## System Redesign Study

## Survey 1 Summary of Results

## First Survey

- You can review the survey via the testing link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/6ZPZHJN
- Three main questions:

1. Ridership / coverage split with existing resources. (Select a point on the ridership - coverage spectrum).
2. Ridership / coverage split if there were additional resources. (Select a point on the ridership - coverage spectrum).
3. Priorities for coverage: meeting needs, responding to growth, or directly serving everyone who pays taxes? (Divide 100 points between the three options).

## Key Takeaways

- Ridership or coverage?
- With existing resources, respondents were evenly split on whether to refocus service design towards ridership (42\%) or coverage ( $41 \%$ ). $15 \%$ chose to maintain the existing balance (60/40 ridership/coverage).
- With additional resources, 50\% of respondents said to focus more on coverage, $41 \%$ said to focus more on ridership improvements, and $9 \%$ said to maintain the current balance.
- Coverage priorities
- Average number of points (of 100 total) assigned to each category:
- Meeting Needs - 49.9
- Responding to Growth - 29.6
- Directly Serving all Taxpayers - 20.3


## Survey 2

- Respondents in survey 1 were evenly split on the question of whether to move towards ridership or coverage with existing resources, and showed a moderate preference for a greater focus on coverage with additional resources.
- The second survey will ask similar questions about the ridership/coverage tradeoff, but with concrete illustrations of the network designs arising from a move in either direction, accompanied by information on job and educational access outcomes.


## Additional demographic questions

4. Home zip code
5. Frequency of RTA ridership
6. Number of cars accessible by household
7. Number of adults in household
8. Age
9. Race / ethnicity

## Response Overview

- 2987 total responses
- 2381 via online survey
- 606 via phone survey
- Open Feb. 6 to Mar. 18

Timeline of Survey Responses by Date
All survey responses


Most responses came in February, with the busiest period in the week of the design workshop, board presentation and several media stories. This is also when the majority of phone surveys were conducted.

## Question 1: Ridership or Coverage? Existing Resources

## Question text

- With our existing transit resources, how much should we spend on ridership and geographic coverage?

\author{

- 100\% Ridership / 0\% Coverage <br> - 90\% / 10\% <br> - 80\% / 20\% <br> - 70\% / 30\% <br> - 60\% Ridership / 40\% Coverage (existing) <br> - 50\% / 50\% <br> - ... <br> - 0\% Ridership / 100\% Coverage
}


## Focus of Existing Resources

## Al/ Responses

Focus of Existing Transit Resources All survey responses



50\% ridership / 50\% coverage ar
lower

What \% of respondents told us to focus more on ridership or coverage than we do today?

Very even split between a greater focus on ridership or on coverage with existing resources.

Only $15.5 \%$ of respondents selected the current 60\% ridership / 40\% coverage split.

## Focus of Existing Resources

## All Responses - Detail

Focus of Existing Transit Resources All survey responses


In this chart, 60\% ridership also means 40\% coverage.

More than half of all "more coverage" responses only wanted to move to 50/50.

Of the "more ridership" responses, a greater proportion selected options representing a more dramatic move towards a ridership network.

## Focus of Existing Resources

 By Riders and Non-Riders| Frequency of RTA Ridership | Existing Resource Focus (\% of respondents by ridership frequency group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| I never use RTA services | 44\% | 15\% | 39\% |
| Once a month or less | 40\% | 16\% | 43\% |
| Several times per month (up to I day per week) | 40\% | 14\% | 45\% |
| Several times per week (2-4 days per week) | 40\% | 17\% | 42\% |
| Every day (5 ar more days per week) | 41\% | 16\% | 41\% |
| Skipped | 47\% | 12\% | 38\% |

Respondents did not differ greatly in their desired existing resource focus by their frequency of RTA ridership.

Those who answered that they "never use RTA services" were slightly more likely to vote for more coverage with existing resources than the other respondent groups.

## Focus of Existing Resources By Age of Respondent

|  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Existing Resource Focus } \\ \text { (\% of respondents by }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ridership frequency group) |  |  |  |$\}$

## Focus of Existing Resources By Race \& Ethnicity

| Race or Ethnicity | \% of all response | Existing Resource Focus (\% of respondents by ridership frequency group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| American Indian or Alaska |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 0\% | 30\% | 50\% | 20\% |
| Asian or Asian American | 2\% | 47\% | 13\% | 38\% |
| Black or African American | 14\% | 45\% | 15\% | 38\% |
| Choose not to answer | 6\% | 45\% | 13\% | 38\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2\% | 47\% | 16\% | 33\% |
| Multiracial or another race | 2\% | 47\% | 14\% | 36\% |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 0\% | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| White or Caucasian | 61\% | 39\% | 16\% | 44\% |
| Skipped | 13\% | 46\% | 12\% | 40\% |

## Focus of Existing Resources

 By Vehicles Available|  |  | Existing Resource Focus <br> (\% of respondents by <br> ridership frequency group) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of all <br> Vehicles Available | More <br> Coverage | Same as <br> today | More <br> Ridership |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | $12 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| 1 | $31 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| 2 | $35 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| 3 or more | $9 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Choose not to answer | $1 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Skipped | $12 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $39 \%$ |

Among those who shared information on the number of vehicles available, people reporting 0 vehicles available selected a more coverage option most often.

## Focus of Existing Resources

 By Adults in Household| Adults in Household | \% of all response | Existing Resource Focus (\% of respondents by ridership frequency group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| 1 | 22\% | 42\% | 16\% | 41\% |
| 2 | 49\% | 39\% | 15\% | 45\% |
| 3 | 10\% | 39\% | 20\% | 40\% |
| 4 | 4\% | 52\% | 13\% | 33\% |
| 5 or more | 2\% | 64\% | 13\% | 16\% |
| Choose not to answer | 1\% | 46\% | 14\% | 32\% |
| Skipped | 12\% | 46\% | 11\% | 40\% |

Respondents living in households with 4 or more adults were more likely to select an option increasing the focus on coverage of existing transit resources.

## Question 2: Ridership or Coverage? Additional Resources

## Question text

- If we had additional funds to spend on transit service, how much of the additional funding should we spend on ridership and how much on geographic coverage?

|  | $-100 \%$ Ridership / 0\% Coverage |
| :---: | :--- |
| More focus | $-90 \% / 10 \%$ |
| on ridership | $-80 \% / 20 \%$ |
|  | $-70 \% / 30 \%$ |
|  | $-60 \%$ Ridership / 40\% Coverage (existing) |
| More focus | $-50 \% / 50 \%$ |
| on coverage | $-\ldots$ |
|  | $-0 \%$ Ridership / 100\% Coverage |

## Additional Resources

## All Responses

Future Resources Split
All survey responses through 2019-03-26


[^0]

More Ridership
Same as today
\% Ridership
\% Ridership

When asked about additional resources, respondents were more likely to select an option with a greater focus on coverage services than the existing system.

## Additional Resources

## All Responses



As with existing resources, a majority of those who chose an option increasing coverage picked a 50/50 split.

## Additional Resources <br> Riders and Non-Riders

|  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Additional Resource Focus } \\ \text { (\% of respondents by }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ridership frequency group) |  |  |  |$]$

All rider/non-rider groups were more likely to suggest a higher focus on coverage with added resources.

A higher coverage focus was slightly more common among nonriders and occasional riders.

## Focus of Additional Resources By Age of Respondent

| Age of Respondent | \% of all responses | Additional Resource Focus (\% of respondents by ridership frequency group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| Under 18 | 1\% | 52\% | 11\% | 34\% |
| 18-24 | 9\% | 46\% | 8\% | 43\% |
| 25-34 | 24\% | 48\% | 8\% | 41\% |
| 35-44 | 18\% | 46\% | 8\% | 44\% |
| 45-54 | 14\% | 53\% | 10\% | 35\% |
| 55-64 | 14\% | 52\% | 11\% | 35\% |
| 65+ | 6\% | 40\% | 7\% | 47\% |
| Choose not to answer | 1\% | 48\% | 12\% | 36\% |
| Skipped | 12\% | 37\% | 6\% | 31\% |

## Focus of Additional Resources By Race \& Ethnicity

| Race or Ethnicity | \% of all response | Additional Resource Focus (\% of respondents within race/ethnicity group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| Skipped | 13\% | 37\% | 6\% | 31\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0\% | 70\% | 10\% | 20\% |
| Asian or Asian American | 2\% | 49\% | 2\% | 47\% |
| Black or African American | 14\% | 52\% | 11\% | 36\% |
| Choose not to answer | 6\% | 46\% | 8\% | 39\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2\% | 56\% | 11\% | 30\% |
| Multiracial or another race | 2\% | 61\% | 5\% | 31\% |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 0\% | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| White or Caucasian | 61\% | 47\% | 9\% | 41\% |

## Focus of Additional Resources

 By Vehicles Available| Vehicles Available | \% of all response | Additional Resource Focus (\% of respondents within vehicle availability group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| Skipped | 12\% | 37\% | 6\% | 31\% |
| 0 | 12\% | 52\% | 7\% | 37\% |
| 1 | 31\% | 46\% | 9\% | 42\% |
| 2 | 35\% | 48\% | 10\% | 41\% |
| 3 or more | 9\% | 55\% | 10\% | 33\% |
| Choose not to answer | 1\% | 45\% | 10\% | 38\% |

## Focus of Additional Resources

 By Adults in Household| Adults in Household | \% of all response | Additional Resource Focus (\% of respondents by adults in household group) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | More Coverage | Same as today | More Ridership |
| Skipped | 12\% | 37\% | 6\% | 31\% |
| 1 | 22\% | 50\% | 8\% | 40\% |
| 2 | 49\% | 46\% | 9\% | 42\% |
| 3 | 10\% | 55\% | 10\% | 33\% |
| 4 | 4\% | 53\% | 11\% | 33\% |
| 5 or more | 2\% | 58\% | 16\% | 18\% |
| Choose not to answer | 1\% | 43\% | 5\% | 43\% |

As with the question about existing resources, households with 4 or more adults were more likely to select a highercoverage option as the focus of added transit resources.

## Question 3

## Purpose of Coverage

## Coverage Purpose

Coverage Prioritization
\% of responses by 10-pt bins


Participants assigned each of the three priorities a score from 0-100 within a 100-point budget.
This chart shows the \% of all responses within each 10-point priotization range.
"Meeting Needs" was the category most frequently assigned the highest priority.

## Average Score by Priority:

- Meeting Needs - 49.9
- Responding to Growth - 29.6
- Directly Serving all Taxpayers - 20.3


## Coverage Purpose Riders and Non-Riders

| Frequency of RTA Ridership | \% of all responses | Average Prioritization Score (by ridership frequency |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Meeting Needs | Respondin $g$ to Growth | Serving all Taxpayers |
| Skipped | 12\% | 47.5 | 30.5 | 22.1 |
| I never use RTA services | 15\% | 47.7 | 29.8 | 22.5 |
| Dnce a manth or less | 26\% | 50.6 | 29.9 | 19.5 |
| Several times per month (up tol day per week) | 12\% | 50.7 | 30.6 | 18.7 |
| Several times per week (2-4 days per week) | 13\% | 49.8 | 28.9 | 21.4 |
| Every day (5 or more days per week) | 22\% | 50.7 | 29.3 | 20.1 |

Coverage prioritization was quite consistent across RTA rider groups. Each group's responses placed "Meeting Needs" as the top priority for coverage service, followed by "Responding to Growth" and "Serving all Taxpayers"

## Survey Demographics

## Survey Demographics

Q4: Respondents' Locations

88\% of respondents shared their zipcode.
4.8\% of responses came from zipcodes outside of Cuyahoga County.


## Survey Demographics

## Q5: Riders / Nonriders

| Frequency of RTA Ridership | \# of responses | \% of all <br> respondents | $\%$ of respondents <br> who answered this <br> question |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Every day (5 or more days per week) | 661 | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Several times per week (2-4 days per week) | 389 | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Several times per month (up to 1 day per week) | 351 | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Once a month or less | 791 | $26 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| I never use RTA services | 439 | $15 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Skipped | 356 | $12 \%$ | - |

- Overall, $47 \%$ of responses came from frequent or semi-regular RTA riders ( 1 ride per week or more), while 41\% came from infrequent or non-riders


## Survey Demographics

## Question 6: Cars Available in Household

| Cars Available in Household | \# of <br> responses | $\%$ of all <br> respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 354 | $12 \%$ |
| 1 | 915 | $31 \%$ |
| 2 | 1032 | $35 \%$ |
| 3 or more | 280 | $9 \%$ |
| Choose not to answer | 42 | $1 \%$ |
| Skipped | 364 | $12 \%$ |

- $12 \%$ of respondents from 0-car households


## Survey Demographics

## Question 7: Adults in Household

| Adults in Household | $\#$ of <br> responses | $\%$ of all <br> respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 669 | $22 \%$ |
| 2 | 1452 | $49 \%$ |
| 3 | 307 | $10 \%$ |
| 4 | 114 | $4 \%$ |
| 5 or more | 45 | $2 \%$ |
| Choose not to answer | 37 | $1 \%$ |
| Skipped | 363 | $12 \%$ |

## Survey Demographics

## Question 8: Age of Respondent

|  | \# of <br> response <br> s | $\%$ of all <br> respondent <br> s | $\%$ of all <br> Cuyahoga <br> County <br> residents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 18 | 25 | $1 \%$ |  |
| $18-24$ | 261 | $9 \%$ | $24.7 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 724 | $24 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 535 | $18 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 411 | $14 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 430 | $14 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ |
| $65+$ | 185 | $6 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ |
| Choose not to | 43 | $1 \%$ |  |
| Skipped | 373 | $12 \%$ |  |

- Compared to the population at large, seniors were the most underrepresented in the survey population.
- People ages 25-34 and under 24 were the most overrepresented.
*ACS 2013-2017 5-Year Estimates


## Survey Demographics

## Q9: Race \& Ethnicity

| Race or Ethnicity | \# of responses | $\%$ of all respondents | \% of respondents who answered this question | \% of Cuyahoga County residents* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White or Caucasian | 1825 | 61\% | 70\% | 59.7\% |
| Black or African American | 405 | 14\% | 16\% | 29.3\% |
| Choose not to answer | 190 | 6\% | 7\% |  |
| Multiracial or another race | 64 | 2\% | 2\% | 2.5\% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 57 | 2\% | 2\% | 5.6\% |
| Asian or Asian American | 55 | 2\% | 2\% | 3.6\% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | $0.1 \%$ |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 4 | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.02\% |
| Skipped | 377 | 13\% |  |  |

Compared to the population of Cuyahoga County as a whole, Black or
*ACS 2013-2017 5-Year Estimates African American respondents were undersampled, as were Hispanic and Latino respondents.


[^0]:    More Coverage

