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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A telephone survey of 1,809 Los Angeles County residents was conducted July through September 2013 with a minimum of 196 surveys in each of Metro’s nine Subregions. The results were then weighted to be representative of the total County population. The survey results can be considered accurate to ± 3.5% at a 95% confidence level on a countywide basis. Results are also accurate at the subregion level to ± 7% at a 95% confidence level. Similar surveys have been conducted every few years; most recently in 2010 and 2006.

The survey was designed to provide actionable feedback on communications programs and service performance. It addresses the public’s awareness and perceptions of Metro and media coverage, awareness and attitudes about major Metro projects, communications and technology, and also provides a commute profile of residents. In addition, it offers feedback on customer service, bicycling, and the ExpressLanes. Key findings are as follows:

Communications

- The Metro brand continues to grow with Metro, Metro Bus and Metro Rail all showing increases of seven points or more in unaided recall over 2010. Total unaided awareness of Metro (combining Metro, Metro Bus and Metro Rail) is now 62 percent, and when residents that were not aware of Metro on an unaided basis were asked if they have heard of Metro, the combined total awareness increases to 93 percent countywide. Over the same time period unaided recall of MTA has declined from 28 to 14 percent.

- Recall of media coverage of Metro has declined from 48 percent to 39 percent, but the tenor of the coverage has improved with 65 percent saying coverage is positive compared to 36 percent in 2010.

- Recall of advertisements for Metro is high at 49 percent, and 21 percent of all residents specifically recall seeing ads with the word “more” on billboards or buses indicating this campaign’s success.

- Awareness for major Metro projects varies from a high of 74 percent for I-405 improvements, likely aided by media ‘Carmageddon’ coverage, to a low of 35 percent for the Gold Line Foothill Extension. In between, 53 percent have seen or heard something about the ExpressLanes, and 47 percent have seen or heard something about the TAP program.
Network TV (49%) and online websites (42%) are the top two sources of information followed at about half this level by regional newspapers (21%), cable TV (20%), and online newspapers (16%). Channels of communication vary significantly with residents’ age; with regional newspapers, network TV and radio all being used more heavily by those over 35, while those under 35 rely more heavily on online websites.

Technology

The Internet dominates across all age groups as the primary source of information about public transit with 38 percent saying they would use Metro.net to plan a trip, and 26 percent opting for Google Maps/Transit. All other cited sources were less than 10 percent. Twenty-nine percent of County residents say they have already visited Metro.net.

Almost two-thirds (64%) of County residents have smartphones and 34 percent have heard of the Metro mobile app, indicating that this has become a critically important channel of communication that will continue to grow in importance.

Commuting and Transit

Commute mode has shifted, perhaps due to gas prices, the job market and the availability of increased transit services, to fewer SOV drivers and more Metro Rail.

Eighty-five percent of County residents say there is a bus stop within three blocks of home and 71 percent say there is a train or rail station within five miles. Sixty-nine percent are aware of at least one bus route in their neighborhood and 47 percent have used a bus in their neighborhood. Twenty-nine percent have used a bus somewhere in Los Angeles County in the last month and 21 percent have used rail service. Fifty-five percent say they have used public transit, but not in the last month, while 11 percent say they have never used public transit. Seventy-two percent say that when they ride a bus, it generally has been Metro.

Perceptions of Metro

Los Angeles County residents are much more positive about Los Angeles County in general in 2013 with 53 percent saying that things are going in the right direction, up 27 points from 26 percent in 2010 when a majority (59%) said things are on the wrong track (now only 25%).

Attitudes about riding Metro are also positive with almost half (48%) saying “I would feel good about riding Metro.” Most of the remaining half (46%) say “I would be willing to try Metro.” Only two percent selected the negative statement “I would be embarrassed to ride Metro.”
Forty-two percent rate the transit system in Los Angeles County as excellent (7%) or good (35%) which is up from 29 percent in 2010. Conversely, only 18 percent say it is poor (12%) or very poor (6%), which is down from 27 percent in 2010. When asked specifically about Metro, 67 percent agree (46%) or strongly agree (21%) with the statement that they are satisfied with Metro Bus and rail services, and 63 percent agree (41%) or strongly agree (22%) that Metro’s image is better than last year.

Several detailed performance factors were also evaluated addressing safety, cleanliness, fares, being responsive, and financial stewardship. Agreement with positive statements about all of these factors improved from 2010 to 2013.

**ExpressLanes**

Support and opposition to the ExpressLanes remains polarized with 25 percent still definitely opposing allowing single occupant drivers to pay to use the ExpressLanes. However, support is much more positive in 2013 than in 2010 with a clear majority of 58 percent definitely supporting (33%) or probably supporting (25%) the concept compared to 36 percent probably opposing (11%) or definitely opposing (25%). The percentage supporting the ExpressLanes is up 14 points from 2010, and the percentage opposing has declined 16 points.

Overall the survey results reflect positive momentum with increased awareness of the Metro brand, more positive coverage in the media, and higher ratings for Metro’s performance. Although the direction is positive, there is still significant room for improvement that can lead to increased market share. Continued improvements in service delivery and increased awareness of transit services available to County residents can both lead to increased ridership.

**Key recommendations include:**

- Build awareness of new services to the general public, increasing awareness of the ability to get almost anywhere in Los Angeles County.

- Continue to build on Metro’s image as transportation for everyone in Los Angeles County; not just the transit dependent, focusing efforts on service improvements that the general public expects in a transit system they would use.

- If all conversion of MTA to Metro is complete and resources are still being allocated to building the Metro brand, these can likely be reallocated to building positive perceptions of Metro service.

- Ensure that the Go Metro app receives adequate resources to be truly effective in meeting users’ needs as this is becoming a key touch-point for Metro.
- Maintain the continuous improvement in the Metro.net website to ensure potential and current riders can easily find what they are looking for and to become a source of entertainment that can be achieved via Metro to increase use by all residents.

- Ensure that there is an effective strategy in place to optimize positive results from the growing number of people using Google Maps/Transit for trip planning.

- Segment marketing efforts with campaigns to older riders still utilizing traditional media, but focusing efforts for younger riders through online channels.

- Continue communications efforts on the ExpressLanes to maintain the trend of growing support.
In the current 2013 survey, residents were asked a series of questions regarding their awareness and perceptions of Metro as a major transit operator in Los Angeles County, as well as awareness of any media coverage involving Metro. Respondents were first asked an open-ended question about what transit operators come to mind when thinking about public transportation in Los Angeles County.

**Figure 1: When Thinking Of Public Transportation In LA County, What Transit Operators Come To Mind?**

n=1,809

Fifty-one percent of residents responded “Metro” (up from 44% in the previous 2010 survey). In addition, Metro Bus and Metrolink were both mentioned by 16 percent each, MTA by 14 percent, and Metro Rail by 11 percent. After eliminating double-counting for respondents who mentioned multiple Metro responses, the total unaided recall of the Metro brand is now at 62 percent. The increases in each of the Metro responses from 2010 to 2013 shows continued improvement in the execution of the Metro brand with the prior brand “MTA,” continuing to decline, dropping by half, from 28 to 14 percent. RTD was mentioned by only two percent.
Unaided awareness of Metro (combined Metro, Metro Bus, Metro Rail, Metro Rapid) varies significantly by region ranging from a high of 78 percent for Central Los Angeles to lows of 45 and 39 percent in the outlying Las Virgenes and North Los Angeles County subregions.

Residents that did not recall Metro on an unaided basis were specifically asked if they have ever heard of Metro. When presented with the Metro name, 81 percent of this group recognized it. Combining both unaided recall and aided recall, 93 percent of County residents are now aware that Metro is the transit operator for Los Angeles County.
When asked whether they are familiar with what Metro does, almost two-thirds (65%) of residents indicate that they are.
Residents were also asked questions related to their awareness of recent media coverage of Metro. When asked whether they had seen, heard, or read any news stories about Metro in the last six months, 39 percent indicate that they have, which is down from 48% in 2010.

Recall of media coverage is positively correlated to age, income and education. Recall of media coverage starts at a low of 27 percent for residents under 25 years old and increases with each age category to 46 percent for residents 65 or older. For income, residents with household income of $50,000 or less, the recall of media coverage is 33 percent. For households with more than $50,000 income it rises to 49 percent. And finally, recall starts at 30 percent for those with less than a high-school education and rises with each category to 51 percent for those with graduate degrees.
Figure 5: Were They Generally Positive Or Negative?
n=714

Media coverage is perceived to be significantly more positive in 2013 than in 2010 with the percentage of residents rating coverage as positive increasing from 36 to 65 percent which is in line with the 2006 survey. This is a ratio of four to one relative to residents reporting negative coverage which dropped from 27 percent to 16 percent. Expanding this to the total population, this means that 25 percent of County residents recall seeing positive media coverage compared to six percent that recall seeing negative coverage. Five percent recall neutral coverage and 61 percent do not recall coverage of any kind. Riders found media coverage to be slightly more positive than non-riders at 72 and 61 percent respectively.
When asked if they recall seeing advertising for Metro, 49 percent say that they do, and 21 percent (of all residents) specifically recall seeing the ads with the word “more” on billboards or the sides of buses.

Recall of advertising is higher for riders (57%) than for non-riders (46%), but generally the differences between demographic groups are not significant. The “more” ads, however, are not only recalled more often by riders (28%) than non-riders (17%), but also by residents that are younger, lower income, and less educated. Twenty-eight percent of riders recall the “more” ads compared to 17 percent for non-riders. For age, recall for those under 45 is 25 percent compared to 17 percent for those 45 and older. And for those with incomes of $50,000 or less recall is 27 percent, compared to 17 percent for those with incomes above $50,000. Finally, recall for those with less than a college degree is eight percent higher than those with more education at 25 and 17 percent respectively.

Residents were also asked about their awareness of some major Metro projects including the Foothill Gold Line extension, the 405 Improvement projects and the TAP program.
When asked if they have seen or heard anything about the Gold Line Foothill Extension, 35 percent indicated that they had.

Proximity plays an important role in familiarity with the Foothill Extension. Residents in the San Gabriel Valley subregion were most likely to have heard about it at 62 percent. All other subregions were below 50 percent including the San Fernando Valley and North Los Angeles County at 23 percent and 24 percent respectively. Awareness is also higher for transit riders (41%) than for non-riders (32%).

Awareness of 405 freeway improvements is over twice as high as the Foothill Extension at 74 percent. This is likely because of the extensive “Carmageddon” media coverage and the impact that closures may have on anyone living in Los Angeles County, as almost everyone uses the 405 at least occasionally.

Residents in the San Gabriel Valley that are furthest from the 405 had the lowest awareness of 405 improvement projects at 65 percent.
All residents were then asked about the TAP program and the “latching” of the gates.

At 47 percent, approximately half of Los Angeles County residents have heard of the Metro Transit Access Pass (TAP) program. There is a distinguishable difference in awareness of TAP based on location: Central Los Angeles has the greatest awareness of TAP at 58 percent, while Las Virgenes (25%) and North Los Angeles County (36%) had the lowest awareness. Also, as would be expected, awareness of TAP is much higher, although not universal, among transit riders at 71 percent compared to 34 percent for non-riders.

When residents that are aware of the TAP program were asked if they knew that Metro has “latched the gates” of certain rail stations in June 2013, 27 percent indicate that they are. Awareness of the gate latching is slightly higher in the Central Los Angeles subregion at 33 percent.
INFORMATION SOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY

Residents were asked where they typically get information and news. Forty-nine percent indicate they get their information and news from network television, 42 percent use online websites, 21 percent read regional newspapers, 20 percent watch cable television, 16 percent read online newspapers, 13 percent listen to AM/FM radio, and six percent read daily or weekly local newspapers\(^1\).

The “digital divide” is clearly present in the sources of information used by different age groups, although the break-point varies for the different media. Regional papers are a more important source of information for residents 45 or older (31%) than for younger residents (12%). Similarly, network TV is less popular with the two youngest age groups of 18-24 and 25-34 at 36 percent compared to 54 percent for those 35 and older. The 18 to 34 age group is less likely to rely on AM/FM radio at seven percent compared to 16 percent for those 35 or older.

Conversely, online websites are a more important source of information for those under 35 at 57 percent. Use of online websites for information declines with each subsequent age category.

\(^1\) The percentages for all media source responses are significantly lower in 2013 than in 2010 due to a change from online surveying where all the options are visible when respondents answer the question, to telephone surveying where the potential responses are not provided in advance.
at 42 percent for those 35 to 44, 39 percent for those 45 to 54, 34 percent for those 55 to 64, and 20 percent for those 65 or older.

Respondents that cited multiple sources of information were asked which of those they rely on most. When combined with respondents that only cited one source, it produces the primary source of information for all respondents. The order of importance for different media channels remains the same with network TV, online websites and regional newspapers finishing in the same first, second and third positions at 34 percent, 27 percent and nine percent respectively. Although differences are not quite as strong as with the previous question, the pattern remains with newspapers and network TV being used more heavily as age increases and online websites being used more heavily by those under 35.

Figure 10: Which Do You Rely On The Most For News?
n=1,051

- Network TV: 34%
- Online Websites: 27%
- Regional Newspapers: 9%
- Cable TV: 9%
- Online Newspaper: 7%
- Radio: 6%
- Social Media Sites: 2%
- Other: 2%
- Local Newspaper: 2%
- Other: 2%
The Internet is the top source of information public transportation. When residents were asked where they would go to find information if they were to look into using public transportation today, 38 percent say they would go to Metro.net doubling its share from 19% in 2010. Twenty-six percent say they would use Google Maps or Google Transit (three times the previous 8%), and eight percent say they would pick up a schedule in hardcopy (up from 2%). The Go Metro mobile app was also cited by two percent.
As in the 2010 survey, residents were asked how often they use the Internet. A majority of 67 percent report daily use, 21 percent report occasional use, and 12 percent never use the Internet\(^2\).

Thirty-three percent who use the Internet (29% of all residents) report having visited Metro.com in the last six months. This is similar to 2010’s 32%.

---

**Figure 12: Have You Visited Metro.Net In The Last 6 Months?**  
\(n=1,629\)

---

As would be anticipated, riders (55%) are more than twice as likely as non-riders (23%) to have visited Metro.net.

Geography also plays a role in use of Metro.net. Forty-one percent of residents in both Central and Westside Los Angeles have visited Metro.net in the last six months. This is in contrast to 18 percent of Las Virgenes subregion residents and 24 percent of North Los Angeles County residents.

---

\(^2\) Reported average Internet usage is down from the 2010 survey that was conducted online. This is in line with the change in methodology from the previous survey which essentially requires Internet usage in order to participate.
The following set of questions is new in the 2013 survey. With the increase in popularity and use of smartphones, the current survey includes questions asking residents about their smartphone use, and how they interface with online Metro information resources.

Almost two-thirds of Los Angeles County residents (64%) own a smartphone and 34 percent have heard of the Go Metro mobile app. When limiting respondents to those that own a smartphone, awareness of Metro’s Go Metro app increases slightly to 37 percent. Among residents that have a smartphone and have heard of the Go Metro mobile app, 18 percent have used it in the last six months. This equates to six percent of the general population.

The proportion of residents that have smartphones is higher for men (70%) than women (58%), and increases with income level starting at a low of 45 percent for those with incomes below $7,500 and generally increasing by income category to a high of 85 percent for those with incomes of $100,000 or more. It also increases with education level starting at a low of 33 percent for those with less than a high school education and increasing to 77 percent for those with a college degree or more education. Finally, it is inversely related to age, starting with the youngest age category of 18-24 where 81 percent have smartphones, and declining with each age category to a low of 32 percent for those 65 or older. Bus riders (61%) are almost as likely as non-riders (65%) to own a smartphone.
Although smartphone ownership is correlated to gender, age, income and education, use of the Go Metro app does not vary to a large extent across these variables.
The 2013 survey presented a series of commute and transit demographic questions in order to provide a profile of Los Angeles County residents.

**Figure 14: Would You Say Your Commute Is...**

* n=1,138

Residents that work full or part-time were asked if their commute is to one regular location (65%), to different locations that change over time (28%), or if they work at home and do not commute (6%). Male commuters are more likely (33%) than female commuters (23%) to commute to different locations.
The means of commute was also assessed. Residents were asked how they usually commute to work or school.

**Figure 15: How Do You Usually Commute To Work Or School?**

* n=1,252

![Pie chart showing commute modes]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway/Light Rail</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Metrolink</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-seven percent of residents report that they drive alone, which is down eight percent from 2010, perhaps reflecting the economy, higher gas prices and the increased availability of public transit. Subway/light rail was the only commute mode that increased by a statistically significant amount, increasing from a share of 0.9 percent to 4.2 percent. Carpooling and rail were directionally down, although the difference is not statistically significant, and bus, walking and biking all increased, but by statistically insignificant amounts.

Those in the youngest age group (18-24) are the most likely to use alternate modes with only 53 percent driving alone. They are more likely to carpool (13%), ride a bus (19%) and walk (6%). Hispanics are also more likely than other ethnicities to use alternate commute modes with 59 percent driving alone, 11 percent carpooling, 14 percent riding a bus, and seven percent riding the subway or light rail. Finally, income is a key factor in commute mode with 46 percent of those with incomes of $35,000 or less driving alone compared to 74 percent for those with incomes above $35,000. Conversely those with incomes of $35,000 or less are much more likely to use a bus (18%) or the subway/light-rail (18%).
A series of questions were asked about carpooling and factors that are likely to increase the chances of car/vanpooling including carpooling facilities and employer support of ridesharing.

Figure 16: Transit Demographics
n=1,252, n=1,252, n=1,138, n=1,138

Fifty-five percent of residents that commute to work or school report that they are aware of a park and ride lot within five miles of their homes, similar to the 54 percent reported in 2010. Awareness of park and ride lots is slightly higher in the outlying subregions of North Los Angeles County, South Bay, Arroyo Verdugo, San Gabriel Valley, and San Fernando Valley.

When asked if they have carpooled or vanpooled to work or school in the last month, 25 percent of commuters said “Yes” up from fourteen percent in 2010, but more in line with the 2006 study when 29 percent said they had carpooled or vanpooled in the last six months.

At 43 percent, commuters aged 18-24 were substantially more likely to carpool/vanpool than any other age group and the incidence of carpooling declined with each age group category to a low of 11 percent for those 65 or older.

Commuters within the income ranges of $25,001-$35,000 and $35,001-$50,000 were more likely to have carpooled/vanpooled at 36 percent and 30 percent respectively, and Hispanics are more likely to have carpooled at 30 percent compared to Caucasians at 18 percent.
Residents that commute to work were asked two questions about employer support of carpooling. They were first asked if their employer provides assistance in formation of carpools or vanpools. Twenty-eight percent indicate that they do, similar to the 30 percent reported in 2010 and 24 percent in 2006. Eighteen percent report that their employer offers to pay for all or part of the cost of bus or train passes, which is below 2010’s 21 percent, but higher than 2006’s 14 percent. As would be expected, riders are more likely (22%) than non-riders (15%) to indicate that their employer pays for part of their transit expense.

The remaining questions in the section detailing commute and transit demographics explore residents’ perceived access, use, and perception of local public transportation modes.

Eighty-five percent of residents believe there is a bus stop within three blocks of their homes which is similar to both 2010 (81%) and 2006 (84%). Seventy-one percent say there is a train station within five miles of their home. This question was revised from previous studies when the question was if there is a station within one mile of their home. The 71 percent is almost twice as high as the previous studies (36% in 2010 and 35% in 2006) which reflects both the increase from one to five miles and also the expansion of the Metro Rail system including the...
extension of the Gold Line and introduction of the Silver Line in 2009 and the opening of the Expo Line in 2012. Media coverage of future expansion of the Purple and Expo lines and introduction of the LAX Line may have also increased awareness of previously existing stations.

Awareness of bus stops within three blocks is fairly consistent across demographic groups, but awareness tends to decrease slightly as age and income increase. Caucasians and Asians tend to be less aware of bus stops than Hispanics and other ethnicities. The perception that there is a bus stop within three blocks is also lower in the Las Virgenes and North Los Angeles County subregions, which likely reflects a lower level of service density in these regions.

Riders are slightly more likely (76%) than non-riders (68%) to be aware of a rail station within five miles of their home. It also varies by subregion, ranging from a low of 13 percent in Las Virgenes, to a high of 78 percent for Central Los Angeles reflecting the relative presence of rail service. Finally, men indicate a slightly higher awareness (75%) than women (68%) of rail stations.

Sixty-nine percent are aware of at least one bus route that serves their neighborhood, which is down slightly from 2010 (76%) and 2006 (73%). Again, there are logical geographic differences ranging from a low of 56 percent in Las Virgenes, to a high of 84 percent in Central Los Angeles.

Among those who are aware of a bus route in their neighborhood, two-thirds (67%) say they have ridden a bus at some point. Since 69 percent are aware of a neighborhood route, this equates to 47 percent of all residents having used a neighborhood bus. This varies with age, income, education, ethnicity, and geographic area. Ridership decreases with age from a high of 85 percent for those 18 to 24 to 58 percent for those 65 or older. It also decreases with income from a high of 86 percent for those with incomes below $7,500 to a low of 39 percent for those with incomes of $150,000 or higher. Use decreases with education level ranging from a low high of 82 percent for residents with less than a high school education to 53 percent for those with graduate school work. It is higher for Hispanics (77%) than Caucasians (54%) and higher in Central Los Angeles (80%) and lower in Las Virgenes (33%) and North Los Angeles County (49%).
When asked if they have used bus or rail service anywhere in Los Angeles County in the past month, 35 percent of residents indicate that they have used both bus and rail (15%), or bus only (14%) or rail only (6%). Eleven percent say they have never used public transit, and the remaining 55 percent say they have at some point, but not in the last month. These percentages are comparable to 2010 for riding both bus and rail, and for rail alone, but twice as high at 14 percent for bus only than the seven percent reported in 2010 (not asked in 2006). The percentage of residents that have not used public transit in the last month (55%) is five points higher than in 2010 (50%), but the percentage that say they have never used transit has dropped significantly from 19 percent in 2010 to 11 percent in 2013, perhaps reflecting the challenging economy during this period.

Income and age are inversely correlated to ridership; as income and age increase, ridership decreases. Residents making less than $7,500 ride the most (57%), while those making over $150,000 ride the least (21%). Similarly 45 percent of those 18 to 24 years old ride compared to 22 percent of those 65 or older. Hispanics, African Americans and Native Americans are also more likely to ride (combined 40%) compared to Caucasians, Asians and other ethnicities (Combined 26%). Also, as might be expected, ridership is highest in Central Los Angeles at 55 percent, and lowest in Las Virgenes (14%) and North Los Angeles County (19%).
Figure 19: How Many Days A Week Do You Ride The Bus/Rail?
n=561

Of those residents who have used bus and/or rail service in the last month, 32 percent ride four to five days per week, 22 percent ride two to three days a week, and 10 percent ride once a week. Twenty-five percent use it less than once per week and 10 percent use transit only for special events. All categories of once a week or more frequent appear higher than in 2010 and the combination of the three categories has increased significantly from 55 percent to 64 percent while the combination of less than once a week and only for special events has decreased from 44 percent to 35 percent.
When asked to choose a statement that best describes their transit use (bus and/or rail), 40 percent of riders that ride at least once a week indicate they use public transit to go everywhere, up from 33 percent in 2010. Twenty-six percent say they use public transit for three or fewer different trips, and 33 percent say it is for the same trip every time. In line with the more frequent use as measured by number of days, riders in 2013 are more likely to use transit for multiple trips or to go everywhere indicating higher frequency of use in both days per week and trip purpose.
Riders who have used transit, but not in the last month, were asked when was the last time that you did use it. A third of this group (33%) said it was some time in the last six months, up from 19 percent in 2010. Fifteen percent rode six to 12 months ago, and 45 percent rode at some point a year or longer ago, which is down from 59 percent in 2010. So even among infrequent riders, it has been a shorter time since their last trip for residents in 2013 than in 2010.
Since there are multiple transit agencies in Los Angeles County, residents were asked whether they generally ride a Metro bus when they ride or rode in the past. At 72 percent, almost three-quarters indicate that when they ride, they generally ride Metro.

At 55 percent, North Los Angeles was the only area where residents indicated that less than 60 percent of their ridership was generally on a Metro bus. Central Los Angeles had the highest Metro percentage at 82 percent.
Residents that indicate that they generally ride Metro were asked how long ago they started riding. At 72 percent, the vast majority indicate that they have been riding for more than five years. The remaining responses are distributed relatively equally between each of the shorter longevity categories with no single category reaching 10 percent. As would be expected, rider longevity increased with age, but even among 18 to 24 year olds 55 percent say they have been riding for more than five years. This increases consistently with age to 80 percent for those 65 or older.
Metro riders that started riding in the last year were asked how they first learned about Metro services that were available to them. This question is slightly different from the similar question from the 2010 survey which asked about transit services in general rather than focusing specifically on Metro. Accordingly, results are not directly comparable.

Twenty-eight percent heard about Metro services from a friend via word of mouth, and another 18 percent heard about Metro services from work, a co-worker, or a family member. Twenty-seven percent noticed a bus on the street and 10 percent learned about Metro from a bus stop or rail station. Nine percent each noticed an advertisement, or found information online or via a smartphone mobile app. Finally, five percent picked up a schedule.
This section of the survey was concluded with two questions asking residents about their likelihood of riding Metro, and how they feel about riding Metro.

Figure 25: Are You Likely To Ride Metro Bus/Rail In The Next 30 Days?

When asked if they are likely to ride a Metro bus or rail transit in the next 30 days, 38 percent say “Yes,” up from 32 percent in 2010. This breaks down into 17 percent that say they will ride Metro Bus only, six percent that say they will ride Metro Rail only, and 15 percent that say they are likely to ride both.

The likelihood of riding bus or rail decreases with age, education and income. Forty-nine percent of 18 to 24 year olds indicate that they are likely to ride, as do 64 percent of residents with income under $7,500, and 64 percent of residents with less than a high school education. Likelihood of riding declines as each of these categories increases to 23 percent for residents 65 or older, 23 percent of residents with $150,000 or more income, and 27 percent for those with a graduate level education. Central Los Angeles residents are the most likely to ride of any subregion at 59 percent.
When asked to rate how they feel about riding Metro, the response was largely positive. Forty-eight percent feel good about riding Metro, and 46 percent are willing to try Metro. Only two percent say they would be embarrassed to ride Metro, and four percent were unwilling or unable to voice an opinion.
Residents were also asked if they would be willing to spend 50 cents more if the bus they relied on came every 10 minutes rather than every 20 minutes. Thirty-six percent say “Definitely Yes,” 24 percent say “Probably Yes,” 12 percent say “Probably No,” and 22 percent say “Definitely No.” Overall, a majority (60%) would agree to a price increase for more frequent service. This is nearly identical to 2010, with the primary difference between 2013 and 2010 being that in 2013 the responses are more polarized with a higher percentage of both “Definitely Yes” and “Definitely No.”

At 53 percent, riders are less likely than non-riders (63%) to support paying 50 cents to cut the headway to 10 minutes.
Another trade-off question was asked of all residents; whether in the face of rising costs and reduced funding they would prefer to maintain current fares and cut service, or raise fares to maintain current service levels. By a ratio of more than two to one (58% to 23%), residents say that they would prefer to see higher fares rather than reduced service. Eleven percent said neither (10%) or both (1%), two percent said “it depends,” and five percent were unable or unwilling to provide an answer.

The percentage choosing to raise fares to maintain service has increased by 10 percent from 48 percent in 2010 to the current 58 percent in 2013. Conversely, the percentage saying to cut service to maintain fares declined by 11 percent from 34 percent to 23 percent.

Riders are not significantly more likely than non-riders to prefer cutting service to maintain the current fares, however, the percentage preferring cutting service to maintain fares declines with income starting at a high of 34 percent for those with incomes below $7,500, and declining as income increases to a low of 16 percent for those with incomes of $150,000 or higher.
Satisfaction and Performance Assessment

Residents were first asked a general attitude question; is Los Angeles County “going in the right direction,” or “on the wrong track.”

Figure 29: Thinking About Los Angeles County In General, Would You Say That Things Are Going In The Right Direction Or Would You Say They Are On The Wrong Track?

In a complete reversal from 2010, residents are feeling more positive than negative about how things are going in Los Angeles County. At 53 percent, a majority now say that things are going in the right direction; a more than two to one ratio to the 25 percent that say it is on the wrong track. This compares with 2010 when 26 percent said that Los Angeles County was going in the right direction and 59 percent said that it was on the wrong track. Clearly, the improving state of the economy is having an impact on residents’ outlook.

Having a positive outlook is related to age with the 18 to 24 age category being the most positive at 70 percent. It then declines with age to 45 percent for those 65 or older.
Residents are also more positive about public transit in 2013. When asked to rate the public transit system in Los Angeles County, seven percent chose an “Excellent” rating (up from 4% in 2010), 35 percent chose “Good” (up from 25%), 32 percent chose “Fair” (slightly down from 35%), 12 percent chose “Poor” (down from 19%), and six percent chose “Very Poor” (down from 8%). Combining the “Excellent” and “Good” categories, this positive rating increased to 42 percent from 29 percent in 2010.

Although attitudes about the public transit system are not generally related to age, the youngest age group, 18 to 24, is the most positive with 56 percent providing an “Excellent” or “Good” rating. Attitudes are, however, correlated to education, starting at 57 percent Excellent/Good for those with less than a high school education, and declining to 22 percent for those with a graduate school education. The ratings also vary significantly by region with Central Los Angeles providing an above average rating (55% Excellent/Good), and Las Virgenes (17% Excellent/Good), Westside (30% Excellent/Good), and Arroyo Verdugo (35% Excellent/Good) providing below average ratings.
Residents were then asked more specifically about Metro, rating their satisfaction with Metro bus and rail service, and asking if Metro’s image is better than last year. This is part of a series of questions where respondents were read a statement and asked to say how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement, specifically: “Strongly Agree,” “Somewhat Agree,” Somewhat Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.”.

**Figure 31: Satisfaction With Metro Service And Image**
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Respondents were first asked about their agreement with the statement “I am satisfied with Metro bus and rail services.” At 67 percent, two-thirds of Los Angeles County residents indicate that they somewhat or strongly agree with this statement, up significantly from 50 percent in 2010. Riders (78% strongly or somewhat agree) and 18 to 24 year olds (83%) are most satisfied with Metro services. Las Virgenes (40%) and Westside (50%) are the least satisfied subregions, and Caucasians (50%) are the least satisfied ethnic group.

The next statement is “Metro’s image is better than last year.” Although a relatively high number of residents (26%) “Don’t Know,” 63 percent either somewhat or strongly agree with this statement, up from 49 percent in 2010. The variation in response to this question is similar to satisfaction with Metro services with riders (76%) and 18 to 24 year olds (75%) agreeing more strongly. Las Virgenes residents (43%), Caucasians (50%) and Asians (50%) were least likely to agree that Metro’s image is better than a year ago.
Sixty-nine percent of Los Angeles County residents agree with the statement that “Metro bus stops and train stations are generally clean.” Sixty-eight percent also agree with the statement that “Metro buses and trains are generally clean.” As with previous statements about Metro, these two statements received more positive responses than in 2010 with bus stop and station cleanliness improving by 11 points from 58 percent, and bus and train cleanliness increasing 12 points from 56 percent in 2010. Unlike the previous, more general statements about Metro, riders provided responses that are more in line with non-riders for these statements. There were no other major differences across demographic groups.
Two questions were also asked about safety; the first about riding buses and trains, and the second about waiting for buses and trains at bus stops and stations. The 2013 survey found that Metro buses and trains are generally perceived as safe to ride. Seventy-nine percent of residents either strongly agree (25%) or somewhat agree (54%) that “Metro buses and trains are generally safe to ride.” This is up from 71 percent in 2010.

At a somewhat lower level 67 percent of residents either strongly agree (16%) or somewhat agree (51%) that “It is generally safe to wait at Metro bus stops and train stations.” This is also up from 2010 when 57 percent strongly or somewhat agreed with this statement.

There were no major differences in agreement with the two statements about safety across the different demographic groups with the exception of riders, who were slightly more likely to agree that riding (84%) and waiting (73%) are safe than non-riders at 77 and 63 percent respectively.
Residents were also asked about the reasonableness of Metro fares and their financial stewardship. Seventy-two percent either strongly agree (27%) or somewhat agree (45%) that “Metro fares are reasonable,” which is up significantly from 50 percent in 2010. Residents with more limited discretionary income (under $35,000) are less likely to agree or strongly agree with this statement at 69 percent, compared to those with higher incomes at 77 percent.

For the statement “Metro uses tax dollars wisely,” a significantly lower 49 percent either strongly (12%) or somewhat (37%) agree with the statement. However, this is up significantly from 34 percent in 2010. Riders (54%) are more likely to strongly or somewhat agree with this statement than non-riders (46%). Men (53%) are also more likely than women (45%) to agree that Metro uses tax dollars wisely.
The last three questions deal with residents’ perception of Metro’s sensitivity to the public, its desire to provide quality services, and communicating effectively.

At 73 percent, almost three-quarters of Los Angeles County residents either strongly (21%) or somewhat (52%) agree that “Metro considers the needs of Los Angeles County residents.” This is up significantly from 57 percent in 2010. Riders more strongly agree with this statement (80% strongly or somewhat agree) than non-riders (69%).

At 78 percent, slightly more than three-quarters of residents either strongly (22%) or somewhat (56%) agree that “Metro cares about providing quality services.” This is also a significant improvement over 2010 when 58 percent agreed with this statement. Again, riders are more likely (83%) to agree with this statement than non-riders (76%).

Residents were also asked if “Metro effectively communicates trip information.” Sixty-five percent either strongly (19%) or somewhat (46%) agree with this statement, but a significant minority of 18 percent either somewhat (13%) or strongly (5%) disagree, indicating that there is still room for improvement in this area. This is a new question in 2013, so it is not possible to compare with previous time periods. Riders, most of whom have direct experience with Metro, are more likely to agree with this statement (76%) than non-riders (60%).
When asked if they have ever tried to contact Metro, about one-fifth (21%) of residents say they have. This did not vary significantly across different demographic groups other than riders which were twice as likely (32%) than non-riders (16%) to have contacted Metro, and African Americans who appear to be more likely (42%) to have contacted Metro.
For residents that have contacted Metro, the primary mode of access at 71 percent is by phone. Twenty percent use online resources, and six percent contacted Metro in person.

Riders are more likely to contract Metro by phone (77%) than non-riders (65%), and less likely (17%) then non-riders (24%) to use online resources. The same pattern exists between those with less than $35,000 household income compared to those with higher incomes, and for those with less than a college education compared to those with a college or higher degree.

Residents with less than $35,000 income use the phone more often (79%) than higher income residents (69%), and are less likely (14% vs. 23%) to use online resources. For education, residents with less than a college degree are more likely (75%) than those with more education (65%) to contact Metro by phone, and less likely (16% vs. 28%) to use online resources.
Residents that have not yet contacted Metro were asked, if they wanted to contact Metro today, how would they do it. This group indicated much higher use of online resources with 49 percent saying they would use the web, compared to 36 percent that say they would call Metro. An additional seven percent say they would do it in person and two percent would use mail.

The use of online resources shows similar variation to those who have already contacted Metro with riders less likely to use online (42%) than non-riders (52%), those with incomes of $35,000 or less, less likely to use online resources (37%) than those with higher incomes (58%), and those with less than a college education also less likely to use online resources (42%) compared to those with a college degree or higher education (60%). Although these segments are less likely to use online resources to contact Metro, their alternatives are more diverse than for those who have already contacted Metro rather than just a higher proportion using telephone.
This section of 10 questions about bicycling and Metro is new in 2013.

Thirty-five percent of residents report having ridden a bicycle in the last six months. At 46 percent, men are almost twice as likely as women (25%) to have ridden a bicycle in the last six months. In addition, bicycle riding varies with income, ethnicity, education and geographic region. Age does not appear to be a significant factor other than reduced incidence of riding for those 65 or older (17%), transit riders are no more or less likely than non-riders to be bicycle riders.

The incidence of bicycle riding is lower for those with incomes of $35,000 or less (26%), than those with higher income (42%). Those with less than a college degree (32%) are also less likely than those with at least a college degree (42%) to ride a bike. Caucasians (46%) are also more likely to ride bikes than other ethnicities (31%). Finally, bicycle riding appears to be more prevalent on the Westside (52%), Las Virgenes (47%), and the San Fernando Valley (42%).

At 48 percent, a somewhat higher proportion of residents have a working bicycle available than have actually used one in the last six months. Although the differences are not quite as marked
between the different demographic groups for bicycle availability, they are essentially the same as with bicycle riding, with higher proportions for men, higher income households, residents with a college degree or higher, and for Caucasians. It is also higher on the Westside, and in Las Virgenes.

Residents that have a working bicycle available were asked if they use it for commuting or errands. One third (34%, or 16% of all residents) use their bicycle for commuting (5%) errands (15%), or both (14%). Men are more likely than women to ride bicycles for both purposes at a combined 40 percent compared to 25 percent for women. As would be expected the percentage of residents using bicycles for errands or commuting drops from 37 percent for those under the age of 55 to 24 percent for those 55 to 64 and 19% for those over 65.

In contrast to bicycle ownership, which is lower for those with incomes of $35,000 or less (40%) than those with higher incomes (56%), residents that have bicycles available and have an income below $35,000 are more likely to actually use them for commuting and errands at 42 percent compared to 31 percent for those with higher incomes.
At 49 percent, almost half of all transit riders that have a bicycle available say that they use them for commuting or errands. This compares to a much lower 26 percent for non-transit riders that have a bicycle available. Geographically, Westside (50%) and San Fernando Valley (41%) residents are also more likely to use their bicycle for commuting or errands.

Figure 41: Do You Use A Bike To Or From Metro’s Stops/Stations?

n=296

![Pie chart showing 68% No, 32% Yes, and 1% Don't know.]

When asked if they use a bicycle to get to or from Metro’s bus stops or rail stations, 32 percent of residents that use a bicycle for commuting or errands say they do. Although it appears that men are more likely (37%) than women (20%) to use their bikes to go to Metro stops, the sample size for this small segment of residents (n=296) is too limited to identify statistically significant differences between groups within the sample.
Of those residents who use a bicycle to access Metro rail or bus services, a majority of 57 percent have used the bike rack on Metro’s buses in the last six months.

A strong majority (81%) of the group that have used bike racks on Metro indicate that a bike rack is generally available.

When the Metro bike rack is full late at night, 40 percent of bicyclists say Metro bus operators let them bring the bike inside the bus, 32 percent say bus operators do not allow them to bring their bicycles inside, and 28 percent “Don’t Know.”
The final set of questions addresses use of bicycles on Metro Rail. Sixty-four percent of cyclists that use their bicycles to get to Metro bus stops or rail stations report taking their bicycles on Metro trains, while 36 percent do not.

When asked if it is easy to find the designated space for bicycles inside the train, over half (59%) of bicycle riders that take their bicycles on the train say “Yes,” but a significant minority of 37 percent say “No.”

At 64 percent, almost two-thirds of riders that take their bicycles on the train utilize the elevator to get to the platform with their bicycle.
EXPRESS LANES

The 2010 Metro survey included a single question regarding residents’ support or opposition to allowing single-occupant drivers to pay to use the ExpressLanes. In the current 2013 survey, four related, more detailed questions were added to the survey.

**Figure 44: Awareness And Use Of ExpressLanes**
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The first question asks if residents have seen or heard anything about the new Metro ExpressLanes (FasTrak) project. A 53 percent majority indicate that they have seen or heard something about the project. This is higher than the 41 percent that indicated awareness of the study in the Metro 2012 Pre-Implementation Survey that was conducted solely within the I-10 and I-110 corridors. There was no variation in this percentage across demographic subgroups with the exception of higher awareness in the San Gabriel Valley (62%) and South Bay (63%) due to their proximity to the I-10 and I-110 corridors, and lower awareness in Las Virgenes (32%), North Los Angeles County (39%), and San Fernando Valley (41%) due to their distance from the corridors.

One-quarter (25%) of residents say they have already used the Metro ExpressLanes. Residents of South Bay (31%) and the San Gabriel Valley (30%), are slightly more likely to have used the ExpressLanes in line with their proximity to the ExpressLane facilities.
Residents with incomes of $35,000 or less are somewhat less likely (18%) than those with higher incomes (29%) to have used the lanes.

Although one-quarter of Los Angeles County residents say they have used the ExpressLanes, only eight percent say they have an ExpressLanes transponder. This indicates that they are using the ExpressLanes as a passenger in a carpool, vanpool or bus, or are using a non-ExpressLanes FasTrak transponder, or are using the facility illegally.

Residents were also asked if they know how the ExpressLanes work and who can use them. Fifty-four percent indicate that they do. However, this means that almost half of Los Angeles County residents still do not know under what circumstances they can use the ExpressLanes.

Finally, County residents were asked whether they support or oppose allowing single-occupant drivers to pay to use the ExpressLanes. Between 2010 and 2013 support of the ExpressLanes concept has shifted from a minority of 44 percent to a majority of 58 percent. This follows the same pattern of surveys conducted before and after the introduction of the SR-91 HOT Lanes which received increased support as familiarity with the facility increased. Although a majority or residents support the ExpressLanes concept, there is still a significant minority of 25 percent that definitely opposes allowing single-occupant drivers to pay to use the ExpressLanes.
Support is somewhat stronger for residents with incomes of over $35,000 at 64 percent compared to 53 percent for those with lower incomes. Support is also slightly higher for non-transit riders at 60 percent compared to 54 percent for riders.
GENERAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Respondents were asked a series of general demographic questions to ensure a representative sample of current Los Angeles County residents. The results reported here are based on data weighted by the subregion populations to avoid over-representation of the lower population subregions which had a much higher survey to population ratio.

The first two questions involve employment and student status.

Figure 46: Are You Currently Employed, A Student Or Both?
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Forty-five percent of respondents report being employed full-time, 12 percent are employed part-time and four percent are self-employed. Fourteen percent say they are students (7% students only and 7% worker-students), and 31 percent say they are neither employed nor a student. Of those respondents who are self-employed, three-quarters (75%) are employed full-time, while one-quarter (25%) are employed part-time.
The last set of demographic questions includes standard Census-type questions regarding race/ethnicity, education, income, gender, and age.

**Figure 47: Ethnic Group**
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When asked what ethnic group respondents consider themselves to be a part of or feel closest to, a majority of 46 percent select Latino/Hispanic, a sizeable minority (27%) of respondents are White, 13 percent say they are Asian, and eight percent are African American/Black.
In response to the question, “What is the last grade you completed in school?” a majority of 64 percent have attended at least some college, while a full 85 percent have at minimum a High School diploma or equivalent. Twenty-two percent hold a four-year bachelor’s degree, 21 percent have a high school diploma or equivalent, 20 percent have attended some college, 16 percent have been to graduate school, six percent have a post-high school certificate or associate degree, and 12 percent have completed less than a high school education.
Income in Los Angeles County is relatively evenly distributed. There are 41 percent of respondents reporting an income of $50,000 or less, 22 percent with incomes of $50,000 to $99,999 and 18 percent report incomes of $100,000 or more.
Age is also relatively evenly distributed across all age categories.

Gender is split 49 percent male and 51 percent female.
The last two questions ask respondents about their interest in taking an active role in Metro projects and services, as well as participating in future research if they were paid for their participation.

**Figure 52: Would You Be Interested In Attending Community Meetings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When respondents were asked if they would be interested in attending community meetings where they could give input on Metro projects and services, one-quarter (25%) are interested, while a majority 71% express no interest.
Finally, when respondents were asked if they would be interested in participating in further surveys if they were being paid, there was a markedly different response from the previous question; this form of (monetized) engagement was nearly perfectly split with 47 percent of respondents indicating interest in being paid for participation in future surveys, and 49 percent not interested.