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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Golden Empire Transit District (GET), along with Stantec, conducted a customer satisfaction survey and various stakeholder engagement activities in spring, 2017. GET periodically surveys its riders to provide them with the opportunity to rate their service, to identify those characteristics of service that are most important such as on-time performance and vehicle cleanliness, and to provide GET with demographic information necessary for the preparation of Title VI and other required reporting.

The overarching goals of the project were to assess satisfaction with current GET services (fixed-route and the ADA paratransit service, GET-A-Lift), identify areas for improvement, as well as community opinions of GET and public transit in Bakersfield. Moreover, Stantec complemented these research efforts with frontline employee focus group sessions with bus drivers, customer service representatives and street supervisors. This research was intended to gain a first-hand perspective from those who deliver the service. Last, we also engaged Bakersfield’s elected officials to capture their feedback and perceptions on public transit in the community.

Stantec reviewed previous on-board surveys and recommended changes to the sampling plan and survey questionnaire, to provide GET with more specific service recommendations that could improve the design and delivery of service, while retaining current rider loyalty.

On-board and rider survey of GET conventional services

Stantec developed a plan to sample all routes (15 routes on weekdays and 14 routes on the weekend) throughout the day to ensure that a sample of all trips (e.g., morning peak, midday, afternoon peak, etc.) were obtained. We purposely oversampled the top five busiest routes (22, 21, 44, 45, and 41) since a large proportion of ridership comes from these routes and riders often make transfers to or from other routes. Surveys were administered both as on-board intercept surveys and as well online through a link promoted on GET’s website, on GET buses, at transit centers, and at the “Stuff the Bus” food drive event on March 31. Surveyors boarded buses and approached riders with surveys and pencils; surveyors also handed out leaflets (bilingual) that contained the link for the online version of the survey. Furthermore, Stantec held a transit operator’s workshop, where some of the concerns of riders were echoed, particularly with respect to satisfaction with routing and scheduling.

We found that:

- GET riders are generally satisfied with the service they receive. The service meets essential transportation needs for targeted markets—students, workers, workers with low incomes and other populations dependent upon transit as their only means of travel.
- Routes 45, 46, and 84 have the highest customer satisfaction rates across the GET network. In contrast, routes 82 and 83 demonstrate the highest levels of dissatisfaction among users.
- While the number of extremely satisfied riders declined from the previous survey, cumulative satisfaction (satisfied and extremely satisfied riders) increased by 10-percent. The level of dissatisfaction remains consistent over the two surveys, making up 9-percent of responses.
- Conventional riders are very satisfied with route directness, with above average satisfaction rates and only 8-percent dissatisfaction. GET should be commended for its transit planning efforts.
- However; while fixed route riders were satisfied with the current routing, GET-A-LIFT riders, who are typically seniors and/or the elderly, expressed dissatisfaction with the GET fixed route service stating that is not close enough to their homes and not direct enough to major activity centers for them to ride GET conventional service instead of GET-A-LIFT. Stantec recommends that GET review these concerns as GET-A-LIFT riders expressed a willingness to ride conventional service which would lower demand on GET-A-LIFT and leverage GET’s investment into accessible conventional transit.
- Regardless of route structure, some riders will always need to transfer between buses to reach their destination. Stantec heard concerns from riders and operators with respect to ease of transferring,
wait-time, and on-time performance, suggesting that some riders are not satisfied with their overall
travel time. During its field work, Stantec observed instances of poorly coordinated time transfers at
all GET transit centers, and particularly the Bakersfield College transit center, where at times buses
were pulling away as others were arriving. This problem can be resolved with more involvement
from dispatch, the use of an AVL system, and stationing street supervisors at GET major transfer
points.

- Only 39-percent of riders have been using GET bus for more than 5 years. This is a significant
drop from previous surveys conducted in 2015, 2013, and 2009, where this figure exceeded 50-
percent. This drop in long-term riders, while mirrored in national transit ridership decline, is of some
concern, and should be further explored to determine root cause.
- Many riders have a desire that GET extend operating hours and service frequency. Forty-seven-
percent of riders requested longer service hours and weekend service.

Community survey and elected official stakeholder engagement

A community survey was developed, which queried typical travel modes and behavior, previous use of
GET, and demographics. The survey was delivered online and via hard copies. The hard copy survey was
distributed around transit centers and at other locations in Bakersfield. The online survey was promoted
through leaflets handed out in the community as well as on GET buses and at transit centers. The survey
was also forwarded to local employers for their staff to complete. Unfortunately, uptake was minimal
despite repeated attempts to engage employers. Further, Stantec reached out to elected officials to
capture their opinions about transit in Bakersfield. Like employers, Stantec had difficulties contacting
elected officials despite numerous attempts. Stantec telephoned and emailed elected officials, contacted
their administrative assistants, and also contacted the City Clerk for that person’s assistance, to get in front
of elected officials. A representative in the Mayor’s office suggested that an online survey be provided as
that would likely increase engagement from elected officials. Accordingly, Stantec set up a SurveyMonkey
survey based upon the Discussion Guide approved by GET and distributed the link to elected officials.
Unfortunately, despite varied and multiple approaches, no feedback was received from elected officials.

We found that:

- Most trips made by residents or commuters within Bakersfield, irrespective of travel mode, are of a
distance that can be covered using public transit. With 72-percent of trips ranging from 1-10 miles,
many Bakersfield residents and commuters could be converted to transit riders.
- When non-riders where asked which mode they would use if their typical or normal method of
travel were no longer available to them, many riders seemed open to using GET. Approximately 48-
percent of current drivers could be persuaded to take transit if their needs and desires could be
met by GET service. GET may wish to consider increasing its marketing efforts to reach these
individuals.

GET-A-Lift open house and rider survey

A GET-A-Lift open house was held on March 29, 2017 at GET administration offices. GET-A-Lift services, issues
facing riders with mobility challenges, the registration and reservation processes and the accessibility of
conventional services were discussed. Fourteen-percent of GET-A-Lift’s daily ridership (250 daily trips)
attended the open house. An exit survey was developed and administered to participants of the open
house. To supplement the exit surveys from the open house and information collected firsthand from
dialogue, on-board rider surveyors conducted surveys on GET-A-Lift vehicles. Last, telephone surveys were
also undertaken to capture feedback based on a customer list supplied by GET. The survey instrument was
the same as the one used at the open house.

We found that:

- GET-A-Lift riders are extremely satisfied with their service and consider it a ‘lifeline’. Riders were
particularly pleased with the individual performance of GET-A-Lift employees who they consider go
above and beyond to meet their travel needs. GET-A-Lift service should be considered one of the most important services that GET provides to the Bakersfield community, providing seniors and the disabled with freedom to live their lives as they please.

- Even though most riders know that GET buses are fully accessible, 68-percent of GET-A-Lift riders would not use conventional transit, even if travel training was provided. Participants at the GET-A-Lift open house expressed frustration with the current GET conventional routing structure, stating that bus stops are often too far from their homes, reportedly sometimes up to 10 blocks away, which some considered a barrier to use.

- Although appreciative of the GET-A-Lift service, many riders reportedly experience frequent delays in GET-A-Lift pick-up. One rider states “[we need] better pickup scheduling, the driver always comes late due to coming from across town”. On-time performance is closely linked with route directness, as indirect routes with multiple pick-up and drop-off points can create a domino effect of late trips throughout the day.

**Overall recommendations**

Stantec recommends that GET explore the following options further, which would benefit all users of GET’s service, increase overall satisfaction levels, and entice new riders onto the service. Naturally, all recommendations must be vetted on their individual merit and financial viability which is outside the scope of this assignment.

**Near-term recommendations**

1. Undertake service and routing review

   From its own observations in the field, Stantec is concerned that GET does not have sufficient service-level frequencies to make transferring between multiple routes convenient or appealing for riders. We believe a comprehensive review of service routing is warranted and should be undertaken to consider service attributes (longer service hours), routing structure and scheduling. Stantec recommends that the review focus on the following:

   - Timed transfers - Many riders complained about missing buses at GET’s major transfer points. With 53-percent of riders transferring between GET Buses in 2012, it is imperative that GET establish an “on the street” procedure for ensuring timed transfers occur. According to some bus operators, GET has an informal “three-minute hold policy” at transit centers however riders and many frontline personnel were unaware of such a policy.

   - Consider moving the operations of the Downtown Transit Center from off-street to on-street, as Downtown transit centers can be sites for concentrated illicit activity, represented by a series of comments from riders concerned for their personal safety. Despite the best efforts of GET’s security personnel, the problem is bigger than GET and is representative of societal problems. Stantec recommends that GET commence conversations or partnerships with Social Services, homeless advocacy agencies, etc., that can serve those populations. As part of a routing and service delivery review, Stantec recommends that GET study the potential of closing the downtown terminal itself and moving the operations curbside to facilitate convenient transfers. The existing footprint of the Downtown Transit Center could serve as a catalyst for Downtown Bakersfield redevelopment. The Downtown would also benefit from more foot traffic that would result from letting riders off curbside.

   - Focus service design strategy on frequency - GET riders identified a desire for more frequent service. Poor performing routes have low performance because they appear to be focused on coverage and/or policy. More frequent service would also benefit timed transfers as riders would be less frustrated by missed connections if they knew another bus is coming shortly.
2. Improve users’ perception of safety

Two strategies that GET can implement to improve users’ perception of safety are to improve both the lighting and cleanliness at bus stops and transit centers. A ready-made solution to this problem is for GET, in collaboration with the City of Bakersfield and Kern County, to issue a Request for Proposals for a shelter advertising program that would increase the number, size, and design of bus shelters, specifically in areas where shelter advertising is permitted. Under similar programs developed by Stantec’s team members, an out of home advertising company such as Lamar or Sun Outdoor, both of which have billboards in Kern County, would assume the capital and operating costs of the shelters while sharing a percentage of the revenues with GET. Last, another strategy that has benefited peer agencies is collaborating with their local law enforcement and contracting “off-duty” police officers to provide police presence at their terminals and major transfer points; this has reportedly been a successful deterrent to criminal activity and improved riders’ perception of safety.

3. Improve communication about system and service changes

GET would benefit from engaging in better communication about system changes. Stantec suspects that some of the existing dissatisfaction is likely a result of riders not understanding how service changes are made, and how they could personally benefit from the services being offered.

4. Review customer service and sensitivity training protocols

The interaction that transit users have with service providers is one of the most important drivers of customer perception, satisfaction, and loyalty. GET’s frontline is the face of transit in Bakersfield and often the only “touch point.” From Stantec’s causal observations, and what was confirmed by riders, a clear majority of GET operators are providing excellent customer service. To ensure the continuation of this practice, and address the concerns of some riders, GET should continue to respond quickly to complaints of driver behavior, and provide clear customer service standards to operators.

Medium-to-long term recommendations

5. Increase reliability

One strategy is to align schedules at transfer points to reduce the prevalence of long transfer times and make transit more reliable for riders who need to transfer between routes. Decreasing the overall wait time is likely to increase users’ overall satisfaction and loyalty as they will feel safer at bus stops and can travel to their desired destinations more quickly. Service reliability begins with street supervision, which is why Stantec recommends GET maintain or increase street supervision, especially at transfer centers, as it is the best tool to improve on-time performance and provide real-time customer service support.

6. Improve schedule displays and communication

Installing real-time bus arrival displays would show users when the next bus is arriving, help users better estimate their travel times, and give them reassurance as to when the next bus will arrive. Improvements to the GET Mobile App and telephone service will also facilitate better communication to riders. While GET currently has an app, it is not necessarily intuitive, and few surveyed riders are currently relying on it for daily information. When mobility and scheduling information is easily accessible through a variety of sources, users’ overall satisfaction is likely to increase. Stantec’s advice to GET is to improve its mobile application and to educate riders in the use of the application to determine bus arrival times at specific stops.

7. Assess fare discounts for certain populations

Fares in Bakersfield are relatively low compared to other North American transit agencies. However, relatively discounted fares for students and children older than six years of age would likely increase satisfaction among users. GET should review its current fare structure accordingly, as many North American agencies are investigating fares commensurate with a rider’s ability to pay.
8. To Know GET, Is to Love GET

From all the research conducted for GET, Stantec has concluded that not enough is known about the agency, its services, or the value it delivers to Kern County and Bakersfield. The rider survey results certainly show that riders are generally satisfied with the agency’s performance, but they wanted more information about the agency in the form of better user information and more marketing of the agency’s services.

Stantec recommends that GET boost its communication with riders, especially since the agency is seeking to secure a more robust form of local funding in the future. That communication should first focus on internal communication so that the agency’s employees can be ambassadors that bring the agency’s message to their families, friends, and neighbors. The second focus of communication should be to educate elected officials, policy makers and opinion leaders on the value of GET services.

GET-A-Lift recommendations

1. Promote Family of Services approach to paratransit service delivery

Riders perceive GET-A-Lift, whether accurately or not, to be over capacity. To relieve this and to leverage investments made into accessible conventional transit, GET should encourage people with disabilities to use conventional transit subject to travel training. Strategies to achieve this include:

- Improve the accessibility of bus stops and pedestrian environments
- Use GET-A-Lift vehicles to bring people to their nearest GET transit center
- Market the conventional system to GET-A-Lift users
- Consider fare incentives for GET-A-Lift registrants using conventional transit
- Consider offering service routes to major destinations pulled from the GET-A-Lift daily manifests. Service routes would allow riders to get on and off buses to frequent multiple destinations in one trip.

Those participating in the workshops as well as those interviewed using the service spoke of the challenges of receiving GET-A-Lift service when needed. GET-A-Lift is valued by its riders however there is an awareness among its riders that fixed route bus service may offer greater freedom. GET should consistently promote the accessibility of its conventional service to support the Family of Services concept.

2. Upgrade the GET-A-Lift reservation system

In the short-term, GET should consider an IVR and web-based trip booking system whereby riders can choose origin, destination, and desired pick up time using an automated system. Customers would not need to wait for an operator to confirm their trip, as this is done on the spot. GET-A-Lift riders can either use a traditional phone, smart phone, or computer to book and confirm trips.

As a longer-term strategy, an online booking system should be put in place, leveraging technology. Many peer agencies have embraced Twitter as a means of communicating with customers in real-time about the status of their trip, a practical and low-cost option. These IVR and web-based systems are evolving to include predictive elements which can recognize the phone number of a caller and provide prompts to callers if they wish to book similar trips to those previously taken, such as to a health care center.

3. Assess booking requirements

Allowing pre-booking several days in advance will allow riders to plan schedules in advance, where they will not need to put all plans on hold until the night before their trip, when GET-A-Lift confirms their pick-up time.
4. Review business case for increased service hours

GET should review the opportunity to extend service hours to determine whether a business case exists. Extending service hours, especially on weekends, and past normal operating hours for major destinations, such as shopping and entertainment, will increase the freedom and mobility of many GET-A-Lift riders.

5. Review all program protocols

A reoccurring criticism of the GET-A-Lift program from its riders was that the program was inconsistent in its protocols. Riders were critical of changing pick up policies, hours of service, same day requests and pick up windows. Inconsistency in program rules is very troubling to the disabled and senior population using the GET-A-Lift service. Stantec recommends that the GET-A-Lift program regularly communicate program protocols to riders and that it adopt quality assurance measures internally so that employees adhere to those protocols.

6. Consider community circulators and service routes

Many GET-A-Lift riders are going to similar locations. These locations are often health care facilities, shopping centers, sheltered workshops and social service centers. Community circulators would serve two trip purposes identified in the survey:

- Provide GET-A-Lift riders with more options: Community circulators would reduce the burden on conventional GET-A-Lift service. This type of service would also meet some of the demand for same day service from riders.
- Solve connectivity issues: for regular fixed route riders while promoting the Family of Services concept to GET-A-Lift Riders

Community Circulators would solve existing ‘first mile, last mile’ challenges, where riders cannot reach a conventional transit stop. Providing frequent fixed route service to GET-A-Lift riders would also promote the Family of Services concept by enabling and empowering them to use the accessible fixed route system.

At a minimum, GET-A-Lift should consider providing high frequency, shared ride fixed route service to the most frequented destinations for disabled and elderly riders such as dialysis clinics, social service centers and shopping to reduce demand for its ADA paratransit service and provide greater freedom to its customers.
2.0 BACKGROUND

Golden Empire Transit District (GET) periodically surveys its riders to provide them with the opportunity to rate their service, to identify those characteristics of service that are most important such as on time performance and vehicle cleanliness, and to provide GET with demographic information necessary for the preparation of Title VI and other required reporting.

Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec) was retained by GET to execute quantitative surveys and qualitative focus groups of GET-A-Lift riders and transit operators. Stantec also reviewed previous onboard surveys and recommended changes to the sampling plan and survey questionnaire to provide GET with more specific service recommendations that could improve the design and delivery of service while retaining current rider loyalty.

Stantec staff, in collaboration with GET staff, developed the survey instruments, sampling plans, and promotional materials.
3.0 GET RIDER SATISFACTION SURVEY

One overarching goal of this project was to understand the perceptions of satisfaction of GET conventional fixed-route services from its patrons. What follows is a description of the rider survey conducted on-board GET’s conventional routes and through an online survey of transit riders.

3.1 METHODOLOGY

Sampling Plan

Stantec developed a sampling plan to sample all routes (15 routes on weekdays, and 14 routes on the weekend) throughout the day, every day during a week in late March, to ensure that a sample of all trips (e.g., morning peak, midday, afternoon peak, etc.) was captured. Stantec observed that ridership is particularly low in the “shoulder-periods” of service hours – early mornings and late evenings. We purposely oversampled the top five busiest routes (22, 21, 44, 45, and 41) since a large proportion of ridership comes from these routes and their riders frequently transfer to other routes.

Based on GET’s most recent NTD data of nearly 18,000 unlinked trips per day, our team had initially planned and felt it was realistic to obtain a total sample of 3,000 surveys. However, once in the field, it became clear that the unique number of riders throughout the network was substantially lower than expected. By the end of our in-field surveying period, surveyors and Stantec staff recognized regular riders and had noted they already completed surveys. In addition, obtaining completed surveys was challenging, as a portion of GET ridership is illiterate, particularly those boarding at the Downtown Transit Terminal. In total, Stantec obtained a statistically-significant survey sample of 1,480 surveys through its on-board surveying and online surveying efforts, with a corresponding response rate of approximately 41-percent.

Survey instrument

The rider survey was developed through an iterative process with feedback from GET, and following approval, was translated into conversational Spanish. The survey was pre-tested with volunteers from our partner, Covenant Community Services, as well as GET staff. A total of 26 questions were developed (including a general comment/suggestions question) and queried a number of topics including satisfaction with current service, opinions of public transit, and demographics. The complete survey can be found in Appendix 1. Hard copy surveys were printed on 65-lb card stock (tabloid, 11” x 17”), which negated the need to provide surveyors with clipboards. Surveys were printed double-sided, with one side of the survey containing the English version, and the other side containing the Spanish version. Furthermore, an online version of the survey was hosted on SurveyMonkey, and was publicized two-weeks in advance before the survey went live, with posters on GET buses and at transit centers, and with leaflets handed out during the surveying week. Last, a press release was developed and distributed to local media to raise awareness of the survey; the story was picked up by several media outlets in Bakersfield.

Survey administration

Stantec recruited surveyors through a local community-based organization, Covenant Community Services, that mentors foster youth. We initially recruited 29 surveyors, but as the actual on-board surveying proceeded, we reduced the number of surveyors to a core of roughly 10 of the most productive individuals. The survey team was comfortable conversing with riders in both English and Spanish. Training occurred the day prior to the start of surveying. All surveyors were supplied with surveying materials, which included surveys, control sheets, pencils, envelopes, ID badges, and schedules.

Stantec staff acted as in-field supervisors for the survey team. We trained surveyors at a training session where we described the project and its goals, explained the surveying materials, the schedule for the week, and survey administration. Stantec staff always provided in-field supervision, fielded surveys, and handed out promotional materials.
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Data collection

Surveys were administered both as on-board intercept surveys and online through a link promoted on GET’s website, on GET buses, at transit centers, and at the “Stuff the Bus” food drive event on March 31. Stantec stationed surveyors at GET major transit hubs: Downtown, Bakersfield College, California State University at Bakersfield (CSUB) and Valley Plaza. Surveyors boarded buses and approached riders with surveys and pencils; surveyors also handed out leaflets (bilingual) that contained the link for the online version of the survey. Surveyors tracked responses and refusals on control sheets for refusal rate calculation and tracking of route and time-of-day sampling. Surveyors collected completed surveys and returned all materials at the end of their shifts. Surveys were also returned to drivers, who then returned them to GET.

Surveying took place from Tuesday March 28 to Sunday April 2, 2017. Shifts were broken into morning and afternoon/evening shifts to ensure that all routes were surveyed at different parts of the day and on different days.

A total of 1,222 print surveys were collected during the surveying week, supplemented by 258 online surveys. The online survey was active from March 28 until May 12, 2017. Initially, the online survey was scheduled to end on April 28, 2017, but was extended by two weeks at the concurrence of GET to allow for greater employer and community participation.

Data processing

The following section describes the data processing used to prepare and analyze data from all surveys. It is presented once here for ease of reference, but applies to GET-A-Lift and community surveys as well.

Data entry and cleaning

Prior to analyzing survey data, it was first necessary to compile all hard copy and online results from each of the three surveys. Excel templates were created for the rider and paratransit surveys, whereby the survey questions formed the columns and survey responses were recorded in the rows. Using this template, data entry was completed for the hard copy surveys. For all multiple-choice questions, survey data was coded using numbers, allowing for efficient analysis of the data. As an example, a response of ‘extremely satisfied’ was recorded as a ‘5’, with responses of ‘satisfied’, ‘no opinion’, ‘dissatisfied’, and ‘extremely dissatisfied’ recorded as ‘4’, ‘3’, ‘2’, and ‘1’ respectively. English and Spanish surveys were recorded in the same template, allowing for data analysis of the full data set of survey results.

Upon completing the data entry for the hard copy survey, online survey results were downloaded into Excel from SurveyMonkey and were reformatted as needed in accordance with the Excel templates. The online results for each survey were then added to the data entry files, resulting in a complete picture of all survey responses (online and hard copy) for each survey. The last step before beginning the data analysis was to clean the data. For example, surveys that were started, but with no questions answered, were removed from the template such as not to skew the final counts of the number of surveys completed.

Data analysis

To obtain a full understanding of the survey results, three methods of data analysis were undertaken, consistent with “best-in-class” approaches: descriptive analysis, spatial analysis, and segmentation.

Microsoft Excel was used to generate summary statistics for each survey question, creating graphs and tables showing the distribution of responses. Where appropriate, cross tabulations and correlation matrices were generated to explore potential correlations between questions. For the GET on-board and community surveys, segmentation techniques were used to isolate specific user groups based on their survey responses.

Finally, using GIS spatial software, spatial data and the existing GET network were geocoded to determine areas of concentrated satisfaction and dissatisfaction among GET riders. Taken together, our approach allows for a comprehensive analysis, which considers quantitative, qualitative, and spatial data.
Transit Operator Workshop

To corroborate and supplement rider surveys, Stantec also held focus sessions with GET operators. On March 28, 2017, Stantec held two frontline employee workshops with GET employees. The frontline employee workshop is a fundamental part of Stantec’s approach to transit market research. Stantec sincerely believes that the success of transit agencies is directly related to the quality of an agency’s service. The higher the quality, the greater the agency’s ridership.

Stantec requested that GET recruit a representative number of employees who have direct contact with the public and provide service. We further requested that the employees recruited for the workshop also be representative of the total population of GET employees in their years of service, age, and ethnicity.

Stantec provided a Frontline Employee Discussion Guide that was approved by GET prior to the workshops. This guide is found in Appendix 2.

Stantec’s moderator began the session by making it clear that the topics of the workshop would not include the labor contract, which was being negotiated at the time of the workshops, work rules or disciplinary actions.

3.2 GET RIDER SURVEY ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The following analysis is based on survey responses from 1,480 completed on-board and online surveys from GET riders. The results are first analyzed question-by-question, and summary statistics demonstrate the distribution of survey responses. Where applicable, maps show areas where riders are most dissatisfied, and should be prioritized for further investigation. Finally, a user profile analysis is presented, which categorizes users based on their loyalty and dependency to GET, and accordingly identifies their relative needs. This analysis isolates the relative importance of various service characteristics for riders, and identifies service improvement strategies that will encourage future transit use.

3.2.1 Demographic profile of respondents

Table 1 below shows that 54-percent of surveyed GET users have a household income of $20,000 or less, and 76-percent lack access to a personal vehicle. Therefore, GET should provide a broad network of routes and service hours that accommodate the needs of riders who have limited mode choice and depend on GET to travel to work, school, for groceries and other amenities, and to simply to visit family and friends.

Over half (54-percent) of surveyed GET users are between 18-34 years old, with students making up the largest occupation category. Despite this, the average age of all respondents is 35 years old, revealing that there are also many older GET users.
### Table 1: Demographics of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ALL USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001-$20,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$35,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-$50,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or retired</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2 Route-level satisfaction

Question: Where did you get on the bus? N= 808

N refers to the number of responses used in the analysis of each question. For this question, 808 riders were included. Throughout this report, the number of responses per question varies, because not all participants responded to every question.

The greatest concentration of GET boarding occurs at the Downtown Transit Center according to the survey. Seven bus routes service this station directly (routes 22, 42, 43, 45, 81, 82, and 84), and travel outwards to peripheral transfer centers and major trip origins and destinations including CSUB, Bakersfield College, and the Walmart on Colony Street. Trips in Bakersfield originate less frequently from peripheral bus stops, which are often characterized by fewer available routes and lower frequency of service (Map 1).

Map 1: Density of trip origins using GET
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Question: What is the route number of the bus you are describing or riding? N=1,430

Of the routes surveyed, the routes connecting CSUB to the downtown core and nearby transit centers (routes 21 and 22), are used most frequently (Figure 1). These findings show that the frequency of usage is consistent with the observed route frequency in the 2015 survey, as well as ridership figures provided by GET for January and February of 2017.

Figure 1: Route Usage

Figure 2 reveals that routes 45, 46, and 84 have the highest customer satisfaction rates across the GET network. In contrast, routes 82 and 83 demonstrate the highest levels of dissatisfaction among users. Route 83 showed few riders who were "extremely satisfied" (less than 10%), and is a candidate for further attention and inquiry into the nature of rider dissatisfaction.

Figure 2: Satisfaction by route
The Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 111 suggests that customer satisfaction is linked to a series of service quality factors including route frequency and operating hours. The mean a.m. peak frequency of all GET routes is one bus every 37 minutes. Routes 82 and 83 fall below this frequency, as route 83 operates every 45 minutes, and route 82 runs every 60 minutes. Routes with high rates of customer dissatisfaction are also closely associated with shorter service hours; therefore, the fact that routes 82 and 83 do not operate after 6:00 pm daily may contribute to dissatisfied riders. As route 82 services CSUB, we recommend that GET undertake further research to align transit service hours with the opening hours of nearby destinations, such as CSUB staff arrival and class times. Stantec recommends forming a partnership with the university to help with ridership on Route 82. Perhaps the CSUB would be open to financing several trips so that the service is more attractive to more students, faculty, and staff. Last, Stantec is a proponent of “clock-faced” headway intervals (that is every 15-, 30- and/or 60-minutes after the hour) as they are typically better understood by riders and easier to interpret. Ultimately, GET will need to investigate and identify the primary drivers between routes where riders are satisfied, and those where they are not and address accordingly if possible.
3.2.3 Perceptions of GET service changes

Question: In the past year, would you say that GET service has improved, stayed the same, or worsened? N=1,381

Forty-one percent of riders believe GET service has improved over the past year (Figure 3). This is a positive result for GET, and reinforces the results from the previous question that showed that, overall, most GET users are satisfied with the service. A smaller percentage of riders, 12-percent, noted that GET bus service had worsened in the past year. Further investigation is warranted to better understand which service factors users perceive as having improved or worsened.

Figure 3: Perceptions of GET service change in previous year

Figure 4 shows the average satisfaction of riders who believe service quality has decreased over the last year. In comparison to satisfaction rates of all riders, these dissatisfied customers have the largest concern with the efficiency of GET service. Reliability and on-time performance is their primary concern, followed closely by the ability to transfer between routes, and wait time. To ease the concerns of dissatisfied riders, GET should focus on improving on-time performance, timing transfers better and enhancing the communication between GET and its riders. Better communication strategies that explain to users why and how GET is making service adjustments are likely to result in higher overall user satisfaction.
Figure 4: Concerns of dissatisfied riders

Question: Thinking about your experience on this bus route in the last 30 days, how satisfied were you with the overall quality of service? N= 1,440

Customer satisfaction is higher than reported in previous surveys. While the number of extremely satisfied riders declined from the previous survey, cumulative satisfaction (satisfied and extremely satisfied riders) increased by 10-percent. This further suggests that GET is providing a service that satisfies many of its riders, as dissatisfaction remains consistent over the two surveys, making up 9-percent of responses (Figure 5).
Overall dissatisfaction with the GET system is concentrated at major transit centers including Downtown, Southwest, Bakersfield College and, throughout the downtown core where routes 21, 45, 81 and several others intersect.

### 3.2.4 Satisfaction with service attributes

#### Measures of Transit Service Quality

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with thirteen measures of transit service quality. These service quality factors were classified into four categories: Ride Quality, Bus Stop Experience, Efficiency of Service, and Monetary Value of the Trip (Table 2).

Further to this, respondents were asked to evaluate their overall satisfaction with the GET system, which considers all aspects of the GET service.

**Question:** Thinking about your experience on this bus route in the last 30 days, how satisfied were you with the following:

#### Table 2: Factors of satisfaction with GET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ride Quality</th>
<th>Bus Stop Experience</th>
<th>Efficiency of Service</th>
<th>Monetary Value of Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your comfort on the bus</td>
<td>Information provided at bus stop and on bus</td>
<td>Directness of route</td>
<td>Monetary Value of Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of crowding inside the bus</td>
<td>Cleanliness at bus stop</td>
<td>Ability to transfer to other transit services</td>
<td>Fare you paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver’s behavior and attitude towards you</td>
<td>Personal safety at bus stop</td>
<td>Reliability of buses being on time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus cleanliness inside and outside</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of time waiting for bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety on the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Ratings of Transit Service Quality

The average ratings of these measures of transit service quality identify areas with low customer satisfaction. To calculate mean satisfaction rates, survey responses were coded per the following table:

#### Table 3: Coding of satisfaction ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average satisfaction for each service quality measure is then compared in figure 6 to the average overall satisfaction of riders. In Figure 6, service quality factors are organized by category (ride quality, bus stop experience, efficiency of service, and monetary value), with their average satisfaction shown in vertical bars. Mean overall satisfaction is considered separately, and is shown using a horizontal dotted line, as satisfaction with specific factors is being compared to this overall satisfaction value. The following legend explains the colors used for ease of interpretation:
In cases where satisfaction with a service factor is greater than the mean overall satisfaction level, riders are generally very satisfied. When satisfaction levels fall below mean overall satisfaction, this is cause for concern, and riders are not satisfied. In instances where a result is just above the mean overall satisfaction line, there are still opportunities to further increase satisfaction in the future.

As evidenced in Figure 6 below and in previous research, average satisfaction levels in transit are often approximately 8/10 (or 4/5). It is therefore imperative to look beyond the absolute rate of satisfied customers, as this will often be similar across North American cities, and instead consider variances in satisfaction rates across specific service attributes.

Mean (average) overall satisfaction for this survey is 4 (out of 5), and therefore factors with mean satisfaction higher than this are a sign of satisfied riders (bus driver attitude, value for money, etc.), while satisfaction rates lower than this average show cause for concern, and require further attention (cleanliness of bus stop, on-time performance, etc.).
Ride Quality
The survey questions in this category assess a series of factors relevant to in-vehicle ride quality (Figure 7). Riders are consistently satisfied with all factors of ride quality (73 – 79-percent are satisfied or extremely satisfied). Riders are especially satisfied with the behavior and attitude of GET operators, and their perception of personal safety on-board. GET should therefore continue existing operator training programs, and continue to encourage strong customer service among frontline staff.

While satisfaction with all factors of ride quality exceeds average satisfaction (a positive attribute), crowding and bus cleanliness have the lowest satisfaction rates within this category. Service improvements to address crowding and cleanliness positively impact rider comfort, and likely to further increase overall satisfaction with GET. This finding corroborates with qualitative feedback collected by Stantec from frontline employees and riders.

Bus Stop Experience
Mean satisfaction levels for information provision at a bus stop (4.09) and sense of safety (4.04) exceed average overall satisfaction, suggesting that riders are satisfied with these service characteristics (Figure 8).

Conversely, mean satisfaction with the cleanliness of bus stops is very low. One rider states “the bus stops need to be cleaned regularly. The stop at NW Promenade is always nasty and the benches are broken.” Cleaning programs to target stations of concern may improve customer satisfaction.
The TCRP Report 111 identifies station cleanliness as a key factor in service quality, and the overall “image” of public transit. Despite this, few transit agencies make specific targets or plans to maintain or improve station cleanliness. Map 2 shows locations where station cleanliness is unsatisfactory to riders, including the northeast quadrant, Southwest Transit Centre, CSUB, and Oildale. It is recommended that GET consider specific strategies for improving station cleanliness in these areas, and establish manageable targets, which should be integrated into both short and long term local transit plans.
Map 2: Satisfaction with station cleanliness by trip origin
While satisfaction with safety at bus stops is relatively high, many qualitative comments were offered in survey responses which express some concern with safety at the Downtown Transit Center and Bakersfield College loop and, to a lesser extent, the Valley Plaza and CSUB transfer hubs (Map 3).

Routes 21, 61, and several others run outside of daylight hours, either in the early morning, or into the night. As perceived safety is often decreased in the night, it is recommended that GET investigate security increases during nighttime hours at major transit hubs. The GET Short Range Transit Plan commits to improving general station security. The findings from this survey suggest that GET is on the right track, and that transfer centers, CSUB and Bakersfield College be considered for further safety improvement, especially during night time hours. GET may wish to consider collaborating with local law enforcement to hire “off-duty” police officers to provide patrols in the evening hours. Several peer agencies have successfully embraced this concept to improve safety perception at their major terminals.

Map 3: Satisfaction with bus stop safety by trip origin

Efficiency of Service

Riders are very satisfied with route directness, with above average satisfaction rates (4.13), and only 8-percent dissatisfaction (Figure 9). Wait time, on-time performance, and ease of transferring between routes is a concern for many riders, suggesting that they are dissatisfied with their overall travel time.
To incentivize transit use and decrease reliance on personal vehicles, we recommend that the door-to-door travel time for transit be minimized. GET routes are sufficiently direct for most riders, which is a difficult feat, and one that GET should be commended for. It appears that route schedules are of a larger concern, as transfers and infrequent routes contribute to unacceptably long travel times for many riders.

Map 4 shows that ease of transferring between routes is a concern for many passengers at the Downtown and Southwest Transit Centers, Bakersfield College, and in East Bakersfield. Riders appear most dissatisfied with their ability to transfer between routes at transit centers. The concern with transferring lies with the scheduling of buses, and not the number of available routes. Schedules at major stations allow 1-5 minutes to transfer between buses. Under the variable conditions of day-to-day operations, many riders will miss transfers; requiring a minimum wait of 20 minutes for the next bus during peak hours, and up to a 60-minute wait during off-peak hours.
Map 4: Satisfaction with ability to transfer between bus routes by trip origin
Monetary Value of Journey

Riders are highly satisfied with the value for money of GET service (mean satisfaction = 4.2), but appear dissatisfied with the cost of the fare itself (Figure 10). GET must address the cost of purchasing fares. Low-income GET riders may be unable to afford the cost of a 15- or 31-day transit pass, potentially forcing them to pay daily fares, which aggregates to higher overall spending on transit, or overspending on monthly passes. GET should consider revisiting its fare structure to consider a rider’s ability to pay, a technique which is becoming more prevalent across North America.

Figure 10: Mean satisfaction with monetary value

3.2.5 GET riders and technology

Question: Do you regularly use a ...? Check all that apply. N=1,438

Many GET riders are tech savvy, and use smartphones most often for daily communication, while fewer riders rely on tablets or computers (Figure 11). Eighty-five percent of riders have access to some form of technology, and therefore GET must distribute information and schedules through electronic and mobile platforms, such as apps and an up-to-date website. Fifteen percent of riders do not have reliable access to technology. To maximize information distribution to all riders, GET should also maintain print copies of schedules, postings, and alerts where possible.
Over one third (37-percent) of riders use printed schedules for schedule information (Figure 12). Although 76-percent of riders have smart phone access, only 11-percent rely on the GET mobile app. This discrepancy may be caused by an inefficient app platform, lack of Wi-Fi access when waiting for a GET bus at the majority of stops, or lack of marketing and communication. It is recommended that GET investigate customer satisfaction with the mobile app further, and offer accurate print, phone, and mobile schedules for customers, though GET should encourage use of digital schedules as print copies add to operating costs.
3.2.6 Fare payment

Question: How did you pay your fare? N=1,385

Forty-two percent of GET riders purchase monthly (31-day) passes, while 36-percent pay cash for a single ride fare (Figure 13). Very few riders purchase day passes, as these are often marketed to tourists or occasional riders. Frontline employees questioned the value of the 15-day pass and one operator called it "...an odd fare product that nobody uses...”

![Figure 13: Fare payment type](image)

- Cash, 36.94%
- 31 day pass, 42.14%
- Day pass, 16.96%
- 15 day pass, 3.90%
Riders who purchase 15-day passes tend to be the least satisfied with their GET experience. Fifteen-day passes are purchased least often by wealthy riders, who opt most for single-ride cash fares, while lower income riders are spread among all fare-types (Figure 14).

Figure 14: Fare payment method and annual household income
**Trip purpose**

**Question:** What is the main purpose of your trip today? N=1,235

Work, personal business, and travel to school are the most common trips taken using GET (Figure 15). While few trips are made for the specific purpose of picking up or dropping off a child, multi-purpose trips including pick up or drop off of children on-route to work or school have not been considered.

![Graph of Trip Purpose](image)

**Figure 15:** Primary purpose of trip

**Frequency of use**

**Question:** How long have you been riding GET buses? N=1,430

Only 38-percent of riders have been using GET bus for more than 5 years (Figure 16). This is a significant decrease from previous surveys conducted in 2015, 2013, and 2009, where this figure exceeded 50-percent. Combined with GET’s higher overall satisfaction ratings, this suggests that GET bus may have lost some of its riders who indicated in the 2015 survey that they were dissatisfied with the service. This emphasizes the importance of responding to client concerns, and adjusting the service as needed.
The majority (78-percent) of GET riders use GET three or more days per week (Figure 17). Most respondents are employed or in school part-time or full-time, showing a reliance on GET to complete habitual travel patterns. This also shows that GET is providing a service that can be accessed regularly, and that there is potential for satisfied riders to be very loyal to the service.
3.2.9 Transportation mode options

Question: How would you travel today if GET were not available? Please choose one. N=1,144

One third (34-percent) of riders consider walking a viable alternative to GET, while others would opt to cycle or drive (Figure 18). It is important to note that 13-percent of riders would not make their trip if GET was not available, suggesting that no other mode is available to them and that they are transit dependent.

![Figure 18: Alternate mode choice if GET was not available](image)

Question: How did you get to the bus stop? Please check all that apply. N=1,438

Many (67-percent) currently walk to the GET, 10-percent transfer from another bus, and 5-percent walk to their original bus stop, then transfer between multiple GET routes (Figure 19). Very few travelers drive or carpool to their bus stop, which may be attributed to lack of car access, or lack of park-and-ride facilities at bus stations.

![Figure 19: Mode choice to reach GET stop](image)
3.2.10 Opinion of GET and public transit

Riders were asked to rate their perception of GET as well as public transit in general by answering the following question:

Question: Do you agree with the following statements?

- I would recommend GET to family and friends
- I have a positive image of GET
- Public transit is an important public service

Most (78-percent) GET riders would recommend the service to their family or friends, and almost all (94-percent) riders believe that public transit is important in society (Figure 20). However, this survey specifically samples bus users, which imparts some degree of bias. Three-quarters (75-percent) have a positive image and opinion of GET. GET should be commended for providing a service that is generally well accepted by its ridership, and who would recommend the service to non-riders.

Figure 20: Image of GET and public transit
3.2.11 Service improvements

Question: Which of the following service improvements would help you use transit more often? Please choose one. N= 919

Many riders are concerned with GET operating hours, and service frequency. Forty-seven percent of riders request longer service hours and weekend service, which increases equity and availability for off-peak travelers (Figure 21). One traveler states “Longer service hours. Start earlier & end later so all can get to work no matter [the] time.” While an interesting perspective, Stantec noted from its observations that ridership is low both in the early morning and late night hours. Extended service hours may be a cost driver to the agency without offsetting ridership to warrant the investment. We advise GET to consider a pilot for early morning or late evening service along one route to determine the viability of further service extension.

![Figure 21: Recommended improvements to service (GET Riders)](image)

3.2.12 Captive and choice riders

In the previous sections, all of the survey data have been analyzed together without assessing the needs and desires of specific user groups. This section specifically assesses two common types of transit users, choice riders and captive riders. Choice riders are transit users who take transit even though they have access to a car. Captive riders, on the other hand, are those who must take transit, because they do not have a car available to them. The characteristics and opinions of the different user groups are presented here. At the end of this section, strategies to improve GET are presented based on the above-described summary statistics and as well as the analysis of captive and choice users presented below.

An emerging methodology to assess the “overall health” of a transit agency is to calculate the proportion of choice users. This is because the number of choice users tends to be greater for agencies that provide high-quality transportation services. The table below demonstrates the socioeconomic information for Bakersfield’s captive and choice conventional riders (Table 5).
Table 5: Profile of captive and choice GET riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CAPTIVE RIDERS N=1029, 76%</th>
<th>CHOICE RIDERS N=332, 24%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,001-$20,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,001-$35,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35,001-$50,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed or retired</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Bakersfield, choice riders who choose to use transit although they have access to a car, make up 24-percent (N=332) of the sample. These users tend to be satisfied with the overall service, and overall, have higher incomes compared to captive riders. Choice riders are also more frequently employed full-time or are students. Moreover, similarly to the overall sample, most choice riders identify as being Latino or Hispanic. However, GET users who identify as being Latino or Hispanic are over represented among choice users, suggesting that compared to other ethnicities, this group is more likely to choose transit even though they have access to a vehicle and do not have significantly lower incomes than other ethnic groups.

Captive riders, who do not have access to a car, and therefore depend on GET to travel in and around Bakersfield, make up 76-percent (N=1,029) of users. These users have lower incomes compared to choice riders and are more frequently unemployed. Figure 22 reveals that in Bakersfield, when captive users do not have access to GET and must find an alternative mode, 36-percent would walk, 24-percent would rely on a ride, and 14-percent would not make the trip at all. While some choice riders would also rely on active transportation, rides from other people, or not make the trip at all, most choice users would simply replace their transit trip with a car trip.
When GET users were asked if they had any suggestions or comments, they were very willing to share their thoughts and opinions about how the GET system can be improved. The word clouds below present a weighted-summary of the comments, suggestions, and concerns of GET customers. The first word cloud shows the results for captive users, while the second word cloud shows the results of choice users. The larger the word or phrase, the more frequently the comment was observed.

**Summary and synthesis of captive riders:**

Captive riders’ most frequent request was to increase bus services on the weekend and extend the hours during the week. Many captive riders also commented that they feel a lack of communication or equity in value for money, and one user expressed his concern by stating, “Stop victimizing the vulnerable people who already live in poverty. When you increase the fee, but then reduce the bus stops it appears that we are moving in the wrong direction.”
Other passenger suggestions include improving transfer times, and one captive rider expressed, "Some buses leave without waiting for connecting buses to let others on. This can be a hassle if it’s the last bus." Addressing running time issues at the route level to improve timed transfers is likely to increase overall trip satisfaction for many users and something GET should investigate.

Several captive riders also mentioned the safety and cleanliness of bus stops, and one passenger expressed the concern that there "Need [to be] lights at the bus stops [as] some stops are very dark and they pass [by you]." Having buses pass by waiting customers can be a frustrating experience, and having to walk in the dark leaves many people feeling unsafe and vulnerable.

Summary and synthesis of choice riders:

While there are many similarities between the comments summarized in the word clouds of captive and choice riders, "keep up the good work," and "this is an excellent service" are much more frequently observed in the comments of choice riders, making it clear that these users really do choose to use the service compared to captive users who do not have the luxury of modal choice.

Another important aspect to consider is that while for some GET customers, walking, or taking a bicycle may be a viable alternative, this is not the case for others. Some users simply cannot walk long distances due to mobility challenges, or the sheer distance or time required to walk, while others do not feel safe walking in certain areas of the city when it is dark out or when there are few other people present on the street.

Understanding the alternative modes that GET customers take is also related to the fact that both captive and choice users have requested earlier GET start times as, currently, they are forced to walk long distances because of lack of service. One GET customer remarked: "I walk 5 miles to work since I can’t arrive at work by [bus at] 5:30am."

Another way in which customers expressed that extending service hours would be beneficial was through a question that asked them what kinds of service improvements would help them use transit more often. Figure 23 demonstrates that both captive and choice users desire extended service hours, both during the week, and on weekends. When GET users were asked whether they had any additional comments, many...
mentioned that because GET has limited operating hours, even though they would like to take the bus, they must walk long distances early in the morning or late at night to commute to and from work. Other commuters commented that the short hours limited them from doing everything they needed to do in a day, and one user wrote that she would benefit from “longer hours on certain routes [by] at least one more hour. I work full time so I never have extra time to do groceries or pay a bill without worrying I’ll miss the last bus at 6:44”. Similarly, the limited hours on weekends are also difficult for users who rely on GET, and one user mentioned that “it’s hard for us disabled people to go to stores on the weekend, [and it is] very hard to see family that work during the week.”

Figure 23: Relative importance of service improvements for captive and choice riders

### 3.2.13 Loyal and Disloyal riders

Another emerging barometer of service quality and rider satisfaction is to categorize and assess whether a transit agency’s customer base is identified as being loyal to the agency. Although all transit agencies have customers who are more and less loyal to the system, it is self-serving for transit agencies to increase the number of loyal transit users on its system. One common way to assess loyalty is by using a Net Promoter Score (NPS), which is determined by subtracting the percentage of customers who are detractors (those who rated their willingness to recommend the service between 1-3 out of 5) from the percentage who are promoters (willing to recommend the service 5/5). The NPS for GET is positive at 10 points, suggesting that overall, some users will be loyal to the system. This demonstrates the high quality of service being offered currently, and it is recommended that GET strive for even higher customer loyalty, as NPS scores of 50 points or higher are considered “best-in-class.”

Loyalty in transit can be more accurately measured by assessing several other customer opinions. Specifically, loyal transit users do not only use the system because they have no other options for getting around; they use the system because there is something about it that they like, they would recommend it to a friend, family member or colleague, and they have a positive image of the system overall. In Bakersfield, 17.5-percent of users are defined as being loyal, while disloyal users make up 8.4-percent of the ridership base. All other users (74.1-percent) are neither loyal, nor disloyal, meaning this neutral ridership base has the potential to be converted to loyal riders into the future.

Table 6 demonstrates how loyalty is defined according to a research paper presented at the Public Transportation Marketing and Fare Policy committee at the Transportation Research Board’s Annual Meeting in January 2017.
Table 6: Definition of loyal and disloyal transit user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A loyal user is defined as someone who is:</th>
<th>A Disloyal user is defined as someone who is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Satisfied overall (5/5)</td>
<td>• Not satisfied overall (≤3/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would recommend the service to family member or friend (5/5)</td>
<td>• Would not recommend the service to family member or friend (≤3/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has a positive image of public transit (5/5)</td>
<td>• Does not have a positive image of transit (≤3/5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is self-serving for GET to increase loyalty among transit users. Loyal customers are more likely to use the system for different trip purposes, and are more inclined to continue using the system as they go through different life stages. For example, a loyal customer is more likely to continue taking transit even when their home or work location changes, when their family structure changes, and even when they start to earn higher salaries. Loyal customers are helping the transit agency promote the service by recommending it to others, and speaking positively about the service with their families, friends, and colleagues. Loyal users, in other words, are valuable assets, and GET should take special care to ensure the needs of this group are being met, while working to increase loyalty among other users.

The first step in increasing overall loyalty among GET users is to understand what motivates overall satisfaction among currently loyal users. Figure 24 demonstrates how both loyal and disloyal users have rated different service attributes. Value, safety, and the interaction that passengers have with the driver come out on top, suggesting that users who have a good experience with these trip attributes are more likely to be loyal overall. In contrast, disloyal users tend to be extremely dissatisfied with travel times, service reliability, and the experience of transferring between routes. These areas require further investigation by GET Bus.

![Figure 24: Relative importance of service factors for loyal and disloyal GET](image-url)
3.3 PEER AGENCY COMPARISON

Comparing satisfaction results with peer transit agencies within the region contextualizes where GET stands amongst peer agencies. In this section, overall satisfaction from the GET rider survey results are compared to the results from the Orange County Transit Authority (OCTA) 2014 Bus Customer Survey, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) 2013 On-Board Survey. Nevertheless, we caution that comparing results from customer satisfaction surveys is not without caveats, including the availability of data and publishing of results, and most importantly, differences in survey instruments and methodology and rider demographic profiles.

These agencies are used as comparisons because they operate in a similar geographic context to GET. However, it is important to note that the OCTA and VTA serve larger and wealthier populations (average income $76,000 and $96,000 respectively), and operate light rail (in the case of VTA) in addition to bus services at a broader geographic scale than Bakersfield.

OCTA asked its patrons, in 2014, the following question “Overall, how satisfied are you with the current bus transportation services offered by OCTA?”, and to provide an answer from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

VTA asked its bus riders in 2013, “Please rate your overall experience with VTA services (buses)”, where riders rated their experience from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

In the current GET survey, riders were asked “Thinking about your experience on this bus route in the last 30 days, how satisfied were you with the overall quality of service?”, and respond from extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied.

While the GET question closely mirrors the OCTA question, one key take-away for future surveying is to ask about overall satisfaction with transit service, rather than past experience on a route in the last 30 days, which may be biased due to factors beyond the control of a transit agency, such as street construction. In addition, both OCTA and VTA list possible responses from ‘worse’ to ‘best’, typical of surveying methods and best practices. In the future, GET may wish to follow best practices and present responses in a ‘worse’ to ‘best’ fashion.

In terms of levels of satisfaction, GET is on par with the VTA, where 79-percent of riders rated their experience on VTA buses as either ‘good’ or ‘excellent’, while 81-percent of GET bus riders indicated they were ‘satisfied’ or ‘extremely satisfied’. Finally, 90-percent of OCTA riders were ‘very satisfied’ or ‘somewhat satisfied’ with bus service. Thus, GET compares favorably with these transit agencies. Differences, apart from demographic, due to service levels, including frequency and bus priority measures, likely underlie the contrasting scores. Moreover, GET may consider modifying the wording of ‘satisfied’ or ‘somewhat satisfied’ in future survey iterations.

While GET had 1,440 survey responses, both OCTA and VTA had more responses, 2,520 and 6,886, respectively. We note that OCTA ran its survey for two weeks in the fall and operates double the number of bus routes compared to GET, likely accounting for the higher response rate. The VTA’s survey had broader goals than assessing customer satisfaction, including origin-destination data gathering, and operates over 80 bus routes. Moreover, VTA achieved a response rate of 54-percent, while OCTA did not report response rate; GET’s response rate was 41-percent. We note that OCTA provided respondents a free 1-day bus pass for completing a survey; GET may wish to incentivize future survey responses in a similar manner. Indeed, Stantec staff were asked on numerous occasions if there were any gifts associated with the survey. VTA’s on-board survey was notably shorter than the present GET survey, and reducing the number of questions could help boost responses and completed surveys. Overall, given the size of Bakersfield and the number of operated bus routes, GET’s response rate and sample size compare favorably with these larger transit agencies.
3.4 GET FRONTLINE EMPLOYEE WORKSHOP SESSIONS

To supplement the various surveying efforts, a frontline employee workshop helped put findings in perspective given GET operators’ first-hand knowledge of the system and its riders. This qualitative approach is used to better understand why opinions are formulated and what motivates certain behavior. Stantec has found through previous research projects that discussions with frontline employees help to identify flaws in service design and provision. Frontline employees are also ‘gatekeepers’ of information, and hear firsthand accounts of service issues from riders.

The GET frontline employees who participated in the workshops were forthcoming and participated freely in the discussion. The Stantec moderator followed the Discussion Guide approved by GET but when the participants went onto topics not on the discussion guide, he allowed the discussion to continue. This practice promoted a free and open dialogue and resulted in a genuine discussion of the challenges and opportunities for GET.

3.4.1 GET Rider Profile

The employees stated that the homeless comprised a significant amount of GET ridership especially when the weather turns cold. GET employees said that the homeless issue is certainly a problem for them as homeless riders sometimes sleep on the bus and also refuse to get off buses. Operators reported that they have had to “fake” buses going out of service to encourage homeless individuals to leave the bus. Overall, the employees that participated in the workshops said that the homeless problem is serious and that the presence of homeless riders puts GET service in a negative light and hinders GET’s ability to attract new riders. These statements were also supported by Stantec staff stationed at the Downtown Transit Centre and at the Southwest Transit Centre, as many homeless people loiter and were seen boarding and alighting buses. Despite the best efforts of GET’s security personnel, the problem is bigger than GET and is representative of societal problems. Stantec recommends that GET commence conversations or partnerships with Social Services, homeless advocacy agencies, etc., that can serve those populations more appropriately than GET.

3.4.2 Trip Purpose

According to frontline employees, most GET riders are using the service for work, school, health care and shopping. Weekday trip purpose varies from weekend trip purpose, as weekend travel is reportedly dominated by shopping and recreational trips, with a much smaller proportion of work trips than during weekday travel.

3.4.3 Route Performance

According to the frontline employees, the GET routes with the highest ridership are those with the highest frequencies:

- 21 – CSUB/Bakersfield College
- 22 – CSUB/Oildale
- 44 – White Lane/Bakersfield College
- 45 – Oildale/Foothill
- 81 – Valley Plaza/Downtown/Bakersfield College (Express)

According to staff, routes 82 (CSUB/Rosedale) and 84 (Northwest/Downtown) have the highest percentage of discretionary riders. Frontline employees stated that GET should develop more express routes such as the 81, where riders are enticed by few stops, and a competitive travel time. Route 45 was a route that the employees said had better weekend ridership than weekday ridership.
3.4.4 Service Performance

The characteristics of GET service that would promote more ridership per the workshop participants are:

1. Frequency – Provide higher levels of service rather than coverage
2. Travel Time – The directness of service matters to GET riders. Part of the success of the best performing GET routes is their ability to get riders to their final destinations quickly.
3. Security – The workshop participants, especially dealing with the growing homeless problem would help retain the loyalty of existing riders as well as provide a sense of security that would help lure new riders.

Frontline employees also suggested better timed transfers to allow for better coordination of schedules between buses. The workshop participants said that the current practice is to hold buses for three (3) minutes as a courtesy to riders that are transferring. Some drivers said that was not enough time especially if a route has ‘tight’ running time. Timed transfers are a problem across the system according to frontline staff. Some routes had too much time between transfers, while others did not have enough.

The frontline employees said that street supervision is adequate but ‘challenged’ at times. Evidently, street supervision is particularly limited during the afternoon peak hours and at night which they perceived as a detriment to service.

3.4.5 Unserved and Underserved Areas for Ridership Growth

The workshop participants were asked to identify areas for ridership growth. There was a consensus among the participants that strengthening service or bringing new service to the following areas would boost ridership:

- Southside – Was served prior to the recent service changes
- Areas to the west of Highway 58/Calder’s Corner
- Stockdale High School
- Bonavista/Walmart Area

3.4.6 Safety and Security

While the frontline employees say they feel safe when they are performing their duties, they are not sure that riders have the same sense of security. The workshop participants attributed this lack of security primarily to the homeless presence at many stops, and on board vehicles. One participant said, “The impression that the general public has sometimes is that the only people riding the buses are a bunch of weirdos.” That problem is most acute per the frontline employees at the Downtown Transit Center. Workshop participants cited “drugs and crime” as the major issues, especially the dealing of drugs in the area around the Transit Center. According to the frontline employees, “Not enough is being done to stop the loitering and soliciting by people who are not bus riders” and “The security guards do their best but that is not enough because the problem is a police problem.” GET can also improve this perception by better communicating their service with the public, including what it is, and who can benefit from it. This may break through existing perceptions, with additional help from police, that homeless or dangerous individuals dominate public transit. A strategy that has benefited peer agencies is collaborating with their local law enforcement and contracting “off-duty” police officers to provide police presence at their terminals and major transfer points; this has reportedly been a successful deterrent to criminal activity and improved riders’ perception of safety and security. This is something GET should investigate.
3.4.7 Fare Payment/Evasion/Transfers

Most GET riders pay their fares using cash or the agency’s 31-day pass. Fare evasion is not a problem with riders although the majority of the homeless riders do not pay fare or attempt to avoid fares. Operators report that homeless people will attempt to vandalize GET’s buses if they are denied entry for not paying by breaking windows.

GET employees believe that up to 75-percent of riders have to transfer to get to their final destinations, which they felt is a disservice to GET’s riders. Drivers that participated in the workshops said that the majority of riders had to transfer two or three times to get to their final destinations. This further supports the need for GET to facilitate timed transfers at major transit centers.

3.4.8 Rider Satisfaction

The workshop participants said the GET riders are generally satisfied with the service that the agency provides. “I think that the majority of our riders feel that we go above and beyond to meet their needs,” said one workshop participant.

3.4.9 Opinions of GET and GET Service in the Community

The participants were asked about the opinion that their friends and neighbors have about transit service and GET. The majority of participants said that their friends and neighbors knew little about GET service and even less about the agency itself. While the participating employees had a genuine sense of pride in their work, there was a feeling amongst the participants that their work was unappreciated by the community and the leadership of the agency. Instituting an Employee Appreciation Day or offering incentives to an “employee of the month”, if not already offered, could help improve frontline morale and sense of appreciation.
4.0 Community survey

In this section, we present findings from our survey of the sentiments of the Bakersfield community toward GET and their travel behaviors. Findings from our engagement with elected officials are also explored within this section. We present findings here because when considered together with the rider survey results, recommendations become apparent, and are listed in Section 5.0.

4.1 METHODOLOGY

A further goal of the current project was to understand non-riders’ and the wider Bakersfield community’s perception of transit and GET, and the barriers that challenge the wider use of transit. As such, a community survey was developed with collaboration from GET staff. The approved survey was translated into Spanish, and contained 21 questions (including a general comment/suggestions question). Questions queried typical travel modes and behavior, previous use of GET, and demographics. The complete survey can be found in Appendix 3.

As noted from the 2015 surveying effort, with the decline in use of land telephone lines and the rise of mobile phones and the Internet, telephone surveying results in low response rates, particularly given the amount of effort required to obtain a desired number of responses. As such, the current survey was limited to a print version (double-sided, English/Spanish, on standard letter paper) and an online version promoted through the same link as the rider survey. Differentiation was obtained through the first question, prompting respondents to respond whether they heard about the survey in the community or on-board a GET vehicle. Stantec’s target sample size was 200.

The print survey was distributed during the surveying week around transit centers and other locations in Bakersfield by surveyors (who were also distributing rider surveys) and Stantec supervisors. The online survey was active from March 28 until May 12, 2017, and was promoted through leaflets handed out in community and as well as on GET buses and at transit centers. The survey was also forwarded to local employers, including all staff at Stantec in Bakersfield, for their staff to complete. A total of 235 surveys were completed.

4.2 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Bakersfield Community Survey was created to capture the travel habits and perspectives of travelers within the community. Of the 235 respondents, 52-percent do not regularly use GET, while 48-percent are typically GET riders. This mixture of riders and non-riders is the product of a survey conducted within the community, where a sample of residents and their travel patterns was obtained. The high proportion of GET riders surveyed in the community can be attributed to surveys collected near GET transfer points. Non-transit users are also less likely to complete a survey if they perceive it to be unimportant, while riders may have a strong opinion that they wish to share.

The following analysis first demonstrates a profile of all respondents, which is followed by an analysis of travelers who do not use GET currently, isolating who these non-riders tend to be, why they choose not to ride, and how GET can better appeal to them.

4.2.1 Demographic profile of all respondents

Most respondents are of working age (18-64), with 66-percent employed or in school full or part-time (Table 7). Most respondents are female, which is not necessarily reflective of the Bakersfield community, but may be a result of the time they were surveyed, or personal willingness to complete an online survey. Over half of respondents possess a valid driver’s license, however, 36-percent have a household income of $20,000 or less, which may impact their ability to comfortably afford a vehicle, and may lead to public transit use.
2017 Customer and Community Satisfaction Survey
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Table 7: Demographic profile of community survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver's license</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001-$20,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$35,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-$50,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or retired</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Use of GET services

Question: If you have used GET bus in the last 90 days, on a five-point scale where one is “poor” and five is “excellent”, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with GET? N=229

It is important to note that 24-percent of respondents identify as non-users in this question, as compared to 52-percent noted previously. This is due to the nature of each question, as many riders state they do not “typically” use GET, but have used it once or twice in the last 90 days. Of the respondents who have used GET Bus in the last 90 days, 53-percent are satisfied or greatly satisfied with the service, while 47-percent are not satisfied, or have no opinion (Figure 25). This is a much higher level of dissatisfaction than the results of the GET rider survey (19-percent dissatisfaction), which may contribute to riders using GET less often, or ceasing to use it altogether. In the rider survey, riders were asked to comment on one specific trip, while this survey speaks to a more general satisfaction with GET. This may contribute to lower overall satisfaction ratings, as a rider may have a positive experience on one trip, but may be generally soured by an experience using GET in the past.
Figure 25: Overall satisfaction with GET

Question: In the last 90 days, have you ridden either GET's fixed-route bus service or the GET-A-Lift paratransit service? N=217

For community members who do not use GET bus, most would not ride because they have access to a personal vehicle, which is often perceived to be more convenient, safe, and private (Figure 26). A combined 19-percent of respondents would not use GET because they have concerns with the convenience, frequency, or cost of GET service. GET can work to address these concerns by improving service quality, and maintaining a clear and equitable fare structure.
Figure 26: Use of conventional GET service in the last 90 days

Question: How long is your average trip, in miles? N=233

Most trips made by community members are of a distance that can be covered using public transit (Figure 27). For commuters who travel less than one mile, many might be inclined to walk, as most able-bodied travelers can cover one mile in 15-20 minutes. For those travelling more than one mile, public transit becomes a viable option, and with 72-percent of trips ranging from 1-10 miles, many community members may be inclined to take transit. For commutes longer than 10 miles, some may be more inclined to drive, depending on the direction of travel, and availability of public transit and personal vehicle(s).
Figure 27: Average trip length

Question: Aside from seeing GET buses on the streets, where else have you come across the GET brand in the last 90 days? (check all that apply) N=215

Most respondents have come across the GET brand on GET’s own digital platforms, such as its website and social media (Figure 28). While this is useful for GET riders, travelers who do not use GET are unlikely to be exposed to GET’s online presence. The use of posters, TV commercials, and newspaper ads are necessary to appeal to non-riders who are unaware of, or disinterested in the GET brand. GET may wish to revisit the effectiveness of its existing TV commercials and newspaper ads, as only 27-percent of respondents are able to recall seeing them, meaning GET ads may be too few, or unremarkable.
4.2.3 Perceptions of public transit

Community members appear to value public transit (Figure 29). Most respondents believe that public transit is generally important to quality of life, and have a positive image of their local public transit service. A considerable portion of the community (57-percent) would support a sales tax to improve public transit, which shows a theoretical support of public transit among many users, but an apprehension for many towards putting their own money into it. This may be a result of low-income individuals who do not have sufficient financial resources to further support public transit financially, or residents who are not fully aware of what their money would be used for. It is recommended that equitable sources of revenue to support public transit be investigated, or that GET better inform the Bakersfield community of the specific projects and targets that an incremental tax revenue would fund. At the end of the day, GET is accountable to not only its riders, who contribute fare revenues, but also to the non-riding, taxpaying public.
4.2.4 Non-riders survey results

Compared to the GET users who participated in the on-board survey of conventional transit, non-riders tend to be older and more car dependent (Table 8). The majority identify as being white, and compared to GET bus riders they are wealthier and more often employed full time. Nearly three quarters of non-riders are female. This may be attributed to a higher proportion of female respondents, as women may be more willing to assist with a survey, or may have been more prevalent in the community depending on time of survey. Many women also expressed concern with GET service, and GET must assess potential causes for this concern. One possibility is that non-riders have a poor perception of safety, and one community member reported, “The bus stations are a little bit scary for a young female. I typically wouldn’t go there during night, nor alone”, a comment echoed by several other community members.
Table 8: Demographic profile of GET bus riders (from on-board surveys) and non-riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>NON-RIDERS</th>
<th>RIDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=123</td>
<td>N=1,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid driver’s license</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001-$20,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$35,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-$50,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or retired</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: How do you typically get to where you need to go? N=116

In Bakersfield, most community members who do not use transit choose to drive to their destinations. Figure 30 reveals that other common ways to travel around Bakersfield include getting a ride from a family member or friend, or carpooling. Cycling and walking combined make up seven percent, suggesting that commuters in Bakersfield rely heavily on motorized transportation to reach their desired destinations.

Figure 30: Typical mode of travel
Question: If you typically drive alone, why do you choose to do so? (check all that apply)  N=134

For GET to assess how to grow ridership, it is important to understand the reasons that Bakersfield residents choose to drive. Figure 31 shows that most non-riders do not use transit because they perceive it to be inconvenient. Other reasons include their need to make multi-purpose trips, or that they simply do not have enough knowledge about the system. Overall, only 22-percent of non-users reported that they prefer to drive their car, suggesting that GET has an opportunity to attract new customers if it can address the perceived inconveniences associated with its service. The frequency of buses and the ease of transferring between routes need to be improved to attract potential riders who use their car as their primary means of travel. Additionally, 9-percent of respondents noted that their “need to transport children to/from school or daycare” was a reason for driving alone. As it stands, only children under 5 years of age have a discounted fare rate. This may be a financial burden for parents with several children, making transit an unaffordable travel option.

![Figure 31: Reasons why respondents drive alone](image_url)

Figure 31: Reasons why respondents drive alone

Question: What change, if any, could cause you to ride GET bus services more often than today?  N= 94

When automobile drivers were asked what kinds of changes would motivate them to ride GET more often than they do today, the majority reported increased service frequency and improved locations of bus stops (Figure 32). Like current GET users, non-users also reported that they would benefit from earlier and later operating hours. Finally, several non-users reported that they would be more likely to use the system if someone could provide them with help in planning their trip. One driver reported, “My main problem with
GET is that I don’t know much about it. If I [were] to ride the bus, I wouldn’t know where I’m going or when the bus is coming.” Educating potential riders about how to use the transit system in Bakersfield is one way to encourage current non-riders to give the GET system a try.

Figure 32: Change that could cause more GET usage

Question: If your typical/normal method of travel was not available, would you ride GET bus services? N=98

When non-riders were asked which mode they would use if their typical or normal method of travel were no longer available to them, many riders seemed open to using GET. Figure 33 demonstrates that 48-percent of current drivers could be persuaded to take transit if their needs and desires could be met by the GET system. In addition, 28-percent could be persuaded to use the system, but extra attention would be needed to motivate these potential users to make GET their primary mode of transportation. Only 24-percent of current drivers would not take GET if they could no longer drive, suggesting these riders are unwilling to use transit regardless of the circumstance.
Many non-users also commented on their perceptions of GET. The majority of comments relate to GET not operating in useful areas. One user commented “I live in a retirement community and our bus stop was moved from across the street from our complex. Aged residents now must walk 1/2 mile to Fairfax & Auburn for the bus. This street is not flat, but a gradual grade and is very difficult for them to navigate. For many this is an impossibility. It has caused many to not be able to just “get out” for a little bit & to have to rely on others to get places. It has robbed them of another piece of their independence. If that stop could be back to this route, it would mean the world to so many here.” It is recommended that GET revisit the rationale behind the location of their stops, ensuring that the distance between stops does not leave vulnerable groups unable to access the system.

Non-riders also commented that they would be more likely to use GET if the routes were more direct, if the waiting times at transfers were shorter, and if the service hours started earlier and ended later. Many non-users also reported their safety concerns, and one commented, “the Bakersfield downtown transit center needs better security, I almost got robbed and stabbed by a man while the security [officers] were sitting in their office with the door and blinds shut.”

The word cloud below collectively demonstrates a weighted-summary (the bigger the word, the more times the comment was cited) of service factors that non-users wish to see improved before they return or begin to take transit in the future.
Interviews with Elected Officials

As part of our community surveying efforts, Stantec was asked to interview elected officials on their perceptions of transit in Bakersfield. A Discussion Guide was developed for this effort and approved by GET. Stantec attempted to contact all eight elected officials (the Mayor plus seven city councilors) by telephone and email but received little response. Additionally, Stantec contacted the City Clerk and asked for this individual’s help to profile the survey to elected officials which they agreed to assist with. In speaking with a representative at the Mayor’s office, it was suggested that an online survey be developed as the chances of receiving feedback in that forum would be greater. Accordingly, Stantec developed a SurveyMonkey survey based on the questions contained in the Discussion Guide and circulated the link to elected officials. Unfortunately, despite its many and varied attempts, Stantec was not successful in obtaining any elected official feedback.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES

Based on the findings and themes from the rider surveys, the operator workshops, and the community surveys, two overarching approaches to improving overall customer satisfaction and loyalty are presented here. The first are what we term “near term”, which are strategies that should be investigated in the next one to two years, or that require immediate study and consultation. In contrast, we have also suggested strategies that would be beneficial to implement in the medium- to long-term. These strategies would require further strategic planning and be more efficient if new technologies could be incorporated. Regardless, all recommendations presented throughout this report and below will require further research to determine their financial viability, establish their respective business cases and corresponding merit to proceed which is outside the scope of this project.

Near-term recommendations

1. Undertake service and routing review

   From its own observations in the field, Stantec is concerned that GET does not have sufficient service-level frequencies to make transferring between multiple routes convenient or appealing for riders. We believe a comprehensive review of service routing is warranted and should be undertaken to consider service attributes (longer service hours), routing structure and scheduling. Stantec recommends that the review focus on the following:

   • Timed transfers - Many riders complained about missing buses at GET’s major transfer points.
   • With 53-percent of riders transferring between GET Buses in 2012, it is imperative that GET establish an “on the street” procedure for ensuring timed transfers occur. According to some bus operators, GET has an informal “three-minute hold policy” at transit centers however riders and many frontline personnel were unaware of such a policy.
   • Consider moving the operations of the Downtown Transit Center from off-street to on-street, as Downtown transit centers can be sites for concentrated illicit activity, represented by a series of comments from riders concerned for their personal safety. Despite the best efforts of GET’s security personnel, the problem is bigger than GET and is representative of societal problems. Stantec recommends that GET commence conversations or partnerships with Social Services, homeless advocacy agencies, etc., that can serve those populations more appropriately than GET. As part of a routing and service delivery review, Stantec recommends that GET study the potential of closing the downtown terminal itself and moving the operations curbside to facilitate convenient transfers. The existing footprint of the Downtown Transit Center could serve as a catalyst for Downtown Bakersfield redevelopment. The Downtown would also benefit from more foot traffic that would result from letting riders off curbside.
   • Focus service design strategy on frequency - GET riders identified a desire for more frequent service. Poor performing routes have low performance because they appear to be focused on coverage and/or policy. More frequent service would also benefit timed transfers as riders would be less frustrated by missed connections if they knew another bus is coming shortly.

2. Improve users’ perception of safety

   Two strategies that GET can implement to improve users’ perception of safety are to improve both the lighting and cleanliness at bus stops and transit centers. A ready-made solution to this problem is for GET, in collaboration with the City of Bakersfield and Kern County, to issue a Request for Proposals for a shelter advertising program that would increase the number, size, and design of bus shelters, specifically in areas where shelter advertising is permitted. Under similar programs developed by Stantec’s team members, an out of home advertising company such as Lamar or Sun Outdoor, both of which have billboards in Kern County, would assume the capital and operating costs of the shelters while sharing a percentage of the revenues with GET. Last, another strategy that has benefited peer agencies is collaborating with their local law enforcement and contracting “off-duty” police officers to
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provide police presence at their terminals and major transfer points; this has reportedly been a successful deterrent to criminal activity and improved riders’ perception of safety.

3. Improve communication about system and service changes

GET would benefit from engaging in better communication about system changes. Stantec suspects that some of the existing dissatisfaction is likely a result of riders not understanding how service changes are made, and how they could personally benefit from the services being offered.

4. Review customer service and sensitivity training protocols

The interaction that transit users have with service providers is one of the most important drivers of customer perception, satisfaction, and loyalty. GET’s frontline is the face of transit in Bakersfield and often the only “touch point”. From Stantec’s causal observations, and what was confirmed by riders, a clear majority of GET operators are providing excellent customer service. To ensure the continuation of this practice, and address the concerns of some riders, GET should continue to respond quickly to complaints of driver behavior, and provide clear customer service standards to operators.

Medium-to-long term recommendations

5. Increase reliability

One strategy is to align schedules at transfer points to reduce the prevalence of long transfer times and make transit more reliable for riders who need to transfer between routes. Decreasing the overall wait time is likely to increase users’ overall satisfaction and loyalty as they will feel safer at bus stops and can travel to their desired destinations more quickly. Service reliability begins with street supervision, which is why Stantec recommends GET maintain or increase street supervision, especially at transfer centers, as it is the best tool to improve on-time performance and provide real-time customer service support.

6. Improve schedule displays and communication

Installing real-time bus arrival displays would show users when the next bus is arriving, help users better estimate their travel times, and give them reassurance as to when the next bus will arrive. Improvements to the GET Mobile App and telephone service will also facilitate better communication to riders. While GET currently has an app, it is not necessarily intuitive, and few surveyed riders are currently relying on it for daily information. When mobility and scheduling information is easily accessible through a variety of sources, users’ overall satisfaction is likely to increase. Stantec’s advice to GET is to improve its mobile application and to educate riders in the use of the application to determine bus arrival times at specific stops.

7. Assess fare discounts for certain populations

Fares in Bakersfield are relatively low compared to other North American transit agencies. However, relatively discounted fares for students and children older than six years of age would likely increase satisfaction among users. GET should review its current fare structure accordingly, as many North American agencies are investigating fares commensurate with a rider’s ability to pay.

8. To Know GET, Is to Love GET

From all the research conducted for GET, Stantec has concluded that not enough is known about the agency, its services, or the value it delivers to Kern County and Bakersfield. The rider survey results certainly show that riders are generally satisfied with the agency’s performance, but they wanted more information about the agency in the form of better user information and more marketing of the agency’s services.

Stantec recommends that GET boost its communication with riders, especially since the agency is seeking to secure a more robust form of local funding in the future. That communication should first
focus on internal communication so that the agency’s employees can be ambassadors that bring the agency’s message to their families, friends, and neighbors. The second focus of communication should be to educate elected officials, policy makers and opinion leaders on the value of GET services.
6.0 GET-A-LIFT OPEN HOUSE AND RIDER SURVEY

GET offers door-to-door specialized services for riders with disabilities. This ADA service is called GET-A-Lift. To assess service quality and satisfaction, Stantec used an open house to directly engage with users of the ADA service. In addition, a survey was developed and administered both as an exit survey to the open house, on-board GET-A-Lift vehicles and, over the telephone. What follows is a description of the findings from the open house and the surveying efforts.

6.1 METHODOLOGY

An open house was held on March 29, 2017 at GET administration offices. The open house was advertised to GET-A-Lift registrants by GET. Two Stantec staff members facilitated the open house and discussed GET-A-Lift services, issues facing riders with disabilities, the accessibility of conventional services, and satisfaction with registration and reservation processes. Moreover, an exit survey was developed, compliant with ADA standards, and administered to participants of the open house. The survey contained 16 questions and is found in Appendix 4. A total of 34 completed surveys were obtained; however, 11 were spoiled by not being completed correctly.

On-board and telephone surveys

To supplement the exit surveys from the open house, a surveyor was recruited from the initial pool of on-board rider surveyors to conduct surveys on GET-A-Lift vehicles as well as over the telephone. The survey instrument was the same as the one used at the open house. The survey administration took place from April 11 to April 26, 2017. A total of 71 surveys were returned from the on-board and telephone efforts.

6.2 GET-A-LIFT RIDER OPEN HOUSE

On March 29, 2017, Stantec staff hosted an open house for GET-A-Lift riders at the Golden Empire Transit District (GET) headquarters, from the hours of 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Recruitment of participants for the event was led by GET. GET sent letters to all registered users of GET-A-Lift informing them of the open house and requested that they confirm attendance if interested. To further encourage attendance, customers were picked up by GET-A-Lift service (for free), brought to GET’s offices and given a ride home by GET-A-Lift.

Five, 90-minute, open house sessions were scheduled during the day; 34 active GET-A-Lift customers attended; this translates to a 14-percent representation of GET-A-Lift’s daily ridership (approximately 250 trips per day). Customers who attended had a variety of mobility challenges; thus, Stantec could capture different perspectives about the service accordingly. The mix of attendees was also representative of newer (less than 3 months) and long-term (10+ years) GET-A-Lift customers. Some of those attending had been customers of the service since its inception, offering a chronological assessment of the service.
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The format of the workshop generally followed the structure and flow of the exit surveys, although time was allowed for additional conversation. Approximately two-thirds of the allotted 90-minutes session was used to collect feedback while the remaining time was used to educate riders on GET’s considerable investment into accessible conventional transit, and how this service option could give riders an alternate, more flexible transportation choice.

A Stantec moderator led the sessions. To encourage maximum participation of attendees, the moderator limited answers to less than three minutes and encouraged individuals throughout the room to offer their feedback.

6.2.1 General findings

Feedback received at the open house was mostly positive. GET-A-Lift riders were sincere in their appreciation of the service. Some areas of concern with service quality were identified, including:

- Inconsistencies in pick up policies especially windows and protocols
- Same day requests for service
- Changing an address for pick up
- Fare policy

Despite these issues, open house attendees were extremely grateful for the service, very satisfied with its current form and view it as a “life-line” that allows them freedom to live their lives. One customer remarked “I would be dead if it weren’t for GET-A-Lift”. Other comments included “an excellent service” as well as “these people are angels.”

Open house attendees indicated that they generally use GET-A-Lift to attend doctor appointments, dialysis, medical trips, shopping, visiting friends and family, church or to simply “get a hamburger.” Some thought that the span of service should be extended later into the evening or to allow a rider to get on and off the service if it is passing a location of interest to them (for example - do a 5-minute stop at the post office and continue with the remainder of their trip afterwards).

GET customer service staff and operators were praised for their high-degree of compassion and resourcefulness – in fact, many specific individuals were called out by name and brought into the room by Stantec so they could be thanked in person by their customers.

Some participants felt that the size of name tags worn by operators are too small as they would like to know the names of their operators so they can refer to them by name. Although challenging for schedulers, assigning drivers to regular assignments may improve service delivery and lower costs for GET as drivers can anticipate rider activity.

A strong interest was expressed in using GET’s accessible conventional transit services, however many stated they are unable to reach their nearest bus stop, or walk to their final destination from a bus stop because of the distance; leaving them no choice but to rely on GET-A-Lift. Some individuals suggested that GET should consider adding a community circulator to help facilitate the use of accessible conventional transit for their travel needs.

Additional open house findings are presented below based on topic of conversation.

6.2.2 Eligibility Process

GET-A-Lift’s eligibility process was viewed as being straightforward, expeditious and not overly burdensome. All individuals expressed that they felt that they had been treated fairly, that their questions were answered and that they were satisfied with the eligibility process in its current form. Their eligibility was quickly confirmed and processed. One participant commented that the assessment process was “good and fast.”
6.2.3 Reservation Process

Open house attendees expressed their satisfaction with the reservation process. Most felt that they could generally book and receive a ride when they need it. Some held a perception, unverified by Stantec, that dialysis trips received preference to other types of trips. It was stated that same day requests are generally fulfilled and that GET is doing a good job of managing both demand and supply of service. When calling to make reservations, call time in queue is generally good, but hold times can be high (estimated at 10 minutes) during busy periods. Customers felt the introduction of an online booking tool, or app, would be beneficial and is something GET should explore.

6.2.4 Service Delivery

Most open house attendees felt that GET is doing a good job of maintaining on-time performance of its GET-A-Lift service. Interestingly, one individual stated that her GET-A-Lift rides always arrive too early and she is consistently being “written up” for something that is “not her fault.” Building on this comment, some said they found the pick-up window policy (±15 minutes) to be confusing and believed it should be communicated to program users in simpler terms. All participants felt that operators generally take the most direct routes to their destinations and that the time they spend on-board vehicles to be fair.

Several attendees expressed interest in being able to get on and off GET-A-Lift services especially at major destinations such as health care and shopping centers. Nevertheless, such requests present safety and scheduling risks unless the agency has some form of advanced fare payment system to allow riders to pay multiple fares.

Some individuals expressed concern about operator behavior and believed that some operators require sensitivity training. When probed further, some individuals expressed that some operators had treated them rudely, or do not understand the needs of riders and that adequate passenger assistance was not provided when boarding and alighting. Concerns about the need for sensitivity training was heard repeatedly over multiple sessions.

Vehicles are always clean and climate control is not seen to be an issue. All users felt safe while riding GET-A-Lift’s service and felt that operators are always fit for duty and obey rules of the road including speeding and/or aggressive driving.

6.2.5 Fares

All participants felt that GET-A-Lift’s fares are fair and that they are receiving a high value for their money. Several individuals suggest that the GET-A-Lift fare structure should be revised to consider someone’s ability to pay. When asked whether they would be enticed by a lower or no-fare option to use accessible conventional transit instead, mix observations were noted. Some were interested in the idea, while others stated the price for GET-A-Lift is very affordable and that this offer would not necessarily appeal to them.
6.2.6 Accessible Conventional Transit and Travel Training

There was a mixed understanding amongst participants about GET’s accessible conventional service. Some knew of it and are active users of it in addition to being GET-A-Lift riders, particularly route 45 to the medical center. Others are aware of conventional service being accessible, stating they would like to use it or have previously used it, but are unable to reach their nearest conventional transit stop. Some expressed that the current conventional routing structure is too confusing for them, that “a trip anywhere in town requires 2 or 3 transfers” and that journey with conventional transit to the same destination “would take you many hours”. One frustrated gentleman on the topic of accessible conventional transit summarized his thoughts by saying “forget it…it is just easier to just book a direct ride through GET-A-Lift”.

When asked about travel training and whether they would be interested in receiving training, most stated that unless GET is able to provide conventional service closer to their homes, the offer of travel training is of little interest or value. An idea was floated that GET should consider having circulators or community buses to facilitate the transition to conventional transit and bridge the barrier to travel gap.

6.3 GET-A-LIFT RIDER SURVEY

The following presents responses from 93 GET-A-Lift users, surveyed at the open house, on the telephone, or on-board GET-A-Lift vehicles. The results are analyzed question-by-question, and summary statistics demonstrate the distribution of survey responses. Based on these responses, a series of recommendations for improving GET-A-Lift customer satisfaction are presented. This analysis focuses on improving GET-A-Lift as a standalone service, as well as its integration within the GET conventional transit service.

While GET-A-Lift users in the rider survey and open house are very satisfied with the existing service, it is important to note that concerns with GET-A-Lift service have emerged more substantially in the rider survey. This is not meant to discredit the excellent service GET is providing, but instead provides a deeper exploration of the concerns riders may have, and how GET can further provide for its riders.
6.3.1 Respondent profile

Question: How long have you been using GET-A-Lift services? N=91

Most survey respondents are relatively short-term users, and began using the service less than five years ago, with 20-percent of respondents joining the service within the last 12 months (Figure 34). With an aging population and expected instances of mobility-challenges within that population demographic, the pressure to provide service will continue, and is likely to increase.

![Figure 34: Length of time using GET-A-Lift](image)

6.3.2 Satisfaction with GET-A-Lift

GET-A-Lift users were asked to evaluate their level of agreement with sixteen statements, measuring their satisfaction with different aspects of the GET-A-Lift service. These statements are divided into three broad categories; eligibility assessment, booking a GET-A-Lift trip, and ride quality (Table 9). The statements considered are:
Table 9: Factors of satisfaction with GET-A-Lift

Please state your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Assessment</th>
<th>Reservation Process</th>
<th>Ride Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to schedule an appointment</td>
<td>Able to reach a customer representative when I call</td>
<td>Vans arrive on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was treated fairly</td>
<td>Customer representative is polite/friendly</td>
<td>Van drivers are courteous/helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions were answered</td>
<td>Reservation process is not complicated</td>
<td>Van interiors are clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process was not complicated</td>
<td>Generally, I am able to get the desired trip times</td>
<td>I feel safe while onboard the vans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the eligibility assessment</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the reservation process</td>
<td>My drivers generally take the shortest routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the ride</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the ride</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the ride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values of existing service quality

Level of agreement with the above statements was coded using the following matrix, where higher numbers correspond to higher satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Level of satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rider satisfaction is very high (4.53/5), echoing the appreciation for GET-A-Lift expressed during the open house sessions. GET-A-Lift riders are a unique demographic group with limited mobility, and are happy to have access to a dedicated, accessible transit service. One rider says “very appreciative and grateful for service”, a comment echoed by several other riders who are grateful that such a service exists. While GET-A-Lift has admirably provided service for a disadvantaged group, it is important to look carefully at factors where riders appear least satisfied, and where there is room for improvement in service quality.

Eligibility Assessment

Despite high overall satisfaction with the existing assessment process, riders surveyed find scheduling assessment appointments difficult, which may be linked to lack of appointment availability, or long wait times while scheduling the assessment (Figure 35). GET should develop strategies for improving appointment scheduling, including more evaluators, or an updated booking system. To mitigate the cost of staffing, GET can seek out partnerships with local non-profit organizations, helping with assessment appointments in times of high demand. Satisfaction with the eligibility assessment process has decreased since the 2015 survey. The ease of scheduling an assessment appointment and the perception of being treated fairly have decreased most, and must be considered in future practices.
Figure 35: Mean satisfaction with GET-A-Lift eligibility assessments
Reservation Process

The existing reservation process is a concern for many GET-A-Lift users (Figure 36). Many riders have difficulty reaching customer service agents, and obtaining the trip times requested. Long hold times on the phone and unexpected disconnections are impacting customer satisfaction. One rider says, “hold time is too long. Waited almost 2 hours for a call back one time”, a concern expressed by multiple other users. To improve the ease of navigating a busy phone system, it is recommended that GET-A-Lift investigate alternative booking systems.

Many riders are also dissatisfied with the pick-up and drop off times they are given, as they are often not the times requested. One rider states “we need better scheduling when it comes to pick up/drop off. [For example] they pick up at 12:30, appointment is at 1:45, ends at 2:30, [then I am picked up] at 3:30”. This presents an opportunity for GET to market the convenience of conventional transit to its paratransit users, as a conventional transit trip offers freedom and flexibility, which may appeal to travelers particularly bothered by the time commitment required when using GET-A-Lift.

As it stands, riders must book GET-A-Lift one day prior to their desired trip. One rider states “I would like same day scheduling (emergency) options, or 2-3 days advance scheduling”. The current GET-A-Lift schedule does not allow for emergency or last-minute travel, and customers must call during operating hours to book with a service agent. It is recommended that GET consider offering emergency bookings to fill under-capacity vehicles, or empty travel slots. This would improve both fleet efficiency, and customer satisfaction.

Figure 36: Mean satisfaction with GET-A-Lift reservation process
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Question: Would you like to be able to book trips online? N = 91

Most GET-A-Lift users are not interested in an online booking system (Figure 37). This further emphasizes the need to improve the quality of the existing phone system, as other methods that rely on technology may not be accessible to senior or low-income groups.

Seniors have become increasingly tech-savvy, and we expect this to continue over time, and must provide a series of information platforms for GET users. We also note that support for online booking was strong at the open house. Perhaps with training, the appetite and comfort with an online or mobile app for trip booking would be more palatable.

Ride Quality

Riders are least satisfied with on-time performance (mean satisfaction = 3.7), or route directness (satisfaction = 3.5) (Figure 38). Many riders experience frequent delays in pick-up. One rider states “[we need] better pickup scheduling, driver always comes late due to coming from across town”. On-time performance is closely linked with route directness, as indirect routes with multiple pick-up and drop-off points to increase service productivity can create a domino effect of late trips throughout the day. Improvements made to the directness of routes is likely to improve on-time performance, however indirect routing is often unavoidable in dedicated services with multiple passengers. Encouraging riders to use conventional transit may be the best solution for GET.

Further, many riders express concern with GET-A-Lift’s operating hours and service area, which does not include late night or early morning service on weekends, regular hours on holidays, or service further than three-quarters of a mile from conventional transit stops consistent with the requirements of ADA.
Figure 38: Mean satisfaction with GET-A-Lift ride quality
6.3.3 Integration with conventional GET transit

Question: Did you know that all GET bus conventional transit vehicles are accessible to customers with mobility challenges? N=86

Thirty-eight percent of GET-A-Lift riders are unaware that conventional GET service is fully accessible (Figure 39). GET should consider more public education about the agency’s investment towards accessible conventional transit to encourage GET-A-Lift users to try it. This is likely to decrease pressure on GET-A-Lift dispatch, scheduling, and cost, as the cost-per-trip of paratransit service is significantly higher than conventional transit. While GET provides travel training for conventional routes, marketing can be improved to make this an attractive and well-known option. In its review of GET’s new website, Stantec had difficulty locating information about travel training. User information needs to be simplified so that GET’s customers can find this information easier.

Question: If you had the opportunity to receive training on how to use conventional fixed route transit, would you consider using conventional service more often? N= 86

![Pie chart showing responses to the question about using conventional service]

**Figure 39: Knowledge of conventional GET bus accessibility**

Even though most riders know that GET Buses are fully accessible, 68-percent of GET-A-Lift riders would not use conventional transit, even if training was provided on how to use it (Figure 40). This should be concern for GET, as most riders do not perceive its conventional transit to be a viable travel option for their unique mobility needs. With only 7-percent of riders willing to consider conventional transit, and many more on the fence, GET should find ways to integrate conventional and paratransit options, and market the utility of conventional transit for mobility-challenged customers.
Question: Have you ever used a GET conventional bus instead of GET-A-Lift to travel? N=86

Thirty-seven percent of GET-A-Lift riders have previously used conventional GET for travel, while the majority have not (Figure 41). This lack of familiarity with conventional transit may be contributing to their unwillingness to try GET. Alternatively, some riders may find the use of conventional transit overwhelming, or inconvenient, as conventional GET bus routes do not extend to all neighborhoods in the city.

Figure 40: Willingness to receive training on conventional transit

Figure 41: Use of GET conventional bus instead of GET-A-Lift
If GET bus offered a lower fare to ride conventional transit instead of GET-A-Lift, would you take advantage of that opportunity? N=88

For most GET-A-Lift riders, fare incentives on conventional transit would not persuade them to change travel modes (Figure 42). With paratransit fares low, few are likely to give up the convenience of door-to-door service delivery for fare incentives on conventional transit. GET may need to reconsider how it prices conventional and paratransit services to encourage desired modal shifts.

Figure 42: Likelihood of switching to conventional GET bus with fare incentive

Finally, we analyzed some common themes raised by GET-A-Lift users through a word cloud analysis.

As was evident throughout the surveying and open house, riders are truly grateful for GET-A-Lift, and complemented the service and the operators. Most thoughts centered on the scheduling and pick-up windows, ideas prevalent in the open house sessions.
7.0 GET-A-Lift Recommendations for Improvement

The purpose of this report is to identify strategies to improve GET-A-Lift rider satisfaction. Based on the open house sessions, rider surveys, and considering Stantec’s observations along with conventional service delivery, we provide the following recommendation aimed at improving GET-A-Lift rider satisfaction:

1. Promote Family of Services approach to paratransit service delivery

Riders perceive GET-A-Lift, whether accurately or not, to be over capacity. To relieve this and to leverage investments made into accessible conventional transit, GET should encourage people with disabilities to use conventional transit subject to travel training. Strategies to achieve this include:

- Improve the accessibility of bus stops and pedestrian environments
- Use GET-A-Lift vehicles to bring people to their nearest GET transit center
- Market the conventional system to GET-A-Lift users
- Consider fare incentives for GET-A-Lift registrants using conventional transit
- Consider offering service routes to major destinations pulled from the GET-A-Lift daily manifests. Service routes would allow riders to get on and off buses to frequency multiple destinations in one trip.

Those participating in the workshops as well as those interviewed using the service spoke of the challenges of receiving GET-A-Lift service when needed. GET-A-Lift is valued by its riders however there is an awareness among its riders that fixed route bus service may offer greater freedom. GET should consistently promote the accessibility of its conventional service to support the Family of Services concept.

2. Upgrade the GET-A-Lift reservation system

In the short-term, GET should consider an IVR and web-based trip booking system whereby riders can choose origin, destination, and desired pick up time using an automated system. Customers would not need to wait for an operator to confirm their trip, as this is done on the spot. Get-A-Lift riders can either use a traditional phone, smart phone, or computer to book and confirm trips.

As a longer-term strategy, an online booking system should be put in place, leveraging technology. Many peer agencies have embraced Twitter as a means of communicating with customers in real-time about the status of their trip, a practical and low-cost option. These IVR and web-based systems are evolving to include predictive elements which can recognize the phone number of a caller and provide prompts to callers if they wish to book similar trips to those previously taken, such as to a health care center.

3. Assess booking requirements

Allowing pre-booking several days in advance will allow riders to plan schedules in advance, where they will not need to put all plans on hold until the night before their trip, when GET-A-Lift confirms their pick-up time.

4. Review business case for increased service hours

GET should review the opportunity to extend service hours to determine whether a business case exists. Extending service hours, especially on weekends, and past normal operating hours for major destinations, such as shopping and entertainment, will increase the freedom and mobility of many GET-A-Lift riders.

5. Review all program protocols

A reoccurring criticism of the GET-A-Lift program from its riders was that the program was inconsistent in its protocols. Riders were critical of changing pick up policies, hours of service, same day requests and
pick up windows. Inconsistency in program rules is very troubling to the disabled and senior population using the GET-A-Lift service. Stantec recommends that the GET-A-Lift program regularly communicate program protocols to riders and that it adopt quality assurance measures internally so that employees adhere to those protocols.

6. Consider community circulators and service routes

Many GET-A-Lift riders are going to similar locations. These locations are often health care facilities, shopping centers, sheltered workshops and social service centers. Community circulators would serve two trip purposes identified in the survey:

- Provide GET-A-Lift Riders with More Options
  Community circulators would reduce the burden on conventional GET-A-Lift service. This type of service would also meet some of the demand for same day service from riders.

- Solve Connectivity Issues for Regular Fixed Route Riders while promoting the Family of Services Concept to GET-A-Lift Riders
  Community Circulators would solve existing ‘first mile, last mile’ challenges, where riders cannot reach a conventional transit stop. Providing frequent fixed route service to GET-A-Lift riders would also promote the Family of Services concept by proving to riders that they can use the accessible fixed route system.

At a minimum, GET-A-Lift should consider providing high frequency, shared ride fixed route service to the most frequented destinations for disabled and elderly riders such as dialysis clinics, social service centers and shopping.
APPENDIX 1
GET RIDER ON-BOARD SURVEY
1. What is the ROUTE NUMBER of the bus you are currently riding? Route: ___________

2. What TIME did you start this trip? Time: _____ a.m. or p.m. (please circle one) ___________

3. Thinking about your experience ON THIS BUS ROUTE IN THE LAST 30 DAYS, how SATISFIED were you with the OVERALL QUALITY of service? Extremely satisfied □ Satisfied □ No opinion □ Dissatisfied □ Extremely dissatisfied □

4. In the past year, would you say that GET service has improved, stayed the same, or worsened? Improved □ Stayed the same □ Worsened □

5. Thinking about your experience ON THIS BUS ROUTE IN THE LAST 30 DAYS, how SATISFIED were you with: The length of time you waited for this bus? □ Reliability of buses being on time? □ Your comfort on the bus? □ Level of crowding inside the bus? □ The information provided at the stop and on the bus? □ Directness of the route? □ Driver’s behavior and attitude toward you? □ The fare you paid? □ Cleanliness of bus stop or shelter? □ Bus cleanliness inside and outside? □ Personal safety at the bus stop? □ Personal safety on the bus? □

6. How satisfied are you with the bus journey you made today in terms of VALUE FOR MONEY? Extremely satisfied □ Satisfied □ No opinion □ Dissatisfied □ Extremely dissatisfied □

7. How did you pay your fare? □ Cash □ Day pass □ 15-day pass □ 31-day pass

8. How do you check bus schedule information? Check all that apply. Printed schedule □ Phone GET Website □ Mobile App □ App name: ___________

9. Do you own or regularly use a …? Check all that apply. Smartphone □ Tablet □ Computer □ Personal business □ Health care

10. What is the MAIN PURPOSE of your trip today? Please choose ONE. Commuting to/from work □ Taking/collegiate child □ Shopping □ Personal business □ Health care □ Education □ Leisure □ Other □

11. How long have you been riding GET buses? Please choose ONE. Less than 1 month □ 1 to 6 months □ 1 to 3 years □ 3 to 5 years □ More than 5 years □

12. On average, how often have you used ANY GET bus in the last 3 months? Please choose ONE. At least 5 days a week □ 3 to 4 days a week □ 2 days a week □ Once a week □ Less than once a week □

13. Where did you get on this bus? Address or intersection: ___________

14. Where will your trip end? Address or intersection: ___________

15. How did you get to the bus stop? Check all that apply. Walked __ blocks Drove __ blocks Rode a bicycle __ blocks Transferred from another GET bus __ blocks

16. Do you AGREE with the following statements? Strongly agree □ Agree □ No opinion □ Disagree □ Strongly disagree □

17. Which of the following service improvements would help you use transit more often? Please choose ONE. More frequent service □ Longer service hours □ More weekend service □ Earlier service hours □ Better reliability □ Different destinations □ Shorter travel time □

18. Do you own or have access to a car? Yes □ No □

19. How would you travel today if GET were not available? Please make trip Drive own vehicle □ Lift from friends/family member □ Walk __

20. What is your home address or ZIP code? ___________

21. Age? ___________ years old

22. Are you? Male □ Female □

23. Do you consider yourself …? Native American □ Latino □ Black/African American □ Asian/Pacific Islander □ Clerical/Professional □ Manual laborer □ Self-employed □ In school □ Retired □ Unemployed/Not working □ Employed casually or part-time □

24. You are: In school □

25. What was the TOTAL COMBINED income of every person living in your household over the past year? Less than $15,000 □ $15,001 to $20,000 □ $20,001 to $25,000 □ $25,001 to $35,000 □ $35,001 to $50,000 □ $50,001 to $100,000 □ $100,001 or more □ Don’t know □

26. Do you have any suggestions or other comments for GET? ___________

GET may wish to contact you to gather further information about this particular survey. You would, of course, have the opportunity to agree or decline at the time. Is it OK to contact you? Phone or email address: ____________________

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED SURVEY TO THE SURVEYOR OR LEAVE IT ON YOUR SEAT. THANK YOU!
1. ¿Cuál es el NÚMERO DE LA RUTA del autobús en que estás montando ACTUALMENTE?
Ruta: ___________

2. ¿A qué HORA empezaste este viaje?
Hora: ______________ a.m. o p.m. (por favor marque uno)

3. Pensando en tu experiencia en ESTA RUTA DE AUTOBÚS EN LOS ÚLTIMOS 30 DÍAS, ¿Qué SATISFECHO estabas con:
- Calidad General del servicio?
- Seguridad personal en el autobús?
- Seguridad personal en la parada?
- Limpieza del autobús dentro y fuera?
- La tarifa que pagaste?
- Que la ruta es directo y eficiente?
- La información disponible en la parada y en el autobús?
- Tu comodidad en el autobús?
- Posibilidad de transferir a otros servicios de tránsito?

4. ¿En el último año, ¿días que el servicio GET ha mejorado, se ha mantenido igual o ha empeorado?
- Mejorado
- Se mantuvo igual
- Empeorado

5. Pensando en tu experiencia en ESTA RUTA DE AUTOBÚS EN LOS ÚLTIMOS 30 DÍAS, ¿Qué SATISFECHO estabas con:
- ¿El tiempo que esperaste para este autobús?
- Confiabilidad de los autobuses a tiempo?
- Posibilidad de transferir a otros servicios de tránsito?
- Tu comodidad en el autobús?
- Nivel de pasajeros que estaban amontonados dentro del autobús?
- La información disponible en la parada y en el autobús?
- Que la ruta es directo y eficiente?
- Conducta y actitud del conductor hacia usted?
- La tarifa que pagaste?
- Limpieza de la parada de autobús o refugio?
- Limpieza del autobús dentro y fuera?
- Seguridad personal en la parada?
- Seguridad personal en el autobús?

6. ¿Qué satisfecho está con el viaje en autobús que realizaste hoy en términos de RELACIÓN CALIDAD-PRECIO?
- Muy satisfecho
- Satisfecho
- Sin opinión
- Insatisfecho
- Muy insatisfecho

7. ¿Cómo pagaste tu tarifa?
- Efectivo
- Pase diario
- Pase de 15 días
- Pase de 24 días

8. ¿Cómo obtienes la información de los horarios de los autobuses?
- Marca todo lo que corresponde.
- Impreso o de molde
- Teléfono
- GET Sito web
- Aplicación móvil
- Nombre de la aplicación

9. Poses o usas regularmente un ...? Marca todo lo que corresponde.
- Teléfono inteligente
- Tableta
- Computadora
- Ninguno

10. ¿Cuál fue el PROPIÓSITO PRINCIPAL de tu viaje hoy? Por favor elige UNO.
- Viaje de ida y vuelta al trabajo
- Tomar o recoger a un niño
- Compras
- Negocios personales
- Cuidado de la salud
- Educación
- Tiempo libre
- Otro

11. ¿Cuánto tiempo llevas usando los autobuses GET? Por favor elige UNO.
- Menos de 1 mes
- 1 a 6 meses
- 1 a 3 años
- 3 a 5 años
- Más de 5 años

12. En promedio, ¿con qué frecuencia has utilizado CUALQUIER autobús GET en los últimos 3 meses? Por favor elige UNO.
- Por menos de 5 días a la semana
- 3 a 4 días a la semana
- 2 días a la semana
- Una vez por semana
- Menos que una vez a la semana

13. ¿Dónde te subiste en este autobús?
- Dirección o intersección:

14. ¿Dónde terminará su viaje?
- Dirección o intersección:

15. ¿Cómo llegaste a la parada de autobús? Marca todo lo que corresponda.

16. ¿Estás de acuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones?
- Yo recomendaría GET a familiares y amigos.

17. ¿Cuál fue el ingreso COMBINADO TOTAL de cada persona que vivía en tu hogar durante el año pasado?

18. ¿Tienes un coche o tienes acceso a uno?
- Sí
- No

19. ¿Cómo viajarías si GET no estuviera disponible? Por favor elige UNO.
- Manejar vehículo propio
- Montar en bicicleta
- Pasear con un amigo o miembro de la familia

20. ¿Cuál es tu dirección de casa o código postal?

21. ¿Años?

22. ¿Eres tú?
- ¿Tienes alguna sugerencia u otros comentarios para GET?

23. Te consideras ...
- Blanco
- Latino
- Negro / afroamericano
- Asia / Islas del Pacífico

24. Tu eres:
- Administrativo / profesional
- Trabajador manual
- Trabajadores por cuenta propia
- Estudiante de colegio
- Retirado

25. ¿Cuál fue el ingreso COMBINADO TOTAL de cada persona que vivía en tu hogar durante el año pasado?
- Menos de $ 15,000
- $ 15,001 a $ 20,000
- $ 20,000 a $ 35,000
- $ 35,001 a $ 50,000
- $ 50,001 y más

26. ¿Tienes alguna sugerencia u otros comentarios para GET?

POR FAVOR, DEVUELVA LA ENCUESTA COMPLETADA AL ENCUESTADOR O DEJÉLA EN SU ASIENTO. ¡GRACIAS!
APPENDIX 2
FRONTLINE EMPLOYEE DISCUSSION GUIDE
Golden Empire Transit District
Frontline Employee Discussion Guide

Introduction
Let’s begin by going around the table and telling me your name, your position and how many years you have worked for Golden Empire.

My name is John and I will moderate the session. This means that I will ask the questions and take down your answers. I do not have the answers to questions. This session is one of multiple research tasks that are being undertaken by GET to improve the ways in which the agency designs and delivers its services.

There are not or wrong answers what I am looking for is your opinion on those characteristics of service that will help GET retain the loyalty of those riding today and to lure new riders to the agency’s buses.

Discussion
Let’s begin by describing who the average riders of GET service are:
  - Is it a female, male, white, Latino, young or middle aged?

What is the trip purpose of your riders—are they going to work, getting to school, riding to the doctor’s office or a clinic or going shopping?

Which routes have the greatest ridership?

Why do these routes perform well when others have fewer riders?

Are there areas of the city that GET buses don’t go to today that should have service?

If GET increased frequency on the better performing routes, would ridership increase?

Are running times adequate? Are some routes too tight on time while others have too much time?

Let’s talk about fares now, how do riders pay their fares today?

Do the majority of riders pay cash, use a pass or a ticket?

How many riders evade fares? What is the profile of the person who evades paying a fare? Is that person male or female: young, middle aged or older, a student or worker.

Let’s talk about security and safety. Are GET riders safe when they are waiting for and riding buses?

Is there anything else you think we should discuss?
APPENDIX 3
COMMUNITY SURVEY
Golden Empire Transit (GET) District is interested in understanding your travel patterns so we can ensure our services are catered to community needs. Your opinions are valuable to us and will help us improve our service. All surveys will be kept confidential. Please do not fill out the survey more than once. This survey is also available at bit.ly/getbus-survey or by scanning the QR code. Thank you for your feedback!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. How do you typically get to where you need to go? Please choose ONE. | Drive  
GET bus  
Other transit  
I got dropped off/picked up  
Carpool  
Bicycle  
Walk  
Other                                                                 |
| 2. If you typically drive alone, why do you choose to do so? Please choose all that apply. | Need to visit multiple destinations before returning home  
Need to transport children to/from school or daycare  
Cannot get home in an emergency otherwise  
Transit is not convenient for me, or takes too much time  
Prefer to drive  
I don’t know about other transportation options  
N.A.  
Other                                                                 |
| 3. If your typical/normal method of travel was not available, would you ride GET bus services? Please choose ONE. | Yes  
No  
GET bus already is my typical/normal method of travel                                                                 |
| 4. In the last 90 days, have you ridden either GET’s fixed-route bus service or the GET-A-Lift paratransit service? Please choose ONE. | Yes  
No  
No, I have access to a personal vehicle  
No, the bus does not run where I’m going  
No, my trip would take too long by bus  
No, the bus does not run frequently enough  
No, the bus costs too much  
No, I don’t know how to use GET  
No (please specify)                                                                 |
| 5. On a five-point scale, where one is “poor” and five is “excellent”, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with GET services? | 5  
4  
3  
2  
1  
N.A.                                                                 |
| 6. If you typically use transit, bicycle, walk, or carpool, what motivates you to do so? Please choose all that apply. | Saving money  
Convenience  
Health benefits  
No access to a car  
Less wear and tear on my car  
No need to worry about parking  
I am environmentally conscious  
N.A.  
Other (please describe)                                                                 |
| 7. What change, if any, could cause you to ride GET bus services more often than today? Please choose ONE. | More frequent GET bus service  
A bus stop nearer to my house/destination  
Earlier operating service hours  
Help planning my trip on transit  
Nothing  
Other (please describe)                                                                 |
| 8. Do you know the location of the GET bus stop nearest to your home? | Yes  
No                                                                 |
| 9. Do you believe public transit plays an important role in your community’s quality of life? | Yes  
No                                                                 |
| 10. Aside from seeing GET buses on the streets, where have you come across the GET brand in the last 90 days? Please check all that apply. | GET website  
GET social media accounts  
GET bus schedules  
GET posters, brochures, or billboards  
TV commercials  
Newspaper ads  
Other                                                                 |
| 11. Do you have a positive image of GET? | Yes  
No                                                                 |
| 12. Would you support a dedicated sales tax supporting increased and/or improved public bus service throughout the Bakersfield Metropolitan area? | Yes  
No                                                                 |
| 13. How long is your average trip, in miles? | Less than 1 mile  
1 to 5 miles  
5 to 10 miles  
More than 10 miles                                                                 |
| 14. Do you have a valid driver’s license? | Yes  
No                                                                 |
| 15. What is your home address or ZIP code? |                                                                 |
| 16. Age? |                                                                 |
| 17. Are you? | Male  
Female                                                                 |
| 18. Do you consider yourself ...? | White  
Latino  
Black/African American  
Asian/Pacific Islander  
Native American  
Other                                                                 |
| 19. You are: | Clerical/Professional  
Manual laborer  
Self-employed  
In school  
Retired  
Unemployed/Not working  
Employed casually or part-time                                                                 |
| 20. What is the TOTAL COMBINED income of every person living in your household over the past year? | Less than $15,000  
$15,001 to $20,000  
$20,001 to $35,000  
$35,001 to $50,000  
$50,001 or more  
Don’t know                                                                 |
| 21. Do you have any suggestions or other comments for GET? |                                                                 |
ENGLISH ON REVERSE
Golden Empire Transit (GET) está interesado en conocer tu opinión sobre cómo estamos funcionando y cómo podemos mejorar. Tus opiniones son valiosas para nosotros y nos ayudarán a mejorar nuestro servicio. Todas las encuestas serán confidenciales. Por favor no llenes la encuesta más de una vez. Esta encuesta también está disponible en línea en bit.ly/getbus-survey o puedes escanear aquí. ¡Gracias por tus comentarios!

1 ¿Generalmente, cómo consigues llegar a donde tienes que ir? Por favor elige UNO.
   - Yo manejo solo  □
   - Servicios de autobús GET  □
   - Otros servicios de transporte público (Kern County, etc.)  □
   - Un familiar o amigo me deja o me recoge  □

2 Si normalmente manejas solo, ¿por qué eliges hacerlo? Marca todo lo que corresponda.
   - Necesito visitar varios destinos antes de volver a casa  □
   - Necesito transportar a los niños a/de la escuela o a/de la guardería  □
   - El transporte público no es conveniente para mi, o toma demasiado tiempo  □
   - Prefiero manejar mi coche  □
   - No conozco otras opciones de transporte  □

3 Si tu método normal de viaje no estaba disponible, ¿viajarías en los servicios de autobús GET? Por favor elige UNO.
   - Sí, yo viajaría en los servicios de autobús GET  □
   - No  □

4 En los últimos 90 días, ¿te has montado ya sea en los servicios de autobús GET o en los servicios de transporte alterno GET-A-Lift? Por favor elige UNO.
   - Sí, yo viajaría en los servicios de autobús GET más a menudo que hoy, pero no sería mi principal medio de transporte  □
   - Los servicios de autobús GET ya son mi método normal de viaje  □

5 En una escala de cinco puntos, donde uno es “pobre” y cinco es “excelente”, ¿cómo calificarías tus satisfacción general con los servicios de autobús GET?
   - 5
   - 4
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1
   - No aplica  □

6 Si generalmente uses transporte público, montas bicicleta, caminas, o te das aventón, ¿qué te motiva hacerlo? Marca todo lo que corresponde.
   - Ahorrar dinero  □
   - Conveniencia  □
   - Beneficios de la salud  □
   - Menos desgaste en mi coche  □
   - Otro (por favor especifica)  □

7 ¿Que cambio, si alguno, podría hacer que uses los servicios de autobús GET más a menudo que hoy? Por favor elige UNO.
   - Servicio más frecuente  □
   - Una parada de autobús más cerca a mi casa/destino  □
   - Más temprano operando, horas de funcionamiento más temprano  □
   - Más tarde operando/horas de funcionamiento más tarde  □
   - Ayuda a planificar mi viaje  □
   - Otro (por favor especifica)  □

8 ¿Sabes dónde queda la parada del autobús GET más cercana a su hogar?
   - Sí  □
   - No  □

9 ¿Crees que el transporte público juega un papel importante en la calidad de vida de su comunidad?
   - Sí  □
   - No  □

10 Aparte de ver los autobuses GET en las calles, ¿dónde has encontrado la marca GET en los últimos 90 días? Marca todo lo que corresponde.
   - Sitio web GET  □
   - Cuentas de redes sociales GET  □
   - Horarios de autobuses GET  □
   - Carteles, folletos, o vallas publicitarias GET  □

11 ¿TIenes una imagen positiva de GET?
   - Sí  □
   - No  □

12 ¿Apoyarías un impuesto de ventas dedicado a mejorar o a aumentar el servicio de transporte público en el área metropolitana de Bakersfield?
   - Sí  □
   - No  □

13 ¿Qué tan lejos es tu viaje promedio, en millas?
   - Menos de 1 milla  □
   - 1–5 millas  □
   - 5–10 millas  □
   - Más de 10 millas  □

14 ¿Tienes una licencia de conducir válida?
   - Sí  □
   - No  □

15 ¿Cuál es tu dirección de casa o código postal?

16 ¿Años?

17 ¿Eres tú?
   - Masculino □
   - Hembra □

18 Te consideras...
   - Blanco □
   - Latino □
   - Negro/afroamericano □

19 Tu eres:
   - Administrativo/profesional □
   - Trabajador manual □
   - Trabajador por cuenta propia □
   - Estudiante de colegio □

20 ¿Cuál fue el ingreso combinado total de cada personal que vivía en tu hogar durante el año pasado?
   - Menos de $15,000 □
   - $15,001 a $20,000 □
   - $20,001 a $35,000 □
   - $35,001 a $50,000 □
   - $50,001 y más □
   - No sé □

21 ¿Tienes alguna sugerencia u otros comentarios para GET?
APPENDIX 4
GET-A-LIFT RIDER SURVEY
GET-A-LIFT – RIDER SURVEY

**TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF**

1. Are you a GET-A-Lift  
   - Rider  
   - Rider Family Member  
   - Healthcare Provider  
   - Social Service Agency Representative  
   - Other, please specify ____________________________

2. How long have you been riding on GET-A-Lift?  
   - Less than one year  
   - One to five years  
   - Five to ten years  
   - Ten years or more

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

3. Tell us about the eligibility assessment process:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to schedule appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was treated fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions were answered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process was not complicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the eligibility assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Tell us about the ride reservation process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to reach a customer representative when I call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer representative is polite/friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation process is not complicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I am able to get the desired trip times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the reservation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Tell us about the ride:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vans arrive on the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van drivers are courteous/helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van interiors are clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe while onboard the vans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My drivers generally take the shortest routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please tell us how satisfied you are with GET-A-Lift’s service as it is today:  
   - Totally satisfied  
   - Satisfied  
   - Somewhat satisfied  
   - Somewhat dissatisfied  
   - Dissatisfied  
   - Totally dissatisfied
7. Did you know that all GET bus conventional transit vehicles are accessible to customers with mobility challenges? (i.e. they are low-floor with ramps)
   □ Yes   □ No

8. Have you ever used a GET bus conventional bus instead of GET-A-Lift to travel?
   □ Yes   □ No

9. If yes, which GET Bus route(s) do you typically use? Select all that apply.
   □ Route 21 – CSUB/Bakersfield College
   □ Route 22 – CSUB / Oil
   □ Route 41 – Valley Plaza/Cottonwood/Bakersfield College
   □ Route 42 – Panama Lane/Westchester
   □ Route 43 – Truxtun/Bakersfield College
   □ Route 44 – White Lane / Bakersfield College
   □ Route 45 – Oildale/Foothill
   □ Route 46 – Stockdale / Foothill
   □ Route 47 – Panama Lane / Truxtun
   □ Route 61 – Panama Lane/Bakersfield College
   □ Route 62 – Ridgeview/Greenfield/Valley Plaza
   □ Route 81 – Valley Plaza/Downtown/Bakersfield College
   □ Route 82 – CSUB/Rosedale
   □ Route 83 – Half Moon / S. Union
   □ Route 84 – Northwest / Downtown
   □ Route 92 – Tejon Ranch / Commerce Center Express

10. If you had the opportunity to receive training on how to use conventional fixed route transit, would you consider using conventional service more often?
    □ Yes   □ No   □ Maybe   □ I need more information to make a decision

11. If GET Bus offered a lower fare to ride conventional transit instead of GET-A-Lift, would you take advantage of that opportunity?
    □ Yes   □ No   □ Maybe   □ I need more information to make a decision

12. Would you like to be able to schedule GET-A-Lift trips online?
    □ Yes   □ No   □ Maybe   □ I need more information to make a decision

13. Please share with us any additional ideas or comments you have: ________________________________
                                                                                          ________________________________
                                                                                          ________________________________
                                                                                          ________________________________

   **LOOKING TO THE FUTURE**

14. What is the best method to communicate with you about the GET-A-Lift Program in the future?
    □ Telephone   □ Mail   □ Email   □ Facebook   □ Twitter   □ An additional Open House
    □ Other, please describe ________________________________

15. If you would like someone to contact you about Travel Training, please provide your contact information: ________________________________

Thank you for your time! Please feel free to contact us about how we can assist you with your transportation needs and improve our services:   Email: webcontact@getbus.org
Telephone: 661-869-2GET (2438)