

# ***LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD COMMUTER'S COUNCIL*** **2003 LIRR REPORT CARD**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Since 1987, the Long Island Rail Road Commuter's Council (LIRRCC)<sup>1</sup> has undertaken an annual survey of Long Island Rail Road riders to rate Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) train service and station conditions, and gauge rider perceptions, opinions and concerns about specific topics. The result is a riders' "report card" on LIRR performance and feedback on railroad accomplishments, issues of concern and suggestions for improvement.

This year, 1278 riders from the eleven branches of the LIRR participated. More men (55%) are represented than women (45%). Almost two thirds of the riders are between the ages of 30-49 (63%). Seventeen percent are between the ages of 50-59 and 14 percent are between the ages of 20-29. The sample of riders this year is slightly older than the sample of riders in 2002.<sup>2</sup>

Surveys were conducted by LIRRCC members on-board peak-period, peak-direction trains between July 7, and August 8, 2003.<sup>3</sup> The sample represents roughly one percent of the total fall 2002 LIRR ridership. To ensure that the sample size for each branch is proportional to the overall LIRR ridership, branch responses were weighted in the analysis of the systemwide results.

As was done in previous years, survey respondents were asked to provide basic demographic information; grade the railroad on 48 performance indicators<sup>4</sup> on a scale from "A" to "F" relating to train and station conditions, service, schedules and personnel; and to rank five service improvements in order of importance. Riders were asked to identify aspects of the railroad they like the best, the least and would most like to see improved. The report card survey included four special topic questions about whether riders would be interested in using peak hour shuttle bus services to LIRR stations.

## **SYSTEMWIDE RESULTS 2003**

Long Island Rail Road riders feel that the LIRR has declined since last year. One key factor, which is likely to have influenced riders' dissatisfaction in 2003, is the MTA's fare increase. Many riders may have expected an increase in service along with the higher ticket prices and evaluated LIRR service and conditions more critically as a result.

This year, riders assigned good grades (B- and B) to a quarter of the 48 performance indicators compared to a third in 2002. The majority of the grades continue to reflect average levels of satisfaction (C and C+).

---

<sup>1</sup> The New York State Legislature created the Long Island Rail Road Commuter's Council (LIRRCC) in 1981 to represent the interests of MTA Long Island Rail Road riders. The Governor appoints the 12 volunteer members upon the recommendation of the County Executives of Nassau and Suffolk and the Borough Presidents of Brooklyn and Queens. The Council is an affiliate of the Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee to the MTA (PCAC). For more information about us, visit our website: [www.pcac.org](http://www.pcac.org).

<sup>2</sup> In 2002, 57 percent of the rider sample were between 30-49, 22 percent were between 20-29 and 17 percent were between 50-59. These numbers differ slightly from what was reported in the 2002 Report.

<sup>3</sup> 95 surveys were conducted in early September.

<sup>4</sup> In 2002, home station maintenance was not evaluated, resulting in 47 indicators.

For overall service, riders assigned the same grade (C+) as last year, but the numerical score declined significantly by 7 percent.

Riders' perception tends to be negative despite the Rail Road's past year of record on-time performance. Riders who think service has gotten better (33%) decreased by 12 percent over 2002, while those who think service has gotten worse (21%) increased by 11 percent. Those who think no change has occurred (46%) increased by 1 percent over last year.

In 2003, actual scores rose significantly in 9 categories and declined significantly in 13 categories. These results strongly contrast with last year's scores, where scores rose significantly in 27 categories and declined in three. Grades improved in only two categories in 2003 and declined in ten categories. In 2002, grades improved in 15 categories and declined in only one category.

The three highest numerical scores (grade B) in the 2003 survey were given to morning and evening train crews and security at Penn Station. While the numerical scores for morning and evening train crews remain the highest scores this year and continue the trend of placing one of the two indicators in the top position since 1994<sup>5</sup>, the scores are not as high as last year. These findings represent a small decrease in rider satisfaction with morning and evening train crews. The decrease in rider satisfaction with morning train crews, however, is statistically significant.

This year, riders feel security at Penn Station has improved and have placed it, as they did in 2001, in the third highest scoring category. Morning train on-time performance slipped out of the top three highest scoring categories in 2003.

Riders were the most dissatisfied with restroom and waiting area cleanliness. Riders gave the lowest mark to the Flatbush Avenue Terminal restroom (D+), which represents a significant decline (-17%) over 2002. Riders considered the Flatbush Avenue Terminal restroom to have worsened-- from third place in 2002 to first place in 2003. On-board restroom conditions moved to second place in 2003 from first place in 2002.

Riders were also very dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the Flatbush Avenue Terminal waiting area. The 2003 numerical score represents a significant decline from 2002 (-21%). The numerical score is also the lowest the category has received over the past four years.

### **Systemwide Improvement**<sup>6</sup>

The following performance indicators showed statistically significant improvement in 2003:

- **Seating Availability.** While the overall grades for morning and evening seating availability did not change from last year (B-and C, respectively), there was a significant change in numerical score (+8% for morning and +2% for evening). This positive trend likely reflects the LIRR's new M7 trains which have added to the number of trains in revenue service this year.
- **Security.** In 2003, riders feel more secure on-board trains (B-, up 2%); in Penn (B-, up 4%), Jamaica (C+, up 4%), Flatbush Avenue Terminal (C+, up 7%) in their home stations (C+, up 5%), and in station parking lots (C, up 8%). While the only grade change is the Flatbush Avenue Terminal (up from a C in 2002), the 2002-03 percent change in numerical scores for all these indicators is significant. Riders' improved sense of security is likely due to a more

---

<sup>5</sup> With the exception of the 2000 Report Card.

<sup>6</sup> Only changes determined through the statistical analysis described in footnote 3 are reported as better. Grade changes, which are determined not statistically significant, are not discussed because there is no valid way to prove that these grade changes did not occur solely by chance.

visible police presence at stations as well as a reduction in rider anxiety since the events of September 11.

- **Home Station Ticket Selling Hours.** Home station ticket selling hours improved from a C last year to a C+ (+8%) in 2003. While the hours of station ticket offices have not increased since 2002, riders are likely reacting to greater numbers of station ticket vending machines (TVMS) and feeling more comfortable using them.

### **Systemwide Decline**<sup>7</sup>

The following performance indicators showed statistically significant decline in 2003:

- **Evening On-Time Performance.** Despite the Rail Road's best on-time performance record this year, riders gave evening on-time performance a lower grade (C+) than in 2002 (B-). The 2003 grade represents a significant 12 percent drop in numerical score over last year.
- **Announcements.** Announcements on-board trains and at Penn Station also declined significantly. In 2003, riders gave a C+ to both morning and evening on-board announcements. This represents a drop in grade for morning on-board announcements over 2002 (B-). Riders' numerical scores for announcements on-board morning trains dropped by 5 percent and by 8 percent for evening trains. While riders gave the same grades in 2003 as last year for morning and evening announcements at Penn Station (B-), the numerical scores declined significantly (down 6% for both).
- **Cleanliness.** Riders feel that cleanliness has declined significantly this year on-board trains (C, down 8%), in the Jamaica Station waiting area (C, down 6%), and in the Flatbush Avenue Terminal waiting area (C-, down 21%) and restroom (D+, down 17%). Grades dropped this year for cleanliness on-board trains from a C+ in 2002 and in the Flatbush Avenue Terminal waiting area and restroom from a C and C- in 2002, respectively. Lower levels of cleanliness at Jamaica Station and at the Flatbush Avenue Terminal may be due to the ongoing construction.
- **Management Performance.** Management performance also declined in 2003, likely due to riders' dissatisfaction with higher ticket prices. Riders' grade for management performance dropped to a C in 2003 from a C+ in 2002. The numerical score dropped significantly by 22 percent.
- **Escalator Reliability.** Riders feel less confident about escalator reliability this year (C) compared to last year (C+). This represents a significant 14 percent drop in numerical score.

---

<sup>7</sup> Only changes determined through the statistical analysis described in footnote 3 are reported as worse. Grade changes which are determined not statistically significant are not discussed because there is no valid way to prove that these grade changes did not occur solely by chance.

## **BRANCH RESULTS 2003**

This year's results for the question regarding perception of change on the LIRR show a mix of trends when analyzed by branch. On seven of the eleven branches, a higher percentage of riders feel that no change in service is occurring.

The most notable change this year occurred on the Port Jefferson branch, where the percentage of riders who feel service has stayed the same increased by 21 percent over last year. In 2002, Port Jefferson branch riders felt the most satisfied of all the branches- 75 percent of the riders felt service was improving.

Riders are most satisfied this year on the Oyster Bay, Hempstead, and West Hempstead branches, with a higher percentage of riders feeling that service is getting better. Riders on the Ronkonkoma branch were the most dissatisfied in 2003, with a higher percentage of riders stating that service is getting worse. The percentage of satisfied Ronkonkoma riders declined by 30 percent between 2002 and 2003.

**Overall Service.** In 2003, riders assigned their highest grades (B-) for overall service to three branches: Port Washington, Long Beach and Far Rockaway. The 2003 grades on the Port Washington, Long Beach and Far Rockaway branches remained the same as in 2002.

In 2002, riders assigned the Babylon Branch one of the highest grades for overall service. In 2003, the Babylon branch grade slipped to a C+, down from the B- it received last year. The branch numerical score declined by seven percent this year and represents a statistically significant decline.

In 2003, riders assigned their lowest grade (C-) for overall service to the Ronkonkoma branch. This decline in grade (from a C in 2002) and numerical score (-16%) is statistically significant. Overall service satisfaction on the Montauk branch increased this year to a C+ (up from a C in 2002), but with no significant increase in score. All other branches received a C+, the same grade as in 2002.

**On-Time Performance.** Morning and evening on-time performance show mixed results by branch this year. In 2003, morning on-time performance grades held steady in the B range on seven branches, declined on three (Long Beach, Port Jefferson and Ronkonkoma) and rose on one (Montauk). Riders assigned the lowest morning on-time performance grade to the Ronkonkoma branch (C+). Montauk was the only branch to improve in grade to a B this year from a B- in 2002.

Evening on-time performance grades did not fair as well: grades declined on seven branches, held steady on four and rose on one. Riders felt that evening on-time performance declined on the Babylon (C+), Oyster Bay (C+), Port Jefferson (C+) and Ronkonkoma (C) branches. The only grade increase this year occurred on the West Hempstead branch (B-) up from a C+ in 2002.

Riders gave their highest grades (B+) for morning on-time performance to the Port Washington branch. Lowest grades (C+) went to evening on-time performance on the Ronkonkoma branch.

**Seating Availability.** Riders gave morning seat availability improved marks on six branches this year, which is a positive indication of the Rail Road's efforts to improve seat availability along with the introduction of the new M7 cars. Riders assigned above average scores (in the B range) on all branches except on the Ronkonkoma branch (C+). While Ronkonkoma riders were the least pleased with morning seat availability, they saw improvement over 2002 (C). Riders on the Montauk branch were the most pleased with morning seat availability (B+).

Evening seat availability was less favorable among individual branches, although riders felt conditions improved on four branches – West Hempstead, Far Rockaway, Long Beach and Ronkonkoma. West Hempstead riders were the most positive (B-). Ronkonkoma riders were the least satisfied (C-).

**Train Crews.** Train crews, once again, received good marks from riders on all branches. This year, train crews received particularly high marks (B+) from riders in the morning on the Far Rockaway, Long Beach, Oyster Bay and Port Washington branches. High marks in the evening were given to train crews on the Long Beach (A+), Far Rockaway (B+) and Oyster Bay (B+) branches. Train crew grades most notably declined in 2003 on the West Hempstead branch in the morning to a B (from a B+ in 2002) and in the evening to a B- (from B+ in 2002).

**Announcements.** Riders assigned the highest grades to Penn Station announcements and the lowest grades to announcements at their home stations. Grades for Penn Station were B and B- across the branches, with one exception: Ronkonkoma riders felt evening announcements at Penn Station were lower (C+). Grades for home station announcements were C+, C and C- across the branches.

On-board announcements received above average marks (in the B range) from riders on five branches in the morning and three in the evening. Riders on the West Hempstead branch gave the highest grade of all the branches to morning on-board announcements (B). Riders on the Far Rockaway, Long Beach and Port Washington branches assigned a B- to both morning and evening on-board announcements. Riders gave the lowest grades (C) to morning and evening announcements on the Ronkonkoma branch.

**On-Board Cleanliness.** Riders saw a decline in on-board cleanliness on six branches and an improvement on two branches. Riders gave the highest grades to train cleanliness on the Oyster Bay (B), Montauk (B-) and West Hempstead (B-) branches. Riders assigned the lowest grades to train cleanliness on the Ronkonkoma (D), Far Rockaway (D+) and Huntington (D+) branches.

**Restrooms and Wait Areas.** Riders identified on-board restrooms as a problem on all but two branches – Montauk and West Hempstead. Riders on nine of the branches assigned a range of below average grades (D, D+ and C-) to on-board restrooms. On-board restrooms on the Montauk and West Hempstead branches received average grades of C, which represent improvements over grades last year of C- and D, respectively.

Restrooms at Jamaica Station and Flatbush Avenue Terminal also received poor grades from riders. Riders on six branches assigned below average grades (D+ and C-) to Jamaica Station restrooms. Riders on nine branches gave grades of D, D+ and C- to Flatbush Avenue Terminal restrooms.

Riders across the branches gave above average grades to the wait area at Penn Station: Babylon, Port Jefferson and Ronkonkoma riders, in particular, assigned higher grades than in 2002. The wait areas at Jamaica Station and Flatbush Avenue Terminal generally received lower grades from riders.

**Management Performance.** Riders were less pleased with management performance this year. Riders on four branches felt management performance was below average (C-) and three branches felt performance was adequate (C). Ronkonkoma branch riders were the least pleased (D+), while Far Rockaway branch riders were the most satisfied (B). Lower grades for this performance indicator may be linked to rider dissatisfaction with the May 2003 fare increase.

**Security.** Riders on the Montauk branch saw a slight improvement in security at home stations (C) and parking lots (C) this year over last year (D+ for both indicators). Far Rockaway, Ronkonkoma and West Hempstead riders felt parking security was below average (C-).

Hempstead and Long Beach riders felt Flatbush Avenue Terminal security declined to C and C-, respectively, compared to a B- in 2003.

**Home Station Access.** Home station building and ticket selling hours received average grades from riders. Home station building hours received low grades from riders on the Oyster Bay (D+) and Montauk (D+) branches and average grades on the Babylon (C), Far Rockaway (C), Port Jefferson (C) and West Hempstead (C) branches. Grades for ticket selling hours were lowest, although slightly improved over 2002, on the Montauk (C-) and West Hempstead (C-) branches, followed by the Far Rockaway (C) and Oyster Bay (C) branches. Riders on the Port Washington branch felt ticket selling hours improved this year (B-), up from a C in 2002.

Riders gave the highest grades to home station maintenance, not evaluated in 2002, on the Port Washington (B), Hempstead (B-), Long Beach (B-) and Huntington (B-) branches. Montauk branch riders assigned the lowest grade (C-).

**Train Service.** Train service is an issue for riders on certain branches. Riders gave the highest grades for morning peak hour service on the Far Rockaway (B), Long Beach (B) and Port Washington branches (B). Riders assigned an average grade (C) to evening peak hour service on the Oyster Bay and Ronkonkoma branches.

Riders rated midday service on the Long Beach branch the highest (B) and midday service on the Oyster Bay, Ronkonkoma and West Hempstead branches the lowest (C-).

Riders were satisfied with the weekend service on the Long Beach and Port Washington branches (B-), but felt weekend service on the Oyster Bay and West Hempstead branches was below average (C-). Riders were also dissatisfied with late night service on the Oyster Bay (D+) and West Hempstead (D+) branches.

## **DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS**

Systemwide, riders assigned the most important priority to both better on-time performance and more frequent peak and off-peak service among a list of five service improvements.<sup>8</sup> Better on-time performance received a slightly higher percentage (42%) than more frequent peak and off-peak service (37%). This year's top priorities represent a combination of the priorities identified by riders in 2001 and 2002.

Consistent with 2001 and 2002, riders in 2003 identified the need for more available seats as the second most important priority. Better air conditioning was the third most important priority. No priority was designated for fourth place since two improvements were chosen for first place this year. Home station security remained the lowest priority for two years in a row.

Branch service improvement priority lists were in keeping with the systemwide results. 2003 riders on seven branches listed more frequent peak and off-peak service as a top priority, compared to eight in 2002. Riders also listed better on-time performance as a top priority on five branches --Babylon, Long Beach, Huntington, Port Washington and Ronkonkoma -- compared to three branches last year.

This year, two branches -- Long Beach and Port Washington --selected two improvements for top priority. Long Beach riders listed better on-time performance and more frequent peak and off-peak service as number one priorities. Port Washington riders felt that better on-time performance and more available seats are number one priorities.

---

<sup>8</sup> Riders were asked to determine priorities among a list of five service improvements: better on-time performance, more available seats, better air conditioning, more frequent peak and off-peak service and home station security.

Systemwide, riders' written comments also identified increased frequency of peak and off-peak service (19%) as the most wanted aspect of service to be improved, followed by cleanliness (11%) on-board trains, in station waiting areas and restrooms. On-time performance (10%) was the third most wanted improvement. Seating availability was sixth in the list of most wanted improvements, despite riders' assigning it a second priority service improvement.

By branch, riders identified other most wanted improvements, such as new trains (Babylon, Long Beach and Ronkonkoma branches), a one-seat ride to Penn Station (Hempstead, Oyster Bay and West Hempstead branches), seating availability (Montauk and Port Washington branches) and better announcements (Port Jefferson branch).

## **SPECIAL TOPIC: PEAK HOUR SHUTTLE BUS SERVICES**

In 2003, riders were asked a series of questions about their likely use of shuttle bus services to railroad stations during peak travel times. Despite the benefits of shuttle bus services for reducing parking demand at railroad stations, almost two thirds (63%) of the riders surveyed systemwide said they were not at all likely to use a shuttle bus service. Almost a quarter (24%) of the riders indicated that they would be likely or very likely to use a shuttle bus and another 14 percent said they don't know.

Riders' interest by branch in using morning or evening peak hour shuttle bus services mirrors the results systemwide: about two thirds of riders say they are not at all likely to use a shuttle bus and a quarter are likely or very likely. Riders on the Babylon (28%), Far Rockaway (26%) and Long Beach (26%) branches indicated a higher likelihood of using a shuttle bus to the rail station. The Far Rockaway branch also had the highest percentage of riders (23%) who are unsure if they would use a shuttle bus service. Riders on the Oyster Bay branch (79%), Hempstead (76%), Port Jefferson (74%) and West Hempstead (70%) branches had the lowest interest.

Systemwide, many riders indicated they were not likely to use shuttle bus services because shuttle buses lack flexibility (43%). Riders were also concerned about not being able to get home if they took a return train prior to or after the peak period (36%). Length of travel on a shuttle bus (26%) and inconvenient bus stops, not close to home (21%), were also of concern. Bus service cost and negative associations were of lesser concern.

By branch, riders' top reason for not wanting to use a shuttle bus service was the same as systemwide: lack of flexibility. Riders on seven branches felt they would be stuck at the station if they decided to return home before or after the peak period. Riders on four branches – West Hempstead, Hempstead, Long Beach and Far Rockaway - were concerned about the length of travel time to the station.

The last question asked riders what would encourage them to use a shuttle bus service to the railroad. Systemwide, riders stated in almost half of their written responses that nothing would get them to take a shuttle bus service (48%).

Riders interested in taking a shuttle bus feel that cost is a factor (17%), with just over a third stating that the service would need to be free. This finding shows that cost is important among riders interested in using a shuttle bus service, but is not a primary concern among riders who are not interested in using the service. Other riders suggested a discount on the monthly LIRR ticket for taking the shuttle bus. Other factors which contribute to riders interest in using a shuttle bus is the convenience of the stop location (13%), service frequency (8%), and coordination with train arrival and departure times (5%).

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of the 2003 Report Card survey clearly show that riders feel conditions have declined since last year on the Long Island Rail Road.

One key factor, which is likely to have influenced riders' dissatisfaction in 2003, is the MTA's fare increase. Many riders may have expected service improvements to accompany higher ticket prices and evaluated LIRR service and conditions more critically as a result.

On a positive note, LIRR riders saw improvements this year in seating availability, security and home station ticket selling hours. Riders' higher marks for morning and evening seating availability clearly recognize the initial benefits of the Rail Road's new M7 fleet. Riders' assessment is likely to continue to improve as the full order of 678 M7 cars is phased in over the next four years.

In 2003, riders gave higher marks for security systemwide: on-board trains, in Penn Station, at Jamaica Station, Flatbush Avenue Terminal, at home stations and in parking lots. Security at Penn Station was given the third highest grade this year. This is a noted improvement over 2002, when riders' felt more insecure, particularly on-board trains, at Jamaica Station and at home stations.

Riders also noted improvement in home station ticket selling hours. This is likely due to riders' growing ease in using the ticket vending machines (TVMs). The Rail Road's introduction of the new TVMs over the past two years has been a benefit for riders.

In 2003, LIRR riders gave significantly lower marks in several areas: evening on-time performance; morning train crews; announcements on-board and at Penn Station; cleanliness on board, in the waiting areas at Jamaica Station and Flatbush Avenue Terminal and in the restroom at Flatbush Avenue; management performance; and escalator reliability. While riders' lower marks for these fundamental services may reflect higher expectations for service provision associated with paying more, they also demonstrate service concerns.

Evening on-time performance and morning train crews are issues for riders. Since the last report card, LIRR's overall (twenty-four hour, seven days a week) on-time performance for most months has been between 93 and 95 percent. Riders clearly feel that evening on-time performance has slipped both in grade and in numerical significance. Satisfaction with morning train crews is a slightly less important issue for riders, with a significant decline in numerical score, but not in grade.

Announcements on-board trains and at Penn Station are also of particular concern to riders in 2003. Riders want to be well informed about the nature and status of service delays. Riders want reassurance from front line personnel that the Rail Road is aware of and actively working to solve the problem at hand.

As was noted in the Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee's (PCAC) November 2003 report, *Best Foot Forward: Training Front Line Personnel to Provide Quality Customer Service*, LIRR ticket clerks, station agents and conductors often lack up-to-the-minute train service information due to inadequate and aging telecommunication technology. Rail Road personnel can also get caught up in solving a particular problem and forget to provide updates to front line personnel or customers.

Cleanliness on-board trains and in station waiting areas and restrooms continues to be an issue this year. Rider dissatisfaction with cleanliness of the Flatbush Avenue restroom increased from the third lowest in 2002 to the worst scoring category in 2003. While on-board cleanliness improved insignificantly over last year, the cleanliness of the Flatbush Avenue waiting area moved significantly into third worst place. Cleanliness must remain a priority for the LIRR in

the waiting room and restrooms during construction at Jamaica Station and the Flatbush Avenue Terminal.

Escalator reliability emerged as a concern to riders in 2003. Finally, riders gave a significantly lower mark for LIRR management performance. The rating on this indicator is likely connected to the higher ticket prices.

Systemwide, riders' written comments conveyed dissatisfaction with frequency of service, on-time performance and seat availability. Other riders were dissatisfied with and wanted to see improvements to train and station cleanliness, better seating and more comfortable temperatures. Another group of riders were dissatisfied with the new ticket prices and wanted to see more new trains and improvements at Penn Station.

Riders' dissatisfaction with service frequency and their desire to have more frequent peak and off-peak service continues to be an issue this year as it has been in the past. In 2003, riders indicated their preference for more frequent service to be a top ranked priority for service improvement on seven of the eleven branches. More frequent service was number one in the list of most wanted improvements requested by riders systemwide. Riders on the Port Jefferson and Huntington branches are particularly vocal on this issue.

In a number of instances, the LIRR cannot improve service frequency without major capital improvements. The LIRR depends on local communities for approval of these projects, and riders represent only a small fraction of the residents. LIRR riders make up a small constituency of these local communities. Riders need to be more proactive in advocating for local community support for LIRR service improvement projects, such as the Port Jefferson Branch Yard.

This is a continuing problem. In the LIRRCC's 2002 Report Card survey, riders identified the need to improve LIRR communication sixth in the list of most wanted systemwide improvements. Riders also gave the Rail Road a C for communication to riders about capital project planning and a C+ for service improvement plans. Riders feel the Rail Road needs to strengthen its communication to riders about these issues.

While the majority of LIRR riders are not in favor of the expansion of shuttle bus services at this time, the LIRR should reevaluate the potential for these services in the future as station parking demand increases.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations address key issues raised by riders in the LIRRCC's 2003 Report Card survey: announcements and customer information, evening on-time performance, cleanliness, and customer communication and frequency of service. The following are based upon the findings of the 2003 Report Card survey as well as recent PCAC report recommendations.<sup>9</sup>

- **Prioritize Agency Improvements in Communication Technology for the Provision of Train Service Information to Front Line Personnel.** The Rail Road should place a priority on upgrading its information technology, such as computer on-line capabilities, branch line radio reception and public address systems, for front line personnel in stations,

---

<sup>9</sup> Refer to PCAC reports: *Best Foot Forward: Training Front Line Personnel to Provide Quality Customer Service* (November 2003).

on-board trains, in central transportation operations and telephone information agents. The LIRR should also develop a schedule for systemwide implementation.

- **Provide All Front Line Personnel with Text Messaging Pagers to Ensure Communication Systems Back-up.** The LIRR should install text messaging pagers in all station ticket offices to ensure back up communication options during an emergency. Text messaging pagers should also be provided to conductors and other personnel as deemed necessary for this purpose.
- **Create Special Communication “Go Teams” to Facilitate Communication to Customers in Emergencies.** Develop special teams of personnel -- Go Teams -- whose principal focus in an emergency is communicating with the public and informing them of available options. A similar recommendation was made recently to NJ TRANSIT after experiencing a train derailment.
- **Require More Frequent On-Board and Station Announcements.** The LIRR should require conductors, ticket sellers and station agents to make more frequent and informed announcements to riders about the status of regular service and service delays, current conditions and alternate travel options, if necessary. Providing this type of information reassures riders that the Rail Road is focused on the problem at hand, provides riders the ability to make more informed choices and improves customer relations.
- **Review Ways to Improve Evening On-Time Performance.** While the Rail Road has set on-time performance records this year, evening on-time performance remains a concern of riders.
- **Review Cleanliness Schedules to Determine Ways to Improve Maintenance Levels.** The LIRR should review current processes and schedules for cleaning on-board, train restrooms, and station wait areas and restrooms.
- **Create a More Proactive Educational Campaign to Inform Riders About and Elicit Support for LIRR Plans to Improve the Frequency of Service.** The LIRR should develop new outlets to educate riders about its current capital plans to improve the frequency of service. The agency should also actively promote ways riders can advocate and support LIRR efforts on the local, state and federal levels.

## SELECTED TABLES

**Table 1. 2003 Results for Performance Indicators, Systemwide<sup>10</sup>**

INDICATOR	2000	2001	2002	2003
Overall Service	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C+ ↓
On-Time Performance AM	B- ↑	B-	B ↑	B
On-Time Performance PM	C+ ↑	C+ ↓	B- ↑	C+ ↓
Seating Availability AM	B- ↑	C+ ↓	B- ↑	B- ↑
Seating Availability PM	C+ ↑	C-	C ↑	C ↑
Schedule Adequacy AM	B- ↑	C+ ↓	B- ↑	B-
Schedule Adequacy PM	C+ ↑	C+ ↓	C+ ↑	C+
Train Crews AM	B ↑	B ↓	B ↑	B ↓
Train Crews PM	B ↑	B- ↓	B ↑	B
Announcements:				
On-Board AM	C+ ↑	C+	B-	C+ ↓
On-Board PM	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C+ ↓
Penn Sta. AM	NA	B-	B-	B- ↓
Penn Sta. PM	B-	B-	B- ↑	B- ↓
Jamaica Sta. AM	B- ↑	C+	C+	C+
Jamaica Sta. PM	C+ ↑	C+	C+	C+
Flatbush Av. AM	NA	C+	C+	C+
Flatbush Av. PM	B-	C+	C+	C
Home Sta. AM	C+ ↑	C ↓	C ↑	C
Home Sta. PM	C+ ↑	C ↓	C	C
Cleanliness:				
On-Board	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C ↓
On-Board Restroom	C ↑	D+	D+	D+
Home Sta. Wait Area	B- ↑	B-	B- ↑	B-
Home Sta. Restroom	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C+
Penn Sta. Wait Area	B-	B- ↓	B-	B-
Penn Sta. Restroom	C+	C	C	C
Jamaica Sta. Wait Area	C+ ↑	C	C	C ↓
Jamaica Sta. Restroom	C ↑	C- ↓	C-	C-
Flatbush Av. Wait Area	C	C- ↓	C ↑	C- ↓
Flatbush Av. Restroom	C- ↑	D+ ↓	C- ↑	D+ ↓
Management Performance	C+ ↑	C ↓	C+ ↑	C ↓
Escalator Reliability	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C ↓
Winter Heating	C+ ↑	C+	B- ↑	C+
Summer A/C	C ↑	C	C+ ↑	C+
Seat Condition	C+ ↑	C	C+ ↑	C
Security:				
On-Board	B-	B- ↓	B- ↓	B- ↑
Penn Sta.	B-	B- ↑	B-	B- ↑
Jamaica Sta.	C+	C+ ↑	C+ ↓	C+ ↑
Flatbush Av.	C+	C+	C	C+ ↑
Home Sta.	B-	C+ ↓	C+ ↓	C+ ↑
Parking	C+ ↑	C ↓	C	C ↑
Home Sta. Hours	C+ ↑	C-	C	C
Home Sta. Ticket-Selling Hours	C+ ↑	C ↓	C	C+ ↑
Home Sta. Maintenance	C+ ↑	C+ ↓	N/A <sup>11</sup>	B-
Peak-Hour Service AM	C+ ↑	B- ↑	B- ↑	B-
Peak-Hour Service PM	C ↑	C+ ↑	C+ ↑	C+
Midday Service	C+ ↑	C+	C+ ↑	C+
Late-Night Service	C ↑	C	C ↑	C
Weekend Service	C+ ↑	C	C+ ↑	C+

**Table 2. 2003 Numerical Scores for Performance Indicators, Systemwide<sup>12</sup>**

<sup>10</sup> The arrow symbol indicates that a statistically significant change has occurred since the previous year and denotes the direction of the change. Grades with numerical scores that represent statistically significant changes in 2002 are further indicated in bold.

<sup>11</sup> Home station maintenance was not evaluated in 2002.

<sup>12</sup> Numerical scores are the mean (average) values calculated for each indicator. The arrow symbol indicates that a statistically significant change has occurred since the previous year and denotes the direction of the change. Numerical scores that represent statistically significant changes in 2002 are further indicated in bold.

INDICATOR	2000	2001	2002	2003	% CHANGE (2002-03)
Overall Service	6.65 ↑	6.58	7.37 ↑	<b>6.87 ↓</b>	<b>-7%</b>
On-Time Performance AM	8.18 ↑	8.10	8.81 ↑	8.56	-3%
On-Time Performance PM	7.02 ↑	6.76 ↓	8.05 ↑	<b>7.08 ↓</b>	<b>-12%</b>
Seating Availability AM	7.76 ↑	7.46 ↓	7.77 ↑	<b>8.43 ↑</b>	<b>+8%</b>
Seating Availability PM	6.28 ↑	5.33	6.30 ↑	<b>6.45 ↑</b>	<b>+2%</b>
Schedule Adequacy AM	7.71 ↑	7.39 ↓	7.77 ↑	7.89	+2%
Schedule Adequacy PM	7.22 ↑	6.77 ↓	7.28 ↑	7.17	-2%
Train Crews AM	9.04 ↑	8.75 ↓	9.25 ↑	<b>9.04 ↓</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Train Crews PM	8.62 ↑	8.41 ↓	8.84 ↑	8.76	-1%
Announcements:					
On-Board AM	7.47 ↑	7.42	7.65	<b>7.27 ↓</b>	<b>-5%</b>
On-Board PM	7.14 ↑	7.02	7.41 ↑	<b>6.81 ↓</b>	<b>-8%</b>
Penn Sta. AM	NA	8.11	8.48	<b>8.01 ↓</b>	<b>-6%</b>
Penn Sta. PM	7.86	7.80	8.36 ↑	<b>7.83 ↓</b>	<b>-6%</b>
Jamaica Sta. AM	7.59 ↑	7.33	7.37	7.30	-1%
Jamaica Sta. PM	7.39 ↑	7.23	7.41	7.11	-4%
Flatbush Av. AM	NA	6.74	6.92	6.68	-3%
Flatbush Av. PM	7.33	6.53	6.85	6.42	-6%
Home Sta. AM	6.85 ↑	5.81 ↓	6.13 ↑	6.02	-2%
Home Sta. PM	6.99 ↑	5.98 ↓	6.26	6.06	-3%
Cleanliness:					
On-Board	6.71 ↑	6.52	6.86 ↑	<b>6.29 ↓</b>	<b>-8%</b>
On-Board Restroom	5.57 ↑	4.06	4.38	4.44	+1%
Home Sta. Wait Area	8.16 ↑	7.79	8.08 ↑	8.24	+2%
Home Sta. Restroom	7.35 ↑	6.65	7.27 ↑	7.07	-3%
Penn Sta. Wait Area	7.78	7.69 ↓	7.84	7.91	+1%
Penn Sta. Restroom	6.74	6.38	6.34	6.15	-3%
Jamaica Sta. Wait Area	6.52 ↑	6.32	6.33	<b>5.93 ↓</b>	<b>-6%</b>
Jamaica Sta. Restroom	5.89 ↑	4.73 ↓	5.18	5.02	-3%
Flatbush Av. Wait Area	6.03	5.30 ↓	6.07 ↑	<b>4.79 ↓</b>	<b>-21%</b>
Flatbush Av. Restroom	5.45 ↑	4.13 ↓	5.29 ↑	<b>4.39 ↓</b>	<b>-17%</b>
Management Performance	6.59 ↑	6.17 ↓	7.30 ↑	<b>5.66 ↓</b>	<b>-22%</b>
Escalator Reliability	7.01 ↑	6.56	6.99 ↑	<b>6.01 ↓</b>	<b>-14%</b>
Winter Heating	7.09 ↑	6.86	7.67 ↑	7.45	-3%
Summer A/C	6.05 ↑	5.64	6.85 ↑	6.95	+1%
Seat Condition	6.91 ↑	6.45	6.82 ↑	6.48	-5%
Security:					
On-Board	7.92	7.90 ↓	7.61 ↓	<b>7.79 ↑</b>	<b>+2%</b>
Penn Sta.	8.09	8.15 ↑	8.30	<b>8.67 ↑</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Jamaica Sta.	6.82	6.86 ↑	6.51 ↓	<b>6.78 ↑</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Flatbush Av.	6.88	6.82	6.34	<b>6.78 ↑</b>	<b>+7%</b>
Home Sta.	7.74	7.26 ↓	6.77 ↓	<b>7.14 ↑</b>	<b>+5%</b>
Parking	6.91 ↑	5.91 ↓	5.82	<b>6.31 ↑</b>	<b>+8%</b>
Home Sta. Hours	6.84 ↑	6.48	6.34	6.43	+1%
Home Sta. Ticket-Selling Hours	6.77 ↑	6.05 ↓	6.17	<b>6.64 ↑</b>	<b>+8%</b>
Home Sta. Maintenance	7.49 ↑	7.00 ↓	N/A <sup>13</sup>	7.53	----
Peak-Hour Service AM	7.44 ↑	7.63 ↑	8.21 ↑	8.16	-6%
Peak-Hour Service PM	6.34 ↑	6.66 ↑	7.46 ↑	7.13	-4%
Midday Service	6.86 ↑	6.60	7.00 ↑	6.91	-1%
Late-Night Service	6.25 ↑	5.40	6.07 ↑	5.99	-1%
Weekend Service	6.67 ↑	6.12	6.66 ↑	6.72	+1%

<sup>13</sup> Home station maintenance was not evaluated in 2002.

**Table 3. Three Highest-Scoring Categories, Systemwide**

YEAR	HIGHEST-SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE / % CHANGE 2002-03	SECOND HIGHEST SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE/ % CHANGE 2002-03	THIRD HIGHEST SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE/ % CHANGE 2002-03
2003	Morning Train Crews	B ↓ (-2%)	Evening Train Crews	B (-1%)	Perceived Security at Penn Station	B-↑ (+4%)
2002	Morning Train Crews	B ↑	Evening Train Crews	B ↑	Morning On-Time Performance	B ↑
2001	Morning Train Crews	B ↓	Evening Train Crews	B- ↓	Perceived Security at Penn Station	B- ↓

**Table 4. Three Lowest-Scoring Categories, Systemwide**

YEAR	LOWEST-SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE / % CHANGE 2002-03	SECOND LOWEST SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE/ % CHANGE 2002-03	THIRD LOWEST SCORING CATEGORY	GRADE/ % CHANGE 2002-03
2003	Flatbush Avenue Restroom Cleanliness	D+ ↓ (-17%)	On-Board Restroom Cleanliness	D+ (+1%)	Flatbush Avenue Waiting Area Cleanliness	C- ↓ (-21%)
2002	On-Board Restroom Cleanliness	D+	Jamaica Station Restroom Cleanliness	C-	Flatbush Avenue Restroom Cleanliness	C- ↑
2001	On-Board Restroom Cleanliness	D+	Flatbush Avenue Restroom Cleanliness	D+ ↓	Flatbush Avenue Waiting Area Cleanliness	C- ↓

**Table 5. Perception of Change, Systemwide**

YEAR	THE LIRR IS GETTING BETTER	THE LIRR IS GETTING WORSE	NO CHANGE IS OCCURRING
2003	33%	21%	46%
2002	45%	10%	45%
2001	35%	20%	44%

**Table 6. Priority Ranking of Service Improvements<sup>14</sup>**

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT	RANK <sup>15</sup> (1 is highest/ 5 is lowest)		
	2001	2002	2003
More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	4	1	<b>1</b>
More Available Seats	2	2	<b>2</b>
Better On-Time Performance	1	3	<b>1</b>
Better Air-Conditioning	3	4	<b>3</b>
Home Station Security	N/A	5	<b>5</b>
No More Short Trains	5	N/A	<b>N/A</b>

**Table 7. Top 20 Most-Wanted Improvements, Systemwide**

Most Wanted Improvement	# Of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	177	19%
Improve Cleanliness	100	11%
Improve On-Time Performance	88	10%
Provide New Trains	77	8%
Lower the Fare	72	8%
More Seat Availability	61	7%
Improve Communication	55	6%
More Express Trains	42	5%
Improve Temperature Control	34	4%
Provide Direct Service to Penn Station (No Change at Jamaica)	30	3%
Improve Seating Comfort	29	3%
Improve Train Scheduling	27	3%
Increase Security	20	2%
Improve Penn Station	20	2%
Faster Train Speed	19	2%
Better Customer Service	17	2%
Remove No Refund For Forgotten Monthly Ticket Policy	15	2%
Create Quiet Cars With No Cell Phones	9	1%
Increase Parking	9	1%
Improve Flatbush Avenue Terminal	5	1%

**Table 8. Comparison of Top Three Most Wanted Improvements, Systemwide**

<sup>14</sup> Possible service improvements represent four of the most-desired service improvements identified in the Council's 2000 Report Card Survey Report.

<sup>15</sup> Priority numbers for 2001 and 2002 have been adjusted to reflect the same ranking scale as 2003.

YEAR	FIRST MOST-WANTED IMPROVEMENT (%)	SECOND MOST-WANTED IMPROVEMENT (%)	THIRD MOST-WANTED IMPROVEMENT (%)
2003	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Trains (19%)	Improve Cleanliness (11%)	Improve On-Time Performance (9%)
2002	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Trains (22%)	More Seat Availability (12%)	Improve On-Board Cleanliness (8%)
2001	More Seat Availability (13%)	Improve On-Time Performance (10%)	Increase Parking (9%)

**Table 9. Likelihood of Riders to Use a Peak Hour Shuttle Bus Service**

LIKELIHOOD TO USE SERVICE	PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSES
Not at all Likely	63%
Don't Know	14%
Likely	14%
Very Likely	10%

**Table 10. Reasons for Not Using a Peak Hour Shuttle Bus Service**

REASON FOR NOT USING SERVICE	PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSES
Lack of Flexibility	43%
Stuck if Return After/ Before Peak	36%
Long Travel Time	26%
Stops Not Close to Home	21%
Other	19%
Cost	11%
Negative Association	9%

**Table 11. Rider Incentives to Use Shuttle Bus Services**

RIDER INCENTIVE TO USE SERVICE	PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONSES
Nothing	48%
Free Shuttle/ Discounted Shuttle/Train Ticket	17%
Convenient Stop Locations	13%
Frequency of Service	8%
Schedule Timed to Trains	5%
Lack of Parking	3%

ble 12. 2003 Results for Performance Indicators, by Branch

INDICATOR		BAB.	FAR ROCK.	HEMP.	LONG BEACH	MONTAUK	OYSTER BAY	PORT. JEFF.	HUNT/HICKS	PORT. WASH	RONK.	WEST. HEMP.
Overall Service		C+	B-	C+	B-	C+	C+	C+	C+	B-	C-	C+
On-Time Performance	am pm	B C+	B B-	B- B-	B B-	B B-	B- C+	B C+	B- C+	B+ B-	C+ C	B B-
Seating Availability	am pm	B C+	B C+	B C	B C+	B+ C+	B- C+	B C+	B C	B C+	C+ C-	B B-
Schedule Adequacy	am pm	B B-	C+ C+	B- B	B- B-	C+ C	D+ D	B- C+	B- C+	B B	C+ C	C- C-
Train Crews	am pm	B B	B+ B+	B B-	B+ A-	B B	B+ B+	B- B	B- B-	B+ B	B- B-	B B-
Announcements: On-Board	am pm	C+ C+	B- B-	C+ C+	B- B-	C+ C+	B- C+	C+ C+	C+ C+	B- B-	C C	B C+
Penn Sta.	am pm	B- B-	B B	B- B-	B B-	B- B-	B- B-	B- B-	B- B-	B- B-	C+ C	B- B-
Jamaica Sta.	am pm	B- C+	B- B-	C C	B- B-	B B-	C+ C+	C+ C+	C+ C+	B- B-	C+ C+	C+ C
Flatbush Av.	am pm	C+ C+	C+ C+	C+ C	B- B-	B- C+	C- C-	C+ C	C C+	B B-	C+ C-	C+ C+
Home Sta.	am pm	C+ C	C C	C- C	C+ C+	C- C-	C+ C-	C C	C C	C+ C+	C- C-	C- C-
Cleanliness: On-Board		C+	C	C	C	B-	B	C+	C	C	C-	B-
On-Board Restroom		C-	D+	C-	C-	C	C+	C-	D+	C-	D	C
Home Sta. Wait Area		B-	B-	B-	B	C	B-	B-	B-	B	B-	B
Home Sta. Restroom		B-	C	C+	C+	C-	C	C+	C+	B-	C+	C+
Penn Sta. Wait Area		B-	B	B-	B	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-
Penn Sta. Restroom		C	C+	C	C	C+	C	C	C	C	C	C
Jamaica Sta. Wait Area		C	C+	C-	C	C	C	C	C-	C+	C-	C+
Jamaica Sta. Restroom		C-	C	D+	C	C	C-	C-	C-	B	D+	C
Flatbush Av. Wait Area		C-	C	D+	C-	D+	C-	C-	D+	C+	D+	D+
Flatbush Av. Restroom		C-	C-	D+	C-	C	D+	D+	D	B	D+	C-
Management Perf.		C	B-	C+	C+	C-	C-	C	C-	C+	D+	C
Escalator Reliability		C	C+	C	C+	C-	C-	C	C	C+	C-	C
Winter Heating		C+	B-	B-	B-	B-	B	B-	C+	B	C	B-
Summer A/C		C+	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	C+	C+	B-	C	B
Seat Condition		C	C+	C+	C+	B-	B	C	C	C+	C-	B-
Security: On-Board		B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	B	B-	B-	B-	C+	B-
Penn Sta.		B	B	B	B	B	B-	B	B-	B	B-	B
Jamaica Sta.		C+	C+	C	C+	C+	C+	C+	C	B-	C+	B-
Flatbush Av.		C+	C+	C	C-	B-	B-	C+	C+	B	C+	B-
Home Sta.		C+	C	C+	C+	C	C+	C+	C+	B	C	C+
Parking		C+	C-	C+	C+	C	C+	C	C	C+	C-	C-
Home Sta. Hours		C	C	C+	C+	D+	D+	C	C+	B-	C+	C
Ticket-Selling Hrs.		C	C	C+	C+	C-	C	C+	C+	B-	C+	C-
Home Sta. Maint.		C+	C+	B-	B-	C-	C+	C+	B-	B	C+	C+
Peak-Hour Service	am pm	B- C+	B B-	B- C+	B B-	B- C+	C+ C	B- C+	B- C+	B B-	C+ C	B- B-
Midday Service		C+	C+	C	B	C	C-	C+	C+	B-	C-	C-
Late-Night Service		C+	C	C-	C+	C-	D+	C	C-	C+	C-	D+
Weekend Service		C+	C+	C	B-	C	C-	C+	C	B-	C	C-

Table 13. Perception of Change, by Branch

BRANCH	THE LIRR IS GETTING BETTER		THE LIRR IS GETTING WORSE		NO CHANGE IS OCCURRING	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Babylon	47%	29%	10%	21%	44%	45%
Far Rockaway	39%	36%	11%	20%	50%	44%

<b>Hempstead</b>	43%	51%	14%	13%	43%	36%
<b>Long Beach</b>	54%	43%	5%	9%	41%	48%
<b>Montauk</b>	52%	43%	2%	13%	46%	44%
<b>Oyster Bay</b>	54%	60%	8%	14%	39%	27%
<b>Port Jefferson</b>	75%	34%	1%	22%	24%	45%
<b>Huntington</b>	45%	34%	10%	21%	45%	45%
<b>Port Washington</b>	45%	38%	7%	10%	48%	52%
<b>Ronkonkoma</b>	32%	16%	18%	48%	50%	36%
<b>West Hempstead</b>	29%	44%	29%	23%	43%	33%

**Table 14. Top Priority Service Improvements, by Branch**

<b>BRANCH</b>	<b>TOP RANKED SERVICE IMPROVEMENT</b>
<b>Babylon</b>	Better On-Time Performance
<b>Far Rockaway</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Hempstead</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Long Beach</b>	Better On Time Performance/ More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Montauk</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Oyster Bay</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Port Jefferson</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service
<b>Huntington</b>	Better On Time Performance
<b>Port Washington</b>	Better On Time Performance/ More Available Seats
<b>Ronkonkoma</b>	Better On-Time Performance
<b>West Hempstead</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service

**Table 15. Top Three Most-Wanted Improvements, by Branch**

<b>BRANCH</b>	<b>MOST-WANTED IMPROVEMENT</b>	<b># OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>% OF TOTAL RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION</b>
<b>Babylon</b>	Provide Newer Trains	48	23%
	Improve Cleanliness	46	22%
	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	22	11%
<b>Far Rockaway</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	7	21%
	Improve Cleanliness	5	15%
<b>Hempstead</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	9	33%
	Provide Direct Service to Penn Station	5	13%
	Improve On-Time Performance	4	11%
<b>Long Beach</b>	Improve Cleanliness	11	19%
	Provide New Trains	6	10%
	Increase Parking	4	7%
<b>Montauk</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	17	29%
	More Seat Availability	5	
	Improve On-Time Performance	4	
<b>Oyster Bay</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	17	31%
	Provide Direct Service to Penn Station	9	17%
	Improve Scheduling	4	7%
<b>Port Jefferson</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	20	24%
	Provide Direct Service to Penn Station	10	12%
	Improve Announcements	9	11%
<b>Huntington</b>	Lower the Fare	25	14%
	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	24	
	Improve Cleanliness	19	
<b>Port Washington</b>	Improve Cleanliness	24	18%
	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	21	16%
	More Seat Availability	12	9%
<b>Ronkonkoma</b>	Improve On-Time Performance	19	13%
	Provide New Trains	16	11%
	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	14	10%
<b>West Hempstead</b>	More Frequent Peak and Off-Peak Service	16	46%
	Improve On-Time Performance	4	11%
	Provide Direct Service to Penn Station	3	9%