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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Heartland Market Research LLC completed a comprehensive statewide customer satisfaction study to evaluate MoDOT’s overall performance as perceived by the general Missouri public and to identify the transportation services and improvements that are most important to Missourians. The survey asked questions to populate multiple MoDOT Tracker measures and to assess the public’s support for transportation. Heartland Market Research obtained a representative sample of the state as well as each of MoDOT’s seven districts, with a minimum of 500 respondents per district. 3,554 Missourians participated in the study.

GENERAL SATISFACTION FINDINGS

- The vast majority of Missourians are satisfied with the job MoDOT is doing. Overall satisfaction was at 85%, tying the highest recorded satisfaction level previously recorded in 2009.
- Missourians continue to agree that MoDOT provides accurate, timely, and understandable information about projects in their area (92%, similar to the statistical results since 2009).
- Missourians generally agree (70%) that MoDOT considers residents’ needs and views in transportation decision-making.
- Customer perception that MoDOT is the “primary transportation expert” remains similar (no statistical difference) as it has since 2009. 91% of Missourians agreed with this statement, up 1% from 2011, down 2% from 2010, and up 6% from 2008.
- Missourians are generally satisfied (71%) with the transportation options available besides their own personal vehicle.
- Of those Missourians who are satisfied with MoDOT, respondents listed highways in good condition (51%) as the thing about MoDOT with which they are the most satisfied. This item was also the primary satisfaction drivers in 2011. 45% of dissatisfied residents named road conditions as their issue of highest concern, also similar to last year’s findings.
In the eyes of the public, MoDOT made enormous progress reducing previous sources of dissatisfaction. In 2011, 38% of Missourians were dissatisfied with how MoDOT handled potholes. In 2012, this number dropped to 8%, the lowest ever recorded since this question was added in 2009. Dissatisfaction with bridge conditions dropped from 6% to 2%. Several other items also showed a decrease in dissatisfaction (delays due to road construction dropped from 11% to 8%, concerns about MoDOT not spending money wisely dropped from 9% to 6%, and dissatisfaction with how MoDOT handled snow and ice removal dropped from 5% to 4%).

88% of the residents indicated they trust MoDOT to keep its commitments to the public.

63% of Missourians were satisfied with the job MoDOT has done keeping the surface of major highways in good condition, the highest satisfaction measure on this issue in the last four years. 24% of Missourians were neutral on this topic and 13% disagreed.

Two-thirds (67%) of residents agreed that MoDOT did a good job of minimizing travel delays caused by construction and maintenance on highways, 23% gave a neutral response, and 10% disagreed.

**FUNDING FINDINGS**

- 52% of Missourians believe MoDOT’s funding should be increased, 44% thought it should remain the same, and 4% thought it should be decreased.
- Residents continued to select tolling as the most acceptable of several listed options for increasing revenues to adequately fund Missouri state highways and roads from the options of replace gas tax with travel tax (8%), increase car registration and license fees (10%), add tolls (26%), increase fuel tax (13%), and increase sales tax (18%). While *none of these* was not provided as an option, a record 25% of Missourians volunteered this option anyway, showing a strong disagreement with the idea of raising or creating taxes.
- More Missourians than ever (63%) disagreed with the idea that up to 25% of each transportation project funds should be spent incorporating bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Unlike government expenditures on education, public safety, economic development, and social services, Missourian agreement that government transportation expenditures have benefited them personally has increased the last two years (from 57% to 66%).
- **According to Missourians, the four highest priorities for MoDOT to emphasize over the next two years are keeping the surface of major highways in good condition, keeping the surface of other state highways in good condition, managing snow and ice on highways, and keeping bridges in good condition.**
IMPORTANT-SATISFACTION ANALYSIS FINDINGS

- In 2011, people were not satisfied with MoDOT’s efforts to keep bridges in good condition and it was classified under Opportunities for Improvement given the high importance residents placed on this service. This year the majority of people are quite satisfied with MoDOT’s bridge maintenance, but since the majority no longer perceive this to be a problem, the overall importance of this item has dropped significantly.

- In 2011, Missourians indicated there were three services needing improvement: Keeping the surface of major highways in good condition, keeping the surface of other highways in good condition, and keeping bridges in good condition. All three items showed significant improvement from 2011 to 2012 and there are currently no service issues where the majority of Missourians believe the service is important, but are dissatisfied with MoDOT’s performance.

- Based upon the importance-satisfaction analysis, the two most important items for MoDOT is to continue to focus on keeping the surface of both major and other highways in good condition.

METHODOLOGY

The 17 question survey was administered by a professional calling center to Missourians starting on May 7, 2012 and ending on May 30, 2012. The calling center randomly called a representative sample of people from every county considering age and gender. During this time, the calling center made 132,131 calls, spoke with 14,368 people, and completed 3,554 phone interviews.

With the exception of the demographic questions (age, gender, and voting), all statewide results presented are weighted results. The data was weighted in accordance with the true distribution of the regional population in terms of geographic (county), gender, and age distributions using the most recent (2010) US government census information available. Following past practice, all district measures presented are unweighted. With a minimum of 500 responses per district, the district measures have a 95% level of confidence with a precision (margin of error) of +/- 4.4%. The statewide results for the stratified-random sample of 3,554 Missourians have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of +/- 1.6%.

Following standard practice for Tracker measures, responses of don’t know/not sure and none chosen/refused were excluded from many of the results in this report. This practice also facilitated valid comparisons of the results with previous customer satisfaction surveys. The summaries in Section 3 provide the results calculated both ways (with the standard exclusions and showing the percentage of don’t know/not sure responses). All charts, graphs, and summaries are rounded. More precise numbers may be found in the tables in Sections 2 and 3.