

Workshop Summary

Census 2000 Applications: What Worked And What Didn't Work

Facilitators:

**Robert Griffiths, Thomas Kane, William
Bannister, Mary Tischer, And Eric Pihl**

General Statements

Travel Is Complicated—And Becoming More So!

- * The Direct Home To Work Trip Is A Small Part Of A Big Picture**
- * Changing Trip Chaining Patterns**
- * Changing Nature Of The Work Force--Part-Time, Full-Time, Multiple-Job, Unemployed, Variable Workplaces**
- * Household Interactions**
- * Sandwich Generation (Children And Elderly Parents)**

Transportation Planning Needs Are Also Getting More Complex

- * Environmental (Social Justice) Issues**
- * Access To Jobs Programs**
- * Unfunded Mandates For Good, Objective Planning**

Good Things About Current Census Products

TAZs For Small Area Analysis

- * MPOs Actively Participated In Developing Boundaries That Made Sense To Them**
- * State And County Codes On TAZ Records Permit Easier Control Total Checks**

The American Fact Finder Is Great

- * Easy, On-Line Access**

Provision Of SAS Code

- * Made Tabulations Easy To Do**
- * Heightened The Ability To Quickly Use Data**

More Good Things

Workplace Geocoding

- * Census 2000 Much Better Than Census 1990
- * The “Big Lumps” Of Workers Seem To Be In The Right Places

Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis

- * Part 1 = To Identify Areas With A High Percentage Of Disadvantaged Population
- * Part 2 = To Find Low-Income Jobs

Travel Time Data For Accessibility Measures

Even More Good Things

Active Participation By AASHTO/Other Agencies With Development Of Census Tables

PUMS Data Is Very Useful

- * Identification/Correction Of Non-Response Biases In Surveys**
- * Survey Expansion**
- * Frequently Used As A Seed Matrix For Population Synthesis**

Current Population Survey (CPS) Looks Good

- * Represents The “Gold Standard”**
- * Documents Changes Over Time**

**Areas Of Concern About
Current Census Products
And
What To Do About It**

Or:

Problems--And Ideas For Resolution

Problems/Ideas #1

Problem: Timeliness Of Census Data Delivery

- * **Too Old For Fast-Growing Areas**
- * **Too Old For “Rust Belt” Areas Losing Population**

Ideas For Resolution:

- * **The Continuous Nature Of The American Community Survey (ACS) Holds A Great Promise For The End User**

Problems/Ideas #2

Problem: Disclosure/Rounding Issues

- * Usefulness Of TAZ-To-TAZ Part 3 Data Is Severely Hampered (Except For Total Flow By 8 Means Of Transportation)**
- * Especially Critical For Minor Modes (Walk, Bike, etc.)**
- * The Completeness Of An EJ Analysis Can Be Compromised**
- * TAZs Were Defined Before Suppression Limitations Were Fully Understood**

Problems/Ideas #2 (Cont.)

Ideas For Resolution:

- * Surely Better Ways Can Be Found To Protect Confidentiality, Without Compromising Transportation Planning Needs**
- * Very Important To Bring Statistical Agencies And Data Users Together**
- * Clear Understanding Of Who Is Being Protected Are Needed**
- * TAZs May Need To Be Re-Defined To Control Suppression**
- * Maybe More One-Way Tables Should Be Requested**
- * Data Synthesis Efforts To Get Things To “Add Up”**

Problems/Ideas #3

Problem: Suspected Census 2000 Worker Undercounts

Ideas For Resolution:

- * Some Comfort From End Users Just To Know “They Are Not Alone” In Having Concerns With Census-Based Worker Accuracy**
- * Part 2 Counts Of Workers Could Have Been Checked By Local Jurisdictions**
- * CPS Is The Gold Standard, So CTPP 2000 Could Be Adjusted To Better Compare With CPS**
- * LEHD May Help Validate ACS Employment Numbers**

Problems/Ideas #4

Problem: Neither CTPP Or ACS Have Full Coverage Of Travel Behaviors

- * **Number Of Workers And Trips By Location Are Needed**
- * **Too Much Expectation On Use Of Census Data To Solve All Transportation Planning Needs**
- * **New Kinds Of Data Needed, That Were Not Needed Before**

Problems/Ideas #4 (Cont.)

Ideas For Resolution:

- * Creative Quilting = Must Be More Creative With Use Of Multiple Data Sources**
- * Household Travel Surveys Contain The Cutting Edge Information**
- * ACS and NPTS Should Be Officially Viewed As Two Parts Of The Travel Story--We Cannot Focus On Just “Long Form” Data**
- * A Consistent “Institutionalized” Methodology Is Needed For Combining Disparate Datasets—Can’t Be Left To Each Planner To Figure Out On Their Own**
- * Alternative Resources Must Continue To Be Researched**

Additional Data Sources (1)

Travel Surveys (Local and NHTS/NPTS)

American Time Use Survey

Travel Time Studies

Transit Ridership Counts

Pedestrian Counts

Address Updates From U.S. Postal Service And 911

County Parcel And Land Use Data

Major Activity Center Data

Building Permit Data

School Enrollment Data

Additional Data Sources (2)

Commercially-Available Data:

- * Business Establishment Data
- * Rectified Roadway Networks (e.g. NavTek)
- * Satellite Imagery
- * Reebie Freight Flow Data
- * Telecommuting Info From Firms Who Track Computer Usage

ES-202 Data

Travel Model Output

Odds And Ends (1)

Corrections Made To The 100% Census Count Were Not Made To The CTPP

Transit Trips Are Typically Under-Represented Due To Journey-To-Work Question Format

- * Usual Means Of Transportation**
- * Primary Means Of Transportation**

Some MPOs Have Better Address Data Incorporated Into TIGER

No Good Way To Calculate Standard Errors On Flow Data

Odds And Ends (2)

No Seasonal Data Available From CTPP--ACS “Could” Be A Good Source

Uncertainties About Whether The Hispanic Questions Were Properly Understood

Getting Access To Census Microdata For Research Is Very Difficult

Some Shared Responsibilities By U.S. Census Bureau And DOT May Help Make Census Products More Useful And Understandable

MPOs Need To Work More Closely With Data Centers On Training Needs And Future PUMA Definitions