit agency, and route details for County Connection transfers, is omitted from this report. For reference, weekend responses that were collected reflect the pattern of weekday transit agency transfers.
Figure 2-23  Distribution of Transfers by Route within County Connection

![Bar chart showing distribution of transfers by route within County Connection. The x-axis represents different routes, and the y-axis represents the percent of transfers. The chart shows a range of percent values from 0.0% to 14.0%, with some routes having higher percentages than others. The sample size (n) is 125.]
Access to Transit Stop

The survey asked riders how they traveled from home to their first bus stop that day. This question confused people for whom the trip purpose was not tied to their home address. Out of 688 weekday respondents, about two-thirds (66%) accessed a County Connection bus via walking, while 13% accomplish the first leg of their trip in a car, either by driving their own vehicle or by carpooling (Figure 2-24). Nearly all of the “Other” category responses came from riders who transferred from another bus or transit service such as BART, which indicates they answered the question in terms of their current ride or trip. In future surveys, the question should ask how people arrived at the bus stop for their current trip. Next, “transfer from public transit” should be added as a selection option to this question. On the weekend, a similar portion of riders access County Connection buses by walking (62%), while 18% access stops by car, either by driving a personal vehicle or carpooling. As with the weekday survey, most weekend riders who reported an access mode of “Other” took BART to reach their County Connection bus stop.

Figure 2-24 Passenger Mode of Transportation to Bus Stop, Weekday

![Figure 2-24 Passenger Mode of Transportation to Bus Stop, Weekday](image)

Figure 2-25 Passenger Mode of Transportation to Bus Stop, Weekend

![Figure 2-25 Passenger Mode of Transportation to Bus Stop, Weekend](image)
Figure 2-26 cross tabulates how respondents accessed bus service for their current trip based on their reported annual household incomes. Responses for “Other” that were for BART or another bus were included. While the primary mode of accessing transit for all income groups was walking, a higher household income corresponded with a decrease in the proportion of people who walked. The lowest income group, households earning under $15,000 annual income, was the least likely to drive themselves. The spike in transit connection to the bus stop on weekends among higher income survey respondents is likely due to a small sample size.

Figure 2-26  Transit Access Mode by Income, Weekday

Figure 2-27  Transit Access Mode by Income, Weekend
FARES

Out of 639 weekday responses, 60% of riders use a Clipper Card compared to 53% of the 198 weekend riders, as shown in Figure 2-28.

Figure 2-28  Passengers with a Clipper Card

Drilling down to how respondents paid for the trip they were on while completing the survey, out of 692 weekday riders, only 34% paid for their current trip with Clipper. While that proportion was similar for weekend riders, there was a notable difference in the proportion of riders paying a cash fare between weekdays and weekends. On weekdays, 23% of riders paid cash fares, compared to 32% on the weekend, as shown in Figure 2-29. The gap between people who had a Clipper Card and those who used it for their trip is likely due to the high percentage of people riding routes that did not require a fare.

Figure 2-29  Fare Payment Method, Weekday
Fare Payment Method, Weekend

- Clipper Card: 33%
- Cash: 32%
- Transfer: 19%
- Monthly Pass: 6%
- 20-Ride Senior/Medicare Punch Card: 5%
- 12-Ride Local/Express Punch Card: 3%
- Commuter Card: 2% (2% each)

n = 192
Fare Payment Method by Race

Clipper Card and cash were the most-used fare payment methods for all races. Persons of color were 6% more likely to use Clipper Card than White riders. Racial disparities in type fare media used were greatest for the 20-Ride Senior/Medicare Punch Card on weekdays, and the Card and Clipper Card and Monthly Passes on weekends, as shown in Figure 2-30. Cash was used more by all people on weekends, but was consistent among racial groups. People of color were twice as likely as white respondents to pay with a monthly pass or 20-Ride Senior/Medicare Punch Card.

Note: Riders surveyed on Route 4, where no fare payment is required, were excluded from the totals above.
Fare Payment Method by Annual Household Income

Figure 2-31 shows riders’ fare payment methods cross-tabulated against annual household income. Clipper Card is the most frequent form of payment over all income groups, although use is highest among passengers with higher household incomes. Over 60% of weekday responses from households making $75,000 or more a year paid with a Clipper Card. There is a clear trend on weekdays that as income goes up, use of Clipper Card usage increases, and as income falls, use of cash increases. However, at all income levels, the use of Clipper Card was still accounted for more usage than cash fares, except for those whose households made between $15,000 and $34,999 per year, which was about the same for cash and Clipper Card usage.

Figure 2-31  Fare Payment Method by Annual Household Income, Weekday
Fare Payment Method by Annual Household Income, Weekend

- Clipper Card
- Cash
- Monthly Pass
- 12-Ride Local/Express Punch card
- Transfer
- 20-Ride Senior/Medicare Punch card
- Commuter Card

n = 142

Less than $15,000
$15,000 to $34,999
$35,000 to $74,999
$75,000 to $99,999
$100,000 or more
Fare Payment by Language Spoken at Home

Clipper Card remains the most used fare media for people who speak English at home, but for survey respondents who speak languages other than English at home, that pattern only holds true for weekdays, as shown in Figure 2-32. On weekends, 48% of non-English speakers paid with cash compared to only 33% who used a Clipper Card. This analysis only factored in respondents who were on routes that required a fare.

Figure 2-32 Fare Payment Method by Language Spoken at Home, Weekday

Fare Payment Method by Language Spoken at Home, Weekend
Fare Payment by Number of Transfers Needed to Complete Trip

Clipper was the most used method of payment for riders who did not need to transfer to complete their trip. Once any transfer was needed, the proportion of Clipper Card usage and cash fares were similar, as seen in Figure 2-33. As with all other analyses, Clipper Card and cash payments are by far the most used fare payment methods.

The sample size for people needing more than two transfers is small; only 33 weekday respondents, or 5% indicated that they needed more than two transfers. On the weekend, only three riders needed more than two transfers, so they were excluded from the graph below.

Figure 2-33 Payment Method by Number of Transfers Needed, Weekday

Figure 2-34 Payment Method by Number of Transfers Needed, Weekend
HOW PASSENGERS GET TRANSIT INFORMATION

Understanding how passengers access information can inform a longer term marketing and communication strategy for County Connection to increase ridership and overall satisfaction. County Connection passengers access transit schedule information through a variety of methods. Figure 2-35 shows the distribution of information sources used by riders to get transit information. Printed schedules are still the primary way people get information. Weekend riders were 10% less likely to use the Internet than weekday riders, but it was still used by nearly a quarter of riders. Because respondents selected multiple modes of gathering information percentages do not add up to 100%.

Future categories for the survey should include other websites, such as Google Maps or a general “Internet” catchall that is distinct from the County Connection Website, and physical locations, such as senior centers or libraries. This analysis was able to break out “other website” due to surveyor write-ins, but this number might have been higher if it had been on the list.

**Figure 2-35  How Passengers Typically Obtain County Connection Schedule Information**

![Chart showing distribution of information sources](chart.png)
Internet Access

Riders continue to increase their ability to access information. Surveyed riders were asked, “How do you access the Internet?” Out of 570 weekday respondents, 79% indicated they had access to a smartphone. On weekends, with 159 respondents, that number was slightly higher, at 82%. Respondents could select more than one device if they accessed the Internet from multiple sources. The results are shown in Figure 2-36. Responses reflected similar results from weekend riders. There were no respondents on weekends who said they did not have any access to the Internet.

Figure 2-36  Passenger Internet Access
PASSENGER SATISFACTION

The passenger survey effort asked passengers to comment on their level satisfaction with County Connection fixed-route services. Overall, respondents had a positive opinion of County Connection, with every question receiving a majority of positive (Good or Excellent) responses. Both weekday and weekend riders are most satisfied with driver courtesy (89%) and the condition of the buses (88%). It is also notable that 79% of weekday respondents are satisfied with the on-time performance of the system, and 78% are satisfied with the length of their trip.

The most commonly suggested areas for improvement included the frequency of service and the time service ends, each of which were earned 22% of their ratings from weekday riders as Poor or Fair. Weekend riders expressed similar dissatisfaction with County Connection’s service frequency and span of service; 30% and 27% of riders, respectively, ranked these areas as Fair or Poor.

Figure 2-37 Overall Passenger Satisfaction, Weekday
Overall Passenger Satisfaction, Weekend

The survey asked passengers to choose one thing to improve County Connection service. The response rates are shown in Figure 2-38. More frequent service received the highest number of responses (33%). Nearly a sixth of weekday riders indicated that they did not have improvements to recommend to make the service better. More weekend service, and expanded weekday schedules received the third- and fourth-highest responses, with 13% and 10% respectively. Weekend riders reported similar preferences, with more frequent service and more weekend service scoring highest among the available choices.

Figure 2-38 Preferred Improvements to County Connection Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More frequent service</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More service on weekends</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses run earlier or later</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper fares</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster service</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reliable service</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner buses or stops</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  600-SERIES ROUTE ANALYSIS

County connection runs 20 600-series bus routes. Because this population has been challenging to reliably survey with onboard paper surveys, a different methodology was used for this targeted population. County Connection staff pulled video for trips occurring between February 6th and February 8th were pulled on March 12th, 2018.

METHODOLOGY

A sample of one trip per route was randomly selected for each route, with seven morning trips and 13 afternoon trips selected. Dispatch downloaded video footage from cameras facing the passengers for each chosen trip. County Connection staff then looked at screen captures when the passenger load was at its highest, which was just before drop off in the morning, and just after pick up at the school in the afternoon.

County Connection staff recorded the following information based on visual inspection:

- Route
- Trip
- Time of day
- Direction of travel
- Number of people on bus at maximum load
- Observed proportion of White and non-White passengers
- Number of riders who did not appear to be students

Without a formal survey, the racial and age component is an estimate.

RESULTS

The following routes were observed to carry a passenger load that was over 50% non-White:

- 605
- 611
- 612
- 613
- 614
- 615
- 616
- 619
- 622
- 635

The 600-series routes’ racial breakdown by route is shown in Figure 3-1.
### Figure 3-1  Load and Racial Breakdown of Riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Passengers on Board</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Passengers on Board</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 TRANSFER FARE ANALYSIS

The goal of a transfer fare analysis is to use paper transfers to analyze travel patterns, such as which routes people transfer between, and from which other regional transit systems they travel. County Connection can access Clipper Card transfer data, but it is harder to analyze trends for cash-paying customers. This analysis looks at transfer information for cash-paying customers.

METHODOLOGY

Between March 8th and 9th, 2018, operators on each trip of each route (for fare-collecting routes) placed envelopes on the front of the fare boxes to gather fare transfers. Riders were asked to drop their paper ticket transfers into the folder, which the drivers then sealed and returned to dispatch at the end of their assignment. Drivers switched envelopes based on the direction of their trip. Nelson\Nygaard then collected and analyzed the information of the transfers.

Inevitably, there will be some level of underreporting of the total transfers that took place during the collection period. For example, Route 10 becomes Route 20 at the end of each trip, but riders still on the bus at the end of the Route 10 trip may not surrender a paper transfer at the beginning of the new Route 20 trip. This makes sense for the passenger because they have not completed their trip and have not transferred to a new bus, but runs the risk of being miscategorized by drivers for ridership at the Route level.

One limitation of paper transfers is that there is no information about the route from which the rider came on paper transfers. Furthermore, passengers coming from a free shuttle, or going to a free shuttle would not have or be required to surrender a paper transfer. Free shuttles were not included in this analysis because transfers are not needed. Free routes include:

- 4 Broadway Plaza/BART Walnut Creek
- 5 Creekside/BART Walnut Creek
- 7 Shadelands/BART Pleasant Hill
RESULTS

There were 1,172 paper transfers collected. Over 50% of all paper transfers occurred on six routes, as shown in Figure 4-1.

**Figure 4-1 Most Paper Transfers Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>% Transfers</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-BART Concord/Clayton</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-DVC/BART Concord</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-AMTRAK/BART Concord</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Treat Blvd</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-BART Walnut Creek/San Ramon</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- DVC/BART Walnut Creek</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 15 north-south routes, there were 648 total transfers, with about the same number in each direction. At the route level, the most notable exception was on Route 21, which had 70 paper transfers on buses heading southbound and only 16 traveling northbound (Figure 4-2). “Transfers” refers to transfers within the County Connection System, from one route to another as compared to a transfer from outside the system such as BART.

**Figure 4-2 Paper Transfers to North/South Routes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Total Southbound</th>
<th>Total Northbound</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96X</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98X</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>321</strong></td>
<td><strong>498</strong></td>
<td><strong>648</strong></td>
<td><strong>77%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 498 paper transfers used on 10 east/westbound routes. There were 23% more transfers made in the eastbound direction (Figure 4-3). The 93X had a small number of transfers, but more than half were people coming from outside the County Connection system.

Figure 4-3   Paper Transfers to East/West Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Total Southbound</th>
<th>Total Northbound</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Route 3 is a loop route, so transfers were not calculated by direction. There were 26 people that transferred to Route 3 on the day of data collection. All were from within the County Connection network.

Just over 25% of all people transferred from another system. BART was the primary connection, with 194 paper transfers submitted. The next most common system for people to have transferred from was Tri-Delta, with 30 people, followed by LAVTA with 21. Figure 4-4 through Figure 4-8 display more detail of the transfers recorded from other transit systems.

Figure 4-4 shows the County Connection routes people transferred to after riding BART with a paper transfer. The BART transfers were determined by counting the physical BART transfers that were collected, based on route and direction. Routes 10, 21, and 20 had the highest number of people coming from BART, with 33, 30 and 22 transfers, respectively. These three routes made up 44% of all transfers from BART.
### Figure 4-4  Paper Transfers to County Connection from BART, by Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Route</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 4-5  Paper Transfers to County Connection from Tri-Delta, by Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Route</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-6  Paper Transfers to County Connection from LAVTA, by Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Route</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-7  Paper Transfers to County Connection from Solano County Transit, by Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Route</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 11 people came from Capitol Corridor, AC Transit, Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST), or Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WestCAT) on the day the data collection took place. Figure 4-8 shows the routes onto which people transferred from the other systems.

**Figure 4-8   Paper Transfers from Other Regional Transit Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Transferred To Route</th>
<th>Total Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>98X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestCAT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

On-Board Survey Instrument, English and Spanish
DEAR RIDER:
Please take a minute to fill this survey out and help us plan for your transit needs. It will only take five minutes. Place the survey in the yellow envelope as you exit the bus, or hand it to the person who gave it to you.

Thank you!

1. What route are you on right now?

2. Where are you going now?
   - Home
   - Work
   - School
   - Shopping
   - Church
   - Healthcare
   - Visiting friends/family
   - Entertainment
   - Other (specify)

3. How did you get from home to your first bus stop today? (Check only ONE)
   - Walked – how many minutes?
   - Used a wheelchair or scooter – how many minutes?
   - Rode my bicycle – how many miles?
   - Drove my car – how many miles?
   - Someone gave me a ride – how many miles?
   - Other (please specify)

4. Did you transfer to connect to this bus?
   - No
   - Yes – Which Route?

5. How many total transfers will you make on this one-way trip?
   - None
   - One
   - Two
   - Three or more

6. How often do you ride County Connection?
   - Less than one day a week
   - 1-2 days a week
   - 3-4 days a week
   - 5 or more days a week

7. What is your primary reason for choosing County Connection for this trip?
   - Cost
   - Convenience
   - Lack of car
   - Avoiding traffic/parking
   - Not able to drive
   - Prefer public transit to driving
   - Other (specify)

8. How did you pay your fare today?
   - Cash
   - Commuter Card
   - Clipper Card
   - Monthly Pass
   - Transfer – BART or Bus
   - No fare required on this route
   - 12-Ride Local/Express Punch card
   - 20-Ride Senior/Medicare Punch card

9. Do you use a Clipper card?  
   - Yes
   - No

10. How would you have made this trip if County Connection had not been available?
    - Drive own vehicle
    - Ride bicycle
    - Carpool/Vanpool
    - Walk
    - Taxi/Uber/Lyft
    - Wouldn’t make trip
    - Get a ride with friend/family member
    - Other (specify)

11. What is your approximate annual household income?
    - Less than $15,000
    - $15,000 to $24,999
    - $25,000 to $34,999
    - $35,000 to $44,999
    - $45,000 to $54,999
    - $55,000 to $64,999
    - $65,000 to $74,999
    - $75,000 to $99,999
    - $100,000 or more

12. How many people live in your household and in which Zip Code?
    - #People in Household
    - Zip Code

13. Are you Hispanic or Latino?  
    - Yes
    - No

14. Which of the following do you most identify with:
    - White
    - Black/African American
    - Asian
    - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
    - American Indian/Alaskan Native
    - Multiracial
    - Other (specify)
15. Do you speak a language other than English at home?
- Yes ► indicate language:
  - Spanish
  - Tagalog
  - Farsi
  - Vietnamese
  - Chinese
  - Other:

16. How well do you speak English?
- Very well
- Not well
- Acceptable
- Not at all

17. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

18. What is your age?
- Under 18
- 19 to 35
- 36 to 55
- 56 to 74
- 75 or older

19. How do you typically obtain schedule information about the County Connection? (check all that apply)
- Printed schedule
- Customer service call center
- County Connection website (countyconnection.com)
- 511.org website
- Friends/family (word of mouth)
- At the bus stop
- Bus driver
- Mobile app
- Bus Tracker real-time info
- Other (specify) ______________

20. In a typical month do you visit or receive...

21. What is your employment status?
- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Retired
- Not employed

22. Are you a student?
- Full-time student
- Part-time student
- Not a student

23. How do you access the Internet?
- Smartphone
- Tablet
- Computer
- I don't access the internet

24. If you could only choose one thing to improve County Connection service, what would you pick?
- Nothing
- More reliable service
- More frequent service
- Cheaper Fares
- Cleaner buses or stops
- Buses run earlier or later
- More service on weekends
- Other (specify) ______________

25. How do you rate County Connection in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Neutral 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. On-time/reliability
| b. Frequency of service
| c. Time service begins
| d. Time service ends
| e. Length of trip
| f. Driver courtesy
| g. Connections with other buses
| h. Condition of buses

Thank you
for your participation in this survey.
Your responses will be kept strictly confidential.
ENCUESTA A BORDO

ESTIMADO PASAJERO:
Sirvase tomar un momento para completar esta encuesta y ayudarnos a planificar para satisfacer sus necesidades de transporte. Solo demorará cinco minutos. Cuando baje del autobús, coloque la encuesta en el sobre amarillo o devuélvalosella a la persona que se la entregó.

¡Gracias!

1. ¿En qué ruta se encuentra ahora?

2. ¿Adónde va en este momento?
   - Casa
   - Iglesia
   - Trabajo
   - Centro de atención médica
   - Escuela
   - Visita a amigos/familiares
   - De compras
   - Entretenimiento
   - Otro (favor de especificar)

3. ¿Cómo llegó de su hogar a la primera estación de autobús hoy? (Marque solo UNA respuesta)
   - Caminando
   - En silla de ruedas o scooter eléctrico
   - En mi bicicleta
   - En mi automóvil
   - Alguien me trajo
   - Otro (favor de especificar)

4. ¿Hizo trasbordo para tomar este autobús?
   - Sí
   - No

5. ¿Cuántos trasbordos hará en total para este viaje en un solo sentido?
   - Ninguno
   - Dos
   - Uno
   - Tres o más

6. ¿Con qué frecuencia utiliza el transporte de County Connection?
   - Menos de un día a la semana
   - 1 a 2 días por semana
   - 3 a 4 días por semana
   - 5 o más días a la semana

7. ¿Cuál es el motivo principal por el que usa County Connection para este recorrido?
   - Costo
   - Conveniencia
   - No tengo automóvil
   - Evitar el tráfico/estacionamiento
   - No puedo conducir
   - Prefiero el transporte público en lugar de conducir
   - Otro (favor de especificar)

8. ¿Cómo pagó la tarifa hoy?
   - Dinero en efectivo
   - Tarjeta Clipper
   - Trasbordo: BART o Autobús
   - Tarjeta para perforar de 12 viajes locales/en expres
   - Tarjeta para perforar de 20 viajes Senior/Medicare
   - Tarjeta de pasajero habitual
   - Pase mensual
   - No se requiere tarifa para esta ruta

9. ¿Utiliza una tarjeta Clipper? Sí / No

10. Si no tuviera a disposición County Connection, ¿cómo hubiera realizado este recorrido?
    - En mi propio vehículo
    - Viaje compartido en automóvil/ivan
    - Taxi/Uber/Lyft
    - En bicicleta
    - Caminando
    - Otro (favor de especificar)

11. ¿Cuáles son los ingresos anuales aproximados de su hogar?
    - Menos de $15,000
    - $15,000 a $34,999
    - $35,000 a $74,999
    - $75,000 a $99,999
    - $100,000 o más

12. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar y cuál es su código postal?
    - N° de personas que viven en su hogar
    - Código postal

13. ¿Es hispano o latino? Sí / No

14. ¿Con cuál de las siguientes opciones se identifica mejor?
    - Blanco
    - Negro/afroamericano
    - Asiático
    - Nativo de Hawái/Isleño del Pacífico
    - Indígena norteamericano/indígena de Alaska
    - Multirracial
    - Otro (favor de especificar)
15. ¿Habla en el hogar un idioma que no sea el inglés?
☐ No
☐ Sí ▶ indique el idioma:
  ☐ Español  ☐ Tagalo  ☐ Farsi
  ☐ Vietnamita  ☐ Chino
  ☐ Otro: 

16. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted inglés?
☐ Muy bien  ☐ No muy bien
☐ Aceptable  ☐ No lo habla

17. ¿Cuál es su sexo?  ☐ Masculino  ☐ Femenino

18. ¿Cuánto tiene?
☐ Menos de 18 años  ☐ 18 a 36 años  ☐ Más de 75 años
☐ De 19 a 35 años  ☐ De 56 a 74 años

19. ¿De qué manera obtiene habitualmente información sobre los horarios de County Connection? (marque todas las opciones que correspondan)
☐ Horario impreso  ☐ Sitio web 511.org
☐ Sitio web de County Connection (countyconnection.com)
☐ En la parada de autobuses  ☐ Conductor del autobús
☐ Aplicación móvil  ☐ Información en tiempo real de Bus Tracker
☐ Centro telefónico de Servicio al Pasajero  ☐ Otro (favor de especificar)

20. En un mes típico, ¿visita o recibe información de...?
☐ Countyconnection.com
☐ Cuenta de Twitter de County Connection
☐ Facebook de County Connection

21. ¿Cuál es su situación laboral?
☐ Empleado de tiempo completo  ☐ Jubilado
☐ Empleado de medio tiempo  ☐ Desempleado

22. ¿Es estudiante?
☐ Estudiante de tiempo completo  ☐ Estudiante de medio tiempo
☐ No es estudiante

23. ¿Cómo accede a Internet?
☐ Teléfono inteligente  ☐ Tableta
☐ Computadora  ☐ No tiene acceso a Internet

24. Si pudiera elegir solo una cosa para mejorar el servicio de County Connection, ¿cuál sería su elección?
☐ Nada  ☐ Un servicio más frecuente
☐ Un servicio más veloz  ☐ Ampliación del horario de los autobuses
☐ Un servicio más confiable  ☐ Tarifas más baratas
☐ Mas limpieza en los autobuses o paradas  ☐ Más servicio los fines de semana
☐ Otro (favor de especificar)

25. ¿Cómo califica al servicio de County Connection en las siguientes áreas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Malo 1</th>
<th>Regular 2</th>
<th>Neutral 3</th>
<th>Bueno 4</th>
<th>Excelente 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Puntualidad/confiabilidad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Frecuencia del servicio</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hora en la que comienza el servicio</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hora en la que termina el servicio</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Duración del recorrido</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Amabilidad del conductor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conexiones con otros autobuses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Estado de los autobuses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gracias por participar en esta encuesta. Sus respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales.
APPENDIX B

Open-Ended Survey Responses
## Appendix B  Open-Ended Survey Responses

### Commendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drivers are all very nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Our Driver Sheila is outstanding. Great Service! Sheila and Oscar are outstanding drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good service most of the time!! &amp; Good Surveyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Driver courtesy depends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I hate public transportation!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Improvements People Would Like to See

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>expand weekend service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More frequent service and more service on weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Need better weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All routes to run on weekend. Routes 11, 15, 18 and 19 need to run more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>More service on weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Too short of the weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Buses run earlier and later, more weekend service, and more reliable service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I really want to use a clipper card with a smartphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Small Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>very poor we have to wait 45 minutes if we miss the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>More service on weekends - Always - to me Hospital!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95X</td>
<td>Better weekend service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Route-Specific Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VA 17 connection, wish you still had #17, Dial A Ride only for those in wheelchair, no help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>on time reliability poor especially #9 from DVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Please don't remove route 3 Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The 250 bus sometimes never shows up at all and is very unreliable, I have been left stranded multiple times!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Add bus on Ygnacio Blvd to Concord Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have la ated the center part of the 9 and 15 routes to keep in my purse. Put the stop back in front of Dana shopping center opposite the one going to the library it was removed + I see 2 ladies with walkers having to walk from the one far up to landana to walk to 711 and shops in mulberry. Extra gold stars for this driver today Sheila 1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tig of connections especially with the construction going on. Improve the route upon entrance to [Walnut Creek] BART station. Run bus later than 6 PM especially if connecting bus gets into a traffic jam entering the bus hub. Sometimes CCTA will not inform connecting driver that there is a delay. Probably if there were more delays, coordination to ___ a bus schedule temporarily should be in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Please run at least the #28 or something on weekends. Would get shelter, industrial and DVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93x</td>
<td>With the new E-Bart station opening, no longer will be parking for those who catch the 93X at hillcrest P&amp;R, many people rely on that at P&amp;R, are there any plans for new P&amp;R location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96x</td>
<td>PM pickups are sometimes tardy from route stops (probably due to traffic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>