



## Marketing and Passenger Demographics

This chapter presents information obtained from surveys and related sources about regional bus users in Massachusetts. If broad user characteristics in this market are better understood, opportunities to offer attractive new services or attract a broader clientele may be identified.

### 7.1 Existing Fare Structures

The regional bus industry has, since its inception, built its business on price-sensitive riders. Fares per mile traveled, summarized by carrier in Chapter 2, section 2.8, ranged for Massachusetts carriers between \$0.16 and \$0.71 per mile for one-way tickets purchased on the day of travel. All commuter carriers offer substantial discounts, sometimes more than half-off the one-way fare, for purchase of 10-ride and 20-ride tickets. Fares for multi-ride tickets ranged from \$0.10 to \$0.45 per mile. The large difference between single-ride and multi-ride fares would suggest that carriers have some flexibility to reduce single-ride one-way and round-trip fares, at least for a limited time. Perhaps they could offer special fares to new riders or as part of a promotional campaign for existing service.

### 7.2 Marketing

Despite the high level of activity seen at a major terminal like South Station, the regional bus industry is culturally remote to a large fraction of the public. Any analysis of regional bus marketing needs to begin by learning how the large numbers of current riders discovered the services they now use.

The CTPS survey of passengers traveling on in-state routes asked how they learned about the service they were using for that trip. For all but two routes, the majority of riders characterized themselves as “a long-time rider” and did

not identify how they found out about the service. The responses to this survey question are summarized in Table 34.

The response “a friend or family member” was clearly the most cited source of bus service awareness, especially for commuter routes. MVRTA and Yankee passengers actually cited “friend or family member” more than “long-time rider.”

The importance of friends and family as a source of information about regional bus service suggests that there may be considerable value in regional carriers’ engaging their existing riders in recruiting new customers, especially for commuter services. Possible campaigns could be as simple as providing extra printed schedules or even one-way tickets to existing riders and asking them to hand them out to friends who might benefit from using the service.

The response “Saw the bus” was the second-most mentioned way of becoming aware of a regional bus service, for some services being the answer of over 10% of respondents. To the casual observer, coach-type buses on roads and highways are simply part of the traffic mix, possibly a tour group or casino bus. Making sure buses are properly marked with easy-to-read destination signs and possibly decals on the backs describing the services provided (not just the name of the bus company) is another simple method for carriers to promote their services. The MVRTA commuter buses have decals on the back describing the service.

The Internet was frequently cited by respondents as a source of information, especially for longer-distance, non-commuter routes. For the Hyannis–Provincetown and Hyannis–Providence routes, heavily used by vacationers and summer workers, the Internet was cited at least as much as “long-time rider.”

All of the carriers operating service in Massachusetts have websites that have some form of schedule information available and in many instances offer online reservation booking and ticket sales. For prospective new riders, becoming familiar with routes and schedules is a critical first step. Even current regional bus users need clear information when considering travel on different, often connecting routes.

The ease of obtaining route and schedule information online varies. The highest level of user accessibility is the PDF format that can easily be printed or downloaded to a personal computer or mobile device and may replicate or be a substitute for printed schedules. Several carriers offer schedules only as HTML pages. This format does not always print out consistently and can sometimes be difficult to read on mobile devices.

**Table 34**  
**How Passengers Learned about Regional Bus Service**

Carrier	Route	Long-Time Rider	At Work	News-paper	Internet Source	Friend or Family Member	Saw Bus	Information Booth	Other
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	56.9%	2.0%	0.0%	3.9%	24.0%	10.6%	1.0%	2.9%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	59.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	23.0%	14.0%	0.0%	2.0%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	68.1%	2.1%	1.1%	6.4%	14.9%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown–Groveland–Haverhill	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>DATTCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	51.3%	0.6%	0.0%	10.1%	25.3%	8.2%	1.3%	3.2%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	41.7%	10.0%	0.0%	3.3%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	59.2%	0.0%	0.6%	3.8%	24.5%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Boston–Rockland Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	61.2%	1.6%	0.3%	9.2%	20.2%	4.3%	1.9%	1.4%

(Cont.)

**Table 34 (Cont.)  
How Passengers Learned about Regional Bus Service**

Carrier	Route	Long-Time Rider	At Work	News-paper	Internet Source	Friend or Family Member	Saw Bus	Information Booth	Other
	Hyannis–Provincetown	25.7%	17.1%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	5.7%	8.6%	0.0%
<b>Peter Pan</b>	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	62.8%	4.7%	0.0%	2.3%	23.3%	4.7%	0.0%	2.3%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	77.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	11.4%	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	15.6%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%
	Boston–Providence	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	5.6%	2.8%	0.0%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester commuter	59.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%	4.6%	0.0%	9.1%
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Hyannis–Providence	38.9%	0.0%	0.0%	38.9%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Providence–Albany via Worcester, Springfield, Lee, Lenox, and Pittsfield	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	55.6%	2.8%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	<b>Yankee</b>	Boston–Concord–Acton	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: CTPS survey

## **Massachusetts Regional Bus Study**

The Greyhound and Peter Pan websites only reveal schedule information as the user attempts to make a reservation between a specific city-pair. Easy-to-download-and-print PDF schedules are not provided. These two carriers have the most extensive New England route systems, and regular users of a particular route are logically a prime potential market for making new trips on connecting services offered directly by these carriers as well as other connecting carriers. It could be advantageous if Greyhound and Peter Pan had system or regional timetables available in a PDF format that included connecting services.

Eleven carriers offer online ticket sales:

- Boston Express (excluding multi-trip tickets)
- Bolt (can only purchase online or by phone)
- Concord Coach
- C&J (excluding multi-trip tickets)
- Dartmouth Coach
- Fung Wah
- Greyhound
- Limoliner (can only purchase online)
- Lucky Star
- Megabus
- Peter Pan (excluding multi-trip tickets)

Six carriers do not offer online ticket sales or credit card sales (unless noted):

- Bloom
- Coach Company
- DATTCO
- MVRTA
- P&B (credit cards accepted at terminal, not onboard bus)
- Yankee

When CTPS staff visited South Station in June 2012, printed schedules were readily available for New Hampshire–based carriers Boston Express, Concord Coach, C&J, and Dartmouth Coach. Plymouth & Brockton also had printed schedules available. Peter Pan had paper schedules available for only some of its services. None of the other carriers had printed schedules readily available.

Regional bus companies offering longer-distance, intercity services usually maintain a schedule database of North American destinations and services to which they will sell tickets and book reservations. These databases only include the company's own services and those partnered or pooled with another company. For example, Greyhound includes information for all NTBA members in its schedule database, but does not provide any information for Concord Coach's extensive Boston–Portland service. Instead, Greyhound

directs all passengers seeking schedule information for service between these two cities to Greyhound's own, rather limited service.

A majority of carriers are using social media both to promote their services and to send out information about delays or problems. Bolt Bus, Boston Express, C&J, Concord Coach, Dartmouth Coach, DATTCO, Greyhound, Limoliner, Megabus, Peter Pan, and World Wide are on both Facebook and Twitter, while P&B is currently only on Facebook.

P&B recently began advertising on the MBTA's website, placing a prominent link to its own website in a banner ad on the MBTA's home page. P&B appears to be the only bus company purchasing ads at this website.

Greyhound markets through national radio, Internet, and yellow page advertising. The company also occasionally uses direct mail, newspaper advertisements, and promotional advertising.

## **7.3 Statewide and RTA-Level Schedule and Trip Planning Data for Rail and Bus Services**

### **7.3.1 Statewide**

There is presently no single online location where a traveler can find information for all of the existing regional services in the state. No statewide map of regional bus and rail services is available either, either in printed form or online.

Google Transit presents an opportunity for information on urban, rural, and intercity bus and rail services, both private and public, to be accessed by the potential traveler in a single location for trip-planning purposes. Unfortunately, P&B is currently the only Massachusetts private carrier included in Google Transit. It would most likely be a less complicated task for the Commonwealth to provide support to private carriers to generate and provide the data necessary for inclusion in Google Transit, and to provide the data for its public services for inclusion, than for it to develop its own trip planner for all services in the state. The site could be comprehensive, including the services of local RTAs, the MBTA, private carriers, Amtrak, and island ferries.

### **7.3.2 RTA-Level**

Most of the websites of the local RTAs in the state include links to private-carrier regional bus service websites, but very little information is provided otherwise. In three RTA districts, regional bus routes have multiple stops within the service area of the RTA. The P&B Hyannis–Provincetown is entirely within the CCRTA service area, Peter Pan's Springfield–Amherst route is entirely within PVRTA, and Peter Pan has two routes that make multiple stops in

## **Massachusetts Regional Bus Study**

BRTA communities. The Springfield–Albany, New York, route serves Lee, Lenox, and Pittsfield, as does a route from New York City that also serves Sheffield and Great Barrington on its way to Williamstown. These regional services could be included in RTA system maps and online trip planners. There may also be opportunities to coordinate the sales, marketing, and use of RTA monthly passes and of the discounted multi-ride tickets available from regional carriers.

### **7.3.3 Peer Comparisons**

A review of state department of transportation websites for the 48 states in the continental U.S. shows that data presented for fixed-route operations within states varies greatly. This is true for both public transit services and regional services provided by private carriers. Several states produce maps and guides that include information on regional bus and rail services. These include:

- California: Amtrak California operates an extensive network of feeder buses connecting with Amtrak service in the state, and a statewide schedule is available both in print and online. The schedule, however, does not include other bus services, such as those operated by Greyhound, which are not part of the Amtrak California feeder network.
- Maine: Maine maintains a website with links to all public transportation service in the state, including interstate bus. The information is organized by county.
- Michigan: A statewide map of intercity bus service is available online.
- Oregon: The State of Oregon produces an intercity bus and rail timetable, which contains schedules for Greyhound and other intercity bus services, as well as for Amtrak and state-supported rail services in Oregon and nearby parts of Washington State. The timetable is available both in print and as a PDF file. A statewide transit-trip-planning website is also available.
- Pennsylvania: The state bureau of public transportation provides an online statewide transit map displaying service by county, including intercity bus.
- Washington: The Travel Washington website features a statewide schematic map of intercity bus routes. Routes are color-coded either by private carrier or, in the case of state-supported routes, by regional travel theme.
- Wisconsin: A statewide map of intercity bus service is available online.
- New Mexico: A statewide transit guide is available in print and online.

## 7.4 Existing Passenger Characteristics

The CTPS survey of intrastate regional bus passengers cited above in the analysis of carrier marketing also elicited demographic data, rider comments, and additional information on riders' viewpoints concerning regional bus services. These broader survey findings are summarized in this section.

### 7.4.1 Reasons for Riding the Bus

Riders were asked to give one or more reasons for their choice of regional bus, and these responses are summarized in Table 35. "Convenience" and "avoiding driving" were the two primary reasons for most routes and carriers. On 10 routes that operate beyond a reasonable driving distance to rail service, at least 10% of respondents selected "only transportation available" as their primary reason for riding the bus. Routes where rail is not available are:

- Bloom Taunton–Boston
- DATTCO Fairhaven–New Bedford–Boston
- P&B Hyannis–Boston
- P&B Provincetown–Hyannis
- Peter Pan Woods Hole–Falmouth–Boston
- Peter Pan Newport–Fall River–Boston
- Peter Pan Springfield–Boston
- Peter Pan Hyannis–Providence
- Peter Pan Providence–Albany
- Peter Pan Springfield–Amherst–Greenfield

### 7.4.2 Passenger Demographics

Tables 36 through 38 summarize passenger demographics by carrier and route. As shown in Table 36, female passengers are in the majority for almost all services.

Table 37 summarizes passenger age by carrier and route. The 45-64 age group is the largest age group for all routes except three. On the Provincetown–Hyannis and Springfield–Amherst routes, the 19-24 age group is largest, with substantial ridership including hospitality industry workers and college students, respectively. The 25-34 age group is largest on the Providence–Albany route, a route that carries virtually no commuters. Conversely, on the several routes that operate only a few peak-period buses, up to 80% of the riders are in the 45-64 age range.

Average household income varies greatly by service, as shown in Table 38. Over half the responses from Coach Company's two routes, C&J's Newburyport route, the MVRTA's commuter bus route, and Yankee Line's route reported household incomes of \$100,000 or more. In contrast, 70% of

## **Massachusetts Regional Bus Study**

P&B's Hyannis–Provincetown riders and 50% of Peter Pan's Providence–Albany routes reported household income under \$30,000.

### **7.4.3 Passenger Ratings of Service**

In the survey, passengers were asked to score several aspects of regional bus service on a three-point scale, with “1” being good and “3” being poor; the responses are summarized in Table 39. The categories of “frequency of trips” and “comfort of seats” received the lowest ratings (the highest numbers) for most carriers. Respondents gave generally satisfactory ratings for reliability, driver courtesy, and cleanliness for most carriers. Satisfaction with travel time varied by route and carrier to a greater degree than did the other categories.

### **7.4.4 Passengers Preferences for Service Changes**

The survey also asked riders to indicate the one type of service improvement they would most want to see implemented. The most popular response was “more frequent service,” typically accounting for about half the responses, as shown in Table 40.

Over half the respondents on Peter Pan's Boston–Springfield and Springfield–Amherst routes asked for more express service. Peter Pan operates one-seat through-trips between Boston and Amherst Fridays and Sundays during the school-year. At other times, passengers must transfer in Springfield.

Respondents may desire direct Boston–Amherst service on more than two days, reflecting perhaps the fact that many students don't have classes all five weekdays. A high percentage of P&B Hyannis–Boston passengers also expressed a desire for more express trips.

Earlier morning departures were desired by Haverhill–Boston route passengers using The Coach Company, and Newport–Fall Rive–Boston passengers using Peter Pan. Later departures from Boston were sought by MVRTA riders to Andover/Lawrence/Methuen and Bloom's riders to West Bridgewater/Taunton.

Marketing and Passenger Demographics

**Table 35  
Reasons for Using Regional Bus**

Carrier	Route	Convenience	Avoid Parking	Speed/ Travel Time	Avoid Driving	Eco-Friendly	Low Ticket Price	Only Option
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	23.7%	18.0%	4.5%	33.3%	1.9%	7.1%	10.9%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	30.0%	11.8%	4.1%	33.5%	7.6%	9.4%	1.2%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	27.3%	18.2%	5.2%	37.7%	7.1%	3.9%	0.7%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown Groveland–Haverhill	29.4%	42.9%	2.0%	41.2%	5.9%	2.0%	2.0%
<b>DATCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	19.8%	10.6%	4.0%	37.4%	2.6%	8.4%	15.4%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	32.1%	3.8%	3.8%	22.6%	2.8%	31.1%	0.9%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	46.9%	19.8%	8.0%	45.7%	10.5%	18.5%	4.6%
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	39.2%	18.3%	2.6%	44.7%	7.31%	16.7%	13.6%

(Cont.)

Table 35 (Cont.)  
Reasons for Using Regional Bus

Carrier	Route	Convenience	Avoid Parking	Speed/ Travel Time	Avoid Driving	Eco-Friendly	Low Ticket Price	Only Option
	Hyannis–Provincetown	30.2%	0.0%	14.0%	4.7%	7.0%	11.6%	30.2%
Peter Pan	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	15.7%	11.4%	0.0%	27.1%	11.4%	20.0%	11.4%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	22.9%	2.1%	8.3%	27.1%	6.3%	8.3%	22.9%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	27.7%	2.1%	2.1%	19.2%	10.6%	10.6%	27.7%
	Boston–Providence	28.9%	11.5%	1.9%	17.3%	5.8%	21.2%	5.8%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester Commuter	16.7%	25.0%	0.0%	36.1%	8.3%	11.1%	2.8%
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	41.2%	0.0%	17.7%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%
	Hyannis–Providence	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.0%	4.0%	12.0%	16.0%
	Providence–Albany via Worcester, Springfield, Lee, Lenox, and Pittsfield	33.3%	0.0%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%	33.3%	22.2%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	31.3%	6.0%	3.0%	9.0%	3.0%	16.4%	31.3%
	Yankee	Boston–Concord–Acton	36.8%	5.3%	5.3%	26.3%	5.3%	10.5%

Source: CTPS survey

**Table 36**  
**Passenger Demographics: Gender**

<b>Carrier</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	41%	59%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	40%	60%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	47%	53%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown–Groveland–Haverhill	36%	64%
<b>DATTCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	45%	55%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	43%	57%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	37%	63%
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	46%	54%
	Hyannis–Provincetown	44%	56%

(Cont.)

**Table 36 (Cont.)  
Passenger Demographics: Gender**

<b>Carrier</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Peter Pan</b>	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	42%	58%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	59%	41%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	44%	56%
	Boston–Providence	46%	54%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester Commuter	43%	57%
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	27%	73%
	Hyannis–Providence	47%	53%
	Providence–Worcester–Springfield–Pittsfield–Albany	38%	62%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	39%	61%
<b>Yankee</b>	Boston–Concord–Acton	50%	50%

Source: CTPS survey

Marketing and Passenger Demographics

**Table 37**  
**Passenger Demographics: Age**

<b>Carrier</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>18 or Under</b>	<b>19-24</b>	<b>25-34</b>	<b>35-44</b>	<b>45-64</b>	<b>65 or Over</b>
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	0.0%	3.9%	11.5%	26.0%	52.9%	5.8%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	1.0%	6.7%	9.5%	12.4%	56.2%	14.3%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	0.0%	1.1%	14.0%	20.4%	60.2%	4.3%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown–Groveland–Haverhill	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	81.5%	14.8%
<b>DATTCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	2.0%	10.5%	19.0%	26.8%	39.9%	2.0%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	0.0%	3.1%	11.3%	22.6%	56.5%	6.5%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	0.0%	2.5%	8.1%	24.2%	63.4%	1.9%
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	0.8%	5.9%	8.9%	13.7%	52.3%	18.5%

(Cont.)

Table 37 (Cont.)  
 Passenger Demographics: Age

Carrier	Route	18 or Under	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65 or Over
Peter Pan	Hyannis–Provincetown	0.0%	55.6%	5.6%	2.8%	22.2%	13.9%
	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	0.0%	8.9%	13.3%	13.3%	46.7%	17.8%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	0.0%	2.9%	17.1%	22.9%	45.7%	11.4%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	2.9%	32.4%	8.8%	11.8%	35.3%	8.8%
	Boston–Providence	0.0%	2.7%	16.2%	13.5%	48.7%	18.9%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester Commuter	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	9.5%	76.2%	9.5%
	Boston– Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	27.3%	36.4%	0.0%
	Hyannis–Providence	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	63.2%	15.8%
	Providence–Worcester–Springfield–Pittsfield–Albany	0.0%	15.4%	46.2%	7.7%	23.1%	7.7%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	4.9%	34.2%	7.3%	22.0%	26.8%	4.9%
Yankee	Boston–Concord–Acton	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	80.0%	0.0%

Source: CTPS survey

Marketing and Passenger Demographics

**Table 38**  
**Passenger Demographics: Household Income**

Carrier	Route	Less than \$30K	\$30-49K	\$50-79K	\$80-99K	\$100K or More
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	4.3%	17.2%	29.0%	9.7%	39.8%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	3.3%	8.7%	18.5%	9.8%	58.7%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	1.2%	4.7%	19.8%	11.6%	62.8%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown–Groveland–Haverhill	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	8.7%	87.0%
<b>DATTCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	22.3%	19.2%	30.8%	10.0%	17.7%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	6.9%	10.3%	22.4%	6.9%	53.5%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	2.1%	8.5%	19.7%	21.1%	48.6%
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	11.3%	18.5%	21.1%	14.3%	34.8%
	Hyannis–Provincetown	69.7%	15.2%	12.1%	0.0%	3.0%

(Cont.)

Table 38 (Cont.)  
 Passenger Demographics: Household Income

Carrier	Route	Less than \$30K	\$30-49K	\$50-79K	\$80-99K	\$100K or More
Peter Pan	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	16.7%	14.3%	14.3%	21.4%	33.3%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	24.2%	15.2%	15.2%	18.2%	27.3%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	32.3%	32.3%	6.5%	6.5%	22.6%
	Boston–Providence	28.1%	25.0%	18.8%	3.1%	25.0%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester commuter	0.0%	5.9%	29.4%	23.5%	41.2%
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	30.0%	20.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	Hyannis–Providence	38.9%	5.6%	27.8%	22.2%	5.6%
	Providence–Worcester–Springfield–Pittsfield–Albany	50.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	40.0%	15.0%	17.5%	10.0%	17.5%
Yankee	Boston–Concord–Acton	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%

Source: CTPS survey

**Table 39**  
**Passenger Ratings of Service Characteristics**

Carrier	Route	Reliability	Courtesy of Drivers	Frequency of Trips	Travel Time	Clean- liness	Comfort of Seats
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham– Taunton	1.7	1.3	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.7
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.3
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	1.6	1.3	1.8	1.7	2.1	2.2
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown– Groveland–Haverhill	1.1	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.4	1.6
<b>DATCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.7
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	1.1	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.3
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston– Plymouth	1.4	1.2	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.8
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne– Hyannis	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.7

(Cont.)

Table 39 (Cont.)  
 Passenger Ratings of Service Characteristics

Carrier	Route	Reliability	Courtesy of Drivers	Frequency of Trips	Travel Time	Cleanliness	Comfort of Seats
Peter Pan	Hyannis–Provincetown	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.2	1.2	1.4
	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	1.2	1.1	1.9	1.2	1.6	1.6
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.5
	Boston–Providence	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Worcester–Boston, Flutie Pass Commuter	1.4	1.1	2.7	1.9	1.7	1.6
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.2
	Hyannis–Providence	1.2	1.1	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.3
	Providence–Worcester–Springfield–Pittsfield–Albany	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.6
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5
Yankee	Boston–Concord–Acton	1.0	1.0	2.1	1.3	1.0	1.1

KEY: 1 = Good; 3 = Poor  
 Source: CTPS survey

Marketing and Passenger Demographics

**Table 40**  
**Passenger Preferences for Changes to Service**

<b>Carrier</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Earlier Service</b>	<b>Later Service</b>	<b>More Frequent</b>	<b>More Express</b>	<b>Other Service</b>
<b>Bloom</b>	Boston–West Bridgewater–Raynham–Taunton	4.7%	23.3%	51.2%	11.6%	9.3%
<b>C&amp;J</b>	Boston–Newburyport	7.0%	11.3%	47.9%	23.9%	9.9%
<b>Coach Company</b>	Boston–Peabody–Newburyport	15.6%	18.2%	50.7%	10.4%	5.2%
	Boston–Topsfield–Boxford–Georgetown–Groveland–Haverhill	26.1%	13.0%	47.8%	8.7%	4.4%
<b>DATTCO</b>	Boston–Taunton–New Bedford–Fairhaven	9.6%	19.9%	52.2%	16.2%	2.2%
<b>MVRTA</b>	Boston–Andover–Lawrence–Methuen	10.4%	25.0%	45.8%	14.6%	4.2%
<b>P&amp;B</b>	Boston–Rockland–Marshfield–Kingston–Plymouth	3.0%	9.1%	52.3%	30.3%	5.3%
	Boston–Rockland–Plymouth–Bourne–Hyannis	4.3%	9.7%	39.2%	38.4%	8.5%

(Cont.)

Table 40 (Cont.)  
 Passenger Preferences for Changes to Service

Carrier	Route	Earlier Service	Later Service	More Frequent	More Express	Other Service
Peter Pan	Hyannis–Provincetown	9.7%	16.1%	71.0%	3.2%	0.0%
	Boston–Bourne–Falmouth–Woods Hole	6.1%	24.2%	54.6%	9.1%	6.1%
	Boston–Fall River–Newport	23.3%	6.7%	56.7%	3.3%	10.0%
	Boston–Framingham–Worcester–Springfield	4.4%	8.7%	26.1%	56.5%	4.4%
	Boston–Providence	3.9%	15.4%	69.2%	7.7%	3.9%
	Boston–Flutie Pass–Worcester commuter	9.1%	4.6%	77.3%	0.0%	9.1%
	Boston–Worcester (intrastate passengers on Hartford bus)	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%
	Hyannis–Providence	7.1%	7.1%	50.0%	14.3%	21.4%
	Providence–Worcester–Springfield–Pittsfield–Albany	12.5%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	12.5%
	Springfield–Amherst (includes one trip to Greenfield)	8.6%	11.4%	25.7%	51.4%	2.9%
Yankee	Boston–Concord–Acton	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: CTPS survey