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## Executive Summary

The Mercer County Bus Survey, was carried out on January $20-22$ and 27-29, 2009, on New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) Routes 601, 602, 603/613, 604, 606, 607, 608, 609/619, 611, and 976 in NJ Transit's Mercer division. Two routes not operated by NJ Transit, the East Windsor Shuttle and the Train Link Shuttle, were also surveyed. This study used mailback surveys distributed on board buses in Mercer County, New Jersey to gather information regarding passenger demographics, satisfaction, travel means, and to determine frequency and purpose of use.

Surveyors distributed 3,348 mailback surveys during this study. This represented approximately 56 percent of observed boards. There were 1,080 usable surveys received, or approximately 32 percent of surveys distributed were returned. On the days surveyed 5,996 observed riders boarded the bus, and 18 percent of these observed boards returned a useable survey. The returned surveys were then entered using SurveyMonkey, an online survey service. They were then cleaned and analyzed. NJ Transit, for whom this work was completed, required that the results be weighted by bus route and time of day; either A.M. Peak or Off Peak.

The first chapter of this report outlines the method and conduct of this survey. The second chapter provides summary results and a route-by-route comparison of selected questions. The third chapter provides some insight and key findings from the survey.

## Survey Conduct

## Introduction

In fiscal 2007, New Jersey Transit (NJ Transit) sought to update bus transit surveys which had been completed a number of years earlier. NJ Transit requested, through DVRPC's Regional Transit Advisory Committee, a comprehensive series of bus and station area surveys to update the data in the DVRPC region. NJ Transit also assisted in the design and conduct of these surveys, as well as provided technical assistance in processing the results. The first transit survey, NJ Transit Rail Customer Survey (DVRPC publication number 08064), was conducted at the Trenton and Hamilton stations during spring 2008. The second transit survey, NJ Transit South Jersey Bus Survey (DVRPC publication number 08065), was conducted in Fall 2008.

The third of these requested transit surveys, The Mercer County Bus Survey, was carried out on January $20-22$ and 27 - 29, 2009, on NJ Transit Routes 601, 602, 603/613, 604, 606, 607, 608, 609/619, 611, and 976 in NJ Transit's Mercer division. Two routes not operated by NJ Transit, the East Windsor Shuttle (EWS) and the Train Link Shuttle (TL), were also surveyed. This study used mailback surveys distributed on board buses in Mercer County, New Jersey to gather information regarding passenger demographics, satisfaction, travel means, and to determine frequency and purpose of use. Passengers were encouraged to complete the survey and place it in a mailbox. However, if passengers completed the survey on board, they could hand them back to the surveyor.

NJ Transit requested these transit surveys to gather data about the riders on their rail and bus lines. Since it has been several years since the last survey, NJ Transit wanted to get "reacquainted" with their riders. From this, an updated demographic profile of their rail and bus service will be created. In addition, by completing the survey of all Mercer County routes, NJT intends to work with Mercer County on a master plan for bus services and improvements that would serve both downtown Trenton and the Route 1 corridor.

This survey will also support an examination of services to Trenton, combined with other surveys to increase transit usage among Trenton and Route 1 corridor job sites, to assist in expanding transit market share for greenhouse gas reduction, and support other transit planning efforts. Specifically, this survey will assist in planning for the Route 1 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, in that several of these routes partially serve the Route 1 corridor. In this effort, NJ Transit had previously surveyed routes 600 and 605, and parts of routes 603 and 606 on April 24 and 27, 2007. NJ transit surveyors distributed 2,264 surveys and received 643 useable surveys. The present survey supplements and updates this previous effort.

## Route Description

Each of the routes is an intra-county bus route through Mercer County, New Jersey. Many of the routes stop at the Trenton Transportation Center or at the Hamilton Rail Station providing connections to NJ Transit's Northeast Corridor and their River LINE rail lines. Three routes, the East Windsor Shuttle, Train Link, and NJ Transit Route 976, are designed to connect neighboring developments and employers to the Princeton Junction Rail Station. All of the NJ Transit routes, except the Route 976 pass through downtown Trenton.

## NJ Transit Route 601 (COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY - TRENTON - HAMILTON

MARKETPLACE) begins its route in Ewing, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: College of New Jersey, Moody Park, Prospect Heights, Trenton, Trenton Transit Center, New Jersey State House, Roebling Market, Hamilton, Hamilton K-Mart Shopping Center, Briarwood Shopping Center, and Hamilton Marketplace.

NJ Transit Route 602 (TRENTON - PENNINGTON) begins its route in Pennington, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: Ewing, College Of New Jersey, Trenton, ETS Ewing (Limited), and East Trenton (Saturdays and holidays only).

NJ Transit Rout 603/613 (MERCER MALL - HAMILTON SQUARE - YARDVILLE - HAMILTON MARKETPLACE) begins its route at the Mercer Mall, and serves the following locations: Nassau Park, Quaker Bridge Mall, Lawrence Center, Helene Fuld Medical Center, Trenton, Sovereign Arena, Independence Plaza, Mercer County Courthouse, Hamilton, White Horse, Yardville, Hamilton Square, RWJU Hospital Hamilton, and Hamilton Marketplace.

NJ Transit Route 604 (EAST TRENTON - TRENTON TRANSIT CENTER) begins its route in East Trenton, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: Perry Street Park and Ride, Trenton, Mercer County Courthouse, Labor and Workforce Building, Hughes Justice Complex, and the Trenton Transit Center.

NJ Transit Route 606 (PRINCETON - MERCERVILLE - HAMILTON MARKETPLACE) begins its route in Princeton, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: Princeton Care Center, Princeton Shopping Center, Palmer Square, Princeton University, Lawrenceville, Lawrence, Rider University, Trenton, Trenton Transit Center, Hamilton, Mercerville, Hamilton Rail Station, Hamilton Square, Foxmoor Shopping Center, Robbinsville, Project Freedom, and Hamilton Marketplace.

NJ Transit Route 607 (EWING - TRENTON - INDEPENDENCE PLAZA) begins its route in Ewing, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: NJ Department of Transportation offices (NJ DOT), Trenton, Mercer County Courthouse, Hamilton, and Independence Plaza.

NJ Transit Route 608 (HAMILTON - WEST TRENTON) begins its route in Hamilton, Mercer County, NJ and serves the following locations: Hamilton Rail Station, Fairgrounds Plaza, Trenton Transit Center, Trenton, West Trenton, NJ State Hospital, West Trenton Rail Station, and Ewing.

NJ Transit Route 609/619 (EWING - QUAKER BRIDGE MALL - MERCER COUNTY
COLLEGE) begins its route in Ewing, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: NJ Department of Transportation Offices, NJ Library for the Blind, NJ State Hospital, West Trenton, Mercer Medical Center, Trenton, State House Complex, Trenton Transit Center, St. Francis Medical Center, Hamilton, Mercerville, Mercer County Vo-Tech, Mercer County College, Quaker Bridge Plaza, and Quaker Bridge Mall Lawrence.

NJ Transit Route 611 (TRENTON - PERRY STREET SHUTTLE) begins its route at the Trenton Commons, Trenton, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: Capital Center, Trenton City Hall, DMV Offices, DEP Offices, Capital Place, NJ State Offices, Labor \& Workforce Building, Hughes Justice Complex, Mercer County Courthouse, Station Plaza, and the Trenton Transit Center.

NJ Transit Route 976 (LAWRENCE - WEST WINDSOR) begins its route in Lawrence, Mercer County, New Jersey, and serves the following locations: Yorkshire Meadows, Avalon Run, Avalon Run East, Avalon Run East II, Liberty Green, Lawrence Square, West Windsor, Avalon Watch, West Windsor Municipal Complex, and the Princeton Junction Rail Station.

The East Windsor Shuttle, or Princeton Junction Commuter Bus, connects the neighborhoods of East Windsor Township and Hightstown Borough with NJ Transit's North East Corridor Service out of Princeton Junction Station. The shuttle is funded by a Federal/State bus grant program administered by NJ Transit, and is locally supported by East Windsor Township, the Borough of Hightstown, and Mercer County. This shuttle only operates during weekday peak travel times.

The Train Link Shuttle is corporate sponsored and is managed by the Greater Mercer TMA. The shuttle is free to employees of participating employers. The Train Link Shuttle connects the Princeton Junction Rail Station and employer facilities located along College Road East and West and the Black Rock site on Scudders Mill Road in Plainsboro Township, Middlesex County, New Jersey.

These routes are illustrated in figure 1.


## Survey Method

The goal of this project was to survey the entirety of each route as it crossed through Mercer County, and not just a particular stop or segment. This required a surveyor to be on board for the entire length of bus runs distributing surveys. For this survey, penetration can be defined in one of two ways. This first way, as Table 1 displays, is by the number of inbound runs surveyed. Using the number of runs for a given route to determine sample size helps to ensure an adequate sample of riders is captured; the assumption being that, if you sample 36 percent of a particular route's inbound runs, as was done with NJ Transit Route 601, then you will sample approximately 36 percent of that route's riders.

NJ Transit, for whom this work was done, required that approximately one-third of inbound runs be sampled. It was possible, however, to capture significantly more than the requested one-third on some routes, as Table 1 demonstrates. Weather played a significant role in the conduct of this survey, and inclement weather forced a shortening of the runs surveyed on some routes.

Table 1: Survey Penetration Based on Runs

| Route | Total Runs | Runs Surveyed | Penetration |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 601 | 45 | 16 | $36 \%$ |
| 602 | 30 | 12 | $40 \%$ |
| $603 / 613$ | 73 | 26 | $36 \%$ |
| 604 | 35 | 14 | $40 \%$ |
| 606 | 67 | 16 | $24 \%$ |
| 607 | 45 | 16 | $36 \%$ |
| 608 | 78 | 20 | $26 \%$ |
| $609 / 619$ | 107 | 31 | $29 \%$ |
| 611 | 36 | 11 | $31 \%$ |
| 976 | 9 | 4 | $44 \%$ |
| EWS | 4 | 4 | $100 \%$ |
| TL | 532 | 173 | $100 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  |  | $33 \%$ |

The second way to define survey penetration is by the number of surveys distributed. Penetration is defined as the number of distributed surveys divided by the number of boards. While the number of runs sampled can tell us how many runs a surveyor was on board distributing surveys, this definition can tell us how many surveys actually made it into the hands of an actual rider. Table 2 highlights the survey penetration by the approximate rider boards on these runs. This is a measure of how many riders actually received a survey on the runs sampled on a particular route.

Table 2: Survey Penetration Based on Boards Surveyed

| Route | Boards | Surveys <br> Distributed | Penetration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 601 | 759 | 363 | $48 \%$ |
| 602 | 158 | 115 | $73 \%$ |
| $603 / 613$ | $485 / 382$ | $307 / 280$ | $63 \% / 73 \%$ |
| 604 | 169 | 90 | $32 \%$ |
| 606 | 726 | 402 | $55 \%$ |
| 607 | 691 | 340 | $49 \%$ |
| 608 | 990 | 379 | $38 \%$ |
| $609 / 619$ | $852 / 394$ | $600 / 236$ | $70 \% / 60 \%$ |
| 611 | 238 | 127 | $53 \%$ |
| 976 | 82 | 49 | $59 \%$ |
| EWS | 43 | 33 | $77 \%$ |
| TL | 27 | 27 | $100 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 5,996 | 3,348 | $56 \%$ |
| SOurce: 2009 |  |  |  |

Table 3 details the surveys distributed and returned for each route and that route's corresponding return and participation rates. Return rate can be defined as the number of surveys returned divided by the number of surveys distributed. While penetration is a measure of the reach of the survey (how many riders received a survey), participation measures the number of riders actually partaking in the survey. This is defined as the number of returned surveys divided by the inbound boards.

Source: 2009 DVRPC

On Route 601, for example, 206 out of 363 surveys were returned, for a rate of 57 percent. In terms of participation, 206 riders were surveyed out of approximately 759 total riders, or approximately 27 percent of total riders participated in the survey.

Table 3: Survey Participation

| Route | Surveys <br> Distributed | Surveys <br> Returned | Return Rate | Participation <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 601 | 363 | 206 | $57 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| 602 | 115 | 25 | $22 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| $603 / 613$ | $307 / 280$ | $123 / 95$ | $40 \% / 34 \%$ | $25 \% / 25 \%$ |
| 604 | 90 | 29 | $32 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| 606 | 402 | 107 | $27 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| 607 | 340 | 127 | $37 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| 608 | 379 | 94 | $25 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| $609 / 619$ | $600 / 236$ | $142 / 40$ | $24 \% / 17 \%$ | $17 \% / 10 \%$ |
| 611 | 127 | 46 | $36 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| 976 | 49 | 16 | $33 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| EWS | 33 | 21 | $64 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| TL | 27 | 9 | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 3,348 | 1,080 | $32 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Source 2009 DRPC |  |  |  |  |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

## Data Entry and Summarization

Completed surveys were forwarded to DVRPC for entry and analysis. A total of 1,080 useable surveys from the 14 routes, approximately 18 percent of boards, were collected and then entered using SurveyMonkey-an online survey service. This service was used to manually enter the collected surveys. SurveyMonkey was chosen as a collection/data entry method/service due to its ease of use and ability to have multiple staff entering data simultaneously on the same database. Another benefit was that it allows a live summary of the data as it is being entered.

Figure 2: SurveyMonkey Entry Form


The surveys were entered manually using SurveyMonkey's online data entry form, which replicated the paper survey to ease entry. A unique number was assigned to every survey, and that number was used as a unique identifier for each entered survey, thus preventing duplicate entries. After all of the surveys had been entered, the data was downloaded as an Excel spreadsheet for cleaning and analysis.

Source: 2008 www.surveymonkey.com
Survey data needed to be reviewed for errors and completeness. This was done to ensure the quality of the data set. Entries were reviewed for consistency. Spelling errors, entry errors, incomplete data, and nonsensical responses were removed. When a clean data set was finally arrived at, it was summarized at the route level and then by time of day.

Each survey asked for the time of day (hour, minute, and A.M. or P.M.) that the rider had boarded the bus, and all entered surveys were coded to one of two time periods for the day. Time of ridership was determined and then coded into the data. Surveys were coded as: A.M. Peak if the rider boarded the bus between 6 A.M. and 9 A.M. or Off Peak if the rider boarded between 9 A.M. and 3 P.M. Any surveys that had a time before the A.M. Peak and after 3 P.M. were also coded as Off Peak, as were any surveys that did not have a time entered.

NJ Transit, for whom this work was completed, required that the data then be weighted by time of day. Weighting the data adjusts for differences between the sample size and the actual ridership, permitting comparison with, and abstraction to, the data universe. The survey data needed to be weighted by the time of day - A.M. Peak and Off Peak.

Weights were determined by bus route average ridership per time period. Farebox data was requested and obtained for a two-week period corresponding to the dates of the survey -Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday for two consecutive weeks- for each of the bus routes surveyed. Total ridership was determined for each bus route for Off Peak and A.M. Peak for both inbound and outbound runs. This total ridership by time period was then averaged to determine normal, or expected, ridership per time period per bus route. Weights were determined by dividing the normalized ridership totals per time period by the total entered surveys per time period.

Weighting attempts to factor sample data to reflect a 100 percent count. The smaller a weight is, the larger the sample size is, and conversely, the larger a weight is, the smaller the sample size. A weight can never be less than one, as this would indicate that there were more surveys returned than there are people in the population. Table 4, Survey Weights, details the weighting for each route. Please note that there is no Off Peak Weight for the East Windsor Shuttle, Train Link Shuttle, and NJT Route 976, as there were too few surveys distributed or collected during the Off Peak on those routes.

Table 4: Survey Weights

| Route | A.M. Peak Weight | Off Peak Weight |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 601 | 2.60 | 4.77 |
| 602 | 4.85 | 7.92 |
| 603 | 3.95 | 3.94 |
| 604 | 3.33 | 12.40 |
| 606 | 5.30 | 7.70 |
| 607 | 5.21 | 5.70 |
| 608 | 9.30 | 11.37 |
| 609 | 3.82 | 8.52 |
| 611 | 7.86 | 8.5 |
| 613 | 2.34 | 6.65 |
| 619 | 11.50 | 9.30 |
| 976 | 5.13 | -- |
| EWS | 2.05 | -- |
| TL | 3.00 | -- |
| Source 2009 |  |  |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

Weighting can be used to gauge participation in a survey. On the Route 601, for example, the A.M. Peak Weight is 2.6 , indicating that nearly half of A.M. Peak riders for the 601 on the days surveyed, returned a useable survey. Weighting can also be seen as the ratio of riders to returned surveys. Using the Route 601 as an example, a ratio of 2.6 to one exists; for every 2.6 riders, one useable survey was returned during the A.M. Peak.

## Survey Summary

## Route by Route Summary

This section is a summary of the weighted results from the NJ Transit Mercer County Bus Survey. Respondents were asked a series of questions, including trip purpose, destination, means of travel to and from the bus route, and certain demographic questions, such as race and age. Selected questions from the survey are summarized below in both graphical and written means. Each selected question is a route-by-route comparison and summary of the responses.

Due to rounding, percentages may not add exactly to 100 percent.

Table 5: What time did you board this bus?

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL | Total | $\%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Off Peak | 491 | 95 | 331 | 99 | 516 | 348 | 637 | 562 | 34 | 246 | 279 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 3,660 | 60 |
| Peak A.M. | 268 | 63 | 154 | 70 | 212 | 344 | 353 | 290 | 330 | 136 | 115 | 72 | 35 | 24 | 2,466 | 40 |
| Answered question | 759 | 158 | 485 | 169 | 728 | 692 | 990 | 853 | 364 | 382 | 394 | 82 | 43 | 27 | 6,126 |  |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Estimated riders boarding the bus in the A.M. Peak (6 A.M. to 9 A.M.) accounted for a 40 percent share. There were 3,660 estimated riders who indicated that they boarded during this time period.
- Off Peak riders accounted for an approximate 60 percent share of estimated riders, with 2,466 who indicated that they boarded the bus during this time period.

Table 6: The place you have come from is....

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 | 976 | WS |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home | 499 | 111 | 331 | 141 | 450 | 545 | 752 | 596 | 316 | 281 | 243 | 82 | 43 |  | 4,418 | 72 |
| Work | 99 | 16 | 67 | 12 | 118 | 39 | 98 | 57 | 0 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 555 | 9 |
| Personal Business | 10 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 62 | 34 | 23 | 43 | 9 | 29 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 4 |
| Other | 36 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 26 | 23 | 9 | 68 | 39 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 4 |
| Technical, College or University | 29 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 7 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 3 |
| School (K-12) | 34 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 30 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 2 |
| Shopping | 24 | 8 | 35 | 0 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 2 |
| Medical/Dental | 19 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 2 |
| Social/Recreational | 5 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 1 |
| Answered question | 754 | 142 | 485 | 169 | 715 | 680 | 969 | 832 | 364 | 375 | 394 | 82 |  | 27 | 6,032 | 98 |
| Skipped question | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

* There were 4,418 estimated riders who indicated that they began this trip from home. This was the largest share of estimated riders, with 72 percent.
- The second most popular response was work, with 555 estimated riders who indicated that they began this trip from work, for a nine percent share.
* Riders indicating that they began this trip from "Personal Business" and "Other" each represent a four percent share, with 263 and 253 estimated riders for each choice, respectively.
- All other choices accounted for an approximate share of ten percent.

Table 7: How did you get to this bus?

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 615 | 123 | 430 | 108 | 606 | 621 | 831 | 717 | 24 | 316 | 322 | 82 | 35 | 3 | 4,832 | 79 |
| Walked | 46 | 30 | 28 | 7 | 67 | 55 | 41 | 41 | 16 | 34 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 431 | 7 |
| Another Bus | 32 | 0 | 4 | 48 | 34 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 143 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 341 | 6 |
| River LINE | 36 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 30 | 24 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 175 | 3 |
| NJT Train | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 126 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 159 | 3 |
| Drove a Car | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 1 |
| SEPTA | 0 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 36 | 1 |
| Bike | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Carpooled/ Dropped |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Off | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Capital Connection | 749 | 158 | 481 | 169 | 728 | 686 | 990 | 845 | 364 | 375 | 385 | 82 | 41 | 27 | 6,081 | 99 |
| Taxi | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 45 | 1 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Walking was the most popular mode by which estimated riders reached the bus. Estimated riders walking to the bus accounted for 4,832 responses, for a 79 percent share.
- The next most popular mode for reaching the bus was by transferring from another bus. There were 431 estimated riders who indicated that they had transferred to the bus from another route.
* The River LINE was the third most popular means of reaching the bus, with 341 estimated riders, or a six percent share.
* Those transferring from a "NJT Train" accounted for 175 estimated riders, or three percent of estimated riders.

Table 8: After getting off the bus, how will you get to your final destination?

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk Only | 591 | 123 | 402 | 122 | 578 | 529 | 698 | 659 | 356 | 295 | 299 | 5 | 4 | 24 | 4,685 | 76 |
| Another Bus | 84 | 10 | 47 | 47 | 88 | 124 | 172 | 124 | 0 | 59 | 49 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 806 | 13 |
| NJT Train | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 72 | 33 | 0 | 211 | 3 |
| River LINE | 14 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 45 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 127 | 2 |
| Other | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 1 |
| Bike | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Capital Connection | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Carpooled/Dropped | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Off |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Drove a Car | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Taxi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SEPTA | 737 | 145 | 469 | 169 | 715 | 676 | 967 | 820 | 356 | 370 | 357 | 77 | 43 | 24 | 5,927 | 97 |
| Answered question |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skipped question | 22 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 23 | 32 | 9 | 11 | 37 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 199 | 3 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Walking was the most popular means of completing this trip after exiting the bus, with 4,685 estimated riders, or 76 percent of estimated riders, indicating that they would walk.
- Connecting with another NJ Transit bus was the next most popular means of travel after exiting the bus, with 806 estimated riders, or 13 percent of estimated riders, indicating that they would transfer to another bus.
- The other means of public transportation-the River LINE, NJ Transit Train, Capital Connection-used to complete the trip after exiting the bus combined for an approximate six percent share of estimated riders. There were 211 estimated riders indicating that they would use a NJT Train, 127 who indicated that they would use the River LINE, and 18 estimated riders who indicated that they would use the Capital Connection.
- Interestingly, 15 estimated riders indicated that they would use a car to complete this trip, either driving or as part of a car pool or being picked up/dropped off. There were five estimated riders who indicated that they would drive a car to finish their trips, and ten estimated riders who indicated that they would use a car pool or be dropped off to complete their trips.

Table 9: The place you are going to is...

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 |  | EWS | TL | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work | 316 | 117 | 185 | 90 | 305 | 382 | 463 | 395 | 339 | 186 | 70 | 77 | 37 | 27 | 2,988 | 49 |
| Home | 182 | 16 | 95 | 12 | 190 | 91 | 144 | 155 | 8 | 72 | 105 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,074 | 18 |
| Personal Business | 79 | 0 | 71 | 16 | 44 | 49 | 100 | 76 | 9 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 480 | 8 |
| Other | 47 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 57 | 38 | 55 | 46 | 0 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 344 | 6 |
| Technical, College or University | 29 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 23 | 27 | 43 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 | 5 |
| School (K-12) | 36 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 32 | 21 | 62 | 61 | 0 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 5 |
| Shopping | 39 | 0 | 59 | 25 | 44 | 11 | 34 | 26 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 | 4 |
| Medical/Dental | 12 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 34 | 68 | 46 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 3 |
| Social/Recreational | 5 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1 |
| Answered question | 744 | 150 | 477 | 169 | 707 | 664 | 969 | 833 | 356 | 382 | 385 | 82 | 43 |  | 5,988 | 98 |
| Skipped question | 15 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 28 | 21 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- There were 2,988 estimated riders who indicated that they were traveling to work. This was the most popular response, accounting for a share of 49 percent of estimated riders.
- Estimated riders traveling home accounted for an 18 percent share. There were 1,074 estimated riders who indicated this travel purpose.
* Estimated riders indicating their travel purpose as being either "Personal Business" or "Other" combined for an approximate share of 14 percent. There were 480 estimated riders indicating that "Personal Business" was their travel purpose, and 344 estimated riders who indicated that "Other" was their travel purpose, for an eight percent and six percent share, respectively.
- All other travel purposes combined for an 18 percent share of estimated riders.

Table 10: Which of the following statements applies to you?

| I have no other way to travel. | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 | 976 | WS |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 541 | 102 | 382 | 139 | 567 | 544 | 831 | 655 | 103 | 298 | 262 | 31 | 14 | 9 | 4,478 | 73 |
| I use the bus because it is the best choice for me. | 150 | 51 | 63 | 30 | 125 | 110 | 118 | 142 | 198 | 55 | 104 | 51 | 29 | 15 | 1,240 | 20 |
| I usually use another type of transportation. | 59 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 21 | 32 | 35 | 55 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 295 | 5 |
| Answered question | 750 | 153 | 469 | 169 | 710 | 675 | 981 | 832 | 356 | 382 | 385 | 82 | 43 | 27 | 6,013 | 98 |
| Skipped question | 10 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 18 | 17 | 9 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- The majority of estimated riders, 73 percent, characterized themselves as having no other way to travel other than the bus. There were 4,478 estimated riders who responded, "I have no other way to travel."
- Estimated riders who indicated that the bus was the best choice for them accounted for a 20 percent share, with 1,240 who responded this way.
- Estimated riders occasionally taking the bus accounted for a five percent share. There were 295 estimated riders who indicated that "I usually use another type of transportation."

Table 11: What type of ticket are you using for this trip?

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 |  | EW |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| One-way/Cash | 386 | 81 | 221 | 70 | 271 | 282 | 580 | 301 | 39 | 207 | 190 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 2,647 | 43 |
| Bus Monthly | 216 | 64 | 170 | 29 | 319 | 255 | 239 | 329 | 48 | 105 | 139 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1,922 | 31 |
| Senior Citizen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /Customer with | 56 | 0 | 55 | 31 | 57 | 94 | 100 | 98 | 16 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 548 | 9 |
| Disability/Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rail Monthly | 31 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 5 | 30 | 48 | 87 | 0 | 9 | 72 | 4 | 9 | 334 | 5 |
| Other | 15 | 8 | 20 | 3 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 174 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 271 | 4 |
| Round Trip | 24 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 173 | 3 |
| Student Fare | 14 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 2 |
| 10 Trip/Multi-trip | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 38 | 1 |
| Answered question | 742 | 153 | 485 | 169 | 710 | 670 | 990 | 845 | 364 | 375 | 394 | 82 | 43 | 24 | 6,046 | 99 |
| Skipped question | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 80 | 1 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Estimated riders indicating that they used a "One-way/Cash" ticket for this trip accounted for a 43 percent share of estimated riders. There were 2,647 estimated riders who indicated they used this type of ticket.
- Estimated riders who used a "Bus Monthly" pass made up a 31 percent share of estimated riders. There were 1,922 estimated riders who indicated that they used a "Bus Monthly" pass for their trips.
- There were 548 estimated riders who used a "Senior Citizen/Customer with disability/children" type of ticket, for a nine percent share of respondents.
- There were 271 estimated riders who indicated that they used an "Other" type of ticket for this trip, accounting for a four percent share of respondents.
- It is NJ Transit policy that riders with monthly rail passes can ride for free as long as the zones on the rail pass are equal to or greater than the bus zones traveled. Overall, there were 334 estimated riders who used a "Rail Monthly" pass for their trip. Routes 611 and 976 had the highest number of estimated riders using a "Rail Monthly" pass, with 87 and 72 riders respectively. That accounts for a 23 percent share for the route 611, and a very large 88 percent share for the route 976.
- Interestingly, nearly half of the estimated riders on the route 611, 174 estimated riders, indicated they used an "Other" type of ticket for this trip. It should be noted that state employees may use a state employee pass to ride NJ Transit buses.

Table 12: How often do you use this bus route?

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 |  | WS |  | otal | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 days/week | 260 | 102 | 134 | 90 | 242 | 309 | 373 | 309 | 253 | 136 | 141 | 72 | 35 | 18 | 2,474 | 40 |
| 7 days/week | 191 | 8 | 150 | 31 | 245 | 159 | 352 | 252 | 16 | 123 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,586 | 26 |
| 6 days/week | 90 | 22 | 83 | 22 | 119 | 112 | 121 | 100 | 8 | 41 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 758 | 12 |
| 3-4 days/week | 79 | 13 | 47 | 25 | 60 | 45 | 89 | 76 | 24 | 56 | 128 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 657 | 11 |
| 1-2 days/week | 56 | 8 | 35 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 23 | 63 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 282 | 5 |
| 1-3 days/month | 51 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 11 | 38 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 3 |
| Less than one day/month | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 21 | 8 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 1 |
| First time customer | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 1 |
| Answered question | 750 | 153 | 481 | 169 | 702 | 675 | 990 | 849 | 364 | 375 | 394 | 82 |  | 27 | 6,054 | 99 |
| Skipped question | 10 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 1 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Estimated riders who indicated that they used this bus route five days per week accounted a 40 percent share. There were 2,474 estimated riders who indicated they used this bus route five days per week.
* There were 1,586 estimated riders who indicated that they used the bus every day of the week. This accounted for a 26 percent share of estimated riders.
* There were 758 estimated riders who indicated they used the bus nearly every day of the week ( 6 days per week), accounting for a 12 percent share.
* Estimated riders who indicated that they were infrequent weekly riders, from "1-3 days per month" to "Less than one day per month," had a combined share of four percent. There were 186 estimated riders and 74 estimated riders riding the bus "1-3 days per month" and "Less than one day per month," respectively.
- There were 35 estimated riders who indicated that they were first time customers accounting for a one percent share.

Table 13: In the past year, has the service on this route...

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\%$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Remained the same | 264 | 99 | 197 | 64 | 357 | 270 | 376 | 328 | 214 | 136 | 148 | 26 | 10 | 6 | 2,496 | 41 |
| Improved | 160 | 41 | 114 | 36 | 184 | 158 | 322 | 197 | 32 | 104 | 86 | 21 | 12 | 3 | 1,471 | 24 |  |
| Somewhat improved | 166 | 5 | 91 | 60 | 104 | 155 | 177 | 160 | 47 | 81 | 102 | 5 | 14 | 3 | 1,170 | 19 |  |
| Somewhat declined | 66 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 31 | 54 | 55 | 111 | 31 | 22 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 9 | 455 | 7 |  |
| Not applicable | 56 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 21 | 20 | 32 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 196 | 3 |  |
| Declined | 15 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 13 | 16 | 21 | 16 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 155 | 3 |  |
| Answered question | 727 | 145 | 457 | 166 | 707 | 665 | 972 | 834 | 364 | 373 | 385 | 82 | 43 | 24 | 5,944 | 97 |  |
| Skipped question | 32 | 13 | 28 | 3 | 21 | 27 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 182 | 3 |  |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- For a large number of estimated riders (41 percent) the service had remained the same in the past year. There were 2,496 estimated riders who indicated this.
- There were 1,471 estimated riders who indicated that they felt service had improved over the past year.
- Only 155 estimated riders-a three percent share of total estimated riders-felt that service had declined over the past year.

Table 14: Gender

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\mathbf{\%}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 400 | 83 | 280 | 112 | 390 | 422 | 552 | 436 | 252 | 201 | 232 | 26 | 18 | 9 | 3,413 | 56 |
| Female | 337 | 66 | 197 | 57 | 325 | 253 | 429 | 397 | 104 | 167 | 153 | 51 | 25 | 18 | 2,578 | 42 |
| Male | 737 | 148 | 477 | 169 | 715 | 675 | 981 | 833 | 356 | 368 | 385 | 77 | 43 | 27 | 5,991 | 98 |
| Answered question | 22 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 9 | 20 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Over half of all estimated riders indicated that they were female, for a 56 percent share. There were 3,413 female estimated riders.
- There were 2,578 estimated male riders, accounting for a 42 percent share.
- There were 135 estimated riders who failed to indicate any gender.

Table 15: Age

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 | 976 | EWS |  | otal | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45-54 years | 168 | 48 | 130 | 41 | 231 | 212 | 254 | 200 | 88 | 102 | 90 | 21 | 12 | 3 | 1,599 | 26 |
| 25-34 years | 112 | 16 | 114 | 31 | 135 | 121 | 158 | 133 | 86 | 61 | 60 | 36 | 2 | 18 | 1,083 | 18 |
| 35-44 years | 152 | 30 | 91 | 38 | 127 | 109 | 154 | 139 | 79 | 63 | 56 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 1,074 | 18 |
| 18-24 years | 153 | 5 | 55 | 26 | 67 | 54 | 98 | 105 | 8 | 67 | 148 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 791 | 13 |
| 55-61 years | 64 | 49 | 35 | 10 | 104 | 83 | 165 | 136 | 64 | 38 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 773 | 13 |
| 62 or over | 44 | 0 | 47 | 19 | 46 | 55 | 140 | 100 | 39 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 527 | 9 |
| Under 18 years | 57 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 38 | 21 | 36 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 3 |
| Answered question | 750 | 153 | 485 | 169 | 715 | 670 | 990 | 849 | 364 | 377 | 385 | 82 |  |  | 6,059 | 99 |
| Skipped question | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 1 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

* Over one-quarter of estimated riders indicated that they were in the 45-to-54-years-old category. There were 1,599 estimated riders who indicated that they were between the ages of 45 and 54 , for a 26 percent share.
* There were an almost equal number of estimated riders who had indicated they were between the ages of 25 and 34 as had indicated they were between the ages 35 and 44 . There were 1,083 estimated riders who indicated that they were between the ages of 25 and 34 , for an 18 percent share of respondents. Estimated riders who indicated that they were between the ages of 35 and 44 also accounted for an 18 percent share of estimated riders, with 1,074 estimated riders indicating this age range.
* There were 527 estimated riders-a nine percent share-who indicated that they were 62 years old or older.
* "Under 18 years old," accounted for the smallest share of estimated riders, with a three percent share.

Table 16: Household size

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 130 | 57 | 106 | 23 | 153 | 197 | 311 | 231 | 87 | 108 | 84 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 1,505 | 25 |
| One | 188 | 48 | 114 | 26 | 127 | 171 | 184 | 200 | 126 | 74 | 97 | 36 | 10 | 6 | 1,408 | 23 |
| Two | 129 | 27 | 87 | 7 | 127 | 165 | 211 | 169 | 87 | 50 | 39 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 1,120 | 18 |
| Three | 150 | 21 | 114 | 41 | 181 | 85 | 172 | 110 | 16 | 89 | 28 | 21 | 12 | 6 | 1,045 | 17 |
| Four | 139 | 0 | 63 | 69 | 127 | 64 | 113 | 123 | 32 | 53 | 127 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 929 | 15 |
| Five or more | 737 | 153 | 485 | 166 | 715 | 681 | 990 | 832 | 348 | 373 | 375 | 82 | 43 | 27 | 6,007 | 98 |
| Answered question |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skipped question | 23 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 16 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- "One" and "Two" person households accounted for nearly half of all estimated riders. There were 1,505 estimated riders who indicated that they were members of a "One" person household. There were 1,408 estimated riders who indicated they were a member of a "Two" person household.
* "Four" and "Three" person households accounted for nearly an equal number of estimated riders. There were 1,045 estimated riders who indicated that they were part of a "Four" person household, for a 17 percent share. Estimated riders who indicated that they were a member of a "Three" person household accounted for 1,120 respondents, or an 18 percent share of all riders estimated.
* Households of "Five or more" persons had the smallest share of estimated riders, with 34 percent. There were 929 estimated riders who indicated that they were a member of a household with "Five or more" persons.

Table 17: How many in your household are employed?

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 | 976 | NS | TL | otal | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| One | 215 | 94 | 205 | 75 | 270 | 338 | 424 | 284 | 183 | 93 | 202 | 31 | 16 | 18 | 2,447 | 40 |
| Two | 276 | 30 | 75 | 31 | 251 | 141 | 289 | 228 | 119 | 104 | 51 | 51 | 21 | 9 | 1,677 | 27 |
| None | 118 | 16 | 114 | 31 | 75 | 138 | 155 | 197 | 0 | 85 | 37 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 969 | 16 |
| Three | 62 | 8 | 55 | 28 | 75 | 33 | 49 | 57 | 39 | 63 | 74 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 545 | 9 |
| Four | 37 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 31 | 36 | 30 | 41 | 16 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 251 | 4 |
| Five or more | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 1 |
| Answered question | 718 | 153 | 477 | 166 | 710 | 686 | 947 | 815 | 356 | 359 | 385 | 82 | 43 | 27 | 5,924 | 97 |
| Skipped question | 41 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 18 | 5 | 43 | 38 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 3 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Estimated riders from households with one person employed accounted for a 40 percent share of total estimated riders. There were 2,447 estimated riders who indicated that they were from a household with one person employed.
- There were 1,677 estimated riders who indicated that they were from a household with two persons employed, for a 27 percent share of total estimated riders.
- Estimated riders who indicated that there were no employed persons in their household accounted for a 16 percent share of total estimated riders. There were 969 estimated riders who indicated that they were from a household with no employed persons.
- Households with "Five or more" persons employed had the smallest share, with 34 estimated riders, or one percent, who indicated as such.

Table 18: How many cars are available in your household?

|  | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 6}$ | EWS TL Total | $\%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 372 | 85 | 331 | 86 | 430 | 452 | 709 | 527 | 32 | 245 | 170 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 3,455 | 56 |
| None | 265 | 35 | 110 | 70 | 192 | 197 | 173 | 184 | 119 | 85 | 93 | 62 | 18 | 15 | 1,617 | 26 |
| One | 69 | 29 | 24 | 10 | 75 | 32 | 90 | 109 | 111 | 34 | 93 | 21 | 16 | 0 | 711 | 12 |
| Two | 30 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 63 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 175 | 3 |
| Three | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 1 |
| Four | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Five or more | 737 | 153 | 481 | 169 | 710 | 686 | 981 | 828 | 356 | 373 | 375 | 82 | 43 | 27 | 6,001 | 98 |
| Answered question |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skipped question | 23 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 2 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Over half of all estimated riders indicated that they had no vehicle available in their households. There were 3,455 estimated riders who indicated that they had no vehicles available, for a 56 percent share of total estimated riders.
- Estimated riders who indicated that they had one vehicle available in their households accounted for a 26 percent share of total estimated riders. There were 1,617 estimated riders who indicated that they had one vehicle available in their households.
- Two-vehicle, three-vehicle and four-vehicle households combined for a 16 percent share of total estimated riders. There were 711 estimated riders who indicated two vehicles available, 175 estimated riders who indicated three vehicles available, and 39 estimated riders who indicated four vehicles available in their respective households.
- There were only four estimated riders who indicated that there were five or more vehicles available in his or her household.

Table 19: Annual household income

|  | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 611 | 613 | 619 |  |  |  | al | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under \$15,000 | 226 | 56 | 189 | 73 | 267 | 249 | 388 | 342 | 16 | 147 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,055 | 34 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 142 | 37 | 118 | 31 | 196 | 165 | 156 | 128 | 0 | 39 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,091 | 18 |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 97 | 21 | 87 | 3 | 99 | 81 | 158 | 105 | 16 | 32 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 762 | 12 |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 74 | 18 | 20 | 32 | 37 | 65 | 95 | 56 | 94 | 43 | 53 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 610 | 10 |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 89 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 41 | 49 | 117 | 83 | 63 | 54 | 19 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 582 | 10 |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 31 | 21 | 28 | 20 | 63 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 240 | 4 |
| \$100,000-\$149,999 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 71 | 7 | 9 | 31 | 16 | 6 | 202 | 3 |
| \$150,000 and over | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 83 | 1 |
| Answered question | 670 | 153 | 446 | 169 | 691 | 631 | 969 | 758 | 332 | 321 | 334 | 82 | 41 | 27 | 5,624 | 92 |
| Skipped question | 89 | 5 | 39 | 0 | 37 | 61 | 21 | 95 | 32 | 61 | 60 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 501 | 8 |

Source: 2009 DVRPC

- Estimated riders who indicated an annual household income under \$15,000 accounted for 34 percent of total estimated riders. There were 2,055 estimated riders who indicated an annual household income under \$15,000.
- Estimated riders who indicated an annual household income between \$15,000 and $\$ 35,000$ accounted for an approximate 30 percent share of total respondents. There were 1,091 estimated riders who reported an annual household income between \$15,000 and $\$ 24,999$, for an 18 percent share. There were 762 estimated riders who reported an annual household income between $\$ 25,000$ and $\$ 34,999$, for a 12 percent share.
- There were 83 estimated riders who reported an annual household income over $\$ 150,000$, for a one percent share of total estimated riders.


## Key Findings

## Route Comparison

To help place the results of the survey in context, a comparison of some of the demographic characteristics across routes and to Mercer County as a whole is useful. Table 20, Mean Household Demographics, displays the mean household income, age, household size, workers per household, and cars available per household for the routes surveyed and for Mercer County. The following values were derived from the survey responses for each route surveyed, and from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2008 American Community Survey (ACS) data for Mercer County. The mean household demographics are only approximations, and were calculated in accordance with NJ Transit's formula and method. The survey participants were given a range of ages, household incomes, household sizes, and cars available to choose from. Values were then approximated from the midpoint of these ranges for these questions and the table below calculated from these approximate values.

By comparing the routes to each other and then to the county at large, a picture of the socioeconomic conditions of the ridership make themselves apparent. One could either compare the survey results as a whole to the county, or on a route by route basis. Either way, a clear picture of the average surveyed NJ Transit rider becomes evident.

Table 20: Mean Household Demographics

|  | Cars per <br> Household | Worker per <br> Household | Household <br> Size | Age | Household <br> Income |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 601 | 0.73 | 1.73 | 3.47 | 43 | $\$ 32,239$ |
| 602 | 0.71 | 1.29 | 2.07 | 47 | $\$ 31,839$ |
| 603 | 0.47 | 1.42 | 3.21 | 45 | $\$ 24,282$ |
| 604 | 0.60 | 1.31 | 3.98 | 42 | $\$ 32,146$ |
| 606 | 0.55 | 1.69 | 3.29 | 45 | $\$ 29,253$ |
| 607 | 0.44 | 1.37 | 2.78 | 46 | $\$ 26,524$ |
| 608 | 0.39 | 1.31 | 2.76 | 47 | $\$ 31,235$ |
| 609 | 0.58 | 1.48 | 3.05 | 49 | $\$ 28,846$ |
| 611 | 1.97 | 1.81 | 2.58 | 50 | $\$ 75,456$ |
| 613 | 0.56 | 1.76 | 3.35 | 47 | $\$ 28,974$ |
| 619 | 1.02 | 1.82 | 3.81 | 39 | $\$ 32,238$ |
| 976 | 1.27 | 1.63 | 3.38 | 38 | $\$ 107,969$ |
| EWS | 1.51 | 1.75 | 3.05 | 50 | $\$ 117,375$ |
| TL | 0.56 | 1.33 | 2.44 | 38 | $\$ 81,944$ |
| Total | 0.69 | 1.54 | 3.10 | 46 | $\$ 34,286$ |
| Mercer | $1.04^{\dagger}$ | $1.36^{\dagger}$ | $2.75^{\dagger}$ | $37^{\dagger} *$ | $\$ 98,174^{\dagger}$ |
| County |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: DVRPC 2009; ( $\dagger$ ) US Census Bureau American Community Survey 2008 estimates.
(*) Median age.

The average household had less than one car available to them, with 0.69 cars per household. This is consistent with the findings, as displayed in Table 18 on page 23, which indicate that over half of riders reported having no access to a vehicle in their household; an approximately 56 percent share. This is also consistent with the findings in Table 10 on page 16, where approximately 73 percent of riders reported that they had no other means of traveling but the bus.

The average number of workers per household and average household size of riders surveyed tended to be higher than the Mercer County average. Households of riders surveyed averaged 1.54 workers and 3.10 persons, while for the county the households averaged 1.36 workers and 2.75 persons, respectively.

The average age for a rider of the bus routes surveyed is 46 years old. This was significantly higher than the median age reported by the Census Bureau for Mercer County. Mercer County has a median age of 37 . The Train Link (TL), route 916, and route 976 were the closest to the county median age with ages of 38,39 , and 38 respectively. The East Windsor Shuttle (EWS) and route 611 had the oldest riders of the routes surveyed with an average age of 50.

Average household income for Mercer County is $\$ 98,174$. That is nearly three times higher than the average household income reported in this survey of $\$ 34,286$. The federal government defines poverty as a ratio of family size to household income, as shown in Table 23. In this survey, participants were asked for their household size. If household size is used as a proxy for family size, an approximate comparison of the average household income from this survey to the federally defined guidelines can be established.

Table 21: Poverty Guidelines by Family Size: 2001 and 2009

| Size of <br> family unit | 2001 <br> household income | 2009 <br> Household income for <br> $\mathbf{4 8}$ contiguous states <br> and DC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\$ 8,590$ | $\$ 10,830$ |
| 2 | $\$ 11,610$ | $\$ 14,570$ |
| 3 | $\$ 14,630$ | $\$ 18,310$ |
| 4 | $\$ 17,650$ | $\$ 22,050$ |
| 5 | $\$ 20,670$ | $\$ 25,790$ |
| 6 | $\$ 23,690$ | $\$ 29,530$ |
| 7 | $\$ 26,710$ | $\$ 33,270$ |
| 8 | $\$ 29,730$ | $\$ 37,010$ |
| Each Additional Person: | $\$ 3,020$ | $\$ 3,740$ |

Source: Federal Register, Vol. 74, No. 14, January 23

None of the routes surveyed technically fall below, or at, the federally determined guidelines for poverty for the given household sizes of this survey. Another way of looking at income and income disparity, if that exists, is to determine how far above or below the federal guidelines a household is. A household may be above the poverty threshold, but that may not mean they are doing well, they could be just scraping by. In the case of the average rider surveyed with an average household size of three persons, who earned an average household income of \$34,286, they would be approximately 87 percent above the federal threshold of $\$ 18,310$ dollars for a family of three.

There were routes that were significantly higher and lower than the survey average. The East Windsor Shuttle (EWS), with an average household income of \$117,375 - more than \$86,000 above the survey average, was a very high 541 percent of the poverty guidelines for a household of three persons. The route 603, though still above the poverty mark for a household of three, was only 32 percent higher with an average household income of $\$ 24,282$ - an income that is $\$ 10,000$ less than the survey average.
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