

# Metro Transit Onboard Survey 2024

Approach, Findings, and Analysis

# final report

prepared for

**Greater Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization** 

prepared by

#### Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

with

Canete Medina Consulting Group, Inc.

www.camsys.com

# Table of Contents

1.0	Intro	1-1						
	1.1	Survey Design to Understand Rider Characteristics and Travel Patterns	1-1					
	1.2	Supporting Transit Planning						
	1.3	Report Structure	1-2					
2.0	Que	stionnaire Design	2-4					
	2.1	Survey Structure and Contents						
	2.2	Comparison with the Previous Transit Onboard Questionnaire	2-5					
	2.3	Definition of a Completed Survey	2-5					
3.0	Sam	ipling Plan	3-6					
	3.1	Key Aspects						
	3.2	Route Group Targets						
	3.3	Route Targets						
	3.4	Weekend Surveying	3-10					
4.0	Surv	/ey Management	4-11					
	4.1	Identify Key Challenges	4-11					
	4.2	Survey Fieldwork Methodology	4-11					
		4.2.1 Methods to Engage Riders	4-11					
		4.2.2 Survey Collection Procedures	4-12					
		4.2.3 Field Data Retrieval	4-12					
		4.2.4 Surveyor Training	4-12					
		4.2.5 Survey Assignments	4-13					
5.0	Surv	/ey Pretest	5-13					
6.0	Logi	istics and Field Implementation	6-15					
	6.1	1 Survey Administration Team						
	6.2	2 Daily Management						
	6.3	3 Crew Transportation						
	6.4	.4 Field Supervisor Role						
	6.5	Survey Fieldworker Role						
	6.6	Field Surveyor Equipment	6-17					

	6.8	, Data Re	etrieval	6-18			
	0.0	Data Pit		0.10			
7.0	Surve	y Data (	Cleaning, Results, and Findings	7-19			
	7.1	Survey	Cleaning	7-19			
	7.2 Final Dataset						
	7.3 Summary Tables						
		7.3.1	Travel Patterns and Socio-demographics Cross-tabulation from Main Survey				
			Responses	7-21			
			Household Demographics	7-27			
			Person Demographics	7-31			
		7.3.2	Travel Patterns and Socio-demographics Cross-tabulation from University				
			Survey Responses	7-34			
Appendix A.			Survey Instruments	7-38			

# List of Tables

Table 3-1 Overall Targets Based on October Data	3-7
Table 3-2 Sampling Plan Route Groups	3-7
Table 3-3 Direction and Time of Day Targets Based on October Data	3-8
Table 3-4 Direction and Time of Day Targets Based on April Data	3-8
Table 3-5 Time of Day Targets Based on October Data	3-9
Table 3-6 Time of Day Targets Based on April Data, Revised	3-9
Table 3-7 Routes-Based Targets Based on October Data	3-9
Table 3-8 Weekend Ridership of Select Routes (6 AM - 9 PM)	3-10
Table 7-1: Main Survey Responses by Type and Likelihood of Complete	7-19
Table 7-2 Time-of-Day Distribution of Survey Reponses	7-21
Table 7-3 Survey Reponses by Route (Non-University)	7-21
Table 7-16 Trip Origin Activity	7-21
Table 7-19 Trip Destination Activity	7-22
Table 7-20 Total Number of Transfers	7-22
Table 7-14 Fare Type and Frequency of Transit Usage – Unfiltered Responses	7-22
Table 7-15 Fare Type and Frequency of Transit Usage – Likely Complete	7-23
Table 7-21 Fare Payment Methods	7-23
Table 7-22 Senior/Disabled or Youth Fare	7-23
Table 7-23 Frequency of Riding Metro Transit	7-24
Table 7-33 Past Use of Metro Transit	7-24
Table 7-4 Access and Egress Mode Distribution – Unfiltered Responses	7-24
Table 7-5 Access and Egress Mode Distribution – Likely Complete	7-25
Table 7-17 Access Mode to Bus Stop	7-25
Table 7-18 Egress Mode from Bus Stop	7-25
Table 7-39 Level of Satisfaction with Metro Transit Service – Unfiltered Responses	7-26
Table 7-40 Level of Satisfaction with Metro Transit Service – Likely Complete	7-26
Table 7-6 Race and Annual Household Income – Unfiltered Responses	7-27
Table 7-7 Race and Annual Household Income – Likely Complete	7-27
Table 7-8 Annual Household Income and Number of Vehicles in Household – Unfiltered Responses	7-28
Table 7-9 Annual Household Income and Number of Vehicles in Household – Likely Complete	7-28
Table 7-10 Household Size and Number of Employed Workers in Household – Unfiltered Responses	7-28

Table 7-11 Household Size and Number of Employed Workers in Household – Likely Complete	7-29
Table 7-12 Household Size and Number of Vehicles in Household – Unfiltered Responses	7-29
Table 7-13 Household Size and Number of Vehicles in Household– Likely Complete	7-29
Table 7-34 Household Size	. 7-30
Table 7-35 Employed Workers in Household	. 7-30
Table 7-36 Number of Vehicles Owned by Household	. 7-30
Table 7-37 Vehicle Availability	. 7-31
Table 7-38 Annual Household Income	. 7-31
Table 7-24 Respondent Age	. 7-31
Table 7-25 Respondent Gender	. 7-31
Table 7-26 Respondent Employment Status	. 7-32
Table 7-27 Respondent Possession of Driver License	. 7-32
Table 7-28 College/University Student	7-32
Table 7-29 Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin	. 7-33
Table 7-30 Respondent Race	. 7-33
Table 7-31 Speak English Well	. 7-33
Table 7-32 Language Spoken at Home	. 7-33
Table 7-41 Survey Reponses by Route (University)	. 7-34
Table 7-41 Frequency of Riding Metro Transit	. 7-34
Table 7-42 Respondent Residence Building	7-34
Table 7-43 Respondent Employment Status	. 7-34
Table 7-44 Respondent UW Status	. 7-35
Table 7-45 Respondent Student Type	. 7-35
Table 7-46 Respondent Age	7-35
Table 7-47 Respondent Gender	7-35
Table 7-48 Respondent Race	. 7-36
Table 7-49 Respondent Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin	. 7-36
Table 7-50 Respondent Experiences a Disability	. 7-36
Table 7-51 Annual Household Income	. 7-36

Figure 1 CM Survey Administration	Team Structure	6-15
-----------------------------------	----------------	------

# 1.0 Introduction

The 2024 Metro transit on-board survey aims to understand the travel patterns and rider characteristics of transit riders in the Madison area. Through the administration of an onboard survey for bus passengers and the subsequent analysis of the data, the study will provide crucial travel and ridership information that can support a variety of short-term and long-term planning studies.

The survey was administered in Spring 2024 by a team led by Cambridge Systematics (CS), with Canete Medina Consulting Group, Inc. (CM), and LOCUS Inc. CM led the data collection efforts on the field, with CS and LOCUS Inc. assisting in the survey design, sampling plans and strategies, and summarization of the survey data. The project was managed by the Greater Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with support from Madison's Metro Transit (Metro).

The 2024 on-board survey for Metro has the following objectives -

- Collect ridership demographics and travel patterns to support short-term service planning and Title VI analysis (including understanding transportation/mobility security).
- Understand impacts of recent bus network redesign on the usage and travel patterns for transit riders (including transfer behavior) and establish a baseline assessment ahead of the upcoming deployment of the Phase 1 (East-West Corridor) of the bus rapid transit (BRT) line.
- Support longer-term regional transit planning and travel demand forecasting efforts, including ridership forecasting for the upcoming BRT projects.

## 1.1 Survey Design to Understand Rider Characteristics and Travel Patterns

The foundational instrument to collect data for understanding travel patterns and characteristics of riders of the transit system is the onboard survey questionnaire. Thus, the successful design, testing, and deployment of the survey instrument was an early and important first goal of the project team. The questionnaire was carefully designed to collect information about a rider's travel behavior and their personal characteristics, while accounting for the constraints of the operating environment (moving bus, constantly boarding/alighting activity, changes in the service/schedule).

The survey was collected via traditional paper questionnaires handed out on the buses by surveyors – respondents could return the form to the surveyor while deboarding, return the survey form by mail postage-pre-paid, or scan the QR code and fill the survey electronically. To improve the quality of data (both in terms of accuracy and completeness), the project team administered the questionnaire in two formats, based on the route types –

- Short form for university routes
- Long form for all other routes

Each questionnaire prioritized certain questions which were deemed critical for fulfilling the goals of the survey and appeared on the top of the survey. The goal was to get survey returns from approximately 3,000

riders covering all routes on the system, including the paratransit routes. While the primary focus was to collect data on weekdays, the surveyors also collected data on certain high ridership routes on weekends.

Using the data collected, the project team built rider profiles with information on trip origins and boardings, alightings, and destinations; access mode to Metro's services; travel purpose; bus routes used; and transfer patterns. In addition, demographics, rider opinions, and perception about transportation security, were also collected.

This study presents the trends and patterns as observed in the survey sample. Even though expansion of the data to match total ridership was not a part of this effort, the sample data still provides a rich array of information that Metro can use to understand who their customers are, where they are going, when they travel, and their trip purpose.

## 1.2 Supporting Transit Planning

Detailed analyses of the travel behavior and rider characteristics database obtained through the on-board survey can provide comprehensive support for transit planning goals. These include,

- The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires recent ridership and survey data to calibrate and validate travel forecasting models. The most recent onboard survey for Metro was conducted in 2015 and was used to test the model's performance. It is fully expected that the current survey iteration will be used to make improvements and refinements to the regional travel demand model, especially after the impact of the pandemic and recent overhaul of the bus network.
- This data can serve as a baseline for ridership forecasting for new transit projects (including the upcoming BRT) and a crucial input for the Before-and-After Analysis, as required by the FTA.
- The Madison area has experienced explosive growth in the past decade, which has transformed the region's housing and job centers the new onboard survey can help understand how well the current system is serving travel needs.
- Additionally, the new on-board transit survey data can be used to support Title VI and equity analyses. The questionnaire was designed with a focus on capturing information relevant to Title VI analysis.

#### 1.3 Report Structure

The rest of the report is organized as follows -

- Section 2 discusses the survey questionnaire design and the definition of a "complete" survey.
- Section 3 describes the sampling plans designed to administer the survey.
- Section 4 outlines the survey management plan, including survey fieldwork strategies, data collection procedures, preparation for survey collection, and key challenges.
- Section 5 provides details of the survey pretest.
- Section 6 covers the field efforts, including logistics and implementation.

• Section 7 outlines the data retrieval, cleaning, and key results/summaries from the survey data.

# 2.0 Questionnaire Design

The survey design, developed by the consultant team in collaboration with the MPO and Metro, had several goals:

- 1. Brevity.
- 2. Consistency with previous surveys.
- 3. Robustness.
- 4. Clarity.
- 5. Equity.
- 6. Priority of key questions.

Design started with the previous survey instrument which had a similar focus. When possible, questions were kept similar to or the same as this instrument. New language was used to reflect updated terminology in some cases, especially with regards to gender identity. Several iterations were produced to agree upon size, layout, and questions.

Three types of surveys were produced:

- 1. Main (long form).
- 2. Short form.
- 3. Paratransit.

The main survey was made to a legal size format, 8.5" x 14", double sided. The short form, for university routes 80, 81, 82, and 84 which have primarily short trips, was letter size, 8.5" x 11", single sided. The paratransit survey was letter size, 8.5" x 11", double sided. (Note that the paratransit survey was not administered by the consultant team.) Online versions of each were produced which were accessible by QR code on the paper survey. Survey papers and QR codes had embedded serial numbers for tracking purposes. The surveys were translated into Spanish, Chinese, and White Hmong. QR codes took the respondent to the online version of the appropriate survey in the appropriate language.

The survey instruments can be found in **Appendix A**.

## 2.1 Survey Structure and Contents

The survey started with a brief intro below a ribbon that showed the Metro logo in a style consistent with Metro's branding. The QR was placed here so respondents could go directly to the phone-friendly online version right away – a popular option, especially on university routes.

To prioritize key information, the questions of most importance were at the top of the front page with the next tier below it. The first section included purpose of the origin and destination stops, location information (origin, destination, boarding stop, and alighting stop), and access/egress modes. These were organized such that the corresponding information from the beginning and end of the trip lined up cleanly. The location information was required for a survey to be considered complete, consistent with modeling needs.

The middle front included additional information about the ride (transfers and fare), transit usage, and travel time. The bottom front had demographic questions including age, gender, employment, ethnicity, language,

disability, and income. While surveys could be accepted as complete without answers in the middle and bottom, they were important enough to be kept here where they were more likely to be answered.

Only questions deemed necessary were included to keep the survey as short as possible. Handing riders long surveys could discourage participation or result in more unfinished surveys due to lack of time or fatigue. The back of the survey included information which was less crucial but still highly desirable. Three of the Transportation Security Index<sup>1</sup> questions developed at the Poverty Solutions lab at University of Michigan were added to capture some measure of how many riders were experiencing some sort of insecurity related to their mobility needs. Long-form and short-form versions of the 2024 survey questionnaire with prior survey instruments are found in **Appendix A**.

## 2.2 Comparison with the Previous Transit Onboard Questionnaire

Aside from slight changes to the wording in some questions and answers, all of the questions on the front of the instrument are nearly the same as the previous survey's, allowing for direct comparison to results. Using better organization of questions, the appearance was more straightforward with better flow while allowing for additional questions without becoming more crowded. In particular the front of the survey could accommodate more of the information which was of keen interest to the MPO and Metro – ethnicity and income were on the back previously. The Transportation Security Index questions were new to the survey as were a few questions regarding the recent redesign – "Has your use of Metro changed since routes were redesigned in June 2023?" and "[How do you rate] changes to routes in June 2023?"

Appendix A shows instruments from prior surveys: 2015, 2012 (University), and 2008.

## 2.3 Definition of a Completed Survey

During the survey's design, key questions essential for the applications outlined by Metro were identified. Only questionnaires that had each of these questions filled out with reasonable information were considered complete. The required information is:

- Origin and destination of overall trip: Locations in geocodeable format and purposes.
- Routes/Transfers: (this) route, number of transfers, boarding time.
- **Bus stops**: boarding stop (surveyed route), alighting stop (surveyed route).

Because the scope of the project did not include coding geocoding the locations and stops, an assessment was done to judge the answers given. Each record's rating shows a likelihood of having complete information.

Additional information was considered *high priority*. This was reflected in the survey design by putting them on the front of the sheet in a location likely to be completed:

• Payment: fare type and payment type.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://poverty.umich.edu/research-funding-opportunities/data-tools/the-transportation-security-index/

- Modes: modes of access and egress.
- **Demographics**: race/ethnicity, household size, household workers, household vehicles, and/or vehicle availability.

# 3.0 Sampling Plan

The data collected from the 2024 transit on-board survey will be used to study transit rider patterns, pandemic impacts on travel needs, understand travel equity within the context of Title VI analysis and transportation security, and support regional travel demand forecasting efforts. Therefore, it was critical that the data collected from the survey spanned all weekday routes across most time periods, and certain weekend routes. The sampling plan was intended to support field implementation, such that data throughput and quality could be optimized. While these targets were based on ridership and fairly even representation of riders, it was understood by the project team that certain routes would be unlikely to achieve these due to expected lower response rates, the distribution of riders over many trips, and limited unique riders.

Because actual ridership of the survey period is only available after-the-fact, planning required using earlier data as a best guess of ridership during the survey period. The most recent ridership data available, for October 2023, was used to estimate targets. February 2024 data was later analyzed to observe trends but still subject to change. February is generally the month of highest daily ridership with April and October falling somewhere lower. There was no comparable data from last year because the redesign had not yet been implemented. April 2024 turned out to have lower ridership than either, due to good weather and other factors.

#### 3.1 Key Aspects

The sampling methodology was developed to satisfy the survey data requirements at a disaggregated route, direction, and time-of-day (ToD) level. This approach ensured that the collected data accurately represents transit riders in the region.

The key aspects of sampling plan guidelines were:

- All Metro Transit main-line fixed-route routes were sampled at least once.
- There were no onboard surveyors on paratransit, however the CS Team provided a custom instrument to Metro to be distributed by their driver.
- The weekend was surveyed on select routes only.
- The primary targets were made by route group and time of day.
- Routes were grouped by their travel market to ensure a minimum target for times of day.
- The secondary targets were made by individual route, but do not necessarily have the same statistical rigor for low ridership routes.
- The focus of the targets was time of day over direction for three reasons:

- The surveying is necessarily done in both directions as a matter of operational logistics.
- Representation by time of day is more relevant to overall analysis and modeling.
- Loop routes have only one direction.
- Targets for some very high segments (e.g. route 80 midday and PM) were lowered to allow for oversampling in more challenging segments.
- Oversampling was recommended for certain route groups for two reasons:
  - To maintain a minimum of representation.
  - To focus on routes likely to have lower income riders.

The original overall weekday target, from October 2023, is shown in the upper rows **Table 3-1** with each of the time periods. These numbers are consistent with the later tables broken down by routes, and directions. Because the nighttime period has limited ridership, it was combined with the PM period for the route or route group targets. It had a lower rate than PM to reflect the relative challenge in collecting surveys at this time when riders were more dispersed as well as in scheduling the shifts to start and end later in the day. Due to lower ridership, the April 2024 targets are each time period were lower. Boardings after 9pm were not included as this was outside of the survey time period.

	AM	MD	PM	NT	Total
Total (Oct)	729	1,396	995	350	3,470
Rate (Oct)	10%	9%	10%	8%	9%
Total (Apr)	616	1,329	906	350	3,201
Rate (Apr)	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%

#### **Table 3-1 Overall Targets Based on October Data**

In terms of statistical significance of the sampling results for each strata (time of day), for confidence interval of 95% with a margin of error 5%, a sample size of about 350 was needed (using the smallest segment). Since the strata used here were quite broad, a lower margin of error was used.

#### 3.2 Route Group Targets

The targets were set at several levels starting with route, direction, and time of day. Due to varying amounts of ridership by route, aggregation was necessary. Some groups contained a single route while others had two or three routes. The goal in creating these groups was to allow for statistically significant targets by time of day. Some cases, such as routes B, C, D, and 80, had enough ridership in each time of day to target them by time of day and direction. Route A also had high enough ridership but was combined with S and W because S and W did not.

#### **Table 3-2 Sampling Plan Route Groups**

Group	Description	Group	Description	
G1: A,S,W	Route A + Sun Prairie	S7: O,J,H,65	Southside	

G2: B	Route B	S8: 28,38	Campus/Downtown
G3: C	Route C	S9: E,55,75	Verona & Southwest
G4: D	Route D	S10: 80	Route 80
G5: F,R	Middleton	S11: 81,82,84	University
G6: G,L,P	Monona to Eastside		

**Table 3-3** and **Table 3-4** show the targets of the first 4 route groups by route direction and time of day, based on October and April data, respectively. As they had some of the highest ridership, there were significant surveys expected in each segment, though AM and midday were combined in some cases and PM and nighttime in all. Some cells were lowered from high values resulting in a lower rate. Surveyors did not avoid getting more surveys than listed, but we focused resources in more sparse times and routes to get a minimum representation rather than a high number of surveys concentrated on a few times and routes. The resulting target rates were around 9%-10%. Each group and almost every cell in April was less than or equal to that in October.

#### Table 3-3 Direction and Time of Day Targets Based on October Data

	East, In, Loop			West, Out			Total					
	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total
G1: A,S,W	54	100	100	254	41	100	100	241	96	200	200	496
G2: B	37	62	60	159	7	5	66	141	60	115	130	305
G3: C	7	'5	85	160	50	85	63	198	62	147	153	363
G4: D	9	0	93	183	45	85	80	210	66	154	172	392

#### Table 3-4 Direction and Time of Day Targets Based on April Data

	East, In, Loop			West, Out			Total					
	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total
G1: A,S,W	44	90	87	220	41	82	90	213	84	172	177	433
G2: B	31	68	59	158	7	5	58	133	57	117	130	304
G3: C	7	5	84	159	44	80	54	178	59	140	146	345
G4: D	9	0	84	174	42	80	70	192	63	149	160	372

In terms of statistical significance of the sampling results for Route Group – Time Period strata for the top 4 route groups (G1-G4), for confidence interval of 90% with a margin of error 10%, a sample size of about 60 was needed (using the smallest segment population). As seen in **Table 3-4**, the recommended targets should satisfy the sample size requirements at the Segment-Time Period level (last four columns).

For route groups 5-11, only times of day were applied. As in the groups 1-4, these were divided into AM, midday, and PM/nighttime, with AM and midday combined in some cases. Explicit oversampling was applied to group 7 (O, J, H, & 65) due to its service in low-income areas. Other oversampling was the result of increasing time of day or individual route cells. For most of these groups, ridership dropped in April.

	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total
G5: F,R	55	100	100	255
G6: G,L,P	40	54	56	151
G7: O,J,H,65	55	72	85	212
G8: 28,38	51	110	77	238
G9: E,55,75		60	68	173
G10: 80	166	300	300	766
G11: 81,82,84				140

#### Table 3-5 Time of Day Targets Based on October Data

#### Table 3-6 Time of Day Targets Based on April Data, Revised

	AM	MD	PM/NT	Total
G5: F,R	48	94	97	239
G6: G,L,P	40	53	49	142
G7: O,J,H,65	55	74	83	212
G8: 28,38	59	110	80	249
G9: E,55,75		44	51	140
G10: 80	103	300	255	658
G11: 81,82,84				144

The university routes in Group 11 are not broken out by time of day because their ridership is almost exclusively in the midday period. Group 10 (80) is undersampled due to its high number of riders and specific service.

In terms of statistical significance of the sampling results for proposed Route Group – Time Period segments for lower ridership groups (G5-G11), for confidence interval of 90% with a margin of error 10%, most combinations in **Table 3-5** satisfied the criteria, based on October ridership. The remaining combinations were close to the targets – some fell to lower values in April, below that threshold.

#### 3.3 Route Targets

While the primary targets were by route group and time of day, the secondary targets provided route-based numbers. As some routes had low ridership, their targets were not statistically significant. On these routes, meeting a set rate of collection was challenging and resource intensive. Every route was surveyed, and using the route group targets, most of those were met. Routes of specific interest were oversampled if necessary. Each of the branches of the routes marked with asterisks was surveyed with the goal of proportional representation.

Route	Target (Oct)	Target (Apr)	Target Rate	Route Group	Route Group Note
<b>A</b> *	487	422	9%	S1: A,S,W	Route A + Sun Prairie
S	5	5	10%	S1: A,S,W	Route A + Sun Prairie
w	4	6	10%	S1: A,S,W	Route A + Sun Prairie

#### Table 3-7 Routes-Based Targets Based on October Data

В	305	304	9%	S2: B	Route B
C*	363	345	10%	S3: C	Route C
D*	392	372	9%	S4: D	Route D
F	145	136	9%	S5: F,R	Middleton
R*	110	102	10%	S5: F,R	Middleton
G	107	106	9%	S6: G,L,P	Monona to Eastside
L	28	24	13%	S6: G,L,P	Monona to Eastside
Р	16	12	16%	S6: G,L,P	Monona to Eastside
Н	82	80	10%	S7: O,J,H,65	Southside
J	60	60	10%	S7: O,J,H,65	Southside
Ο	45	51	11%	S7: O,J,H,65	Southside
65	26	22	11%	S7: O,J,H,65	Southside
28	98	129	10%	G8: 28,38	Campus/Downtown
38	140	120	9%	G8: 28,38	Campus/Downtown
Е	88	88	11%	G9: E,55,75	Verona & Southwest
55	25	25	13%	G9: E,55,75	Verona & Southwest
75	60	60	11%	G9: E,55,75	Verona & Southwest
80	766	658	8%	G10: 80	Route 80
81	5	5	10%	G11: 81,82,84	University
82	11	11	10%	G11: 81,82,84	University
84	124	128	8%	G11: 81,82,84	University

\* Routes with multiple branches.

#### 3.4 Weekend Surveying

Select routes were surveyed on the weekend days, with a priority for high frequency routes. The expectation was to capture some riders with lower income, service jobs, and non-traditional work hours (contributing to the Title VI analysis). Several of the most used bus trips on each of the routes in **Table 3-8** were considered for surveying across the times of day on the weekend. This did not have the same level of sampling or targeting as the weekday surveying. Also, while statistical significance at the system level was ensured, sampling at the route level mostly focused on capturing as many trips as possible in the time available. There was some variation in weekend ridership in the months shown here, especially on the university buses. Ultimately route 80 was not surveyed on the weekend.

#### Table 3-8 Weekend Ridership of Select Routes (6 AM - 9 PM)

Route	October	February	April
Α	2,984	2,936	2,777
В	1,581	1,743	1,634
С	1,149	1,337	1,299
D	1,495	1,557	1,689
80	1,199	2,838	854

# 4.0 Survey Management

This survey management plan was used to outline the requirements and expectations of the onboard survey. In addition, the survey management plan was designed to provide the survey team with a detailed understanding of the challenges associated with data collection and to outline the best practices and frameworks to collect data effectively.

## 4.1 Identify Key Challenges

The data collection effort in Madison was complex and required careful planning by team members. Consideration was required to ensure that the final sample collected would be consistent with industry standards. Through the pretest survey and continuous monitoring of survey runs and collection rates, the team was able to identify several challenges and address them in an agile fashion to deliver a high-quality product.

- **Repeat riders**: The surveyors encountered the same riders multiple times on some of the low-ridership routes. The survey assignments were accordingly modified to direct more resources to route-direction-time periods with more ridership yield.
- Low collection rates on certain routes: During the initial weeks of the survey effort, the team identified routes that gave lower than expected collection rates despite multiple attempts. In order to maximize the yield of the surveying efforts and get as close to the route group targets as possible, the team pivoted to other routes in the group with higher collection rates. Routes which had high response rates were completed earlier allowing resources to be allocated elsewhere.
- **Crowding in UW Campus Area**: The Metro system is used extensively for short trips on the routes serving the University of Wisconsin campus and near downtown. There are some challenges associated with such type of crowding particularly related to survey completion using support of surveyor and collecting forms when there is a lot of boarding/alighting activity.
- **Changes in ridership**: The planning of the survey was based on earlier ridership not long after the transit network redesign was implemented. April 2024 ridership dropped significantly from October 2023 and February 2024 totals, affecting data collection targets for some routes more than others.

## 4.2 Survey Fieldwork Methodology

Survey planning involves numerous interrelated activities, starting with the development of essential documentation for training, processes, and survey procedures. This section details the various survey methods and day-to-day operational procedures employed in the Madison Metro Transit on-board survey. The planning and methodological approach described here was meticulously applied to ensure the effectiveness, representativeness, and accuracy of this onboard survey.

#### 4.2.1 Methods to Engage Riders

A key aspect of obtaining complete and accurate responses is gaining trust with the riders. While surveyors had only a short time to interact with riders, there were ways to prepare the riders in advance. Metro conducted some community outreach efforts such as posting announcements on buses, distributing

newsletters, or sending email blasts to customers. This ensured that riders were aware of the upcoming onboard survey. The announcements explained what data the survey would collect and why it was important, particularly emphasizing the significance of gathering demographic profiles.

#### 4.2.2 Survey Collection Procedures

The instruments handed out were a long (two-sided) form for the main routes and a short form (single-sided) for university loops. A paratransit-specific survey instrument was drafted and provided by the client project manager, printed with survey identification/number. Surveyors attempted to hand paper forms to all riders on a surveyed trip. Riders were asked to return the form to the surveyor before exiting the bus or to use the QR code to fill it out electronically. Completed paper surveys could also be returned by postage-paid mail. Surveyors recorded the ID numbers of forms handed out on each trip for tracking and data collection purposes. Paratransit surveys were distributed and collected by drivers or returned by mail. Surveyors were asked to specifically request the information at the top of the survey which was most essential.

#### 4.2.3 Field Data Retrieval

At the end of a crew assignment the forms were passed to the crew supervisors. Unused forms were returned for later use. After the survey ended, all data collected from the used physical forms were uploaded into a spreadsheet. The team developed a comprehensive data coding scheme to ensure that all closed-ended responses were assigned unique coded values, while open-ended items were coded during the back-end processing if necessary.

- Each response choice was assigned an individual numeric value during the survey design phase, allowing the survey to capture rider responses using these pre-selected coded values.
- Open-ended responses were analyzed and coded when applicable. For instance, if a respondent indicated their trip purpose as "other" and specified "sightseeing", it would be recoded under the "recreation" category.

When the data were properly uploaded, coded, and made available electronically, the physical forms from riders were delivered to the client for archiving.

#### 4.2.4 Surveyor Training

A field supervisor training class was held the week of the Pretest Survey. The field supervisors together with the logistics team and scheduling team conducted the Pretest Survey to learn from the field and adjust the survey administration procedures as necessary.

A field crew training class was held the week before the start of the survey. The class was conducted at the Metro office and included visits to locations where they might have to board buses on their shifts. The training class covered the contents of the Field Manual including a session on how to properly approach riders.

The Field Manual contained the following sections:

- Project Overview and Overall Survey Schedule.
- Safety First.

- Crew Shift Assignments.
- Proper Attire and ID Badges.
- Appropriate Behavior.
- What a Daily Field Survey Routine is Like.
- Filing out Distribution Sheets.
- Questionnaire.
- Interviewing Procedures.
- Quality and Standards and Performance Tracking.
- Miscellaneous items such as Parking, Late or Cancelled Buses, and Reporting Issues

#### 4.2.5 Survey Assignments

The team planned different options for assignments and worked with Metro to choose a method. Ultimately the team decided on following the bus operators to the extent possible. Survey crews typically had shifts of 6-10 hours in length, including a period of active surveying, transiting between trips (waiting for buses, traveling to next ride), and some down time for eating and using restroom facilities (as required by law). Crews could board at the garage and stay with the operator for some or all of their shift. Assignments could not be created until the March driver pick information was available. The set of potential assignments was prioritized for efficiency and representation. Assignments were swapped based on needs, such as additional surveying for certain routes or times.

The three methods considered were:

- **A.** Scheduling based on bus equipment, boarding a particular bus at the start of the crew's workday and staying on until the end of a bus cycle regardless of who is driving the bus and irrespective of any change in route for the equipment;
- **B.** Scheduling based on bus operator, shadowing a bus driver from the beginning of their workday to the end even if the driver changes vehicle or changes route;
- **C.** Scheduling based on bus route schedules, riding a bus from one end of the route to the other, then catching the next scheduled bus on the same route or boarding a new route, regardless of the equipment or bus operator.

B was selected as the primary method. Surveyors did not necessarily work the driver's entire shift.

# 5.0 Survey Pretest

The survey pretest took place on March 6, 2024. Supervisors boarded buses on A2, B, D2, and 80 routes at the garage in the morning and on vehicles in operation in the evening. These were not full day runs but partial runs to test logistics as well as responsiveness to the survey. Routes with higher ridership were selected to ensure that a substantial number of riders could be approached. Route 80 was included to test the short form survey.

Overall the results were good, showing smooth operation. No issues occurred regarding getting surveyors on the vehicles to administer the survey. Staff were able to communicate with drivers and Metro staff on-site at the garage. The returned surveys, both paper and electronic, indicated no clear issues with the design and people were fairly willing not only to take the survey but to provide a good deal of information.

# 6.0 Logistics and Field Implementation

In the Madison Metro Transit Onboard Survey project, seamless coordination and efficient management of logistical elements were crucial for the successful execution of fieldwork. This section provides insights into the detailed planning and execution of logistical operations, including team management, crew transportation, equipment preparation, survey staging, and data retrieval. By ensuring that all logistical elements were carefully managed, the project team maintained data integrity, upheld survey protocols, and facilitated agile adjustments to field implementation strategies.

# 6.1 Survey Administration Team

The Canete Medina survey administration team carried out the onboard survey with support and supervision from the larger CS team and management. It was structured as follows:



#### Figure 1 CM Survey Administration Team Structure

**Field Crew** – Led by the field manager, the field crew team was responsible for distributing and collecting questionnaires onboard buses. The field manager and other field supervisors ensured that field crew members were aware of their assignments, that they were properly trained, and that they had the materials that they needed to conduct the fieldwork. Field supervisors were also responsible for monitoring the work of the field surveyors and in charge of handling any site issues that might arise unless they required consultation with the project lead of Canete Medina or the project manager of CS. Michael Ward was the field manager for Canete Medina.

**Scheduling** – Led by the scheduling manager and supported by 2-3 schedulers, the scheduling team assigned field crews to buses that would be surveyed. The team was in charge of contacting field crews and ensuring that they showed up at the right time and at the correct boarding location. The team also informed the field crew where their last drop off location would be and how they would get home from there. The scheduling team coordinated with the logistics and field crew teams regarding transportation of crews to and from work sites. Timothy Arehart was the scheduling manager for Canete Medina.

**Logistics** – Led by the logistics manager and supported by two logistics assistants, the logistics team was responsible for preparing all survey materials for the field crew, collecting the completed responses, pre-

processing of the responses, and delivery to the CS team. The logistics team also monitored the performance of the field crews by logging the number of collected responses received from each field surveyor. Lastly, the logistics team managed the transportation and other field data collection needs of the survey team. Claire Johnson was the logistics team manager for Canete Medina.

### 6.2 Daily Management

Continuous management during the field implementation was critical for the Metro Transit Onboard Survey. Careful oversight ensured that no routes were over-surveyed or under-surveyed, preventing the collected data from deviating from the sampling plan. Meticulous staff management was implemented to ensure that no field crew members were overworked, underutilized, or inadequately trained. This daily management of survey operations, combined with near-real-time analysis of the collected trip data, allowed for nimble adjustments to the collection schedules and strategies.

The daily management encompassed the following elements:

- Document and address issues in the field.
- Track data collection trends and share regular updates on number of surveys collected by route group.
- Analyze data collection metrics and adjust the field implementation plan as needed.
- Track surveyor performance to ensure that all team members are fulfilling their duties.

## 6.3 Crew Transportation

Canete Medina was responsible for transporting crews to their initial boarding locations and picked them up at their final drop-off location as needed. Field crew transportation was managed by the logistics team in coordination with the Scheduling and field crew teams. This was simplified by boarding and alighting buses at the Metro garage when possible – with Metro staff informing drivers that a surveyor would be joining. Canete Medina staff gave schedules to Metro staff in advance. An Airbnb was rented at a central location to provide a meeting and coordination space, and room was made available at the MPO office. Discussions were held with a community organization which had space, but ultimately this was found to not be ideal due to costs, limitations on hours, and restrictions to access.

#### 6.4 Field Supervisor Role

The field manager and field Supervisors were responsible for ensuring that the fieldwork was conducted according to the survey administration plan and schedule. Field supervisors ensured that field crews were properly trained on surveying procedures, that they knew what buses to board, that they had the proper survey materials, and they knew what to do at the end of their shift.

The daily responsibilities of field supervisors included:

- Gather all field crews at the initial boarding location.
- Ensure that all assigned crews were present.
- Make substitutions or change crew assignments if crews were absent.

- Distribute survey materials to the crew.
- Hold a briefing at the start of the crew shift.
- Hold a debriefing at the end of the shift.
- Collect all survey materials at the end of the shift.
- Take field notes of survey conditions and crew performance.

#### 6.5 Survey Fieldworker Role

Field Surveyors were responsible for distributing and collecting questionnaires onboard buses. They also responded to questions posed by riders about the survey, and assisted riders with disabilities and limited English proficiency. Field crews arrived at the meeting location on time, boarded the correct buses based on their assignment schedule, kept track of their survey materials, reported any issues encountered to the field supervisors, and followed proper surveying procedures as detailed in the Field Survey Manual and during the field crew training.

#### 6.6 Field Surveyor Equipment

The logistics team prepared all survey materials that were used by the field crew team. The materials included:

- Surveyor bags.
- Printed field surveyor assignment sheets containing their schedule for the day.
- Distribution sheets together with printed questionnaires and other printed materials to be distributed to riders.
- Field Manual including contact information to report issues.
- Printed bus schedules of routes to be surveyed.
- Clipboards, pencils, pens, rubber bands, and other supplies.
- Memo from Metro informing drivers that their buses will be surveyed and that they need to allow surveyors to board their buses.
- ID Badges.
- Other materials as needed.

#### 6.7 Survey Staging Location

Based on the survey assignments prepared by Canete Medina, the field crews met at designated locations and traveled to the initial boarding sites. The field supervisor also had the option to meet all field surveyors at the bus depots or garages at the start of the day, depending on the survey assignments. The logistics team staged the survey materials pickup and drop-off at the client-provided conference room and their Airbnb.

## 6.8 Data Retrieval

The logistics team collected the completed responses, pre-processed the forms, and delivered them to the data entry team. Following data entry, Canete Medina coordinated and shared the electronic files containing responses with the rest of the CS team. The physical forms and final electronic data were then shared with the client.

# 7.0 Survey Data Cleaning, Results, and Findings

This phase of the project involved a preliminary analysis of the collected data. This included data quality assessment and key findings from the uncleaned and unweighted survey records regarding travel patterns and socio-demographic distribution of survey respondents. A total of 3,045 responses were collected from the onboard survey.

## 7.1 Survey Cleaning

Data entry procedures focused on accurate input of all information provided by respondents on paper forms. Certain information was verified based on the survey ID, including route and time. Riders may have reported multiple routes, though the survey is intended to have as *this route* the one on which the survey was distributed.

Further cleaning focused on improving location information to increase the number of surveys which could be considered complete by virtue of having information in a geocodeable format. In this process and for the purpose of reporting the results, it was important to indicate completeness for each entry.

#### 7.2 Final Dataset

The onboard survey dataset went through a thorough completeness assessment through two crucial steps:

- 1. The team validated the trips reported by respondents by checking their alignment with the routes on which the surveys were conducted.
- 2. The team compared the on-board survey dataset with the boarding and alighting counts collected for the trips to verify consistency in travel patterns between the two datasets.

Following this completeness assessment, the team identified nearly 2,019 likely complete records from 3,045 long form surveys collected (67%), in addition to 1,023 short form records. The total likely complete of 3,042 records from 4,068 collected. Of these 264 were from weekend trips – with 165 likely complete. These will form the basis for survey expansion by the MPO and Metro. Table 7-1 shows that completion rates were much higher for online responses than paper. This could be a function of greater time to complete, self-selection of those willing to put in more effort, layout, or a combination of all these factors. A quarter of university surveys (253) were done online, a lower share than the main survey despite some expectations that college students would prefer using their phones.

Response Method	Responses	Share of Responses	Likely Complete	Share Likely Complete
Paper Surveys	1,838	62%	1,134	60%
Online	1,013	34%	800	77%

#### Table 7-1: Main Survey Responses by Type and Likelihood of Complete

Mail-ins	111	4%	85	77%
Grand Total	3,045	<b>100</b> %	2,019	66%

## 7.3 Summary Tables

A comprehensive understanding of the travel patterns and socio-demographic characteristics of transit riders is a crucial outcome of the onboard survey analysis for modeling purposes. This section presents high-level findings from the analysis of unexpanded data, offering insights into the transit usage patterns, rider demographics, household compositions, and social dynamics of the sample. Because this is not expanded, it does not precisely reflect the population of riders.

To describe the survey responses, a set of cross-tabulations were prepared. Additionally, this section includes an extensive collection of tables and charts summarizing the answers to each key question in the survey database. These summaries provide insights into the people and patterns which show up in the survey.

# 7.3.1 Travel Patterns and Socio-demographics Cross-tabulation from Main Survey Responses

Time of Day	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
AM Peak	575	18.9%	409	20.3%
Mid-day	1,278	42.0%	837	41.5%
PM Peak	987	32.4%	657	32.5%
Night	200	6.6%	112	5.5%
Unknown	5	0.2%	4	0.2%
Grand Total	3,045	100.0%	2,019	100.0%

#### Table 7-2 Time-of-Day Distribution of Survey Reponses

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-3 Survey Reponses by Route (Non-University)

Route	Responses	Likely Complete	Route	Responses	Likely Complete
A1	278	187	0	55	39
A2	413	253	Р	4	1
В	373	206	R1	108	77
C1	275	199	R2	37	26
C2	145	116	S	1	1
D1	247	166	W	4	1
D2	252	175	28	223	173
E	86	63	38	69	50
F	180	116	55	20	13
G	74	34	65	15	13
Н	85	37	75	39	32
J	40	26	Unknown	5	4
L	17	11			

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-4 Trip Origin Activity

Origin	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Home/Residence	1,540	50.6%	1,059	52.5%
Work	605	19.9%	433	21.4%
College/University	502	16.5%	323	16.0%
School (K-12)	52	1.7%	23	1.1%
Medical/Dental	38	1.2%	18	0.9%
Store/Shopping	109	3.6%	64	3.2%
Restaurant	43	1.4%	18	0.9%

Social/Recreation	65	2.1%	33	1.6%
Other	69	2.3%	42	2.1%
No Answer	22	0.7%	6	0.3%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### **Table 7-5 Trip Destination Activity**

Destination	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Home/Residence	1,166	38.3%	779	38.6%
Work	690	22.7%	495	24.5%
College/University	601	19.7%	417	20.7%
School (K-12)	48	1.6%	28	1.4%
Medical/Dental	40	1.3%	23	1.1%
Store/Shopping	145	4.8%	87	4.3%
Restaurant	58	1.9%	42	2.1%
Social/Recreation	119	3.9%	71	3.5%
Other	107	3.5%	63	3.1%
No Answer	71	2.3%	14	0.7%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-6 Total Number of Transfers

Transfers	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
0	2,251	73.9%	1,764	87.4%
1	427	14.0%	199	9.9%
2	140	4.6%	38	1.9%
3 or more	58	1.9%	18	0.9%
No Answer	169	5.6%	2,019	100%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	Responses	Percenta
				ge

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-7 Fare Type and Frequency of Transit Usage – Unfiltered Responses

	Frequency					
Payment Method	Less than once	1-2 trips	3-4 trips	5 or more trips	No	Grand
	a week	a week	a week	a week	Answer	Total
Cash	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	2.8%	0.5%	<b>8.0</b> %
Unlimited Ride Pass	5.3%	6.5%	14.2%	29.3%	0.9%	56.1%

10-Ride Card	1.0%	0.9%	1.3%	1.0%	0.1%	4.3%
31-Day Pass	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	3.6%	0.2%	<b>5.9</b> %
31-Day Pass (low income)	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	1.4%	0.2%	<b>2.6</b> %
EZ Rider Youth Pass	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	1.3%
Other	1.2%	1.5%	3.0%	7.0%	0.3%	<b>13.0</b> %
No Answer	0.5%	0.4%	0.7%	1.2%	6.0%	<b>8.8</b> %
Grand Total	10.8%	11.7%	22.1%	<b>47.0</b> %	8.3%	100.0%

#### Table 7-8 Fare Type and Frequency of Transit Usage – Likely Complete

			Frequency			
Payment Method	Less than once	1-2 trips	3-4 trips	5 or more trips	No	Grand
	a week	a week	a week	a week	Answer	Total
Cash	1.8%	1.0%	0.9%	1.7%	0.0%	5.4%
Unlimited Ride Pass	5.4%	7.2%	16.8%	32.9%	0.3%	<b>62.7</b> %
10-Ride Card	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	4.5%
31-Day Pass	0.6%	0.4%	1.0%	3.8%	0.0%	5.8%
31-Day Pass (low income)	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.0%	0.0%	1.5%
EZ Rider Youth Pass	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.9%
Other	1.5%	1.8%	3.7%	8.5%	0.1%	15.7%
No Answer	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%	1.8%	3.5%
Grand Total	10.6%	11.9%	24.6%	50.3%	2.5%	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### **Table 7-9 Fare Payment Methods**

Payment Method	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Cash	244	8.0%	110	5.4%
Unlimited Ride Pass	1,707	56.1%	1,265	62.7%
10-Ride Card	130	4.3%	90	4.5%
31-Day Pass	181	5.9%	117	5.8%
31-Day Pass (low income)	80	2.6%	31	1.5%
EZ Rider Youth Pass	40	1.3%	19	0.9%
Other	395	13.0%	316	15.7%
No Answer	268	8.8%	71	3.5%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-10 Senior/Disabled or Youth Fare

Fare	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Senior/Disabled	141	4.6%	79	3.9%
Youth	101	3.3%	55	2.7%

No	2,397	78.7%	1,754	86.9%
No Answer	406	13.3%	131	6.5%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### Table 7-11 Frequency of Riding Metro Transit

Frequency	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Less than once a week	329	10.8%	215	10.6%
1-2 trips a week	357	11.7%	241	11.9%
3-4 trips a week	674	22.1%	497	24.6%
5 or more trips a week	1,431	47.0%	1,016	50.3%
No Answer	254	8.3%	50	2.5%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-12 Past Use of Metro Transit

Length of Usage	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Less than 6 mos.	239	7.8%	156	7.7%
6 mos. To 2 years	937	30.8%	678	33.6%
3 years to 5 years	508	16.7%	384	19.0%
More than 5 years	694	22.8%	506	25.1%
No Answer	667	21.9%	295	14.6%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-13 Access and Egress Mode Distribution – Unfiltered Responses

	Egress Mode							
Access Mode	Walked	Rode bike	Dropped off	Parked on the street	Parked at a lot	Other	No Answer	Grand Total
Walked	87.1%	0.2%	2.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	2.6%	93.4%
Rode bike	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Dropped off	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.4%
Parked on the street	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%

Parked at a lot	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
No Answer	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	2.3%
Grand Total	<b>90.2</b> %	0.6%	3.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	<b>4.6</b> %	100.0%

#### Table 7-14 Access and Egress Mode Distribution – Likely Complete

	Egress Mode							
Access Mode	Walked	Rode bike	Dropped off	Parked on the street	Parked at a lot	Other	No Answer	Grand Total
Walked	92.4%	0.1%	1.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%	95.7%
Rode bike	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Dropped off	1.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Parked on the street	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Parked at a lot	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No Answer	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Grand Total	95.5%	0.4%	2.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	<b>0.7</b> %	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-15 Access Mode to Bus Stop

Access Mode	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Walked # blocks	2,843	93.4%	1,933	95.7%
Rode bike or similar device # miles	16	0.5%	10	0.5%
Dropped off at a bus stop	72	2.4%	37	1.8%
Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked on the street	27	0.9%	22	1.1%
Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked at a lot	14	0.5%	10	0.5%
Wheelchair/scooter # blocks	3	0.1%	1	0.0%
No Answer	70	2.3%	6	0.3%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-16 Egress Mode from Bus Stop

Egress Mode	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares

Walked # blocks	2,748	90.2%	1,929	95.5%
Rode bike or similar device # miles	19	0.6%	9	0.4%
Picked up at a bus stop	108	3.5%	50	2.5%
Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked on the street	16	0.5%	9	0.4%
Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked at a lot	9	0.3%	6	0.3%
Wheelchair/scooter # blocks	4	0.1%	1	0.0%
No Answer	141	4.6%	15	0.7%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### Table 7-17 Level of Satisfaction with Metro Transit Service – Unfiltered Responses

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Good	Great	N/A	Total
Cleanliness of buses	2.9%	25.6%	31.4%	13.0%	27.2%	100.0%
Changes to routes in June 2023	11.7%	22.1%	20.4%	9.6%	36.2%	100.0%
Personal safety while riding	1.4%	16.9%	31.5%	22.3%	27.9%	100.0%
Personal safety at bus stops	2.9%	19.6%	30.6%	18.3%	28.6%	100.0%
Personal safety when transferring	2.4%	15.4%	24.2%	15.5%	42.5%	100.0%
Convenience of routes	9.2%	25.7%	25.0%	11.9%	28.1%	100.0%
Driver courtesy	1.9%	14.9%	27.0%	27.6%	28.6%	100.0%
Driver helpfulness	1.8%	14.1%	25.7%	26.2%	32.2%	100.0%
Wait time for buses	15.0%	30.4%	19.8%	6.3%	28.5%	100.0%
Travel time on buses	6.5%	24.4%	29.5%	10.7%	28.8%	100.0%
Maps, schedules, and information	7.5%	20.8%	28.5%	13.8%	29.5%	100.0%
Online trip planning	6.3%	20.2%	24.7%	14.9%	33.9%	100.0%
Bus tracking	10.1%	22.8%	23.7%	11.8%	31.6%	100.0%
Fare cost	2.4%	16.7%	22.9%	20.1%	38.0%	100.0%
Overall satisfaction	3.1%	19.4%	34.2%	14.7%	28.7%	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-18 Level of Satisfaction with Metro Transit Service – Likely Complete

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Good	Great	N/A	Total
Cleanliness of buses	2.7%	28.1%	35.8%	14.7%	18.7%	100.0%
Changes to routes in June 2023	12.6%	24.7%	23.0%	10.5%	29.2%	100.0%
Personal safety while riding	1.2%	18.1%	36.1%	25.6%	19.1%	100.0%
Personal safety at bus stops	2.6%	21.7%	35.2%	20.6%	19.9%	100.0%
Personal safety when transferring	2.3%	16.2%	26.4%	16.9%	38.1%	100.0%
Convenience of routes	9.8%	29.5%	28.3%	13.1%	19.3%	100.0%
Driver courtesy	1.7%	16.3%	30.2%	32.4%	19.4%	100.0%
Driver helpfulness	1.3%	15.4%	28.8%	30.7%	23.8%	100.0%
Wait time for buses	16.7%	35.5%	22.2%	6.2%	19.4%	100.0%
Travel time on buses	6.2%	28.0%	34.7%	11.5%	19.6%	100.0%

Maps, schedules, and information	8.0%	22.9%	33.4%	15.5%	20.3%	100.0%
Online trip planning	6.7%	23.3%	28.2%	16.7%	25.1%	100.0%
Bus tracking	12.1%	25.8%	27.2%	12.2%	22.6%	100.0%
Fare cost	2.2%	18.2%	25.2%	22.9%	31.6%	100.0%
Overall satisfaction	3.0%	21.4%	39.6%	16.3%	19.6%	100.0%

#### Household Demographics

#### Table 7-19 Race and Annual Household Income – Unfiltered Responses

			l	Househo	ld Incom	ne		
Race	Under \$15,000	\$15,000- \$34,999	\$35,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$74,999	\$75,000- \$99,999	\$100,000 and more	No Answer	Grand Total
Black/African-American	2.5%	1.9%	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	1.3%	<b>7.8</b> %
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%
Asian	7.1%	5.0%	2.0%	1.7%	1.1%	1.2%	1.5%	19.5%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
White	11.4%	10.2%	5.5%	7.0%	5.3%	9.0%	3.2%	51.6%
Two or more races	1.4%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	4.5%
Other	0.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%	3.1%
No Answer	1.1%	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	9.6%	12.5%
Grand Total	<b>24.6</b> %	19.9%	10.0%	10.4%	7.1%	11.3%	16.7%	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

White and wealthier people were more likely to give complete information. Those who gave more location information tended to answer the income question more also.

#### Table 7-20 Race and Annual Household Income – Likely Complete

			ł	louseho	ld Incom	ie		
Race	Under \$15,000	\$15,000- \$34,999	\$35,000- \$49,999	\$50,000- \$74,999	\$75,000- \$99,999	\$100,000 and more	No Answer	Grand Total
Black/African-American	1.4%	1.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	<b>4.8</b> %
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	<b>0.8</b> %
Asian	6.8%	4.9%	2.5%	1.7%	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%	19.2%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
White	11.7%	11.9%	7.3%	9.0%	6.9%	11.5%	3.0%	61.3%
Two or more races	1.1%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	4.5%

Other	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	2.0%
No Answer	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	5.0%	7.3%
Grand Total	22.3%	20.7%	11.8%	12.3%	8.7%	13.6%	10.6%	<b>100.0</b> %

#### Table 7-21 Annual Household Income and Number of Vehicles in Household – Unfiltered Responses

	Number of Vehicles								
Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total			
Under \$15,000	11.3%	5.5%	2.6%	1.3%	3.8%	24.6%			
\$15,000-\$34,999	8.3%	7.2%	1.9%	0.5%	2.1%	19.9%			
\$35,000-\$49,999	3.4%	3.4%	1.5%	0.6%	1.1%	10.0%			
\$50,000-\$74,999	3.2%	3.7%	2.1%	0.5%	0.9%	10.4%			
\$75,000-\$99,999	1.7%	2.6%	1.7%	0.4%	0.8%	7.1%			
\$100,000 and more	1.3%	4.4%	3.6%	1.0%	0.9%	11.3%			
No Answer	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.4%	11.7%	16.7%			
Grand Total	31.1%	28.2%	14.8%	4.6%	21.2%	100.0%			

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-22 Annual Household Income and Number of Vehicles in Household – Likely Complete

	Number of Vehicles								
Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total			
Under \$15,000	10.2%	5.7%	2.4%	1.4%	2.6%	22.3%			
\$15,000-\$34,999	7.9%	8.3%	2.1%	0.5%	1.8%	20.7%			
\$35,000-\$49,999	3.9%	4.1%	2.0%	0.7%	1.1%	11.8%			
\$50,000-\$74,999	3.4%	4.9%	2.5%	0.6%	1.0%	12.3%			
\$75,000-\$99,999	1.8%	3.6%	2.0%	0.5%	0.8%	8.7%			
\$100,000 and more	1.3%	5.8%	4.6%	1.1%	0.8%	13.6%			
No Answer	1.3%	1.0%	1.5%	0.4%	6.3%	10.6%			
Grand Total	29.9%	33.4%	<b>17.0</b> %	5.3%	14.4%	100.0%			

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-23 Household Size and Number of Employed Workers in Household – Unfiltered Responses

Number of Employed Workers

Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total
1 (Live alone)	6.0%	18.8%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	25.6%
2	3.0%	6.1%	19.2%	0.0%	0.2%	28.6%
3	0.9%	1.7%	3.6%	4.0%	0.2%	10.5%
4 or more	0.5%	1.1%	4.3%	7.8%	0.1%	13.8%
No Answer	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	20.9%	21.6%
Grand Total	10.4%	28.1%	27.8%	<b>12.0</b> %	21.7%	100.0%

#### Table 7-24 Household Size and Number of Employed Workers in Household – Likely Complete

	Number of Employed Workers									
Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total				
1 (Live alone)	5.3%	21.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	27.5%				
2	3.0%	5.9%	23.7%	0.0%	0.2%	32.8%				
3	0.7%	1.5%	3.8%	4.8%	0.1%	<b>11.0</b> %				
4 or more	0.4%	1.0%	4.8%	7.9%	0.0%	14.1%				
No Answer	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	14.2%	14.6%				
Grand Total	9.4%	30.6%	32.5%	12.8%	14.8%	100.0%				

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

# Table 7-25 Household Size and Number of Vehicles in Household – Unfiltered Responses

	Number of Vehicles									
Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total				
1 (Live alone)	16.2%	8.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	25.6%				
2	8.6%	12.3%	7.1%	0.5%	0.2%	28.6%				
3	3.1%	3.5%	2.7%	1.1%	0.1%	10.5%				
4 or more	2.8%	3.3%	4.8%	2.8%	0.1%	13.8%				
No Answer	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	20.7%	21.6%				
Grand Total	31.1%	28.2%	14.8%	4.6%	21.2%	100.0%				

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-26 Household Size and Number of Vehicles in Household– Likely Complete

	Number of Vehicles					
Household Size	0	1	2	3	No Answer	Grand Total
1 (Live alone)	15.8%	11.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	27.5%
2	8.6%	14.8%	8.7%	0.6%	0.1%	32.8%
3	2.8%	3.7%	3.1%	1.3%	0.1%	<b>11.0</b> %

4 or more	2.3%	3.6%	5.0%	3.2%	0.1%	14.1%
No Answer	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	14.6%
Grand Total	<b>29.9</b> %	33.4%	<b>17.0</b> %	5.3%	14.4%	100.0%

#### Table 7-27 Household Size

Household Size	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
1 (Live alone)	778	25.6%	555	27.5%
2	871	28.6%	663	32.8%
3	320	10.5%	222	11.0%
4 or more	419	13.8%	285	14.1%
No Answer	657	21.6%	294	14.6%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-28 Employed Workers in Household

Number of Employed Workers	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
0	317	10.4%	189	9.4%
1	856	28.1%	617	30.6%
2	845	27.8%	656	32.5%
3	365	12.0%	258	12.8%
No Answer	662	21.7%	299	14.8%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-29 Number of Vehicles Owned by Household

Number of Vehicles	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
0	948	31.1%	603	29.9%
1	859	28.2%	674	33.4%
2	450	14.8%	344	17.0%
3	141	4.6%	107	5.3%
No Answer	647	21.2%	291	14.4%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

Vehicle Available?	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	1,491	49.0%	1,002	49.6%
Yes	844	27.7%	689	34.1%
No Answer	710	23.3%	328	16.2%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### Table 7-30 Vehicle Availability

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-31 Annual Household Income

Household Income	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Under \$15,000	748	24.6%	450	22.3%
\$15,000-\$34,999	606	19.9%	417	20.7%
\$35,000-\$49,999	306	10.0%	239	11.8%
\$50,000-\$74,999	317	10.4%	249	12.3%
\$75,000-\$99,999	216	7.1%	175	8.7%
\$100,000 and more	343	11.3%	275	13.6%
No Answer	509	16.7%	214	10.6%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### **Person Demographics**

#### Table 7-32 Respondent Age

Age	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
< 18	134	4.4%	84	4.2%
18-24	1,005	33.0%	702	34.8%
25-34	825	27.1%	618	30.6%
35-44	297	9.8%	202	10.0%
45-54	178	5.8%	116	5.7%
55-65	160	5.3%	97	4.8%
> 65	117	3.8%	81	4.0%
No Answer	329	10.8%	119	5.9%
Grand Total	3,045	100.0%	2,019	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-33 Respondent Gender

Gender	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares

Man	1,296	42.6%	866	42.9%
Woman	1,273	41.8%	928	46.0%
Prefer to self-describe	9	0.3%	5	0.2%
Non-binary/Genderqueer	107	3.5%	82	4.1%
Prefer not to say	32	1.1%	23	1.1%
No Answer	328	10.8%	115	5.7%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### Table 7-34 Respondent Employment Status

Employed	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	604	19.8%	355	17.6%
Yes	2,084	68.4%	1,536	76.1%
No Answer	357	11.7%	128	6.3%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-35 Respondent Possession of Driver License

Driver License	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	689	22.6%	405	20.1%
Yes	1,728	56.7%	1,335	66.1%
No Answer	628	20.6%	279	13.8%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-36 College/University Student

College/University Student	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	1,113	36.6%	794	39.3%
Yes, University/College (18+)	1,178	38.7%	865	42.8%
Yes, Other	124	4.1%	84	4.2%
No Answer	630	20.7%	276	13.7%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	2,295	75.4%	1,641	81.3%
Yes	359	11.8%	233	11.5%
No Answer	391	12.8%	145	7.2%
Grand Total	3,045	<b>100</b> %	2,019	100%

#### Table 7-37 Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### **Table 7-38 Respondent Race**

Race	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
Black/African-American	237	7.8%	97	4.8%
American Indian/Alaska Native	25	0.8%	17	0.8%
Asian	595	19.5%	387	19.2%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5	0.2%	2	0.1%
White	1,570	51.6%	1,237	61.3%
Two or more races	137	4.5%	90	4.5%
Other	94	3.1%	41	2.0%
No Answer	382	12.5%	148	7.3%
Grand Total	3,045	100.0%	2,019	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-39 Speak English Well

Speak English Well?	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
No	126	4.1%	71	3.5%
Yes	2,593	85.2%	1,829	90.6%
No Answer	326	10.7%	119	5.9%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey

#### Table 7-40 Language Spoken at Home

Language	Responses	Shares	Likely Complete	Shares
English	1,933	63.5%	1,413	70.0%
Spanish	78	2.6%	37	1.8%
Hmong/Miao	6	0.2%	4	0.2%
Cantonese/Mandarin	128	4.2%	84	4.2%
Korean	25	0.8%	15	0.7%

Other	107	3.5%	64	3.2%
Two or More Languages	403	13.2%	263	13.0%
No Answer	365	12.0%	139	6.9%
Grand Total	3,045	100%	2,019	100%

#### 7.3.2 Travel Patterns and Socio-demographics Cross-tabulation from University Survey Responses

#### Table 7-41 Survey Reponses by Route (University)

Route	Responses	Share
80	843	82.3%
81	7	0.7%
82	4	0.4%
84	169	16.5%
Unknown	1	0.1%
Total	1,024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey – Short Form

#### Table 7-42 Frequency of Riding Metro Transit

Trip Frequency	Responses	Share
1-2 trips a week	143	14.0%
3-4 trips a week	247	24.1%
5 or more trips a week	575	56.2%
Less than once a week	57	5.6%
No Answer	2	0.2%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey – Short Form

#### Table 7-43 Respondent Residence Building

Residence	Responses	Share
Eagle Heights/University Houses	283	27.6%
Other	401	39.2%
University Residence Halls	295	28.8%
No Answer	45	4.4%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey – Short Form

#### Table 7-44 Respondent Employment Status

Respondent Employment Status	Responses	Share
No	342	33.4%
Yes	678	66.2%

No Answer	4	0.4%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-45 Respondent UW Status

UW Status	Responses	Share
UW Campus Visitor	8	0.8%
UW Faculty/Staff	92	9.0%
UW Health Employee	18	1.8%
UW Student	872	85.2%
Other	24	2.3%
No Answer	10	1.0%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-46 Respondent Student Type

Student Type	Responses	Share		
Undergraduate	601	58.7%		
Graduate	270	26.4%		
Special	1	0.1%		
Professional	8	0.8%		
Guest	2	0.2%		
Not a Student	132	12.9%		
Missing Answer	10	1.0%		
Total	1024	100.0%		

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-47 Respondent Age

Age	Responses	Share
18-24	660	64.5%
25-34	239	23.3%
35-44	54	5.3%
45-54	14	1.4%
55-65	4	0.4%
< 18	2	0.2%
> 65	3	0.3%
No Answer	48	4.7%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-48 Respondent Gender

Gender

Responses

Share

Man	378	36.9%
Women	587	57.3%
Non-binary/Genderqueer	32	3.1%
Prefer to self-describe	2	0.2%
Prefer not to say	10	1.0%
No Answer	15	1.5%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-49 Respondent Race

Respondent Race	Responses	Share
American Indian/Alaska Native	9	0.9%
Asian	312	30.5%
Black/African-American	70	6.8%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	0.2%
Other	53	5.2%
Two or more races	19	1.9%
White	487	47.6%
No Answer	72	7.0%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey – Short Form

#### Table 7-50 Respondent Hispanic/Latino/Spanish Origin

847	82.7%
160	15.6%
17	1.7%
1024	100.0%
	847 160 17 1024

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-51 Respondent Experiences a Disability

Experience a Disability	Responses	Share
No	939	91.7%
Yes	63	6.2%
No Answer	22	2.1%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Table 7-52 Annual Household Income

Household Income	Responses	Share
Under \$15,000	427	41.7%
\$15,000-\$34,999	218	21.3%

\$35,000-\$49,999	60	5.9%
\$50,000-\$74,999	86	8.4%
\$75,000-\$99,999	31	3.0%
\$100,000 and more	45	4.4%
Prefer not to say	131	12.8%
No Answer	26	2.5%
Total	1024	100.0%

Source: CS Analysis of 2024 Madison Transit Onboard Survey - Short Form

#### Appendix A. Survey Instruments

## **2024 Short-form Survey**

#### (m) metro transit

#### Dear Metro Rider:

4. Where do you live?: (✓ only one) <sup>1</sup>□ Eagle Heights/University Houses

 $_2\square$  University Residence Halls

2□ 1-2 trips a week

We want to learn about you and how you use bus services. This information will help us make decisions about bus services in the future. Please fill out the survey on the bus and give it to the surveyors. If you need more time, you can mail it. Fold it so the mailing label is visible and drop it into any mailbox.

#### **PASSENGER SURVEY**

✓ all

You may also fill it out online via QR or link:



1.	. What is the ROUTE NUMBER? (✓ only one)				5.	<ol> <li>Do YOU have a job/work? (✓ only one)</li> </ol>			
	1□ 80	₂□ 81	₃□ 82	₄□ 84		1 <b>□</b> No		_	
2.	What tin	ne did you	get on TH	IIS ROUTE?				₂□ Yes	
	Time:			6.	6. Please check which best describes you? (✓ only one)				
					_	1 UW Student		₄□ uw	
3.	How many times per week do you make this trip using					Faculty/Staff			
	Metro Ti	r <b>ansit?</b> (✓ or	nly one)			$_2\square$ UW Health Employee	₅□ Other		
	₁□ Less t	than once a v	week	₃□ 3-4 trips a week		₃□ UW Campus Visitor			

₃□ 3-4 1	trips a week		3 UW Campus Visitor					
$_4\Box$ 5 or more trips a week		7.	If you are a UW student, which best describes you? that apply)					
one)			1□ Undergraduate	₄□ Professional				
ouses	₃∐ Other		₂□ Graduate	₅□ Guest				
			3□ Special	6 Other				

8.	What is YOUR age?	Years	12	Do YOU experience a di	sability or mobility impairment?	
9.	What is YOUR gender? (✓ only on	e)		(✓ only one)		
	1 <sup>□</sup> Man 4	Non-binary/Genderqueer		₁∐ No	₂□ Yes	
	₂□ Woman	₅□ Prefer not to say				
	₃□ Prefer to self-describe		13	. How much money did yo	u and the people you live with	
10.	Of what racial group(s) do you c member? ( all that apply)</td <td>onsider yourself a</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">make last year (before taxes)? Only include yourself and the people you live with. Note: If you are a college student living away from home, do NOT include your parents'</td>	onsider yourself a		make last year (before taxes)? Only include yourself and the people you live with. Note: If you are a college student living away from home, do NOT include your parents'		
	$_1\square$ Black/African-American	₅□ White		household information.	If you are currently living with	
	$_2\square$ American Indian/Alaska Native	$_6\Box$ Two or more races		roommates, PLEASE incl	ude information about your	
	₃□ Asian	<sub>7</sub> □ Other				
	<sup>4</sup> Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	r		10 Under \$15,000 \$50,000-\$74,999	4	
11.	Are YOU of Hispanic, Latino, or S	Spanish origin? (🗸 only		₂ <b>□</b> \$15,000-\$34,999	₅□ \$75,000-\$99,999	
	one)			₃□ \$35,000-\$49,999	₀□ \$100,000 and more	
		₂□ Yes		<sup>7</sup> Prefer not to say		

#### իկիկաիլիկերիցնակներըներին կլիրինիրի



#### 2024 Long-form Survey

#### (m) metro transit PASSENGER SURVEY Dear Metro Rider: You may also fill it out online via QR or link: We want to learn about you and how you use bus services. This information will help us make decisions about bus services in the future. Please fill out the survey on the bus and give it to the surveyors. If you need more time, you can mail it. Fold it so the mailing label is visible and drop it into any mailbox. www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1957304/madison **ABOUT YOUR BUS RIDE** 1. Where did you BEGIN this trip? (✓ only one) 4. What is your FINAL destination for this trip? (✓ only one) 1 Home/Residence 5□ Medical/Dental 1 Home/Residence 5□ Medical/Dental D Work D Work 6 6 Store/Shopping Store/Shopping 3□ College/University D Restaurant □ College/University D Restaurant 4□ School (K-12) 8□ Social/Recreation 4 School (K-12) B□ Social/Recreation Other: Other: Where is that located? Where is that located? Place name, address, or intersection: Place name, address, or intersection: 2. At what bus stop did you get ON THIS ROUTE? 5. At what bus stop will you get OFF THIS ROUTE? Nearest street intersection: Nearest street intersection: On street: On street: At street: At street: Stop name: Stop name: 3. How did you get to the FIRST bus stop at the BEGINNING How will you get from your LAST bus stop to your FINAL 6. of this trip? (✓ only one) destination of this trip? (✓ only one) Walked blocks Walk blocks $_{2}\square$ Rode bike or similar device miles 2 Ride bike or similar device \_ miles <sup>3</sup> Dropped off at a bus stop Get picked up at a bus stop $_4\square$ Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked on the street <sup>4</sup> Drive/ride in a vehicle parked on the street 5 Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked at a lot $_{5}\square$ Drive/ride in a vehicle parked at a lot ₀□ Wheelchair/scooter blocks 6 Wheelchair/scooter blocks 7. What is the ROUTE NUMBER? Route: 12. How long will this trip take, including time spent walking, waiting for the bus, riding the bus, any transfers, and 8. What time did you get on THIS ROUTE? walking to final destination? ( < only one) Time: 1 Less than 30 minutes 3 ☐ 60-90 minutes 9. How many TRANSFERS or ROUTE CHANGES will you 2 □ 30-60 minutes <sup>4</sup> More than 90 minutes make in total on this trip? 13. Did you use a Senior/Disabled or Youth Fare? ( <- only one) 0 П 1 1 2 2 3 3 or more <sup>1</sup> Senior/Disabled $_2\square$ Youth $_3\square$ 10. What ROUTES (in order) will you take on this trip? No Route # Route # Route # 14. How did you PAY for this trip? (✓ only one) 11. How many times per week do you make this trip using Cash 5 31-Day Pass (low income) Metro Transit? (✓ only one) Unlimited Ride Pass EZ Rider Youth Pass ⊥ Less than once a week ₃□ 3-4 trips a week □ 10-Ride Card 7 Other 2 1-2 trips a week <sup>₄</sup>□ 5 or more trips a week

4 31-Day Pass

	ABOUT Y	συ	RSELF					
1.	What is YOUR age? Years	6.	Do YOU work/have a jo	ob? (√ (	only one)			
2.	Are YOU of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin? ( v only one)		1□ No		,,			
	1□ No		± =					2 Ves
	2 <b>–</b> Yes	7.	Do YOU experience a d	lisabilit	y or mo	bility	impairn	nent?
3.	Of what racial group(s) do you consider yourself a		(✓ only one)					
	member? (✓ all that apply)		₁□ No				2□ Yes	-
	$_{1}\square$ Black/African-American $_{5}\square$ White		not to oncurar				3	Prefer
	$_2\square$ American Indian/Alaska Native $_6\square$ Two or more races	0	What is YOUR conder?	16	1			
	3 □ Asian 7 □ Other	8.	what is YOUR gender?	(✓ only	one)			
	<sup>4</sup> Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		1 □ Man	leer				
4.	Do YOU speak English well? (✓ only one)		<sup>2</sup> □ Woman			- 🗆	Prefer no	ot to sav
	1 No		<sup>3</sup> Prefer to self-describe	<u>د</u>		5		
_	₂∐ Yes	9.	How much money did	vou AN	D the n	– Deople	vou live	with
5.	Which language(s) do YOU speak at home? (       all that apply)         1 English       4 Cantonese/Mandarin         2 Spanish       Corean	5.	make last year (before the people you live wit	taxes)	<b>Only i</b> e: If you	nclude are a	yourse college	lf and
	$_{3}\Box$ Hmong/Miao $_{6}\Box$ Other		student living away from	m hom	e, do N(	OT incl	ude you	r
			parents' household info	ormatic SE inclu	n. If yo do info	u are c rmatio	urrently	Vour
			roommates when desc	rihing v	our hou	isehol		youi
			1□ Under \$15,000 \$50,000-\$74,999	10116 1		Jenor	<b>u.</b> (* omj	4□
			₃☐ \$15,000-\$34,999			εΠŚ	75.000-\$	999999
			₃□ \$35,000-\$49,999			₀□ \$1(	00,000 ar	nd more
10.	<b>Do YOU have a valid driver's license?</b> ( vonly one)	19	. How long have YOU us	ed Met	ro Tran	sit? (√	only one	)
	ı□ No		$_{1}\Box$ Less than 6 mos.			-		₃□ 3
	2 🗖 Yes		years to 5 years					
11.	Are YOU a student? (✓ only one)		<sub>2</sub> 6 mos. To 2 years			$_4$ DM	ore than	5 years
	$_{1}\square$ No $_{2}\square$ Yes, University/College (18+) $_{3}\square$ Yes, Other	20	. Where do you access t	he bus	schedu	le or r	eal-time	:
12.	Including yourself, how many people live in YOUR		departure information	<b>?</b> (✓ all t	hat apply	)		
	household?		$_1\Box$ Metro Website				4	□ None
	$_{1}\Box$ 1 (Live alone) $_{2}\Box$ 2 $_{3}\Box$ 3 $_{4}\Box$ 4 or more		2□ Google Maps				5□	l Transit
13.	Including yourself, how many people in YOUR household		App					
	are working or have a job?		Other					6
14.	0       1       1       2       3       3       or more         How many motor vehicles (cars, vans, motorbikes, or	21	. Has your use of Metro	change 3? (√ or	ed since	route	s were	
	trucks) are available to people in YOUR household? (		₁□ No		,	2	Yes, I rid	e more
	$\Box \Box 0$ $\Box \Box 1$ $2 \Box 2$ $3 \Box 3$ or more					₃□	Yes, I rid	e less
15.	Were any of these vehicles available today for YOU to				и тни	NK?		
	make this trip? (✓ only one)	Cir	cle HOW YOU RATE Met	ro serv	ice ove	rall.		
	1 <b>No</b>			N/A	Poor	Fair	Good	Great
	2 <b>□</b> Yes	Cle	anliness of buses	N/A	1	2	3	4
16.	In the past 30 days, how often did you skip going	Cha	anges to routes in June 2023 sonal safety while riding	N/A N/A	1 1	2	3	4 4
	somewhere because of a problem with transportation?	Per	sonal safety at bus stops	N/A	1	2	3	4
	1 Often 2□ Sometimes 2□ Never	Per	sonal safety when	N/A	1	2	3	4
17.	In the past 30 days, how often were you not able to leave	Cor	nvenience of routes	N/A	1	2	3	4
	the house when you wanted to because of a problem	Dri	ver courtesy	N/A	1	2	3	4
	with transportation? ( <pre> </pre> only one)	Dri	ver helpfulness	N/A	1	2	3	4
	$_{1}\square$ Often $_{2}\square$ Sometimes $_{3}\square$ Never	Wa	it time for buses	N/A	1	2	3	4
18.	In the past 30 days, how often did problems with	Ma	ps, schedules, and	N/A	1 1	2	3 3	4
	transportation affect your relationships with others?	info	ormation	,			-	
	(✓ only one)	On Pure	line trip planning tracking	N/A	1	2	3	4
	1⊔ Utten 2⊔ Sometimes 3⊔ Never	Far	e cost	N/A	1	2	3	4
		Ove	erall satisfaction	N/A	1	2	3	4

Please submit any other comments on Metro service to mymetrobus@cityofmadison.com.

#### 2015 Long-form Survey



#### METRO TRANSIT PASSENGER SURVEY

#### Dear Metro Rider:

Thank you for taking time to answer questions about you, your bus service, and how you use it. The information you provide is very important and will be used to guide improvements to bus service in the future.

If possible, please complete this survey on the bus and return it to the surveyors. If you are unable to do so, please complete the survey as soon as possible, and fold it so the mailing label is visible and drop it into any mailbox.

You may also scan the QR code at the end of survey or go to the following website to complete the survey: www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1957304/madison

Check here if you already filled out a survey on another trip. Please continue to complete this form.

#### ABOUT YOUR BUS RIDE

1. What is the ROUTE NUMBER?

Route:

- 2. What time did you get on THIS ROUTE? Time: 2**D** PM
- 3. Where did you BEGIN this trip? (✓ only one)
  - ₅□ Medical/Dental 1□ Home/Residence 2□ Place of Work 6 Store/Shopping
  - 3□ College/University 7□ Restaurant/Eat Out ₄□ School (K-12) ₀□ Social/Recreation Other

#### Where was that located?

Place name and exact address:

Or nearest street intersection: On street:

- At street: How did you arrive at the FIRST bus stop at the 4
- BEGINNING of this trip? (✓ only one) blocks
  - 1□ Walked 2 Rode bike
  - 3□ Was dropped off at bus stop
  - 4 Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked on the street
  - <u>5</u>П Drove/rode in a vehicle and parked at park-and-
  - ride or other lot
  - 6 Used wheelchair/scooter

#### 5. Did you TRANSFER or CHANGE to THIS ROUTE? ( < only one)

2 Yes

- 6. At what bus stop did you get ON THIS ROUTE? Nearest street intersection: On atreat

On street:	_
At street:	
Place Name:	

lace	Name:	_	

At what bus stop will you get OFF THIS ROUTE?

Nearest street intersection:

On street:	
At street:	

Place Name:

000011



8. Will you TRANSFER or CHANGE ROUTES to complete your trip? ( < only one)

2 Yes

- How will you get from your LAST bus stop to your 9. FINAL destination for this trip? (✓ only one)
  - 1□ Walk blocks

- 2 Ride bike
- 3□ Will be picked up at bus stop
- 4□ Drive/ride in a vehicle parked on the street 5 Drive/ride in a vehicle parked at park-and-ride lot

₅□ Medical/Dental

- or other lot
- 6□ Will use wheelchair/scooter
- 10. What is your FINAL destination for this trip? ( vonly one)
  - 1 Home/Residence
  - 2 Place of Work
  - 6 Store/Shopping 3□ College/University 7 Restaurant/Fat Out ₀□ Social/Recreation
  - ₄□ School (K-12) Other

#### Where is that located?

Place name and exact address: \_

Or nearest street intersection:

On street: At street:

- 11. How many TRANSFERS or ROUTE CHANGES will you make in total on this trip?
  - Number of transfers
- 12. What ROUTES (in order) will you take on this trip? Route#\_\_\_\_ Route#\_\_\_\_\_ Route#
- 13. How did you PAY for this trip? (< only one)
- ₁□ Cash
- 2 Unlimited Ride Pass
- 3□ 10-Ride Card
- ₄□ 31-Day Pass
- 5 31-Day Pass (low income) 6 EZ Rider Youth Pass
- Differ
- 14. Did you use a Senior/Disabled or Youth Fare? (✓ only one)
  - 1 Senior/Disabled 2 Youth 3 Neither
- 15. How many times per week do you make this same trip using Metro Transit? ( vonly one)
  - Less than once a week ₃□ 3-4 trips a week 2□ 1-2 trips a week ₄□ 5 or more trips a week

#### ABOUT YOURSELF

- 16. What is YOUR age? Years
- 17. What is YOUR gender? ( < only one) 1 Male 2 Female 3 Do not identify as either
- 18. Are YOU employed? ( < only one)
- 1□ No 2 Yes
- 19. Do YOU have a valid driver's license? (< only one) 1 No 2 Yes

continued *D* 

- 20. Are YOU a college/university student? ( < only one) 1□ No 2□ Yes
- 21. Are YOU of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin? (✓ only one) 1 **No**

₂□ Yes

- 22. Of what racial group(s) do YOU consider yourself a member? ( </ all that apply)
  - 1 Black/African-American ₂□ American Indian/Alaska Native
  - 3 Asian
  - 4□ Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander
  - ₅□ White 6□ Two or more races
  - 7 Other
- 23. Do YOU speak English well? (< only one) 10 No 2 Yes
- 24. Which language(s) do YOU speak at home? (✓ all that apply) ₁□ English ₄□ Cantonese/Mandarin

₅□ Korean

₀□ Other

- 2 Spanish ₃□ Hmong/Miao
- 25. How long have YOU used Metro Transit? (✓only one)
  - 1□ Less than 6 mos. ₃□ 3 years to 5 years 2□ 6 mos. to 2 years ₄□ More than 5 years

#### ABOUT YOUR HOUSEHOLD

Note: If you are a college student living away from home, do NOT include your parents' household information. If you are currently staying with room-mates, PLEASE include information about your room-mates when describing your household.

26. Including yourself, how many people live in YOUR household?

Number of people in household

27. Including yourself, how many people in YOUR household are employed?

Number of workers in household

28. How many motor vehicles (cars, vans, motorbikes, or trucks) are available to people in YOUR household? ( vonly one)

1D 0 <sub>2</sub>□ 1

· T 2 ₄□ 3 or more

#### իկկիսիկիկիրիզիսիներըիսիսիներըներին

8266-80782 IW NOSIDAM SUITE 201 **1245 E. WASHINGTON AVENUE METRO TRANSIT** POSTACE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE







29. Were any of these vehicles available today for YOU to make this trip? ( < only one)

1□ No

30. What category best describes the combined total income (before taxes) in 2014 for everyone in YOUR household? ( < only one)

₂□ Yes

1 <b>□</b> Under \$15,000	₄ <b>□</b> \$50,000-\$74,999
₂□ \$15,000-\$34,999	₅ <b>□</b> \$75,000-\$99,999
₃□ \$35,000-\$49,999	₀□ \$100,000 and more

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK?

#### Circle HOW YOU RATE Metro service.

N/A Poor Fair Good Cood a. Cleanliness of buses N/A 1 2 3 4 b. Personal safety while riding N/A 1 2 3 4 c. Personal safety at a bus stop N/A 1 2 3 4 d. Personal safety at a transfer point N/A 1 2 3 4 e. Convenience of routes N/A 1 2 3 4 f Driver courtesv N/A 1 2 3 4 g. Time waiting for bus N/A 1 2 3 4 h. Travel time on bus N/A 1 2 3 4 i. Crowding on bus N/A 1 2 3 4 j. Maps and schedules N/A 1 2 3 4 k. On-line trip planning N/A 1 2 3 4 I. Bus tracking N/A 1 2 3 4 m.Overall satisfaction N/A 1 2 3 4

#### Comments on Metro service:

# 2012 Short-form (University) Survey

	○ Fill bubble if you	already filled out	us Bl	JS PA	55ENG	K SUP		riation
	Fill bubbles completely with #2 pencil.						University of Viscon	eta-Madica
=	1. Please check	1. Please check which best describes you (fill one):						
-	O UW Student	O UW Facult	y/Staff	OUWH	ospital Emplo	oyee OUW	Campus Visitor	Oother
Ē	2. I currently live in (fill one):							
	O Eagle Heigh	O Eagle Heights/University Houses		O University Residence Halls		ce Halls	OOther	
-	3. If you are a UW student, the status that best describes you is (fill one):							
-	O Undergradua	ate O Gradu	uate	() Speci	al OP	rofessional	OGuest	Other
-	4. If you are a UV	V student, how	many cr	edits are	you curre	ntly registere	ed for (fill one)	?
-	0 0 0 1 2 3	0 0 0 0 4 5 6 7	0 0 8 9	0 O 10 11	0 12+			
-	5. What time is it	(fill one)?						
-	06AN - 10AM 010AM -		3PM	O 3PM - 6PM		O 6PM - 9PM	O 9PM - 3AM	
-	Please return the	completed for	m to a s	urvey cre	ew member	or drop-off	bax.	
-	ACCU-SCAN* DIRE ON 2 (Parton	Ready APPERSON PRINT RESOUR	ices					84125-1