Quality of Life (QOL)
Purpose

• Understand
  – QOL
  – MnDOT’s role

• Sharing Results

• Performance Measures Review
3 study methods

- Literature review
- Focus groups
- Questionnaire
Method 2: Focus groups across the state with 29 locales, 3 age groups & 4 race/ethnicity groups

- Alexandria
- Bemidji *
- Brainerd
- Detroit Lakes
- Duluth
- Mankato
- Metro, plus a pilot study*
- Rochester
- St. Cloud
- Virginia
- Willmar*
Focus group results: 11 QOL areas

- Education
- Employment/finances
- Environment
- Housing
- Family, friends, & neighbors
- Health
- Local amenities
- Recreation & entertainment
- Safety
- Spirituality, faith & serenity
- Transportation
Focus group results:
7 separate transportation areas

- Access
- Design
- Environment
- Maintenance
- Mobility
- Safety
- Transparency (planning & communications)
Method 3: Questionnaire

- Representative sample, 45% response

- Quantify QOL & transportation’s role

- Importance & satisfaction with performance
Minnesotans’ satisfied with Quality of Life

Average Satisfaction, 7 = very satisfied

- Younger (18-34): 6.14
- Middle (35-59): 6.05
- Older (60+): 6.23
- Overall: 6.14
Importance of QOL areas

- Health: Very important
- Safety and security: Very important
- Family, friends and neighbors: Very important
- Housing: Very important
- Employment and finances: Very important
- Environment: Very important
- Education: Very important
- Spirituality faith and serenity: Very important
- Transportation: Very important
- Local services and amenities: Very important
- Rec and entertainment: Very important

Legend:
- Very unimportant
- Somewhat unimportant
- Neither
- Slight important
- Somewhat important
- Slightly unimportant
- Very important
Importance of 5 QOL life areas differ significantly across age groups

- Education
- Transportation
- Spirituality, faith, & serenity
- Local services
- Employment & finance

Average Importance, 7 = very important

- Younger (18-34)
- Middle (35-59)
- Older (60+)
### Relationship among 11 QOL areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Local services/amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Family/friends</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Safety/security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Factor 1** includes: Education, Environment, Employment, Housing, Transportation
- **Factor 2** includes: Health, Family/friends, Safety/security
- **Factor 3** includes: Local services/amenities, Recreation, Spirituality, faith & serenity
Focus group results: 7 transportation areas

- Access
- Design
- Environment
- Maintenance
- Mobility
- Safety
- Transparency (planning & communications)
All transportation areas are important
8 out of 10 Minnesotans’ satisfied with MnDOT services

- 23% Slightly satisfied
- 48% Somewhat satisfied
- 14% Very satisfied
- 6% Slightly dissatisfied
- 4% Somewhat dissatisfied
- 1% Very dissatisfied
- 5% Neither
Satisfaction of MnDOT services consistent across regions

- Metro
- Central
- Northeast
- Northwest
- South

Average Satisfaction,
7 = very satisfied

Accessibility, Mobility, Design, Safety, Communications, Environment, Maintenance, Planning
7 of 8 areas significant predictors of satisfaction with MnDOT services
Four areas identified as ‘good work’
Important for Minnesota’s future?

Short term (5-10 years)
• Maintenance
• Access
• Safety

Next generation…
• Access
• Maintenance
• Safety
Maintenance quotes

• “Our snow and ice removal is remarkable.” (Minneapolis)
• “We could do without potholes” (Willmar)
• “Does MnDOT check or compare how long roads last? They just don’t seem to last as long as they used to” (Rochester)
• “More funding to increase maintenance so fillings don’t fall out when driving” (Brainerd)
• “How does asphalt compare to concrete?” (Minneapolis)
Maintenance: 5 significant predictors statewide

- Keep road surface smooth, .48
- Road/pavement markings clearly visible, .12
- Visual appeal of roadsides, .08
- Clearing roads of debris, .07
- Rest areas for road trips, .05

Satisfaction with maintenance
Maintenance: most important selected items (identified by 10%+)

- Clearing roads of snow and ice: 76%
- Keeping road surfaces smooth: 54%
- Clearing sidewalks of snow and ice: 13%
- Making road/pavement markings clearly visible: 11%
- Making highway signs clearly readable: 11%
Access quotes

• “Not enough access to bus” (Mankato respondent)
• “The Amtrack service is the best kept secret around” (St. Cloud respondent)
• “The airport is a plus” (Bemidji respondent)
• “It’s nice to hop on the light rail at the Mall of America and take it downtown” (Mankato)
• “I personally don’t want to give up my car but I don’t understand why others won’t” (Brainerd respondent)
• “High speed rail is a great idea but I’m afraid we can’t sustain it” (Duluth respondent)
• “The cost of light rail versus buses—it’s a big waste of money” (Minneapolis respondent)
• “Essential services are fairly accessible to all” (Duluth respondent)
• “The Mesabi Bike Trail has really brought in tourism. People come from all parts of the state and country” (Virginia respondent)
Accessibility: 6 significant predictors statewide

- Traffic information re delays, etc, .15
- Access to taxis, .12
- Availability of parking in community, .10
- Access to regional airport, .10
- Public transportation fees, .10
- Access to trails, .06

Satisfaction with accessibility
Accessibility: most important items (identified by 10%+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility &amp; Accessibility items</th>
<th>% of respondents cited as most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community travel time</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute time</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking in community</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time to/from TC</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic information re...</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time through...</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend highway traffic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation options</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Safety quotes

• “I love the rumble strips—best thing they have ever done” (Bemidji)

• “The problem with Highway xx is the people who drive on it’ (Detroit Lakes)

• “I really get irritated with cell phones” (Bloomington)

• “Bikers don’t seem to think that the rules apply to them” (Willmar)

• “It’s very hard to see the white lines on a rainy night” (Bemidji)

• “Need warning lights in some areas” (Virginia)
Exploring safety: 6 significant predictors

- Road safety excluding other drivers, .24
- Railroad crossing safety, .15
- Road safety with other drivers, .15
- Bike safety considering design, .07
- Pedestrians safety in community, .07
- Safety for 10 year old, .04

Satisfaction with Safety
Safety: most important items (identified by 10%+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety items</th>
<th>% of respondents cited as most important safety item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road safety with other drivers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for 10 year old</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety excluding others</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians safety</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for 80 year old</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much traffic for walk</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists Safety</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike safety considering design</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike safe considering traffic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much traffic to bike</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad crossing safety</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next stop…

- Understand
  - QOL
  - MnDOT’s Role
- Sharing Results
- Performance Measures
- Review
Questions?

– Contacts:
  • ingridss@umn.edu; 612 624 4947
  • Karla.Rains@state.mn.us; 651 366 3172

• Thanks to colleagues, contributors and citizens who participated!