I Background

In April of 2024, Transit Authority of River City (TARC) conducted a consumer satisfaction survey as part of a larger strategic plan. The survey consisted of two sections, an online and telephone survey of the general population and an onboard survey of TARC riders.

This document summarizes the findings of this survey. Specifically, it will review:

* Summary of Findings, including the entirety of the survey in total and broken out by rider type (Current riders and lapsed/non-riders);
* Methodology, including survey and sampling plan development, data collection, weighting and data processing;
* Appendix 1, total counts of completed surveys by route;
* Appendix 2, a copy of the sampling plan;
* Appendix 3, a detailed outline of the weighting plan with the final weighting tables;
* Appendix 4, a copy of the final survey instrument.

II Executive Summary

This section gives a brief overview of the key findings of the study. The results in this section are discussed in greater detail in the Summary of Findings section.

The story of TARC is an economic one, both in what it does now and what the public wants to see it do in the future. TARC primarily serves commuting health care and service workers, essential workers who do not necessarily work a traditional 9 to 5, Monday to Friday schedule. Whether or not one is currently riding TARC, they want to see TARC serve employment hubs and schools, providing service to those who may lack other transportation options. If there was one common area of improvement where both current riders and the population at large could agree it was that TARC should provide more frequent service.

Tradeoffs

Key questions of this survey effort included the following tradeoff questions, asking riders and lapsed/non-riders alike to choose between two options for TARC services.

More frequent service to key commuting areas or Even service across the entire system

Findings:

Riders and the general public were in agreement in their preference for service to prioritize key areas for commuting such as business hubs and schools.

More frequent service to key commuting areas or Even service across the entire system

Findings:

The general public is strongly in favor of service prioritizing service to areas in need. Riders specifically were more evenly split, though still favoring service to areas in need.

Quicker trip involving a transfer or Slower trip on one bus

Findings:

Riders were split nearly down the middle. The general public slightly preferred fewer transfers over fast trips.

Longer walk to a bus stop with more frequent service or Shorter walk to a bus station with less frequent service

Riders and the general public were in agreement in their preference for a longer walk to a bus stop that receives more frequent service.

More detailed analysis of tradeoff results can be found in Figures 3 through 6.

Preferred Service Improvements

When asked to identify what one service improvement would benefit them the most the general public preferred:

1. Buses going more places;

2. More frequent service;

3. More direct service; and

4. Better sidewalk connections.

Additionally, riders preferred:

1. More frequent service;

2. More reliable service;

3. Buses going more places; and

4. Longer hours of service.

Satisfaction with TARC

Riders reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction with the service that TARC provides. Over half (53%) of TARC riders rate their satisfaction with the service an 8 or above, while only 1 in 4 (24%) non-riders say the same.

Key Differences Between Riders and the General Public

Riders and the general public differed on number of expected attributes, including mode use, car access, income level, employment type, race, and English proficiency. TARC riders are significantly more likely to commute to work or school on weekends, more likely to work service jobs. These differences reinforce the message that TARC riders work part-time jobs at non-traditional hours and rely heavily on TARC’s service to provide transportation to these jobs.

III Summary of Findings

TARC Use

Recipients of the general population survey were asked first if they had ever used TARC fixed route service, or TARC’s paratransit service TARC3. Of those, nearly half (45%) reported having used a TARC service at some point.

While 45% may seem high, note that even using TARC just once would qualify people as having ridden.

Have you ever used TARC buses or TARC3 paratransit service to get around in the Louisville region? (Q3A) Yes or No

Total (A) (n=408)

Yes 45%

No 55%

Current Riders (B) (n=39)1

Yes 100%

No N/A

Non-Riders/ Lapsed Riders (C) (n=369)

Yes 45%

No 55%

Base=General public survey respondents and answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

1Current riders base is only current riders in the general population survey, leading to a small base

Of those who reported having used TARC, about 2 in 10 (21%) reported having used TARC local buses in the past 6 months and only 2% reporting having used TARC3 in the past 6 months.

Table 2: Recent TARC usage

Have you used TARC in the last 6 months? (Q3)

Total

TARC Local Buses

Yes 10%, No 90%, (n=1,613)

TARC 3 Paratransit

Yes 1%, No 99%, (n=880)

Rider Type

Current Rider 10%, Non/Lapsed 90%, (n=1,616)

Current Riders

TARC Local Buses

Yes 100%, No 0%, (n=1,245)

TARC 3 Paratransit

Yes 17%, No 83%, (n=513)

Rider Type

Current Rider 100%, (n=1,245)

Non/Lapsed

TARC Local Buses

No 100% (n=368)

TARC 3 Paratransit

No 100%, (n=367)

Rider Type

Non/Lapsed 100%

Base=Those answering who have used TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Of those who have ever used TARC, almost one-half (46%) said they used it prior to COVID-19 stay at home orders being implemented, which includes 68% of current riders and 40% of lapsed and non-riders. One in six (16%) said they used it at least once a week.

Table 3: TARC usage prior to COVID-19

How often did you use TARC prior to COVID-19 stay at home orders? (Q5.)

Total (n=1,351), Current Riders (n=1,194), Non/Lapsed (n=157)

I did not use TARC prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Total 54%, Current Riders 32%, Non/Lapsed 60%

Less than once a week

Total 30%, Current Riders 8%, Non/Lapsed 36%

1-3 days per week

Total 5%, Current Riders 14%, Non/Lapsed 2%

4 days per week

Total 2%, Current Riders 7%, Non/Lapsed 1%

5 days per week

Total 4%, Current Riders 15%, Non/Lapsed 1%

More than 5 days per week

Total 5%, Current Riders 24%, Non/Lapsed <1%

Average

Total 0.8, Current Riders 2.7, Non/Lapsed 0.3

Median

Total 0.0, Current Riders 2.4, Non/Lapsed 0.0

Base=Those answering who have ever used TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Unsurprisingly, riders make most of their work and school trips using TARC, while non-riders make the majority of their work or school trips using a personal vehicle. TARC riders also make significantly more trips for work and school using other modes, including walking (1.1 trips per week compared to 0.3), carpooling (0.3 trips compared to 0.1) and using other forms of transportation (0.4 trips compared to 0.1). Those who are extremely transit reliant made significantly more trips using TARC than those who are not reliant, with 4.8 trips compared to 3.3.

Figure 1: Work and School trip modes

In a typical week, how many one-way trips do you take using each of the following for travel? (Q8)

Work/School Trips

Walk for all or most of the trip

Total 0.4

Current Riders 1.1

Non/Lapsed 0.3

Drive or ride in a personal car

Total 5.0

Current Riders 0.7

Non/Lapsed 5.4

Using TARC

Total 0.3

Current Riders 4.1

Non/Lapsed n/a

Ride a personal bicycle to a TARC stop

Total 0.4

Current Riders 0.5

Non/Lapsed 0.4

Used a carpool or vanpool

Total 0.1

Current Riders 0.3

Non/Lapsed 0.1

Use another form of transportation

Total 0.1

Current Riders 0.4

Non/Lapsed 0.1

Total(n=1,069-1,270)

Current Riders(n=907-909)

Non/Lapsed riders(n=161-361)

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Drivers make more non-commuting trips, while TARC riders predominantly use TARC to commute. Drivers make an average of 7.6 one-way non-commuting trips driving per week, compared to an average of five commuting trips, whereas current TARC riders make an average two non-commuting trips on TARC compared to four commuting trips (2.3 compared to 4.1).

Figure 2: Other trip purpose trip modes

In a typical week, how many one-way trips do you take using each of the following for travel? (Q8)

Non-Commuting Trips

Walk for all or most of the trip

Total 1.1

Current Riders 0.9

Non/Lapsed 1.1

Drive or ride in a personal car

Total 7.6

Current Riders 0.6

Non/Lapsed 8.2

Using TARC

Total 0.2

Current Riders 2.3

Non/Lapsed n/a

Ride a personal bicycle to a TARC stop

Total 0.8

Current Riders 0.4

Non/Lapsed 0.8

Use a carpool or vanpool

Total 0.1

Current Riders 0.2

Non/Lapsed 0.1

Use another form of transportation

Total 0.2

Current Riders 0.3

Non/Lapsed 0.1

Total(n=1,070-1,270)

Current Riders(n=908-909)

Non/Lapsed riders(n=161-361)

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.

When asked how familiar they are with TARC, two-thirds (67%) of lapsed and non-riders reported being familiar with TARC. About one-half (51%) reported being only somewhat familiar.

Table 4: Familiarity with TARC

How familiar would you say you are with TARC? (Q11)

Non-Riders/ Lapsed Riders (C) (n=371)

Net Familiar 67%

Very Familiar 17%

Somewhat Familiar 51%

Have heard of TARC, but not familiar with it 32%

Never heard of TARC 1%

Base=Non-riders or lapsed riders answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

TARC riders were significantly more likely to report commuting to work or school on weekends with nearly 7 in 10 (69%) saying that they do so compared to just 22% of non-riders. Nearly half (46%) of all riders reported commuting to work on both Saturdays and Sundays in a typical week compared to just over 1 in 10 lapsed and non-riders (12%). Those who are low income were significantly more likely to report commuting on both Saturdays and Sundays, with 42% reporting this compared to just 11% of those who are not low income. Those who are extremely transit reliant are significantly more likely to commute on weekends, with over 8 in 10 (81%) commuting at least one day in a typical weekend to just 6 in 10 (61%) of non-reliant riders.

Total (A) (n=717)

Current Riders (B) (n=501)

Non-Riders/ Lapsed Riders (C) (n=216)

In a typical week, do you commute for work or school on weekends? (Q26)

Net Yes

Total 22%, Current Riders 69%, Non/Lapsed 18%

Yes, Saturdays only

Total 7%, Current Riders 15%, Non/Lapsed 6%

Yes, Sundays only

Total 1%, Current Riders 8%, Non/Lapsed <1%

Yes both Saturdays and Sundays

Total 14%, Current Riders 46%, Non/Lapsed 12%

No

Total 78%, Current Riders 31%, Non/Lapsed 62%

Base=Those answering who are employed or in school

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Tradeoffs

Service Tradeoffs

People were asked to compare more frequent service to schools and employment hubs at the expense of coverage of the entire area. Both riders and non-riders were in agreement that service to key areas should be prioritized, with over 7 in 10 (75% and 71%, respectively) preferring service that focuses on key areas at the expense of wider coverage. This result remains consistent across all demographics and rider types.

Figure 3: Service area tradeoff

Total (n=1,085), Current Riders (n=849), Non/Lapsed (n=236)

Which would you prefer? (Q14)

TARC should focus on more frequent service to areas with jobs and schools.

Total 72%, Current Riders 75%, Non/Lapsed 71%

TARC should focus on all areas, even if it is less frequent

Total 28%, Current Riders 25%, Non/Lapsed 29%

Base=Those answering

1TARC should focus on service every 15 minutes to areas with lots of jobs and schools, so that many people can rely on buses to get to work or school on time, but that means some people don’t have any service.

2TARC should provide service every hour or two throughout the area, so everyone has some bus service but very few people have frequent service to get to work or school on time.

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.).

Service Tradeoffs continued

Overall, 8 in 10 (80%) believe TARC should focus primarily on areas of communities with low incomes and limited access to cars versus serving all areas equally. However, riders were more evenly split than lapsed and non-riders, with fewer than 6 in 10 preferring this option compared to more than 8 in 10 (83%) lapsed and non-riders

Figure 4: Service to communities in need tradeoff

Total (n=1,193), Current Riders (n=851), Non/Lapsed (n=342)

Which would you prefer? (Q15)

TARC should focus first on service to communities in need

Total 80%, Current Riders 56%, Non/Lapsed 83%

TARC should focus on service to all areas equally

Total 20%, Current Riders 44%, Non/Lapsed 17%

Base=Those answering

1Focus first on needs of communities where many people have low incomes or don’t have reliable access to a personal vehicle.

2Provide service equally to all communities, regardless of need, income or access to a personal vehicle.

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Trip Tradeoffs

People were then asked their preference between two types of trips, comparing a shorter trip with transfers to a longer trip with none. Riders slightly preferred a trip that is faster but requires a transfer, with 6 in 10 (60%) being open to transferring for a shorter total trip. Lapsed and non-riders were split, with about half (51%) preferring a one seat trip. This discrepancy is likely due to riders’ increased familiarity with the system leading to more comfort with planning and executing a trip that requires a transfer. People 65 and older were significantly more likely to prefer a trip that does not require a transfer compared to younger riders (65% of 65+ compared to 54% of those 35 to 64 and 59% of those under 35).

Figure 5: Transfer tradeoff

Which would you choose? (16A)

Total (n=1,122), Current Riders (n=825), Non/Lapsed (n=297)

A bus trip that requires a transfer between buses but that makes the total trip shorter

Total 50%, Current Riders 60%, Non/Lapsed 49%

A bus trip that requires no transfers, even if the trip takes longer

Total 50%, Current Riders 40%, Non/Lapsed 51%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Trip Tradeoffs continued

Both current riders and lapsed/non-riders were in agreement that they would prefer walking farther to a bus stop that receives frequent service compared to a shorter walk to a stop where the bus comes once every hour or less. Shorter walks were more popular among those over the age of 65 and those who report having a disability, though notably, both groups still preferred a longer walk for more frequent service with around 6 in 10 (65% and 57% respectively) preferring this option. Men were significantly more likely to prefer a longer walk, with over 8 in 10 (84%) compared to about 7 in 10 (69%) women. Extremely transit reliant riders were significantly more likely to prefer walking to a more frequent bus with over 8 in 10 (82%) selecting this compared to less than 7 in 10 highly reliant and non-reliant riders (69% and 65% respectively).

Figure 6: Stop distance tradeoff

Total (n=1,040), Current Riders (n=756), Non/Lapsed (n=284)

Which would you choose? (16B.)

Walking a few extra blocks to a bus stop where the bus arrives every 15 minutes or less

Total 76%, Current Riders 72%, Non/Lapsed 77%

Walking to your current bus top, but the bus only comes once every hour or less

Total 24%, Current Riders 28%, Non/Lapsed 23%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Service Improvements

People were then asked to select the service improvement that would benefit them the most, if TARC were to implement it.

Riders focused more on improvements to current service, with 4 in 10 (40%) reporting that they would prefer more frequent service, and nearly 2 in 10 (19%) reporting that they would benefit most from more reliable service. Riders were also significantly more likely than lapsed and non-riders to select longer hours of service and lower fares as the most beneficial improvements.

Lapsed and non-riders preferred more changes to existing service. Nearly 3 in 10 (28%) of lapsed and non-riders selected buses going to more places as the most beneficial improvement. They were also significantly more likely to report more direct service (17% compared to 3%) and better sidewalk connections (10% compared to 3%) than riders.

Those riding on weekends were significantly more likely to prefer buses going more places (14% compared to 8% of weekday riders) while weekday riders were significantly more likely to prefer more frequent service (44% compared to 34% of weekend riders).

People under 35 were the most likely group to prefer better sidewalk connections, with nearly 2 in 10 (18%) preferring this option. Those with disabilities were most likely to prefer more direct service with around 3 in 10 (29%) preferring this option.

More reliable service was particularly popular among extremely transit reliant riders (26% compared to 16% of moderately reliant riders), while more frequent service was popular among highly reliant riders (46% compared to 31 percent of non-reliant riders.

Figure 7: Service improvements

Total (n=1,045), Current Riders (n=835), Non/Lapsed (n=210)

If TARC were to improve service for existing routes, which

would help you the most? (Q17)

Buses going to more places

Total 26%, Current Riders 10%, Non Riders 28%

More frequent service

Total 22%, Current Riders 40%, Non Riders 19%

More direct service

Total 15%, Current Riders 3%, Non Riders 17%

More reliable service

Total 13%, Current Riders 19%, Non Riders 12%

Better sidewalk connections

Total 9%, Current Riders 3%, Non Riders 10%

Better bus stops

Total 7%, Current Riders 7%, Non Riders 7%

Longer hours of service

Total 6%, Current Riders 9%, Non Riders 5%

Lower fares

Total 3%, Current Riders 7%, Non Riders 2%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Use of On-Demand Service

People were asked for their thoughts on a proposed TARC microtransit service, regardless of whether they are current TARC riders.

Riders were significantly more likely to report that they would likely use this service, with over 7 in 10 (73%) identifying as likely compared to 6 in 10 (61%) lapsed and non-riders. Notably, while it is smaller, the portion of lapsed and non-riders who say they would likely use the service still represents the majority.

Both those under 35 and those 35 to 64 were more likely to report being likely to use such a service compared to those over 65 (72% and 65% compared to 53%).

Nearly 4 in 10 (39%) of those without a car available reported being “very likely” to use this service, a significantly higher figure compared to the people with a car available who reported the same (20%).

Figure 8: Use of a microtransit service

In the future, TARC may provide a service similar to

Uber or Lyft. How likely would you be to use this

service? (Q12)

Total (n=1,369)

Likely 62% Unlikely 25%

Rider (n=1,011)

Likely 73% Unlikely 21%

Non/Lapsed (n=358)

Likely 61% Unlikely 26%

 Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

In order to account for survey respondents typically over predicting how likely they are to purchase or use products or services in the future (a common problem with survey research), a factor was applied to those who said they were very and somewhat likely to use micro transit in the future. With this factor applied, it can be estimated that two in ten residents (21%) are likely to seriously consider using micro transit in the future.

Table 6: Likelihood to use

Very Likely Factor 6

Somewhat Likely Factor 2

Not Likely N/A

Total

Very Likely 22% Factored 13%

Somewhat Likely 40% Factored 8%

Not Likely 62% Factored 21%

Current Riders

Very Likely 44% Factored 26%

Somewhat Likely 29% Factored 6%

Not Likely 73% Factored 32%

Non/Lapsed

Very Likely 20% Factored 12%

Somewhat Likely 42% Factored 8%

Not Likely 61% Factored 20%

Those who reported being likely to use the service were then asked how their TARC use would change if this service was offered. Lapsed and non-riders were significantly more likely to report that the implementation of this service would lead to them using TARC more often, with nearly 8 in 10 (79%) compared to around 7 in 10 (69%) riders

Overview of Conversion Scoring

Experience has shown that although a survey respondent may report they are likely to change their travel behavior, they will not necessarily do so. Therefore, the results for their likelihood to use microtransit have been factored down using industry accepted variables (Ipsos, 2016) in order to estimate the true proportion who might ride if the service were available. (Jamieson, 1989) (Morwitz, 2001)

Specifically, the proportion of people who indicate they are very likely to use has been adjusted, assuming only 60% of area residents giving that rating would seriously consider changing their behavior if the circumstances changed as described in the questionnaire. Similarly, this conversion scoring assumes 20% of those saying they would be somewhat likely to use would actually do so.

Note that the factors used by WBA are more conservative than those frequently used by others. This is done to give us a greater degree of confidence in our result

Figure 9: TARC use with micro transit

If TARC offered this service, would you use TARC

about the same, or more often than you do now?

(Q13)

Total (n=893)

Much More Often 28%

Somewhat More Often 49%

I still would not use TARC 4%

Current Riders (n=690)

Much More Often 35%

Somewhat More Often 34%

I still would not use TARC N/A

Non/Lapsed (n=203)

Much More Often 28%

Somewhat More Often 51

I still would not use TARC 4%

Base=Those answering who are likely to use on-demand service

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Trip Characteristics (Riders only)

Trip characteristics were asked of riders with questions about the current trip being limited to only those who were surveyed onboard buses.

More than 4 in 10 riders (43%) reported using TARC more than 5 days per week, with another 3 in 10 (28%) reporting using TARC exactly 5 days per week. Those without access to a car were significantly more likely to report using TARC more than 5 days per week, with about one-half (49%) reporting this compared to one-quarter (26%) of those with access to a car.

Table 7: TARC frequency of use

How often do you typically use TARC? (Q4)

Current Riders (n=1,203)

Less than once a week 4%

1-3 days per week 14%

4 days per week 11%

5 days per week 28%

More than 5 days per week 43%

Average 4.5

Median 4.5

Base=Those answering who have used TARC in the last 6 months

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Home was the most common origin, accounting for nearly half (48%) of all trips. About 3 in 10 (29%) riders reported coming from work.

Table 8: Origin type

Where are you coming from now? (Q6)

Current Riders (n=1,078)

Home 48%

Work 29%

Shopping/Restaurant 6%

Doctor, Medical service, or hospital (non-work only) 5%

Recreation/social 5%

School/college (student only) 3%

Religious community 1%

Sporting or special event <1%

Airport (passengers only) <1%

Other 2%

Base=Onboard respondents answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Home and work were also the two most common destinations, with more than 4 in 10 (44%) reporting going home, and around 3 in 10 (31%) reporting going to work.

Table 9: Destination Type

What type of place is your final destination on this one-way trip? (Q7)

Current Riders (n=1,051)

Home 44%

Work 31%

Recreation/social 6%

Shopping/Restaurant 5%

Doctor, Medical Service, or hospital (non-work only) 4%

School/college (student only) 4%

Religious community 2%

Sporting or special <1%

Airport (passengers only) <1%

Other 3%

Base=Onboard respondents answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Trips were categorized by their combined origin and destination into the following categories:

Home-based work – trips that have an O-D combination of home and work.

Home-based other – trips that have an O-D combination of home and another location.

Non-home-based work – trips that have an O-D combination of a non-home location and work.

Non-home-based other – trips that have an O-D combination of home and another location.

More than half (53%) of all trips were categorized as home-based work, and another 35% were categorized as home-based other. Those with low incomes were significantly more likely to be making home-based trips somewhere other than work, with over 4 in 10 (43%) trips compared to less than 3 in 10 (29%) of those who are not classified as low income.

Figure 10: Trip type

Total

Home-based work 53%

Home-based other 35%

Non-home based work 6%

Non-home based other 6%

Weekday

Home-based work 56%

Home-based other 33%

Non-home based work 6%

Non-home based other 6%

Weekend

Home-based work 46%

Home-based other 41%

Non-home based work 6%

Non-home based other 7%

Satisfaction

Those who have ridden TARC were asked to rate their satisfaction with TARC’s general performance. Lapsed and non-riders were significantly more likely to give ratings of 5 and lower (46%) compared to just 2 in 10 (22%) riders. Riders were significantly more likely to give ratings of 8 or higher with over half (53%) giving these high ratings compared to about 1 in 4 (24%) lapsed riders.

Table 10: General satisfaction

How would you rate your satisfaction with TARC’s overall general performance? (Q11A)

Total (n=1,141)

Net 0-5 41%

Net 6-7 29%

Net 8-10 31%

Average 6.0

Median 6.0

Current Riders (n=1,031)

Net 0-5 22%

Net 6-7 25%

Net 8-10 53%

Average 7.4

Median 8.0

Non/Lapsed (n=110)

Net 0-5 46%

Net 6-7 30%

Net 8-10 24%

Average 5.5

Median 6.0

Base=Those answering who have ridden TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

These patterns remained similar when people were asked how likely they would be to recommend TARC to a friend or colleague.

This can be used to calculate TARC’s net promotor score (NPS), which is a good measure of word-of-mouth, which can have a tremendous impact on whether the public views TARC service positively or negatively and whether or not people will consider using TARC. TARC is viewed positively in general by current riders (+14 NPS). Notably, however, TARC is viewed very negatively by former riders (-49).

Table 11: Likelihood to recommend TARC

How likely would you be to recommend using TARC to a friend or colleague? (Q11B)

Total (n=1,155)

Detractors (0-6) 60%

Passives (7-8) 19%

Promoters (9-10) 21%

Average 5.5

Median 5.0

Net Promoter Score -49

Current Riders (n=1,021)

Detractors (0-6) 31%

Passives (7-8) 25%

Promoters (9-10) 45%

Average 7.5

Median 8.0

Net Promoter Score +14

Non/Lapsed (n=134)

Detractors (0-6) 67%

Passives (7-8) 17%

Promoters (9-10) 16%

Average 5.0

Median 5.0

Net Promoter Score -49

Base=Those answering who have ridden TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Lapsed and non-riders were asked whether they agreed with a series of questions regarding why they do not use TARC. By far, the most common reason was that they simply prefer other modes of transportation, with 9 in 10 (90%) agreeing that this is a reason they do not use TARC. Additionally, there were a number of other reasons people said they don’t ride – lack of knowledge of the system, lack of shelters, wait times, concerns about crime and harassment, span, and inability to get where they need to go. These were all reported by between 5 and 6 in 10 people (51% to 59%)

While bus fares were the least common answer overall, nearly 4 in 10 (37%) low-income non-riders reported that bus fares being too expensive is a reason they don’t ride.

People under 35 were significantly more likely to report inconvenience-based reasons for not riding, with significant portions reporting wait times being too long, buses being too crowded, buses being unreliable, and too many transfers.

Figure 11: Reasons for not using TARC

I do not currently ride TARC because...

(n=224-353)

I prefer other modes of transportation 90% Agree 4% Disagree

I don't know which buses will take me where I want to go 59% Agree 19% Disagree

There is a lack of shelter or protection from the weather at bus stops 58% Agree 18% Disagree

Wait times for buses are too long 56% Agree 14% Disagree

I am concerned about harassment and crime at bus stops 56% Agree 24% Disagree

I am concerned about harassment and crime onboard buses 53% Agree 24% Disagree

Buses don't operate when I need to travel 52% Agree 16% Disagree

The buses don't take me where I want to go 51% Agree 17% Disagree

I have to transfer too many times 46% Agree 18% Disagree

Buses are not reliable 31% Agree 29% Disagree

Buses are too crowded 15% Agree 43% Disagree

Bus fares are too expensive 12% Agree 50% Disagree

Base=Non-riders or lapsed riders answering

Please rate your agreement with the following statements. I do not ride TARC because… (Q12.)

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Transit Reliance

Transit reliance is the level of reliance on public transportation that an individual has in order to travel. The questions used to determine transit reliance for this study were:

* Q18, “Do you have access to a car or motorcycle in your household?”;
* Q19, “Do you have a valid driver’s license?”; and
* Q19B, “Thinking about your most recent trip on TARC, if TARC had not been available, how would you have made your trip?”

Depending on the responses to these questions, riders were categorized as being either Extremely Reliant, Highly Reliant, Moderately Reliant, or Not Reliant on public transit. These were defined as:

* Extremely Reliant – Would not have made this trip if TARC was not available;
* Highly Reliant – Would have made the trip another way if TARC was not available, but do not have a valid driver’s license;
* Moderately Reliant – Do have a valid driver's license, but do not have access to a working vehicle; and
* Not Reliant – Would have driven themselves were TARC not available.

Almost six in ten riders (56%) can be categorized as extremely or highly reliant on transit. Low-income riders were significantly more likely to be categorized as extremely and highly reliant, with nearly one-fourth (24%) in the former and over 4 in 10 (42%) in the latter compared to those who are not low- income.

Table 12: Transit reliance

Transit Reliance

Total (n=964)

Extremely Reliant 19%

Highly Reliant 37 %

Moderately Reliant 30%

Not Reliant 14%

Current Riders (n=964)

Extremely Reliant 19%

Highly Reliant 37 %

Moderately Reliant 30%

Not Reliant 14%

Non/Lapsed

N/A

Base=Those who have ridden TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

There is a great disparity between riders and non-riders in both car ownership and driver’s license possession. Only about one-fifth (21%) of riders have access to a car, while nearly all (97%) non-riders do. Similarly, less than half (45%) of riders have a valid driver’s license while the vast majority (98%) of lapsed and non-riders report having a valid driver's license.

Table 13: Access to a vehicle and driver’s license

Do you have access to a car or motorcycle in your household? (Q18)

Total (n=1,309)

Yes 91% No 9%

Current Riders (n=940)

Yes 21% No 79%

Non/Lapsed (n=369)

Yes 97% No 3%

Do you have a valid driver’s license? (Q19)

Total (n=1,294)

Yes 94% No 6%

Current Riders (n=926)

Yes 45% No 55%

Non/Lapsed (n=368)

Yes 98% No 2%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Those who have ridden TARC were asked how they would have made their last TARC trip were the service not available. Lapsed riders were significantly more likely to report that they would have driven a vehicle, with nearly half (47%) doing so compared to 1 in 8 riders (12%). Riders were significantly more likely to report using modes such as rideshare (30% compared to 14%), walking (21% compared to 7%), bicycling (5% compared to 1%), and not making the trip at all (15% compared to 8%).

Table 14: Alternate trip mode

Thinking about your most recent trip on TARC, if TARC had not been available, how would you have made your trip? (Q19B)

Total (n=1,014)

Drive a vehicle directly to your final destination 42%

Ride with someone to your final destination 20%

Rideshare service such as Uber, Lyft or Taxi 16%

Walk 9%

Bike or scooter to your final destination 2%

Some other way 2%

Would not make this trip 10%

Current Riders (n=862)

Drive a vehicle directly to your final destination 12%

Ride with someone to your final destination 15%

Rideshare service such as Uber, Lyft or Taxi 30%

Walk 21%

Bike or scooter to your final destination 5%

Some other way 4%

Would not make this trip 15%

Non/Lapsed (n=152)

Drive a vehicle directly to your final destination 47%

Ride with someone to your final destination 20%

Rideshare service such as Uber, Lyft or Taxi 14%

Walk 7%

Bike or scooter to your final destination 1%

Some other way 2%

Would not make this trip 8%

Base=Those answering who have ridden TARC

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Demographics

The average TARC rider is significantly younger (43.1) than the average lapsed or non-rider (54.3). TARC riders are significantly more likely to fall into all age groups below 44 when compared to lapsed and non-riders.

Table 15: Age

Please select the category that includes your age. (Q2)

Total (n=1,553)

18 to 24 3%

25 to 34 13%

35 to 44 15%

45 to 64 37%

65 or older 32%

Average 53.2

Median 55.0

Current Riders (n=1,182)

18 to 24 13%

25 to 34 20%

35 to 44 22%

45 to 64 36%

65 or older 9%

Average 43.1

Median 41.9

Non/Lapsed (n=371)

18 to 24 1%

25 to 34 12%

35 to 44 14%

45 to 64 36%

65 or older 35%

Average 54.3

Median 56.4

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

TARC riders are more likely to live alone, with over 3 in 10 reporting this compared to one-fourth of non-riders saying the same.

Table 16: Household size

Including yourself, how many people live in your household? (Q20)

Total (n=1,173)

1 26%

Net: 2+ 74%

Average 2.3

Median 2.0

Current Riders (n=829)

1 34%

Net: 2+ 66%

Average 2.8

Median 2.0

Non/Lapsed (n=344)

1 25%

Net: 2+ 75%

Average 2.2

Median 2.0

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

TARC riders have a significantly lower average income compared to lapsed and non-riders. TARC riders have a median household income of $25,000. Current riders are far more likely to be low income with nearly half (48%) receiving the distinction compared to just 1 in 20 (5%) of non-riders.

Table 17: Income

Which of the following best describes your total annual income? (Q21)

Total (n=1,179), Current Riders (n=884), Non/Lapsed (n=295)

Less than $15,000 Total 4% Current 27% Non 1%

$15,000 to less than $20,000 Total 2% Current 14% Non 1%

$20,000 to less than $25,000 Total 2% Current 9% Non 2%

$25,000 to less than $30,000 Total 4% Current 10% Non 2%

$30,000 to less than $35,000 Total 3% Current 6% Non 3%

$35,000 to less than $40,000 Total 1% Current 7% Non 1%

$40,000 to less than $45,000 Total 3% Current 7% Non 3%

$45,000 to less than $50,000 Total 5% Current 6% Non 5%

$50,000 to less than $75,000 Total 15% Current 6% Non 16%

$75,000 to less than $100,000 Total 14% Current 4% Non 15%

$100,000 to less than $125,000 Total 14% Current 1% Non 16%

$125,000 to less than $150,000 Total 7% Current 1% Non 8%

$150,000 to less than $200,000 Total 11% <1% Non 12%

$200,000 or more Total 13% Current <1% Non 15%

Average, Total $107.4k, Current $32.1k, Non $115.2k

Median, Total $92.1k, Current $25.0k, Non 99.9k

% low income, Total 9%, Current 48%, Non 5%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Nearly 3 in 10 TARC riders speak a language other than English at home, which is significantly higher than the 6% of lapsed and non-riders who do the same.

Table 18: Language spoken at home

Do you speak a language other than English at home? (Q22)

Total (n=1,290)

Yes 8%, No 92%

Current Riders (n=924)

Yes 29%, No 71%

Non/Lapsed

Yes 6%, No 94%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Of those who speak another language, the majority (58%) speak Spanish. Notably, over 1 in 3 people reported speaking a language that was not on the list.

Table 19: Language spoken at home continued

Which Language? (Q23)

Total (n=125)

Spanish (Including all dialects) 58%

Arabic 3%

French (Including all dialects) 1%

Chinese (Including Mandarin) 1%

Somali 1%

Vietnamese 1%

Other 36%

Current Riders (n=120)

Spanish (Including all dialects) 54%

Arabic 8%

French (Including all dialects) 3%

Chinese (Including Mandarin) 2%

Somali 2%

Vietnamese 2%

Other 29%

Non/Lapsed (n=5)

Spanish (including all dialects) 60%

Other 40%

Base=Those who speak another language at home and answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

The three language-focused questions were examined in conjunction to determine the portion of people who speak a language other than English and speak English less than very well. These are the people who would benefit most from multilingual signage. Riders are significantly more likely to speak Spanish and speak English less than very well, making up 3% of riders compared to 1% of lapsed and non-riders. In total, 1 in 20 (5%) riders speak a language other than English and speak English less than very well.

Table 20: English Proficiency by alternate language

English Proficiency

Total (n=1,250)

Speaks primarily English 93%

Speaks English very well 6%

Speaks English less than very well 1%

Spanish 1%

French (Including all dialects) <1%

Arabic <1%

Somali <1%

Chinese (Including Mandarin) <1%

Other <1%

Current Riders (n=884)

Speaks primarily English 75%

Speaks English very well 20%

Speaks English less than very well 5%

Spanish 3%

French (Including all dialects) <1%

Arabic <1%

Somali <1%

Chinese (Including Mandarin) <1%

Other 1%

Non/Lapsed (n=366)

Speaks primarily English 94%

Speaks English very well 5%

Speaks English less than very well 1%

Spanish 1%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Nearly 8 in 10 of those who speak another language report still speaking English “very well.” When including those who do not speak another language, 94% of riders speak English very well overall.

Table 21: English proficiency

How well do you speak English? (Q24)

Total (n=238)

Very well 87%

Well 4%

Not well 9%

Not at all <1%

Current Riders

Very well 78%

Well 13%

Not well 7%

Not at all 1%

Non/Lapsed (n=13)

Very well 90%

Not well 10%

Base=Those who speak another language and answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Four-fifths of riders (79%) report being employed and are significantly more likely to be employed than lapsed and non-riders (64%). Notably, this difference is partially accounted for by 3 in 10 non-riders who are retired (compared to less than 1 in 10 riders). Riders and lapsed/non-riders are employed full time at similar rates, but riders are significantly more likely to be employed part-time, with nearly 2 in 10 (18%) compared to less than 1 in 10 (6%) of lapsed and non-riders.

Table 22: Employment status

What is your current employment status? (Q25)

Total (n=1,061)

Net: Employed 65%

Employed full time (30 or more hours per week) 57%

Employed part time (less than 30 hours per week) 7%

Student, also employed <1%

Self employed 1%

Net: Not employed 34%

Student, not employed <1%

Unemployed, furloughed or disabled 4%

Retired 29%

Homemaker 1%

Other <1%

Current Riders (n=700)

Net: Employed 79%

Employed full time (30 or more hours per week) 54%

Employed part time (less than 30 hours per week) 18%

Student, also employed 3%

Self employed N/A

Net: Not employed 25%

Student, not employed 4%

Unemployed, furloughed or disabled 14%

Retired 7%

Homemaker N/A

Other 1%

Non/Lapsed (n=361)

Net: Employed 64%

Employed full time (30 or more hours per week) 57%

Employed part time (less than 30 hours per week) 6%

Student, also employed <1%

Self employed 1%

Net: Not employed 35%

Student, not employed N/A

Unemployed, furloughed or disabled 3%

Retired 31%

Homemaker 1%

Other <1%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

The most common industry of employment among all surveyed is healthcare, with about 2 in 10 (22%) working in this field. Three in ten (29%) riders working in hospitality, food, recreation, or leisure, which is significantly greater than the 1 in 20 (4%) lapsed and non-riders in the same field.

Table 23: Employment industry

What type of industry do you work in? (Q27)

Total (n=646)

Healthcare 22%

Education 11%

Industrials 10%

Financial/Insurance 9%

Professional services such as law or consulting 8%

Federal or State government 7%

Hospitality, food, recreation or leisure 6%

Retail or E-commerce 4%

Public or social services 4%

Media or creative industries 3%

Warehousing 3%

Transport or logistics (such as shipping) 2%

Data infrastructure or telecommunications 2%

Energy or utilities 2%

Non-profit 2%

Childcare 2%

Agriculture, forestry or mining <1%

Life sciences (such as lab technician or microbiologist) <1%

Something else 3%

Current Riders (n=438)

Healthcare 15%

Education 4%

Industrials 5%

Financial/Insurance <1%

Professional services such as law or consulting 2%

Federal or State government 3%

Hospitality, food, recreation or leisure 29%

Retail or E-commerce 7%

Public or social services 6%

Media or creative industries 1%

Warehousing 16%

Transport or logistics (such as shipping) 5%

Data infrastructure or telecommunications <1%

Energy or utilities 1%

Non-profit N/A

Childcare <1%

Agriculture, forestry or mining 1%

Life sciences (such as lab technician or microbiologist) <1%

Something else 5%

Non/Lapsed (n=208)

Healthcare 22%

Education 12%

Industrials 10%

Financial/Insurance 10%

Professional services such as law or consulting 9%

Federal or State government 7%

Hospitality, food, recreation or leisure 4%

Retail or E-commerce 4%

Public or social services 3%

Media or creative industries 3%

Warehousing 2%

Transport or logistics (such as shipping) 2%

Data infrastructure or telecommunications 2%

Energy or utilities 2%

Non-profit 2%

Childcare 2%

Agriculture, forestry or mining N/A

Life sciences (such as lab technician or microbiologist) N/A

Something else 3%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Riders are also significantly more likely to be considered essential workers, with three-fourths (76%) saying they are an essential worker compared to only about half (54%) of lapsed and non-riders.

Table 24: Essential worker status

Are you considered an essential worker? (Q28)

Total (n=621)

Yes 56%, No 44%

Current Riders (n=416)

Yes 76%, No 24%

Non/Lapsed (n=205)

Yes 54%, No 46%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Two-thirds of riders (66%) are African-American/Black. Lapsed and non-riders are overwhelmingly more likely to be Caucasian or white (75%), compared to one in seven (15%) riders. This reflects ongoing trends in ridership after the pandemic, where many systems have seen decreases in the proportion of riders who are White or Caucasian and increases in the proportion of riders who are People of Color.

Table 25: Race/ethnicity

What is your race or ethnicity? (Q29)

Total (n=1,374)

Caucasian or white only 69%

Net: POC 31%

African American or Black 18%

Hispanic or Latino 5%

Asian 4%

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander 2%

American Indian or Native Alaska Native 1%

Middle Eastern/North Africa 1%

Multi-Racial <1%

Other <1%

Current Riders (n=1,035)

Caucasian or white only 15%

Net: POC 85%

African American or Black 66%

Hispanic or Latino 11%

Asian 3%

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander 1%

American Indian or Native Alaska Native 5%

Middle Eastern/North Africa 1%

Multi-Racial 1%

Other 2%

Non/Lapsed (n=339)

Caucasian or white only 75%

Net: POC 25%

African American or Black 13%

Hispanic or Latino 4%

Asian 4%

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander 2%

American Indian or Native Alaska Native 1%

Middle Eastern/North Africa 1%

Multi-Racial N/A

Other N/A

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Nearly 6 in 10 riders (58%) are male, which is significantly higher than the less than half (47%) of lapsed and non-riders.

Table 26: Gender identity

What is your gender identity? (Q30)

Total (n=1,045)

Female 51%

Male 48%

Non-Binary 1%

You use a different term <1%

Current Riders (n=1,045)

Female 41%

Male 58%

Non-Binary 1%

You use a different term <1%

Non/Lapsed

Female 52%

Male 47%

Non-Binary 1%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

On average, riders have a lower level of education, with levels below an associates or technical degree being significantly more common among riders. Bachelor’s degrees and graduate degrees are significantly more common among lapsed and non-riders.

Table 27: Education level

What is your highest level or education? (Q31)

Total (n=1,379)

Less than high school 1%

High School or GED 10%

Some college credit 15%

Associates or technical degree 9%

Bachelor’s or undergraduate degree 30%

Graduate or professional degree 35%

Current Riders (n=1,017)

Less than high school 8%

High School or GED 48%

Some college credit 20%

Associates or technical degree 10%

Bachelor’s or undergraduate degree 9%

Graduate or professional degree 6%

Non/Lapsed (n=362)

Less than high school <1%

High School or GED 7%

Some college credit 14%

Associates or technical degree 9%

Bachelor’s or undergraduate degree 32%

Graduate or professional degree 38%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Riders are more likely to report having a disability (21%) compared to less than 1 in 10 (9%) lapsed and non-riders

Table 28: Disability status

Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (Q32)

Total (n=1,264)

Yes 10%

No 90%

Current Riders (n=906)

Yes 21%

No 79%

Non/Lapsed (n=358)

Yes 9%

No 91%

Base=Those answering

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Among those with disabilities, the most common mobility devices used are support canes and wheelchairs.

Table 29: Mobility devices

Do you use any of the following mobility devices when riding? (Q33)

Total (n=213)

Net: Use mobility device 41%

Support cane 25%

Manual wheelchair 15%

Scooter 6%

Respirator tank 5%

Walker 3%

Braces 1%

Long cane (for the blind) 1%

Current Riders (n=181)

Net: Use mobility device 39%

Support cane 16%

Manual wheelchair 1%

Scooter 1%

Respirator tank 2%

Walker 7%

Braces 5%

Long cane (for the blind) 4%

Non/Lapsed (n=32)

Net: Use mobility device 42%

Support cane 27%

Manual wheelchair 18%

Scooter 7%

Respirator tank 6%

Walker 3%

Braces N/A

Long cane (for the blind) N/A

Base=Those answering who have a disability

\*Top Mentions

Superscript letters (e.g., B, or C) indicate that the labeled percentage is significantly higher than the percentage in the corresponding segment (i.e., B for current riders, C for non-riders/lapsed riders.)

Methodology

The survey was administered in two ways – a paper survey distributed onboard that riders could either fill out and return to a survey distributor onboard the bus, fill out later and return by mail, or go online to complete; and mail invitations sent to a sampling of households in the TARC service area giving recipients the options of completing the survey online, calling WBA’s call center to complete the survey by phone, or receiving a telephone call from WBA asking them to complete the survey by phone.

The questionnaire was developed by both TARC staff and the research team. It contained 33 questions and took approximately ten minutes to complete. The questionnaire was available in both English and Spanish.

In total, 3,500 English paper surveys and 350 Spanish surveys were printed (3,850 printed surveys in total). For the general public survey, 25,000 letters were printed and mailed to residents in TARC’s service area, a technique known as address-based sampling (ABS).

The online version of the questionnaire could be accessed via a QR code or shortlink on both the paper questionnaire and invitation letter. Respondents then used a unique ID from the paper copy of the survey/mail invitation to access the survey online. This unique ID allowed the research team to link paper and web surveys to the trip on which they were distributed or the household to which the survey was sent.

The survey covered the following key topics:

* Preferences for TARC service,
* Trip characteristics,
* Frequency of TARC use,
* Transit reliance,
* Demographics and Title VI information.

Once the survey was completed, customers were invited to enter into a drawing to win a $100 gift card as a thank you for participating. This incentive was also advertised by interviewers to help improve response rates.

Onboard Sampling Plan

A sampling plan for onboard distribution was designed based on ridership from October 2024 to determine how many completed surveys would be needed by each surveyed route and by each day part (Weekday, Weekend), and the estimated number of survey distribution shifts needed to collect those surveys. Additionally, once the sampling plan was approved, the research team further divided the weekday quotas by time period (AM peak, PM peak, and off peak), to ensure responses were representative of a typical day. The sampling plan included the majority of routes, with input from TARC on routes to prioritize.

A sampling plan for ABS surveying was designed based on the TARC service area. 25,000 invitation letters were mailed to addresses with ZIP codes within the area that TARC serves. A list of these ZIP codes, along with the onboard sampling plan is located in Appendix 2: Sampling Plan.

Survey Methodology

For the onboard portion of the survey, data was collected between April 21st and April 26th, 2024. Interviewers boarded buses and distributed paper surveys. For the general population portion of the study, data was collected between April 2nd and April 21st, 2024. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix 4: Survey Tool.

Data Cleaning and Quality Control

Following the end of data collection, initial cross-tabulations were run to examine the data in total and identify any remaining outliers or entry errors.

Data Weighting

In order to adjust the data to be representative of the system as a whole, smoothing weights were created and applied to each record to make them representative of the region for both riders and non-riders, and by route among riders. Weights to the proportion of riders versus non-riders was determined based on public transportation usage for the greater Louisville area from the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS). The total data were also weighted by race/ethnicity and household income based on American Community Survey (ACS) data for the area. Additional rider-specific weights were calculated using ridership during the fielding period provided by TARC. A full explanation of the process and the final weights can be found in Appendix 3: Weighting Methodology.

Appendix 1: Survey Totals

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Route  | Total  | AM peak  | PM Peak  | Off Peak  | Weekend  |
| 2  | 26  | 6  | -  | 20  | -  |
| 4  | 128  | 22  | 13  | 48  | 45  |
| 6  | 130  | 16  | -  | 69  | 45  |
| 10  | 135  | 14  | 15  | 91  | 15  |
| 15  | 52  | -  | 29  | 13  | 10  |
| 17  | 21  | 2  | -  | 19  | -  |
| 18  | 17  | 7  | -  | 10  | -  |
| 19  | 132  | -  | 22  | 61  | 49  |
| 21  | 41  | 6  | -  | 23  | 12  |
| 22  | 8  | -  | 3  | 5  | -  |
| 23  | 168  | 14  | 27  | 78  | 49  |
| 27  | 43  | -  | 29  | 14  | -  |
| 28  | 124  | -  | 18  | 23  | 83  |
| 29  | 29  | 8  | -  | 21  | -  |
| 31  | 2  | -  | -  | 2  | -  |
| 40  | 12  | -  | 5  | 7  | -  |
| 43  | 55  | -  | 9  | 11  | 35  |
| 52  | 2  | -  | -  | 2  | -  |
| 63  | 39  | -  | 16  | 23  | -  |
| 71  | 27  | 1  | -  | 26  | -  |
| 72  | 15  | -  | 12  | 3  | -  |
| Total  | 1,206  | 96  | 198  | 569  | 343  |

Appendix 2: Sampling Plan

Route No. 4

Route Name: Fourth Street

Obj ID, 1

Route Type F

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 46,515

Daily Average: 2,114

Weekend

Total Boardings: 8,414

Daily Average: 940

Weekday Shifts: 3

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 6

Route Name: Sixth Street

Obj ID, 5

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 14,456

Daily Average: 657

Weekend

Total Boardings: 3,006

Daily Average: 339

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 10

Route Name: Dixie Highway RAPD

Obj ID, 2

Route Type F

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 38,134

Daily Average: 1,733

Weekend

Total Boardings: 9,083

Daily Average: 1,020

Weekday Shifts: 3

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 15

Route Name: Market Street

Obj ID, 7

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 24,199

Daily Average: 1,100

Weekend

Total Boardings: 3,587

Daily Average: 403

Weekday Shifts: 2

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 17

Route Name: Bardstown Road

Obj ID, 8

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 9,378

Daily Average: 426

Weekend

Total Boardings: 1,918

Daily Average: 216

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 18

Route Name: 18th Street – Dixie Highway

Obj ID, 9

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 13,276

Daily Average: 603

Weekend

Total Boardings: 3,049

Daily Average: 339

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 19

Route Name: Muhammad Ali Blvd

Obj ID, 10

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 30,044

Daily Average: 1,366

Weekend

Total Boardings: 5,870

Daily Average: 661

Weekday Shifts: 3

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 22

Route Name: Twenty-Second Street

Obj ID, 12

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 977

Daily Average: 44

Weekend

Total Boardings:

Daily Average:

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 23

Route Name: Broadway

Obj ID, 3

Route Type F

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 85,706

Daily Average: 3,896

Weekend

Total Boardings: 14,492

Daily Average: 1,612

Weekday Shifts: 7

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 27

Route Name: Hill Street

Obj ID, 14

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 10,767

Daily Average: 489

Weekend

Total Boardings: 2,337

Daily Average: 262

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 28

Route Name: Jackson Street – Preston Highway

Obj ID, 15

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 48,401

Daily Average: 2,200

Weekend

Total Boardings: 8,688

Daily Average: 982

Weekday Shifts: 3

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 29

Route Name: Eastern Parkway

Obj ID, 16

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 15,600

Daily Average: 709

Weekend

Total Boardings: 2,976

Daily Average: 335

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 31

Route Name: Shelbyville Road

Obj ID, 17

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 9,327

Daily Average: 424

Weekend

Total Boardings: 1,758

Daily Average: 194

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 40

Route Name: Taylorsville Road

Obj ID, 18

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 10,089

Daily Average: 459

Weekend

Total Boardings: 1,499

Daily Average: 170

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 43

Route Name: Poplar Level

Obj ID, 19

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 19,400

Daily Average: 882

Weekend

Total Boardings: 2,785

Daily Average: 307

Weekday Shifts: 2

Weekend Shifts: 1

Route No. 63

Route Name: Crums Lane

Obj ID, 21

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 11,131

Daily Average: 506

Weekend

Total Boardings: 2,195

Daily Average: 245

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 71

Route Name: Jefferson-Louisville-New Albany

Obj ID, 22

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 9,601

Daily Average: 436

Weekend

Total Boardings: 2,056

Daily Average: 230

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

Route No. 72

Route Name: Clarksville

Obj ID, 23

Route Type L

Day WKD

Weekday

Total Boardings: 8,058

Daily Average: 366

Weekend

Total Boardings: 1,863

Daily Average: 208

Weekday Shifts: 1

Weekend Shifts:

ABS ZIP codes

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ZIP  | County  | State  | ZIP  | County  | State  |
| 47150  | Clark  | Indiana  | 40229  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 47129  | Clark  | Indiana  | 40228  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 47130  | Clark  | Indiana  | 40213  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40258  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40218  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40272  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40206  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40118  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40205  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40216  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40280  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40211  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40041  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40212  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40207  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40214  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40220  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40215  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40222  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40209  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40291  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40210  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40243  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40208  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40223  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40292  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40299  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40203  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40025  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40217  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40242  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40204  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40241  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40202  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40023  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |
| 40219  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  | 40245  | Jefferson  | Kentucky  |

Appendix 3: Weighting Methodology

All results from questions asked of the general population were weighted by rider type, ethnicity, and income level.

Results from riders were weighted by route ridership proportionally to other routes. In order to calculate expansion weights:

1. The average daily ridership for each given day type and route was calculated using ridership provided to the research team by TARC.

2. Then, average daily ridership for each route on a given day type was divided by the number of records from each route on that day type to calculate the expansion weight. Full rider expansion weights are shown in the table below.

Average daily ridership by route / Records: Completed Surveys by route = Expansion Weight

Route No. Route Type Day Route Name Avg Monthly Riders Sample Weight

2 5,467 26 0.50314

4 F WKD Fourth St 54,929 128 1.02684

6 L WKD Sixth St 17,462 130 0.32141

10 F WKD Dixie H. R. 47.217 135 0.83691

15 L WKD Market St 27,786 52 1.27860

17 L WKD Bardstown Rd 11,296 21 1.28711

18 L WKD 18th, Dixie 16,325 17 2.29782

21 16,732 41 0.97651

22 L WKD 22nd St. 977 8 0.29222

23 F WKD Broadway 100,198 168 1.42712

27 L WKD Hill St. 13,104 43 0.72920

28 L WKD Jackson/Prest. 57,089 124 1.10165

29 L WKD Eastern PKWY 18,576 29 1.53273

31 L WKD Shelbyville Rd. 11,085 2 13,26225

40 L WKD Taylorsville Rd. 11,588 12 2.31067

43 L WKD Poplar Level 22,185 55 0.96518

52 1,172 2 1.40220

63 L WKD Crums Lane 13,326 39 0.81761

71 L WKD Jeff/Lou/NA 11,657 27 1.03308

72 L WKD Clarksville 9,921 15 1.58262

Unknown/Abs Riders 39 1.00000

TOTAL 504,006 1245

Without Unknowns 1200

Appendix 4: Final Survey Instrument

WBA Research

24-208

March 2024

TARC Rider Survey

ONBOARD SURVEY: Please take a few minutes to help TARC plan for your transit needs by completing this survey. If you complete this survey you can be entered into a random drawing to receive 1 of 10 $100 gift cards. All personal information will be kept strictly confidential and WILL NOT be shared or sold.

GENERAL PUBLIC SURVEY: Please take a few minutes to complete this survey and allow regional transportation providers learn about your travel choices and help to inform future transportation investments around the Louisville region. If you complete this survey you can be entered into a random drawing to receive 1 of 10 $100 gift cards. All personal information will be kept strictly confidential and WILL NOT be shared or sold.

CATI: Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and I am calling from WBA Research, a national research firm. We are conducting a survey regarding customer satisfaction on behalf of regional transportation providers in the Louisville area. We are not selling anything; this is strictly for research purposes and we are only interested in your opinions. All personal information will be kept strictly confidential and WILL NOT be shared or sold. In order to ensure quality, this call may be monitored or recorded. (READ IF NECESSARY: This survey will take around 10 minutes to complete.)

PROGRAMMER NOTE: “READ LIST” and other instructions for phone administered survey only.

Screener

Q1. What is the ZIP code of your primary residence?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ [FORCE 12345 FORMAT]

99998 Refused  THANK & TERMINATE

Q2. Please select the category that includes your age. (READ LIST.)

01 Under 18  THANK & TERMINATE

02 18 - 24

03 25 - 34

04 35 - 44

05 45 - 64

06 65 or older

98 DO NOT READ: Refused  THANK & TERMINATE

GENERAL PUBLIC SURVEY ONLY:

Q3A. Have you ever used TARC buses or TARC3 paratransit service to get around in the Louisville region?

01 Yes

02 No

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Refused

THOSE WHO HAVE USED TARC AT ANY POINT [Q3A(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q3. Have you used TARC in the last 6 months?

 Yes No DNR: DK/Rfsd

1. TARC local buses 01 02 99
2. TARC3 Paratransit service 01 02 99

RIDER TYPE TRACKING QUOTA

Non-Riders/Lapsed Riders: [(Q3A(02,99)) OR (Q3A(01) AND Q3(02,99) TO ALL)]

Riders: [(Q3A(01) AND Q3(01 TO EITHER)) OR ONBOARD]

THOSE WHO HAVE USED TARC IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS [Q3(01) TO ANY], ASK:

Q4. How often do you typically use TARC?

01 Less than once a week

02 1-3 days per week

03 4 days per week

04 5 days per week

05 More than 5 days per week

98 DO NOT READ: Refused

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Not sure

THOSE WHO HAVE USED EVER USED TARC [Q3A(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q5. Just prior to the COVID-19 stay at home orders were implemented in 2020 (i.e., January to March of 2020), how often did you typically use TARC?

00

I did not use TARC prior to the COVID-19 pandemic

01

Less than once a week

02

1-3 days per week

03

4 days per week

04

5 days per week

05

More than 5 days per week

98

DO NOT READ: Refused

99

DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Not sure

GENERAL PUBLIC SURVEY ONLY:

Q3A. Have you ever used TARC buses or TARC3 paratransit service to get around in the Louisville region?

03 Yes

04 No

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Refused

THOSE WHO HAVE USED TARC AT ANY POINT [Q3A(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q3. Have you used TARC in the last 6 months?

 Yes No DNR: DK/Rfsl

1. TARC local buses 01 02 99
2. TARC3 paratransit service 01 02 99

RIDER TYPE TRACKING QUOTA

Non-Riders/Lapsed Riders: [(Q3A(02,99)) OR (Q3A(01) AND Q3(02,99) TO ALL)]

Riders: [(Q3A(01) AND Q3(01 TO EITHER)) OR ONBOARD]

THOSE WHO HAVE USED TARC IN THE LAST 6 MONTHS [Q3(01) TO ANY], ASK:

Q4. How often do you typically use TARC?

06 Less than once a week

07 1-3 days per week

08 4 days per week

09 5 days per week

10 More than 5 days per week

98 DO NOT READ: Refused

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Not sure

THOSE WHO HAVE USED EVER USED TARC [Q3A(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q5. Just prior to the COVID-19 stay at home orders were implemented in 2020 (i.e., January to March of 2020), how often did you typically use TARC?

00

I did not use TARC prior to the COVID-19 pandemic

01

Less than once a week

02

1-3 days per week

03

4 days per week

04

5 days per week

05

More than 5 days per week

98

DO NOT READ: Refused

99

DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Not sure

THOSE WHO ARE ONBOARD, ASK:

Q6. Where are you COMING FROM NOW? This is the starting place of the one-way trip where you received this survey. (SELECT ONE.)

01 Home

02 Work

03 Recreation/Social

04 School/College (student only)

05 Doctor, medical service, or hospital (non-work only)

06 Shopping/Restaurant

07 Religious/Community

08 Airport (passengers only)

09 Sporting or special event

95 Other (specify)

98 DO NOT READ: Prefer not to answer

Q7. What TYPE OF PLACE is your FINAL DESTINATION on THIS ONE-WAY TRIP? (SELECT ONE.)

01 Home [DO NOT SHOW IF Q6(01)]

02 Work

03 Recreation/Social

04 School/College (student only)

05 Doctor, medical service, or hospital (non-work only)

06 Shopping/Restaurant

07 Religious/Community

08 Airport (passengers only)

09 Sporting or special event

95 Other (specify)

98 DO NOT READ: Prefer not to answer

TRIP CHARACTERISTICS

ASK EVERYONE:

Q8. In a TYPICAL WEEK, how many ONE-WAY trips do you take using each of the following for travel? If more than one method is used for a ONE-WAY trip, please count the method used for most of the distance of that trip.

Please count each round trip as two one-way trips.

# of one way trips for work or school / # of one way trips for other purposes

A. Walk for all or most of the trip

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

B. Drive or ride in a personal car, truck, SUV, moped, or motorcycle

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

C. [IF Q3A(01) OR ONBOARD]: Using TARC

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

D. [IF Q3A(01) OR ONBOARD]: Ride a personal bicycle to a TARC stop and ride TARC

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

E. Use a carpool or vanpool

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

F. Use another form of transportation (specify)

\_\_\_ Trips

\_\_\_ Trips

Thinking about all of the trips you take in a typical week, how many ONE-WAY trips do you take for the following purposes? Your best guess is fine. (READ LIST. RANDOMIZE A-D.)

Please count each round trip as two one-way trips.

A.

Shopping or errands

\_\_\_ Trips

B.

Employment or school

\_\_\_ Trips

C.

Medical appointments

\_\_\_ Trips

D.

Visiting, recreation, social, or out for a meal

\_\_\_ Trips

E.

Any other purposes (specify)

\_\_\_ Trips

Many places in the Louisville area currently do not have adequate bus service (including, perhaps, where you live). What one place would you travel to or from by bus if there was increased bus service to this place?

ONLINE ONLY: You can identify the location by dragging the red “choose location” marker to the map or enter the address or location manually in the provided text field and hit the search button.

ONBOARD:

Name of place/business/building:

Steet:

Cross Street 1 & 2:

City:

State:

ZIP:

97 There is nowhere I would travel by bus even if it went there

99 Not sure

NON-RIDERS ONLY [(Q3A(02,99)) OR (Q3A(01) AND Q3(02,99) TO ALL)], ASK:

Q11. How familiar would you say you are with TARC?

05 Very familiar

04 Somewhat familiar

02 Have heard of TARC, but not familiar with it

01 Never heard of TARC

IF TARC RIDER [Q3(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q11A. Using a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is very dissatisfied and 10 is very satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with TARC’s Overall General Performance?

00 Very dissatisfied – 10 Very satisfied

99 Don’t know

Q11B. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all likely and 10 is very likely, how likely would you be to recommend using TARC to a friend or colleague?

00 Not likely at all

10 Very likely

99 Don’t know

IF NON-RIDER OR LAPSED RIDER [(Q3A(02,99)) OR (Q3A(01) AND Q3(02,99) TO ALL)], ASK:

Q12A. Please rate your agreement with the following statements.

I do not ride TARC buses because… (RANDOMIZE.)

01 Completely disagree

02 Somewhat disagree

03 Neither agree nor disagree

04 Somewhat agree

05 Completely agree

I don’t know which buses will take me where I want to go

05

04

03

02

01

b. The buses don’t take me where I want to go

05

04

03

02

01

c. Wait times for buses are too long

05

04

03

02

01

d. I am concerned about harassment and crime onboard buses

05

04

03

02

01

e. I am concerned about harassment and crime at bus stops

05

04

03

02

01

f. I prefer other modes of transportation

05

04

03

02

01

g. Buses are too crowded

05

04

03

02

01

h. Bus fares are too expensive

05

04

03

02

01

i. Buses are not reliable

05

04

03

02

01

j. I have to transfer too many times

05

04

03

02

01

k. Buses don’t operate when I need to travel

05

04

03

02

01

l. There is a lack of shelter or protection from the weather at bus stops

05

04

03

02

01

TRANSIT CONCEPTS AND NEW SERVICES

ASK EVERYONE:

Q12. In the future, TARC may provide a service similar to Uber or Lyft. Customers will have the freedom to go from any point to any other point within a designated area in smaller vehicles just by using an app on their phones.

How likely would you be to use this service if it was available to you?

01 Very unlikely

02 Somewhat unlikely

03 Neither likely nor unlikely

04 Somewhat likely

05 Very likely

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Refused

THOSE WHO ARE LIKELY TO USE ON-DEMAND SERVICE [Q12(04-05)], ASK:

Q13. If TARC offered this service, would you use TARC about the same, somewhat more often, or much more often than you do now?

00 [NON-RIDERS AND LAPSED RIDERS ONLY [(Q3A(02,99)) OR (Q3A(01) AND Q3(02,99) TO ALL)]: I still would not use TARC

01 About the same

02 Somewhat more often

03 Much more often

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know/Refused

ASK EVERYONE:

SHOW TO ALL: Now for a different kind of question. TARC is a public agency that relies on a small percentage of tax dollars. It has only a limited number of buses and limited money to operate them. That means they have to make hard choices about how much service they can provide and where in the greater Louisville area they can provide it.

Q14. If you could tell TARC which of the following to choose, what would you tell them? (RANDOMIZE PUNCHES 01 & 02.)

01 TARC should focus on service every 15 minutes in areas with lots of jobs and schools, so that many people can rely on buses to get to work or school on time, but that means some people don’t have any service

02 TARC should provide service every hour or two throughout the area, so everyone has some bus service but very few people have frequent service to get to work or school on time

99 Not sure

Q15. As a public transportation service, TARC also has to decide whether to prioritize the needs of people who have fewer transportation choices. If you could tell TARC which of the following to choose, what would you tell them? (RANDOMIZE PUNCHES 01 & 02.)

01 Focus first on needs of communities where many people have low incomes or don’t have reliable access to a personal vehicle

02 Provide service equally to all communities, regardless of need, income or access to a personal vehicle

99 Not sure

Q16A. If you had to choose one of the following, which would you choose? (RANDOMIZE PUNCHES 01 & 02.)

01 A bus trip that requires no transfers, even if the trip takes longer

02 A bus trip that requires a transfer between buses but that makes the total trip shorter

99 Not sure

Q16B. If you had to choose one of the following, which would you choose? (RANDOMIZE PUNCHES 01 & 02.)

01 Walking a few extra blocks to a bus stop the bus arrives every 15 minutes or less

02 Walking to your current bus stop, but the bus only comes once every hour or less

Q17. If TARC were to improve service for existing routes, please indicate which one improvement would help you the most. (RANDOMIZE. ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY.)

01 More frequent service for existing routes

02 Longer hours of service for existing routes

03 More reliable service

04 Lower fares

05 Buses going to more places in the greater Louisville area

06 More direct service/Fewer transfers

07 Better sidewalk connections to TARC stops

08 Better bus stops

99 DO NOT READ: Don’t know

RIDER INFORMATION

These last few questions are for classification purposes only.

Q18. Do you have access to a car or motorcycle in your household?

01 Yes

02 No

98 Prefer not to answer

Q19. Do you have a valid driver’s license?

01 Yes

02 No

98 Prefer not to answer

IF TARC RIDER [Q3(01)] OR ONBOARD, ASK:

Q19B. Thinking about your most recent trip on TARC, if TARC had not been available, how would you have made your trip?

01 Drive a vehicle directly to your final destination

02 Ride with someone to your final destination

03 Rideshare service such as Uber, Lyft, or Taxi

04 Bike or scooter to your final destination

05 Walk

95 Some other way (specify)

96 Would not make this trip

99 Not sure

ASK EVERYONE:

Q20. Including yourself, how many people live in your household? (RANGE=1-9.)

\_\_\_ \_\_\_ number of people in household

10 10 or more people

98 Prefer not to answer

Q21. Which of the following BEST describes your TOTAL ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME in 2023 before taxes?

01 Less than $15,000

02 $15,000 to less than $20,000

03 $20,000 to less than $25,000

04 $25,000 to less than $30,000

05 $30,000 to less than $35,000

06 $35,000 to less than $40,000

07 $40,000 to less than $45,000

08 $45,000 to less than $50,000

09 $50,000 to less than $75,000

10 $75,000 to less than $100,000

11 $100,000 to less than $125,000

12 $125,000 to less than $150,000

13 $150,000 to less than $200,000

14 $200,000 or more

98 Prefer not to answer

Q22. Do you predominantly speak a language other than English at home?

01 Yes

02 No

98 Prefer not to answer

THOSE WHO SPEAK ANOTHER LANGUAGE [Q23(01)], ASK:

Q23. Which language?

01 Spanish (including all dialects)

02 Arabic

03 Vietnamese

04 Chinese (including Mandarin)

05 Somali

06 French (including all dialects)

95 Other (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

Q24. How well do you speak English?

04 Very well

03 Well

02 Not well

01 Not at all

98 Prefer not to answer

ASK EVERYONE:

Q25. What is your current employment status? (ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY.)

01 Employed full time (30 or more hours per week)

02 Employed part time (less than 30 hours per week)

03 Student, also employed

04 Student, not employed

05 Unemployed, furloughed, or disabled

06 Retired

95 Other (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

THOSE WHO ARE EMPLOYED OR IN SCHOOL [Q25(01-04)], ASK:

Q26. In a typical week, do you commute for work or school on weekends (Saturdays or Sundays)?

01 Yes; on Saturdays only

02 Yes; on Sundays only

03 Yes; on both Saturdays and Sundays

04 No; I do not commute for work or school on the weekends

THOSE WHO ARE EMPLOYED OR EMPLOYED AND IN SCHOOL [Q25(01-03)], ASK:

Q27. What type of industry do you work in? (ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY. READ LIST.)

01 Agriculture, forestry, or mining

02 Industrials (such as manufacturing or construction)

03 Energy or utilities

04 Transport or logistics (such as shipping)

15 Warehousing

05 Media or creative industries

06 Data infrastructure or telecommunications

07 Healthcare

08 Education

09 Life sciences (such as lab technician or microbiologist)

16 Military

17 Federal or state government

10 Retail or e-commerce (such as a store owner or employee)

11 Hospitality, food, recreation, or leisure travel

12 Public or social services

13 Financial/Insurance services

14 Professional services such as law or consulting

95 Something else (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

99 Don’t know

Q28. Are you considered an essential worker?

01 Yes

02 No

98 Prefer not to answer

ASK EVERYONE:

Q29. What is your race or ethnicity? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.)

01 African American or Black

02 American Indian or Alaska Native

03 Asian

04 Caucasian or White

05 Hispanic or Latino

06 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

07 Middle Eastern/North African

95 Other (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

Q30. What is your gender identity?

01 Female

02 Male

03 Non-binary

95 You use a different term (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

Q31. What is your highest level of education?

01 Less than high school

02 High school or GED

03 Some college credit

04 Associate’s or technical school degree

05 Bachelor’s or undergraduate degree

06 Graduate or professional degree

99 Don’t know/Prefer not to answer

Q32. Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

01 Yes

02 No

98 Prefer not to answer

THOSE WHO REPORT HAVING A DISABILITY [Q32(01)], ASK:

Q33. Do you use any of the following mobility device or devices when riding? If so, please select them from the following list. Select all that apply. (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY.)

97 I do not use mobility devices

01 Manual wheelchair

02 Motorized wheelchair

03 Scooter

04 Braces

05 Prosthesis

06 Service / Guide animal

07 Support cane

08 Long cane (for the blind)

09 Crutches

10 Walker

11 Respirator / Oxygen tank

95 Other (specify)

98 Prefer not to answer

ASK EVERYONE:

Q34. Please enter your name, email, and telephone number so we can send the gift card to you if you are selected. (Participation in drawing is optional)

Your Name:

Email:

Telephone Number:

99 Do not wish to enter drawing

Thank you for your help!