



State Highway User Survey 2003

**Summary report of a survey of 1500
users nationally**

Contents

Conclusions	3
Background	4
Methodology	5
Summary of Findings and Trends	6
Overall Satisfaction: Demographic Breakdown	7
Type/Frequency of User	8
Relationship Between Features and Satisfaction	
Satisfied overall by rating of features	9
Not satisfied overall by rating of features	9
Relationship between Priorities for Expenditure and Satisfaction	
Overall Rating by Most Important Priority for Expenditure	10
Overall Rating by First or Second Priority	10
Transit's Performance	11
Rating of Transit in Road User's Regional Area	12
Rating of State Highways now Compared with 2 Years Ago	13
Priorities for Expenditure	14
Regional Priorities — Most Important	15
Regional Priorities — Important at All	16
Features — Satisfaction Ratings	17
Regional Satisfied Ratings for Features	18
Regional Not Satisfied Ratings for Features	19
Knowledge of Transit	20
Information — Importance and performances	20
Contact with Transit	21
Factors Influencing Performance Ratings	23
Graphs	
Questionnaire	

Road User Survey 2003

Conclusions

Transit's "product" the state highway system, is well rated overall. Transit's performance is also well rated, but does not match its product. There is a slight perception that Transit is doing a better job in maintaining existing state highways than in developing new ones.

Although the overall rating has not increased significantly over the 5 year period three surveys have asked this same question, nearly 6 out of 10 road users rated the state highways "better" than 2 years ago. This appears to indicate that as the state highways improve, expectations also increase and a range of measures is a better indicator of Transit's performance than simply road user satisfaction levels.

It is also apparent that road users are differentiating the aspects and features. The positive rating of the state highway system overall by nearly 8 out of 10 road users, is bettered or equalled in the ratings specifically for road markings, signs, picnic areas and appearance in the landscape. However for three aspects in particular, the specific ratings do not match the overall rating of the state highway system. These are surface/smoothness, safety design, and congestion and flows.

The questionnaire design in this particular survey allows us to cross check the results. We find that these three aspects are the same three aspects identified as the main priorities for expenditure.

"Improving the safety of the road" is clearly the most important priority for expenditure, chosen first or second by over 7 out of 10 road users. This national priority differed from that of the Auckland region where there was a greater preference by Aucklanders for "improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion".

Transit is not clearly identified with its role. While supply of information from Transit was generally well rated, and was important, there was a need apparent for Transit and the communities in which it is impacting to be more involved over new proposals.

Road users' perceptions vary by region, frequency of use, type of user etc.

Much detailed uncovering of trends and relationships is possible by interrogation of the database — the following is a summary of main findings only.

Background

- In 1998 and 2000, Transit (via AC Nielsen) surveyed road users as to their ratings of a wide range of features of the state highways, plus overall satisfaction. Results were reported for road users in total, in detailed reports on the features of the state highways.
- For 2003, the methodology was reviewed. It was considered important to start looking at road users not just in total, but by segment — commercial drivers, heavy medium or light users in terms of distance travelled per annum, and by looking at demographic characteristics (age and gender). Regional breakdowns were also considered important.
- In 2003, fewer questions were asked, and questioning focused on “aspects” such as “safety” and “traffic congestion” and “impact on the environment”. The project team established to steer the project agreed that detailed features (eg guard rails, extra lanes, markers etc) should be established as the response by the road and traffic engineers to the prioritisation of broader aspects, rather than being directly rated by road users.
- A focus was placed on gaining better understanding of the prioritisation of key aspects by road users. It was considered this would lead to the overall performance ratings of Transit being more transparent.
- Reasons for any dissatisfaction were sought, to ensure results were actionable. These comments will be available in a separate appendix.
- This report is a summary of the main results from the 2003 survey. More detailed analysis is available through direct use of the database.

Methodology

Note re regional results

- The population of the Transit regions varies considerably. Carrying out interviews on a population basis would have resulted in too few interviews in some regions to provide reliable results. The survey was thus carried out on a quota sampling basis.
- The sample size was increased from 1000 to 1500 and a “quota sample” of a minimum of 200 interviews was carried out in each area.
- Results were then weighted up (Auckland, Hamilton, Wellington) or down (all others) to true population proportions. The regional base figures shown in the results are the “weighted” true population basis (eg 76 for Napier, 533 for Auckland) not the actual number of interviews — which was a minimum of 200 per region.
- This enabled results to be analysed separately for each region, given the different landscape, population density and networks in each region. Total results for all road users were weighted to reflect true population proportions and to enable comparisons between 2003 results and those for the earlier surveys.

Results

- Data from the 2003 survey was processed into an Espri database. This can readily be interrogated to provide cross tabulations and other analysis to meet the needs of diverse potential users within Transit. (Access is via a standalone PC at Transit national Office — the database is not available across Transit’s national computer network.)

Note re significance of results

- Results have only been commented on where significant at the 95% confidence level.

Reasons

Reasons comments will be published as a separate appendix.

Summary of findings and trends

Overall Satisfaction with the State Highways

- 78% rated the state highways overall as good, very good or excellent, 22% as fair or poor.
- Overall satisfaction in 2003 was rated higher than in 2000.
- Within the margin of error, the 2003 rating matched the higher rating recorded in 1998.
- The pattern of satisfaction with the state highways in New Zealand overall, was similar to the 1998 and 2000 measures.
- All 3 surveys now taken have been close with only minor variations. The 3 measures show a consistent pattern of around 5% of road users giving an excellent rating, followed by around 30% giving a “very good” rating, 40% have given a “good” rating. For each measure, around 20% have given a poor or fair rating. As this is an established pattern over 5 years, it seems unlikely that satisfaction levels will experience more than minor fluctuations in the future. However the factors important in shaping the satisfaction levels may vary.
- Priorities for expenditure, and ratings of key features, were different for road users with different levels of overall satisfaction.
- Road users who chose “improve safety on the road” as the top priority for expenditure, were significantly more likely to rate the state highways overall as “very good” and less likely to rate them as “poor”. Nearly half of those choosing as a priority “reducing the impact on the environment”, gave a very good rating. Road users who chose improving the smoothness and straightness as the most important priority for expenditure, were more likely to rate “poor” and less likely to give a “very good” rating for the state highways overall.

Table 1a

Pattern over 5 years	%	Fair/Poor	State Highways Overall		
			Good	Very Good	Excellent
1998		18	43	32	6
2000		23	47	26	3
2003		22	42	31	5

State Highways Overall

- The results are shown as percentages, adding to 100% across the page.
- Results are available for 2003 broken down by segments of road users.
- Commercial drivers, approximately 20% of the sample (as in previous years) rated the state highway system significantly less favourably, as did “high” users, males and young people. There were also significant regional variations.
- Roads users resident in the Auckland region are significantly less satisfied, and Hamilton, Christchurch and Dunedin residents more satisfied.

Table 1b

	Fair/Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Commercial drivers	29	48	20	3
General drivers	20	40	34	5
Auckland/Northland	27	48	21	4
Hamilton	21	29	44	5
Napier	27	43	27	3
Wanganui	23	38	35	6
Wellington/Marlborough	23	45	28	4
Christchurch	13	39	41	7
Dunedin	15	39	39	5
Low users	16	37	40	7
Medium users	15	37	43	5
High users	26	44	26	4
Male	26	43	27	4
Female	18	41	36	5
Ages				
Under 24	26	53	21	1
25-39	21	43	33	2
40-54	24	44	28	4
55-69	21	38	31	9
70 or over	13	27	46	14

- The regional pattern has shifted from the previous two measures — Hamilton, Christchurch, Dunedin and Wanganui had increased satisfaction significantly. For Hamilton, the majority of road users now gave a “very good” rather than “good” rating. Christchurch, Dunedin and Wanganui had a similar improvement. Christchurch and Dunedin also now had the lowest number of road users giving a “poor” rating. Napier had regained some “excellent” raters.
- Wellington had shown only a very slight improvement — the majority of their road users were still in the “good” category.
- Auckland had a slight increase in “excellent” raters, but along with Napier, had an increase in fair/poor raters with 1 in 10 giving a “poor” rating. Auckland was the only region not increasing the “very good” raters.
- The less frequent driver, and the driver for recreational rather than commercial reasons, tended to give more positive ratings than the frequent and commercial drivers with their higher needs and expectations.

Table 1c

Use at least once a week	Fair/Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Passenger — commercial bus/ van	18	35	43	3
Private car — passenger	23	48	23	4
Private car — driver	24	43	29	4
Pedestrian	26	44	26	3
Cyclist	26	51	20	3
Motorcyclist	33	36	25	7
Commercial van/taxi	29	48	20	3
Commercial truck driver	32	36	27	4
Company car	31	45	21	3

Factors in satisfaction

The following two tables 2a and 2b show the relationships between satisfaction or dissatisfaction with various features, and rating of the state highway system overall.

The “satisfied” table illustrates how satisfaction with safety design, surface quality and managing congestion is reflected in higher satisfaction scores overall. For example, in the first line of percentages across the table, 80% of road users giving an excellent rating overall, were satisfied with safety design. 38% of those giving a “poor” rating overall, were satisfied with safety design. There was a clear link between satisfaction with safety, surface quality and congestion, and overall satisfaction with the state highway system.

However, satisfaction with appearance/landscape and environmental impact, road markings, signs and rest areas, showed little tendency to be related to satisfaction overall.

Table 2a Features — Satisfied by Overall Rating of State Highways

Features - satisfied	Overall Rating of State Highways					
	Total	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Total	1509	107	227	630	472	69
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Safety Design & Features	60	38	46	56	76	80
Quality of the Surface & Smoothness	66	42	47	64	81	80
Road Markings	90	81	84	90	95	89
Road Signs	85	83	78	87	86	83
Reducing Congestion, Improving Traffic Flows	31	18	19	32	36	52
Rest Areas	67	57	61	66	74	67
Overall Appearance in the Landscape	84	70	80	89	86	74
Environmental Impacts	66	52	68	68	67	63

Table 2b Features — Not Satisfied by Overall Rating of State Highways

Features – Not Satisfied	Overall Rating of State Highways					
	Total	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Total	1509	107	227	630	472	69
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Safety Design & Features	39	59	54	44	24	17
Quality of the Surface & Smoothness	34	55	53	36	18	20
Road Markings	10	19	15	9	5	11
Road Signs	15	16	21	13	14	17
Reducing Congestion, Improving Traffic Flows	63	78	74	64	56	40
Rest Areas	22	31	25	23	19	19
Overall Appearance in the Landscape	12	23	17	9	11	22
Environmental Impacts	30	39	26	29	30	31

However when overall satisfaction with the state highway system was examined by priorities for expenditure, the links between safety, congestion and surface quality, and overall satisfaction, were not so clear((Tables 3a and 3b).

- In total, 36% of road users chose “improve traffic flow/congestion” as the main priority for expenditure. Of those who rated the state highway system overall as excellent, 46% chose “improve traffic flow/congestion” as their first priority for expenditure.

- In total, 44% of road users chose “improve safety on the road” as their main priority — but if they had rated the state highway system as “excellent” they were less likely to choose safety as a priority (37%).
- Improve “smoothness and straightness” was chosen as a first priority for expenditure by 14% in total, but by 22% of those rating the state highway system overall as poor.

Table 3a Expenditure State Highways — Most Important by Overall Rating of State Highways

Expenditure State Highways - Most Important	Total	Overall Rating of State Highways				
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Total	1509	107	227	630	472	69
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Improve the safety of the road	44	32	41	44	50	37
Improve traffic flow and reduce congestion	36	39	35	38	31	46
Improve smoothness/straightness	14	22	18	14	11	10
Reduce impact on environment	3	3	3	2	5	2
Something else more important	1	1	1	0	1	4

Table 3b Expenditure State Highways — Important at all by Overall Rating of State Highways

Expenditure State Highways - Important at all	Total	Overall Rating of State Highways				
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Total	1509	107	227	630	472	69
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Improve the safety of the road	72	64	70	73	75	72
Improve traffic flow and reduce congestion	65	68	65	69	58	65
Improve smoothness/straightness	36	46	39	33	37	33
Reduce impact on environment	20	15	17	22	21	22
Something else more important	2	2	1	2	3	5
More/ improved passing lanes	1	0	2	1	1	1

Transit's Performance

The two sets of tables, 2a and b, and 3a and b, on features and priorities, show that the three factors of safety, congestion and surface quality were clearly all linked to overall satisfaction, whereas environment, appearance, signs, rest areas and (to some extent) markings were not significant in forming overall satisfaction (or dissatisfaction).

Table 4a *Transit's performance on maintenance and development*

	Needs A lot of Imprvt/ Poor	Needs Some Imprvt/ Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SH Overall	7	15	42	31	5
Maintenance	8	21	44	23	3
Development	12	19	42	17	3

- The rating (for the state highways overall) was higher than when Transit was named and two specific aspects were asked about, ie satisfaction with the state highway system overall, was higher than Transit's perceived performance on the two measures taken in the survey for comparison.
- "Maintaining existing state highways" thus rated a little below the overall rating and "developing new highways and motorways" rated a little lower still, with some being unable to rate on this aspect.
- 70% gave a positive rating on maintenance, and 62% for development of state highways.
- 26% of users rated Transit as very good (or in some cases excellent) for maintenance, and 20% for developing and designing new state highways. The majority gave a "good" rating for each. Approximately 20% said "a little improvement" was needed and the remaining around 10% that "a lot of improvement" was needed.
- Auckland, Hamilton, Christchurch and Dunedin residents tended to give more favourable ratings on maintenance, Northland less favourable, with fewer than 50% satisfied.
- Hamilton, Napier and Dunedin residents tended to give more favourable ratings for Transit's developing and designing of new highways and motorways, Wellington less favourable ratings, with fewer than 50% satisfied (see Table 4b).
- Dissatisfaction was only above 40% in Wellington for Transit's performance in developing new highways, and in Northland for maintenance.

(Note: Results split out for Auckland/Northland and Wellington/Marlborough, because the regional grouping would have masked two very different responses for each of these Transit regions.)

Table 4b Regional Rating — Satisfied by Transit NZ Regions

Regional Rating – Satisfied	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Auckland	Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Wellington	Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	(444)	(89)	232	76	124	223	(171)	(52)	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maintenance on the existing state highways	70	68	(73)	(39)	75	70	69	66	(67)	(63)	75	74
Developing and designing new highways and motorways	62	60	(61)	(57)	69	68	61	52	(48)	(65)	63	72

Table 4c Regional Rating — Not Satisfied by Transit NZ Regions

Regional Rating – Not Satisfied	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Auckland	Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Wellington	Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	(444)	(89)	232	76	124	223	(171)	(52)	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maintenance on the existing state highways	28	30	(24)	(60)	25	29	30	33	(32)	(37)	24	25
Developing and designing new highways and motorways	31	34	(33)	(40)	29	22	27	41	(43)	(33)	27	21

Table 5a Rating of the State Highways now compared with 2 years ago

	%
A lot better	18
A little better	40
No different	27
A little worse	7
A lot worse	6
DK	2

- Nearly 60% noted improvement, rating the state highways “a little better” or “a lot better” than 2 years ago. Most of the remainder, nearly 30%, rated them as “no different”. Few thought the highways worse.
- This confirms the importance of surveying not just an overall rating (which has changed little since 1998) but also a direct comparison measure. This question used in 2003, indicates where — and how much — road user expectations have increased. The minority who did rate the state highways worse were mainly in Auckland/Northland.
- At least 50% in all regions rated the state highways as better than 2 years ago.
- There were marked regional variations. Dunedin and Hamilton, at over 70%, had the most road users thinking the state highways were better (see Table 5b).
- Wellington and Christchurch road users were more likely to choose “no different” than were those in other regions.

Table 5b Rating compared with 2 years ago

	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total better	58	50	74	56	58	55	58	70
Total worse	13	22	8	12	11	7	5	10

(Note: “no different” rating is not included in this table)

Priorities

Road users were asked their priorities for expenditure (figures add to 100%/200% down the columns)

Table 6a

	Total Most Important	Auckland Most Important	Total Important First or Second
	%	%	%
Improving the safety of the road	44	37	72
Improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion	36	48	65
Improving the smoothness of the surface and the straightness and comfort of the ride	14	9	36
Reducing the impact on the environment and improving the appearance in the landscape	3	3	20
Something else	1	3	2

- In total, safety was the top priority. However, there were marked regional variations in priorities for expenditure. In Auckland/Northland, the first choice was “improving traffic flow/congestion”. In all other regions “improving safety” was chosen first more often, with congestion the second highest priority.
- More Napier, Wanganui and Dunedin residents chose “improve smoothness, straightness etc” as the priority than did other regions.
- This pattern of regional variations for first choice for expenditure was also evident when first or second choices were combined.
- 3 out of 4 Auckland/Northland residents chose congestion first or second (more than chose safety), whereas only 2 out of 4 in all other areas except Wellington and Christchurch chose congestion.
- Safety was most frequent first or second choice in all areas except Auckland where congestion dominated.
- “Reducing the impact on the environment” was less important in Wellington and Dunedin.
- When priorities for expenditure (first and second) were analysed against road users’ ratings of the state highways compared with 2 years ago, it was apparent that fewer road users who saw “improve traffic flow/congestion” as a priority, were rating the state highways “a lot better than 2 years ago”.
- Safety, closely followed by congestion, were the two clear priority areas for expenditure. There were also a number of indicators that road users believed safety was already being addressed.
- Those who chose “safety” as their first or second priority, were more likely to rate the state highways “a lot better” than 2 years ago and less likely to rate them as “worse” than were those who chose other priorities. Those who chose “safety” as their first priority were less likely to rate as “poor” and more likely to rate as “very good” the state highways overall.

Table 6b Expenditure State Highways — Most Important by Transit NZ Regions

Expenditure State Highways - Most Important	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	232	76	124	223	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Improving the safety of the road	44	37	52	50	42	47	48	48
Improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion	36	48	27	23	29	34	31	24
Improving the smoothness of the surface and the straightness and comfort of the ride	14	9	15	20	25	12	15	24
Reducing the impact on the environment and improving the appearance in the landscape	3	3	3	3	2	4	5	1
Something else more important	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0

Table 6c Expenditure State Highways — Important first or second by Transit NZ Regions

Expenditure State Highways - Important at all	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	232	76	124	223	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Improving the safety of the road	72	70	73	71	74	75	72	75
Improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion	65	76	49	54	56	70	64	53
Improving the smoothness of the surface and the straightness and comfort of the ride	36	23	52	43	48	32	38	54
Reducing the impact on the environment and improving the appearance in the landscape	20	24	20	21	19	14	23	12
Something else more important	2	2	3	3	0	3	2	2

Satisfaction with aspects/features of state highways

- Satisfaction was very high at over 80% for road markings, signs and appearance in landscape. Road markings achieved over 90% satisfaction in all areas except Auckland, Wellington and Marlborough.
- A majority were satisfied with rest areas, surface quality and safety design.
- “Reducing congestion and improving traffic flows” stood out as the aspect where a minority of 31% of road users were satisfied, although in one area, Dunedin, a majority of road users were satisfied.
- 26% rated reducing congestion as needing “a lot of improvement”.
- For all other features and design aspects, a majority of road users gave a favourable rating, although for safety design and features there was a significant minority of nearly 40% seeking improvement.

Table 7a

Rating of Features %	Needs a lot of imprvt	Needs some imprvt	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Road markings	2	8	43	36	12
Appearance in the landscape	3	10	52	28	5
Road signs	2	13	45	32	8
Rest and picnic areas	5	17	45	19	4
Environmental impacts	5	24	48	16	2
Quality of surface and smoothness	9	25	48	16	2
Safety design and features	9	30	41	17	2
Reducing congestion and improving traffic flows	26	37	25	5	1

- When regional segments were analysed there were significant differences.
- Auckland and Northland were less satisfied with managing congestion. Napier, Wanganui Christchurch and Dunedin were more satisfied.
- Wellington road users were less satisfied with appearance in the landscape. Dunedin was more satisfied.
- Hamilton and Wanganui were more satisfied with safety design and features. Marlborough less satisfied.

These results can be used to help prioritise expenditure regionally (see Tables 7b and 7c).

Table 7b Features — Satisfied by Transit NZ Regions

Features Satisfied	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Auckland	Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Wellington	Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	(444)	(89)	232	76	124	223	(171)	(52)	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Safety design and features	60	54	(55)	(50)	70	62	70	53	(56)	(44)	68	62
Quality of surface and smoothness	66	67	(70)	(51)	64	60	59	66	(68)	(58)	73	67
Road markings	90	87	(86)	(92)	94	95	94	86	(86)	(88)	94	92
Road signs	85	82	(82)	(83)	85	91	87	84	(84)	(86)	83	92
Reducing congestion and improving traffic flows	31	22	(23)	(17)	27	40	43	29	(25)	(42)	41	56
Rest and picnic areas	67	62	(62)	(64)	69	71	73	69	(66)	(80)	72	65
Appearance in the landscape	84	88	(87)	(90)	79	81	84	77	(77)	(77)	87	92
Environmental impacts	66	70	(68)	(79)	57	60	63	66	(66)	(65)	72	70

Table 7c Features — Not Satisfied by Transit NZ Regions

Features – Not Satisfied	Total	Auckland/ Northland	Auckland	Northland	Hamilton	Napier	Wanganui	Wellington/ Marlborough	Wellington	Marlborough	Christchurch	Dunedin
Total	1509	533	(444)	(89)	232	76	124	223	(171)	(52)	207	113
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Safety design and features	39	45	(44)	(50)	30	38	30	47	(44)	(56)	32	38
Quality of surface and smoothness	34	33	(30)	(49)	36	40	40	34	(31)	(42)	27	33
Road markings	10	13	(14)	(8)	6	5	6	13	(13)	(12)	6	8
Road signs	15	17	(18)	(17)	15	9	13	15	(15)	(14)	17	8
Reducing congestion and improving traffic flows	63	74	(73)	(80)	69	54	51	64	(70)	(42)	51	33
Rest and picnic areas	22	24	(24)	(26)	21	20	17	23	(25)	(17)	21	24
Appearance in the landscape	12	8	(8)	(8)	19	17	12	17	(16)	(22)	10	7
Environmental impacts	30	26	(27)	(20)	42	35	35	28	(30)	(23)	26	25

Knowledge of Transit

- Respondents were asked to name the organisation responsible for developing, designing, managing and maintaining the state highways in New Zealand.

Table 8a

	%
Don't know	48
Transit	37
LTSA	7
Other	8

- Fewer than half of road users were able to name Transit.
- Northland was the only region where more than half named Transit — the recent establishment of the office may have created publicity/awareness. Knowledge was lower in Marlborough.
- “Other” organisations named (incorrectly) included 1% each for Ministry of Transport, National Roads Board, Ministry of Works and Fulton Hogan.
- Road users who named Transit tended to rate the state highways overall less favourably than road users who did not know who was responsible for the state highway. This could indicate the Transit name has negative connotations, or simply that as with more frequent/commercial road users, expectations are higher and hence a positive rating is more difficult to achieve.

Table 8b

	Overall rating of state highways				
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Named Transit	6	17	47	25	3
Don't know	8	12	37	38	5

Information — Importance and Performance

- 70% of road users rated getting information about conditions and closures and new state highway projects as very important or important.
- 76% of road users rated Transit as good or adequate at providing this information.
- The rating was more positive for conditions and closures than for “keeping road users in your community involved and informed about proposals for improvements” — with 27% rating Transit “poor” in this latter area.
- All regions rated Transit similarly well for information on conditions and closures.

- Involving communities in proposals for improvements was an aspect where opinions were divided, with as many giving a “poor” rating as “good”.
- There were regional variations on ratings for “keeping road users in your community involved and informed about proposals for improvements”. Wanganui residents gave a significantly higher “poor” rating (1 in 3 road users) for involving the community in proposals for improvements. This could reflect adverse publicity last year re a Transit survey.
- Hamilton residents were less likely to rate information on conditions and closures as important.

Table 8c

	Not at all Important	Not Very Important	Important	Very Important
How important is information on conditions and closures?	4	25	34	36
Rating Transit for:		Poor	Adequate	Good
Making available information for road users on conditions and closures		18	40	36
Keeping road users involved and informed about proposals for improvements to the state highways		27	40	27
Contact with Transit during the last year	%		Contact helpful	%
Phone	3		Helpful	6
Public meeting	1		Not helpful	2
Direct	2		Other	1
Other	1			
Mail	1			
No contact	92			

- Only 8% of road users had had contact with Transit in the last year, this was mainly by phone or direct, and was mainly rated as “helpful”. Contact varied only in Christchurch where phone contact was lower.
- Commercial drivers were more likely to have contact (11% versus 7% ordinary road users) and to have phone contact (7% versus 2%).
- Those who rated the state highways overall as “excellent” were more likely to rate information on conditions and closures as “very important”, and less likely to rate it as “not very important”.
- Those who gave a “poor” rating overall were more likely to rate information as “very important”.
- Those who gave poor and fair ratings overall, were more likely to rate information as “very important”. Those who gave poor and fair ratings overall, were more likely to rate the availability of information as poor, less likely to rate it as “good”.
- Availability and quality of information is thus significant to satisfaction with Transit.

Factors influencing performance ratings (see tables and graphs in appendix)

- Cross analysis of the answers from one question with the answers to other questions, revealed key factors in improving performance.
- The “poor” raters — ie road users who rated the state highways overall as “poor”, were not seeking expenditure on a single factor.
- Of road users who gave an overall rating of “poor” for the state highways, a third chose “improve safety” as their priority for expenditure, and a little over a third chose “improve traffic congestion”. The remainder wanted “improve smoothness/straightness etc”, a higher proportion choosing this latter as a priority than for those giving better ratings to the state highways overall.
- Improving smoothness/straightness was important in raising overall rating of performance. Road users prioritising expenditure on this were less likely to give a “very good” rating and more likely to give a “poor” rating overall.
- Road users who chose “improve smoothness/straightness” as top priority, were more likely to rate the state highways now as “a lot better” than 2 years ago, than were road users who chose other priorities for expenditure. This could have been because they felt other priorities — safety and congestion — had already improved.
- Road users who rated the roads “a lot better” than 2 years ago were less likely to choose congestion as first or second priority, and more likely to choose “improving safety” (8 out of 10 chose this).
- Road users who rated the state highways “a little worse” or “a lot worse” were less likely to choose “improve safety” as a first or second priority for expenditure.
- Road users who rated the state highways overall as “very good” were less likely to choose “improve traffic congestion” as a first or second priority.
- When ratings for each of the features and design questions were cross analysed with overall ratings, safety and congestion were the most significant relationships ie the higher the rating for these aspects, the higher the overall rating of the state highways.
- Road markings and surface quality were also important to overall performance.
- Rest areas, signs and the impact on the environment did not appear to be important in shaping the overall performance rating.
- Results for the effect on overall performance of ratings of “appearance in the landscape” were ambiguous with both those who rated overall as “poor”, and those who rated as “excellent” being less likely to be satisfied with the appearance in the landscape that were middle raters.

Transit State Highway User Survey

Good _____ my name is _____ from
 We are surveying people's experiences and opinions of driving on the State highways in New Zealand.

Does anyone in this household drive a commercial vehicle such as a truck or taxi? Yes/No
If No: Are you the **main** person in the household who drives on the State highway? Yes/No

May I speak with that person please?
 What is a suitable time to call back? _____

(Repeat introduction) **Details of commercial vehicle:** _____

By "State highways" what we mean are the main roads between towns and cities, including motorways, but not local roads such as residential streets and rural roads. State highways all have a number, like State highway 1 or 2.

1. Thinking about the State highways with which you are most familiar. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent, how would you rate the 'State highways' in New Zealand?

(Read out) (Circle)	Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	(Don't read out) D/k/Refused 9
--------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--

2. In deciding what to spend the money for State highways on, which of these do you think is the most important?

(Read all and Rotate)	1st	2nd
And the next most important? (Repeat list)		
(Read out)		
improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion	1	1
improving the smoothness of the surface and the straightness and the comfort of the ride	2	2
reducing the impact on the environment and improving the appearance in the landscape	3	3
improving the safety of the road	4	4
Or is something else more important to you (write in)	5	5

3(a) And how would you rate the State highways now compared to 2 years ago?

	(a)	(b)	(c)
(Read out)	SH	1st priority	2nd priority
A lot better	1	1	1
A little better	2	2	2
No different	3	3	3
A little worse	4	4	4
A lot worse	5	5	5
(Do not read out) Don't know/Refused	9	9	9
(if '4' or '5') Why is that? _____			

(b) And for your most important priority for spending money, that is _____ *(chosen 1st in Q2)*
 how would you rate this now compared with 2 years ago? *(repeat scale)*

(c) And for your 2nd priority, that is (2nd in Q2) how would you rate this compared with 2 years ago?
(repeat scale)

4. Rating the features and design of State highways which you travel on, as either excellent, very good, good, needs some improvement, needs a lot of improvement.

(a) Thinking firstly about the safety design and features of the State highways, such as the design of the bends and the provision of guard rails and other safety features, how would you rate these?

(Read out)	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Needs some imprvt	Needs a lot of imprvt	(Don't read out) D/k/Refused
(Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(b) And the quality of the surface and smoothness of the State highways. How would you rate these?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(c) And the road markings on State highways, such as painted lines, cats eyes, and reflection marker posts, how would you rate these?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(d) And the road signs on State highways, such as warning and direction signs, how would you rate these?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(e) And thinking about reducing congestion and improving traffic flows, how would you rate the management of this?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(f) And the rest and picnic areas at the roadside on the State highways, how would you rate these?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(g) Thinking about the overall appearance of State highways in the landscape, how would you rate the management of this?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

(h) Thinking about the environmental impacts of State highways, such as noise, pollution, rubbish, how would you rate the management of these impacts?

(Read out) (Circle)	5	4	3	2	1	9
----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(if '2' or '1') What needs to be done to improve your rating? _____

- 5(a) Do you know the name of the organisation that is responsible for developing, designing, managing and maintaining the State highways in New Zealand?

Transit (NZ)	1
Transfund	2
Other (write in)	3
No, D/K	9

The organisation responsible for developing, designing, managing and maintaining the State highways in New Zealand is Transit New Zealand.

In your regional area, that is the area covered by your telephone directory, overall, how would you rate Transit for

- (b) doing its job of maintenance on the existing State highways?
 (c) developing and designing new State highways and motorways?

<i>(Read out)</i>	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Needs some imprvt	Needs a lot of imprvt	<i>(Don't read out)</i> D/k/Refused
<i>(Circle) (b)</i>	5	4	3	2	1	9
<i>(Circle) (c)</i>	5	4	3	2	1	9

- 6(a) Thinking now about information about State highways. How important is it to you to get the information you need on conditions and closures and new State highway projects

Very Important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important	<i>(Don't read out)</i> D/k/Refused
4	3	2	1	9

- (b) How would you rate Transit for making available information to road users about highway conditions and closures?

Good	Adequate	Poor	<i>(Don't read out)</i> D/k/Refused
3	2	1	9

- (c) How would you rate Transit for keeping road users in your community involved and informed about proposals for improvements to the State highways?

Good	Adequate	Poor	<i>(Don't read out)</i> D/k/Refused
3	2	1	9

- (d) Have you yourself had any contact with Transit, during the last year, such as by phone or in a public meeting or direct contact?

_____	Phone	1
_____	Public Meeting	2
_____	Direct	3
_____	Other	4
_____	No contact	9

(write in)

'if yes' Did you find that contact helpful or not helpful

Helpful	1
Not helpful	2
Other	3

Why was that? _____

Now I just need to ask some questions so we can group the answers for different types of people.

			Age Groups				
Male	1	<i>(read out)</i>	Under 24	25 - 39	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+
Female	2		1	2	3	4	5

And the region you are in, from your telephone directory is? (*Circle*)

Northland	1	Auckland	2	Waikato	3
Bay of Plenty	4	Gisborne	5	Hawke's Bay	6
Taranaki	7	Wanganui	8	Manawatu	9
Wairarapa	10	Wellington	11	Nelson & Bays	12
Marlborough	13	West Coast	14	Christchurch	15
Timaru/Oamaru	16	Otago	17	Southland	18

How many vehicle drivers are there in your household? Including yourself?

(*Circle*) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0+(write in) _____

Could you please tell me about how many kilometres you drive a year in total on all roads?

(*Read out*)

Under 5,000k a year that is under 100k a week or about \$10 petrol a week? 1

Over 5,000k a year but less than 10,000 (that is up to 200k a week or \$20 petrol) 2

Over 10,000k a year that is over 200k a week and would spend more than \$20 a week on petrol 3

(*Don't read out*) Don't know/ Refused 9

And lastly,

How often do you use the State highways as:

	At least once a week	At least once a month	Less frequently	Never
Driver of a private car?	1	2	3	4
Driver of a company car?	1	2	3	4
Passenger in a private or company car?	1	2	3	4
Do you use it as:				
Pedestrian?	1	2	3	4
Cyclist?	1	2	3	4
Motor cyclist?	1	2	3	4
Passenger in a bus or commercial van?	1	2	3	4
<i>If commercial driver only.</i>				
Commercial car, van or taxi driver?	1	2	3	4
Commercial truck driver?	1	2	3	4

Thank you, and may I have a name should my Supervisor need to check back?
