Illinois Department of Transportation

THE FALL 2009 ILLINOIS MOTORIST OPINION SURVEY

Conducted for

Illinois Department of Transportation

Conducted by

Survey Research Office
Center for State Policy and Leadership
University *of* Illinois *at* Springfield (UIS)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Initial Table Results Report: December 30, 2009
Updated Table Results Report: January 8, 2010
Full Updated Report: January 28, 2010

Report prepared by:

Richard Schuldt
Director, UIS Survey Research Office

Survey conducted with particular assistance from the following staff of the UIS Survey Research Office:

Gayla Oyler, *Office Manager and Mail-Out Survey Manager*

Mark Winland, *Interviewing Lab Manager, Data Input Management*
Valerie Howell, *Research Assistant*
Anthony Wilcox, *Research Assistant*

Introduction

The Illinois Department of Transportation contracted with the Survey Research Office, located within the Center for State Policy and Leadership, of the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) to conduct a mail-out Motorist Opinion Survey in the Fall of 2009. Similar surveys had been conducted for the Department in every year since 2001. In most of these years, the survey was conducted in the Spring. In 2001, surveys were conducted in both the Spring and Fall while in 2008, the survey was conducted in the Summer. Staff of the UIS Survey Research Office offered advice concerning final question wording, assisted in developing the specific methodology (see below), implemented the data collection procedures (see below) and data input, and analyzed the results. Preliminary results for all substantive questions were provided on December 30, 2009. In this report, results have been updated to include returns through January 8, 2010. Summary descriptive text has also been added.

Methodology

The sample. For the recent Fall 2009 survey, a stratified sample of Illinois household addresses was purchased from Genesys Sampling Systems, one of the leading vendors of samples in the country. (This sampling methodology is known as address-based sampling, or ABS.) The sample was stratified by IDOT region, with 2000 household addresses randomly selected from District 1, and 225 from each of the other eight IDOT Districts (for a total of 1,800 outside of District 1). Thus, a grand total of 3,800 randomly-selected household addresses were in the original sample. For each of the selected addresses, Genesys Sampling Systems provided a household name if it was available (94%) and also provided a telephone number if available (63%).[1]

It should be noted that this sampling methodology was different from that used in previous surveys in this series. For all previous surveys in this series, a stratified sample of “listed” Illinois households (households listed in telephone directories) was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc., another one of the leading vendors of samples in the country. The ABS methodology, available only recently and the one selected for the 2009 survey, has the advantage of including households with unlisted phone numbers as well as households with only cell phones and households with no phones.[2]

[1] Availability of the telephone number is useful as a rough indicator of households that are “listed households” (listed in the telephone directories).

[2] In the initial Spring 2001 survey, the sample was purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. rather than selected from the Secretary of State’s list of licensed drivers because of time considerations. From 2002 through 2008, the decision to proceed with samples of listed households was been driven by the desire to maintain consistency in this aspect of the methodology, particularly since a purpose of these surveys is to assess changes over time. However, in recent years, it has become feasible to purchase a random sample of household addresses and match names to these addresses. Because this methodology includes broader coverage of relevant households – and because we could include questions which would allow a measurement of “listed households” (thus allowing the for comparable results), we decided to use the ABS methodology for the 2009 survey.

In all years, the sampling methodology has included district stratification. In the most recent three surveys, 3,800 households/household addresses have been selected for the sample (see above). In the earlier years, 3,520 households were selected, with downstate districts 2 through 9 each containing 190 rather than 225 households. The initial household sample size for District 1 has remained the same (2,000 for each survey).

With one exception, the surveys in all years of this series have been cross-sectional surveys. The exception here was that of the Spring 2002 survey. In that survey, both a cross-sectional sample (such as this) and a panel design (following up on those who responded in the Fall 2001 survey) were used. Because the cross-sectional portion of this design was thought to better represent licensed drivers, the original cross-sectional sampling design was selected for subsequent surveys.

Data collection procedures. Each original sample member was sent an initial survey package in mid-November, 2009.[3] These initial packages consisted of a personalized letter over the signature of IDOT's Director of Communications, a four-page questionnaire in booklet form, and a postage-paid return envelope addressed to the UIS-SRO in an outside envelope with the IDOT logo.[4] For selected addresses with a matched household name, the survey package was sent to "the household of" that particular name. For addresses with no matched name, the survey package was sent to "current household."

About one week after this initial mailing, a postcard thank-you / reminder was sent to all sample members. And, about two weeks after the postcard, a follow-up survey package was sent to non-respondents. This follow-up survey package was similar in composition to the first survey package.[5]

A web-based version of the questionnaire was introduced in 2008 and was continued in 2009. In all U.S. mail correspondence with sample members, we informed them that they could complete a web-based version of the questionnaire that could be accessed by going to a particular web-site address.

A couple other variations in the methodology used across the surveys are worthy of note. In the three cross-sectional surveys prior to 2003, we asked the licensed driver with the next birthday to complete the questionnaire in order to "randomly" vary the characteristics of the respondent. In the Spring 2003 through 2007 surveys, we explicitly asked for the youngest licensed driver in the household to complete the survey in a random half of the sample, while still asking for the licensed driver with the next

[3] The 2009 Motorist Survey was the first since one of the two surveys in 2001 to have been conducted in the Fall. Most of the earlier surveys had been conducted in mid-Spring. However, the 2008 Motorist Survey was conducted in the Summer (data collection from mid-July through mid-August).

[4] The survey packages were the same as those for all the earlier surveys, with the exception of the inclusion of focus group participation forms in the Fall 2001 survey packages.

[5] Initial survey packages were mailed November 13 through 17, 2009. Postcard reminders were mailed November 23 and 24. Follow-up survey packages to non-respondents were mailed December 4 and 7, 2009. Survey packages were re-sent to addresses with incorrect matched names from December 14 through 22, 2009.

birthday in the other half. For the 2008 survey, we began asking for the youngest licensed driver in the household for all sample members. For the 2009 survey, we followed the 2008 practice of asking for the youngest licensed driver. But for households without licensed drivers, we also asked for the youngest adult (18 years of age or older) to complete the survey if there was no licensed driver in the household. As was also the case in 2008, we asked for the licensed driver / household member with the next birthday if the youngest was not available. It should be noted that the recent change (of always asking for the youngest driver / household member) was made in an effort to obtain a greater proportion of younger licensed drivers / household members in the responding sample.

Returns and response rate. Through January 8, 2010, over 1,000 (n = 1,016) usable surveys had been returned to the Survey Research Office. Only 46 of these questionnaires were completed through the web-version of the questionnaire. The total number of completed questionnaires represents just over one-quarter (26.7%) of the initial sample. Excluding mail problems and sample members no longer in the population (e.g., deceased), the cooperation rate for the survey is nearly 30 percent (29.6%).[6] This cooperation rate is 25 percent for District 1 (Chicago area) and a higher 35 percent for Districts 2 through 9 (the "downstate" regions). Relevant response and cooperation rate numbers for the total sample and by IDOT district are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Estimated Response Rates,
Total and by IDOT District
(completions and noted mail problems through 1/08/10)

District		Original number	Mail problems & out of popul.*	Remain-ing number	Returns	"Initial" Response Rate (base: all)	Coopera-tion Rate (base: Remain-ing)
1	Schaumburg	2,000	177	1,823	456	22.8%	25.0%
2	Dixon	225	21	204	58	25.8%	28.4%
3	Ottawa	225	22	203	65	28.9%	32.0%
4	Peoria	225	24	201	83	36.9%	41.3%
5	Paris	225	36	189	70	31.1%	37.0%
6	Springfield	225	28	197	82	36.4%	41.6%
7	Effingham	225	13	212	77	34.2%	36.3%
8	Collinsville	225	15	210	63	28.0%	30.0%
9	Carbondale	225	30	195	62	27.6%	31.8%
TOTAL		**3,800**	**366**	**3,434**	**1,016**	**26.7%**	**29.6%**
1		*2,000*	*177*	*1,823*	*456*	*22.8%*	*25.0%*
2 - 9		*1,800*	*189*	*1,611*	*560*	*31.1%*	*34.8%*

*Included in "mail problems" are undeliverable survey packages returned because of an incorrect name. For the earliest 84% of these households where the name on the data base was found to be incorrect, we re-sent surveys to "Current Household." Through 1/08/2010, we had received completed surveys from only 6% of these household addresses.

[6] For households in the sample with listed telephone numbers (which constituted the sampling frame in earlier surveys), the "initial" response rate is 31.1%, and the cooperation rate is 33.8%. This compares to a slightly higher 36.5% cooperation rate for the 2008 survey.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire was in the format of a four-page booklet. It contained questions that have been part of the survey series since its inception, and as usual, it contained sections consisting of topical issue questions.

Continuing questions are found in the first and last parts of the questionnaire.

In the first part of the questionnaire (pages 1 and 2), respondents were asked to rate various aspects of state highways and bridges under three main headings: maintaining highways and traffic flow; road repair and construction; and traveler services. Respondents were then asked about their awareness and use of the IDOT toll-free telephone number and website. And following this, they were asked to rate IDOT employees on four characteristics and to give a couple overall evaluations of IDOT (overall performance and frequency IDOT can be trusted to do what is right regarding transportation issues). They were also asked to assess IDOT's impact on their area's economy and overall quality of life.[7]

In the last part of the questionnaire (bottom of page 4), respondents were asked selected "objective background" demographic and driving-related information. These included questions about the number of miles respondents drive per year (in total and on their job), and commuting time and miles. They were asked about residential location as well as about their age, gender, education level and household income. For the second consecutive year, respondents were also asked whether they are now driving more, less or about the same as they were last year. And for the first time, respondents were asked several questions so that we could identify those respondents who could have been selected under the sampling methodology used in previous years (e.g., whether or not the respondent is a licensed driver; whether they have a landline phone line and, if so, whether it is listed; and whether they have a cell phone).

This year's topical issue questions focused on three subjects: traffic safety activities and messages; Amtrak, including high-speed rail; and the federal stimulus package.

<u>For the traffic safety topic</u>, respondents were asked to evaluate the amount of activities IDOT conducts to promote traffic safety and then asked to rate the effectiveness of traffic safety messages. Both of these traffic safety questions had been used in several earlier surveys, including the 2008 survey.

<u>For the Amtrak and high-speed rail topics</u>, respondents were asked how far they live from an Amtrak station and were asked a couple questions relating to their experience riding Amtrak in Illinois. Opinions questions here included one concerning support for/opposition to having high-speed rail in Illinois and support for/opposition to Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for this. Another opinion question was whether a high-speed rail Chicago-St. Louis route should go through the same cities as the current Amtrak route. Respondents were also

[7] The trust question was first asked in the Spring 2005 survey and in every survey since. The assessed impact questions have been asked in every survey since the Spring 2005 survey, except for 2006.

asked about their likelihood of using high-speed rail on three different possible routes linking Chicago to other cities (St. Louis, Milwaukee and Detroit).

For the federal stimulus package topic, respondents were asked about their awareness of the stimulus package and also asked to evaluate its impact on transportation-related funding and construction in Illinois so far.

"Analysis" groups within the responding sample and sampling errors

Three "analysis" groups. Results for the 2009 respondents have been run for each the following "analysis" groups, identified below together with the respective "weighting" schemes.

1. The total group: all 2009 responding sample members, weighted by IDOT district (estimated licensed drivers).

2. The LLD group (listed licensed drivers): 2009 respondents who indicated having a listed landline phone AND who are licensed drivers, weighted only by IDOT district (estimated licensed drivers). These respondents would have been eligible in sampling procedures used in previous years.

3. The population-weighted group: all 2009 respondents, weighted by gender, age and education characteristics of the Illinois adult public as well as by area of the state (estimated adult population).

For the total group and the LLD group, weighting results "by IDOT district" (as has been done for every survey in the series) means that respondents have been weighted to reflect each district's overall estimated proportion of licensed drivers. The targeted proportions for each district used in this weighting, as in the past reports, are: District 1 - Schaumburg (58.6%); District 2 - Dixon (8.8%); District 3 – Ottawa (5.9%); District 4 - Peoria (4.8%); District 5 - Paris (5.7%); District 6 – Springfield (5.3%); District 7 - Effingham (2.7%); District 8 - Collinsville (5.5%); and District 9 - Carbondale (2.8%).[8]

For the population-weighted (or "popul") group, results have been weighted by gender, age and education level as well as by area of the state. This reflects a sample that is more demographically representative of the Illinois public as a whole.[9]

Sampling errors. For the results of the two groups which are based on all question-naires returned (n of 1016, for the total group and the population-weighted group), the

[8] For the weighting, the 2000 population Census figures for Illinois counties were used. However, the proportion of licensed drivers for the Chicago metro area was decreased somewhat from the population proportion because of two factors: 1) the likelihood that this area contains a higher proportion of households with no licensed driver; and 2) the likelihood that the population in this area contains a higher proportion of household members not old enough to drive. It is acknowledged that estimation is involved here; however, it should be noted that any small changes in this weighting will have no impact on the substantive results.

[9] For area of the state weighting, we used more current population estimates for the City of Chicago, the Chicago suburbs (basically, the rest of District 1), north/central Illinois and southern Illinois.

sampling error for this survey is just over +/- 3 percent (+/- 3.1%), at the 95 percent confidence level. That is, the percentage results for the full sample will be within about 3 percentage points of the actual population characteristics 95 percent of the time.[10] For the LLD group, with a smaller sample size (621), the sampling error is just under +/- 4 percent.

Which results to use?

Table 2 presents selected sample relevant characteristics for each of these three groups. Table 2A presents demographic and driving-related characteristics for these three groups. It also presents profiles on the relevant demographic / driving characteristics for the most recent survey years for comparison purposes.

What results should be used for comparing results to earlier years: the total group results or the LLD group results? As noted earlier, address-based sampling methodology used for the 2009 survey is more inclusive in its household coverage than the listed household sampling used in previous survey years. Indeed, as seen in Table 2, 40 percent of the respondents in the 2009 total group results would not have been eligible to be selected in earlier years (i.e., they were not licensed drivers in households with a listed telephone number). So, initially, the LLD group results would seem more useful to be used in comparisons of the 2009 results with those in earlier survey years.

But, an examination of Table 2A and comparisons of the 2009 total group and LLD group profiles with those in the most recent surveys suggests that the better comparison group here is probably the 2009 total group. Most importantly, we find that the age distribution for the 2009 total group is somewhat younger than is the 2009 LLD group – and closer to the age distributions in earlier years.[11] The gender distribution of the 2009 total group, while skewed toward males, is also slightly better than that for the LLD group. The 2009 total group also has the advantage of being based on more respondents. *Thus, for use in comparisons to earlier survey results in tables throughout this report, we have used the 2009 total group results*.

What results should be used for the 2009 survey year: the total group results or the population-weighted group results? As noted above, the total group results appear more useful than do the LLD results for comparative purposes. And, a comparison of the total group and population-weighted group profiles with those of earlier survey years will also give advantage to the total group results when it comes to comparisons with earlier years.

[10] Note that this assumes a non-biased sampling frame and no bias in those who responded.

[11] However, even though we consistently asked that the youngest licensed driver / adult household member complete the questionnaire, we find an age distribution that is closer to the 2006 and 2007 samples (where the "youngest" was asked half the time) than to the 2008 sample (where the "youngest" was consistently asked for). Perhaps the 2008 survey was more successful in attracting more younger respondents because it was conducted in the Summer. Also note that the 2009 gender distribution is skewed toward males, as it had been prior to the 2008 survey. In the 2008 survey, respondents were about equally divided between males and females.

However, the population-weighted group results have the advantage of offering a picture of current opinions of the Illinois public from a group with characteristics more representative of the Illinois adult public. For instance, and by intention (i.e., weighting), the gender distribution of the population-weighted results is more balanced and thus more representative. The age distribution, which is much younger, is also more representative as is the education distribution. The population-weighted results also shows more representation from the City of Chicago (because of estimates being based on adult population rather than licensed drivers.)

Because of these relative advantages, this report contains the following.

For the tables summarizing current 2009 results, both the total group results and the population-weighted group results are presented.

For questions that appeared in earlier surveys, the focus of the tables and text will be on the 2009 total group results because of their advantage in being comparable to earlier years. However, we will comment on any meaningful differences that exist between the 2009 total group and population-weighted results. (Switching the focus back and forth as we moved from current results to comparative results here would be more confusing.)

For questions that are appearing for the first time in the 2009 survey, the focus of the text will be on the population-weighted results. Because these questions are relevant to the full public, these results have the advantage of being more representative.

It should be noted that the choices regarding results to be used -- along with the arguments presented above to justify these choices – are, in large part, more theoretical than practical. While we believe it is necessary to justify these choices, *for the most part, we find few practical and meaningful differences in the 2009 results, regardless of which of the three analysis weighting group results are used*. (We note those where there are.)

Demographic and driving-related characteristics, 2003 through 2009

Table 2B presents profiles of the respondents for selected demographic and driving-related characteristics from the most recent 2009 survey back to the 2003 survey.[12] As indicated above, the 2009 total group results are used in this comparison.

Certainly, there are some changes in the profiles across these years. (Here, the gender balance in 2008 stands out in contrast to the skewness toward males in the other survey years.) But overall, there is a great deal of consistency. And at least some of the changes reflected here are the results of real changes in the Illinois population, not the artifact of differential response bias.

[12] Information on these demographic characteristics for the earlier 2001 and 2002 survey years can be found in earlier reports. Their presentation here would not affect the overall point being made about the general consistency of respondent attributes across the survey years.

Table 2
Three Response / Weighting Groups,
2009 Survey

Characteristic	2009 Total (1016)	2009 LLD (621)	2009 Popul (1016)
Cooperation rate	29.6%	33.8%	29.6%
Comparable Group **(listed & licensed driver)**			
Comparable	60%	100%	55%
Not in previous sampling frames	40%	0%	45%
District			
Schaumburg (1)	59%	58%	64%
Dixon (2)	9%	9%	8%
Ottawa (3)	6%	6%	5%
Peoria (4)	5%	5%	4%
Paris (5)	6%	6%	5%
Springfield (6)	5%	5%	5%
Effingham (7)	3%	3%	2%
Collinsville (8)	6%	6%	4%
Carbondale (9)	3%	3%	2%
Licensed driver			
Yes, licensed	97%	100%	96%
Not licensed	3%	0%	4%
Phones			
Landline			
No landline	14%	0%	18%
Listed landline	62%	100%	57%
Unlisted landline	20%	0%	21%
Unknown	4%	0%	5%
Cell phone			
Have cell phone	90%	90%	89%
Combination			
No phone	2%	0%	3%
Landline only	8%	10%	6%
Cell only	14%	0%	17%
Both land & cell	74%	90%	72%
Unknown	2%	0%	2%

Table 2A
Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2006 to 2009

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total (1016)	2009 LLD (621)	2009 Popul (1016)
Cooperation rate	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%	29.6%	33.8%	29.6%
Gender						
Male	54%	57%	50%	57%	58%	49%
Female	46%	43%	50%	43%	42%	51%
	(98%)	*(97%)*	*(98%)*	*(99%)*	*(99%)*	*(99%)*
Age						
16 to 35	13%	12%	16%	12%	9%	25%
36 to 45	16%	14%	12%	14%	8%	18%
46 to 55	22%	21%	20%	21%	21%	20%
56 to 65	22%	23%	21%	25%	27%	19%
66 to 75	15%	18%	18%	16%	20%	11%
Over 75	13%	12%	13%	12%	15%	8%
Mean	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs	55.8 yrs	58.4 yrs	48.8 yrs
Median	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	60.0 yrs	50.0 yrs
	(96%)	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(99%)*	*(96%)*
Education						
Up to HS	28%	28%	28%	26%	26%	31%
Post HS	32%	33%	33%	35%	36%	37%
4-yr college	39%	39%	40%	38%	39%	32%
	(97%)	*(96%)*	*(97%)*	*(98%)*	*(99%)*	*(97%)*
Income						
< $25,000	13%	12%	15%	16%	12%	19%
$25-49,999	27%	26%	24%	27%	29%	27%
$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%	24%
$75-100,000	16%	19%	18%	16%	17%	13%
> $100,000	17%	20%	20%	17%	18%	16%
	(85%)	*(85%)*	*(82%)*	*(83%)*	*(83%)*	*(83%)*
Up to $49,999	40%	38%	39%	43%	41%	47%
$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%	24%
$75,000 and up	33%	39%	38%	33%	36%	30%
Miles drive / yr						
Up to 6,000*	23%	19%	23%	26%	27%	28%
6,000+ -12,000	36%	33%	37%	34%	34%	33%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	32%	29%	27%	26%	26%
Over 20,000	13%	15%	11%	15%	14%	14%
Mean	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles	13,837 miles	13,307 miles	13,738 miles
Median	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles
	(90%)	*(86%)*	*(90%)*	*(90%)*	*(94%)*	*(88%)*

*Among those who indicated any driving miles *(continued on next page)*

Table 2A (continued)

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total	2009 LLD	2009 Popul
Residential location						
City of Chicago	10%	12%	11%	13%	10%	21%
Chicago suburbs	38%	37%	35%	39%	41%	36%
Metro East	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
City > 75,000	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	5%
City 20-75,000	10%	10%	11%	8%	8%	7%
City/town 10-20,000	8%	8%	10%	8%	8%	8%
Town < 10,000	13%	14%	12%	11%	11%	11%
Rural	9%	10%	10%	11%	12%	9%
	(96%)	*(94%)*	*(97%)*	*(96%)*	*(98%)*	*(96%)*
Miles drive-job/yr						
% giving number	*42%*	*35%*	*27%*	*32%*	*31%*	*30%*
Of these:						
1 to 100	*9%*	*8%*	*6%*	*11%*	*9%*	*11%*
101 to 1000	*20%*	*23%*	*26%*	*21%*	*21%*	*22%*
1001 to 5000	*23%*	*19%*	*24%*	*21%*	*20%*	*20%*
5001 to 12,000	*26%*	*21%*	*22%*	*22%*	*21%*	*23%*
Over 12,000	*22%*	*29%*	*21%*	*26%*	*28%*	*24%*
Median	*5,000*	*5,731*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*
Commuting						
% giving answer	*53-54%*	*58%*	*51-52%*	*53%*	*50%*	*57%*
Of these:						
avg miles one way to work	*Mean = 18.4 Med = 14.2*	*Mean = 18.2 Med = 14.0*	*Mean = 15.9** Med = 11.0*	*Mean = 16.4 Med = 12.0*	*Mean = 15.8 Med = 11.0*	*Mean = 16.3 Med = 12.0*
avg minutes to work	*Mean = 30.2 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 31.7 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 28.2 Med = 20.0*	*Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 27.4 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0*
avg minutes home from work	*Mean = 31.1 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 35.7 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 30.7 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 29.8 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 30.5 Med = 25.0*
avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)	*Mean = 61.3 Med = 55.0*	*Mean = 67.4 Med = 60.0*	*Mean = 59.0 Med = 45.0*	*Mean = 59.3 Med = 50.0*	*Mean = 57.2 Med = 50.0*	*Mean = 59.2 Med = 50.0*

**In the calculation of these means, a few outlier cases were excluded.

Table 2B
Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2003 to 2009

Characteristic	2003 Sample	2004 Sample	2005 Sample	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total Sample
Cooperation rate	44.3%	40.4%	40.1%	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%	29.6%
Gender							
Male	55%	57%	56%	54%	57%	50%	57%
Female	45%	43%	44%	46%	43%	50%	43%
	(98%)	*(98%)*	*(98%)*	*(98%)*	*(97%)*	*(98%)*	*(99%)*
Age							
16 to 35	16%	15%	15%	13%	12%	16%	12%
36 to 45	19%	18%	18%	16%	14%	28%	14%
46 to 55	21%	22%	20%	22%	21%	20%	21%
56 to 65	19%	19%	21%	22%	23%	21%	25%
66 to 75	13%	15%	15%	15%	18%	18%	16%
Over 75	12%	11%	11%	13%	12%	13%	12%
Mean	53.2 yrs	53.4 yrs	53.9 yrs	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs	55.8 yrs
Median	53.0 yrs	53.0 yrs	54.0 yrs	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs
	(97%)	*(97%)*	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(96%)*
Education							
Up to HS	32%	33%	29%	28%	28%	28%	26%
Post HS	30%	30%	32%	32%	33%	33%	35%
4-yr college	37%	38%	39%	39%	39%	40%	38%
	(98%)	*(96%)*	*(97%)*	*(97%)*	*(96%)*	*(97%)*	*(98%)*
Income							
< $25,000	16%	17%	14%	13%	12%	15%	16%
$25-49,999	30%	31%	27%	27%	26%	24%	27%
$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%	24%
$75-100,000	15%	14%	16%	16%	19%	18%	16%
> $100,000	15%	17%	18%	17%	20%	20%	17%
	(88%)	*(83%)*	*(85%)*	*(85%)*	*(85%)*	*(82%)*	*(83%)*
Up to $49,999	46%	48%	41%	40%	38%	39%	43%
$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%	24%
$75,000 and up	30%	31%	34%	33%	39%	38%	33%
Miles drive / yr							
Up to 6,000*	21%	20%	19%	23%	19%	23%	26%
6,000+ -12,000	38%	36%	33%	36%	33%	37%	34%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	29%	31%	28%	32%	29%	27%
Over 20,000	14%	16%	16%	13%	15%	11%	15%
Mean	14,459 m (est)	14,795 miles	15,244 miles	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles	13,837 miles
Median	12,000 m (est)	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,000 miles
	(94%)	*(88%)*	*(90%)*	*(90%)*	*(86%)*	*(90%)*	*(90%)*

*Among those who indicated any driving miles. The results in the 2003 report were re-calculated to make this consistent. *(continued on next page)*

Table 2B (continued)

Characteristic	2003 Sample	2004 Sample	2005 Sample	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total Sample
Residential location							
City of Chicago	*not comp**	11%	12%	10%	12%	11%	13%
Chicago suburbs	*not comp*	36%	34%	38%	37%	35%	39%
Metro East	*not comp*	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
City > 75,000	*not comp*	8%	6%	8%	8%	8%	7%
City 20-75,000	*not comp*	10%	12%	10%	10%	11%	8%
City/town 10-20,000	*not comp*	10%	8%	8%	8%	10%	8%
Town < 10,000	*not comp*	11%	13%	13%	14%	12%	11%
Rural	*not comp*	11%	10%	9%	10%	10%	11%
		(95%)	*(96%)*	*(96%)*	*(94%)*	*(97%)*	*(96%)*
Job miles drive / yr							
% giving number		*42%*	*42%*	*42%*	*35%*	*27%*	*32%*
Of these:							
1 to 100	*na**	*5%*	*8%*	*9%*	*8%*	*6%*	*11%*
101 to 1000	*na*	*22%*	*20%*	*20%*	*23%*	*26%*	*21%*
1001 to 5000	*na*	*27%*	*24%*	*23%*	*19%*	*24%*	*21%*
5001 to 12,000	*na*	*24%*	*24%*	*26%*	*21%*	*22%*	*22%*
Over 12,000	*na*	*23%*	*24%*	*22%*	*29%*	*21%*	*26%*
Median	*na*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,731*	*5,000*	*5,000*
Commuting							
% giving answer		*63%*	*62%*	*53-54%*	*58%*	*51-52%*	*53%*
Of these:							
avg miles one way to work	*na*	*Mean = 16.8 Med = 13.0*	*Mean = 17.0 Med = 12.0*	*Mean = 18.4 Med = 14.2*	*Mean = 18.2 Med = 14.0*	*Mean = 15.9** Med = 11.0*	*Mean = 16.4 Med = 12.0*
avg minutes to work	*na*	*Mean = 30.0 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 28.1 Med = 22.0*	*Mean = 30.2 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 31.7 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 28.2 Med = 20.0*	*Mean = 28.7 Med = 25.0*
avg minutes home from work	*na*	*Mean = 32.9 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 30.8 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 31.1 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 35.7 Med = 30.0*	*Mean = 30.7 Med = 25.0*	*Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0*
avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)	*na*	*Mean = 62.9 Med = 50.0*	*Mean = 58.9 Med = 47.0*	*Mean = 61.3 Med = 55.0*	*Mean = 67.4 Med = 60.0*	*Mean = 59.0 Med = 45.0*	*Mean = 59.3 Med = 50.0*

*"not comp" indicates that the residential location question did not produce comparable data in 2003. "na" indicates that the information is not contained in the 2003 report.

**In the calculation of these means, a few outlier cases were excluded.

A SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The following pages summarize the final results. As noted earlier, *when summarizing results for questions that have appeared in earlier surveys, our focus is on the total group results for 2009*, the analysis group which we believe is the best comparison to these earlier results. However, we also present the population-weighted results in the 2009 tables. *When summarizing results for the topical questions which first appear in the 2009 survey, our focus is on the population-weighted results*, the analysis group which is more representative of the Illinois adult public as a whole. Throughout the summary, we do offer comments on the results for the other analysis groups not the focus of the respective section (including the LLD group results) when this is warranted.

In tables reporting trends, we present results for the total sample for all previous surveys, with the exception of the 2002 survey. For the Spring 2002 survey results, we have included three averages: that for all respondents; that for the cross-sectional sample; and that for the panel sample. However, it is our opinion that the best comparison here is the with the 2002 "cross-sectional" sample (the middle result reported), and it is this figure we use when examining and commenting upon trends below.

Questions continuing throughout the survey series

Ratings of specific aspects of highways and bridges

We asked respondents to rate nine aspects under the category of Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, another ten aspects under the category of Road Repair and Construction (nine of which are continuing aspects for the whole survey series), and five aspects under the category of Traveler Services.

Generally speaking, the 2009 results here fit into the overall consistency across the survey series that we have seen with regard to the order of aspects within each major category. When present (which is rare), differences in rank order generally occur only for those aspects rated very similar to each other.

Overall, most of the Fall 2009 mean ratings are either on par with recent mean ratings or show improvement from the mean ratings found in last year's Summer 2008 survey. This is in contrast to last year's results (Summer 2008), where declines in mean ratings from 2007 to 2008 were more the norm than the exception. And, while most of these declines were very modest to slight, we did find several items where the 2008 mean rating was the lowest, or among the lowest, of mean ratings across the survey series. The 2009 results show a rebound for many of these items, and some 2009 mean ratings are found to be the most positive, or among the most positive, in the entire survey series.

The largest changes in mean ratings from 2008 to 2009, all improvements, are found for the following items. It should be noted that some of these items also experienced the largest 2007-to-2008 changes, when all of the largest changes were less positive in nature. When relevant, these 2007-to-2008 changes are also noted in the list below.

- Cleanliness of rest areas (+.19; -.08 from 2007 to 2008)
- Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on non-interstate highways (+.18; -.12 from 2007 to 2008)
- Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstate highways (+.15; -.12 from 2007 to 2008)
- Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (+.14; -.08 from 2007 to 2008)
- Availability of free IDOT road maps (+.14)
- Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (+.13)
- Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (+.12; -.12 from 2007 to 2008)
- Information highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (+.11)
- Safety of rest areas (+.10)
- Information signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging (+.09)

Among the items where the 2009 mean rating is the most positive, or tied for the most positive, across the survey series are the following.

- All five items in the Traveler Services section
- Cleanliness of roadsides / absence of litter, in the Maintaining Highways section
- Warning signs when workers are present, in the Road Repair/Construction section

In addition, there are other items where the 2009 mean rating is not the most positive in the survey series, but where the 2009 results have rebounded to fairly high levels found in past surveys. These are identified in the upcoming sections.

Text and tables in these sections summarize these results in more detail. Detailed 2009 tables and trend tables follow the summary 2009 table and text for each section. The summary 2009 tables and detailed 2009 tables present results for both the total analysis group as well as the population-weighted results (with the focus on the total group results). The trend tables use the total analysis group mean ratings.

Maintaining highways and traffic flow

Results are presented below (in Table 3) for both the total group results and the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an "excellent" rating, the percent giving an "excellent" *or* "good" rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 3A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 3B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 3B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

Table 3
Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: Summary Results

Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: 2009 Results [a]	**Total Group**			**Population-wgtd**		
	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean*[b]	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean*
Tier One						
1. Traffic signs (5)	20%	76%	*3.91*	20%	75%	*3.90*
2. Electronic message boards to advise of delays or construction areas (6)	20%	72%	*3.84*	20%	72%	*3.83*
Tier Two						
3. Visibility of lane / shoulder markings (7)	14%	63%	*3.66*	14%	63%	*3.66*
Tier Two or Three *(dependent on group)*						
4. Snow and ice removal (4)	10%	62%	*3.63*	9%	56%	*3.53*
Tier Three						
5. Cleanliness of roadsides (1)	9%	59%	*3.58*	9%	58%	*3.56*
6. Landscaping and overall appearance (3)	8%	58%	*3.51*	7%	57%	*3.50*
Tier Four						
7. Timely removal of debris and dead animals (2)	8%	54%	*3.44*	8%	54%	*3.44*
8. Timing of traffic signals (8)	8%	52%	*3.42*	9%	52%	*3.43*
9. Roadside lighting and reflectors (9)	8%	50%	*3.41*	9%	50%	*3.42*

[a] Items are ordered and ranked by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.
[b] Means scores for the LLD analysis group are within +/- .01 of the total group means except for two items: snow and ice removal (#4, where the LLD mean is +.06 more favorable); and landscaping and overall appearance (#6, where the LLD mean is +.03 more favorable).

The 2009 results

Using these 2009 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the nine aspects can be ordered into the following general four tiers. The following offers the rationale for these tiers, with the aspects themselves identified in the table above.

<u>In the first tier</u> are two aspects (ranked 1 and 2) which both receive "excellent" ratings from about one in five respondents, and receive ratings of "excellent" or "good" by more than seven in ten respondents.

In the second tier are two aspects (ranked 3 and 4) which receive "excellent" ratings by slightly to somewhat more than one in ten respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by somewhat more than six in ten respondents. (Note that the second of these items – ranked #4 in the table – drops to the third tier and the fifth ranking position when the population-weighted results are used.)

In the third tier are two aspects (ranked 5 and 6) which receive "excellent" ratings by slightly less than one in ten respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by nearly six in ten respondents. (Again, note that this tier includes the item ranked #4 in Table 3 if the population-weighted results are used.)

And, in the fourth tier are three aspects (ranked 7 through 9) which receive "excellent" ratings by fewer than one in ten respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by proportions at or just somewhat above half of the respondents.

See Table 3B for the full distribution of results for 2009, provided both for the "total" analysis group and for the population-weighted analysis group.

Changes from earlier surveys

Rankings. Overall, the order of the nine items has remained very similar across the survey series. Not surprisingly then, with regard to the most recent two surveys, the 2009 order of the specific aspects is very similar to that in 2008, with only two small changes: "snow and ice removal" dropped from 3rd position in 2008 to 4th position in 2009 (and to 5th position if the population-weighted results are used); and "roadside lighting and reflectors" dropped from the 6th position in 2008 to the 9th position in 2009.

Mean ratings. When comparing 2009 mean ratings to those in 2008, we generally find either stability or more positive mean scores in 2009. This is in contrast to the 2007-to-2008 changes which showed declines in all but one mean rating (although five of the eight declines from 2007 to 2008 were -.05 or less).

The greatest increase from 2008 to 2009 (+0.12) is found for #6 "landscaping and overall appearance" (and would be +0.15 if the LLD results are used).

For this item, this latest 2009 result (3.51) shows a rebound from the low point of the survey series found in the 2008 survey generally back to levels found from the Fall 2002 through the Spring 2007 surveys (which range from 3.48 to 3.54).

More modest increases (+0.07) are found for three items, all in the bottom half of the items (#5, #7 and #8).

For #5, "cleanliness of roadsides," the 2009 mean rating (3.58) is the most positive of the survey series (slightly above that found in Fall 2001, the only other survey conducted in the Fall). Surveys conducted in the Spring from 2002 through 2007 and in the Summer of 2008 have means which range from 3.45 to 3.54.

For #7, “timely removal of debris and dead animals,” the 2009 mean rating (3.44) is found to have rebounded from its lowest mean rating of 2008 back to its 2007 level (and 2001-2002 level) but lower than that found from 2004 through 2006 (3.50 to 3.51) or its high point in 2003 (3.56).

For #8, “timing of traffic signals,” the 2009 mean rating (3.42) is only slightly less positive than this item’s most positive mean rating found in 2004 (3.44).

There is a great deal of stability (+.01 to +.03) in items ranked #1 through #3 from 2008 to 2009 and in the item ranked last.

For the item consistently rated #1 across the survey series, “traffic signs,” there is also a great deal of stability in mean rating scores across this series (ranging from a low of 3.86 in the first survey in 2001 to a high of 3.94 in 2004, with 2009 at 3.91).

For #2, “electronic messages boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas,” the mean ratings for the 2008 and 2009 surveys (3.83 and 3.84, +.01 from 2008 to 2009) are slightly lower than the mean ratings found in both 2006 and 2007 (3.87), the most positive of the ratings for this item in the survey series. At the same time, these two most recent means are slightly more positive than those found in both 2004 and 2005 as well as in Fall 2001 (range 3.79 to 3.81). The Spring 2001 and 2003 mean ratings for this item were the least positive (3.70).

For #3, “visibility of lane and shoulder markings,” the 2009 mean rating (3.66) is only slightly more positive than the 2007 and 2008 mean ratings and only slightly less positive than the most positive ratings of the whole survey series (3.69 in Fall 2001, 3.68 in Spring 2004 and 3.67 in Spring 2002).

For #9, “roadside lighting and reflectors,” the variability in the mean rating going back to the Fall 2001 survey is very small (3.39 to 3.43, with 2009 at 3.41).

We find a decrease in the mean rating from 2008 to 2009 for only one item, that of #4 “snow and ice removal” (-.07, with the 2009 total group mean at 3.63).

It should be noted this is the one item which shows the most instability in mean scores across the various analysis groups in 2009 (3.63 for the total group; 3.69 for the LLD group, and 3.53 for the population-weighted group). For the analysis group of licensed drivers in listed households (LLD), the 2009 mean score for this item is just slightly lower than the mean rating in 2008.

Also, as we noted in last year’s report, this item – probably not surprisingly -- is the aspect in this section which shows the most seasonal variability, with its lowest mean scores generally found when surveys have been conducted either later in the Spring (3.75 in 2007), in the Summer (3.70 in 2008), or in the Fall (3.72 in 2001; 3.63 in 2009). For the earlier Spring surveys of 2002 through 2006, the mean ratings range from a low of 3.86 to a high of 3.96 (with 3.95 and 3.96 found in 2003 and 2004). The Spring 2001 survey shows a somewhat lower mean of 3.82, still higher than that for surveys conducted later in the calendar year.

Table 3A
Ratings on Aspects relating to
Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow

Aspect rated[a]	**Excellent (5)**[b]	**Good (4)**	**Fair (3)**	**Poor (2)**	**Very Poor (1)**	***n* *(% of sample)***	***mean***
1. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, miles to destination signs) (5)	20% (20%)	56% (55%)	20% (20%)	4% (4%)	1% (0^{+}%)	*1000* *(98%)*	*3.91* *(3.90)*
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (6)	20% (20%)	52% (51%)	20% (20%)	6% (6%)	1% (1%)	*957* *(94%)*	*3.84* *(3.83)*
3. Visibility of lane and shoulder markings on highways (7)	14% (14%)	49% (49%)	29% (28%)	6% (7%)	2% (2%)	*997* *(98%)*	*3.66* *(3.66)*
4. Snow and ice removal (4)	10% (9%)	52% (47%)	31% (34%)	6% (7%)	2% (2%)	*988* *(97%)*	*3.63* *(3.53)*
5. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (1)	9% (9%)	50% (50%)	33% (33%)	6% (7%)	2% (2%)	*990* *(98%)*	*3.58* *(3.56)*
6. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (3)	8% (7%)	50% (50%)	30% (31%)	9% (9%)	3% (3%)	*991* *(98%)*	*3.51* *(3.50)*
7. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement (2)	8% (8%)	46% (46%)	32% (31%)	12% (12%)	3% (3%)	*959* *(95%)*	*3.44* *(3.44)*
8. Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (8)	8% (9%)	44% (43%)	34% (34%)	11% (11%)	4% (4%)	*974* *(96%)*	*3.42* *(3.43)*
9. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visibility after dark and in bad weather (9)	8% (9%)	42% (41%)	36% (36%)	11% (11%)	3% (3%)	*977* *(96%)*	*3.41* *(3.42)*

[a] Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age and education level). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

[b] The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

Table 3B
Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow: Trends Across Surveys

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 means (n)	Spring 2002 means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Sum-mer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
1. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, miles to destination signs) (5)	3.86 (1379)	3.89 (1236)	3.92 3.93 3.90	3.90 (1399)	3.94 (1307)	3.91 (1310)	3.91 (1304)	3.90 (1386)	3.88 (1291)	3.91 (1000)
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construc-tion areas (6)	3.70 (1323)	3.81 (1199)	3.79 3.75 3.82	3.70 (1322)	3.79 (1234)	3.80 (1244)	3.87 (1241)	3.87 (1342)	3.83 (1240)	3.84 (957)
3. Visibility of lane and shoulder markings on highways (7)	3.57 (1372)	3.69 (1229)	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.61 (1399)	3.68 (1308)	3.59 (1305)	3.61 (1303)	3.64 (1383)	3.65 (1284)	3.66 (997)
4. Snow and ice removal (4)	3.82 (1363)	3.72 (1222)	3.93 3.89 3.99	3.95 (1400)	3.96 (1302)	3.91 (1326)	3.86 (1300)	3.75 (1362)	3.70 (1271)	3.63 (988)
5. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (1)	3.36 (1384)	3.56 (1242)	3.50 3.45 3.55	3.52 (1407)	3.47 (1314)	3.52 (1297)	3.52 (1308)	3.54 (1391)	3.45 (1281)	3.58 (990)
6. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (3)	3.43 (1377)	3.52 (1231)	3.53 3.48 3.58	3.53 (1399)	3.52 (1305)	3.54 (1301)	3.49 (1303)	3.54 (1387)	3.39 (1283)	3.51 (991)

(continued on next page)

Table 3B. (continued)
Ratings on Aspects relating to
Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 Means (n)	Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Sum-mer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
7. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement (2)	3.43 (1342)	3.46 (1207)	3.50 3.46 3.54	3.56 (1363)	3.50 (1277)	3.51 (1267)	3.50 (1252)	3.44 (1341)	3.37 (1243)	3.44 (959)
8. Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (8)	3.33 (1347)	3.37 (1212)	3.44 3.41 3.48	3.42 (1387)	3.44 (1291)	3.35 (1283)	3.40 (1273)	3.38 (1347)	3.35 (1245)	3.42 (974)
9. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visi-bility after dark and in bad weather (9)	3.33 (1352)	3.41 (1203)	3.44 3.42 3.46	3.39 (1363)	3.43 (1291)	3.39 (1273)	3.41 (1277)	3.41 (1359)	3.40 (1260)	3.41 (977)

Road repair and construction

Results are presented below (in Table 4) for both the total group results and for the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an "excellent" rating, the percent giving an "excellent" *or* "good" rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 4A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 4B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 4B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

Table 4
Road Repair and Construction: Summary Results

Road Repair and Construction: 2009 Results [a]	**Total Group**			**Population-wgtd**		
	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean* [b]	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean*
Tier One						
1. Warning signs when workers are are present (7)	20%	76%	*3.92*	21%	75%	*3.92*
Tier Two						
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic And alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	12%	63%	*3.67*	12%	61%	*3.64*
3. Advance information about future construction projects through informa-tional highway signs (10)	10%	56%	*3.53*	10%	54%	*3.51*
Tier Three						
4. Advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers Internet (9)	9%	48%	*3.38*	9%	46%	*3.34*
5. Signs about alternative routes when construction (8)	8%	46%	*3.33*	8%	45%	*3.33*
Tier Four						
6. Ride quality / smoothness on interstates (3)	4%	42%	*3.25*	4%	39%	*3.20*
Tier Five						
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	4%	33%	*3.09*	3%	29%	*3.01*
7. Timeliness of repairs on interstates (1)	3%	34%	*3.09*	4%	31%	*3.04*
9. Ride quality / smoothness on non-interstates (4)	3%	33%	*3.08*	4%	32%	*3.06*
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstates (2)	2%	29%	*2.98*	3%	28%	*2.96*

[a] Items are ordered by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.
[b] All means scores for the LLD analysis group are within +/- .03 of the total group means. And, only three LLD means differ by .03: work zone signs (#2, where the LLD mean is +.03 more favorable); signs about alternative routes (#5, where the LLD mean is -.03 less positive); and timeliness of repairs on interstates (#8, where the LLD mean is +.03 more favorable).

The 2009 results

Using these 2009 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the ten aspects can be ordered into the following general five tiers. The following offers the rationale for these tiers, with the aspects themselves identified in the table above.

> <u>In the first tier</u> is one aspect (ranked 1) which receives "excellent" ratings from one in five respondents, and receives ratings of "excellent" or "good" by about three-quarters of the respondents.
>
> <u>In the second tier</u> are two aspects (ranked 2 and 3) which receive "excellent" ratings by about one in ten respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by well over half of the respondents (with the most positive here receiving "excellent" or "good" ratings from somewhat more than 60% and the next item receiving such from somewhat less than 60%).
>
> <u>In the third tier</u> are two aspects (ranked 4 and 5) which receive "excellent" ratings by slightly fewer than one in ten respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by proportions slightly to somewhat less than half of the respondents.
>
> <u>In the fourth tier</u> is one aspect (ranked 6) which receives "excellent" ratings by just under one in twenty respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by about four in ten.
>
> <u>In the fifth tier</u> are four aspects (ranked tied for 7th through 10) which receive "excellent" ratings by fewer than one in twenty respondents and "excellent" or "good" ratings by proportions ranging from just under 30 percent to about one-third.

See Table 4B for the full distribution of results for 2009, provided both for the "total" analysis group and for the population-weighted analysis group.

Changes from earlier surveys

<u>Rankings</u>. Overall, the order of the items within this section has remained very similar across the survey series. Most recently, the 2009 order of the specific aspects is virtually identical to that in 2008. The only departure here is that there are two items tied for the 7^{th} position in 2009 while more differentiation between these two items was present in 2008.

<u>Mean ratings</u>. When comparing 2009 mean ratings to those in 2008, we find either stability or more positive mean scores in 2009. This is in contrast to the 2007-to-2008 changes which showed declines for eight of the ten items. (One item was stable, and one other item showed only a modest increase of +.05).

Increases of more than .10 are found for four items, all ranking in the bottom half of the items in this section (#9, #6, #10 and one of the items tied for #7).

For #9, “ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways,” the 2009 mean rating is 0.18 more positive than the 2008 mean. This latest increase follows two consecutive decreases and brings the mean for this item back to a level as positive as the 2006 mean (at 3.08). More generally, the 2009 mean is back to a fairly consistent level found from the Fall 2001 survey through the 2006 survey (range of 3.07 to 3.09, with the exception of 2003 survey which had a slightly more positive 3.13).

For #6, “ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates,” the 2009 mean rating increased by +0.15 from the 2008 mean and brings it to a level just below that of the 2006 survey and just above that of the 2007 survey. More generally, the 2009 mean (3.25) is about midway between the fairly narrow range of means we find for this item from Fall 2001 through 2009 (3.22 to 3.29), with the less positive 2008 mean being the exception here (3.10).

For #10, “timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways,” the 2009 mean rating increased by 0.14 from the 2008 mean. This latest increase follows two consecutive decreases and brings the mean for this item back to a level nearly as positive as the 2006 mean (2.98 vs. 3.00). More generally, the 2009 mean is just somewhat less positive than the fairly consistent level of means found from the Fall 2001 survey through the 2006 survey (range of 3.00 to 3.04, with the exception of the 3.08 found in 2003). Over the entire survey series, the 2009 mean is about midway between the most positive mean score (3.08, in 2003) and the least positive mean score (2.84, found in 2008).

For the second #7 item, “timeliness of repairs on interstate highways,” the 2009 mean rating increased by 0.13 from the 2008 mean. This latest increase again follows two consecutive decreases and brings the mean back to levels found in both the 2005 and 2006 surveys (3.08 to 3.10), a level slightly less positive than that found in 2003 and 2004 (3.14 to 3.17).

Very modest increases of around .05 are found for two items (#2 and #1).

For the #2 item, “work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed,” the 2009 mean is .06 more positive than the 2008 mean. This 2009 mean is slightly higher than the 2006 mean. Only the first Spring 2001 survey shows a more positive mean rating for this item.

For the #1 item, “warning signs when workers are present,” the 2009 mean is .04 more positive than the 2008 mean. This 2009 mean is tied with the 2006 mean for the most positive in the whole survey series for this item. However, it should be noted that there is a great deal of stability in the mean ratings for this item from 2003 through 2009, ranging only from a low of 3.86 to a high of 3.92.

Little change in mean ratings from 2008 to 2009 is found for four items (one of the items tied for #7, #3, #4 and #5). And, three of these items generally show a great deal of consistency in their mean ratings across surveys over the past six years or more.

For the first #7 item, “the flow of traffic through work zones,” the 2009 mean rating is only .03 more positive than the 2008 mean. While there is a great deal of stability in this item’s mean ratings going back to the Spring 2002 survey (with a range of 3.05 to 3.11), the latest 2009 mean rating is tied with the 2003 and 2004 means, with only the 2006 mean rating more positive.

For #3, “advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways,” the 2009 mean is only .02 more positive than the 2008 mean. But the 2009 mean is .07 more positive than the 2007 mean, the first survey in which this item appeared.

For #4, “advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio and newspapers,” again the 2009 mean is only .02 more positive than the 2008 mean. Means for this item across the survey series range only from a low of 3.36 to a high of 3.43 (the 2009 mean at 3.39), with the exception of the much more positive 3.57 found in Spring 2006.

For #5, “signs about alternative routes when there is construction,” the 2009 mean is virtually the same as the 2008 mean (a decline of only .01). The means for this item from 2004 through 2009 range only from 3.32 to 3.35 (the 2009 mean at 3.33), with the exception of 2007 which had a modestly more positive 3.39.

Table 4A
Ratings on Aspects relating to Road Repair and Construction

Aspect rated[a]	Excellent (5) [b]	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	*n (% of sample)*	*mean*
1. Warning signs when workers are present (7)	20% (21%)	55% (54%)	20% (22%)	3% (3%)	1% (0^+%)	*999 (98%)*	*3.92 (3.92)*
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	12% (12%)	52% (49%)	30% (32%)	6% (6%)	1% (2%)	*993 (98%)*	*3.67 (3.64)*
3. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (10)**	10% (10%)	45% (45%)	33% (34%)	9% (9%)	2% (2%)	*939 (92%)*	*3.53 (3.51)*
4. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio, and newspapers (9)	9% (9%)	39% (38%)	36% (36%)	13% (15%)	3% (3%)	*921 (91%)*	*3.38 (3.34)*
5. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	8% (8%)	38% (37%)	35% (37%)	16% (16%)	3% (2%)	*971 (96%)*	*3.33 (3.33)*
6. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (3)	4% (4%)	37% (35%)	41% (42%)	13% (15%)	4% (4%)	*966 (95%)*	*3.25 (3.20)*
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	4% (3%)	30% (26%)	44% (47%)	17% (18%)	6% (7%)	*978 (96%)*	*3.09 (3.01)*
8. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (1)	3% (4%)	31% (28%)	44% (44%)	17% (18%)	5% (6%)	*932 (92%)*	*3.09 (3.04)*
9. Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways (4)	3% (4%)	30% (28%)	44% (44%)	18% (20%)	5% (5%)	*965 (95%)*	*3.08 (3.06)*
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (2)	2% (3%)	26% (26%)	45% (44%)	19% (20%)	7% (8%)	*919 (90%)*	*2.98 (2.96)*

[a] Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age and education level). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

[b]The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

Table 4B
Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Road Repair and Construction:
Trends Across Surveys

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 means (n)	Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
1. Warning signs when workers are present (7)	3.81 (1374)	3.89 (1233)	3.82 3.79 3.86	3.89 (1402)	3.86 (1302)	3.89 (1299)	3.92 (1299)	3.91 (1383)	3.88 (1284)	3.92 (999)
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	3.71 (1378)	3.58 (1231)	3.65 3.63 3.67	3.60 (1392)	3.62 (1302)	3.61 (1300)	3.65 (1300)	3.61 (1381)	3.61 (1280)	3.67 (993)
3. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (10)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3.46 (1314)	3.51 (1214)	3.53 (939)
4. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio, and newspapers (9)	3.41 (1294)	3.39 (1162)	3.40 3.36 3.45	3.42 (1309)	3.42 (1211)	3.36 (1196)	3.57 (1217)	3.43 (1299)	3.36 (1191)	3.38 (921)
5. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	3.25 (1328)	3.32 (1200)	3.24 3.23 3.26	3.29 (1373)	3.34 (1260)	3.32 (1261)	3.35 (1267)	3.39 (1344)	3.34 (1252)	3.33 (971)

(continued on next page)

Table 4B. (continued)
Ratings on Aspects relating to Road Repair and Construction:
Trends Across Surveys

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 means (n)	Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
6. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (3)	3.08 (1358)	3.26 (1207)	3.28 3.27 3.30	3.29 (1380)	3.28 (1289)	3.22 (1287)	3.28 (1275)	3.22 (1363)	3.10 (1260)	3.25 (966)
7. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	2.95 (1372)	2.98 (1221)	3.11 3.05 3.17	3.09 (1378)	3.09 (1299)	3.06 (1279)	3.11 (1278)	3.07 (1374)	3.06 (1270)	3.09 (978)
7. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (1)	2.97 (1322)	3.07 (1171)	3.16 3.12 3.22	3.17 (1337)	3.14 (1227)	3.08 (1238)	3.10 (1225)	3.00 (1316)	2.96 (1218)	3.09 (932)
9. Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways (4)	2.89 (1342)	3.10 (1188)	3.12 3.10 3.14	3.13 (1369)	3.09 (1272)	3.07 (1265)	3.08 (1256)	3.02 (1337)	2.90 (1253)	3.08 (965)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (9)	2.87 (1305)	3.00 (1132)	3.09 3.04 3.15	3.08 (1318)	3.04 (1216)	3.03 (1229)	3.00 (1209)	2.92 (1291)	2.84 (1207)	2.98 (919)

Traveler services

Results are presented below (in Table 4) for both the total group results and for the population-weighted results. This table presents: the aspects according to the tiers described in the text below; the rank order (based on mean score for the total group); and, for each of the respective results, the percent giving an "excellent" rating, the percent giving an "excellent" *or* "good" rating, and the mean rating. (See Table 5A for more complete results across the full rating distribution, and see Table 5B for trends in mean rating scores across the survey years. In Table 5B, the total group means are used for comparison purposes.)

Table 5
Traveler Services: Summary Results

Traveler Services: 2009 Results [a]	**Total Group**			**Population-wgtd**		
	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean* [b]	Excel-Lent	Exclnt or Good	*Mean*
Tier One						
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging (3)	24%	85%	*4.08*	24%	84%	*4.07*
Tier Two						
2. Informational signs about tourist Attractions and state parks (4)	19%	78%	*3.94*	19%	76%	*3.92*
Tier Three						
3. Cleanliness of rest areas (1)	17%	72%	*3.84*	17%	69%	*3.80*
4. Safety of rest areas (2)	14%	69%	*3.78*	14%	66%	*3.75*
Tier Four						
5. Availability of free IDOT maps (5)	17%	56%	*3.53*	16%	55%	*3.48*

[a] Items are ordered by the mean of the total group results. The number in parentheses after the aspect is the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire.
[b] The LLD group means for top two and bottom items are the same as the total group mean. The LLD group mean for #3 is only +.02 more favorable, and for #4, only +.01 more favorable.

The 2009 results

Using these 2009 findings – with particular focus on the total group results, the five aspects can be ordered into the following four tiers.

In Tier One and Tier Two are the two items that relate to informational signs, with "signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging" receiving somewhat more favorable ratings than did "signs about tourist attractions and state parks." The former received "excellent" ratings from nearly one-quarter of the respondents compared to nearly one-fifth for the latter. And, well over eight in ten respondents gave either "excellent" or "good" ratings to the former compared to just under eight in ten for the latter.

Next, in Tier Three, are the two items relating to characteristics of rest areas, with "cleanliness" receiving just slightly more favorable ratings than did "safety" (17% of the former giving "excellent" ratings vs. 14% for the former; and just over seven in ten giving "excellent" or "good" ratings to the former and just under seven in ten doing so for the latter).

In Tier Four, and in fifth position, is "availability of free IDOT maps," which still received "excellent" or "good" ratings from well over half the respondents. About one in six gave this item an "excellent" rating.

Changes from earlier surveys

Rankings. The rank order of these aspects in 2009 accords with that in virtually every previous survey. Note that, in the 2008 survey, the mean rating for "cleanliness of rest areas" was virtually tied with that of "safety of rest areas" rather than being slightly to somewhat more positive, which has been the case in all other surveys.[13]

Means. An examination of the 2008 to 2009 mean rating changes shows positive increases for every one of the items in this section.

For #-3, "cleanliness of rest areas," the 2009 mean is 0.19 more positive than that for 2008. The recent 2009 mean is tied with the Spring 2002 survey for the most positive across the entire survey series (at 3.85). The least positive mean for this item was found in last year's 2008 survey (3.69).

For #5, "availability of free IDOT road maps," the 2009 mean is 0.14 more positive than the 2008 mean (3.54 vs. 3.40), a level that had been fairly consistent from 2004 through 2008 (3.39 to 3.42). The 2009 mean is the most positive of the means for this item across the entire survey series.

For #2, "informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks," the 2009 mean is 0.11 more positive than the 2008 mean. The latest 2009 mean (3.94) is the most positive for this item across the entire survey series, with the second most positive found for the Fall 2001 survey (3.89). Means for this item in the remaining surveys range only from 3.83 to 3.87.

For #4, "safety of rest areas," the 2009 mean is 0.10 more positive than that found in 2008. And, this 2009 mean (3.79) is the most positive mean for this item across the survey series. With the exception of the very first survey of Spring 2001 (at a lower 3.58), the this item's mean ratings in all previous surveys had ranged from a low of 3.67 to a high of 3.74.

For #1, "informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging,“ the 2009 mean is 0.09 more positive than the 2008 mean. With the exception of 2008, this item has consistently had mean scores just or somewhat above 4.00 – with the latest 2009 mean (4.08) actually being the most positive of the survey series. The 2008 mean score for this item (3.99) was the least positive for this item.

[13] Also, the Spring 2002 survey shows a slight departure in the order for the earlier nine surveys, and this is dependent upon which sample is examined.

Table 5A
Ratings on Aspects relating to Traveler Services

Aspect rated[a]	**Excellent (5)** [b]	**Good (4)**	**Fair (3)**	**Poor (2)**	**Very Poor (1)**	***n* *(% of sample)***	***mean***
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, and lodging (3)	24% (24%)	61% (60%)	14% (15%)	1% (1%)	0^{+}% (0^{+}%)	*943 (93%)*	*4.08 (4.07)*
2. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (4)	19% (19%)	59% (57%)	20% (21%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	*904 (89%)*	*3.94 (3.92)*
3. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (1)	17% (17%)	55% (53%)	23% (25%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	*802 (79%)*	*3.84 (3.80)*
4. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (2)	14% (14%)	55% (53%)	26% (29%)	3% (3%)	1% (1%)	*762 (75%)*	*3.78 (3.75)*
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps (5)	17% (16%)	39% (39%)	28% (28%)	12% (12%)	4% (5%)	*637 (63%)*	*3.53 (3.48)*

[a] Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age and education level). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

[b] The actual scale in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

Table 5B
Mean Ratings on Aspects relating to Traveler Services: Trends Across Surveys

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 means (n)	Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, and lodging (3)	4.02 (1343)	4.07 (1191)	4.08 4.04 4.13	4.05 (1350)	4.07 (1265)	4.06 (1266)	4.02 (1254)	4.03 (1331)	3.99 (1217)	4.08 (943)
2. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (4)	3.83 (1303)	3.89 (1159)	3.88 3.83 3.93	3.86 (1320)	3.86 (1223)	3.87 (1240)	3.84 (1219)	3.84 (1300)	3.83 (1181)	3.94 (904)
3. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (1)	3.71 (1165)	3.77 (1035)	3.87 3.85 3.89	3.79 (1168)	3.78 (1095)	3.80 (1096)	3.74 (1052)	3.77 (1122)	3.69 (1031)	3.85 (802)
4. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (2)	3.58 (1100)	3.67 (983)	3.71 3.70 3.72	3.72 (1118)	3.72 (1021)	3.74 (1037)	3.68 (994)	3.70 (1067)	3.69 (976)	3.79 (762)
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps (5)	3.24 (947)	3.34 (847)	3.40 3.35 3.46	3.35 (991)	3.42 (891)	3.42 (908)	3.39 (871)	3.39 (951)	3.40 (836)	3.54 (637)

Average composite ratings for each general area

For each of the three general areas, we calculated an average composite rating, with the composite rating for the Road Repair and Construction section based on the nine items that are consistent across all survey years. In 2009, the composite mean ratings for all three general areas fall between the alternatives of "good" (when coded as 4) and "fair" (when coded as 3). For the composite median ratings, the same is true for two of the sections, but the median for the Traveler Services section is right at "good."

The 2009 results

For the total group results in 2009, the most positive average scores are found for Traveler Services (mean = 3.85; median = 4.00) followed by the averages for Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow (mean = 3.60; median = 3.67) and then Road Repair and Construction (mean = 3.32; median = 3.33). [See Table 6A (includes standard deviations and n's), Table 6B (trend data in a form more consistent with other tables), and Table 6C (summarizes survey-to-survey changes).] For the population-weighted results, the median ratings are the same while the mean ratings are slightly less positive for each of the composite scores.[14]

Trends in the survey series

For the composite ratings on items within the area of <u>Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow</u>, we find a high degree of consistency in average scores from the Fall 2001 survey to the 2007 survey, with mean composite ratings ranging only from 3.60 to 3.63. The latest 2009 survey (3.60) falls within this small range. Last year's 2008 composite mean rating of 3.56 was the second lowest of the ten surveys, surpassed only by the 3.54 recorded in the first Spring 2001 survey. Across this time span, the median composite rating has been 3.67 in every year, with the exception of the first survey of Spring 2001 (median = 3.56).

For the composite ratings on items within the area of <u>Road Repair and Construction</u>, we find a high degree of consistency in average scores for seven of the nine surveys conducted from the Fall 2001 survey to the 2009 survey.[15] For these seven surveys, the mean composite rating ranges only from 3.29 to 3.33, and the median composite rating is 3.33 in all seven surveys. The latest 2009 survey results are part of this consistent pattern. In the two other surveys during this time span, we find slightly to somewhat more positive average composite scores for the 2006 survey (mean = 3.36, median = 3.42), and just slightly lower average composite scores for last year's 2008 survey (mean=3.27; median=3.30). Again, the lowest average composite scores are found for the first Spring 2001 survey (mean and median both = 3.22).

For the composite ratings on items within the area of <u>Traveler Services</u>, we find the average scores in the latest 2009 survey to be the most favorable (or tied) across the entire survey series (again, mean = 3.85; median = 4.00). Prior to 2009, we find a high

---

[14] The LLD group composite means are all only +.01 more favorable than the total group composite means.

[15] In calculating the composite score for 2007, 2008 and 2009, only the 9 continuing items were used.

degree of consistency in average scores from the Fall 2001 survey to last year's 2008 survey. Across this time span, the mean composite rating ranges only from 3.74 to 3.79 (and is either 3.77 or 3.78 for five of these eight surveys) while the median composite rating is 3.80 for every survey except the 2007 survey (where the mid-point case just makes it into the 4.00 category from the 3.80 category). In this area, the mean composite rating in the first survey of Spring 2001 was slightly to somewhat lower than would be the case in years to come, consistent with results in the other two sections. Here, however, the median rating for the Spring 2001 survey was on par with those that would occur in most future surveys.

Table 6A
Summary Statistics for Composite Section Ratings

For each of the above three sections, a composite rating was derived by calculating the average score across the items in the section. This was done by summing all relevant ratings and dividing by the total number of items rated in the respective section. The composite rating for the Road Repair and Construction section is based on the nine items that are consistent across all survey years.

	Median	Mean	Std dev	*n*
Fall, 2009				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow *(population-wgtd in parentheses)*	3.67 (3.67)	3.60 (3.58)	0.59 (0.59)	*1007*
Road repair and construction (1-9) *(population-wgtd in parentheses)*	3.33 (3.33)	3.32 (3.29)	0.63 (0.64)	*1009*
Traveler services *(population-wgtd in parentheses)*	4.00 (4.00)	3.85 (3.82)	0.63 (0.63)	*958*
Summer, 2008				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.56	0.57	*1296*
Road repair and construction (1-9)	3.30	3.27	0.64	*1298*
Traveler services	3.80	3.74	0.68	*1241*
Spring, 2007				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.61	0.57	*1402*
Road repair and construction (1-9)	3.33	3.30	0.65	*1397*
Traveler services	4.00	3.77	0.67	*1352*
Spring, 2006				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.62	0.57	*1318*
Road repair and construction	3.42	3.36	0.62	*1315*
Traveler services	3.80	3.75	0.64	*1271*
Spring, 2005				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.61	0.56	*1315*
Road repair and construction	3.33	3.30	0.64	*1311*
Traveler services	3.80	3.79	0.62	*1278*
Spring, 2004				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.63	0.53	*1320*
Road repair and construction	3.33	3.33	0.61	*1318*
Traveler services	3.80	3.78	0.65	*1280*

(continued on next page)

Table 6A
Summary Statistics for Composite Section Ratings

	Median	Mean	Std dev	*n*
Spring, 2003				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.62	0.53	*1418*
Road repair and construction	3.33	3.33	0.59	*1416*
Traveler services	3.80	3.77	0.63	*1370*
Spring, 2002 ***Top number: total*** ***Middle number: cross-sectional*** ***Bottom number: panel***				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.63* 3.61 3.67	0.54 0.54 0.53	*1760* *964* *796*
Road repair and construction	3.33 3.33 3.38	3.33* 3.30 3.36	0.60 0.59 0.61	*1753* *959* *795*
Traveler services	4.00 3.80 4.00	3.80* 3.77 3.84	0.60 0.61 0.60	*1680* *900* *780*
Fall, 2001				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.67	3.60	0.53	*1245*
Road repair and construction	3.33	3.29	0.62	*1243*
Traveler services	3.80	3.77	0.63	*1205*
Spring, 2001				
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.56	3.54	0.57	*1391*
Road repair and construction	3.22	3.22	0.60	*1389*
Traveler services	3.80	3.71	0.65	*1359*

*indicates the difference between the two Spring 2002 samples is significant at the .01 level.

Table 6B
Average Composite Rating Scores
Across Surveys

Rating Area	Spring 2001	Fall 2001	Spring 2002	Spring 2003	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Summer 2008	Fall 2009 "Total"
	Mean Composite Scores									
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.54	3.60	3.63 3.61 3.67	3.62	3.63	3.61	3.62	3.61	3.56	3.60
Road repair and construction	3.22	3.29	3.33 3.30 3.36	3.33	3.33	3.30	3.36	3.30	3.27	3.32
Traveler services	3.71	3.77	3.80 3.77 3.84	3.77	3.78	3.79	3.75	3.77	3.74	3.85
	Median Composite Scores									
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	3.56	3.67	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67
Road repair and construction	3.22	3.33	3.33 3.33 3.38	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.42	3.33	3.30	3.33
Traveler services	3.80	3.80	4.00 3.80 4.00	3.80	3.80	3.80	3.80	4.00	3.80	4.00

Table 6C
Differences in Summary Composite Section Ratings
Across Surveys

Rating Area *(in order, differences between Spring 2002 and Fall 2001 represent: total sample, cross-sectional sample, and panel sample)*	***Difference:*** **Fall 2001 – Spring 2001**	***Difference:*** **Spring 2002 – Fall 2001**	***Difference:*** **Spring 2003 – Spring 2002** [a]	***Difference:*** **Spring 2004 – Spring 2003**	***Difference:*** **Spring 2005 – Spring 2004**	***Difference:*** **Spring 2006 – Spring 2005**	***Difference:*** **Spring 2007 – Spring 2006**	***Difference:*** **Summer 2008 – Spring 2007**	***Difference:*** **Fall 2009 "Total" – Summer 2008**
Year-to-Year Changes in Mean Composite Ratings									
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	+.06	+.03 +.01 +.07	+.01	+.01	-.02	+.01	-.01	-.05	+.04
Road repair and construction	+.07	+.04 +.01 +.07	+.03	+.00	-.03	+.06	-.06	-.03	+.05
Traveler services	+.06	+.03 +.00 +.07	+.00	+.01	+.01	-.04	+.02	-.03	+.11
Year-to-Year Changes in Median Composite Ratings									
Maintaining highways and traffic flow	+.09	+.00 +.00 +.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	.00	.00
Road repair and construction	+.11	+.00 +.00 +.05	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.09	-.09	-.03	+.03
Traveler services	+.00	+.20 +.00 +.20	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.20	-.20	+.20

[a] To calculate this difference, the cross-sectional mean (mean in middle position) was used for the Spring 2002 results.

Overall ratings of IDOT and employees and general trust in IDOT

Overall job IDOT is doing. In 2009 – for the total group results, just over one in twenty (6%) gave IDOT an overall rating of "excellent" while over half (54%) responded with "good." Over one-third (35%) said "fair" while one in twenty gave a rating of "poor" (3%) or "very poor" (2%). The average (mean) rating is 3.59. (See the middle of Table 7A.) The population-weighted results are only slightly less favorable (mean of 3.56).

Across the surveys, the mean rating for IDOT's overall job performance ranges from 3.50 to 3.63. This mean rating showed steady positive increases from 2001 (3.53) through a plateau of 3.63 reached in both 2003 and 2004. Since then, the mean rating declined to 3.58 and 3.60 in 2005 and 2006, respectively, then to 3.54 in 2007 and to 3.50 in last year's 2008, slightly lower than the 2001 level and the least favorable mean found in the survey series. In 2009, we see a recovery in this mean rating back to the level found in 2005 and 2006, and earlier in 2002. The 2009 mean is only slightly less positive than the most positive mean ratings found in 2003 and 2004. (See the 2nd row from the bottom of Table 7B.)

To illustrate the changes these ratings took from their "high point" in 2003 and 2004 to last year's 2008 ratings (the "low" point in the series), the percent who gave an "excellent" rating decreased from only 6 percent in these earlier years to 4 percent. But, the percent who gave either an "excellent" or a "good" rating declined somewhat from 62 percent to 56 percent – and the percent who gave either a "poor" or "very poor" rating increased from 4 percent to 12 percent. In 2009, the percent who gave an "excellent" rating is back up to 6 percent, and the percent who gave either an "excellent" or "good" rating rebounded to 60 percent. At the same time, the percent who gave either a "poor" or "very poor" rating declined to 5 percent. Again, we see the 2009 ratings are only slightly less positive than the 2003 and 2004 results.

General trust. For the fifth year in a row, respondents were asked, "Generally speaking, how often do you think you can trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?" In 2009 – for the total group results, more than 70 percent (73%) chose either "just about always" (15%) or "most of the time" (58%). Nearly one-quarter (23%) chose "only some of the time" while just under one in twenty (4%) chose "hardly ever." (See the bottom of Table 7A.) (The population-weighted results are only slightly less positive.)

When the 2009, 2008 and 2007 results are scored so as to be comparable to the earlier surveys, the 2009 mean rating of 3.83 is equivalent to that in 2008 and just slightly more positive than that found in 2007. The latter in turn was slightly to somewhat more positive than the results for either 2005 or 2006.[16]

[16] In 2009, 2008 and 2007, the response alternative "never" was not asked as it had been in 2005 and 2006. The "never" alternative had received very few responses in both 2005 and 2006 (about 1%), and eliminating it makes the response alternatives more balanced and more comparable to the "trust question" more usually asked in surveys.

Ratings of employees. First here, we should note that the following results are based on fewer respondents who actually gave a rating to the various aspects. This has always been the case for the items in this section and is not surprising, given the fact that fewer respondents actually come into contact with IDOT employees than experience most of the highway-related aspects in the first three sections. Further, we generally find that the proportion of respondents who gave a rating is positively related to the overall favorability of the rating. To illustrate, nearly six in ten respondents rated the most positive of the items here, just over half did so for the second most positive item, and under half did so for the items ranked #3 and #4.

Turning to the substantive results, the rank order of these four Employee Performance aspects is the same as that for previous surveys. Again, and according to the total group results, the most positive rating goes to "courtesy and respect shown to motorists" (mean of 3.82 in 2009; with 72% giving "excellent" or "good") followed by "overall conduct on the job" (3.76; with 69% giving "excellent" or "good") and then "helpfulness of the information provided" (3.72; 65% giving "excellent" or "good"). The aspect rated least positive is "accessibility of employees" (3.46; 53% giving "excellent" or "good"). (See Table 7A for the 2009 results.) The population-weighted results here show just a slightly less favorable rating for the first item, equivalent mean ratings for the second and third items, and a slightly more favorable rating for the "accessibility" item.

An examination of the 2009 mean ratings for the licensed drivers in listed households (the LLD group) shows that, in this section, these means are consistently somewhat more positive than are the total group mean ratings: 3.89 vs. 3.82 for courtesy and respect shown to motorists; 3.83 vs. 3.76 for overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job; 3.76 vs. 3.72 for helpfulness of information; and 3.51 vs. 3.46 for accessibility.

Using the 2009 total group mean scores, we find small to modest declines from 2008 to 2009 for each of these items (-.06 for overall conduct and also for accessibility; -.05 for courtesy and respect; and -.03 for helpfulness of information). However, if we use the LLD group mean scores, we would find a great deal of stability from 2008 to 2009 for each of these items (changes of only -.01 to +.02). Thus, while we generally consider the total group results to be the best comparative data, we prefer to err on the side of caution and not make a conclusion about changes here from 2008 to 2009 – except to say that ratings for these items either held stable or decreased slightly to modestly.[17]

Trends across the survey years for these items are summarized below and are presented in Table 7B.

For "courtesy and respect shown to motorists," there is a great deal of stability in the mean rating scores over the past six survey years (2003 through 2008), with means ranging only from 3.86 to 3.89. Use of the 2009 total group mean would show a decline

---

[17] This is the only section where we see consistent differences at this magnitude (though actually fairly small) between the total group and LLD group means. It should be noted that the results here for the LLD group are based on fewer respondents than most other items and have greater sampling error.

in the mean rating basically back to levels found in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002. Use of the 2009 LLD mean rating would show the stability carrying through into 2009.

For "overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job," there is a great deal of stability in the mean rating scores in the survey series through 2008 except for that of the first survey conducted, with means during this span of Fall 2001 to 2008 ranging from a low of 3.75 to a high of 3.82. Use of either the total group mean or the LLD group mean would carry this pattern of consistency through 2009. However, use of the 2009 total group mean would put the 2009 result at the lower end of this range (3.76) while use of the LLD group mean would actually put the 2009 result at this item's most positive level (3.83), just slightly more than that found in 2008. The Spring 2001 mean rating was a lower 3.64.

For "helpfulness of the information provided by employees," the mean ratings for the Fall 2001 through 2008 surveys range from a low of 3.70 to a high of 3.78. Use of either the total group mean or the LLD group mean would carry this pattern of consistency through 2009. However, use of the 2009 total group mean would put the 2009 result at the lower end of this range (3.72) while use of the LLD group mean would put the 2009 result toward the higher end of this range (3.76). The Spring 2001 mean rating was the lowest of all at 3.59.

For "accessibility of employees when you need them," the mean rating was either 3.55 or 3.58 for five of the six surveys between the Fall 2001 survey and the Spring 2006 survey (the Spring 2002 mean was 3.46). The mean rating then shows a small drop to 3.49 and 3.52 in the 2007 and 2008 surveys. If the 2009 total group mean is used, we would find another small decline, to 3.46. If the LLD group mean is used, we would find a continuation of the 2007-2008 level (3.51). As is the case for the items above, the lowest mean rating of 3.34 occurred in the first survey conducted in Spring 2001.

Table 7A
Ratings of IDOT's Employees on Selected Aspects and Overall Rating of IDOT Performance

Aspect rated [a]	**Excellent (5)** [b]	**Good (4)**	**Fair (3)**	**Poor (2)**	**Very Poor (1)**	***n* *[% of Total]***	***mean*** [d]
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	15% (15%)	57% (56%)	25% (26%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	*584 [58%]*	*3.82 (3.80)*
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	14% (14%)	55% (54%)	26% (28%)	4% (3%)	2% (1%)	*530 [52%]*	*3.76 (3.76)*
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	14% (14%)	51% (50%)	30% (31%)	4% (4%)	2% (1%)	*451 [44%]*	*3.72 (3.72)*
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	9% (8%)	44% (48%)	34% (33%)	11% (9%)	2 (2%)	*454 [45%]*	*3.46 (3.50)*
Overall performance: How would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Dept of Transportation is doing?	**6% (6%)**	**54% (52%)**	**35% (37%)**	**3% (4%)**	**2% (2%)**	***908 [89%]***	***3.59 (3.56)***
General trust:	**Just about always (4)**	**Most of the time (3)**	**Only some of the time (2)**	**Hardly ever (1)**	**Never (not asked 2007 - 2009)**	***n (% of total)***	***mean***
How often trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?	**15% (13%)**	**58% (59%)**	**23% (24%)**	**4% (4%)**	**---**	***761 [75%]***	***2.83*** *[3.83]* [c] ***(2.84)***

[a] Within each item, results on the top (no parentheses) are those for the total group, weighted only by District (estimates of licensed drivers). Results on the bottom (in parentheses) are those for the population-weighted group (weighting by population estimates for District, gender, age and education level). The items are ordered by mean rating for the total group results, from most positive to least positive. The numbers next to the items indicate the order that they appeared in the questionnaire.

[b] The actual scales (for both scales) in the questionnaire is reversed. However, we have recoded the scale so that the higher score represents a more positive rating.

[c] In 2007 through 2009, the response alternative "never" was not asked as it had been in 2005 and 2006. The "never" alternative had received very few responses in both 2005 and 2006 (about 1%), and eliminating it makes the response alternatives more balanced and more comparable to the "trust question" more usually asked in surveys. If the 1-to-4 scale in 2008 is scored on a 2-to-5 scale (thus more comparable to the 2005 and 2007 results), the means becomes 3.84.

[d] The LLD group mean rating for overall performance is the same as the total group mean, and the LLD mean for general trust is only -.01 less favorable than the total group mean. However, for the four items at the top of the table, the LLD group mean ratings are all more favorable than the total group means (in order, +.07 for #1; +.07 for #2; +.04 for #3; and +.05 for #4).

Table 7B
Mean Ratings of IDOT's Employees on Selected Aspects and Overall Rating of IDOT Performance: Trends Across Surveys

Aspect rated	Spring 2001 means (n)	Fall 2001 means (n)	Spring 2002 Means T: Total M: Cross B: Panel	Spring 2003 means (n)	Spring 2004 means (n)	Spring 2005 means (n)	Spring 2006 means (n)	Spring 2007 means (n)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	3.66 (640)	3.81 (612)	3.86 3.81 3.92	3.89 (887)	3.89 (819)	3.86 (804)	3.87 (802)	3.88 (870)	3.87 (767)	3.82 (584)
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	3.64 (598)	3.79 (554)	3.82 3.76 3.88	3.81 (818)	3.79 (744)	3.75 (740)	3.78 (730)	3.79 (801)	3.82 (690)	3.76 (530)
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	3.59 (507)	3.70 (456)	3.78 3.73 3.84	3.78 (713)	3.76 (621)	3.73 (651)	3.74 (623)	3.74 (687)	3.75 (571)	3.72 (451)
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	3.34 (485)	3.55 (447)	3.52 3.46 3.60	3.58 (687)	3.58 (588)	3.55 (622)	3.55 (611)	3.49 (683)	3.52 (564)	3.46 (454)
How would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Dept of Transportation is doing?	**3.53 (1271)**	**3.56 (1157)**	***3.63 3.59 3.68***	**3.63 (1361)**	**3.63 (1249)**	**3.58 (1260)**	**3.60 (1265)**	**3.54 (1308)**	**3.50 (1198)**	**3.59 (908)**
How frequently do you trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?	**----**	**----**	----	**----**	**----**	**3.78 (918)**	**3.75 (1026)**	**3.81** [2.81*] **(1020)**	**3.83** [2.83*] **(981)**	**3.84** [2.84*] **(761)**

*See footnote c in Table 7A. The "never" alternative was not asked in the 2007 through 2009 surveys.

Assessed importance of IDOT for area. Respondents were asked "how important [they] think IDOT is for [their] area's economy" and "for [their] area's overall quality of life." The same questions were asked in the 2008, 2007 and 2005 surveys. (See Table 8.)

For the 2009 total group results, just over eight in ten (81%) responded that IDOT was either "very important" (41%) or "important" (40%) for their area's economy while 14 percent said it was "somewhat important" and just over one in twenty (6%) said it was either "not very" (5%) or "not at all important" (1%). The distribution for assessed importance on the area's overall quality of life is virtually the same. Population-weighted results are overall very similar on both items as well.

Table 8
Assessed Importance of IDOT for Area

IDOT's importance for …	Very Impor-tant (5) [a]	Impor-tant (4)	Some-what impor-tant (3)	Not very impor-tant (2)	Not at all impor-tant (1)	*n [% of total]*	*mean*
Area's economy							
2009 [b]	41% (41%)	40% (40%)	14% (13%)	5% (5%)	1% (2%)	*878 [86%]*	*4.14*[c] *(4.14)*
2008	46%	34%	17%	3%	0+%	*1101 [84%]*	*4.22*
2007	44%	38%	13%	4%	1%	*1234 [87%]*	*4.20*
2005	32%	46%	18%	3%	1%	*1144 [86%]*	*4.06*
Area's overall quality of life							
2009 [b]	41% (42%)	41% (40%)	14% (12%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	*848 [83%]*	*4.17*[c] *(4.19)*
2008	45%	38%	14%	2%	0+%	*1078 [82%]*	*4.25*
2007	40%	41%	15%	3%	0+%	*1170 [83%]*	*4.17*
2005	33%	48%	16%	3%	0+%	*1153 [87%]*	*4.10*

[a] These values have been reversed from those in the questionnaire so that higher scores represent greater satisfaction.

[b] Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results.

[c] The LLD mean rating is 4.11 for impact on the area's economy (-.03 less favorable than the total group mean) and is 4.16 for impact on the area's quality of life (only -.01 from the total group mean).

Overall, the assessed importance of IDOT on their area's economy in 2009 is found to be somewhat less than it was in 2008 and slightly less than it was in 2007. However, the assessed importance in 2009 is greater than it was in 2005.

For the assessed importance of IDOT on their area's quality of life, the 2009 evaluations are again somewhat less than the 2008 evaluations but are on par with those in 2008. Again, the 2009 evaluations here are greater than those found in 2005.

Awareness and use of toll-free telephone number and website

Toll-free telephone number. For the 2009 total group results, about two-thirds (66%) indicated not being aware of IDOT's toll-free number to get information on road conditions. Just over one-quarter (26%) are aware of it but have never called while the remaining 8 percent said they had called it, 2 percent having done so in the past year. The population-weighted results show just slightly more who are not aware of the toll-free number (69%) and just slightly fewer who have ever called (7%). (See Table 9A.)

Overall, the results are very similar across the past seven years – with a "hint" of evidence that awareness has increased just slightly during the past year. (See Table 9A.)

Website. For the 2009 total group results, just over six in ten (61%) respondents indicated not being aware of IDOT's website that contains information on construction zones and road conditions. Just over one-quarter (27%) are aware of it but have never visited it while the remaining 12 percent said they have visited it. For each of these categories, the population-weighted results are within 1 or 2%. (See Table 9B.)

Over the past seven years, the percent <u>not aware</u> of the website has decreased by more than 10 percentage points -- from just over three-quarters in 2003 and 2004, to about 70 percent in 2005, then to about two-thirds in 2006 through 2008, and now to just over 60 percent in 2009. And, the total percent who indicated they have been to the website has doubled – from about 5 to 6 percent in 2003 and 2004, to 8 and 9 percent in 2005 and 2006, and then to 11 to 12 percent in the past three surveys. (See Table 9B.)

Table 9A
Awareness and Use of IDOT Toll-Free Number

Topic	Spring 2003	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Sum-mer 2008	Fall 2009 [a]
Aware of toll-free number to get info on road conditions? And have you called this number?							
NOT aware	68%	69%	69%	68%	68%	68%	66% (69%)
Aware -- but never called	24%	23%	24%	26%	24%	24%	26% (24%)
Called, but not in last 12 months	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6% (5%)
Called in last 12 months	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2% (2%)
n	*1353 (95%)*	*1260 (94%)*	*1254 (95%)*	*1252 (95%)*	*1318 (93%)*	*1252 (95%)*	*952 [94%]*

[a] Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results. LLD results (not reported in the table) are all within +/- 1% of the total group results.

Table 9B
Awareness and Use of IDOT's Internet Site

Topic	Spring 2003	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Sum-mer 2008	Fall 2009 [a]
Aware of website to get info on construction zones and road conditions? And ever visited site to get this info?							
NOT aware of website	77%	77%	71%	67%	69%	66%	61% (63%)
Aware -- but never visited	17%	18%	21%	23%	21%	22%	27% (26%)
To website but not for this info	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3% (3%)
Looked at this info on website	4%	4%	6%	7%	8%	10%	9% (8%)
n	*1344 (94%)*	*1246 (94%)*	*1239 (93%)*	*1232 (93%)*	*1284 (91%)*	*1236 (94%)*	*941 [93%]*

[a] Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results. LLD results (not reported in the table) are all within +/- 1% of the total group results.

Topical questions

As noted earlier, this year's topical issue questions focused on three general topical areas. They are:

Traffic safety questions

Assessed amount of traffic safety activities, and evaluations of the effectiveness of traffic safety messages (page 3, also asked in the 2008 and 2005 surveys)

Amtrak and high-speed rail

Level and sources of awareness of the "Illinois Works" capital improvement program (page 3)

Knowledge of year of last Illinois capital improvement program (page 3)

Priorities for selected types of capital improvements (page 3)

Support/opposition for the "Illinois Works" capital improvement program, and for any capital improvement program (page 3)

Support/opposition for three selected ways to pay for capital improvement program (page 4)

the Federal stimulus package

Importance of three selected characteristics of a stage agency (page 3)

Ratings of IDOT on these three selected characteristics, considering "tax dollars spent" (page 3)

Traffic Safety Questions

Amount of traffic safety activities. Respondents were first informed that "IDOT promotes traffic safety by conducting activities such as encouraging people to wear seat belts, discouraging people from drinking and driving, and encouraging the use of child restraint seats." After this information, respondents were first asked whether the "amount of activities IDOT conducts to promote traffic safety is too much, about right, or too little." And respondents were then asked to rate "the effectiveness of messages IDOT uses to promote traffic safety (relating to such things as: seat belts, drinking & driving, child restraint seats)."

The same questions were asked in the 2008 and 2005 surveys. Since we have earlier comparative results, our focus for 2009 here will be on the total group results. Results across these surveys are presented in Table 11.

Amount of traffic safety activities. For the 2009 total group results, nearly eight in ten respondents (79%) believe that the amount of traffic safety activities is "about right," and among the remainder, about three times as many believe the amount is too little rather than too much (16% vs. 5%). Population-weighted results are the same here.

These results are very close to those in both the 2008 and 2005 surveys, with only slightly more 2009 respondents choosing "too little" compared to the earlier surveys (16% vs. 13-14%).[18]

Effectiveness of traffic safety messages. For the 2009 total group results, just over two-thirds (69%) of the respondents rated the effectiveness of IDOT's traffic safety messages as either "excellent" (15%) or "good" (54%), just over one-quarter (26%) rated them as "fair," and one in twenty (5%) rated them as "poor" (4%) or "very poor" (1%). The population-weighted results here differ only slightly.

The 2009 total group results are just slightly more positive than those in either 2008 or 2005 (which are similar).[19]

Table 11
Evaluations of IDOT Traffic Safety Activities and Messages

Amount of activities IDOT conducts to promote traffic safety							
	Too little	**About right**	**Too much**	***n* *(% of sample)***			
2009 [a]	16% (16%)	79% (79%)	5% (5%)	*889 [88%]*			
2008	13%	80%	6%	*1162 [89%]*			
2005	14%	81%	5%	*1159 [87%]*			
Effectiveness of messages IDOT uses to promote traffic safety							
	Excellent (5) [b]	**Good (4)**	**Fair (3)**	**Poor (2)**	**Very Poor (1)**	***n* *(% of sample)***	***mean***
2009 [a]	15% (16%)	54% (53%)	26% (25%)	4% (4%)	1% (1%)	*871 [86%]*	*3.78 (3.78)*
2008	13%	54%	27%	5%	1%	*1154 [88%]*	*3.73*
2005	12%	54%	27%	5%	1%	*1188 [90%]*	*3.72*

[a] Results without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results. For amount of activities, the LLD results are 15% too little, 80% about right and 5% too much – with 86% rating, virtually the same as the total group results. For effectiveness of messages, the LLD results across the rating scale, in order, are: 13%, 54%, 27%, 5%, 1% -- with 85% rating, only slightly less favorable than the total group results.

[b] The scale in the printed questionnaire has been reversed to calculate the mean score.

[18] For licensed drivers with listed household numbers – the LLD group, the 2009 results are even closer.

[19] For licensed drivers with listed household numbers – the LLD group, the 2009 results are even closer (virtually identical to the 2008 results).

Opinions relating to Amtrak and High-Speed Rail Service

For the 2009 results in this section, our focus will be on the population-weighted results. total group results are also reported (all respondents weighted only by IDOT district). As noted earlier, the population-weighted results – which are weighted by geographic area, age, education and gender – better reflect the Illinois population. (Differences between the results are small.)

Distance / time from Amtrak. Respondents were first asked how far they live from a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois and then asked how long (time) it takes them to get to the closest train station that has a current Amtrak stop. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 1.

Amtrak Table-1
Distance and Time from Residence to Amtrak Stop
(Questions 1 and 2)

How far away do you live form a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois?	Wgtd by IDOT district (Total group)	Wgtd by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Live in city with stop	21%	24%
1 to 25 miles	32%	29%
26 to 50 miles	20%	19%
51 to 75 miles	5%	4%
More than 75 miles	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	20%	22%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
How long does it take you to get to the closest train station that has a current Amtrak stop?		
Up to 30 minutes	40%	40%
31 to 45 minutes	15%	14%
46 minutes to 1 hour	12%	12%
Over 1 hour / up to 1 ½ hours	7%	7%
More than 1 ½ hours	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	23%	25%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		

Distance from city with Amtrak station. For the population-weighted results, we find that nearly one-quarter (24%) of the respondents reported they live in a city with an Amtrak station, and just over half (53%) reported they live within 25 miles of such a city (including living in the city). Over seven in ten (72%) reported they live within 50 miles of an Amtrak station city while only 6 percent reported they live further than this. Over one in five (22%) did not know or did not answer the question.

Length of time to get to closest Amtrak station. For the population-weighted results, we find that 40 percent of the respondents reported they can get to the closest Amtrak station within ½ hour, just over half (54%) can do so within 45 minutes, and nearly two-thirds (66%) can do so within 1 hour. Nearly one in ten (9%) reported it takes longer. One-quarter of the respondents either did not know or did not answer the question.

Amtrak ridership. Respondents were asked whether they have ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois. If so, they were then asked how many times they had done so in the past 12 months. The results are reported in Amtrak Table 2.

Amtrak Table - 2
Amtrak Ridership
(Questions 3 and 3A)

Have you ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois?	Wgtd by IDOT district (Total group)	Wgtd by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Yes	46%	45%
No	53%	54%
Don't know	1%	1%
(n = 993; 98% of sample)		
<u>Of those who have</u>*: How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months?** ***(count round-trip as 2)		
Never	44%	43%
Once or twice	38%	39%
Three to five times	9%	9%
More than five times	6%	6%
Don't know	2%	3%
(n = 451; 44% of sample; 97% of relevant respondents)		
<u>Based on all respondents</u>*: How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months?** ***(count round-trip as 2)		
Never	74%	74%
Once or twice	18%	18%
Three to five times	4%	4%
More than five times	3%	3%
Don't know	1%	1%
(n = 977; 96% of sample)		

As seen in the above table, somewhat less than half (45%) of the respondents indicated they have ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois. _Of these_, more than four in ten indicated they have not done so in the past 12 months. _Translated into all respondents_, we find that nearly three-quarters have not ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois within the past 12 months while nearly one-quarter (24%) indicated they have. Just under one in five (18%) indicated they have done so once or twice, while 7 percent indicated they have ridden an Amtrak train more than this in the past 12 months.

High-speed rail opinions. Respondents were asked how much they favor or oppose having high-speed rail in Illinois and then were asked whether they favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail. Results are presented in bottom section of Amtrak Table 3. Results are presented in the top two sections of Amtrak Table 3.

Amtrak Table - 3
High Speed Rail Opinions
(Questions 4, 5 and 7)

How much do you favor or oppose having high-speed rail in Illinois? (Q-4)	Wgtd by IDOT district (Total group)	Wgtd by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Strongly favor	28%	27%
Favor	32%	32%
Oppose	9%	8%
Strongly oppose	6%	7%
Don't know / no answer	24%	26%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
How much do you favor or oppose Illinois applying for federal funds to help pay for high-speed rail in Illinois? (Q-5)		
Strongly favor	29%	25%
Favor	29%	30%
Oppose	10%	10%
Strongly oppose	9%	10%
Don't know / no answer	23%	26%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
If federal money for high-speed rail on Chicago-St. Louis route, should route go through same cities as it does now? (Q-7)		
Yes	30%	29%
No	9%	10%
Don't know / no answer	60%	61%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		

High-speed rail in Illinois and Illinois applying for federal funds. Nearly six in ten (59%) respondents favor having high-speed rail in Illinois, with over one-quarter (27%) strongly in favor. Only 15 percent oppose it, while just over one-quarter (26%) did not express an opinion. The distribution of opinion regarding whether Illinois should apply for federal funds shows just slightly fewer in favor – 55 percent, with one-quarter strongly in favor. One in five (20%) oppose this while again, just over one-quarter did not express an opinion.

High-speed rail cities between Chicago and St. Louis. Respondents were also asked whether a high-speed rail route between Chicago and St. Louis should go through the same cities as the route does now. Results are presented in bottom section of Amtrak Table 3. Just over six in ten (61%) did not express an opinion. For those who did, those in favor of the route going through the same cities outnumber those opposed by about three to one (29% vs. 10%).

Amtrak Table - 4
Projected Ridership on Three High-Speed Rail Routes
(Questions 6A, 6B and 6C)

How many times would you use high-speed rail on the following routes? ***(count round-trip as 2)***	Wgtd by IDOT district (Total group)	Wgtd by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
A. Chicago – St. Louis route		
Never	38%	38%
Less than once a year	17%	17%
Once or twice	16%	16%
Three to five times	4%	4%
More than five times	2%	2%
Don’t know / no answer	22%	22%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
B. Chicago – Milwaukee route		
Never	40%	39%
Less than once a year	14%	14%
Once or twice	15%	16%
Three to five times	4%	5%
More than five times	1%	1%
Don’t know / no answer	26%	25%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
C. Chicago – Detroit route		
Never	50%	50%
Less than once a year	10%	11%
Once or twice	6%	6%
Three to five times	2%	2%
More than five times	1%	1%
Don’t know / no answer	31%	31%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		

Projected ridership on three high-speed rail routes. Respondents were asked how many times <u>per year</u> they would use high-speed rail if it were available on three possible routes. Results are presented in Amtrak Table 4 on the previous page.

The Chicago – St. Louis route. Six in ten respondents (60%) either said they never would use the route (38%) or did not express an opinion (22%). One in six (17%) said they would use it less it once a year and about the same number (16%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Six percent said they would use it more.

The Chicago – Milwaukee route. More than six in ten respondents (64%) either said they never would use the route (39%) or did not express an opinion (25%). One in seven (14%) said they would use it less it once a year and about the same number (16%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Six percent said they would use it more.

The Chicago – Detroit route. Eight in ten respondents (81%) either said they never would use the route (50%) or did not express an opinion (31%). About one in ten (11%) said they would use it less it once a year and about half this number (6%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Three percent said they would use it more.

Federal stimulus package-related questions

Respondents were asked whether they had ever heard of the federal stimulus package that was enacted into law in February of 2009. And, they were asked how much of an impact the federal stimulus package has had on transportation funding and transportation-related construction in Illinois so far. The results are reported in Stimulus Table 1.

Awareness of the federal stimulus package. Three-quarters (75%) indicated they had heard of the federal stimulus package, with just over one in five (22%) indicating they had heard of the package and had seen the name (the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act). One quarter (25%) either indicated they had not heard of the stimulus package (16%) or did not know / did not answer (9%).

Assessed impact on Illinois transportation-related funding and construction. A plurality of about one-third (32%) did not express an opinion on this question. For those who did, we see a very symmetrical distribution – with 6 percent saying the stimulus package has had “a large impact” and 6 percent also saying it has had “no impact at all,” 14 percent saying the stimulus has had “a substantial impact” and the same number also saying it has had “not much of an impact,” and 28 percent saying it has had “some impact.”

Among those who had heard of the stimulus package, the no opinion percentage here drops to about one in five (19%). For those who do have an opinion, we again find a very symmetrical distribution – with 7 percent saying “a large impact” and the same number saying “no impact at all,” 17 percent saying “a substantial impact” and the same number saying “not much of an impact,” and 33 percent saying “some impact.”

Stimulus Table - 1
Awareness of and Assessed Impact of Federal Stimulus Package (Questions 1 and 2)

Had you heard of the federal stimulus package (ARRA)?	Wgtd by IDOT district (Total group)	Wgtd by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Yes, had heard of this	55%	53%
Yes, heard & had seen name	24%	22%
No, not heard of this	13%	16%
Don't know / no answer	9%	9%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
In your opinion, how much of an impact has the federal stimulus package had on transportation-related funding and construction in Illinois?		
A large impact	6%	6%
A substantial impact	14%	14%
Some impact	29%	28%
Not much of an impact	15%	14%
No impact at all	6%	6%
Don't know / no answer	30%	32%
(n = 1016; 100% of sample)		
Among those who had heard of federal stimulus package:		
A large impact	7%	7%
A substantial impact	16%	17%
Some impact	34%	33%
Not much of an impact	18%	17%
No impact at all	7%	7%
Don't know / no answer	18%	19%
(n = 799; 100% of relevant)		