

Institute for Policy and Economic Development

IPED Technical Reports

University of Texas at El Paso

Year 2006

Sun Metro Fixed Route Rider Survey

Dennis L. Soden*

Mathew McElroy†

Susanne Green‡

*University of Texas at El Paso, desoden@utep.edu

†University of Texas at El Paso, mmcelroy@utep.edu

‡

This paper is posted at DigitalCommons@UTEP.

http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/iped_techrep/57

Sun Metro Fixed Route Rider Survey

For: The City of El Paso

Dennis L. Soden
Mathew S. McElroy
Susanne Green

Technical Report 2006-07
August, 2006

Institute for Policy and Economic Development
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968-0703
915.747.7974 Fax 915.747.7948
iped.utep.edu



Introduction

During summer 2006, the Institute for Policy and Economic Development (IPED) at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) was contracted by the City of El Paso to conduct an intercept survey to measure bus rider's attitudes and perceptions regarding Sun Metro bus system services. The goal of the survey was to provide a series of benchmarks for bus system improvements and establish a set of baseline data for ongoing program evaluation.

The results reported here indicate El Paso is heavily dependent on mass transit, as 76 percent of riders do not own cars. This is explained in part by the fact that El Paso riders tend to "reverse commute," beginning their journeys downtown and commuting outward toward the suburbs.

Of the topics covered by the survey, bus reliability was among the most important. This is due to the fact that summer temperatures regularly rise above 100 degrees in El Paso. As such, complaints go from 10 to 140 per 100,000 riders during winter and moderate temperature months to 175 per 100,000 during the summer. Due to this seasonal complaint pattern, biannual program evaluation based on seasonal trends is recommended. In fact, Sun Metro's current improvement plan hinges on bus reliability as the critical path to customer satisfaction. It is anticipated that once the bus reliability issues are solved, other areas such as safety, cost, and location of stops may become the most important issues for Sun Metro riders.

Methodology

The survey project began with a series of meetings with Sun Metro officials to finalize the survey instrument. Survey findings for each variable are presented in table form on the following pages.

The survey was conducted from July 19th-22nd, a high-profile time for Sun Metro bus services due to recent administrative changes and frequent media coverage regarding services issues. A proportional sample was collected based on rider data provided by Sun Metro. Bilingual interviewers collected data throughout the workday during the work week and on the weekend. Survey locations included (in order of the most riders):

1. San Jacinto Plaza,
2. East El Paso Terminal,
3. Alameda at Zaragosa,
4. Five Points,
5. North Gate, and
6. West Side (Cross Roads).

In total, 597 surveys were administered with 303 conducted in English and 294 conducted in Spanish. Potential participants were informed of the purpose of the study, that their participation was voluntary, and that all responses would remain confidential and be reported only in the aggregate. The sample reflected the demographic composition of El Paso in terms of race/ethnicity and gender.

Findings¹

- Seventy-six percent of riders do not own a car (see Table 5)
- Forty-six percent of riders are low income (see Table 38)
- Eighty-five percent of riders walk to the bus stop (see Table 3)
- Fifty-two percent of riders use bus services daily (see Table 1)
- Eighty-six percent of riders most frequently ride the bus in the morning (see Table 6)
- Thirty-five percent of riders use the bus to get to work (see Table 4)
- Sixty-two percent of riders have been on a bus that broke down (see Table 27)
- Seventy-five percent of riders waited 60 minutes or less for services to resume after a bus broke down (see Table 28)

¹ Valid percent is used and does not include missing system cases (n=597).

- Twenty-seven percent of riders have complained about services (see Table 25)
- Eighty-five percent of riders believe it is very important that buses run on time (see Table 8)
- Eighty-five percent of riders believe it is very important that buses do not break down (see Table 15)
- Eighty-two percent of riders believe it is very important that buses have working air-conditioning and heating (see Table 16)

Also of concern is the finding that only 7 percent of Sun Metro's ridership self identifies as not living in El Paso. This finding is in sharp contrast with El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) data that suggest 54% of Sun Metro ridership comes from Juarez, Mexico. This unexpected finding certainly has implications for Sun Metro's goal of providing international services for riders and may be a function of the current immigration debate along the border. Given this disparity, IPED will conduct a supplemental survey at the end of September at one of the international bridges and during a time when schools are in session (UTEP, El Paso Community College, and area high schools).

Presented below are the aggregated results for each of the questions asked during the survey. Readers will want to take note of the valid percent column in each of the tables. The data here reflect the percent of responses for individuals who actually answered the question. The percent column that precedes this calculates the percentage for the entire sample, including people who did not answer a specific question. The latter is more important when nonresponse or missing data tend to be problematic for a particular study. This is not the case for this survey, so valid percent is the best measure of actual rider attitudes.

Table 1. How many times per week do you use the bus?

Bus rides per week		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Daily	311	52.1	52.1	52.1
	2-3 times per week	160	26.8	26.8	78.9
	Once a week	46	7.7	7.7	86.6
	Once a month	46	7.7	7.7	94.3
	Other	34	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Just over 52 percent (52.1%) of survey respondents ride the bus daily.
- ✓ Almost 80 percent (78.9) ride the bus at least two to three times per week.

Table 2. How many trips do you make a day using the bus?

Bus trips per day		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	49	8.2	8.3	8.3
	2	257	43.0	43.8	52.1
	3	79	13.2	13.5	65.6
	4	129	21.6	22.0	87.6
	5 or more	73	12.2	12.4	100.0
	Total	587	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.7		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ Forty-four (43.8) percent of survey respondents ride the bus twice daily.
- ✓ The majority of respondents (52.1 percent) ride the bus one to two times per day.

Table 3. How do you get to the bus station/bus stop?

Mode to bus station		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Walk	510	85.4	85.4	85.4
	Drive	15	2.5	2.5	87.9
	Bicycle	15	2.5	2.5	90.5
	Carpool	26	4.4	4.4	94.8
	Other	31	5.2	5.2	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ The vast majority of riders walk to the bus stop (85.4 percent).
- ✓ Other initiatives such as bicycle racks and park and ride locations seem to have met with limited popular success.

Table 4. What is the purpose of your trip today?

Purpose of bus trip		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	School	50	8.4	8.5	8.5
	Work	205	34.3	34.8	43.3
	Errands/shopping	120	20.1	20.4	63.7
	Doctor/medical appointment	52	8.7	8.8	72.5
	Visit family or friends	78	13.1	13.2	85.7
	Entertainment (movies)	37	6.2	6.3	92.0
	Other	47	7.9	8.0	100.0
	Total	589	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.3		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ The largest group of respondents ride the bus to get to work (34.8 percent).
- ✓ Errands and shopping make up the second-largest trip purpose category (20.4 percent).

Table 5. Do you own a car?

Car ownership		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	133	22.3	22.3	22.3
	No	453	75.9	75.9	98.2
	Other	11	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ The Sun Metro rider population is heavily mass transit dependent, as just under 76 percent (75.9%) do not own an automobile.

Table 6. When do you most frequently ride the bus?

Time when frequently ride the bus		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Morning	498	83.4	85.9	85.9
	Evening	16	2.7	2.8	88.6
	Other	2	.3	.3	89.0
	Morning and Evening	64	10.7	11.0	100.0
	Total	580	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	17	2.8		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ Eighty five percent (85.9%) of survey respondents most frequently ride the bus in the morning. This finding is not surprising given the large number of people who use the bus for errands and shopping, school, and other visits.

Table 7. Matrix of importance of Sun Metro services to riders

Rank Order of Importance	Sun Metro Services	Mean
1	No break down of buses	4.72
2	Having buses be on time	4.71
2	Accommodations for elderly riders	4.71
2	Accommodations for handicap riders	4.71
3	Working heating and air conditioning	4.66
4	Safe terminals and drop off points	4.56
5	Speed to destination	4.51
6	Location of stops and pick-up points	4.50
7	Courtesy of drivers and agents	4.48
8	Cleanliness of buses	4.43
9	Location of stops near businesses	4.39
10	Cleanliness of terminals	4.38
11	Location of stops near schools	4.37
12	Cost to ride bus	4.36
13	Way to provide feedback to Sun Metro	4.35
14	Accommodations for youth riders	4.25

- ✓ The most important issue for Sun Metro riders is clearly bus maintenance. It is interesting to note that bus timeliness, which also has bearing on maintenance, places second.
- ✓ Accommodations for youth riders placed last, but this may be more a function of the fact that school for the fall semester was not yet in session when this survey was conducted.

Table 8. Importance of having the buses be on time (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Buses on time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
2	10	1.7	1.7	3.0
3	46	7.7	7.7	10.7
4	23	3.9	3.9	14.6
5	509	85.3	85.3	99.8
NR	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Not surprisingly, 85.3% of respondents felt that it was very important for buses to run on time.

Table 9. Importance of courtesy of drivers and agents (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Courtesy of drivers and agents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	9	1.5	1.5	1.5
2	13	2.2	2.2	3.7
3	65	10.9	10.9	14.6
4	110	18.4	18.4	33.0
5	398	66.7	66.7	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Courtesy of drivers was also important to riders (85 percent felt it was either important or very important), but further down the list of priorities when compared to timeliness and heating and air-conditioning.

Table 10. Importance of speed to destination (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Speed to destination	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
2	10	1.7	1.7	3.0
3	79	13.2	13.2	16.2
4	71	11.9	11.9	28.1
5	428	71.7	71.7	99.8
NR	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Speed to destination was of concern to survey respondents, with 71.7 percent of respondents saying it was very important.

Table 11. Importance of cleanliness of buses (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Cleanliness of buses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	11	1.8	1.8	1.8
2	11	1.8	1.8	3.7
3	77	12.9	12.9	16.6
4	109	18.3	18.3	34.8
5	387	64.8	64.8	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Bus cleanliness was not as high on the priority list, with just under 65 percent (64.8%) saying that it was very important.

Table 12. Importance of cleanliness of terminals (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Cleanliness of terminals	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	12	2.0	2.0	2.0
2	14	2.3	2.3	4.4
3	82	13.7	13.7	18.1
4	117	19.6	19.6	37.7
5	369	61.8	61.8	99.5
NR	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Sixty two percent (61.8%) of survey respondents felt that cleanliness of terminals was very important.
- ✓ Almost twenty percent (19.6%) said that cleanliness of terminals was important.

Table 13. Importance of cost of bus ride (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Cost of bus ride	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	10	1.7	1.7	1.7
2	18	3.0	3.0	4.7
3	103	17.3	17.3	21.9
4	85	14.2	14.2	36.2
5	380	63.7	63.7	99.8
NR	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ In early discussions with Sun Metro staff and during pretests cost seemed to be among the most important issues to riders. However, while 63.7 percent of survey respondents feel that it was very important, it lags well behind other issues such as heating and cooling and other bus maintenance issues.

Table 14. Importance of location of stops and pick-up points (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Location of stops and pick-up points	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	14	2.3	2.3	2.3
2	7	1.2	1.2	3.5
3	62	10.4	10.4	13.9
4	98	16.4	16.4	30.3
5	414	69.3	69.3	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Bus stop location was also an important concern among riders since 85% walk to the bus stop.
- ✓ Sixty nine percent (69.3%) of respondents said that bus stop location was very important.

Table 15. Importance of no breakdowns of buses (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

No breakdowns of buses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	14	2.3	2.3	2.3
2	7	1.2	1.2	3.5
3	29	4.9	4.9	8.4
4	37	6.2	6.2	14.6
5	507	84.9	84.9	99.5
NR	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Among the most important issues of all questions asked related to bus maintenance. Here, we find that 84.9 percent of riders felt that no breakdowns of buses was very important. Over 90 percent responded that the importance of no breakdowns was either important or very important.

Table 16. Importance of working heating and air conditioning (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Working heating and air conditioning	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	13	2.2	2.2	2.2
2	11	1.8	1.8	4.0
3	37	6.2	6.2	10.2
4	46	7.7	7.7	17.9
5	490	82.1	82.1	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Eighty-two percent (82.1%) felt that working heating and air-conditioning were very important. Close to 90 percent felt that heating and air-conditioning were either important or very important.
- ✓ The survey was conducted during August of 2006 and temperatures were regularly above 100 degrees. As such, this result is not surprising.

Table 17. Importance of safe terminals and drop off points (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Safe terminals and drop off points	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	6	1.0	1.0	1.0
2	12	2.0	2.0	3.0
3	49	8.2	8.2	11.2
4	104	17.4	17.4	28.6
5	424	71.0	71.0	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Safe terminals and drop-off points were also very important to riders, as 71 percent chose the highest importance category.

Table 18. Importance of accommodations for handicap riders (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Accommodations for handicap riders	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
2	5	.8	.8	2.2
3	32	5.4	5.4	7.5
4	65	10.9	10.9	18.4
5	485	81.2	81.2	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Over 90 percent of riders felt that accommodations for handicapped passengers were either important or very important, which is not surprising given the high percentage of elderly riders.

Table 19. Importance of accommodations for elderly riders (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Accommodations for elderly riders	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	9	1.5	1.5	1.5
2	3	.5	.5	2.0
3	36	6.0	6.0	8.0
4	59	9.9	9.9	17.9
5	489	81.9	81.9	99.8
NR	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ As with handicap accommodations, over 91 percent of respondents felt that accommodations for elderly riders were either important or very important.

Table 20. Importance of location of stops near businesses (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Location of stops near businesses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	15	2.5	2.5	2.5
2	12	2.0	2.0	4.5
3	72	12.1	12.1	16.6
4	128	21.4	21.4	38.0
5	368	61.6	61.6	99.7
NR	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Sixty-one percent (61.6%) of respondents felt that location of stops near businesses was very important.

Table 21. Importance of location of stops near schools (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of least importance, 3 being neutral and 5 being of great importance)

Location of stops near schools	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	18	3.0	3.0	3.0
2	19	3.2	3.2	6.2
3	83	13.9	13.9	20.1
4	87	14.6	14.6	34.7
5	387	64.8	64.8	99.5
NR	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Sixty-four percent (64.8%) of respondents said that bus stop locations near schools were very important.

Table 22. Importance of accommodations for youth riders

Accommodations for youth riders	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	15	2.5	2.5	2.5
2	25	4.2	4.2	6.7
3	105	17.6	17.6	24.3
4	106	17.8	17.8	42.0
5	343	57.5	57.5	99.5
NR	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Among the least important issues to survey respondents were accommodations for youth riders, as only 57.5 percent of respondents ranked it as very important. This finding may be a result of the fact that the major semesters were not in session for either UTEP, El Paso Community College, nor any of the local school districts.

Table 23. Importance of a way to provide feedback to Sun Metro

Way to provide feedback to Sun Metro	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	24	4.0	4.0	4.0
2	19	3.2	3.2	7.2
3	81	13.6	13.6	20.8
4	80	13.4	13.4	34.2
5	386	64.7	64.7	98.8
NR	7	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Sixty-four percent (64.7%) of respondents felt that it was very important to have a way to provide feedback to Sun Metro.

Table 24. Importance of public input into route expansion and changes

Public input into routes	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	20	3.4	3.4	3.4
2	17	2.8	2.8	6.2
3	76	12.7	12.7	18.9
4	87	14.6	14.6	33.5
5	392	65.7	65.7	99.2
NR	5	.8	.8	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Sixty-five percent (65.7%) felt that input into route expansion and changes was very important.

Table 25. Have you ever filed a complaint or called to complain about any Sun Metro services?

Complaints against Sun Metro	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	162	27.1	27.1	27.1
No	435	72.9	72.9	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Over a quarter (27.1%) of respondents have complained to Sun Metro about its services.

Table 26. Have you ever contacted an elected official about a problem or concern related to Sun Metro?

Contacted official about Sun Metro		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	43	7.2	7.2	7.2
	No	554	92.8	92.8	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Only seven percent (7.2%) of respondents have ever contacted an elected official about a problem with Sun Metro.

Table 27. Have you ever been on a Sun Metro bus that broke down?

On bus that broke down		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	371	62.1	62.1	62.1
	No	226	37.9	37.9	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Sixty-two percent (62.1%) of survey respondents have been on a Sun Metro bus that broke down, which underscores the findings related to bus maintenance described above.

Table 28. If on a Sun Metro bus that broke down, how long did it take for service to resume?

Length of time to resume service		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5	1	.2	.3	.3
	10	16	2.7	4.3	4.5
	15	13	2.2	3.5	8.0
	20	28	4.7	7.5	15.5
	25	1	.2	.3	15.8
	30	85	14.2	22.7	38.5
	35	5	.8	1.3	39.8
	40	17	2.8	4.5	44.4
	45	26	4.4	7.0	51.3
	50	2	.3	.5	51.9
	60	85	14.2	22.7	74.6
	65	1	.2	.3	74.9
	70	2	.3	.5	75.4
	72	1	.2	.3	75.7
	75	2	.3	.5	76.2
	80	2	.3	.5	76.7
	90	28	4.7	7.5	84.2
	95	3	.5	.8	85.0
	100	1	.2	.3	89.6
	105	1	.2	.3	89.8
	110	1	.2	.3	90.1
	120	23	3.9	6.1	96.3
	150	5	.8	1.3	97.6
	180	6	1.0	1.6	99.2
	240	3	.5	.8	100.0
	Unsure/Don't remember	16	2.7	4.3	89.3
	Total	374	62.6	100.0	
Missing	System	223	37.4		
Total		597	100.0		

✓ Of respondents who had been on a bus that broke down, 38.5 percent waited half an hour or less for service to resume. Seventy-four percent (74.9) waited up to an hour for service to resume.

Table 29. If on a Sun Metro bus that broke down, did another bus have to come and pick up riders?

Bus replacement		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	261	43.7	69.4	69.4
	No	80	13.4	21.3	90.7
	Unsure/Don't remember	35	5.9	9.3	100.0
	Total	376	63.0	100.0	
Missing	System	221	37.0		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ Sixty-nine percent (69.4%) of the time when a bus broke down a bus replacement to pick up stranded riders was necessary.

Table 30. Would you be willing to pay a little more to get better and more reliable services from Sun Metro?

Pay more for bus reliability		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	269	45.1	45.1	45.1
	No	232	38.9	38.9	83.9
	Maybe	96	16.1	16.1	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Almost half (45.1%) of survey respondents were willing to pay a little more to get better and more reliable services from Sun Metro.

Table 31. How much more are you willing to pay per ride to get better and more reliable services from Sun Metro?

Amount willing to pay more	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid .05	2	.3	.8	.8
.10	18	3.0	6.9	7.6
.20	6	1.0	2.3	9.9
.25	66	11.1	25.2	35.1
.30	7	1.2	2.7	37.8
.35	2	.3	.8	38.5
.40	2	.3	.8	39.3
.50	86	14.4	32.8	72.1
.55	1	.2	.4	72.5
.60	1	.2	.4	72.9
.70	1	.2	.4	73.3
.75	5	.8	1.9	75.2
1.00	42	7.0	16.0	91.2
1.25	1	.2	.4	91.6
1.50	7	1.2	2.7	94.3
2.00	10	1.7	3.8	98.1
2.50	4	.7	1.5	99.6
3.00	1	.2	.4	100.0
Total	262	43.9	100.0	
Missing System	335	56.1		
Total	597	100.0		

- ✓ Just over 35 percent (35.1%) were willing to pay 25 cents or less for improved services from Sun Metro.
- ✓ Almost three fourths of respondents were willing to pay 50 cents or less for improved services.

Table 32. Location of survey

Location of survey	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid San Jacinto	304	50.9	54.4	54.4
East El Paso Terminal	63	10.6	11.3	65.7
Alameda at Zaragoza	33	5.5	5.9	71.6
Five Points	59	9.9	10.6	82.1
North Gate	49	8.2	8.8	90.9
West Side (Crossroads)	51	8.5	9.1	100.0
Total	559	93.6	100.0	
Missing System	38	6.4		
Total	597	100.0		

- ✓ Data collection was designed to match current rider patterns. As such, 54 percent (54.4%) of survey responses were collected in downtown El Paso at San Jacinto Plaza. The remainder of the responses were collected at outlying terminals and frequently used or heavily populated pickup locations.

Table 33. Language survey completed in

Language of respondents		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	303	50.8	50.8	50.8
	Spanish	294	49.2	49.2	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ The language interviews were completed in was divided evenly between English and Spanish.

Demographics

Table 34. What race/ethnicity do you consider yourself?

Race/ethnicity of respondents		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Hispanic	487	81.6	81.6	81.6
	African American	28	4.7	4.7	86.3
	Caucasian	49	8.2	8.2	94.5
	Asian	1	.2	.2	94.6
	Other	32	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

✓ Over 81 percent (81.6%) of respondents self identified as Hispanic, which closely mirrors the overall demographic for El Paso County.

Table 35. Gender

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	269	45.1	46.8	46.8
	Female	306	51.3	53.2	100.0
	Total	575	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	22	3.7		
Total		597	100.0		

✓ The sample was relatively well distributed between males and females.

Table 36. How old are you?

Age of respondents		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 18	13	2.2	2.2	2.2
	18-25	134	22.4	22.4	24.6
	26-30	53	8.9	8.9	33.5
	31-35	51	8.5	8.5	42.0
	36-40	48	8.0	8.0	50.1
	41-45	47	7.9	7.9	58.0
	46-50	73	12.2	12.2	70.2
	51-60	87	14.6	14.6	84.8
	61-70	52	8.7	8.7	93.5
	71 and over	39	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ The majority of respondents were either age 18 to 25, which suggests a young working ridership since most schools were not in session, or 46 and above.

Table 37. Are you currently employed?

Respondent employed		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	315	52.8	59.0	59.0
	No	219	36.7	41.0	100.0
	Total	534	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	63	10.6		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ Fifty-nine percent of respondents were employed.

Table 38. What is your household income?

Household income		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$10,000	214	35.8	45.9	45.9
	\$10,001-\$20,000	168	28.1	36.1	82.0
	\$20,001-\$30,000	44	7.4	9.4	91.4
	\$30,001-\$40,000	11	1.8	2.4	93.8
	\$40,001-\$50,000	12	2.0	2.6	96.4
	\$50,001-\$60,000	10	1.7	2.1	98.5
	\$60,001-\$70,000	3	.5	.6	99.1
	Over \$70,001	4	.7	.9	100.0
	Total	466	78.1	100.0	
Missing	System	131	21.9		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ The great majority of respondents were low income, as 45.9 percent made less than \$10,000 a year and another 36.1 percent made between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year.

Table 39. Do you live in El Paso?

Respondent living in El Paso		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	481	80.6	92.9	92.9
	No	37	6.2	7.1	100.0
	Total	518	86.8	100.0	
Missing	System	79	13.2		
Total		597	100.0		

✓ Just under 93 percent (92.9%) of survey respondents self identified as living in El Paso.

Table 40. If respondent lives in El Paso, what is your zip code?

If yes, what is your zip code?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	79901	44	7.4	9.3	9.3
	79902	67	11.2	14.1	23.4
	79903	32	5.4	6.8	30.2
	79904	27	4.5	5.7	35.9
	79905	36	6.0	7.6	43.5
	79907	24	4.0	5.1	48.5
	79912	32	5.4	6.8	55.3
	79913	2	.3	.4	55.7
	79915	11	1.8	2.3	58.0
	79916	1	.2	.2	58.2
	79920	1	.2	.2	58.4
	79922	10	1.7	2.1	60.5
	79923	2	.3	.4	61.0
	79924	39	6.5	8.2	69.2
	79925	10	1.7	2.1	71.3
	79927	20	3.4	4.2	75.5
	79928	4	.7	.8	76.4
	79930	46	7.7	9.7	86.1
	79931	1	.2	.2	86.3
	79932	21	3.5	4.4	90.7
	79934	1	.2	.2	90.9
	79935	4	.7	.8	91.8
	79936	23	3.9	4.9	96.6
	79938	6	1.0	1.3	97.9
	79945	1	.2	.2	98.1
	79949	3	.5	.6	98.7
	79960	1	.2	.2	98.9
	79961	1	.2	.2	99.2
	79968	1	.2	.2	99.4
	88521	1	.2	.2	99.6
	88563	1	.2	.2	99.8
	88581	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	474	79.4	100.0	
Missing	System	123	20.6		
Total		597	100.0		

- ✓ Survey respondents tended to come from all areas of El Paso, with no particular zip code or area of town showing significantly higher ridership than the others. This is likely due to the fact that surveyors were stationed in areas across El Paso County.

Table 41. If respondent does not live in El Paso, where do you live?

If no, where do you live?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	514	86.1	86.1	86.1
California	1	.2	.2	86.3
Chihuahua	2	.3	.3	86.6
Durango	3	.5	.5	87.1
Homeless	1	.2	.2	87.3
Horizon City	2	.3	.3	87.6
Juarez	70	11.7	11.7	99.3
New Mexico	1	.2	.2	99.5
New Orleans	1	.2	.2	99.7
San Diego	1	.2	.2	99.8
South Carolina	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total	597	100.0	100.0	

- ✓ Not surprisingly, of riders from outside of El Paso, most identified the place they live as Juarez.