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## 16. Abstract

This report summarizes the results of an initial and follow-up telephone survey of the general public in SAGINAW, Michigan. The purpose of the initial survey was to determine public attitudes toward, and awareness of, the Saginaw Transit System (STS). The purpose of the follow-up survey was to evaluate the effectiveness of STS marketing efforts during the time from the initial survey to the follow-up survey. This report compares the results from the follow-up survey conducted in 1981 with those of the initial survey conducted in 1980. The comparison indicates which marketing efforts have been most successful and highlights significant changes in attitude and awareness levels.

The major objectives of this research were threefold:

1. To develop and implement a methodology that could be used by other state transportation departments to survey public attitude and awareness levels regarding transit systems in their states.
2. To provide relevant market data to STS for use in developing effective marketing efforts for public transportation services.
3. To assist the Michigan Department of Transportation in determining the type of marketing efforts which might be appropriate at the state level.
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INTRODUCTION

The major objective of this research was to develop and implement a methodology that could be used by other state transportation departments to measure public attitudes toward, and awareness of, fixed-route public transit systems. The information gathered would be used to assist these systems in developing effective marketing efforts for public transportation services, as well as determine the type of marketing efforts which might be appropriate at the state level. This project involved five selected Michigan communities with transit systems receiving assistance under terms of Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

In order to design public transportation services to better meet the public's needs, it was necessary first to collect market data which identified these needs. With this information it would then be possible to design service to meet these needs and to prepare promotional material to inform and persuade the public about existing service. A methodology was necessary to collect this information.

The initial survey results on a particular community were provided to the transit system in that community. The transit system was encouraged to use these results in planning and developing its marketing efforts, e.g., the definition of target markets and formulation of goals and strategies for each target segment. Each system was encouraged to develop marketing projects based on this information. The effectiveness of these projects was evaluated by a follow-up survey conducted approximately 21 months after the initial survey to determine the extent to which attitudes and awareness had changed.

The intent of the methodology developed and employed in this project is that it will be adaptable to other state transportation departments' marketing efforts throughout the country. Special Report 181 of the Transportation Research Board suggests that "some agency with an overview capability" develop "a common set of survey questions." It states that "some uniformity along these lines would help develop a common data base that could be used by all
systems in further research." It suggests that a state department of transportation is one of the "most likely collection centers."

While some Michigan transit systems already are doing some type of telephone marketing research, the value of this type of research conducted at the state level is primarily that of standardization, similar to that developed for what is now the Federal Highway Administration in highway travel surveys during the 1940s. Current efforts to compare marketing research conducted in different communities throughout the country have been severely hampered by the fact that each urbanized area used different questionnaires and techniques. This approach ensures that questions are uniform, that the administration of the survey is consistent in its quality, and that other factors remain stable from community to community.

The approach taken in this research project, to the best of our knowledge, has not been undertaken to date. It is, thus, intended to contribute to the development of a research methodology which is applicable to other state transportation departments throughout the country, as well as provide information which will benefit the State of Michigan and the marketing efforts of Michigan transit systems. Further, this procedure should be relatively easy to implement, given the existence of similar transportation departments throughout the United States.

In preparing for this project, several alternative survey methods were considered. One of the most direct surveys would have been to conduct a home interview of residents in the study areas. However, setting up offices in five different cities, training personnel, and incurring travel-related expenses made this option impractical for the time allotted. Instead, it was decided that a telephone interview survey would be best.

The goal for each community was to collect 1,000 interviews. It was estimated that meeting this goal would require about twice as many telephone calls to account for number changes, no answers, interview refusals, etc. Each interview solicited responses to a 38 -item questionnaire (Appendix A) regarding attitudes and awareness of local public transportation services. In order to ensure that the interviews were adequately distributed throughout the transit service area, a systematic sample selection process was used. This process established a sample universe made up of those telephone exchanges that correspond geographically with the existing transit service area. A copy of the telephone exchanges used for drawing the sample for Saginaw is provided in Appendix B of this report.

The actual telephone numbers were selected by using a separate ratio developed for each city. This ratio was determined by counting the total number of directory pages containing the universe exchanges and then multiplying this amount by the average number of residential telephone numbers per page (businesses, governmental agencies and other nonresidential services were excluded). This latter figure was then divided by 2,000 and produced the ratio of $1: 20$ for Saginaw.

This ratio meant that one telephone number was selected for each of 20 numbers on the telephone directory page. The results of this selection process produced both an alphabetical and geographical distribution of samples. Results of this selection process, indicating how many telephone numbers were called for each exchange prefix, are shown for Saginaw in Appendix B.

Appendix C provides a breakdown of the actual number of interviews completed versus the number attempted.

All interviews were conducted from the Lansing office over state leased 1 ines. Additional telephone lines were installed with special headset attachments to aid the interviewer in recording citizen responses. Because the questionnaire was quite extensive, experimental interviews were conducted prior to starting the initial survey. Modifications were made and interviewing commenced January 23, 1980, and ended June 6, 1980. The interviews were conducted during the hours of 12 noon -8 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Post-survey interviewing started October 12, 1981, and ended December 8, 1981, during the hours of $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. to 6 p.m., Monday through Thursday and 9 a.m. to $4: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. on Friday. Each interview took about five minutes to complete and, in general, the public was very cooperative with this effort.

Data from completed questionnaires were edited and coded on to special coding forms designed especially for this survey. Data from the coding forms were keydisked onto a magnetic tape. Quantitative data, read from the magnetic tape, were entered onto a disk file. The editing program was run and data were read to determine if any data were invalid. Corrections were made to invalid data in an effort to obtain as many valid interviews as possible. The report program was run on validated data, and frequency distributions were established for the total sample. The frequency distributions indicate the number and percentage of respondents answering in each specific way to a specific question. (Computer printouts of data are available for inspection at the Bureau of Urban and Public Transportation, Michigan Department of Transportation, Transportation Building, Lansing, Michigan.)

The data in this report are analyzed by demographic factors and frequency of bus usage. As used in this report, the terms heavy user, moderate user, light user, other user, and nonriders are defined as follows:
Heavy user, - Daily or almost every day
Moderate user - Once a week
Light user, $\quad$ Once a month or once a year
Other user $\quad$ A frequency mentioned other than the above frequencies,
Nonriders $\quad$ - Respondents who have not used the bus service during the
past year,

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the analysis of the quantitative data. This statistical computer package was used in conjunction with the Burroughs 7700 computer. The data were crosstabulated into contingency tables and subsequently statistically analyzed by means of the chi-square test. Crosstabulation provides a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables. The chi-square test determines the significance of deviations from the expected frequencies. Given the nature of a pre- and post-survey, and because the number of interviews taken differed, pre to post, this type of statistical analysis was deemed appropriate to test the data.

Throughout this report many tables summarize the crosstabulations, basically by ridership groups. Only in areas of significant crosstabulations are the findings discussed in detail.

## SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings of the study are summarized below. Each is discussed more fully in the body of the report and is accompanied by tables displaying the relevant data.

## Transit Awareness

Awareness of a bus system in the Saginaw area among respondents was at 74 percent in the pre-survey and 84 percent in the post-survey.

Thirty-two percent ( $32 \%$ ) of the pre-survey respondents and 48 percent of the post-survey respondents correctly identified the transit system in Saginaw.

The majority of bus riders were aware of the cost to ride the bus. Most nonriders, however, did not know the cost for a ride on the bus.

The majority of bus riders knew how often the bus came by. Most nonriders, though, indicated "no" or "don't know" to this question.

Both bus riders and nonriders reported they knew how to obtain bus information.

The majority of bus riders and nonriders were aware of special bus services for elderly people and handicapped people.

Transportation Patterns

Most respondents, pre ( 90 percent) and post ( 87 percent), had not used the bus service during the preceding year.

Of those who had used the bus service, light users comprised 47 percent of pre-survey riders and 44 percent in the post-survey.

Heavy users rode the bus mainly for shopping, work, and school purposes, whereas moderate users rode basically to go shopping and for personal business. Light and other users indicated shopping as their primary purpose for riding the bus.

Other household members of bus riders and nonriders rode basically for personal business, shopping, and school purposes in both pre- and post-surveys.

Most bus riders live within one or two blocks of the nearest bus route. Nonriders, however, were about evenly distributed between the "1 to 2 blocks," "1 mile or more," and "don't know" responses.
"Car" was cited as the usual means of transportation. The highest percentage occurred for nonriders; the lowest percentage was recorded for heavy users.

The number of automobiles in a household varied by bus rider groups:

> 0 cars......... $48 \%$, pre-survey heavy users $60 \%$, post-survey heavy users $44 \%$, post-survey moderate users
> 1 car........ $54 \%$, pre-survey moderate users $39 \%$, pre-survey light users $50 \%$, post-survey light users
> 2 or more cars. .... $65 \%$, pre-survey nonriders $60 \%$, post-survey nonriders

The majority of bus riders and nonriders normally have a vehicle available to them. The only exceptions were post-survey heavy and moderate users.

## Transportation Attitudes

The most frequently mentioned reason nonriders cited for not riding the bus was "don't need to, I have a car," followed by "doesn't stop near me or I live in the country," and "no reason."

Overall, most bus riders and nonriders believed the bus fare was "just right."

The majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they would not use the bus more if the bus routes were closer or if the bus came by more frequently.

Bus riders, and to a lesser extent, nonriders, bel jeved the bus system serves the areas to which they most frequently travel.

Most pre- and post-survey bus riders had considered riding the bus more because of rising gasoline prices. The reverse was true for nonriders.

Most bus riders and nonriders indicated they had not considered getting in a carpool because of rising gasoline prices.

Most bus riders and nonriders had considered driving less with the rising gasoline prices.

Gasoline prices apparently affected both bus riders and nonriders.

An overwhelming majority of pre- and post-survey bus riders and nonriders view the bus service as a viable, valuable energy conservation measure.

The opinion of most bus riders and nonriders toward improvements in STS's bus service is that no changes were needed. Opinions regarding five improvements showed an overall decline in the follow-up survey. Only two improvements showed an increased need.

## Demographics

Sex:

In general, female bus riders and nonriders outnumbered male bus riders and nonriders in both surveys.

Shopping was the most frequently mentioned purpose for using the bus service by males and females in both surveys. Pre-survey males followed with work,
school, and visits or recreation (each cited with a 16 percent frequency). Post-survey males and pre- and post-survey females second ranking was personal business.

Age:
-16-20 year-old riders used the bus primarily for shopping and school purposes

Shopping also was mentioned more frequently by riders $21-39$ years $01 d, 40-60$ years old, and older than 60 years.

As the age groups increased in years, the percentage of males comprising each age group tended to decrease. The reverse was true for females; as the age groups increased in years, so did the percentage of females comprising each age group.

The majority of bus riders were between $21-39$ years old and older than 60 years in both surveys. Most nonriders were between $21-39$ years old and $40-60$ years old.

## Occupation:

Nineteen percent (19\%) of the pre-survey males were skilled/semi-skilled, followed by 17 percent retired, and 14 percent professional. Twenty-eight percent ( $28 \%$ ) of the post-survey males indicated they were retired and 12 percent, each, for skilled/semi-skilled and unskilled labor.

Pre-and post-survey females reported an identical ranking of homemaker (40 percent/38 percent), retired (19 percent/24 percent), and professional ( 10 percent/7 percent).
-Students comprised the following age groups:

$$
54 \%, \text { pre-survey } 16-20 \text { years old }
$$

$$
60 \% \text {, post-survey } 16-20 \text { years old }
$$

-Homemakers, comprised the following age groups:
$32 \%$, pre-survey 21-39 years old
$31 \%$, post-survey $21-39$ years old
$44 \%$, pre-survey $40-60$ years old
$45 \%$, post-survey $40-60$ years old
-Retirees were reflected more in the older than 60 age group.
Retired, homemaker, and student were the three most frequently mentioned occupations by bus riders. Nonriders reported homemaker, retired, and professional.

## Advertising Awareness

NOTE: Please see specific sections on "Advertising Awareness" (pg. 41) and "Conclusions" (pg. 52) for more detailed findings.

Radio - Even though the majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they regularly listen to the radio, most reported that they had not heard any STS radio announcements.

Those bus riders and nonriders who did hear STS radio announcements heard them more frequently on WSAM, WSGW, and WWWS.

Television - Even though the majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they regularly watch TV, most reported that they had not seen any STS television announcements.

Those bus riders and nonriders who did see STS TV announcements reported each of the following TV stations at least once: WEYI-TV, WNEM-TV, WJRT-TV, and WUCM-TV.

Newspapers - The majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they regularly read a local newspaper. When asked if they had seen any STS newspaper ads, most of the pre-survey bus riders replied "no." However, most post-survey responses were "yes or think so." Most nonriders indicated "no."

These bus riders and nonriders who did see STS newspaper ads reported the Saginaw News more than any other newspaper.
Other Media
Exposure - When respondents were asked if there were any other places they had seen, heard or read advertisements or otherwise obtained information about STS, "billboards," "displays," "other" media,
and "ads for stores/institutions which mention that they can be reached by bus" were the most common places cited.
"Displays" and "other" places were the two mediums showing an overall pre to post increase in recognition.

## TRANSIT AWARENESS

## Bus System Awareness

The first question in the survey asked respondents, "Is there a city bus system in the Saginaw area?" An overwhelming majority of respondents in both the initial and follow-up survey were aware of the existence of a bus system in the Saginaw area. Responses are summarized below:

| City Bus System? | Total Respondents |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | \% |
| Yes or think so | Pre  <br> Post 74 <br> 84  |
| No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pre, } \quad 20 \\ & \text { Post } \\ & 6 * \end{aligned}$ |
| Don't know | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Pre } & 6 \\ \text { Post } & 10^{*} \end{array}$ |
| Totals | $\text { Pre } \quad \begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=1,089) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post $\left.\quad \begin{array}{l}100 \% \\ (N=1,000)\end{array}\right)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the . 001 level between the pre and post "no" response, and at the .005 level for the "don't know" response. Post-survey results show an increased awareness of STS over pre-survey results.

Bus System Name

The second question asked respondents to name the bus system in the Saginaw area. Summarized below are the responses to this question.

| Response |  | Total Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% |
| Saginaw Transit System | Pre Post | $32$ |
| Saginaw Transit | Pre Post | $-0-$ |
| Other responses (included names which sound similar to the Saginaw Transit System, route destination names, and incorrect responses) | Pre Post | $\frac{18}{6 *}$ |
| Don't Know | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 46 \end{aligned}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $(N=803)$ |
|  | Post | $(N=837)$ |
| *There is a significant difference regarding the "Saginaw Transit" and the Saginaw Transit System (STS) produces an increase in recall, pre | .001 <br> other <br> naw $T$ <br> $t$, fr | en the two survey categories. Adding responses together t to 48 percent. |

## Cost for Bus Ride

The following table summarizes responses to the question, "How much does it cost for a ride on the bus?" The results indicate the majority of bus riders were aware of the cost to ride the bus. Most nonriders, however, replied "don't know." At the time of the initial survey, Apri1 - June 1980, the cash fare was 35 cents. Subsequent to this, the fare was raised to 40 cents. The follow-up survey occurred in November and December 1981, just prior to another STS fare increase to 50 cents. The possibility of this fare increase was reported in the newspaper during post-survey interviewing, and may account for 10 percent of the Total Respondents, who responded "more than 404.

| Cost |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{0}{0}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\neq}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders }}{\underline{\%}} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| More than 35¢ | Pre | 5 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| More than 40¢ | Post | 16 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 10* | 10 |
| $35 ¢$ | Pre | 53 | 23 | 31 | 38 | 5 | 8 |
| $40 ¢$ | Post | 32 | 38 | 40 | 57 | 8 | 13 |
| Less than 35 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Pre | 5 | 15 | 22 | 25 | 6 | 7 |
| Less than 40¢ | Post | 12 | 12 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Senior | Pre | 16 | 31 | 17 | 12 | 1 | 3 |
| Citizen Rate | Post | 32 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 3 |
| Pass/Punch | Pre | 21 | 0 | 8 | 0 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Card | Post | 8 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Don't know | Pre | 0 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 84 | 77 |
|  | Post | 0 | 31 | 19 | 19 | 77 | 68 |
| Other | Pre | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | Pre | (N-100\% 19$)$ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | ( $N=13$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=36)$ | ( $N=8$ ) | ( $N=724$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=800$ ) |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | (1) $100 \%$ | 100\%, | 100\% 71 | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=25)$ | ( $N=16$ ) | ( $N=48$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=21)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=717)$ | $(N=827)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .005 level between the pre and post more than current cash fare" response for nonriders. The 6 percent increase could be due to reports of an impending fare increase by the press at the time of the post-survey.

Bus Frequency

Respondents were asked if they knew how often the bus came by. The majority of bus riders indicated "yes" to this question. Most nonriders, though, indicated "no" or "don't know," as the following table shows:

Bus Rider Usage

| Bus Frequency |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }} \frac{\%}{\%}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre | 84 | 62 | 70 | 75 | 11 | 18 |
|  | Post | 88 | 63 | 60 | 57 | 15 | 22 |
| No | Pre | 11 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 36 | 33 |
|  | Post | 0 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 17* | 15 |
| Don't know | Pre | 5 | 31 | 22 | 25 | 53 | 49 |
|  | Post | 12 | 25 | 27 | 43 | 67* | 62 |
| Other | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Totals | Pre | * $100 \%$ | (100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=19)$ | ( $N=13$ ) | $=36)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | ( $N=724$ ) | $(N=800)$ |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=25)$ | ( $N=16$ ) | $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | $(N=721)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=831)$ |

*There is a significant difference, pre to post, between the "no" response (. 001 level) and the "don't know" response (. 05 level) for nonriders. Post-survey results show a 4 percent increase in bus frequency awareness.

## Bus Information

The item "Do you know how to obtain bus information?" produced the following results. The majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they knew how to obtain bus information with the amount of usage not an issue.


There is a significant difference at the 05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of nonrider responses. Most pre-survey nonriders (54 percent) and significantly more post-survey nonriders ( 64 percent) replied they knew how to obtain bus information, yet chose not to use their local bus service.

Special Services for the Elderly

Respondents were asked if STS had special bus services for elderly people. The majority of bus riders and nonriders were aware of these services as the following table indicates:

| Elderly Services |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{\%}}$ | Total $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes or think | Pre | 90 | 77 | 75 | 76 | 79 | 69 |
| so | Post | 96 | 82 | 81 | 86 | 80 | 74 |
| No | Pre | 5 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 13 |
|  | Post | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3* | 4 |
| Don't know | Pre | 5 | 15 | 19 | 12 | 14 | 18 |
|  | Post | 4 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 22 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(\mathrm{N}=19)$ | ( $N=13$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=36)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | ( $N=724$ ) | ( $N=800$ ) |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N-25)$ | $(N=16)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) | ( $N=21$ ) | $(N=721)$ | $(N-831)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the . 01 Teve1 between the pre and post "no" response for nonriders. Awareness of HANDI-CAB service has increased slightly. This slight increase is expected, since the service has not been heavily marketed.

Special Services for Handicappers

As with elderly services, respondents were asked if STS had special bus services for handicapped people. The pattern of responses is about the same as the previous question. The majority of bus riders and nonriders were aware of these services as the following table indicates:

Bus Rider Usage

| Handicapper Services |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | Moderate | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\underline{o} \text { iders }}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\underline{\%}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes or think | Pre | 95 | 84 | 89 | 75 | 80 | 71 |
| so | Post | 100 | 88 | 83 | 91 | 86 | 80 |
| No | Pre | 0 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 11 |
|  | Post | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3* | 4 |
| Don't know | Pre | 5 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 18 |
|  | Post | 0 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 16 |
| Totals | Pre | (N100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=19$ ) | $(N=13)$ | ( $N=36$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | $(N=724)$ | $(N=800)$ |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | ( $N=16$ ) | $(N=48)$ | $\mathrm{N}=21)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=721)$ | $(N=831)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .05 level between the pre and post "no" response for nonriders. Awareness of HANDI-CAB service has increased by 6 percent.

## TRANSPORTATION PATTERNS

## Transit Usage

In response to the statement, "Have you personally used the bus service during the past year?" the majority of respondents said "no" in both the pre- and post-surveys.


Those respondents who indicated they had used the bus service during the past year were characterized as heavy, moderate, light or other users based upon their frequency of using bus services. Following is a breakdown of bus usage patterns:
Usage
Heavy

- Daily or almost every day


## Trip Purpose

Question No. 6, "For what purpose(s) do you use the bus service?" provided for four choices. The major (first choice) trip categories for travel by public transit bus are shown in the following table. Heavy users rode the bus for shopping, work, and school purposes. Moderate users mentioned shopping and personal business. Light and other users indicated shopping as their primary purpose for riding the bus.

Bus Rider Usage

| (First Choice) Purpose |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work | Pre | 22 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 |
|  | Post | 28 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 11 |
| Personal | Pre | 11 | 27 | 11 | 12 | 14 |
| business | Post | 4 | 38 | 17 | 5 | 16 |
| Shopping | Pre | 33 | 46 | 52 | 38 | 45 |
|  | Post | 40 | 31 | 48 | 70 | 47 |
| School | Pre | 22 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 14 |
|  | Post | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 7 |
| Visits or recreation | Pre | 6 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 11 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 6 |
| Dining | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medical | Pre | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Post | 8 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| When I don't |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| have a car/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| when car is | Pre | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
| in garage | Post | 0 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 6 |
| Other | Pre | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Post | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $N=18$ ) | ( $N=11$ ) | $(N=35)$ | ( $N=8$ ) | ( $N=72$ ) |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=20) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=109)$ |

Other Household Members Transit Usage

Given that a respondent rides the bus is it likely that other household members also ride? Most bus riders and nonriders reported a higher percentage of "no" responses in both the pre-and post-surveys (see Appendix D).

Those respondents who indicated that other members of their household had used the bus service during the past year were asked "who" this member was. The most frequently mentioned responses were children, spouses, and "other" members. The "children" response increased, pre to post, from 45 percent to 53 percent (see Appendix E). This supports STS's increase in School Tripper ridership.

Respondents were then asked: How often do other members use the bus service?" Heavy users indicated in both pre- and post-surveys a higher percentage of heavy usage by other household members. Pre-survey moderate users indicated primarily moderate usage; post-survey results showed moderate and light usage. Light users reported light usage by other members of the household. And results for nonriders show a tendency towards heavy usage (see Appendix F).

Question No. 9, "For what purpose(s) do the other members use the bus service?" provided for four choices. Appendix $G$ shows the major (first choice) trip categories for travel by public transit bus. Other household members of bus riders and nonriders rode basically for personal business, shopping, and school purposes in both pre-and post-surveys.

Nearness of Bus Route

The item, "How far do you live from the nearest bus route?" revealed that the majority of bus riders live within one or two blocks of the nearest bus route. Nonriders, however, were about evenly distributed between the "one or two blocks," "one mile or more," and "don't know" responses.

Overa11, Saginaw residents have noticed that route improvements have brought the bus closer to their home, as witnessed by the 8 percent increase in "one or two blocks" responses.

Bus Rider Usage

| Distance |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\rho}{\underline{\rho} \text { ders }} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 or 2 blocks | Pre | 69 | 69 | 61 | 88 | 23 | 28 |
|  | Post | 84 | 75 | 67 | 57 | 31 | 36 |
| 3 or 4 blocks | Pre | 11 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
|  | Post | 12 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 9 | 10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 4 \text { to } 1 / 2 \\ & \text { mile } \end{aligned}$ | Pre | 5 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
|  | Post | 0 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| $1 / 2-1$ mile | Pre | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 mile or more | Pre | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 30 | 28 |
|  | Post | 4 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 28 | 25 |
| Don't know | Pre | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 24 |
|  | Post | 0 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 24 | 21 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(\mathrm{N}=19)$ | $(N=13)$ | $(N=36)$ | $(N-8)$ | $(N=724)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=800)$ |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=25)$ | ( $N=16$ ) | ( $N=48$ ) | $(N=21)$ | $(N=718)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=828)$ |

## Usual Transportation Mode

Question No. 34, "What is your usual means of transportation?" provided for two choices. The major (first choice) responses are shown below:

Bus Rider Usage

| (First Choice) Usual Mode |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{0}}$ | 0ther | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }} \frac{\%}{\%}$ | Total <br> Respondents <br> $\%$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Car | Pre Post | $37$ | $62$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59 \\ & 71 \end{aligned}$ | $50$ | $91$ | $87$ |
| Bus | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & 64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| Friends or relatives take me | Pre Post | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $25$ | 6 | 7 |
| Bike, motorcycle | Pre Post | $5$ | $0$ | $3$ | $0$ | $1$ | $1$ |
| Senior Citizen's or Handicapper Van | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 15 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Usually walk | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 2 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=723)$ | $(N=799)$ |
|  | Post | $(N-25)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $(N-48)$ | $(N-21)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=721)$ | $(N=831)$ |

"Car" was cited as the usual means of transportation. The highest percentage occurred for nonriders; the lowest percentage was recorded for heavy users. Heavy users primarily rely on the bus for their transportation needs.

## Number of Automobiles

The item, "How many automobiles does your household have?" resulted in the following breakdown:

| Number of Automobiles |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{L i g h t}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }}$ | Total <br> Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pre | 42 | 54 | 39 | 25 | 30 | 31 |
|  | Post | 24 | 37 | 50 | 29 | 36 | 37 |
| 2 | Pre | 5 | 15 | 14 | 38 | 45 | 43 |
|  | Post | 16 | 19 | 31 | 24 | 42 | 39 |
| 3 | Pre | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 13 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 11 |
| 4 or more | Pre | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 5 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| 0 | Pre | 48 | 31 | 31 | 25 | 5 | 8 |
|  | Post | 60 | 44 | 13 | 28 | 4 | 8 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(\mathrm{N}-19)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=13$ ) | $N=36)$ | $(N=8)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=724$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=800$ ) |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(\mathrm{N}=25)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=16$ ) | $\mathrm{N}=48)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | $(N=721)$ | $(N=831)$ |

Bus riders, pre and post, basically reported no cars or only one auto in their household. As expected, nonriders reported two or more cars. overall, the number of one car households is increasing, while two and three car households are declining. The potential for new bus riders is increasing as the number of one car households increases.

## Availability of Vehicle

The question, "Is a vehicle normally available for your use?" produced the following results:

Bus Rider Usage

| Vehicle Available |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{0} \text { \% }}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | Total Respondents \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | $56$ | $50$ | $80$ | $85$ |
| No | Pre Post | $48$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 43 \end{aligned}$ | $8$ | 12 |
| Sometimes | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 16 \end{array}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{13}{5}$ | $\frac{2}{4}$ | $\frac{2}{4}$ |
| Other | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $1$ | 1 |
| Totals | Pre | $(N=100 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=8)$ | $(N=724)$ | $(N=800)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (N=100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $(N=48)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=721) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=831)$ |

Pre-survey heavy users were about evenly split between the "yes" and "no" responses, while 72 percent in the post-survey replied they did not normally have a vehicle available for their use. Most pre-survey moderate users indicated "yes," while 56 percent in the post-survey replied "no." Light and other users and nonriders reported they did normally have a vehicle available in both surveys.

## Reasons for Not Riding the Bus

The respondents classified as nonriders, i.e., those who had not used the bus service during the previous year, were asked, "Is there any particular reason why you don't ride the bus?" Pre- and post-survey results indicate "don't need to, have a car" as the primary reason for not riding the bus by nonriders. Second and third ranking for both surveys was "doesn't stop near me, or I live in the country," and "no reason."

This question provided for four choices. The following table summarizes the responses for nonriders first choice:
(First Choice)
Reasons for Not Riding the Bus
Don't need to, have a car
Doesn't stop near me or I live in the country

| Pre \%* | Post \%* |
| :---: | :---: |
| 48 | 63 |
| 28 | 17 |
| 13 | 11 |
| 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 1 |
| $(N=720)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=715)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .001 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of responses for nonriders. Pre to post results show a significant increase in the percentage of nonriders who don't ride the bus because they have a car. Eleven percent ( $11 \%$ ) fewer said the bus "doesn't stop near me, or I live in the country," indicating that these nonriders appear to be aware that STS route changes and additions have brought the bus closer to them.

## Fairness of cost

Respondents were asked their opinions regarding the cost for a bus ride. The following table shows that most bus riders and nonriders believed the fare was "just right." It is difficult to judge what, if any effect, talk of an impending $10 \phi$ fare increase had on the high level of support for the post-survey $40 \phi$ fare.

| Do You Think This Fare is: |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\operatorname{Light}}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | Nonriders | Total Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |
| Too Much | Pre Post | $5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $6$ | $6$ |
| Not enough | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $3$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 4 |
| Just right | Pre Post | $95$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 82 \end{aligned}$ | $78$ | $86$ | $79$ | $81$ |
| Don't know | Pre Post | 0 4 | 0 | 10 3 | 0 | 7 11 | 6 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-32) \end{gathered}$ | $(\mathrm{N}=7)$ | $(N=115)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=183) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=17) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=100 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=259) \end{gathered}$ |

## Closer Routes

Question 13 asked respondents, "Would you use the bus more if the bus routes were closer?" The table below highlights the results:

| Closer Routes |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\sigma}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{o}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders }}{\underline{\%}} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Respondents $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{12}{5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 82 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \\ & 74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{48}{55}$ | $48$ |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $3$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $2$ |
| Maybe | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $8$ | $6$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 15 \end{array}$ | $\frac{13}{12}$ | 12 |
| Probably not | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 15 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | 16 15 | 16 13 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1 |
| Totals | Pre | $(N=100 \%,$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-34) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=8)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=529) \end{gathered}$ | $(\mathrm{N}=602)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=14) \end{gathered}$ | $(N-100 \% \text {. }$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=20) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=538)$ | $(N=641)$ |

Considering the response categories of "no" and "probably not" together, the majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated that closer bus routes would not induce them to use the bus more. The pre to post decrease in "yes" responses for bus riders could indicate that recent route changes have met the needs of some riders.

## Frequency of Service

Respondents were asked if they would use the bus more if it came by more frequently. The results, as shown below, indicate that bus riders and nonriders would not use the bus more if it came by more frequently. The overall decrease in "yes" responses appears to indicate that service changes have met the needs of some respondents.

*There is a significant difference at the . 05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of nonrider responses. Pre to post results show a percentage decrease in "yes" responses and an increase in "no" and "probably not" (considered together).

Travel Areas Served

The item, "Does the bus system serve the areas to which you most frequently travel?" revealed the following results. There is a difference in response between riders and nonriders. The majority of riders replied that the bus system served the areas they frequently traveled (pre/post $=75$ percent $/ 76$ percent - 100 percent), whereas this was only true for 39 percent of the pre-survey nonriders and 61 percent of the post-survey nonriders.

Serve Areas
Bus Rider Usage

| Serve Areas |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\frac{\%}{\underline{1}}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{o}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{\%}}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\underline{\%}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre | 100 | 92 | 84 | 75 | 39 | 44 |
|  | Post | 100 | 88 | 92 | 76 | 61* | 65 |
| No | Pre | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 33 | 30 |
|  | Post | 0 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 15* | 14 |
| Don't know | Pre | 0 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 28 | 26 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 24 | 21 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\%, | ( $100 \%$ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=19)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=13$ ) | $N=36)$ | $(N=8)$ | $(N=724)$ | $(N=800)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ N=48 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=721) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=831) \end{gathered}$ |

*Among nonriders there is a significant difference at the . 001 level between the pre and post "yes" and "no" response. Significantly more post-survey nonriders indicated that the bus system served the areas they frequently traveled. The addition of fashion Square Mall service could account for much of the change.

## Effects of Gasoline Prices

Question 18 was a four-part question relating to the rising gasoline prices of the last few weeks before each survey. Respondents were asked if they had considered: a) riding the bus, b) getting in a carpool, c) driving less, or d) if gas prices affect them?

The attitude of most pre- and post-survey bus riders was that they had considered riding the bus more because of rising gasoline prices. (Those bus riders who indicated "no" to this question had evidently not considered riding the bus more than their current riding patterns.) Most nonriders, however, replied "no" to this question (see Appendix H).

Most bus riders and nonriders indicated they had not considered getting in a carpool because of rising gasoline prices (see Appendix 1).

In general, bus riders and nonriders had considered driving less with the rising gasoline prices (see Appendix J).

The results indicate that gasoline prices apparently affected both bus riders and nonriders. Those bus riders who indicated "no" to this question may depend on STS for their primary transportation needs (see Appendix K).

## Energy Conservation Measure

Respondents were asked if they thought of the bus service as a viable, valuable energy conservation measure. The table, as shown in Appendix $L$, indicates an overwhelming majority of bus riders and nonriders view the bus service as a viable, valuable energy conservation measure.

Improvements

Question 20 asked respondents what improvements they would like to see in the city bus system that would cause them to use the bus more often. This question provided for four choices. The results, as shown below, indicate most bus riders and nonriders, pre and post, replied no changes needed. "The only exception was for pre-survey heavy users who indicated "other" improvements.

Overall, improvements in STS since the initial survey appear to be meeting the needs of Saginaw residents. Opinions regarding more convenient routes, closer stops, more frequent service, more bus shelters, and better route and schedule information declined in the follow-up survey. Expanded service hours and "other" improvements were the only areas showing an increased need among Saginaw residents.

| (First Choice) Improvements |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { other }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }}$ | $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower fares | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $2$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ |
| More convenjent routes | Pre Post | $\frac{11}{4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $8$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 7 |
| Closer stops | Pre Post | $5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 9 \end{array}$ |
| More frequent service | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $3$ | $0$ | $1$ | $1$ |
| More bus shelters | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 | $0$ | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| Faster service | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $3$ | $0$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Expanded service hours | Pre Post | 0 24 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 2 3 | 2 |
| Better route and schedule information | Pre Post | 0 | 0 | 5 0 | 0 | 6 3 | 5 3 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\frac{12}{17}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| No changes needed | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & 77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \\ & 59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ |
| I would not use the bus in any case | Pre Post | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | 0 <br> 5 | 5 4 | 5 4 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-19) \end{gathered}$ | $(N-13)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=723)$ | $(N=799)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-16) \end{gathered}$ | $(N-47)$ | $N=21)$ | $(N-718)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=827)$ |

Sex

In general, female bus riders and nonriders outnumbered male bus riders and nonriders in both surveys. The table, as shown in Appendix M, illustrates the percentage of male and female respondents across ridership and nonrider groups.

The table below shows the percentage of male and female bus riders and their first choice for purpose of using the bus service:

Bus Riders
(First Choice)
Purpose,
Shopping
Work
School
Visits or recreation

Males, pre to post, reported an increase in "personal business, " when I don't have a car/when car is in garage," "medical," and "other" purposes. Females, pre to post, reported an increase in "shopping" and "work" uses.
"Shopping" was the most frequently mentioned purpose for using the bus service by males and females in both surveys. Pre-survey males followed with "work," "schoo1," and "visits or recreation" (each cited with a 16 percent frequency). Post-survey males, and pre-and post-survey females followed with personal business."

Age

By. purpose, the following distribution of age groups was found for all respondents in the surveys:


Sixteen to 20 year-old riders used the bus primarily for shopping and School purposes. Shopping also was mentioned more frequently by riders, 21-39 years old, $40-60$ years 01 d , and the 01 der than 60 years age group.

As the age groups increased in years, the percentage of males comprising each age group tended to decrease. For example, 37 percent of the pre-survey males were in the $16-20$ year-old group compared with 20 percent, older than 60 years. The reverse was true for females, i.e., as the age groups increased in years, so did the percentage of females comprising each age group. Sixty-three percent ( $63 \%$ ) of the pre-survey females were in the $16-20$ year-old group compared with 80 percent, older than 60 years (see Appendix N).

Appendix 0 lists the various age groups with the percentage of bus riders and nonriders comprising each age group. The 21-39 year-old group and the older than 60 years group contained the highest percentage of bus riders. Most nonriders were between 21-39 years old and 40-60 years old.

## Occupation

By sex, the distribution of occupations is shown in Appendix $P$. In rank order, 19 percent of the pre-survey males were skilled/semi-skilled, 17 percent retired, and 14 percent professional. Twenty-eight percent (28\%) of the post-survey males were retired and 12 percent, each, for skilled/semi-skilled and unskilled labor. Pre- and post-survey females reported an identical ranking of homemaker ( 40 percent/38 percent), retired (19 percent/24 percent), and professional ( 10 percent/7 percent).

By age groups, the distribution of occupations is shown in Appendix Q. As expected, the majority of respondents between the ages of $16-20$ were students. Approximately a third of the pre-and post-survey respondents between the ages of $21-39$ were homemakers. First ranking for $40-60$ year-old respondents also was homemaker. Retired was cited more frequently by the older than 60 years group.

Based upon ridership groups, the distribution of occupations is shown in the following table. Student, homemaker, and retired were the three most frequently mentioned occupations by bus riders. Nonriders primarily reported homemaker, retired, and the professional categories.

| (First Choice) Occupation |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\underline{\sigma}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{}{ }^{*}} \frac{\%}{\underline{\%}}$ | Total <br> Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General office/ clerical | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 5 4 |
| Management | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Government | Pre Post | $5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $12$ | $1$ | $1$ |
| University | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | $1$ | $0$ |
| Proprietor | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $1$ | $1$ |
| Professional | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Sales | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $10$ | $0$ | $4$ | 3 4 |
| Skilled/semiskilled | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $8$ | $2$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $5$ | $5$ |
| Technical | Pre Post | $5$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 2 |
| Service worker | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Unskilled labor | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | 0 5 | 4 5 | $4$ |
| High school or college student | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $6$ |
| Homemaker | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{27}{30}$ | $29$ |
| Retired | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ | $28$ | $38$ | $\frac{16}{21}$ | $\frac{19}{25}$ |
| Not employed | Pre Post | $11$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 14 \end{array}$ | $6$ | $6$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & =19) \end{aligned}$ | $(N=13)$ | $N=32)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=657)$ | $(N=729)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & =24) \end{aligned}$ | $(N=100 \%)$ | $(N=47)$ | $(N-21)$ | $(N=705)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=812)$ |

There is a significant difference at the 05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of nonrider responses. Significant changes include a decrease, pre to post, in the percentage of general office/clerical, professional, and skilled/semi-skilled occupations, and an increase in the percentage of retired.

## ADVERTISING AWARENESS

Radio Station Listening

Respondents were asked if they had heard any STS radio announcements. The majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they had not heard any STS radio announcements. Those who did hear announcements were noted more in the post-survey than in the pre-survey. (Heavy and other users were the only exceptions.)

The following table shows the results to the question:


[^0]Listed below are Saginaw radio stations with the percentages of respondents who heard announcements on specific radio stations.

The most frequently mentioned stations by riders and nonriders were WSAM, WSGW, and WWWS. Since the initial survey, STS advertised regularly on WSGW, WWWS, and WSAM, and occasionally on WKCQ, WHNN and, W106. The survey results mirror STS's radio advertising buys.

Bus Rider Usage

| Radio Stations |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{\%}{\underline{\%}}}$ | Moderate | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }} \underset{\underline{\%}}{ }$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W106 | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $7$ | $3$ |
| WGER | Pre Post | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $2$ |
| WHNN | Pre | $0$ | $0$ | $12$ | $0$ | $4$ | $\frac{5}{3}$ |
| WKCQ | Pre Post | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | $0$ | $3$ | 2 |
| WKNX | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $4$ |
| WRDD | Pre Post | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $1$ |
| WSAM | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| WSGW | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| WWWS | Pre Post | $33$ | 0 | $38$ | $\frac{25}{45}$ | 5 8 | 8 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\frac{17}{13}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $6$ |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 36 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ (N=6) \end{array}$ | $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=4)$ | $(N=155)$ | $(N=175)$ |
|  | Post | $(N=8)$ | $(N=4)$ | $(N=16)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-9) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=202)$ | $(N=100 \%$ |

Respondents were asked if they regularly listen to the radio. The majority of bus riders and nonriders replied "yes," as indicated in the table below:

| Regularly Listen? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{\underline{\%}}}$ | Total <br> Respondents <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre Post | $74$ | $62$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & 81 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 62 * \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | 25 33 | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 37 * \end{aligned}$ | 23 36 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ | $\frac{2}{1}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $(N=100 \%)$ | $(N=100 \% \text {, }$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $(\mathrm{N}=8)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=724)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=800 \%)$ |
|  | Post | $(N=25)$ | $(N=100 \%,$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=47) \end{gathered}$ | $(N-21)$ | $(N=720)$ | $(N=829)$ |

*There is a significant difference among nonriders between the two surveys due to a change in the "yes" response (. 05 level) and "no" response (. 001 level). The results indicate that fewer post-survey nonriders are regular radio listeners, compared to pre-survey findings.

## Television Station Viewing

As with radio, respondents were asked if they had seen any STS television announcements. Most bus riders and nonriders had not seen any STS television announcements; however, those who had were noted more in the post-survey than the pre-survey.

The following table lists the responses to this question:

| Seen Announcements? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }} \\ & \frac{\%}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes or think | Pre | 5 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| so | Post | 24 | 19 | 13 | 24 | 17* | 17 |
| No | Pre | 90 | 92 | 94 | 100 | 88 | 88 |
|  | Post | 68 | 81 | 79 | 76 | 78 | 78 |
| Don't know | Pre | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Post | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=19$ ) | $(N=13)$ | ( $N=36$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | $(N=723)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=799)$ |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $N=25$ ) | $(N=16)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=47)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | $(N=720)$ | ( $N=829$ ) |

*There is a significant difference at the .001 level between the pre and post "yes or think so" response for nonriders. More post-survey nonriders reported they had seen STS TV announcements. This could be due to STS's greater visibility on the TV newscasts. (STS has never purchased TV advertisements.)

Listed below are Saginaw TV stations with the percentage of respondents who saw announcements on specific TV stations.

Bus Rider Usage

| TV Stations |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text { Non- } \\ \text { riders } \end{array}}{\%}$ | Total <br> Respondents <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEYI | Pre | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 |
| Ch. 25 | Post | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 |
| WNEM | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| Ch. 5 | Post | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| WJRT | Pre | 0 | 100 | 50 | 0 | 28 | 28 |
| Ch. 12 | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2* | 2 |
| WUCM | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ch. 19 | Post | 67 | 33 | 50 | 50 | 44* | 45 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $0$ | 1 0 |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 67 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 37 \end{aligned}$ | 41 37 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (N=0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-72) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-4) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=105)$ | $(N-122)$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .001 level between the pre and post "WJRT" and "WUCM" response for nonriders. Since the initial survey, STS appeared twice on the "Day by Day" show on WUCM. It appears as though this TV exposure resulted in significant publicity for the system.

Respondents were asked if they regularly watch television. As with radio, the majority of bus riders and nonriders indicated they regularly watch TV. The responses to this question are tabulated as follows:

| $\frac{\text { Regularly }}{\text { Watch? }}$ |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\frac{\%}{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }}$ | Total $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre | 79 | 85 | 89 | 88 | 76 | 76 |
|  | Post | 92 | 81 | 85 | 71 | 72 | 73 |
| No | Pre | 21 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 22 | 22 |
|  | Post | 8 | 13 | 15 | 29 | 27 | 25 |
| TV's broken |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| or don't | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| have TV | Post | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | Pre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $N=19$ ) | $(N=13)$ | $=36)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=8)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=723)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=799$ ) |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & =21 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=720) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=829) \end{gathered}$ |

Newspaper Readership

Respondents were asked if they had seen any STS newspaper ads. Most pre-survey bus riders and nonriders said "no." Post-survey responses for bus riders were primarily "yes or think so;" nonriders were nearly equal between "yes" and "no" responses.

| Seen Ads? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\sigma}}$ | $\frac{\operatorname{Light*}}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Total }}{\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes or think so | Pre Post | $32$ | $31$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33 \\ & 62 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{25}{46 *}$ | 26 |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ | 61 | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \\ & 36 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 50 * \end{aligned}$ | 69 |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | 5 4 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=723) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=799)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=47)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=719) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=828) \end{gathered}$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of responses for light users. Among nonriders there is a significant difference at the . 001 level between the pre and post "yes or think so" and "no" response. STS advertised heavily in the newspaper since the initial survey, and the significant increase in recall for light users and nonriders mirror the newspaper buys.

Listed below are Saginaw area newspapers with the percentages of respondents who saw ads in specific newspapers. An overwhelming majority of bus riders and nonriders saw STS newspaper ads more often in the Saginaw News than in any other newspaper.


Respondents were asked if they regularly read a local newspaper. The majority of bus riders and nonriders replied "yes" to this question. Heavy and 1 ight users and nonriders reported a pre to post increase in newspaper readership, as indicated in the table below:

| Regularly |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\frac{\%}{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\frac{\%}{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders }}{\%}}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 76 \end{aligned}$ | $69$ | $55$ | $88$ | $66$ | $65$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $14$ | $21$ | 21 |
| Sometimes | Pre Post | $8$ | 23 19 | 14 | 12 24 | 12 | 13 9 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 3 0 | $0$ | $1$ | 1 0 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $(\mathrm{N}=724)$ | $(N=800)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-48) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=21)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=719)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=829)$ |

## Other Media Exposure

Respondents were asked if there were any other places they had seen, heard or read advertisements or otherwise obtained information about STS. Most of the bus riders and nonriders indicated they had not obtained information about STS from any other source than those previously listed.

The following table shows the responses to this question:

| Other Places? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\frac{\%}{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\frac{\%}{0}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\frac{\text { riders* }}{\%}}$ | Total <br> Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes or | Pre | 42 | 31 | 14 | 38 | 22 | 22 |
| think so | Post | 24 | 19 | 27 | 43 | 28 | 28 |
| No | Pre | 58 | 61 | 83 | 50 | 74 | 74 |
|  | Post | 76 | 81 | 69 | 43 | 64 | 64 |
| Don't know | Pre | 0 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 8 | 8 |
| Totals | Pre | ( ${ }^{100 \%}$ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | ( $N=13$ ) | $(N=36)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | $(N=722)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=798$ ) |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | ( $N=16$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=21)$ | ( $N=718$ ) | ( $N=828$ ) |

[^1]Of those who had obtained information from another place, "billboards," "displays," "other" media, and "ads for stores/institutions which mention that they can be reached by bus" were the most common places cited.
"Displays" and "other" places were the two mediums showing an overall pre to post increase in recognition.

The specific breakdown is as follows:

| Places? |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders }} \frac{\%}{\underline{6}}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Billboards | Pre | 25 | 50 | 20 | 0 | 27 | 27 |
|  | Post | 0 | 0 | 28 | 50 | 11* | 13 |
| Bulletin | Pre | 12 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 5 | 6 |
| boards | Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| Displays | Pre | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
|  | Post | 17 | 67 | 27 | 12 | 15* | 16 |
| News | Pre | 0 | 0 | 20 | 67 | 18 | 17 |
| articles | Post | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 18 | 17 |
| Other | Pre | 38 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 35 |
|  | Post | 33 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 43 | 41 |
| Ad for stores/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| which mention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| that they can be reached by | Pre | 13 | 25 | 60 | 0 | 9 | 11 |
| bus | Post | 50 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 9 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=8$ ) | ( $N=4$ ) | ( $N=5$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}-3)$ | ( $N=158$ ) | $(N=178)$ |
|  | Post | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=11)$ | $(N=8)$ | $(N=190)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=218$ ) |

[^2]The main purpose of the follow-up survey was to evaluate the effectiveness of STS marketing efforts during the time from the initial survey to the follow-up survey. The section on "Advertising Awareness" clearly shows that newspapers were remembered by more respondents, followed by radio, "other" media, and television. Inspection of the Total Respondents column in the table below, shows that pre-survey recall of newspaper ads was 26 percent, increasing to 48 percent in the post-survey. Radio followed with 23 percent recall in the pre-survey, increasing to 32 percent in the post-survey. "Other" media increased in recognition from 22 percent in the pre-survey to 28 percent in the post-survey. And television increased overall in pre to post recall from 9 percent to 17 percent.

The medium which received the most increase in recognition, pre to post, varied depending on the ridership group reporting. Follow-up results for newspapers show a higher percentage of recall over initial survey results for heavy, moderate, and light users, and nonriders. For heavy users there was a 28 percent increase; moderate users, 25 percent; light users, 29 percent; and nonriders, 21 percent. Follow-up results for television show a higher percentage of recall over initial survey results for other users with a 24 percent increase.

The table below highlights these findings and summarizes parts from four tables in the section on "Advertising Awareness:"


Newspapers may have received more recognition, pre to post, by heavy, moderate, and light users, and nonriders, because it was used extensively as part of STS's marketing efforts during the time from the initial survey to the follow-up survey. Residents in the STS service area were exposed to newspaper advertising (along with other media) for the following projects:

Total System Revision - to introduce STS route and schedule improvements.

Passport Bus Pass - to inform riders of the convenience of the monthly bus pass and stimulate sales.

1981 Energy Expo - to increase recognition of STS.

Shop By Bus - to inform the public of STS service to shopping centers

New Bus Introduction - to inform residents of new bus features.

Saginaw students and parents were informed of the convenience of the Student Bus Pass via newspapers. Saginaw Township residents were informed of the new bus, and downtown monthly parkers and Saginaw area commuters were informed of the cost savings by commuting to work via STS buses.

Newspapers were an effective medium for the bus riders and nonriders previously mentioned, because the survey results indicated that, overall, newspaper readership increased, while radio and television use declined. Those respondents who regularly read the newspaper increased, pre to post, from 65 percent to 69 percent. Radio and television use declined from 75 percent to 63 percent, and 76 percent to 73 percent, respectively. The table below highlights these findings and summarizes parts from three tables in the section on "Advertising Awareness:"

Bus Rider Usage

MEDIUM
Respondents Who
Regularly Listened,
Watched or Read Medium

| RADIO | Pre | 74 | 62 | 72 | 75 | 76 | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "Yes" | Post | 72 | 69 | 81 | 67 | 62 | 63 |
| TELEVISION | Pre | 79 | 85 | 89 | 88 | 76 | 76 |
| "Yes" | Post | 92 | 81 | 85 | 71 | 72 | 73 |
| NEWSPAPER | Pre | 48 | 69 | 55 | 88 | 66 | 65 |
| "Yes" | Post | 76 | 56 | 77 | 62 | 69 | 69 |


| RADIO | Pre | 74 | 62 | 72 | 75 | 76 | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "Yes" | Post | 72 | 69 | 81 | 67 | 62 | 63 |
| TELEVISION | Pre | 79 | 85 | 89 | 88 | 76 | 76 |
| "Yes" | Post | 92 | 81 | 85 | 71 | 72 | 73 |
| NEWSPAPER | Pre | 48 | 69 | 55 | 88 | 66 | 65 |
| "Yes" | Post | 76 | 56 | 77 | 62 | 69 | 69 |

## NEWSPAPER

"Yes"
Bus Rider Usage

STS implemented an aggressive marketing program during the interim from pre-survey to post-survey interviewing. In addition to radio, television, and newspapers, they also made use of a variety of other mediums. These include the following:

Coupons

Timetables

Exterior and interior bus signs

Posters

Ceremonies

Transfer Point Signs

1980 and 1981 City Calendars

School Tripper Service Timetables

Monthly pass

Counter cards

Sales forms

Santa Promotion (Santa suit and candy canes)

Saginaw area Telephone Directory - yellow pages ad

Fliers

Form letters

Surveys

Window Decals

Ride $n$ Shop Ticket

Slide-tape presentation

Commuter Computer

Contest

Key Tags

Bus Displays

Reception

Premiere Ticket

STS's goal of increased ridership was met when more than 1.1 million riders were served in 1981. This represented an increase of 48 percent over 1980 figures. This was attributable not only to the marketing efforts, but also, in part, to the introduction of STS's fleet of advanced-design Grumman Flxible buses in the fall of 1981. The increase in ridership also was achieved despite reports of an impending fare increase by the press at the time of the post-survey.

The first objective of this research was to develop and implement a methodology that could be used by other state transportation departments to survey public attitude and awareness levels regarding transit systems in their states. In light of this, it appears appropriate to identify the following limitations of this marketing research survey in an effort to assist these departments, should they attempt to replicate this study.

1. It is suggested that the follow-up survey be conducted during the same time of year as the initial survey. This would prevent any seasonal fluctuation from affecting the results, such as a heavier expenditure of advertising dollars in one part of the year over another. The original intention of this study was that the follow-up survey be conducted one year after the initial survey; however, a lapse of approximately 21 months occurred. This was due to departmental personnel cuts in the Surveys Section and the longer than expected lead time to install additional temporary telephone 1 ines.
2. The initial and follow-up telephoning should be conducted on the same days, and during the same time of day, i.e., consistent interviewing days and hours from pre-survey to post-survey. Interviews for the initial survey were conducted during the hours of 12 noon - 8 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Post-survey interviewing was conducted during the hours of 9 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Thursday and 9 a.m. to $4: 30$ p.m. on Friday. Again, this was due to scheduling problems in the Surveys Section.
3. Use of a closed-end questionnaire, one in which the possible answers are prescribed for the respondents, 1 imits valuable information that could be gained if an open-end questionnaire had been used. An open-end questionnaire is one to which the respondent is free to answer in his own words. (Question 2., which asks for the specific name of the transit system in each city, was the only open-end question; all other questions were closed-end.) The sheer size of the sample and scope of the study precluded the use of an open-end questionnaire.
4. The marketing efforts from the initial survey to the follow-up survey were not consistent among the five transit systems. This also was due to personnel cuts, budget cutbacks, and the independent marketing efforts of each transit system. If the marketing efforts had been consistent, a comparison could be made among the transit systems in an attempt to obtain insights about transit marketing effectiveness. Nevertheless, each transit system was provided with the reports of the other four systems. In this way, an exchange of information took place, which led to a sharing of strengths and weaknesses among the systems. Improvement in awareness, image, and ridership are goals shared by all transit systems.

## APPENDICES

2nd 3rd 4th PUBLIC TRANSIT "ATTITUDE AND AWARENESS" SURVEY

RESPONDENT: $\qquad$

ADDRESS: $\qquad$ REFUSAL:

PHONE NUMBER: $\qquad$ COMPLETION:

INTERVIEWER INITIALS:
** INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS **
ALL INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS ARE
CAPITALIZED. DO NOT READ THESE
THINGS TO THE RESPONDENT. EVERY-
THING PRINTED IN this typeface IS TO
BE READ TO THE RESPONDENT. BELOW
THE RESPONDENT IS INDICATED BY "R."

EACH TIME YOU TRY A PHONE NUMBER, NOTE IN THE BOXES (UPPER LEFT) THE DAY AND THE HOUR OF THE DAY. IF NO ONE ANSWERS, GO ON TO THE NEXT PERSON TO BE CALLED. IF THE PHONE IS ANSWERED, BUT NO "R" WHO IS OLD ENOUGH (I.E., OLDER THAN 16) IS THERE, ATTEMPT TO FIND OUT THE BEST TIME TO CALL AGAIN AND NOTE THAT TIME AND DAY DOWN IN THE RESCHEDULE BOX (MID-RIGHT).

IF AN APPROPRIATE "R" DOES ANSWER, INTRODUCE YOURSELF AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN - AND SAY • • .

He1l0, my name is $\qquad$ , with the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation is conducting a survey to help in planning bus service in the $\qquad$ area. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated. The questions will take a few minutes of your time. Is this a convenient time for me to speak with you? IF "YES," CONTINUE. IF "NO," ASK FOR RESCHEDULE TIME AND NOTE ABOVE. My first question is: (DETERMINE WITHOUT ASKING) "Rn is
$\qquad$ MALE, $\qquad$ FEMALE):

1. Is there a city bus system in the $\qquad$ area? YES OR THINK SO
B NO (IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 32)
C $\qquad$ DON'T KNOW (GO TO QUESTION 32)
2. What is the name of it?
3. Have you personally used the bus service in $\qquad$ during the past year?

A_ YES (IF YES, GO TO 5)
$B \quad$ NO (IF NO, GO TO 4 THEN 7)
C DON'T KNOW (GO TO 4 THEN 7)
4. Is there any particular reason why you don't ride the bus?

| A | NO |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | DON'T NEED TO, HAVE A CAR |
| C | DOESN'T STOP NEAR ME, (OR) I LIVE IN THE COUNTRY |
| D | DOESN'T GO WHERE I WANT TO GO |
| E | DOESN'T GO WHEN I WANT TO GO |
| F | TAKES TOO LONG |
| G | COSTS TOO MUCH |
| H | IT'S INCONVENIENT |
| I | IT'S UNRELIABLE |
| 3 | IT'S UNCOMFORTABLE |
| K | IT'S NOT SAFE |
| L | I DON'T LIKE BUSES |
| M | I DON' $T$ LIKE THE PEOPLE WHO RIDE BUSES |
| N | UUST NEVER THOUGHT ABOUT IT OR GOT AROUND TO IT |
| 0 | OTHER $\quad$ O $\quad$, |

5. How often do you use the bus service? (MENTION THE 5 OPTIONS)
A $\quad$ ONCE A YEAR
B_ $\quad$ ONCE A MONTH
C ONCE A WEEK
D $\quad$ ALMOST EVERY DAY

6. For what purpose(s) do you use the bus service?

7. Have any other members of your household used the bus service during the past year?

A YES
B NO (IF NO, GO TO 10)
C DON'T KNOW (GO TO 10)

IF THEY MENTION WHO, CHECK:

8. How often do other members use the bus service? (MENTION THE 5 OPTIONS)
A_ONCE A YEAR
B_ ONCE A MONTH
C $\quad$ ONCE A WEEK
D $\quad$ ALMOST EVERY DAY
DAILY
OTHER
9. For what purpose(s) do the other members use the bus service?

10. How much does it cost for a ride on the bus?

11. Do you think this fare is:

12. How far do you live from the nearest bus route?
A ONE OR TWO BLOCKS
B THREE OR FOUR BLOCKS
C QUARTER MILE TO HALF MILE
D HALF MILE TO ONE MILE
ONE MILE OR MORE
DON'T KNOW (GO TO 14)
13. Would you use the bus more if the bus routes were closer?
$A \quad$ YES
$B \quad$ NO
$C \quad$ DON'T KNOW
$D \quad$ MAYBE
$E \quad$ PROBABLY NOT
$B \quad$ OTHER
14. Do you know how often the bus comes by?
$\mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{YES}$
$\mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{NO}$
C DON'T KNOW (GO TO 16)
D_ DOESN'T SEEM TO FOLLOW SCHEDULE/IT VARIES
E__ OTHER (GO TO 16)
15. Would you use the bus more if it came by more frequently?

| A | YES |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | NO |
| C | DON'T KNOW |
| D. | MAYBE |
| E | PROBABLY $Y$ NOT |
| F | OTHER |

16. Does the bus system serve the areas to which you most frequently travel?

17. Do you know how to obtain bus information?

18. With the rising gas prices of the last few weeks, have you considered:
$\mathrm{A} \quad$ RIDING THE BUS?
B
GETTING IN A CARPOOL?
$\mathrm{D} \quad$ DRIVING LESS?

## Response:

A_ DON'T KNOW
$B \quad$ HAVEN'T THOUGHT ABOUT IT
C OTHER
D YES
E— NO
19. Do you think of the bus service as a viable, valuable energy conservation measure?

20. What improvements would you like to see in the city bus system that would cause you to use the bus more often?

A $\qquad$ LOWER FARES
B $\quad$ MORE CONVENIENT ROUTES
C CLOSER STOPS
$\qquad$ MORE FREQUENT SERVICE
$\mathrm{E} \quad$ MORE BUS SHEL TERS

F FASTER SERVICE
G MORE COURTEOUS DRIVERS
H EXPANDED SERVICE HOURS
I $\qquad$ AVAILABLE CHANGE
J BETTER TRANSFER SYSTEM
K BETTER ROUTE AND SCHEDULE INFORMATION
L OTHER
M NO CHANGES NEEDED

N $\qquad$ I WOULD NOT USE THE BUS IN ANY CASE
21. During the past year the transit authority has advertised its service in local newspapers and on radio stations:

Have you heard any $\qquad$ radjo announcements?
$\qquad$ YES (GO TO QUESTION 22) OR THINK SO
B $\qquad$ NO (GO TO QUESTION 23)
$\qquad$ DON'T KNOW (GO TO QUESTION 23)
D OTHER
("R" MAY ALSO ANSWER Q. 23 HERE. IF SO, COMPLETE 23 AND GO TO Q.24.)
22. On which station(s) did you hear the announcements? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

23. Do you regularly 1 isten to the radio?
$\mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{YES}$
$B \quad$ NO
C__ RADIO IS BROKEN OR DON'T HAVE RADIO
D__ OTHER
24. Have you seen any $\qquad$ TV announcements?

A YES (GO TO QUESTION 25) OR THINK SO
B NO (GO TO QUESTION 26)
C DON'T KNOW (GO TO QUESTION 26)
("R" MAY ALSO ANSWER Q. 26 HERE, IF SO, COMPLETE 26 AND GO TO Q.27.)
25. On which station(s) did you see the announcements? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

26. Do you regularly watch TV?

27. Have you seen any $\qquad$ newspaper ads?

A YES (GO TO QUESTION 28) OR THINK SO
B NO (GO TO QUESTION 29)
C DON'T KNOW (GO TO QUESTION 29)
D OTHER
("R" MAY ALSO ANSWER Q. 29 HERE. IF SO, COMPLETE 29 AND GO TO Q.30.)
28. In which of the papers did you see the ads? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

|  | LANSING |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | STATE JOURNAL |
| B | MSU STATE NEWS |
| C | E.L. TOWNE COURIER |
| D | LANSING STAR |
| E | WHEELER DEELER |
| F | OTHER |
| G | DON'T KNOW |
|  | KZOO |
| A | KZOO GAZETTE |
| B | PORTAGE HERALD-HEADLINER |
| C | THREE RIVERS COMMERCIAL |
| D | OTHER |
| E | DON'T KNOW |
|  | SAGINAW |
| A | SAGINAW NEWS |
| B | OTHER |
| C | DON'T KNOW |

GR
A $\quad$ GRAND RAPIDS PRESS
$B \quad$ GRAND RAPIDS TIMES
$C \quad$ GRAND VALLEY SHOPPERS' GUIDE
$B \quad$ NORTH KENT LEADER
$\mathrm{E} \quad$ THE PHOTO REPORTER
OTHER $\quad$ DON' $T$ KNOW

## AA

A A.A. NEWS
B M.U. EASTERN ECHO
C MICHIGAN DAILY
D $\quad$ YPSILANTI PRESS
$E \quad$ OTHER KNOW
DON'T KNOW
29. Do you regularly read a local newspaper?
A YES
B NO
C SOMETIMES
$\mathrm{D} \quad$ OTHER
30. Are there any other places that you have seen, heard or read advertisements or information about the transit system?
A__ YES (GO TO QUESTION 31) OR THINK SO
B NO (GO TO QUESTION 32)
C_ DON'T KNOW (GO TO QUESTION 32)
D OTHER
31. Where?
$\qquad$ BILLBOARDS

B BULLETIN BOARDS
$C$ DISPLAYS
D_NEWS ARTICLES
E $\qquad$ OTHER $\qquad$

## F <br> $\qquad$ AD FOR STORES/INSTITUTIONS WHICH MENTION THAT THEY CAN BE REACHED BY BUS

32. Does $\qquad$ have special bus services for elderly people?

| A | YES |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | NO |
| C | THINK SO |
| D | DON'T KNOW |

33. Does $\qquad$ have special bus services for handicapped people?
$\begin{array}{cc}A & Y E S \\ B & N 0\end{array}$
C THINK SO
D_ DON'T KNOW
34. What is your usual means of transportation?

| A | CAR |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | BUS |
| C | DART |
| D | TAXI |
| E | FRIENDS OR RELATIVES TAKE ME |
| F | BIKE, MOTORCYCLE |
| G | SENIOR CITIZEN'S OR HANDICAPPER VAN |
| H | USUALLY WALK |
| I | HITCHHIKE |
| J | OTHER |
| K | I GO A VARIETY OF WAYS |

35. How many automobiles does your household have?

36. Is a vehicle normally available for your use?

| $A$ | $Y E S$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $B$ | NO |
| $C$ | SOMETIMES |
| $D \quad$ OTHER |  |

37. Which of these age groups are you in?
$\mathrm{A} \quad$ OLDER THAN 60 YEARS
$\mathrm{B} \quad$ BETWEEN 40 AND 60 YEARS
$\mathrm{C} \quad$ BETWEEN 21 AND 39 YEARS
$\mathrm{B} \quad$ BETWEEN 16 AND 20 YEARS
38. What is your occupation?


That was my last question . . . thank you so much for your time! Good-bye!

## APPENDIX B <br> SAGINAW <br> TELEPHONE EXCHANGES SURVEYED

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exchange |  |  |
| Prefix | Pre-Survey | Post-Survey |
| 752 | 140 | 238 |
| 753 | 192 | 240 |
| 754 | 185 | 201 |
| 755 | 183 | 197 |
| 770 | 49 | 28 |
| 777 | 220 | 240 |
| 781 | 215 | - |
| 790 | 43 | 120 |
| 792 | 259 | 334 |
| 793 | 207 | 188 |
| 799 | 180 | 204 |
| Totals | 1,873 | 1,990 |

## APPENDIX C

## SAGINAW <br> INTERVIEW SAMPLING RESULTS

## Pre-Survey

## Post-Survey

Start Date
Finish Date
Ratio
Interviews Taken
Disconnected or Changed
Refusals
Businesses*
No Answer**

Numbers Called
*Businesses were not included in the surveys.
**Numbers tried three times with no answer.

November 25, 1981
December 8, 1981
1:20
1,000
205
246
70
469

1,990

## APPENDIX D <br> OTHER MEMBERS TRANSIT USAGE

Bus Rider Usage

| Other Members ${ }^{\prime}$ <br> Transit Usage |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{g}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { ther }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text { Non- } \\ \text { riders } \end{array}}{\underline{\%}}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 11 \end{array}$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \\ & 92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & 88 \end{aligned}$ |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $1$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=721)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=797) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=716) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=825) \end{gathered}$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of nonrider responses. A slight increase occurred in the percentage of nonriders who reported that other household members had used the bus services.

APPENDIX E
WHO OTHER MEMBER?

Bus Rider Usage

| Who Other Member? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders }}{\%} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband/wife | Pre | 17 | 60 | 30 | 0 | 14 | 22 |
|  | Post | 22 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 17 | 18 |
| Son/daughter/ children | Pre | 33 | 20 | 30 | 100 | 54 | 45 |
|  | Post | 45 | 29 | 29 | 50 | 61 | 53 |
| Mother/father | Pre | 17 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 8 |
|  | Post | 11 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 7 |
| Roommate | Pre | 17. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
|  | Post | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | Pre | 16 | 20 | 30 | 0 | 21 | 21 |
|  | Post | 11 | 28 | 28 | 33 | 20 | 21 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | $(N=6)$ | ( $N=5$ ) | $N=10)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=1)$ | $(N=28)$ | $(N-50)$ |
|  | Post | $\left(\begin{array}{l} 100 \% \\ (N=9) \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=7) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=7)$ | $(N=6)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=46) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=75)$ |

## APPENDIX F

OFTEN OTHER MEMBERS?

Bus Rider Usage

| Often Other Members? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders }}{\%} \end{aligned}$ | Total Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heavy | Pre | 43 | 0 | 11 | 50 | 35 | 29 |
| usage | Post | 82 | 14 | 23 | 33 | 51 | 47 |
| Moderate | Pre | 14 | 60 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 27 |
| usage | Post | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 |
| Light | Pre | 14 | 40 | 56 | 0 | 31 | 33 |
| usage | Post | 9 | 43 | 77 | 0 | 19 | 26 |
| Other | Pre | 29 | 0 | 11 | 50 | 6 | 11 |
| usage | Post | 9 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 14 | 14 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=7$ ) | ( $N=5$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=9$ ) | ( $N=2$ ) | $(N=32)$ | $(N=55)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (N=6) \end{aligned}$ | $\binom{100 \%}{\left(N^{2}\right.}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=86) \end{gathered}$ |

APPENDIX G<br>OTHER MEMBERS' TRIP PURPOSE?

Bus Rider Usage
(First Choice)
Other Members'
Trip Purpose
Work
Pre
Post
Persona1, Pre
business
business
Shopping $\quad$ Pre
School

| Visits or |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| recreation | Pre |
|  | Post |
| Medical | Pre |
|  | Post |


| $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\%}$ | $\frac{0 \text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \text { riders } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 0 | 20 | 10 | 50 | 6 | 9 |
| 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 | 10 | 50 | 16 | 12 |
| 0 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| 43 | 80 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 32 |
| 36 | 29 | 46 | 50 | 31 | 35 |
| 57 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 41 | 38 |
| 37 | 0 | 31 | 17 | 39 | 33 |
| 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| 0 | 14 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |

When I don't

| When car is | Pre | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in garage | Post | 0 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=5) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} 100 \% \\ (N=10) \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-56) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $(N=100 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=7) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=100 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=6) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=49)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-86) \end{gathered}$ |

Bus Rider Usage

| Considered Riding the Bus? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\frac{\text { Non- }}{\text { riders* }} \underset{\underline{\%}}{ }$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $2$ | $0$ | $1$ | $1$ |
| Haven't thought about it | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 3 8 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $8$ | $3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | $2$ | $3$ |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \\ 80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 75 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 62 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 35 \end{aligned}$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 64 \\ 53 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=36)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=724)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=800) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=720)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=830) \end{gathered}$ |

*There is a significant difference at the . 001 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution of nonrider responses. Pre to post results show an increase in "haven't thought about it" responses and a decrease in "no" responses.

## APPENDIX I <br> CONSIDERED GETTING IN A CARPOOL?

| Considered Getting in a Carpool? |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { other }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders* }}{\underline{\%}} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $1$ |
| Haven't thought about it | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 | 3 0 | 0 19 | 2 | 2 |
| Other | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $8$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $4$ | $5$ |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 37 36 | 36 34 |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 63 \\ 68 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 69 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 67 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ 62 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56 \\ 59 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \\ & 60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (N=724) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=800) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ \left(N=\begin{array}{c} 25 \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=21) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=720)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=830) \end{gathered}$ |

*There is a significant difference at the . 05 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution on nonrider responses. Pre to post results show an increase in "no" responses, indicating a declining interest in carpools.


> APPENDIX K DO GAS PRICES AFFECT YOU?

| Do Gas Prices Affect You? |  | $\frac{H e a v y}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{0 \text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text { Non- } \\ \text { riders } \\ \% \end{array}}{\frac{\%}{2}}$ | Total $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Don't know | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ |
| Haven't <br> thought about it | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other | Pre Post | 16 | 0 | 19 | 25 | 2 | 4 2 |
| Yes | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 63 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 62 \end{aligned}$ | $86$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84 \\ & 76 \end{aligned}$ |
| No | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ 31 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 27 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 20^{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ N=36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=723) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=799)$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-21) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=720)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=830) \end{gathered}$ |

*There is a significant difference at the .005 level between the pre and post "no" response for nonriders. Apparently, concern over rising gas prices has decreased as gas prices have stabilized.


## APPENDIX M

SEX BY USAGE

Bus Rider Usage

| Sex |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{q}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text { Non- } \\ \text { riders } \end{array}}{\underline{\%}}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{15}{44}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| Female | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \\ & 84 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \\ & 56 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 77 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50 \\ 76 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & 72 \end{aligned}$ |
| Totalis | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=19) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} 100 \% \\ =13) \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N-36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=8) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=723)$ | $(N=100 \%$ |
|  | Post | $(N=25)$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=21) \end{array}$ | $(N-720)$ | $(N=830)$ |

## APPENDIX N

SEX BY AGE

Age Groups

Sex
Male
Female
Totals

| 16-20 | 21-39 | 40-60 | Older than | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years | Years | Years | 60 Years | Response |
| \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 37 | 33 | 24 | 20 | 14 |
| 39 | 30 | 23 | 26 | 22 |
| 63 | 67 | 76 | 80 | 86 |
| 61 | 70 | 77 | 74 | 78 |
| 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| ( $N=84$ ) | $(N=432)$ | $\mathrm{N}=323)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=233$ ) | $(N=14)$ |

Post $\quad(N=85) \quad(N=364) \quad(N=261) \quad(N-280) \quad(N=9)$

APPENDIX 0
AGE BY USAGE

Bus Rider Usage

| Age Groups |  | $\frac{\text { Heavy }}{\frac{\%}{6}}$ | $\frac{\text { Moderate }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Light }}{\underline{\%}}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{\%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non- } \\ & \frac{\text { riders }}{\%} \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> $\frac{\text { Respondents }}{\%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16-20$ years | Pre Post | 16 | 8 | 25 | 12 | 7 | 8 |
|  |  | 16 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 8 | 9 |
| 21-39 years | Pre | 42 | 31 | 20 | 50 | 44 | 40 |
|  | Post | 36 | 50 | 29 | 33 | 39 | 36 |
| 40-60 years | Pre | 10 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 30 |
|  | Post | 8 | 6 | 23 | 14 | 28 | 26 |
| 01der than 60 years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pre | 32 | 46 | 33 | 38 | 19 | 21 |
|  | Post | 40 | 25 | 29 | 29 | 24 | 28 |
| No response | Pre Post | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Totals | Pre | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | . $100 \%$ | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=19$ ) | ( $N=13$ ) | $(N=36)$ | $(N=8)$ | ( $N=722$ ) | $(N=798)$ |
|  | Post | ( 100\% | (N $100 \%$ | (N100\% | (100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  |  | ( $\mathrm{N}=25$ ) | $(N=16)$ | ( $N=48$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=721)$ | $(N=831)$ |

> APPENDIX P OCCUPATION BY SEX

Sex

| (First Choice) Occupations | Pre (\%) | Male Post (\%) | Pre (\%) | Female Post (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General office/clerical | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 |
| Management | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Government | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| University | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proprietor | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Professiona 1 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 7 |
| Sales | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| Skilled/semi-skilled | 19 | 12 | 2 | 2 |
| Technical | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Service worker | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Unskilled labor | 8 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| High school or college student | 9 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| Homemaker | 1 | 1 | 40 | 38 |
| Retired | 17 | 28 | 19 | 24 |
| Not employed | 10 | 10 | 5 | 6 |
| Totals | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=273) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=268) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=722) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=706)$ |


| (First Choice) Occupations |  | Age Groups |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} 16-20 \\ \text { Years } \end{array} \\ \underline{\theta} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-39 \\ & \frac{\text { Years }}{\underline{\%}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{40-60}{\text { Years }} \\ & \underline{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 01 \text { der than } \\ 60 \text { Years } \\ \hline \underline{\underline{6}} \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text { No } \\ \text { Response } \end{array}}{\underline{o g}}$ |
| General office/ clerical | Pre Post | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Management | Pre Post | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{0}$ | $0$ |
| Government | Pre Post | $1$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ |
| University | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| Proprietor | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{3}$ | $1$ | 0 |
| Professional | Pre Post | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $1 .$ | 0 |
| Sales | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| $\text { Ted }- \text { skilled }$ | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 11 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| cal | Pre Post | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 |
| ice rker | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $6$ | $1$ | 0 |
| iskilled labor | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| High school or college student | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 0 1 | 1 | 0 100 |
| Homemaker | Pre Post | $5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \\ & 31 \end{aligned}$ | $44$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 100 |
| Retired | Pre Post | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 79 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| Not employed | Pre Post | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5 <br> 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 |
| Totals | Pre | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=83) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=401) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=301) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=210) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} 100 \% \\ (N=2) \end{array}\right.$ |
|  | Post | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=85) \end{gathered}$ | $(N \stackrel{100 \%}{=357)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{100 \%}{=}(N 54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (N=278) \end{gathered}$ | $(N=10 \%)$ |


[^0]:    *There is a significant difference at the . 05 level between the pre and post "yes or think so" response for nonriders. There was an increase, pre to post, in the percentage of nonriders who heard STS radio announcements.

[^1]:    *There is a significant difference at the .001 level between the two surveys due to a change in the distribution on nonrider responses. The results indicate a pre to post increase in the percentage of nonriders who obtained information about STS from sources other than radio, TV, and newspaper announcements.

[^2]:    *There is a significant difference at the 05 level between the pre and post "billboards" and "displays" responses for nonriders. STS Transit Information Racks and Energy Expo displays could account for the 11 percent increase in "displays" responses.

