



**Illinois Department
of Transportation**

**THE FALL 2010 ILLINOIS
MOTORIST OPINION SURVEY**

Conducted for
Illinois Department of Transportation

Conducted by



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

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Initial Report on Survey Results: December 30, 2010
Methodology and Tables Summarizing Results

Final Report: January 31, 2011

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 2010. 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. The 2009 survey was also conducted in the Fall.

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 are being provided in this report.

Methodology

The sample. For the recent Fall 2010 survey, a stratified sample of random 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.) For each of the selected addresses, Genesys Sampling Systems provided a “matched” household name, if available (86%), and also provided a telephone number if available (50%).¹ For the 2010 survey, only households with a “matched” name were sent surveys.

The final sample (with “matched” names) was stratified by IDOT region, with nearly 2,000 household addresses randomly selected from District 1, and nearly 1,900 from the remaining eight downstate districts (with 221 to 240 sent to each of these districts, for a total of 1,875). Thus, a grand total of 3,874 randomly-selected household addresses were in the original sample.

It should be noted that this sampling methodology was virtually the same as that used last year but different from that used in previous surveys in this series.² For all surveys previous to 2009 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 both the 2010 and 2009 surveys, has the advantage of including households with unlisted phone numbers as well as households with only cell phones and households with no phones.³

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 2009, surveys were also sent to addresses without “matched” names (sent to Current Resident). Because of the lack of personalization for these addresses (and the accompanying relatively low response rate that resulted from this group last year), it was decided to forego sending surveys to these addresses.

³ 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

In all years, the sampling methodology has included district stratification. As noted above, nearly 3,900 households were sent questionnaires in the recent 2010 survey. In 2007 through 2009, 3,800 households/household addresses were selected for the sample. 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).⁴

Data collection procedures. Each original sample member was sent an initial survey package in the third week of October, 2010.⁵ 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.⁶ The survey package was sent to "the household of" that particular name.

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.⁷

A web-based version of the questionnaire was introduced in 2008 and was continued in 2009 and 2010. 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.

Another variation in the methodology used across the surveys relates to who in the household we ask to complete the questionnaire. The changes here relate to increasing the number of younger respondents (who have always been under-represented in these surveys), as well as increasing the respondent pool from only

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 for the analysis of comparable results), we decided to use the ABS methodology for the 2009 and 2010 surveys.

⁴ 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.

⁵ The 2009 and 2010 Motorist Surveys were the first surveys 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Initial survey packages were mailed in the third week of October, 2010. Postcard reminders were mailed about one week later. And, follow-up survey packages to non-respondents were mailed in mid-November, 2010.

licensed drivers to all adults, as topical questions became more relevant to the latter in the last couple years. We have tried to accomplish these changes while at the same time keeping cross-time comparisons valid and meaningful.

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 birthday in the other half.

For the 2008 survey, we asked 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.

For the 2010 survey, we asked for the youngest adult at least 18 years old to complete the survey. We then asked for the household member with the next birthday if the youngest was not available. We did this to make the instructions more simple.⁸

Returns and response rate. Through December 21, 2010, 1,140 usable surveys had been returned to the Survey Research Office.⁹ Nearly 7 percent (n = 78) of these questionnaires were completed through the web-version of the questionnaire. The total number of completed questionnaires represents almost 30 percent (29.4%) of the initial sample. Excluding sample members no longer in the relevant populations or to whom mail was undeliverable, the cooperation rate becomes nearly 32 percent (31.6%). As usual, the cooperation rate is higher in the downstate districts – nearly 38 percent – than in the Chicago metro area’s District 1 – just over one-quarter (26.0%). The cooperation rates in the downstate districts range from a low of just over 31 percent for District 8 (Collinsville) to a high of nearly 43 percent for District 4 (Peoria). Relevant response rate and cooperation rate numbers for the total sample and by IDOT district are presented in Table 1 below.

⁸ The only “negative” here was that 16 and 17-year-old licensed drivers would not be eligible. However, extremely few respondents in this age group had responded over the course of the surveys.

⁹ We set this cut-off date in order to provide an initial report by December 31, 2010. Only about 20 additional questionnaires have been received after this cut-off date. Thus, we did not see the necessity to re-run the results. Response and cooperation rates are based on the number returned by this cut-off date of December 21, 2010.

Table 1
Estimated Response Rates,
Total and by IDOT District
 (returns/completions through 12/21/10)

District		Original number	Mail problems & out of popul.*	Remaining number	Returns/completions	“Initial” Response Rate (base: all)	Cooperation Rate (base: Remaining)
1	Schaumburg	1,999	112	1,887	490	24.5%	26.0%
2	Dixon	238	11	227	89	37.4%	39.2%
3	Ottawa	238	19	219	81	34.0%	37.0%
4	Peoria	240	23	217	93	38.8%	42.9%
5	Paris	228	26	202	81	35.5%	40.1%
6	Springfield	221	19	202	74	33.5%	36.6%
7	Effingham	240	19	221	87	36.2%	39.4%
8	Collinsville	240	20	220	69	28.8%	31.4%
9	Carbondale	230	20	210	76	33.0%	36.2%
TOTAL		3,874	269	3,605	1,140	29.4%	31.6%
1		1,999	112	1,887	490	24.5%	26.0%
2 - 9		1,875	157	1,718	650	34.7%	37.8%

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.¹⁰

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. And, respondents were asked several questions so that we could identify those respondents who could have been selected under the sampling methodology used in

¹⁰ 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.

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 Safe Routes to School program.

For the traffic safety topic, 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 and 2009 surveys.

For the Amtrak and high-speed rail topics, also asked in the 2009 survey, 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 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 Safe Routes to School Program topic, respondents were asked about their awareness/familiarity of the program and awareness of their community's involvement in it. And, they were asked their opinion of the program.

“Analysis” groups within the responding sample and sampling errors

Two “analysis” groups. Results for the 2010 respondents have been run for two “analysis” groups, identified below together with the respective “weighting” schemes.¹¹

1. The total sample group (or the “total group”): all 2010 responding sample members, weighted by IDOT district (estimated licensed drivers).
2. The population-weighted group: all 2010 respondents, weighted by gender, age and education characteristics of the Illinois adult public as well as by area of the state (estimated adult population).

¹¹ In last year's report (2009), we also looked at results for those respondents who would have been in the sampling frame surveys conducted prior to 2009 – in other words, those respondents who had listed landline telephone numbers and who were licensed drivers (the “LLD group” in last year's report). However, we discovered that these results did not differ much at all from the results of the two analysis groups identified above, and further, were based on about half as many respondents. Also, we found that the demographic characteristics for the 2009 “total group” were generally closer to the demographic characteristics in earlier surveys than were those for the “LLD group.” Thus, with the exception of one section, we did not see the need to analyze results from this sub-group in 2010. The exception, the section on evaluation of IDOT employees, was the one section where we found the greatest differences (albeit fairly small) between the “LLD group” and the total sample group in 2009.

For the total group (or total sample 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%).¹²

For the population-weighted (or “popul” or “popul-wgtd”) 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.¹³

Sampling errors. For the results of the two groups which are based on all questionnaires returned (n of 1,140, for the total group and the population-weighted group), the sampling error for this survey is +/- 3 percent, 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.¹⁴

Relevant characteristics for the two analysis groups. Table 2A presents selected sample-relevant characteristics for both of the two analysis groups. Table 2B presents demographic and driving-related characteristics for these two 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 the 2010 survey year: the total group results or the population-weighted results? The 2010 total group results appear more useful when comparing the results from continuing questions across the survey years. 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.)

¹² 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.

¹³ 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. It should be noted that the 2010 results did not have to be weighted by gender, since we basically found a 50/50 split from the completions.

¹⁴ Note that this assumes a non-biased sampling frame and no bias in those who responded.

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

For the tables summarizing current 2010 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 in upcoming text will be on the 2010 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 2010 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 2010 survey, the focus of the upcoming 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 2010 results between these two groups. (We will note those where there are.)

Demographic and driving-related characteristics, 2003 through 2010

Table 2C presents profiles of the respondents for selected demographic and driving-related characteristics from the most recent 2010 survey back to the 2003 survey.¹⁵ The 2010 total group results (weighted by district) are used in this comparison.

Certainly, there are some changes in the profiles across these years. (Here, the gender balance in 2008 and 2010 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.

¹⁵ 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 2A
Two Response / Weighting Groups,
2010 Survey

Characteristic	2010 Total Group (District- weighted) (1,140)	2010 Population- Weighted (1,140)
Initial response rate	29.3%	29.3%
“Comparable” group (listed & licensed driver)		
Comparable	59%	53%
Not in sampling frames prior to 2009	41%	47%
District		
Schaumburg (1)	59%	63%
Dixon (2)	9%	8%
Ottawa (3)	6%	5%
Peoria (4)	5%	4%
Paris (5)	6%	5%
Springfield (6)	5%	5%
Effingham (7)	3%	2%
Collinsville (8)	6%	5%
Carbondale (9)	3%	2%
Licensed driver		
Yes, licensed	97%	96%
Not licensed	3%	4%
Phones		
Landline		
No landline	18%	23%
Listed landline	60%	54%
Unlisted landline	17%	18%
Unknown	4%	4%
Cell phone		
Have cell phone	90%	91%
Combination		
No phone	2%	2%
Landline only	7%	6%
Cell only	19%	24%
Both land & cell	70%	66%
Unknown	1%	2%

Table 2B
Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2006 to 2010

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total (1016)	2009 Popul (1016)	2010 Total (1140)	2010 Popul (1140)
Cooperation rate	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%	29.6%	29.6%	31.6%	31.6%
Gender							
Male	54%	57%	50%	57%	49%	50%	48%
Female	46%	43%	50%	43%	51%	50%	52%
	(98%)	(97%)	(98%)	(99%)	(99%)	(98%)	(98%)
Age							
16 to 35	13%	12%	16%	12%	25%	15%	23%
36 to 45	16%	14%	12%	14%	18%	12%	17%
46 to 55	22%	21%	20%	21%	20%	21%	19%
56 to 65	22%	23%	21%	25%	19%	23%	20%
66 to 75	15%	18%	18%	16%	11%	18%	12%
Over 75	13%	12%	13%	12%	8%	12%	9%
Mean	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs	55.8 yrs	48.8 yrs	55.3 yrs	50.5 yrs
Median	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	50.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	51.0 yrs
	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(97%)	(97%)
Education							
Up to HS	28%	28%	28%	26%	31%	27%	31%
Post HS	32%	33%	33%	35%	37%	34%	37%
4-yr college	39%	39%	40%	38%	32%	39%	32%
	(97%)	(96%)	(97%)	(98%)	(97%)	(98%)	(98%)
Income							
< \$25,000	13%	12%	15%	16%	19%	16%	17%
\$25-49,999	27%	26%	24%	27%	27%	25%	26%
\$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	24%	23%	23%
\$75-100,000	16%	19%	18%	16%	13%	18%	17%
> \$100,000	17%	20%	20%	17%	16%	18%	18%
	(85%)	(85%)	(82%)	(83%)	(83%)	(86%)	(86%)
Up to \$49,999	40%	38%	39%	43%	47%	41%	43%
\$50-74,999	26%	23%	23%	24%	24%	23%	23%
\$75,000 and up	33%	39%	38%	33%	30%	36%	35%
Miles drive / yr							
Up to 6,000*	23%	19%	23%	26%	28%	25%	27%
6,000+ - 12,000	36%	33%	37%	34%	33%	37%	35%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	32%	29%	27%	26%	23%	24%
Over 20,000	13%	15%	11%	15%	14%	15%	14%
Mean	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles	13,837 miles	13,738 miles	13,823 miles	13,775 miles
Median	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles
	(90%)	(86%)	(90%)	(90%)	(88%)	(88%)	(86%)

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

Table 2B (continued)

Characteristic	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total	2009 Popul	2010 Total	2010 Popul
Residential location							
City of Chicago	10%	12%	11%	13%	21%	12%	21%
Chicago suburbs	38%	37%	35%	39%	36%	38%	34%
Metro East	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%
City > 75,000	8%	8%	8%	7%	5%	6%	5%
City 20-75,000	10%	10%	11%	8%	7%	10%	9%
City/town 10-20,000	8%	8%	10%	8%	8%	8%	7%
Town < 10,000	13%	14%	12%	11%	11%	12%	12%
Rural	9%	10%	10%	11%	9%	11%	10%
	(96%)	(94%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)
Miles drive-job/yr							
% giving number	42%	35%	27%	32%	30%	28%	29%
<i>Of these:</i>							
1 to 100	9%	8%	6%	11%	11%	11%	13%
101 to 1000	20%	23%	26%	21%	22%	23%	25%
1001 to 5000	23%	19%	24%	21%	20%	24%	20%
5001 to 12,000	26%	21%	22%	22%	23%	16%	17%
Over 12,000	22%	29%	21%	26%	24%	25%	25%
Median	5,000	5,731	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,342
Commuting							
% giving answer	53-54%	58%	51-52%	53%	57%	55%	59%
<i>Of these:</i>							
<i>avg miles one way to work</i>	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 = 16.3 Med = 12.0	Mean = 18.8** Med = 11.4	Mean = 18.4** Med = 11.0
<i>avg minutes to work</i>	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 = 28.7 Med = 25.0	Mean = 27.8 Med = 25.0	Mean = 28.3 Med = 25.0
<i>avg minutes home from work</i>	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 = 30.5 Med = 25.0	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0	Mean = 31.5 Med = 30.0
<i>avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)</i>	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 = 59.2 Med = 50.0	Mean = 58.4 Med = 50.0	Mean = 59.8 Med = 55.0

**In the calculation of these 2008 means, a few outlier cases were excluded. In 2010, a few extreme cases here were set at 500 miles for the maximum.

Table 2C
Selected Response and Demographic Characteristics, 2003 to 2010

Characteristic	2003 Sample	2004 Sample	2005 Sample	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total Group	2010 Total Group
Cooperation rate	44.3%	40.4%	40.1%	39.4%	39.4%	36.5%	29.6%	31.6%
Gender								
Male	55%	57%	56%	54%	57%	50%	57%	50%
Female	45%	43%	44%	46%	43%	50%	43%	50%
	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)	(98%)	(99%)	(98%)
Age								
16 to 35	16%	15%	15%	13%	12%	16%	12%	15%
36 to 45	19%	18%	18%	16%	14%	28%	14%	12%
46 to 55	21%	22%	20%	22%	21%	20%	21%	21%
56 to 65	19%	19%	21%	22%	23%	21%	25%	23%
66 to 75	13%	15%	15%	15%	18%	18%	16%	18%
Over 75	12%	11%	11%	13%	12%	13%	12%	12%
Mean	53.2 yrs	53.4 yrs	53.9 yrs	55.0 yrs	56.1 yrs	55.1 yrs	55.8 yrs	55.3 yrs
Median	53.0 yrs	53.0 yrs	54.0 yrs	55.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs	57.0 yrs
	(97%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(96%)	(97%)
Education								
Up to HS	32%	33%	29%	28%	28%	28%	26%	27%
Post HS	30%	30%	32%	32%	33%	33%	35%	34%
4-yr college	37%	38%	39%	39%	39%	40%	38%	39%
	(98%)	(96%)	(97%)	(97%)	(96%)	(97%)	(98%)	(98%)
Income								
< \$25,000	16%	17%	14%	13%	12%	15%	16%	16%
\$25-49,999	30%	31%	27%	27%	26%	24%	27%	25%
\$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%
\$75-100,000	15%	14%	16%	16%	19%	18%	16%	18%
> \$100,000	15%	17%	18%	17%	20%	20%	17%	18%
	(88%)	(83%)	(85%)	(85%)	(85%)	(82%)	(83%)	(86%)
Up to \$49,999	46%	48%	41%	40%	38%	39%	43%	41%
\$50-74,999	23%	22%	25%	26%	23%	23%	24%	23%
\$75,000 and up	30%	31%	34%	33%	39%	38%	33%	36%
Miles drive / yr								
Up to 6,000*	21%	20%	19%	23%	19%	23%	26%	25%
6,000+ -12,000	38%	36%	33%	36%	33%	37%	34%	37%
12,000+ - 20,000	28%	29%	31%	28%	32%	29%	27%	23%
Over 20,000	14%	16%	16%	13%	15%	11%	15%	15%
Mean	14,459 m (est)	14,795 miles	15,244 miles	14,045 miles	15,205 miles	13,479 miles	13,837 miles	13,823 miles
Median	12,000 m (est)	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	12,000 miles	10,000 miles	10,000 miles
	(94%)	(88%)	(90%)	(90%)	(86%)	(90%)	(90%)	(88%)

*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 2C (continued)

Characteristic	2003 Sample	2004 Sample	2005 Sample	2006 Sample	2007 Sample	2008 Sample	2009 Total Group	2010 Total Group
Residential location								
City of Chicago	<i>not comp*</i>	11%	12%	10%	12%	11%	13%	12%
Chicago suburbs	<i>not comp</i>	36%	34%	38%	37%	35%	39%	38%
Metro East	<i>not comp</i>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
City > 75,000	<i>not comp</i>	8%	6%	8%	8%	8%	7%	6%
City 20-75,000	<i>not comp</i>	10%	12%	10%	10%	11%	8%	10%
City/town 10,000-19,999	<i>not comp</i>	10%	8%	8%	8%	10%	8%	8%
Town < 10,000	<i>not comp</i>	11%	13%	13%	14%	12%	11%	12%
Rural	<i>not comp</i>	11%	10%	9%	10%	10%	11%	11%
		(95%)	(96%)	(96%)	(94%)	(97%)	(96%)	(96%)
Job miles drive / yr								
% giving number		42%	42%	42%	35%	27%	32%	28%
Of these:								
1 to 100	<i>na*</i>	5%	8%	9%	8%	6%	11%	11%
101 to 1000	<i>na</i>	22%	20%	20%	23%	26%	21%	23%
1001 to 5000	<i>na</i>	27%	24%	23%	19%	24%	21%	24%
5001 to 12,000	<i>na</i>	24%	24%	26%	21%	22%	22%	16%
Over 12,000	<i>na</i>	23%	24%	22%	29%	21%	26%	25%
Median	<i>na</i>	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,731	5,000	5,000	5,000
Commuting								
% giving answer		63%	62%	53-54%	58%	51-52%	53%	55%
Of these:								
avg miles one way to work	<i>na</i>	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	Mean = 18.8** Med = 11.4
avg minutes to work	<i>na</i>	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	Mean = 27.8 Med = 25.0
avg minutes home from work	<i>na</i>	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	Mean = 30.6 Med = 25.0
avg minutes total commute (adding avgs for above)	<i>na</i>	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	Mean = 58.4 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 2008 means, a few outlier cases were excluded. In 2010, for a few extreme cases for miles commute, the maximum was set at 500.

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 2010, the analysis group which we believe is the best comparison to these earlier results. However, we also present the population-weighted results in the 2010 tables. When summarizing results for the topical questions which first appear in the 2010 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 group(s) not the focus of the respective section when this is warranted (including respondents who are licensed drivers in “listed” households for one section).

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; one of which has appeared since the 2007 survey), and five aspects under the category of Traveler Services.

Generally speaking, the 2010 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, and only one item changed “Tiers.”

A majority of the Fall 2010 mean ratings for these items are basically on par with their respective 2009 mean ratings, with 13 of the 24 items having a 2010 mean rating within +/- 0.04 of its 2009 mean. For those items which show greater changes in mean ratings than this from 2009 to 2010, “declines” (i.e., less favorable mean ratings) are far more common than are “increases” (i.e., more favorable mean ratings) – by 10 to 1.

To put this in a broader context, by far the most common change in mean ratings for these items from 2008 to 2009 was that of improvement rather than decline – by a margin of 14 to 1. The other 9 items showed greater stability in their mean ratings from 2008 to 2009. It should be noted that several of the items show a 2008 mean rating that is the lowest, or among the lowest, of mean ratings across the survey series while some

of the 2009 mean ratings are the most positive, or among the most positive, in the entire survey series.

So, it seems useful to compare the 2010 means with those in 2008 as well. This comparison shows that the vast majority of items have 2010 means basically on par with those in 2008, with 17 of the 24 items having a 2010 mean rating within +/- 0.04 of its 2008 mean. For those items showing greater changes than this, improvement is far more common than decline – by a margin of 6 to 1.

These changes are summarized in the Summary Change Table below.

Summary Change Table
Changes in Mean Ratings for Items, Last Three Years

	Change^a	2008 to 2009	2009 to 2010	2008 to 2010
Maintaining Highways & Traffic Flow	Increase	4	0	1
	Stable	4	7	8
	Decrease	1	2	0
Road Repair & Construction	Increase	5	1	4
	Stable	5	6	5
	Decrease	0	3	1
Traveler Services	Increase	5	0	1
	Stable	0	0	4
	Decrease	0	5	0
All Items	Increase	14	1	6
	Stable	9	13	17
	Decrease	1	10	1

^aStable is defined as having mean ratings within +/- 0.04. Thus, even most “increases” and “decreases” are not changes of great magnitude.

The largest changes in mean ratings from 2009 to 2010, all declines, are found for the following ten items. Note the common topics of work zones, informational signs, and rest areas.

- Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #2 of 10 (-0.12)
- Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks, Traveler Services, item ranked #2 of 5 (-0.11)
- Cleanliness of rest areas, Traveler Services, item ranked #3 of 5 (-0.10)
- Landscaping and overall appearance, Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, item ranked #6 of 9 (-0.09)
- Availability of free IDOT road maps, Traveler Services, item ranked #5 (-0.09)
- Safety of rest areas, Traveler Services, item ranked #4 of 5 (-0.07)

- Warning signs when workers are present, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #1 of 10 (-0.07)
- The flow of traffic through work zones, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #9 of 10 (-0.06)
- Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic, Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, item ranked #9 of 9 (-0.06)
- Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging, Traveler Services, item ranked #1 of 5 (-0.06)

The only item showing an increase in mean ratings from 2009 to 2010 greater than +0.05 is the following.

- Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #7 of 10 (+0.05)

Of the seven items showing the largest changes in mean ratings from 2008 to 2010, six are “increases” (improvements). These are listed below. Note the common topics of ride quality and smoothness and timeliness of repairs.

- Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #7 of 10 (+0.23)
- Ride quality and smoothness on interstate highways, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #6 of 10 (+0.15)
- Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #10 of 10 (+0.13)
- Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #8 of 10 (+0.10)
- Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter, Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, item ranked #5 of 9 (+0.09)
- Cleanliness of rest areas, Traveler Services, item ranked #3 of 5 (+0.05)

The only item showing a decrease in mean ratings from 2008 to 2010 greater than -0.05 is the following.

- Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed, Road Repair and Construction, item ranked #2 of 10 (-0.06)

It should be noted that the first of the items in the above list of 2008-to-2010 increases, that of “ride quality of smoothness on non-interstate highways,” has a 2010 mean rating which ties (with Spring 2003) for being the most positive across the entire survey series.

Text and tables in these sections summarize these results in more detail. Detailed 2010 tables and trend tables follow the summary 2010 table and text for each section. The summary 2010 tables and detailed 2010 tables present results for both the total sample group (weighted only by district) and the population-weighted sample. Here, our focus is on the total group results because of their greater comparability to earlier surveys. So, the trend tables contain only the total sample group mean ratings for the 2009 and 2010 surveys.

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: 2010 Results ^a	Total Group			Population-wgtd		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean
Tier One						
1. Traffic signs (5)	17%	76%	3.87	16%	74%	3.83
2. Electronic message boards to advise of delays or construction areas (6)	18%	72%	3.85	17%	69%	3.80
Tier Two						
3. Visibility of lane / shoulder markings (7)	14%	64%	3.67	14%	64%	3.67
4. Snow and ice removal (4)	12%	64%	3.67	12%	61%	3.61
Tier Three						
5. Cleanliness of roadsides (1)	7%	57%	3.54	7%	57%	3.51
Tier Four						
6. Landscaping and overall appearance (3)	7%	51%	3.42	7%	51%	3.42
7. Timely removal of debris and dead animals (2)	7%	51%	3.41	8%	51%	3.40
8. Roadside lighting and reflectors (9)	7%	49%	3.40	7%	47%	3.36
9. Timing of traffic signals (8)	7%	49%	3.36	7%	48%	3.33

^aItems 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.

The 2010 results

Examining the 2010 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.

In the first tier are two aspects (ranked 1 and 2) which both receive “excellent” ratings from about one in six respondents, and receive ratings of “excellent” or “good” by about seven in ten respondents or more.

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 slightly to somewhat more than six in ten respondents.

In the third tier is one aspect (ranked 5) which receives “excellent” ratings by 7 percent and “excellent” or “good” ratings by somewhat less than six in ten respondents.

And, in the fourth tier are four aspects (ranked 6 through 9) which receive “excellent” ratings by fewer than one in ten respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by about half of the respondents.

See Table 3B for the full distribution of results for 2010, provided both for the “total” analysis group and for the population-weighted analysis group.

Changes from earlier surveys

Rankings and tiers. 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 2010 order of the specific aspects is very similar to that in 2009, with only one small change: the eighth and ninth ranked items change positions. Also, the #6 item, “landscaping and overall appearance,” dropped from Tier Three to Tier Four.

Mean ratings. When comparing 2010 mean ratings to those in 2009, we generally find a great deal of stability – with all but two items having a 2010 mean score that falls within +/- 0.04 of their respective 2009 mean score (three slight increases; four slight decreases). For the other two items, we find decreases in the mean scores from 2009 to 2010.

In contrast, a year ago, we generally found either stability or more positive scores in 2009 compared to 2008. A comparison of the 2010 and 2008 results finds that all but one of the items has a 2010 mean within +/- 0.04 of its respective 2008 mean score (five slight increases; one no change; two slight decreases). The other item shows an increase of +0.09 from its 2008 mean score.

Items showing largest changes from 2009 to 2010:

The greatest decrease from 2009 to 2010 (-0.09) is found for #6 “landscaping and overall appearance.” For this item, the latest 2010 result (3.42) shows a return almost to the low point of the survey series found in the 2008 survey (3.39) and down from its highest mean score found in 2009. In 2009, this item actually showed the greatest increase from its 2008 mean score.

A small decline (-0.06) is found for #9, “timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic.” For this item, the latest 2010 result (3.36) is back to nearly the 2008 level (3.35), which in turn is tied for the second lowest mean score for this item in the survey series.

Item showing largest change from 2008 to 2010:

The greatest increase from 2008 to 2010 (+0.09) is found for #5 “cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter.” While the 2010 mean score for this item is slightly below its 2009 mean (3.54 vs. 3.58), it has rebounded from its 2008 level (3.45), the lowest mean score for this item since the first Spring 2001 survey.

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)	<i>n</i> (% of sample)	<i>mean</i>
1. Traffic signs (for example, directional signs, warning signs, miles to destination signs) (5)	17% (16%)	59% (58%)	20% (20%)	3% (3%)	1% (2 ⁺ %)	1111 (97%)	3.87 (3.83)
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction areas (6)	18% (17%)	54% (52%)	24% (26%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	1080 (95%)	3.85 (3.80)
3. Visibility of lane and shoulder markings on highways (7)	14% (14%)	50% (50%)	27% (27%)	7% (7%)	2% (2%)	1109 (97%)	3.67 (3.67)
4. Snow and ice removal (4)	12% (12%)	52% (49%)	28% (29%)	6% (7%)	2% (3%)	1094 (96%)	3.67 (3.61)
5. Cleanliness of roadsides, absence of litter (1)	7% (7%)	50% (50%)	34% (34%)	7% (7%)	2% (3%)	1118 (98%)	3.54 (3.51)
6. Landscaping and overall appearance of roadsides and medians (3)	7% (7%)	44% (44%)	37% (36%)	9% (9%)	4% (4%)	1110 (97%)	3.42 (3.42)
7. Timely removal of debris and dead animals from pavement (2)	7% (8%)	44% (43%)	34% (35%)	10% (10%)	5% (4%)	1076 (94%)	3.41 (3.40)
8. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visibility after dark and in bad weather (9)	7% (7%)	41% (40%)	38% (38%)	10% (10%)	3% (4%)	1103 (97%)	3.40 (3.36)
9. Timing of traffic signals to maintain flow of traffic (8)	7% (7%)	42% (41%)	35% (35%)	11% (12%)	5% (5%)	1093 (96%)	3.36 (3.33)

^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.

^bThe 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)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)	Fall 2010 "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)	3.87 (1111)
2. Electronic message boards to advise drivers of delays or construction 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)	3.85 (1080)
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)	3.67 (1109)
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)	3.67 (1094)
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)	3.54 (1118)
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)	3.42 (1110)

(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)	Summer 2008 means (n)	Fall 2009 "Total" means (n)	Fall 2010 "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)	3.41 (1076)
8. Roadside lighting and reflectors for visibility 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)	3.40 (1103)
9. 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)	3.36 (1093)

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: 2010 Results ^a	Total Group			Population-wgtd		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean
<i>Tier One</i>						
1. Warning signs when workers are are present (7)	18%	75%	3.85	17%	74%	3.83
<i>Tier Two</i>						
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	9%	59%	3.55	8%	57%	3.51
3. Advance information about future construction projects through informa- tional highway signs (10)	11%	58%	3.55	10%	56%	3.50
<i>Tier Three</i>						
4. Advance information about construction projects through tv, radio, newspapers Internet (9)	10%	51%	3.38	10%	49%	3.35
5. Signs about alternative routes when construction (8)	8%	48%	3.35	8%	48%	3.34
<i>Tier Four</i>						
6. Ride quality / smoothness on interstates (3)	4%	42%	3.25	4%	42%	3.24
<i>Tier Five</i>						
7. Ride quality / smoothness on non-interstates (4)	3%	34%	3.13	3%	34%	3.13
8. Timeliness of repairs on interstates (1)	2%	33%	3.06	2%	31%	3.01
9. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	2%	32%	3.03	2%	30%	2.97
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstates (2)	2%	30%	2.97	2%	29%	2.94

^aItems 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.

The 2010 results

Examining the 2010 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.

In the first tier is one aspect (ranked 1) which receives “excellent” ratings from just less than one in five respondents, and receives ratings of “excellent” or “good” by about three-quarters of the respondents.

In the second tier are two aspects (ranked 2 and 3) which receive “excellent” ratings by about one in ten respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by just less than six in ten respondents.

In the third tier are two aspects (ranked 4 and 5) which receive “excellent” ratings by about one in ten respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by about half of the respondents.

In the fourth tier is one aspect (ranked 6) which receives “excellent” ratings by just under one in twenty respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by just over four in ten.

In the fifth tier are four aspects (ranked 7 through 10) which receive “excellent” ratings by fewer than one in twenty respondents and “excellent” or “good” ratings by proportions ranging from about 30 percent to about one-third.

See Table 4B for the full distribution of results for 2010, provided both for the “total” analysis group and for the population-weighted analysis group.

Changes from earlier surveys

Rankings and tiers. Overall, the order of the items within this section has remained very similar across the survey series. Most recently, the 2010 order of the specific aspects differs from the 2009 order only within the bottom tier. Here, the item ranked ninth in 2009 is now ranked seventh, while the two items tied for seventh in 2009 are now ranked eighth and ninth. The items within each of the Tiers remained the same from 2009 to 2010.

Mean ratings. When comparing 2010 mean ratings to those in 2009, we find six items which have a 2010 mean rating within +/- 0.03 of its respective 2009 mean (two slight increases; two no change; two slight decreases). For the remaining four items, a sizeable decrease is found for one item (-0.12), small decreases are found for two items (-0.07 and -0.06), and a small increase (+0.05) is found for the final item.

In contrast, a year ago, we found either stability or more positive mean scores in 2009 compared to 2008. A comparison of the 2010 and 2008 results finds five of the items has a 2010 mean within +/-0.04 of its 2008 mean (three slight increases; two slight decreases). Meanwhile, four of the remaining items show quite sizeable increases from 2008 to 2010. And, the final item shows a small decrease from 2008 to 2010.

Items showing largest changes from 2009 to 2010:

The greatest decrease from 2009 to 2010 (-0.12) is found for the item ranked #2 “work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed.” For this item, the latest 2010 result (3.55) is the least positive mean across the survey series. It should be noted that last year’s mean (3.67) was the second most

positive mean for this item across the survey series, being surpassed only by the mean first survey of 2001.

A smaller decline (-0.07) is found for the item ranked #1, “warning signs when workers are present.” For this item, the latest 2010 result (3.85) is the second least positive mean across the survey series, with only the mean in the first survey of Spring 2001 being lower (3.81). It should be noted that last year’s mean (3.92) was tied for the most positive across the survey series.

Another small decline (-0.06) is found for the item ranked #9, “the flow of traffic through work zones.” For this item, the latest 2010 result (3.03) is the lowest mean since the 2001 surveys.

A small increase (+0.05) is found for the item ranked #7, “ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways.” The latest 2010 result (3.13) is tied with the Spring 2003 mean for being the most positive mean rating for this item across the survey series.

Items showing largest changes from 2008 to 2010:

The greatest increase (+0.23) is found for the item ranked #7, “ride quality and smoothness of pavement on non-interstate highways.” As noted above, the latest 2010 result (3.13) is tied with the Spring 2003 mean for being the most positive mean rating for this item across the survey series. In contrast, the 2008 mean rating for this item was the lowest in the series.

A sizeable increase (+0.15) is also found for the item ranked #6 “ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates.” While the 2010 mean score for this item shows no change from its 2009 mean (3.25), it has maintained its rebound from its 2008 level (3.10), the lowest mean score for this item since the first Spring 2001 survey.

Another sizeable increase (+0.13) is also found for the item ranked #10 “timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways.” While the 2010 mean score for this item is virtually the same as that in 2009 mean (2.97 vs. 2.98), it also has maintained its rebound from its 2008 level (2.84), the lowest mean score for this item in the survey series.

And, a rather sizeable increase (+0.10) is found for the item ranked #8 “timeliness of repairs on interstate highways.” While the 2010 mean score for this item is just slightly lower than in 2009 (3.06 vs. 3.09), it likewise has maintained its rebound from its 2008 level (2.96), the lowest mean score for this item in the survey series.

A small decrease (-0.06) from 2008 to 2010 is found for the item ranked #2, “work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed.” As noted above (see the first item under “largest changes from 2009 to 2010”), this item also showed the greatest decrease in mean ratings in this section from 2009 and 2010. And, the latest 2010 result (3.55) is the least positive mean for it across the survey series.

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)	<i>n</i> (% of sample)	<i>mean</i>
1. Warning signs when workers are present (7)	18% (17%)	57% (57%)	19% (19%)	4% (5%)	2% (2%)	1107 (97%)	3.85 (3.83)
2. Work zone signs to direct merging traffic and alert motorists to reduce speed (6)	9% (8%)	50% (48%)	31% (33%)	8% (8%)	3% (3%)	1112 (98%)	3.55 (3.51)
3. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through informational signs on highways (10)**	11% (10%)	46% (46%)	31% (31%)	8% (10%)	3% (3%)	1045 (92%)	3.55 (3.50)
4. Advance information about construction and repair projects to the public through tv, radio, and newspapers (9)	10% (10%)	41% (39%)	32% (32%)	13% (14%)	5% (5%)	1031 (90%)	3.38 (3.35)
5. Signs about alternative routes when there is construction (8)	8% (8%)	40% (40%)	35% (35%)	13% (12%)	4% (5%)	1082 (95%)	3.35 (3.34)
6. Ride quality and smoothness of pavement on interstates (3)	4% (4%)	38% (38%)	43% (42%)	10% (10%)	5% (6%)	1093 (96%)	3.25 (3.24)
7. Ride quality and smoothness on non-interstate highways (4)	3% (3%)	31% (31%)	46% (46%)	15% (15%)	5% (4%)	1087 (95%)	3.13 (3.13)
8. Timeliness of repairs on interstate highways (1)	2% (2%)	31% (29%)	43% (43%)	17% (19%)	6% (7%)	1055 (92%)	3.06 (3.01)
9. The flow of traffic through work zones (5)	2% (2%)	30% (28%)	44% (44%)	16% (18%)	8% (9%)	1102 (97%)	3.03 (2.97)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (2)	2% (2%)	27% (26%)	42% (41%)	22% (23%)	6% (7%)	1053 (92%)	2.97 (2.94)

^aWithin 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.

^bThe 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)	Fall 2010 "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)	3.85 (1107)
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)	3.55 (1112)
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)	3.55 (1045)
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)	3.38 (1031)
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)	3.35 (1082)

(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)	Fall 2010 "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)	3.25 (1093)
7. 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)	3.13 (1087)
8. 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)	3.06 (1055)
9. 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)	3.03 (1102)
10. Timeliness of repairs on non-interstate highways (2)	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)	2.97 (1053)

Traveler services

Results are presented below (in Table 5) 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: 2010 Results ^a	Total Group			Population-wgtd		
	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean	Excel- lent	Exclnt or Good	Mean
Tier One						
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging (3)	23%	82%	4.02	24%	80%	4.00
Tier Two						
2. Informational signs about tourist attractions and state parks (4)	16%	72%	3.83	15%	71%	3.80
Tier Three						
3. Cleanliness of rest areas (1)	15%	69%	3.74	14%	68%	3.71
4. Safety of rest areas (2)	13%	66%	3.71	13%	65%	3.69
Tier Four						
5. Availability of free IDOT maps (5)	14%	55%	3.44	13%	53%	3.38

^aItems 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.

The 2010 results

Examining the 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 one in six respondents for the latter. And, about eight in ten respondents gave either “excellent” or “good” ratings to the former compared to just over seven 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.” For

these items, about one in seven gave an “excellent” rating while about two-thirds gave “excellent” or “good” ratings.

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 seven gave this item an “excellent” rating.

Changes from earlier surveys

Rankings and tiers. The rank order of these aspects in 2010 accords with that in virtually every previous survey.¹⁶ And, there is no change in the Tiers from 2009 to 2010.

Means. An examination of the 2009 to 2010 mean rating changes shows decreases for every one of the items in this section, ranging from -0.06 to -0.11. This is in contrast to last year, when we discovered increases in the mean ratings for every one of these items from 2008 to 2009. However, as will be seen below, the 2009 mean scores were among the most positive for these items in the survey series, while the 2008 means were among the least positive in the series for several of these items. A comparison of the latest 2010 results with 2008 shows either no change or slight increases in the mean ratings.

Items, ordered by size of changes from 2009 to 2010:

For the item ranked #2, “informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks,” the 2010 mean (3.83) is 0.11 less positive than the 2009 mean and back to the level found in 2008. It should be noted that last year’s 2009 mean (3.94) is the most positive for this item across the entire survey series. Means for this item in the remaining surveys, including this year, range only from 3.83 to 3.87.

For the item ranked #3, “cleanliness of rest areas,” the 2010 mean (3.74) is 0.10 less positive than that for 2009 (3.84) but a bit more positive than that found in 2008 (3.69). It should be noted that the 2009 mean is among the most positive across the entire survey series (second only to Spring 2002’s 3.85), and the 2008 mean is the least positive across this series.

For the item ranked #5, “availability of free IDOT road maps,” the 2010 mean (3.44) is 0.09 less positive than the 2009 mean (3.53) but a bit more positive than the 2008 mean (3.40). It should be noted that the mean for this item had been fairly consistent from 2004 through 2008 (3.39 to 3.42). And, last year’s 2009 mean is the most positive for this item across the entire survey series.

¹⁶ 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. 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.

For the item ranked #4, “safety of rest areas,” the 2010 mean (3.71) is 0.07 less positive than that found in 2009 (3.78), the most positive mean for this item across the survey series. It is just slightly more positive than the 2008 mean (3.69). With the exception of the very first survey of Spring 2001 (at a lower 3.58), this item’s mean ratings in all surveys previous to 2009 had ranged from a low of 3.67 to a high of 3.74 – which puts the 2010 mean in the middle of this range.

For the item ranked #1, “informational signs at highway exits for food, gas and lodging,” the 2010 mean (4.02) is 0.06 less positive than the 2009 mean (4.08), the most positive for this item of the survey series. However, the 2010 mean is slightly more positive than the 2008 mean (3.99), the least positive for this item of the series. It should be noted that, with the exception of 2008, this item has consistently had mean scores slightly or somewhat above 4.00.

Table 5A
Ratings on Aspects relating to Traveler Services

Aspect rated^a	Excellent (5)^b	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	<i>n</i> (% of sample)	<i>mean</i>
1. Informational signs at highway exits for food, gas, and lodging (3)	23% (24%)	59% (57%)	16% (16%)	2% (3%)	1% (1%)	1085 (95%)	4.02 (4.00)
2. Informational highway signs about area tourist attractions and state parks (4)	16% (15%)	57% (56%)	23% (23%)	4% (4%)	1% (1%)	1049 (92%)	3.83 (3.80)
3. Cleanliness of rest areas for highway motorists (1)	15% (14%)	55% (53%)	22% (23%)	6% (7%)	2% (2%)	909 (80%)	3.74 (3.71)
4. Safety of rest areas for highway motorists (2)	13% (13%)	54% (52%)	26% (28%)	6% (6%)	1% (2%)	865 (76%)	3.71 (3.69)
5. Availability of free IDOT road maps (5)	14% (13%)	41% (40%)	25% (26%)	14% (14%)	5% (7%)	746 (65%)	3.44 (3.38)

^aWithin 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.

^bThe 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)	Fall 2010 "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)	4.02 (1085)
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)	3.83 (1049)
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)	3.84 (802)	3.74 (909)
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)	3.78 (762)	3.71 (865)
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)	3.53 (637)	3.44 (746)

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 2010, 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 2010 results

For the total group results in 2010, the most positive average scores are found for Traveler Services (mean = 3.77; median = 4.00) followed by the averages for Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow (mean = 3.57; median = 3.67) and then Road Repair and Construction (mean = 3.28; 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 average ratings (both for means and medians) are either the same or just slightly less positive than for the total group results.

Trends in the survey series

For the composite ratings on items within the area of Maintaining Highways and Traffic Flow, 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 2010 survey (3.57) falls just below this small range, down from 3.60 in 2009 but on par with the 2008 composite mean (3.56) and slightly more positive than the mean in the very first survey in Spring 2001 (3.54). 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 Road Repair and Construction, we find a high degree of consistency in average scores for nine of the ten surveys conducted from the Fall 2001 survey to the 2010 survey.¹⁷ For these nine surveys, the mean composite rating ranges only from 3.27 to 3.33, and the median composite rating is 3.33 in all but one of these nine surveys (the median in the other, the 2008 survey, is 3.30). The latest 2010 survey results are part of this consistent pattern, albeit toward the “lower” end of this range. The 2010 composite mean here is slightly less positive than was the case in 2009, which was toward the “higher” end of this range, but on par with the 2008 composite mean (3.27). It should be noted that the most positive composite average across the entire survey series was found for 2006 survey (mean = 3.36; median = 3.42) while the least positive was found for the very first Spring 2001 survey (mean and median both = 3.22).

For the composite ratings on items within the area of Traveler Services, we also find a great deal of consistency across the survey series, with nine of the eleven surveys having means ranging from 3.74 to 3.79. We find the composite mean in the latest

¹⁷ In calculating the composite score for 2007 through 2010, only the 9 continuing items were used.

2010 survey to be in the middle of this range. This composite mean is 0.08 less positive than the 2009 composite (3.85), but this was the most positive across the entire survey series. And, it is slightly more positive than the 2008 mean (3.74), which is at the “lower” end of this range. It should be noted that the least positive composite mean here was found for the very first Spring 2001 survey (3.71), as was the case for the other two composite means. Median composite scores are 3.80 or 4.00 across the entire series, with the 2010 result being the latter.

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, 2010				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	3.67 (3.62)	3.57 (3.55)	0.59 (0.61)	1139
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9) (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	3.33 (3.33)	3.28 (3.28)	0.66 (0.67)	1137
<i>Traveler services (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	4.00 (4.00)	3.77 (3.74)	0.68 (0.71)	1106
Fall, 2009				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	3.67 (3.67)	3.60 (3.58)	0.59 (0.59)	1007
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9) (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	3.33 (3.33)	3.32 (3.29)	0.63 (0.64)	1009
<i>Traveler services (population-wgtd in parentheses)</i>	4.00 (4.00)	3.85 (3.82)	0.63 (0.63)	958
Summer, 2008				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.56	0.57	1296
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i>	3.30	3.27	0.64	1298
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.74	0.68	1241
Spring, 2007				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.61	0.57	1402
<i>Road repair and construction (1-9)</i>	3.33	3.30	0.65	1397
<i>Traveler services</i>	4.00	3.77	0.67	1352
Spring, 2006				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.62	0.57	1318
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.42	3.36	0.62	1315
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.75	0.64	1271
Spring, 2005				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.61	0.56	1315
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.30	0.64	1311
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.79	0.62	1278

(continued on next page)

Table 6A
Summary Statistics for Composite Section Ratings

	Median	Mean	Std dev	n
Spring, 2004				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.63	0.53	1320
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33	0.61	1318
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.78	0.65	1280
Spring, 2003				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.62	0.53	1418
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33	0.59	1416
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.77	0.63	1370
Spring, 2002 <i>Top number: total</i> <i>Middle number: cross-sectional</i> <i>Bottom number: panel</i>				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.63*	0.54	1760
	3.67	3.61	0.54	964
	3.67	3.67	0.53	796
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.33*	0.60	1753
	3.33	3.30	0.59	959
	3.38	3.36	0.61	795
<i>Traveler services</i>	4.00	3.80*	0.60	1680
	3.80	3.77	0.61	900
	4.00	3.84	0.60	780
Fall, 2001				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.67	3.60	0.53	1245
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.33	3.29	0.62	1243
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.77	0.63	1205
Spring, 2001				
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.56	3.54	0.57	1391
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.22	0.60	1389
<i>Traveler services</i>	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"	Fall 2010 "Total"
Mean Composites											
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.54	3.60	3.63 3.61 3.67	3.62	3.63	3.61	3.62	3.61	3.56	3.60	3.57
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.29	3.33 3.30 3.36	3.33	3.33	3.30	3.36	3.30	3.27	3.32	3.28
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.71	3.77	3.80 3.77 3.84	3.77	3.78	3.79	3.75	3.77	3.74	3.85	3.77
Median Composites											
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	3.56	3.67	3.67 3.67 3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	3.22	3.33	3.33 3.33 3.38	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.42	3.33	3.30	3.33	3.33
<i>Traveler services</i>	3.80	3.80	4.00 3.80 4.00	3.80	3.80	3.80	3.80	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.00

Table 6C
Differences in Summary Composite Section Ratings
Across Surveys

Rating Area <i>(in order, differences between Spring 2002 and Fall 2001 represent: total sample, cross-sectional sample, and panel sample)</i>	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	Difference: Fall 2010 “Total” – Fall 2009
Year to Year Changes / Means										
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	+.06	+.03 +.01 +.07	+.01	+.01	-.02	+.01	-.01	-.05	+.04	-.03
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	+.07	+.04 +.01 +.07	+.03	+.00	-.03	+.06	-.06	-.03	+.05	-.04
<i>Traveler services</i>	+.06	+.03 +.00 +.07	+.00	+.01	+.01	-.04	+.02	-.03	+.11	-.08
Year to Year Changes / Medians										
<i>Maintaining highways and traffic flow</i>	+.09	+.00 +.00 +.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>Road repair and construction</i>	+.11	+.00 +.00 +.05	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.09	-.09	-.03	+.03	.00
<i>Traveler services</i>	+.00	+.20 +.00 +.20	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.00	+.20	-.20	+.20	.00

^aTo 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 2010 – for the total group results, just over one in twenty (6%) gave IDOT an overall rating of “excellent” while over half (53%) responded with “good.” About one-third (34%) said “fair” while just over one in twenty gave a rating of “poor” (6%) and hardly any indicated “very poor” (1%). The average (mean) rating is 3.57. (See the middle of Table 7A.) The population-weighted results are only slightly less favorable (mean of 3.54).

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. 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 2008, slightly lower than the 2001 level and the least favorable mean found in the survey series. In 2009, we saw a recovery in this mean rating to 3.59, the level found in 2005 and 2006, and earlier in 2002. The 2010 mean is only slightly less positive than this (3.57) and in the middle of the range for the full survey series. (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 the “low point” in 2008, the percent who gave an “excellent” rating decreased from only 6 percent in these earlier years to 4 percent in 2008. At the same time, 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 2010, the percent who gave an “excellent” rating is 6 percent, as it was in 2009, and the percent who gave either an “excellent” or “good” rating is 59 percent, nearly matching the 60 percent in 2009. The percent who gave either a “poor” or “very poor” rating is 7 percent, just slightly more than the 5 percent found in 2009.

General trust. For the sixth 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 2010 – for the total group results, three-quarters (75%) chose either “just about always” (13%) or “most of the time” (62%). Just over one in five (21%) chose “only some of the time” while less than one in twenty (4%) chose “hardly ever.” (See the bottom of Table 7A.) (The population-weighted results are virtually the same.)

When the 2007 through 2010 results are scored so as to be comparable to the earlier surveys, we find the 2010 mean rating (3.84) is basically the same as the 2008 and 2009 means (both 3.83) and just slightly more positive than the 2007 mean (3.81). Mean scores were somewhat lower in 2005 and 2006 (3.78 and 3.75, respectively).¹⁸

¹⁸ In 2007 through 2010, 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, 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 3.81 in 2010; with 71% giving “excellent” or “good”) followed by “overall conduct on the job” (3.77); with 68% giving “excellent” or “good”) and then “helpfulness of the information provided” (3.73; 67% giving “excellent” or “good”). The aspect rated least positive is “accessibility of employees” (3.51; 56% giving “excellent” or “good”). (See Table 7A for the 2010 results.) The population-weighted results here show just slightly less favorable ratings for all items.

Using the total group mean scores, we find a small increase from 2009 to 2010 in the mean rating for the item ranked #4, “accessibility of employees when you need them” (+0.05) and slight changes of only +/- 0.01 for the other three items. For the 2008 to 2010 changes, we find small decreases for the item ranked #1, “courtesy and respect shown to motorists” (-0.06), and for the item ranked #2, “overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job” (-0.05). Very slight decreases are found for the other two items.

Here, it is also useful to examine the 2010 mean ratings for the licensed drivers in “listed” households – the “exact” comparison group to surveys prior to 2009.¹⁹ Means for this comparison group here are slightly, but consistently, more positive than are the total group mean ratings: 3.85 vs. 3.81 for courtesy and respect shown to motorists; 3.82 vs. 3.77 for overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job; 3.79 vs. 3.73 for helpfulness of information; and 3.54 vs. 3.51 for accessibility. This was also the case in 2009.²⁰

Using the mean scores for licensed drivers in listed households for the last two surveys, we would find a great deal of stability from 2008 to 2009 for each of these items (changes of only -.01 to +.02) and then: a slight decrease to 2010 for the item ranked #1, “courtesy and respect shown to motorists” (3.87 to 3.89 to 3.85 for 2008, 2009 and 2010, respectively); slight increases for the item ranked #3, “helpfulness of the information provided” (3.75 to 3.76 to 3.79) and the item ranked #4, “accessibility of

¹⁹ “Listed” households are households with directory-listed telephone numbers (labeled the “LLD Group” in the 2009 report – for Listed Licensed Drivers). We present these results here because, in 2009, this was the only section where we saw consistent differences of the greatest magnitude (though actually fairly small) between the total group results and results from licensed drivers in “listed” households. It should be noted that the results for this “LLD” group are based on fewer respondents than most other items and have greater sampling errors.

²⁰ The magnitudes of the differences in 2009 were in the range of +0.05 to +0.07.

employees” (3.52 to 3.51 to 3.54); and stability for the item ranked #2, “overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job” (3.82 to 3.83 to 3.82).

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

For the item ranked #1, “courtesy and respect shown to motorists,” there is a great deal of stability in the mean rating scores over the six survey years of 2003 through 2008, with means ranging only from 3.86 to 3.89. In the last two surveys, the total group mean has declined to 3.82 and 3.81, about the level we found in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002. But, the mean ratings for the exact comparison group (licensed drivers in listed households) for the two recent years are generally within this range (3.89 in 2009 and a 3.85 in 2010, just below this range).

For the item ranked #2, “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 2010 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. Results in the past two years for the total sample group fall at the “lower” end of this range, while the 2008 result was at the “high” end. Mean ratings for the exact comparison group (licensed drivers in listed households) for the two recent years also fall at the higher end of this range or just above it (3.83 and 3.82). The first survey of Spring 2001 had a lower mean rating of 3.64.

For the item ranked #3, “helpfulness of the information provided by employees,” the mean ratings for the Fall 2001 through 2010 surveys range from a low of 3.70 to a high of 3.78. Results for the total sample group in the past two years tend toward the “lower” end of this range (3.72 and 3.73). Mean ratings for the exact comparison group (licensed drivers in listed households) for the two recent years tend toward the “higher” end of this range, or just above it (3.76 in 2009 and 3.79 in 2010). The Spring 2001 mean rating was the lowest of all at 3.59.

For the item ranked #4, “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 total sample group means are used, we would find another small decline to 3.46 in 2009 and then a small rebound in 2010 to the 2007/2008 level (3.51). Using mean ratings for the exact comparison group (licensed drivers in listed households) for the two most recent surveys, we would find stability from 2008 to 2009 (3.52 and 3.51) and then a small increase in 2010 (3.54) back almost to the 2005/2006 level (3.55). The Spring 2001 mean rating was the lowest of all at 3.34.

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)	<i>n</i> [% of Total]	<i>mean</i>
1. Courtesy and respect shown to motorists (1)	18% (18%)	53% (52%)	24% (23%)	5% (6%)	1% (1%)	671 [59%]	3.81 (3.81)
2. Overall conduct of IDOT employees on the job (4)	17% (17%)	51% (50%)	26% (26%)	4% (6%)	1% (2%)	622 [55%]	3.77 (3.75)
3. Helpfulness of the information provided by employees (3)	14% (14%)	53% (52%)	26% (25%)	5% (7%)	2% (2%)	533 [47%]	3.73 (3.70)
4. Accessibility of employees when you need them (2)	10% (11%)	46% (46%)	30% (30%)	10% (10%)	3% (3%)	539 [47%]	3.51 (3.50)
Overall performance: How would you rate THE OVERALL JOB the Illinois Dept of Transportation is doing?	6% (5%)	53% (52%)	34% (35%)	6% (6%)	1% (2%)	1033 [91%]	3.57 (3.54)
General trust:	Just about always (4)	Most of the time (3)	Only some of the time (2)	Hardly ever (1)	Never (not asked 2007 - 2010)	<i>n</i> (% of total)	<i>mean</i>
How often trust IDOT to do what is right regarding transportation issues?	13% (13%)	62% (61%)	21% (21%)	4% (4%)	---	870 [76%]	2.84 [3.84]^c (2.83)

^aWithin 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.

^bThe 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.

^cIn 2007 through 2010, 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 2010 is scored on a 2-to-5 scale (thus more comparable to the 2005 and 2007 results), the means becomes 3.84.

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)	Fall 2010 "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)	3.81 (671)
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)	3.77 (622)
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)	3.73 (533)
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)	3.51 (539)
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)	3.57 (1033)
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)	3.83 [2.83*] (761)	3.84 [2.84*] (870)

*See footnote c in Table 7A. The "never" alternative was not asked in the 2007 through 2010 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 2005 survey and in the 2007 through 2009 surveys. (See Table 8.)

Table 8
Assessed Importance of IDOT for Area

IDOT’s importance for ...	Very Important (5) ^a	Important (4)	Somewhat important (3)	Not very important (2)	Not at all important (1)	<i>n</i> [% of total]	<i>mean</i>
Area’s economy							
2010^b	40% (42%)	39% (39%)	17% (16%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	965 [85%]	4.16 (4.18)
2009^b	41% (41%)	40% (40%)	14% (13%)	5% (5%)	1% (2%)	878 [86%]	4.14 (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							
2010^b	41% (41%)	41% (41%)	15% (14%)	2% (2%)	1% (1%)	928 [81%]	4.20 (4.20)
2009^b	41% (42%)	41% (40%)	14% (12%)	4% (5%)	1% (1%)	848 [83%]	4.17 (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

^aThese values have been reversed from those in the questionnaire so that higher scores represent greater satisfaction.

^bResults without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results.

For the 2010 total group results, nearly eight in ten (79%) responded that IDOT was either “very important” (40%) or “important” (39%) for their area’s economy while 17 percent said it was “somewhat important” and under one in twenty (3%) said it was either “not very” (2%) or “not at all important” (1%). The distribution for assessed importance on the area’s overall quality of life is just slightly more positive – with just

over eight in ten (82%) saying either “very important” or “important.” The population-weighted results are very close to these results.

Overall, the assessments of the importance of IDOT on their area’s economy in both 2010 and 2009 (means = 4.16 and 4.14) are found to be somewhat less positive than they were in 2008 and 2007 (4.22 and 4.20). However, these assessments are more positive than in 2005 (4.06).

For the assessments of the importance of IDOT on their area’s quality of life, the 2010 and 2009 evaluations (means = 4.20 and 4.17) are again somewhat less positive than the 2008 evaluations (4.25). However, they are basically on par with those in 2007 (4.17) and are more positive than in 2005 (4.10).

Awareness and use of toll-free telephone number and website

Toll-free telephone number. For the 2010 total group results, about two-thirds (66%) indicated not being aware of IDOT’s toll-free number to get information on road conditions. One-quarter (25%) are aware of it but have never called while the remaining 9 percent said they had called it, 2 percent having done so in the past year. The population-weighted results show 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 eight – with a “hint” of evidence that awareness has increased just slightly during the past two years. (See Table 9A.)

Website. For the 2010 total group results, just over six in ten (62%) respondents indicated not being aware of IDOT’s website that contains information on construction zones and road conditions. One-quarter (25%) are aware of it but have never visited it while the remaining 13 percent said they have visited it. For each of these categories, the population-weighted results are within 1%. (See Table 9B.)

Over the past eight years, the percent not aware 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 2010. 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 13 percent in the past four 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	Fall 2010^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%)	66% (69%)
Aware -- but never called	24%	23%	24%	26%	24%	24%	26% (24%)	25% (23%)
Called, but not in last 12 months	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6% (5%)	7% (6%)
Called in last 12 months	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2% (2%)	2% (1%)
<i>n</i>	1353 (95%)	1260 (94%)	1254 (95%)	1252 (95%)	1318 (93%)	1252 (95%)	952 [94%]	1078 [95%]

^aResults without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted 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	Fall 2010^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%)	62% (62%)
Aware -- but never visited	17%	18%	21%	23%	21%	22%	27% (26%)	25% (24%)
To website but not for this info	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3% (3%)	4% (5%)
Looked at this info on website	4%	4%	6%	7%	8%	10%	9% (8%)	9% (9%)
<i>n</i>	1344 (94%)	1246 (94%)	1239 (93%)	1232 (93%)	1284 (91%)	1236 (94%)	941 [93%]	1069 [94%]

^aResults without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted 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 2009, 2008 and 2005 surveys)

Amtrak and high-speed rail

How far respondents live from an Amtrak station and the number of times riding Amtrak trains in Illinois; opinions regarding high-speed rail in Illinois; and likelihood of using high-speed rail on three possible routes (page 3)

Safe Routes to School program

Awareness/familiarity with the program and whether their community is involved; opinion of the program (page 4)

Traffic Safety Questions

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 2005 survey and in the 2008 and 2009 surveys. Since we have earlier comparative results, our focus for 2010 here will be on the total group results. Results across these surveys are presented in Traffic Safety Table 1.

Amount of traffic safety activities. For the 2010 total group results, over eight in ten respondents (82%) believe that the amount of traffic safety activities is "about right," and among the remainder, nearly three times as many believe the amount is too little rather than too much (13% vs. 5%). Population-weighted results are the same here. These results are very close to those in both the 2008 and 2005 surveys while only slightly more 2009 respondents chose "too little" (16%).

Effectiveness of traffic safety messages. For the 2010 total group results, about seven in ten (71%) of the respondents rated the effectiveness of IDOT's traffic safety messages as either "excellent" (14%) or "good" (57%), just under one-quarter (23%) rated them as "fair," and just over one in twenty (6%) rated them as "poor" (4%) or "very poor" (2%). The population-weighted results here are virtually the same.

Overall, the 2010 and 2009 total group results (means = 3.79 and 3.78) are a bit more positive than in either 2008 or 2005 (3.73 and 3.72).

Traffic Safety Table 1
Evaluations of IDOT Traffic Safety Activities and Messages

Amount of activities IDOT conducts to promote traffic safety ...							
Year of survey:	Too little	About right	Too much	n (% of sample)			
2010^a	13% (13%)	82% (82%)	5% (5%)	999 [88%]			
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 ...							
Year of survey:	Excellent (5)^b	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	n [% of sample]	mean
2010^a	14% (15%)	57% (56%)	23% (23%)	4% (4%)	2% (2%)	983 [86%]	3.79 (3.79)
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

^aResults without parentheses are total group results. Results underneath in parentheses are population-weighted results. The scale in the printed questionnaire has been reversed to calculate the mean score.

Opinions relating to Amtrak and High-Speed Rail Service

For the 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 very to extremely 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.

Distance from city with Amtrak station. For the population-weighted results, we find that about one-quarter (26%) of the respondents reported they live in a city with an Amtrak station, and just over half (54%) reported they live within 25 miles of such a city

(including living in the city). Over seven in ten (71%) reported they live within 50 miles of an Amtrak station city while only 7 percent reported they live further than this. Over one in five (23%) did not know or did not answer the question. All of these results are very close to those found in the 2009 survey.

Length of time to get to closest Amtrak station. For the 2010 population-weighted results, we find that over four in ten of the respondents (43%) reported they can get to the closest Amtrak station within ½ hour, nearly six in ten (59%) reported they can do so within 45 minutes, and nearly seven in ten (69%) can do so within 1 hour. Almost one in ten (9%) reported it takes longer. Almost one-quarter of the respondents either did not know or did not answer the question.

These results do not depart much from those found in 2009. But, we will note that in 2009, fewer reported living within 30 minutes (40% vs. 43%), living within 45 minutes (54% vs. 59%), and living within 1 hour (66% vs. 69%).

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

How far away do you live from a city that has a current Amtrak stop in Illinois?	2009 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2009 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	2010 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2010 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Live in city with stop	21%	24%	22%	26%
1 to 25 miles	32%	29%	30%	28%
26 to 50 miles	20%	19%	19%	17%
51 to 75 miles	5%	4%	5%	5%
More than 75 miles	2%	2%	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	20%	22%	20%	23%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	
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%	42%	43%
31 to 45 minutes	15%	14%	16%	16%
46 minutes to 1 hour	12%	12%	10%	10%
Over 1 hour / up to 1 ½ hours	7%	7%	6%	6%
More than 1 ½ hours	2%	2%	2%	3%
Don't know / no answer	23%	25%	21%	23%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	

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)**

	2009 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2009 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	2010 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2010 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Have you ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois?				
Yes	46%	45%	46%	47%
No	53%	54%	51%	50%
Don't know	1%	1%	3%	3%
	<i>(n = 993; 98% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1132; 99% of sample)</i>	
<i>Of those who have:</i> How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months? (count round-trip as 2)				
Never	44%	43%	35%	35%
Once or twice	38%	39%	37%	37%
Three to five times	9%	9%	14%	14%
More than five times	6%	6%	8%	8%
Don't know	2%	3%	6%	6%
	<i>(n = 451; 44% of sample; 97% of relevant respondents)</i>		<i>(n = 553; 48% of sample; includes some initial "don't know" if ever respondents)</i>	
<i>Based on all respondents:</i> How many times ridden Amtrak in Illinois in the past 12 months? (count round-trip as 2)				
Never	74%	74%	71%	69%
Once or twice	18%	18%	17%	18%
Three to five times	4%	4%	6%	7%
More than five times	3%	3%	4%	4%
Don't know	1%	1%	2%	2%
	<i>(n = 977; 96% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1123; 98% of sample)</i>	

As seen in this table, somewhat less than half (47%) of the respondents indicated they have ever ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois. *Of these*, over one-third indicated they have not done so in the past 12 months. *Translated into all respondents*, we find that about seven in ten (69%) have not ridden an Amtrak train in Illinois within the past 12 months while nearly three in ten (29%) indicated they have. Just under one in five (18%) indicated they have done so once or twice, while just over one in ten (11%) indicated they have ridden an Amtrak train more than this in the past 12 months.

Compared to the 2009 results, fewer 2010 respondents report never having ridden Amtrak in the past 12 months (69% vs. 74%). The same percentage report riding Amtrak once or twice, while more 2010 respondents report riding Amtrak three or more times (11% vs. 7%).

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 the top two sections of Amtrak Table 3.

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

	2009 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2009 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	2010 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2010 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
How much do you favor or oppose having high-speed rail in Illinois? (Q-4)				
Strongly favor	28%	27%	29%	29%
Favor	32%	32%	33%	32%
Oppose	9%	8%	10%	10%
Strongly oppose	6%	7%	7%	6%
Don't know / no answer	24%	26%	22%	22%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	
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%	27%	26%
Favor	29%	30%	30%	28%
Oppose	10%	10%	12%	13%
Strongly oppose	9%	10%	10%	9%
Don't know / no answer	23%	26%	21%	24%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	
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%	30%	30%
No	9%	10%	10%	10%
Don't know / no answer	60%	61%	59%	60%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	

High-speed rail in Illinois and Illinois applying for federal funds. About six in ten 2010 respondents (61%) favor having high-speed rail in Illinois, with nearly three in ten (29%) strongly in favor. Only 16 percent oppose it, while just over one-fifth (22%) did

not express an opinion. These results are very close to the 2009 results, with the largest difference being the somewhat fewer respondents having no opinion in 2010 than in 2009 (22% vs. 26%).

The distribution of opinion regarding whether Illinois should apply for federal funds shows somewhat fewer in favor – 54 percent, with about one-quarter (26%) strongly in favor. Just over one in five (22%) oppose this, with nearly one-quarter not expressing an opinion (24%). Again, these results are very close to those found in 2009.

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. Six in ten (60%) did not express an opinion. For those who did, those in favor of the route going through the same cities outnumber those opposed by three to one (30% vs. 10%). The 2009 results were virtually the same.

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

The Chicago – St. Louis route. About six in ten respondents (59%) either said they never would use the route (38%) or did not express an opinion (21%). One in six (16%) said they would use it less it once a year and about the same number (18%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Seven percent said they would use it more. These results are very close to the 2009 results.

The Chicago – Milwaukee route. Nearly seven in ten respondents (69%) either said they never would use the route (40%) or did not express an opinion (29%). One in eight (12%) said they would use it less it once a year and about the same number (13%) said they would use it once or twice a year. Six percent said they would use it more. Somewhat more 2010 than 2009 respondents said they would not use this route or did not express an opinion (69% vs. 64%) while somewhat fewer 2010 respondents said they would use this route up to twice per year (25% vs. 30%). The same proportion said they would use this route more in 2010 and 2009.

The Chicago – Detroit route. Eight in ten respondents (80%) either said they never would use the route (48%) or did not express an opinion (32%). 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. These results are very close to those found in 2009.

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)	2009 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2009 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)	2010 Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	2010 Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
A. Chicago – St. Louis route				
Never	38%	38%	38%	38%
Less than once a year	17%	17%	16%	16%
Once or twice	16%	16%	18%	18%
Three to five times	4%	4%	4%	4%
More than five times	2%	2%	3%	3%
Don't know / no answer	22%	22%	21%	21%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	
B. Chicago – Milwaukee route				
Never	40%	39%	40%	40%
Less than once a year	14%	14%	12%	12%
Once or twice	15%	16%	12%	13%
Three to five times	4%	5%	4%	4%
More than five times	1%	1%	2%	2%
Don't know / no answer	26%	25%	30%	29%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	
C. Chicago – Detroit route				
Never	50%	50%	49%	48%
Less than once a year	10%	11%	10%	11%
Once or twice	6%	6%	6%	6%
Three to five times	2%	2%	2%	2%
More than five times	1%	1%	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer	31%	31%	32%	32%
	<i>(n = 1016; 100% of sample)</i>		<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>	

The Safe Routes to School Program

Respondents were asked how familiar they are with the Safe Routes to School Program, while being informed that “it is a program that makes funds available to communities for a variety of programs and projects to encourage and make it safe for children to walk or bicycle to school.” They were then asked, “as far as you know, has your community been involved in developing programs and projects as part of this program?” And, then they were asked their general opinion of this Program. Here, our focus is on the “population-weighted” results, which better reflects the demographic characteristics of the entire Illinois public.

Familiarity and involvement with Safe Routes to School program. As seen in Safe Routes Table 1, about 7 percent indicated being familiar with the program, while nearly one-quarter (23%) indicated at least hearing about it (including those who indicated being familiar). Over half (53%) said they have never heard of the program, and another one-quarter said they didn’t know or did not answer.

Seven percent (7%) also indicated that their community has been involved in developing programs and projects as part of this program. (See bottom portion of Safe Routes Table 1.) One-tenth indicated their community has not been involved in the program while over 80 percent did not know or did not answer.

Safe Routes Table 1
Familiarity and Community Involvement with Program
(Questions 1 and 2)

How familiar are you with the Safe Routes to School Program?	Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Are familiar with the Program	6%	7%
Heard of but not familiar	16%	16%
Have never heard of the Program	52%	53%
Don't know / no answer	26%	25%
<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		
As far as you know, has your community been involved in developing programs & projects as part of this program?		
Yes, community has	7%	7%
No, community has not	9%	10%
Don't know / no answer	84%	83%
<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		

Reported familiarity with the program does not differ much by three broad regions of the state. (See Safe Routes Table 1A.) About 6 to 7 percent are familiar with the program in each region, and 22 to 24 percent have at least heard of the program. Compared to those living in other types of “subjective” residential locations, respondents who

indicated living in the City of Chicago did express more familiarity (13% vs. 4%-6% in all other residential locations, except Metro East) and more awareness (29% vs. 18%-24% in all other types, except Metro East). (Only 5 percent of Metro East residents indicated awareness, but it should be noted that this is based on fewer than 30 respondents.) And, those with children in K through 12th grade indicated somewhat greater familiarity (11% vs. 6%) and more awareness (28% vs. 21%) of the program compared to those who do not.

Safe Routes Table 1A
Familiarity with Program, by Selected Groups
(Question 1)

Group	Familiar with program	Heard of program	<i>Familiar or Heard^a</i>	Never heard of	Don't know / no answer	<i>n</i>
Area of state						
Chicago metro	7%	14%	22%	52%	26%	490
North/central	6%	18%	24%	53%	23%	418
Southern	7%	15%	22%	54%	24%	232
Location of residence (subjective / Q9)						
City of Chicago	13%	16%	29%	53%	19%	93
Chicago suburbs	6%	14%	20%	53%	27%	310
Metro East	0%	5%	5%	75%	20%	28
Other metro > 75,000	4%	18%	22%	59%	29%	82
City 20,000-75,000	6%	19%	24%	42%	33%	114
City/village/town 10,000-19,999	5%	13%	18%	61%	22%	104
City/village/town under 10,000	5%	17%	22%	55%	22%	193
Rural area	6%	15%	21%	57%	22%	168
Have children in K through 12?						
Yes	11%	17%	28%	56%	16%	192
No	6%	15%	21%	52%	27%	916

^a This may not exactly equal the sum of the preceding columns due to rounding.

Reported community involvement with the program also does not differ much by three broad regions of the state, with 7 to 8 percent in each region reporting involvement. (See Safe Routes Table 1B.) When examine the results by “subjective” residential location, we find the greatest incidence of community involvement is reported by residents in the City of Chicago and by residents of “other metro areas of more than 75,000” (“other” meaning outside of the Chicago and St. Louis metro areas in the context of this question). But even in these two residential locations, community involvement is reported only by just over one-tenth of the respondents. The same is the

case with respondents who have children in K through 12th grade. Overwhelmingly, most respondents across all these groups don't know.

Safe Routes Table 1B
Community Involvement with Program, by Selected Groups
(Question 2)

Group	Community has been involved	Community has not been involved	Don't know / no answer	n
Area of state				
Chicago metro	8%	9%	83%	490
North/central	7%	11%	82%	418
Southern	7%	11%	83%	232
Location of residence (subjective / Q9)				
City of Chicago	11%	11%	78%	93
Chicago suburbs	7%	8%	86%	310
Metro East	4%	4%	91%	28
Other metro > 75,000	11%	4%	86%	82
City 20,000-75,000	7%	13%	80%	114
City/village/town 10,000-19,999	5%	8%	87%	104
City/village/town under 10,000	5%	16%	80%	193
Rural area	8%	15%	77%	168
Have children in K through 12?				
Yes	11%	16%	73%	192
No	7%	8%	85%	916

General opinion of Safe Routes to School program. As seen in Safe Routes Table 2, nearly one-quarter of the respondents generally have a positive opinion of the program, while one-tenth have a mixed opinion and very few have a negative opinion. Two-thirds (65%) gave no opinion (don't know or no answer).

When we examine opinions among those who said they are familiar with the program (7% of all respondents), a majority is found to have a positive opinion compared to one-third who have a mixed opinion. Again, very few have a negative opinion. For this group, only about one-tenth gave no opinion.

When we examine opinions among those who indicated their community is involved in the program (again, 7% of all respondents), the incidence of those having a positive opinion climbs to just over 70 percent while one-quarter said they have a mixed opinion.

Again, very few have a negative opinion. And, only 4 percent in this group gave no opinion.

**Safe Routes Table 2
General Opinion (Question 3)**

Generally, would you say your opinion of the Safe Routes to School Program is:	Weighted by IDOT district (Total group)	Weighted by area, age, educ & gender (Popul-wgtd)
Positive	24%	24%
Mixed	10%	10%
Negative	1%	2%
Don't know / no answer	65%	65%
<i>(n = 1140; 100% of sample)</i>		
<i>Among those who are familiar with the Program:</i>		
Positive	59%	54%
Mixed	27%	33%
Negative	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer	13%	11%
<i>(unweighted n = 76; 7% of sample)</i>		
<i>Among those whose community is involved with the Program:</i>		
Positive	69%	71%
Mixed	25%	25%
Negative	1%	1%
Don't know / no answer	5%	4%
<i>(unweighted n = 82; 7% of sample)</i>		