

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Purpose and Methods 9

 1.1.1 Purpose..... 9

 1.1.2 Interviewing 9

 1.1.3 Quotas, oversampling, and weighting 9

 1.1.4 Margin of error..... 10

 1.1.5 Figures and tables..... 10

Chapter 2. Profile of Sample..... 11

2.1 Personal Demographics 11

2.2 Driving Habits 11

2.3 Regions 11

 2.3.1 Metro 12

 2.3.3 Southwest..... 12

 2.3.4 Bay 13

 2.3.5 Grand..... 13

 2.3.6 North 14

 2.3.7 Superior..... 14

Chapter 3. Evaluations of MDOT 15

3.1 Satisfaction with MDOT..... 15

3.2 MDOT Projects: Right Solutions for Transportation Problems? 18

Chapter 4. Perceptions of Transportation in Michigan 21

4.1 Quality of Transportation in the Past Five Years 21

4.2 Transportation Funding..... 23

4.3 Choices: Directions for Transportation in Michigan..... 29

Chapter 5. Improving Transportation: Public Satisfaction & Transportation Priorities..... 33

5.1 Road Conditions and Repair 34

5.2 Traffic..... 36

5.3 Alternative Modes of Transportation..... 38

5.4 Information 40

5.5 Combining Satisfaction Today with Priority for the Future..... 42

 5.5.1 Metro Region 44

 5.5.2 University Region..... 44

 5.5.3 Southwest Region 45

 5.5.4 Bay Region 46

 5.5.5 Grand Region 46

 5.5.6 North Region 47

 5.5.7 Superior Region 48

Appendix A. Survey Marginals 50

Appendix B. Profile of the Sample 60

List of Tables

Table 1. Sample and Population Breakdown by Region 9

List of Figures

Figure 1. MDOT Regions 10

Figure 2. Michigan Is Satisfied with the Job Being Done by MDOT 15

Figure 3. Metro Residents Are the Least Likely Satisfied with MDOT; Residents in the 3 S/SW Regions Are Most Likely 16

Figure 4. Except for People Under 30 Yrs of Age, Where Satisfaction w/ MDOT Is Highest; Satisfaction Increases the Older One Gets 17

Figure 5. Satisfaction with MDOT Is Lower for People Living in High Density Areas 17

Figure 6. Dissatisfaction with MDOT's Job Performance Is Much Higher for Those Who Commute an Hour or More 18

Figure 7. One-Half of Michigan Adults Believe No More Than Some of MDOT's Projects Were the Right Solutions for Their State 19

Figure 8. University Residents Least Likely to Believe Transportation Projects Were the Right Solutions; Grand Residents Most Likely 20

Figure 9. More Michigan Adults Believe the Quality of Transportation Is Better Than Believe It Is Worse Than It Was Five Years Ago 21

Figure 10. Michigan Adults with the Longest Commutes Are Most Likely to Say Transportation Has Gotten Worse in Past Five Years 22

Figure 11. Bay Residents Are Least Likely to Believe Transportation Is Better Rather Than Worse Than Five Years Ago; Grand Residents Most Likely to Believe It 23

Figure 12. People Agree Most That Improving Transportation Is Critical for Improving the Economy; But Agree Least That It Is More Important for Economy Than Lowering Taxes 24

Figure 13. Grand Residents Most Likely To Agree That Improving Transportation System Is Critical To Economic Improvement; SW Residents Least Likely to Agree 25

Figure 14. Southwest Residents Are Much Less Likely to Agree That a Better Transportation System Is More Important For the Economy Than Lower Taxes 26

Figure 15. Superior, Bay & Grand Residents Most Likely to Agree That Tolls Are a Fair Way to Collect Revenues; University Residents Least Likely to Agree 26

Figure 16. Metro & Superior Residents Least Likely to Agree That Michigan Is Using Its Transportation Money Efficiently & Effectively 27

Figure 17. A Majority Think Michigan Should Spend More to Maintain and Improve the Quality of Transportation 28

Figure 18. Support for Spending More on Transportation Is Lowest in the University & North Regions 28

Figure 19. The Higher the Respondent's Household Income, the More They Support More Transportation Spending 29

Figure 20. By a Ratio Greater than 2-to-1, Michigan Adults Prefer Building & Maintaining Existing Hwys Over Developing Alternative Modes Of Transportation 32

Figure 21. All Regions Strongly Support an Emphasis on Highways to Alternative Modes; Alternative Modes Has Greatest Support in Superior & Metro Regions..... 31

Figure 22. The Higher the Respondent's Household Income, the More They Support More an Emphasis on Highways over Alternative Modes of Transportation..... 31

Figure 23. The Greater Their Area's Population Density, the More Support a Respondent Has for an Emphasis on Alternative Modes of Transportation over Highways 32

Figure 24. Public Satisfaction: Road Conditions and Repair 35

Figure 25. More Resources for Future Priorities: Road Conditions and Repair..... 36

Figure 26. Public Satisfaction: Traffic 37

Figure 27. More Resources for Future Priorities: Traffic 38

Figure 28. Public Satisfaction: Alternative Modes of Transportation..... 39

Figure 29. More Resources for Future Priorities: Alternative Modes of Transportation..... 40

Figure 30. Public Satisfaction: Information 41

Figure 31. More Resources for Future Priorities: Information..... 42

Figure 32. All Adults: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items 43

Figure 33. Metro: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items..... 44

Figure 34. University: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items 45

Figure 35. Southwest: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items 46

Figure 36. Bay: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items..... 47

Figure 37. Grand: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items..... 48

Figure 38. North: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items..... 49

Figure 39. Superior: The Importance of Transportation Items as a Future Priority by the Level of Satisfaction with the Items..... 49