

Private-Sector Applications in Planning and Marketing

Rube Diamond, *chairman*

Participants: P. Becker, R. Dunphy, L. Hammel, L. Bontempo, G. Hall,
M. Altman, and R. Schmitt.

A disparate group of users and producers of data came together in this workshop. It was immediately noted that the cited workshop title was probably too constraining. Some saw the need for direct focus on problems related to marketing transportation-related data from the census [i.e., the journey-to-work tabulations and the Urban Transportation Planning Package (UTPP)]; others identified the need to center on private-sector applications; and still others were concerned about nontransportation uses in the broadest sense.

There evolved an understanding that the appropriate role for the group was to consider all nontraditional uses of the data (as opposed to those of the five other workshops) and in that scope of concern to focus on actions needed to expand the use and utility of the data for both public and private applications.

At the beginning the discussion centered around the concerns regarding nonreported or uncodable place-of-work data within the central business district (CBD). The question of definition of CBD was discussed. The following concerns regarding the 1980 census were expressed:

1. Nonreported or uncodable place-of-work data should be allocated in all census products in addition to the UTPP and the number of workers who are allocated rather than "not reported" should be reported.
2. No public product provides detailed characteristics of workers by place of work for small areas. A subset of this issue is that the UTPP, Part III, did not include such tabulations as household income, age, and so on.
3. There was a vigorous discussion about the data dealing with the handicapped. A consensus was reached that the 1980 census did not provide adequate information related to the type of disability by age, sex, race, and mode of travel.
4. Agreement was reached regarding the lack of an information and education program pointing up the utility of UTPP data to meet private-sector interests and demonstrating how to integrate the UTPP with other census and local data.
5. There was concern about a lack of specificity with origin and destination information. Origin and destination data could be improved for user needs by having the respondent answer a question on the beginning and ending times of a work trip for a specific day, e.g., Thursday, March 29, 1990.
6. There appeared to be a lack of data from the 1980 census identifying mode of travel of the secondary part of a trip, for example, by car to a kiss-and-ride area and then continuing on to work by commuter train or light rail.
7. The 1980 census did not adequately reflect the demographic characteristics of people who remain at home to work and thus perhaps travel one day a week to the main office.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Questionnaire Content

Classification of modes does not need to be revised, but all modes should be reported for the journey to work and the question needs some rewording. The present question about travel time to work can be retained or superseded by obtaining work departure and arrival time. Nonwork transit trip information was determined to be not necessary. Questions H28 and H29 should be combined, obtaining separate ownership levels for automobiles, vans, and trucks.

Procedures and Sample Size

In the collection of data, a specific day and time should be used and the question should refer to the usual place of work. The number of stages in which the census was conducted was not thought to be as important as that the data be reliable and timely. It was believed that the use of follow-on surveys was not to be depended on, but if there was such surveys, they should consider collecting information in more depth on the handicapped, multiple-job workers, and working students.

Geographic Coding

For private-sector use, workplace data should be collected to block and block-group levels. Greater use of local resources to help in geocoding was advocated. Coding should be to the lowest geographic level available. Nonreported or uncodable place-of-work data should be allocated in all census products in addition to the UTPP, and the number of workers who are allocated rather than "not reported" should be specified. Data collected by commutershed (contiguous Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in which the flow of workers extends from one to the other) should be recognized at whatever geographic level is appropriate.

Data Products

There should be a tight definition of what constitutes a reasonable time lapse between collection of the data and product delivery. Improved products in all media are needed and integration with other products needs careful study. The Census Bureau needs a rapid response system for special tabulations. Many portions of the UTPP should become standard census tabulations, for instance, allocations of place of work, machine-readable place-of-work geography, and STF 4W tabulations by place of work.