

1  
2  
3 **Disclosure and Utility of Census Journey-to-Work Flow data from the American**  
4 **Community Survey - Finding the Right Balance**  
5

6  
7 Ed Christopher  
8 FHWA Resource Center  
9 19900 Governors Drive  
10 Olympia Fields, Illinois 60461  
11 708-283-3501 (fax)  
12 708-574-8131 (cell)  
13 708-283-3534  
14 edc@edthefed.com

15  
16 Nandu Srinivasan  
17 Cambridge Systematics Inc.  
18 FHWA, HPPI (Room 3306)  
19 400 7th Street SW  
20 Washington DC 20590  
21 202-366-7742 (fax)  
22 202-366-5021  
23 nanda.srinivasan@fhwa.dot.gov

24 The rounding and threshold rules set by the Census Bureau severely impacted the  
25 utility of several journey to work tables for CTPP 2000. In fact, several tables had to be  
26 eliminated from the original data request. Although not yet known, the specific  
27 disclosure rules for the American Community Survey (ACS) look like they will be similar  
28 to those used for CTPP 2000 if not stricter.  
29

30 Using data from CTPP 2000 and three-year accumulated ACS test site data prepared  
31 for NCHRP 8-48 (available from US DOT), we will examine the potential effect of the  
32 current CTPP disclosure rules on the ACS data. Specifically, we will compare  
33 commuter flows from CTPP 2000 with and without threshold suppression to ACS test  
34 data with and without suppression across several geographies. It should be noted that  
35 several of the counties in the ACS 3-year test data were sampled at rates that  
36 approximate the same number of observations that would be available from  
37 accumulating 5 years "true" ACS data. The results of this effort will help illuminate the  
38 discussion about the appropriate level of geography for commuter flow data.  
39

40 In addition, we will use the 1990 CTPP along with CTPP 2000 to examine the effects of  
41 rounding specifically the decision to round values between 1 and 8 to 4. Several  
42 individuals have hypothesized that this decision by the Census Bureau Disclosure  
43 Review Board has lead to consistent undercounting of certain commuter groupings. In  
44 doing this analysis we will show what the optimum rounded values could be while  
45 reducing any systematic bias and still protecting the Census Bureau's concern for  
46 confidentiality of the data.  
47

48 Three test sites will be examined.  
49  
50  
51  
52

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52