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Purposes of survey

1. Engage with the public to gain their input on a policy issue of immediate, high relevance.
   ◦ *Mode patterns* (their usual patterns of transportation infrastructure use)
   ◦ *Awareness* (self-assessment of being informed about transportation infrastructure issues)
   ◦ *Quality* of different aspects of transportation infrastructure
   ◦ *Values* they prioritize in transportation infrastructure and policy.
   ◦ *Policy preferences*, gathered in a confidential, apolitical setting
   ◦ *Demographic information* (zip code, age, race, gender, political identification)

2. Strengthen relationships with MnDOT's market research, public engagement, and communication services teams.

3. Test the conventional wisdom about the rural/urban divide or party line splits on transportation issues.
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Preliminary results of State Fair Surveys

- 3-5 minute survey using iPads and Qualtrics (*See handout*)
- UMN Dare to Discover pavilion at 2018 & 2019 State Fair. 7 days, 4-5 hour sessions, space funded by CTS
- Completed by 1633 Minnesota adult participants (2018: 754; 2019: 879)
- 7 MnDOT volunteers, 8 UMN students
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Preliminary results of Online Survey

- 466 respondents
- Survey open for one week in 2019 (February 25th to March 4th)
- 3-5 minute survey
- Sent to list serve of 1,650 Minnesotans who opted in to provide input to MnDOT
What kinds of transportation do you usually use? (Select all that apply.)

- Private vehicle
- Walking
- Public transit
- Bicycling
- Taxi / Uber / Lyft
- Motorcycle
- Paratransit
- Electric vehicle *
- Wheelchair *
- Other
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“I feel well informed about transportation infrastructure issues in Minnesota.”

8% Strongly disagree
23% Somewhat disagree
19% Neither agree nor disagree
40% Somewhat agree
11% Strongly agree
Quality of transportation infrastructure (1 to 5 stars)

- EV charging facilities
- Roads & bridges
- Paratransit *
- Sidewalks
- Public transit
- Bike paths & facilities
- Airports
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Most important values (forced to choose 4)

Convenience: It is easy and fast to get around.

Coverage: It connects to all of the places we need to go.

Cost to taxpayer: It does not cost the public too much.

Cost to user: It is affordable to use.

Economic vitality: It supports a strong economy.

Environment: It has minimal negative environmental impacts.

Equity: It provides good transportation access for everyone.

Health: It promotes good health.

Maintenance: It is taken care of (not deteriorating).

Safety: It is safe to use.
Most important values (forced to chose 4)

- Maintain what we have
- Safety
- Convenience
- Environment
- Connects / access
- Cost to user
- Equity
- Cost to taxpayer
- Supports economy
- Health
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Most important values, by party  
(2018 State Fair only)

- Maintain what we have
- Safety
- Connects / access
- Convenience: easy & fast to get around
- Cost to user
- Environment
- Equity
- Cost to taxpayer
- Supports economy
- Health

[Graph showing values distribution by party]
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Correlations of party ID & preferences  (2018 State Fair only)

*significant   **very significant   ***clearly very significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to taxpayer</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√ Republican***</td>
<td>√ Democrat***</td>
<td>√ Democrat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ No preference*</td>
<td>not Republican***</td>
<td>not Independent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not Democrat***</td>
<td>not No preference**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cost to user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√ Democrat***</td>
<td>√ No preference**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not Republican***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not Decline to state*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attitude towards policy options (strongly agree to strongly disagree)

Transit funding: Increase funding for public transit.

Reduce wear and tear: Restrict or charge high fees for heavy vehicles.

Gas tax: Raise the gas tax to pay for roads & bridges.

Local tax: Raise local sales taxes to pay for roads & bridges.

User fees: Charge tolls or fees for using roads and airports.

Fares: Increase fares for transit users.

No change: Things are fine as they are.

Downsize: Reduce transportation infrastructure to reduce costs.
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Increase transit funding.
Restrict / charge high fees for heavy vehicles.
Gas tax for roads & bridges.
LOST for roads & bridges.
User fees (airports, toll roads).
Increase transit fares.
No change: Things are fine as they are.
Downsize infrastructure to reduce costs.
Representativeness considerations

Geographic

• 67% Hennepin and Ramsey counties (1365)
• 17% Greater Metro Area: Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Scott, & Washington counties (341)
• 16% Greater Minnesota (332)
Thank you!

Please contact us with questions, ideas, permission to use data, or requests for updates:

Guillermo Narváez, ProxemicInsights@gmail.com
Kathy Quick, ksquick@umn.edu
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